

LANGUAGE ATTITUDES AND CODE-SWITCHING
BEHAVIOUR OF FACILITATORS AND LEARNERS IN
LANGUAGE, LITERACY AND COMMUNICATION SENIOR
PHASE OUTCOMES-BASED EDUCATION CLASSROOMS

by

Visvaganthie Moodley

THESIS

Submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Linguistics

in the

Faculty of Human Sciences

at the

University of Natal, Durban, South Africa.

PROMOTER : PROF. N. M. KAMWANGAMALU

SEPTEMBER, 2003

BRN 438707

HC 05 / 03730



T 401.9

DECLARATION

I, Visvaganthie Moodley, declare that this work:

**LANGUAGE ATTITUDES AND CODE-SWITCHING
BEHAVIOUR OF FACILITATORS AND LEARNERS IN
LANGUAGE, LITERACY AND COMMUNICATION SENIOR
PHASE OUTCOMES-BASED EDUCATION CLASSROOMS**

is my own. I have acknowledged the sources used in this study in the references. This work has not been submitted before for any other degree or examination in any other university.


.....

V. MOODLEY

September, 2003

Durban.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I extend my sincere gratitude to the following persons for their assistance and support during the period of my study for this thesis:

- **Prof. N. M. Kamwangamalu**, my supervisor, for his patience, encouragement, faith in my abilities, wealth of information and constructive criticism. It has been a privilege and honour to have been guided through my study in the field of code-switching and in the area of publishing by this honourable academic who, though no longer a faculty member at the University of Natal, agreed to supervise my thesis from abroad at his new post at Howard University.
- My husband **Kenneth**, for his love, patience, support, and sacrifices made, and invaluable computer skills.
- My daughters, **Kathryn Rae** and **Alanta Keanne**, for their unlimited patience, immeasurable love, faith in my abilities, encouragement and support, and for listening to my various thinkings throughout the study.
- My mother, **Kanniamma Govender**, for her unwavering faith, prayers and support throughout my years of study.
- The **principal educator participants** of this research, the **principal, staff, learners** and **SGB members** of each of the three schools of this study, and the **subject advisors** of the Port Shepstone Region (whose identity for ethical reasons are withheld) for their invaluable time, assistance and input.
- **Logarane Rugdeo** and **Saleem Vallee** for transcribing and translating the lessons from Afrikaans to English, **Thandeka Mbhele** for transcribing and translating the lessons from Zulu to English, and **Rhodina Dhoopraj** for helping me transcribe and verify some of the tapes.
- **Paul Sadapal** for liaising between one of the principal participants and myself.
- My friends **Andy Saywerth**, **Ranee Govender**, **Lali Naidoo** and **Nirendhri Yengopal** for their constant encouragement, support and for showing a keen interest in my work.
- My family, **Roland Govender**, **Rajes Frank**, **Robert Frank** and **Saroj Naicker** for their love, support and assistance.
- **All those whose names I have not mentioned** but have, in some way, helped me towards the completion of this thesis.

DEDICATION

TO

My husband, **Kenneth Steven**,

and daughters, **Kathryn Rae** and **Alanta Keanne**,

for their unwavering faith in me and constant support throughout my years of study.

ABSTRACT

This thesis has a dual focus viz. language attitudes and code-switching behaviour of facilitators and learners in the Key Learning Area of Language, Literacy and Communication (LLC), in the senior phase (more specifically Grades 8 and 9), Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) classroom. The schools that form the basis of this study are an Afrikaans medium school (comprising predominantly Afrikaans native language (NL) speakers); an English medium school (comprising both English NL and Zulu NL speakers); and a school that claims to be an English medium school, but where, in reality, the language of learning and teaching (for its predominantly Zulu NL speakers) is English-Zulu CS. These schools were specifically selected because the linguistic ethos of each is distinctly different from each other and because each may be distinguished as exNED¹, exHOD² and exDET³ schools as a result of the separatist principles of the government prior to 1994.

This study, firstly, investigates the attitudes of school stake-holders viz. educators, subject advisors, parent component of the school governing body (SGB) and Grade 8 and 9 learners, toward the three principal languages i.e. English, Afrikaans and isiZulu, offered for study at KwaZulu Natal (KZN) schools, more specifically in Port Shepstone, the lower south coast of KZN. It also investigates the attitudes of the school stake-holders toward code-switching (CS). The methods I employed in collecting the data for determining attitudes toward the three

¹ Natal Education Department which controlled the “White” schools prior to 1994.

² House of Delegates which controlled the “Indian” schools prior to 1994.

³ Department of Education and Training which controlled the “Black” schools prior to 1994.

languages and CS between these languages are questionnaires and interviews. An analysis of the data reveals that, for the participants of this research: (i) English is the most prestigious and coveted language and is the preferred medium of instruction for English NL and Zulu NL speakers; (ii) Afrikaans and Zulu are both perceived as “low-languages” but are greatly valued by their respective indigenous speakers mostly because they endow them with a sense of identity; and (iii) Zulu is the preferred additional language by English NL speakers. In addition, an analysis of the data reveals that the participants have mixed attitudes toward CS: (i) a few see code-switching as a degenerative form of linguistic behaviour that hinders learning; (ii) a few perceive it positively with the view that it fulfills a variety of functions in both informal and formal domains; and (iii) most attach a neutral value to it, in that, depending on the ‘*wheres*’ and ‘*whys*’ and *how often* it is used, code-switching can either promote or hinder learning. This study shows that most of the participants of this study hold neutral views toward CS thus indicating a shift in attitudes toward this form of linguistic behaviour i.e. from mostly negative to neutral views.

Secondly, in investigating whether CS is used in the LLC English (LLCE) [L1], LLCE [L2], and LLC Afrikaans (LLCA) [L2] classrooms by means of lesson recordings, the data reveals that: (i) the facilitator of the LLCE [L1] classroom of the English medium school does not make use of CS in her classroom but that the Zulu speaking learners use CS during group-work; (ii) the facilitator and learners of LLCE [L2] of the Afrikaans medium school do not make use of CS because it is proscribed at the school; (iii) the Zulu NL facilitator and learners of LLCE [L2] make use of English-Zulu CS; and (iv) the English NL speaking facilitators and learners of LLCA [L2] use Afrikaans-English CS, and the Zulu NL speaking facilitators and learners of LLCA [L2]

use Afrikaans-English-Zulu CS as the medium of teaching and learning. This study also examines the forms and functions of English-Zulu CS, Afrikaans-English CS and Afrikaans-English-Zulu CS by bilingual and multilingual teachers and learners. An analysis of data obtained from lesson recordings reveals that the facilitators and learners engage in various forms of CS behaviour in their teaching and discussing, respectively. These forms are: intersentential switching, intrasentential switching, lexical switching and tag switching. Through an analysis of data obtained from the lesson recordings, this research also reveals that the use of CS fulfills social, psychological and pedagogical functions. Code-switching therefore claims a legitimate place as a teaching and learning agent in the LLC, senior phase, OBE classroom. As such, I argue that CS is not demonstrative of language incompetence, nor is it necessarily an interlanguage but a linguistic code that may be employed as a powerful teaching and learning resource by those who have the linguistic repertoire to do so.

Finally, I explore the implications of this research for principals, teachers and SGB members, L2 teachers and teaching, and teaching methodology. I suggest that there is a need for the education role-players to engage in consciousness raising as the language policy documents clearly accord CS official status, particularly in the OBE curriculum, and more importantly, because CS is a reality in the classroom. In addition, I suggest that by employing CS in the teaching of languages, learning is enhanced, language communicative competence is promoted, and the achievement of the specific outcomes outlined for LLC by OBE curriculum are facilitated. Furthermore, in exploring the implications for methodology, I argue that CS can be used consciously, as a technique for teaching and learning. Lastly, I suggest that if the Department of Education is committed to promoting multilingualism among its learners, then it should make the necessary financial resources available to schools.

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS AND ACRONYMS

• TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

R	researcher / interviewer
T	teacher / facilitator
P	principal
L	learner
Ls	learners
L followed by a number	line
LL	lines
/	interruption in talk
}	overlapping talk
.....	short pause
-----	long pause
...../	part of transcription has been omitted
N>R	no response from learner
<u>UNDERLINE</u>	emphasis on a word
bold	switch to Zulu
<i>italics</i>	switch to Afrikaans
<i>bold italics</i>	switch to English

ACRONYMS

A	Afrikaans
CLT	Communicative Language Teaching
C2005	Curriculum 2005
DET	Department of Education and Training
DOE	Department of Education
E	English
HOD	House of Delegates
KLA	Key Learning Area
A & C	Arts and Culture
EMS	Economics and Management Science
HSS	Human and Social Sciences
LLC	Language, Literacy and Communication
LLCA	Language, Literacy and Communication, Afrikaans
LLCE	Language, Literacy and Communication, English
LLCZ	Language, Literacy and Communication, Zulu
LO	Life Orientation
MLMMS	Mathematical Literacy, Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences
NS	Natural Sciences
TECH	Technology
KZN	KwaZulu Natal
L1	First Language
L2	Second Language
LOLT	Language of Learning and Teaching
MT	Mother Tongue
NED	National Education Department
NL	Native Language
OBE	Outcomes-Based Education
SA	Subject Advisor
SGB	School Governing Body
SO	Specific Outcome
TL	Target Language
Z	Zulu

CONTENTS

<i>Title</i>	
<i>Declaration</i>	i
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	ii
<i>Dedication</i>	iii
<i>Abstract</i>	iv
<i>Transcription Conventions and Acronyms</i>	vii
1. CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Introductory remarks	1
1.2 Code-switching : Background and definition	7
1.2.1 Background	7
1.2.2 Code-switching and linguistic description	8
1.2.3 Types of code-switching	13
1.2.4 Who engages in code-switching behaviour?	16
1.2.5 Is code-switching a conscious or calculated phenomenon?	17
1.2.6 What are the domains of code-switching?	19
1.3 Aims	20
1.4 Rationale for study	22
1.5 Domain of Study	24
1.6 Data and Methodology	25
1.6.1 Setting and subjects	25
1.6.2 Subject content	27
1.6.3 Data collection and analysis	28
1.7 Structure of study	29
2. CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE	32
2.1 Theoretical frameworks in code-switching and pedagogy	32
2.1.1 Gumperz's (1982) Interactional Model	33
2.1.2 Myers-Scotton's (1993) Markedness Model	43

2.1.3	Spady's (1994) Model for Outcome Based Education	58
2.1.4	Canale and Swain's (1980) Model of Communicative Competence	71
2.2	Language, Literacy and Communication (LLC) in OBE-C2005	84
2.2.1	Rationale	85
2.2.2	Literacy and literacies	87
2.2.3	Specific Outcomes of LLC	88
2.2.4	Language across the curriculum	92
2.2.5	Skills-related assessment criteria	93
2.3	Attitudes toward languages and code-switching	95
2.3.1	Introduction	95
2.3.2	Attitudes toward Zulu	98
2.3.3	Attitudes toward Afrikaans	104
2.3.4	Attitudes toward English	108
2.3.5	Attitudes of monolinguals and bilinguals toward code-switching	116
2.3.6	Conclusion	122
2.4	Use of the native language (NL) in ESL classrooms	123
2.4.1	Introduction	124
2.4.2	The English-Only Policy	127
2.4.3	Evidence in support of using the NL in classrooms	130
2.4.4	Conclusion	141
2.5	Functions of code-switching	145
2.5.1	Introduction	145
2.5.2	Situational, metaphorical and conversational code-switching	148
2.5.3	The functions of code-switching and code-mixing in educational contexts	155
2.5.3.1	Code-switching as a communicative resource	156
2.5.3.2	Code-switching as a referential function	158
2.5.3.3	Code-switching as reiterative	159
2.5.3.4	Code-switching for explanation purposes and for introduction of new subject matter	162
2.5.3.5	Code-switching for classroom management and influencing learner behaviour	164
2.5.3.6	Code-switching as a phatic function	165

2.5.3.7	Code-switching as an emblem for group solidarity	167
2.5.3.8	Code-switching for quotation	168
2.5.3.9	Code-switching as a metalinguistic function	169
2.5.4	Conclusion	170
3.	CHAPTER THREE: DATA ANALYSIS AND ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRES AND INTERVIEWS	172
3.1	Introduction	172
3.2	Data collection procedures	173
3.2.1	The ethnographic approach	173
3.2.2	The data sources	176
3.2.3	Negotiating entry into the field study and ethical considerations of school-based research	177
3.3	Methods of collection	180
3.3.1	Questionnaires	180
3.3.2	Interviews	183
3.3.3	Recording of Lessons	187
3.4	Analysis	190
3.4.1	Analysis of data obtained from questionnaires about language attitudes and CS behaviour of education stake-holders	190
3.4.1.1	Questionnaire for educators	195
3.4.1.2	Questionnaire for subject advisors	218
3.4.1.3	Questionnaire for School Governing Body	225
3.4.1.4	Questionnaire for Learners	238
3.4.2	Analysis of data obtained from interviews about language attitudes and CS behaviour of education stake-holders	261
3.4.2.1	Interview with educators	264
3.4.2.2	Interview with subject advisors	273
3.4.2.3	Interview with School Governing Body	279
3.4.2.4	Interview with learners	284
3.5	Conclusion	293

4. CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS OF LESSON RECORDINGS - FORMS AND FUNCTIONS OF CODE-SWITCHING IN THE CLASSROOM	296
4.1 Introduction	296
4.2 Forms of code-switching	298
4.3 Functions of code-switching in the classroom	305
4.4 Conclusion	329
5. CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	332
5.1 Introduction	332
5.2 Conclusions	332
5.2.1 The attitudes of school stake-holders toward Afrikaans, Zulu and English	333
5.2.1.1 Attitudes toward Afrikaans	333
5.2.1.2 Attitudes toward Zulu	335
5.2.1.3 Attitudes toward English	338
5.2.2 The attitudes of school stake-holders toward code-switching	341
5.2.3 Does code-switching in the classroom enhance learning?	345
5.2.4 Does code-switching in the classroom promote communicative competence?	347
5.2.5 The role of code-switching in the LLC classroom and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) methodology	351
5.2.6 The role of the NL in fostering L2 development	355
5.3 Implications	359
5.3.1 Implications for principals, teachers and school governing bodies	359
5.3.2 Implications for L2 teachers and teaching	364
5.3.3 Implications for methodology	368
5.4 Limitations and Suggestions	371
5.5 Conclusion	374
REFERENCES	376

APPENDICES		398
Appendix A	Questionnaires	398
Appendix A1	Questionnaire for educators	398
Appendix A2	Questionnaire for subject advisors	402
Appendix A3	Questionnaire for parent component of SGB	403
Appendix A4	Questionnaire for learners	405
Appendix B	Interviews	408
Appendix B1	Interview questions for educators	408
Appendix B2	Interview questions for subject advisors	408
Appendix B3	Interview questions for parent component of SGB	409
Appendix B4	Interview questions for learners	410
Appendix B1a	Sample transcriptions of interview with educators: School A	411
Appendix B1b	Sample transcriptions of interview with educators: School E	413
Appendix B1c	Sample transcriptions of interview with educators: School Z	417
Appendix B2a	Sample transcriptions of interview with subject advisors	421
Appendix B3a	Sample transcriptions of interview with SGB	425
Appendix B4a	Sample transcriptions of interview with learners: School A	426
Appendix B4b	Sample transcriptions of interview with learners: School E	428
Appendix B4c	Sample transcriptions of interview with learners: School Z	430
Appendix C	Lesson recordings	434
Appendix C1	LLCE (L1) : School E [Group-work]	434
Appendix C1a	Oral Work	434
Appendix C1b	Literature study [Novel]	434
Appendix C2	LLCE (L2) : School A	437
Appendix C2a	Oral work [Group-work]	437
Appendix C2b	Vocabulary	437

Appendix C2c	Comprehension	438
Appendix C2d	Language study	439
Appendix C2e	Literature study [Novel]	440
Appendix C3	LLCE [L2] : School Z	441
Appendix C3a	Oral work [Group-work]	441
Appendix C3b	Comprehension	444
Appendix C3c	Language study	446
Appendix C3d	Literature study [Poetry]	449
Appendix C4	LLCA [L2] : School E	452
Appendix C4a	Language study	452
Appendix C4b	Comprehension	454
Appendix C4c	Literature study [Poetry]	458
Appendix C5	LLCA [L2] : School Z	463
Appendix C5a	Literature study [Poetry]	463
Appendix C5b	Comprehension	466
Appendix C5c	Language study	466
Appendix C5d	Literature study [Short Story : Group-work]	467

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

In the wake of the baneful legacy of apartheid, South Africa officially emerged as a plurilingual country, displaying its lingual flag which incorporates five of its eleven official languages. The new 1,35 minute anthem includes Xhosa, Zulu, Sotho, Afrikaans and English - the order in which they appear. South Africa's multilingual status is even more telling in the architecture of educational language policies; one of the goals of the new government, the African National Congress (ANC), in overcoming the undemocratic doctrines within the education and training system. The vision of the Freedom Charter is "to open the doors of learning and culture to all" (ANC Education Policy, A Policy Framework for Education and Training 1994). One of the strategies in promoting this goal was to add nine African languages (i.e. isiNdebele, sePedi, seSotho, siSwati, xiTsonga, seTswana, tshiVenda, isiXhosa and isiZulu), which had been both undervalued and unrecognized during the apartheid regime, to the two colonial languages (i.e. English and Afrikaans) which have enjoyed elevated status and the privileges as official languages. The quest for the recognition of the equality of all eleven languages is encapsulated in the vision of the new education policy :

"We envisage a time when all educational institutions will be implementing multilingual education, in order to facilitate learning and to enable all students to be confident, proficient and fluent users in at least two South African languages. In moving towards this goal, we shall be building on the linguistic strengths of learners and teachers, harnessing the rich multilingual reality of

The shift to OBE education for compulsory education time span viz. Grade 9, is of significance

regime [It is a political..... historical political resistance against the previous regime]. Ek het vir my studente gesê ... [I told my students...] *I told them: 'You are the generation, we've lost a generation, but in our new South Africa we have to transform, we have to build a new South Africa. Somebody has to suffer and bear the brunt'* of wat ook al of iets soos daai [or something like that]. *'To lift us out of...'* - ek het dit gesê in die klas - en toe sê ek [I said this in the class - and then I said]: *'Unfortunately it's you.'* Maar toe sê hulle [But then they said]: *'No, no, no, why must we do it?'* Maar dit is 'n kwessie van ... uhm ... die tale kan, maar daar is sekere situasies waar die politisie, die *cultural* en daai geskied ... *historical* ... uhm ... resistance ... hy's nog daar [But it is a question of ... the languages can, but there are certain situations where the politics, the cultural and that event he's still there] [Lawrence 1998:269].

Myers-Scotton (1992:101) states that CS is “the selection of forms by bilinguals/multilinguals from an embedded language in utterances framed by a matrix language during the same conversation.” The matrix language is that language which assumes the dominant role (Kamwangamalu 1994:74), and is otherwise referred to as the ‘host’ language and the embedded language is the ‘guest’ language (Barnes 1993:269). In this study, in School A (the exNED school), in the LLC-English (LLCE) classroom, the matrix language is English and the embedded language is Afrikaans; in School E (the exHOD school), in the LLCE classroom, the matrix language is English and the embedded language is Zulu, and in the LLC-Afrikaans (LLCA) classroom, the matrix language is Afrikaans and the embedded language is English; in School Z (the exDET school), in the LLCE classroom, the matrix language is English and the embedded

elements from another language in the flow of speech of one language is both linguistically and sociolinguistically consistent.” Linguistically, the result of CS is a successive stretch of speech without a break in phonemic systems (Haugen 1956, in Valdes-Fallis 1978:65). The switching of two languages simultaneously or interchangeably implies some degree of competence in the two languages even if bilingual fluency is not yet stable (Duran 1994:3).

1.2.2.2 CODE-MIXING :

Whereas CS is the ability to switch from one code to the other, determined by the function, situation and participants, code-mixing (CM) entails transferring linguistic units from one code into another (Kachru 1978:108). CM is the deliberate mixing of various linguistic units such as affixes, words, phrases and clauses from two (or more) languages within the same sentence, in the course of a single utterance, without an associated change in topic (Wardhaugh 1992:106; Bokamba 1988:24). CM is thought to be different from CS in that while CS is intersentential, i.e. switching that occurs at a clause or sentence boundary, CM is intrasentential, i.e. switching that occurs within a single sentence or even within a word (Bokamba 1988:24; Kamwangamalu 1992:173; Nwoye 1992:365,369). Mixing is perceived as going beyond switching such that there is greater integration of the two varieties than is normally the case in switching (Kachru 1978:108; Gibbons 1979:114-5). The following extract, from a lesson recording of Grade 9 learners (during group-work) of this study, serves as an illustration of code-mixing :

And futhi uOld Major zange amentione ukuthi ama ani [sic].... lokhuza ama humans ayafida ama animals [Old major did not mention the fact that the ani...[sic] humans used to feed the animals]. [Appendix C1b, LL69-70].

This brings us to the next distinction, viz. between code-mixing and borrowing.

1.2.2.3 BORROWING :

Borrowing (also called a loan word) is an instance where a word or “short, frozen, idiomatic phrases” (Gumperz 1982a:66) from one language becomes accepted as a normal part of the lexicon of another language (Hoffmann 1991:102; Nwoye 1993:366; Barnes 1993:269). In the most generic sense of the word, *borrowing* entails integration phonologically, morphologically and syntactically, of a linguistic item from one language into another (Kamwangamalu 1994:71; Brice 2001:2). In distinguishing CS from borrowing, Alvarez (1979:19) asserts that in CS, a bilingual introduces a completely unintegrated word or words from one language into another, host, language. Once a word or phrase is used habitually and becomes integrated and accepted in the host language, then it can be regarded as borrowing, and not an instance of CS. Borrowing occurs in order to fill a lexical gap or extend meaning where a word or phrase in the original language will not serve. This is unlike code-mixing which does not fill gaps (Kachru 1978:109-10; Gumperz 1982a:66; Bokamba 1988:25). Examples of borrowing, which Poplack (1987:108) calls ‘nonce borrowing’ and which Myers-Scotton (1993b:130) calls ‘single-morpheme/lexeme switches’ that have become accepted by the South African Zulu speakers are :

'iphone', 'ishirt', iskirt, 'ibank', iforce etc.

In my discussion of the forms and functions of CS in the classroom, Chapter Four, I will show how other examples of nonce borrowing are becoming normal features in the speech pattern of Zulu-English bilinguals.

Kamwangamalu (1992:175; 1993:71) points out that unlike code-switching and code-mixing which occur in the speech of bilingual speakers only, borrowing may occur in the speech of monolingual and bilingual speakers alike. According to Hoffmann (1991:103), the motivation for the use of a borrowed item from one language to another is twofold, viz. (i) it could be a negative kind, in that it could be caused by laziness, fatigue or some form of emotional stress which makes the bilingual speaker forget the correct term, and (ii) a speaker may consciously choose an item from the other language because s/he considers it more appropriate or more precise.

Because there still exists some disagreement in the literature as to what constitutes a “true” instance of CS, for the purpose of this study, I adopt Poplack’s (1981:170) definition of code-switching: Code-switching is “a switch according to degree of adaptation to the other language.”

Four types of CS have been identified, an account of which follows.

1.2.3 TYPES OF CODE-SWITCHING :

The four types of CS that have been identified and that I shall be using in the data analysis, especially in the discussion of the forms of CS, are (a) intersentential code-switching; (b) intrasentential code-switching; (c) lexical code-switching; and (d) tag switching.

1.2.3.1 INTERSENTENTIAL CODE-SWITCHING :

Intersentential CS involves a switch at a clause or sentence boundary (Jacobson 1978:21; Baker 1980:3; Romaine 1989:122; Nyowe 1993:365). An example of CS at the clause level is given by Poplack (1980) in her title to an article of Spanish-English speech in Puerto Rico :

Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Englishy **termino en espanol** [... and finish it in Spanish];

and an example of CS at the sentence boundary is :

Toe ek daar kom, toe was hy reeds dood. Hulle sê hy het hom doodverstik [When I arrived there, he was already dead. They said that he choked him to death]. **But if you ask me, I'd rather say they've killed him** (Barnes 1993:128).

1.2.3.2 INTRASSENTENTIAL CODE-SWITCHING :

In *intrasentential CS* the syntactic strings, such as phrases, of one language are embedded into a sentence of another language i.e. switching occurs within a sentence (Jacobson 1978:21; Baker 1980:3; Nwoye 1993:369). Poplack (1980:605) states that for a speaker to produce intrasentential switches, s/he must know enough about the grammar of each language and the way they interact, to avoid ungrammatical sentences. Consider the following extract from a lesson recording of this study as a point of illustration :

T What is a herdsboy? Is someone who .../ Is iemand wat hierdie olifant oppas, oppas, *look after*, wie gee die olifant die kos, *ukudla kwayo ikunikezo ubani na* [Is someone who looks after the elephant, look after, look after, who gives the elephant food, who gives the elephant the food]. [Appendix C5a, LL48-52].

1.2.3.3 LEXICAL SWITCHING :

Lexical switching involves the incorporation of lexical items from the speaker's second language into an utterance in his/her mother tongue (Jacobson 1978). This is illustrated in the Afrikaans-English switch below :

Die dosent het nie enigsins met die Engels Departementkontak gemaak voor die les

nie en iemand gaan haal uit die gemeenskap uit en dit was '*n total flop* [The lecturer had not made contact with the English Department before the lesson and someone was taken from the community and it was a total flop]. [Lawrence 1998:268].

Moreover, all three types of CS may be found within one and the same discourse (Romaine 1989:123) as can be seen in the following example drawn from a lesson recording of this study:

Yes. Sometimes you go on holiday **Khisimusi** [Christmas] to your uncle's. He's got a big beautiful house but the time will come right? When you want to come back home because **ikhaya lakho indawo ekufunakala ubekuyona. Akukhatha lekile ukuthi umizi waking mungakanani kodwa indawo ekujunakala ubekuyona** [..... the best place to be is your home. No matter how small your house is, it doesn't matter. But it's the place to be]. East or west, home is best. Alright, let's continue. [Appendix C3c, LL37-42]

1.2.3.4 TAG SWITCHING :

Poplack (1980:589) and Nwoye (1993:369) define *tag switching* as the insertion of a tag in one code into an utterance which is otherwise entirely in the other code. These researchers also note that tag-like switches include interjections, fillers, tags and idiomatic expressions, all of which can be produced in the second language with only minimal knowledge of the grammar of that language. As such, they may be easily inserted at a number of points in a monolingual utterance without violating syntactical rules (Appel and Muysken 1987:118; Romaine 1989:122). Examples of such tags in English are *OK, right, now then, so, I mean* etc.; in Afrikaans, *reg, né, jy sien,* [right, okay, you see] etc.; and in Zulu, *ngiyabona, yebo* [I see, yes] etc.

The following examples of tag switches are drawn from the recordings of lessons :

- (i) **Okay**, wat beteken dit ? [....., what does it mean?] [Appendix C4c, L38].
- (ii) **Alright**, omunye ifinisha ongayenza? [....., is there any one else who can suggest a conclusion?] [Appendix C3b, L96].

In addition to the above literature on CS, I examine three other relevant issues which are significant to my study. These are: (i) Who engages in CS behaviour? (ii) Is CS an unconscious or calculated phenomenon? and (iii) What are the domains of CS?

1.2.4 WHO ENGAGES IN CODE-SWITCHING BEHAVIOUR?

Various researchers (e.g. Loveday 1982) maintain that those who engage in this “frequent and natural form of speech behaviour” (Nwoye 1992:366) are those who have the resources to do so i.e. bilinguals or multilinguals. According to Loveday (1982:10), code-switchers are not only those who are efficient in two language worlds, but also those who may be non-fluent L2 speakers. This is clearly seen in my own study; although educators may have a very limited facility in a L2, they, nevertheless, use it for rhetorical reasons. For example, one interviewee states that although she is truly a monolingual, on occasion she switches to Zulu or Afrikaans to joke with her pupils :

Sometimes I will switch to Zulu or Afrikaans to ask a pupil to be quiet but mostly when I'm joking about something. And I have some pet names in Zulu..... It's just light-hearted. Otherwise, no. I don't really switch. I don't switch at all in my actual teaching. I can't speak any of these languages. [Appendix B1b, ET1].

Indeed, Loveday notes that non-fluent L2 speakers are the “more typical, if not ideal, representatives of bilinguals”. This definition aptly describes the English NL and Zulu NL

learner participants of my own study, in that, they are not fluent bilinguals as they are still in the process of acquiring Afrikaans and English as additional languages. The data from questionnaires and interviews with principals, teachers, subject advisors and SGB members, however, indicates that the participants are either English monolinguals, English-Zulu bilinguals, or English-Afrikaans bilinguals, and some are multilinguals. CS, as I have noted, is not a random, unstructured linguistic code. It is, as Kamwangamalu (1994:74) notes, “first and foremost a context-bound phenomenon”. Hence, bilingual speakers never engage in CS unless they are satisfied - unconsciously (*or not*) [my addition] - that the situational context is appropriate for them to resort to CS; and that their use of this strategy does not violate the norms of language use. In other words, bilinguals would engage in CS only with those with whom they wish to identify, and most importantly, with whom they share the same linguistic repertoire, the same norms for language use, and the same (positive) attitudes toward CS (Kamwangamalu 1994:74).

1.2.5 IS CS AN UNCONSCIOUS OR CALCULATED PHENOMENON?

CS is thought to be mostly an unconscious, spontaneous strategy (Adendorff 1993:4; Nwoye 1993:366; Wardhaugh 1992:109) and users might not even be aware of their CS behaviour until it is brought to their attention (Heller 1988:7). On this note, Gumperz (1982a:6) points out :

“While linguists, concerned with grammatical description as such, see the code alternation as highly salient, participants immersed in the interaction itself are often quite unaware which code is used at any time. Their main concern is with the communicative effect of what they are saying. Selection among linguistic elements is automatic, not really subject to conscious recall.”

For instance, in a study of Afrikaans-English CS in Cape Town, McCormick (1995:200) has

shown that CS seemed to be largely unconscious. She provides the following example of how people, at a formal meeting where English is considered the appropriate code, unconsciously switch to Afrikaans in a debate :

- A : I want proposals. I don't want suggestions anymore.
 J : *Dis nie 'n suggestion nie!* [It's not a suggestion!]
 C : I don't want any rank imperialism!
 J : *Wat sê hulle van tien rand, dan bied ons more or less?*
 [What do you say about ten rand, then we offer more or less]
 H : *Vyfrand.* [Five rand]
 A : Mr H - prop-uh, suggested ten rand.

However, under other circumstances CS can be a conscious, calculated and pragmatic strategy for achieving specific discourse objectives, although such conscious acts are often not premeditated. For example, Adendorff (1993:3) cites instances where politicians Nelson Mandela and Margaret Thatcher greeted their audiences (at separate meetings) in Afrikaans before switching to English. Undoubtedly, this was carefully calculated to create an effect on the audience in some way or the other. Similarly, in their study of CS in a major township in South Africa, Finlayson and Slabbert (1997:398) show that speakers are conscious of the way they switch. At the school I teach, a multilingual teacher who acted as chairperson at a parent-teacher meeting indicated that her switch from English to Zulu throughout her address was a carefully calculated one. She used CS to ensure that the Zulu speaking parents "felt welcome and comfortable" even though they could speak English. She merely repeated, in Zulu, what she had said in English. Her opening address is given below :

A very warm welcome ladies and gentlemen, parents and relatives of our learners at Marburg Secondary School. We, as teachers, realize that your children are

very precious and loved by you. We are looking forward to be visited by you, in the different classrooms and to discuss the learning areas as well as your child's progress with you. This will happen soon after we have informed you of aspects we consider serious. On behalf of the governing body, staff, and learners we thank you for sacrificing your time to spend part of this evening with us. **Ngi bingelela umhlangano obambwa abazali, nezihlobo zabantwana aba funda e Marburg Secondary School. Tina abafundisi siyazi izingane zenu zinosizo, futhi niyazithanda kakhulu. Siyabonga uku vakashelwa yinina, sicela ni vakashele umfundisi nomfundisi bonke ebafundisa izingane zenu. Mangabe kukhona inkinga ni nga xoxa, nibonisane inhlela yoquba kuyaphambili** [A very warm welcome ladies and gentlemen, parents and relatives of our learners at Marburg Secondary School. We, as teachers, realize that your children are very precious and loved by you. Thank you for visiting us and now every learner must visit all the teachers who teach them. If you have any problems, we can discuss it].

My own study will show that CS can be both an unconscious and conscious linguistic event; while the learner participants of this study indicate that, for them, CS is largely a spontaneous form of language behaviour, the educator and subject advisor participants indicate that, for them, mostly in formal situations (such as the school, office and meetings), CS is a conscious strategy used to fulfill a variety of functions. Hence, as I will discuss in the final chapter, CS in the educational domain carries a strong element of consciousness.

1.2.6 WHAT ARE THE DOMAINS OF CS?

Fishman (1965) defines 'domain' as a "cluster of social situations typically constrained by a common set of behavioural rules (to account for language choices) in bilingual communities" (cited in Milroy and Muysken 1995:5-6). According to Kamwangamalu (1999:258), the phrase

'domain of CS', refers to the social context in which CS occurs, such as the workplace, the home, school and playground. In each domain, Romaine (1989:31) notes that there may be pressures of various kinds e.g. economic, administrative, cultural, political, religious, and so on, which influence the bilingual speaker towards use of a specific code. For the purposes of my research, the domain in which CS is observed is the school, and the predominant pressure that influences the participants (i.e. the educators and learners) is educational.

1.3 AIMS

The aim of this study is twofold: Firstly, it investigates attitudes of education stake-holders i.e. learners, educators, subject advisors and parent component of the SGB members toward English, Afrikaans and Zulu, and CS between these languages. Secondly, it investigates whether CS, if used as a communicative and learning resource by bilingual facilitators and learners in senior phase, LLC, OBE classrooms, could promote communicative competence; promote the acquisition of specific skills and knowledge within the LLC classroom; enhance learning; and foster development of the language being learnt. In addition, I investigate whether learners' vocabulary, and understanding and interpretation of verbal and written information could be enhanced if bilingual facilitators of LLCE (L2) and LLCA (L2) employ CS for emphasis, clarification, explanation, reinforcement and elicitation of learner responses, and if English monolingual facilitators allow the use of CS by learners. Likewise, I investigate whether the use of CS amongst Zulu-English learners, who are taught by English monolingual facilitators and/or who are immersed in English L1 schools, could promote learning and foster English language development.

The broad problems and issues that are investigated in this study are :

- (a) Whether CS in the classroom by bilingual facilitators and learners and CS by bilingual learners amongst themselves can effectively enhance learning.
- (b) Whether CS by bilingual facilitators and learners promote learners' acquisition of specific skills and knowledge or outcomes as described by the OBE framework.
- (c) Whether CS has a significant role in Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), the methodology that underpins OBE.
- (d) Whether a learner's NL can be effectively employed in promoting communicative competence and fostering second and first language development.
- (e) Whether there is sufficient pedagogical reasons for motivating a change in attitude towards CS and reviewing the 'English-only' policy in English L2 and English L1 classrooms, and 'Afrikaans-only' policy in Afrikaans L2 classrooms.

I also search for answers to the following questions :

- (a) What are the attitudes of school stake-holders i.e. subject advisors, principals, teachers, learners, SGB members and parents toward English, Afrikaans, Zulu and CS?
- (b) What are the specific functions of CS by learners and facilitators?
- (c) Does CS by facilitators and learners promote the acquisition of skills and knowledge and/or outcomes advocated by OBE? If so, how?
- (d) Does CS promote communicative competence and foster second and first language development? If so, how?
- (e) Does CS facilitate the learning process, and if so, how?

This research will not be examining the issue of the structure of CS. Neither will it be examining the issue of mother tongue instruction.

1.4 RATIONALE FOR STUDY

According to the statistics provided by Statistics South Africa, official year book (1999) the three principal languages in KwaZulu Natal (KZN) are isiZulu, English and Afrikaans. These comprise 80%, 16% and 2% respectively in its provincial population of 7,672 million people. English and Afrikaans are the two most common languages studied as second languages by Zulu NL and Afrikaans NL speakers and Zulu NL and English NL learners, respectively, in KZN. These official languages have to be 'passed' by learners for promotion purposes. Also, as the demand for proficiency in English by parents, educators and learners alike appears to be gaining momentum, it is imperative that *every* teacher i.e. not only the language teacher, employs whatever means are available to assist learners not only to pass examinations but become both communicatively and academically competent. Thus far, some researchers e.g. Adendorff (1993) and van der Walt (2001) have demonstrated that the use of CS in the classroom can be a means of enhancing learning. This study therefore explores the role of CS as a communicative and learning resource in the classroom.

Secondly, as the number of linguistically and culturally diverse learners entering English medium schools (where English is studied as a first language) increases, more and more educators are faced with the challenge of teaching learners with limited English skills. Educators, however, have not been trained to meet these challenges and invariably the learners become victims of the 'swim or drown' syndrome. It is my contention that if these learners are allowed and even encouraged to use their NL strategically (i.e. so that use of the NL fulfills pedagogical functions and is not used to such an extent that it is the dominant language) not only could CS give them

a greater sense of identity in a multiethnic context but also enhance their listening, speaking, reading and writing skills.

Thirdly, OBE is a newly implemented educational framework compulsory for up to Grade 9. Although the Constitution advocates a policy of multilingualism and promotes exploration of “a variety of strategies to learn effectively” (Gultig et al. 1998) and the use of learners’ mother tongue is alluded to in the specific outcomes of LLC, neither the Policy Document for OBE, senior phase issued by the Department of Education nationwide (DOE 1997d) nor the South African Curriculum for the twenty first century: Curriculum 2005 (DOE 2000b) makes *explicit* reference to use of learners’ mother tongue in the classroom as a possible strategy in learning and/or promoting language development. This research is conducted in the OBE classroom as I believe that code-switching to the learners’ mother-tongue is one of the strategies that can be employed to enhance learning as well as to promote language development.

Fourthly, although CS is a normal feature in the linguistic repertoire of many bilinguals, the use of CS, as many researchers (e.g. Nyowe 1992; Gibb 1998) show, is often stigmatised. Thus, there is a need for investigation into the attitudes of school stake-holders toward CS. Fifthly, although some research has been done on CS in the classroom in KZN, Adendorff (1993) suggests the need to re-examine the ‘English-only’ policy in the classroom; and van der Walt (2001) states that the use of CS in classroom situations is not well documented. Finally, as discussed at the outset, this study builds on my MA (2001) dissertation.

To my knowledge, no comparative study between English L2 and Afrikaans L2 acquisition using CS has been done thus far, and except for research by Kamwangamalu and Virasamy (1997) on Zulu peer tutoring (which is different from CS) in English-only classrooms, there has been no research on whether CS enhances Zulu-English speaking learners in EL1 acquisition. Also, there appears to be no research on the role of CS in OBE classrooms thus far. My study should: (i) examine the possibility of adopting CS as a strategy in both L2 and L1 acquisition; (ii) motivate a change in attitude towards CS among educators; (iii) alert language policy committees within the school, particularly EL1 schools, to the limitations of an ‘English-only’ policy in the classroom and motivate a change in the policy; and (iv) have implications for methodology in OBE classrooms.

This research is constructed on the theories of Gumperz’s (1982) Interactional Model, Myers-Scotton’s (1993) “markedness model”, William Spady’s (1994) model for OBE and Canale and Swain’s (1980) Model of Communicative Competence - a discussion of which follows in the next chapter.

1.5 DOMAIN OF STUDY

Kamwangamalu (1992), as I have noted earlier (in 1.2.7), writes that the domains for CS refer to the social setting in which bilingual speakers carry out their daily activities. Although Jacobson (1978:178) suggests that CS is used exclusively in informal situations, Kamwangamalu notes that there is “strong evidence that the use of CS is not limited to casual encounters only.” This research supports Kamwangamalu’s assertion in that the domain of this study is a formal one -

it is an educational one. The linguistic repertoire of each of the schools however differs.

In the exNED school (i.e. the school which was governed by National Education Department in the apartheid era), for all learning areas, except LLCE, the sole medium of instruction is Afrikaans, and the language used in LLCE, is only English. Outside the classroom however, e.g. the play field, Afrikaans-English CS is a normal form of language behaviour. In the exHOD school (i.e. the school which was governed by House of Delegates in the old dispensation), which constitutes both English monolinguals and Zulu-English bilinguals, the medium of instruction is solely English, except in the LLCA classroom, where both teachers and learners engage in Afrikaans-English CS. For the Zulu NL learners, however, English-Zulu CS is a common feature outside the classroom and during group-work at this school. In the third school, an exDET school, (i.e. the school which was governed by the Department of Education and Training in the old dispensation) Zulu-English CS is a normal feature for both teachers and learners, in and outside the classroom.

1.6 DATA AND METHODOLOGY

I have used the ethnographic approach to conduct this study and have adopted both quantitative and qualitative methods in gathering the data. The data is based on questionnaires, interviews, and lesson recordings. I return to this topic of methods in data collection in Chapter Three.

1.6.1 SETTING AND SUBJECTS :

This study is set in three schools of differing linguistic demographics in the Port Shepstone

region, which for easy reference, as mentioned, I label School A, School Z and School E. The reasons I have chosen each of these schools are as follows: Firstly, as stated at the outset, each of these schools has its roots in the previous apartheid dispensations where each department of education virtually developed curricula in isolation. This is to say, Schools A, Z and E are exNED, exDET and exHOD schools respectively. This is of relevance to this study as one of my aims is to investigate the attitudes of stake-holders toward English, Afrikaans and Zulu as well as CS. By examining schools of these vastly differing backgrounds, I believe I could obtain a more balanced and “accurate” view of language attitudes in the Port Shepstone region. In addition I would be able to explore any differences in attitudes that might exist between the schools, and if so, consider the possible reasons for these.

Secondly, and more importantly, as mentioned in the preceding section, the language of learning and teaching (LOLT) at each of the schools is different: (a) **School A** is an Afrikaans medium school where Afrikaans-English (AE) learners study ESL and this study investigates Afrikaans-English CS practices; (b) **School Z** comprises predominantly Zulu-English (ZE) learners who study 3 languages viz. Zulu L1, English L2 and Afrikaans L2. This is of particular relevance to this study as it investigates English-Zulu CS practices in the EL2 classroom as well as the CS practices that occur within the AL2 classroom. In addition, this study investigates whether facilitators use Zulu, the learners’ mother tongue in the AL2 classroom; and (c) **School E** is a multi-ethnic school comprising both EL1 speakers and ZE learners who study Afrikaans L2. This is also of relevance to this study as it investigates Afrikaans-English CS practices. In addition, as the medium of instruction at this school is English, and more importantly, ZE learners study

English as a *first language*, this school is an appropriate base for my investigation of the role of CS (particularly during learner-group work sessions) in EL1 acquisition.

The subjects are the 4 teachers of LLC (in OBE terminology, facilitators) and their Grade 8 or 9 learners who are engaged in the OBE curriculum. In addition to these facilitators and learners who are the principal participants in my investigation of CS practices in the classroom, the other stake-holders of these schools i.e. principals and SGB members (the number of these participants is given at the end of this section) were given questionnaires and were interviewed to determine their attitudes toward the three official languages i.e. English, Afrikaans and Zulu, and toward CS. The final component of the subjects are subject advisors. Subject advisors (the number of these participants is given at the end of this section) play a significant role in this research as they have the power of 'advising' or influencing educators of the languages. Their own attitudes would therefore be crucial to this study.

1.6.2 SUBJECT CONTENT :

The subject content comprises the different aspects of LLC, LLCE [L1], LLCE [L2] and LLCA [L2]. Facilitators of each school were asked to tape-record various aspects of LLC (e.g. language study, comprehension and literature study) and at least one group-work session as follows: (a) School A: Tape-recording of LLCE [L2] lessons by an Afrikaans-English bilingual facilitator; (b) School Z: Tape-recording of LLCE [L2] *and* LLCA [L2] lessons by a Zulu-English facilitator and Zulu-English-Afrikaans facilitator respectively; and (c) School E: Tape recording of LLCA [L2] lessons by an English-Afrikaans bilingual facilitator and in the LLCE [L1] class, only the

recordings of learner-group work sessions by an English monolingual facilitator. The English monolingual facilitator was asked to tape groups that comprise: (i) only Zulu-English bilingual learners, and (ii) both Zulu-English bilingual learners and English monolingual learners. The reason for this is that I wished to investigate (i) whether Zulu-English bilingual learners employ CS in EL1 classes; and (ii) whether there are any differences between language practices between the two groups, and if so what the possible reasons for their linguistic behaviour are. The reason that I requested each facilitator to tape-record various aspects of language learning is that, within the OBE framework, these aspects must not be taught in isolation but in an integrated manner. The different aspects of language learning that are taped for this research purpose are oral work, grammar, vocabulary, comprehension and literature (poetry and other genre). For the purposes of this study I explore how CS - if employed - is used in the framework of OBE in these various aspects.

1.6.3 DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS :

Using ethnographic observation, I used questionnaires, interviews and tape-recordings of lessons and group-work discussions. The questionnaires were formulated in English and were distributed to the principals and all of the educators at the three secondary schools that form the basis of this study; each learner participant of the three schools of this study; the parent component of the SGB of each of the three schools; and all of the subject advisors of the Port Shepstone region. Of these a total of 78 educators (including 2 principals), 17 subject advisors, 10 SGB parent-members and 188 learners, responded. In addition, using a semi-structured approach, I conducted interviews, in English, with 30 educators (including 3 principals), 10 subject advisors, 5 SGB

parent-members and 30 learners. This sample of interviewees, except the SGB members, comprised those persons who were both available and willing to be interviewed. With regard to the SGB participants, I first telephoned the parents of School A and E, requested an interview and thereafter set up an appointment. The SGB parent-members of School Z were approached by a Zulu NL speaker of the school. However, as my discussion in Chapter Three will show, they were reluctant to become involved in the study.

The tape-recordings of lessons were done by the facilitator- participants themselves. I sought the assistance of two proficient English-Afrikaans speakers, a Zulu -English speaker, and an English-Afrikaans-Zulu speaker to translate and transcribe the recorded texts from Afrikaans to English, Zulu to English, and Afrikaans and Zulu, to English, respectively. The translated texts were then verified for accuracy by the facilitators who participated in this study. The actual lessons of each facilitator were examined to see how s/he fulfills her/his objectives and if CS is used, the functions it serves. Group-discussions by learners were also examined for the same reasons. Only transcriptions relevant to this study were analysed. Hence, only sample transcriptions are provided in the appendices.

1.7 STRUCTURE OF THE STUDY :

The issues reported on in this study are covered in 5 chapters. In *Chapter One*, thus far, I have presented the topic of my study; placed this study in context; provided a definition of code-switching; distinguished between code-switching, code-mixing and borrowing - concepts that are of relevance to this study; and presented a brief overview and types of CS. I have also

outlined the aim of my study; presented some broad issues and questions that will be explored in this study; noted the domain of this study; and provided a brief overview of the setting and participants, the subject content and data collection and analysis.

In *Chapter Two* I present a review of pertinent literature to this study. Firstly, I outline the theoretical frameworks in code-switching and pedagogy that form the basis of this study. More specifically, I present Gumperz's (1982) *Interactional Model*, Myers-Scotton's (1993) *Markedness Model*, William Spady's (1994) *Model for OBE* and Canale and Swain's (1980) *Model of Communicative Competence*. Secondly, I discuss the role of LLC within the framework of OBE in the South African curriculum. Thirdly, I provide insight into the attitudes held toward languages, more specifically, English, Afrikaans and Zulu, and code-switching. Fourthly, in discussing the issue of the 'English-only' policy vs. mother tongue use in pedagogy, I provide evidence in support of the use of learners' NL in the classroom. Finally, in *Chapter Two*, I provide greater insight into the phenomenon of CS by discussing the role and functions of CS, more particularly in the educational context.

In *Chapter Three* I discuss the methods I have used in gathering my data and present an analysis of the questionnaires and interviews and a detailed discussion of my findings. The discussion in this chapter focuses on the attitudes of the various participants toward English, Afrikaans and Zulu, as well as code-switching, particularly in the classroom. It also examines the status of each of the three languages in KZN and the role each plays in promoting multilingualism in the province. In *Chapter Four* I present an analysis of the various lesson recordings in the LLC

classroom, including group-work sessions by learners. The discussion, in this chapter, focuses on English-Afrikaans, English-Zulu, and English-Afrikaans-Zulu CS at the schools of this research and the forms and functions they fulfill in pedagogy.

In the final chapter, *Chapter Five*, I summarize the findings, discuss their implications for pedagogy and delineate some limitations of this study. Following Chapter Five, are the bibliography and appendices. The latter comprises questionnaires and interview questions for principals, educators, learners, subject advisors and parent component of the SGB (i.e. Appendices A1-A4 and B1-B4 respectively), samples of transcriptions of interviews with each of the four groups of participants (i.e. Appendices B1a - B4c) and samples of the various lesson recordings (i.e. Appendices C1-C5).

A discussion of the pertinent literature on code-switching and pedagogy follows.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

INTRODUCTION :

In this chapter I focus on the review of literature that is pertinent to my research topic. As the thrust of my topic concerns both code-switching and pedagogy, I present a review on both these aspects. Firstly, I discuss the theoretical frameworks in code-switching and pedagogy upon which this research is constructed. Secondly, I present the literature on language, literacy and communication (LLC) in the South African OBE curriculum. Thirdly, I provide evidence supporting the use of learners' NL in the classroom. Fourthly, I present the more salient functions of code-switching in the social and educational arena. Finally, I discuss attitudes toward the languages that form the thrust of this research i.e. English, Afrikaans and isiZulu, and attitudes toward code-switching.

2.1 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS IN CODE-SWITCHING AND PEDAGOGY

The principal theories upon which this research is constructed are: (2.1.1) Gumperz's (1982) 'Interactional Model'; (2.1.2) Myers-Scotton's (1993) 'Markedness Model'; (2.1.3) Spady's (1994) 'Model for OBE'; and (2.1.4) Canale and Swain's (1980) 'Model of Communicative Competence'.

2.1.1 GUMPERZ'S (1982) INTERACTIONAL MODEL

Gumperz's 'Interactional Model' of communication sees communication as the outcome of exchanges involving more than one active participant. Conversational involvement by more than one person is thus a necessary precondition for understanding (Gumperz 1981b:324, 325). The theoretical notion of the interactional model rests on the concept of conversational inference i.e. the situated process by which participants in a conversation assess the intentions of the other participants and on which they base their responses. To understand the issues that underpin this model, I will very briefly examine Paul Grice's (1973) notion of 'conversational cooperation' as it underlies Gumperz's model. The term 'conversational cooperation' is commonly understood to refer to the assumptions that conversationalists must make about each other's contributions, both verbal and non-verbal. This is to say, that whatever inferences are made, are made within the context of, and are dependent on, the mutual exchange of signals (Gumperz 1981a:12). Within this framework, communication is not governed by fixed social rules; it is a two-step process in which the speaker first takes in stimuli from the outside environment. S/he then, in the light of his/her own cultural background, personal history and his/her knowledge about his/her interlocutors, evaluates and selects from among them. S/he then decides on the norms that apply within the setting and situation before encoding his/her intent. Communication is said to take place only when the speaker's move elicits a response from one of his/her listeners (Gumperz and Hymes 1972:15). There are a number of features that characterize the Interactional Model. Those that are relevant to my own research are: (a) It is assumed that a speaker begins with a certain communicative intent; (b) linguistic choices are dynamic events which transcend linguistic competence; (c) code choices comprise a contextualizing cue; (d) there are no assumptions about

sharedness of rules or evaluative norms; and (e) the choice of a linguistic code is mostly an unconscious one.

(a) It is assumed that a speaker begins with a certain communicative intent :

Gumperz's 'Interactional Model' assumes that a speaker begins with a certain communicative intent, conscious or subconscious. The speaker's intent might be to ask for something specific or s/he might want to persuade the other or simply talk to be sociable. Whatever the intent, the first step is to determine what, if any, limitations the environment imposes on his/her choice of interactional strategies. The speaker would scan his/her surroundings to determine for example, whether the setting is the home, church, school, public etc. while simultaneously using his/her knowledge about his/her audience(s) and their possible social identities to determine what role to enact (Gumperz and Hymes 1972:15-16). To ensure conversational involvement, the participants must agree, at least in very general terms - explicitly or implicitly - on what the interaction is about i.e. even though they might differ in specific details, they must share at least some basic expectations regarding the goal of the conversation and what is likely to follow (Gumperz 1981a:12). Without this sharedness, Gumperz (1981a:12) states that "interactants are likely to lose interest, interactions tend to be brief or perfunctory, and productive exchanges are unlikely to result." Within the context of this research, the speaker(s), are either the educator(s) and/or their learners within the domain of the school. In addition, in School A, the Afrikaans medium school, learners when speaking with their peers will use their knowledge about the latter i.e. whether they are Afrikaans speaking or English speaking and choose whether to address their hearers in Afrikaans or English or code switch in both languages. In School E, the English

medium school, English monolingual speakers would use only English to all of their interlocutors, but the Zulu speakers would use English to their English speaking hearers, and English, Zulu or English-Zulu CS to their Zulu peers. In School Z, the use of English, Zulu and English-Zulu CS appears to be the norm.

(b) Linguistic choices are dynamic events which transcend linguistic competence :

According to the 'Interactional Model', linguistic choices are dynamic events; and as stated earlier, 'true' communication only occurs when a move elicits a response so that an interaction between two or more interlocutors takes place. This model asserts that interpretation of a speaker's utterance does not exist in isolation, but is an ongoing process of interpretation in conversation. It is language use in context that enables an addressee to interpret particular contextualizing cues (a concept I discuss in (c) below), react to others and pursue their communicative ends. Just as grammatical knowledge enables the speaker to distinguish potentially meaningful sentences from non-sentences, knowledge of the social values associated with certain activities and social relationships implied in a message is necessary to interpret a particular context (Gumperz 1982a:4-5; Gumperz and Herasimchuk 1975:81). Gumperz and Herasimchuk (1975:81) provide the following three examples :

1. They are holding a meeting to discuss the issue.
2. They are getting together to talk it over.
3. They're sittin' down to rap about it.

Each of these utterances can be used to describe the same event, and is thus, in a sense, referentially equivalent. However, their social implications are different. Example 1 is a

structured situation implying specific role functions of the parties involved. Example 2 is unmarked with respect to these characteristics and the phrase “talk it over” implies a casual conversation. Example 3 is unstructured and the speaker is unconfined by what can be said and to whom. These examples demonstrate how, within the Interactional Model, linguistic choices are dynamic events and communication is not merely the ability to produce grammatically correct sentences. Thus, in my own study, one needs to have a knowledge of the social values associated with the relationship that exists between teacher and learners, and learners and learners to better understand their interaction.

The “Interactional Model’ also focuses on communicative competence, a term coined by Dell Hymes to suggest that meaningful communication transcends grammar to concentrate on aspects of shared knowledge and cognitive abilities (Gumperz 1997:39). Gumperz (1982a:1) maintains that the construction of sentences “does not by itself constitute meaning”. To participate in a verbal exchange or interaction i.e. to create and sustain a conversation, interlocutors require knowledge and abilities which extend beyond grammatical competence. Gumperz maintains that even before interlocutors decide to participate in a conversation, they need to be able to infer what the interaction is about and what is expected of them. Once involved in a conversation, both interlocutors, the speaker and the hearer, must actively respond to what transpires through signalling involvement either directly through words or indirectly through gestures or other non-verbal signs. The response, moreover, must relate to the illocutionary force of the speaker which refers to his/her communicative intent i.e what s/he intends to say such as stating, questioning, promising, inviting and complaining (Wardhaugh 1992:285). This is to say that the hearer must

respond with what s/he thinks the speaker intends rather than the surface or literal meaning of the words used. Consider the following example provided by Moodley (2001:24) of an interaction between teacher and pupil which illustrates how successful communication occurs when interlocutors share some common background knowledge about school registers which enables inferencing to take place :

- T Did you fetch the register?
 P Mrs Mtudi is not in.
 T Okay. Try again later.

Moodley (2001) notes that this is a typical routine encounter in the domain of the school. When speaker T, the teacher, enquires of the hearer, speaker P, the pupil, if s/he had fetched the register, the expected response is either “yes”/ “no”/ “here it is” and the like. However, P’s response is, “Mrs Mtudi is not in.” On the surface, this response hardly constitutes the expected response. However, because both the teacher and pupil share the same schemata or background knowledge concerning the register, the teacher is able to make appropriate inferences and is therefore able to correctly perceive P’s underlying meaning. The intended meaning of P’s utterance could be, for example, “Mrs Mtudi has not yet arrived at school, so the office where the register is kept is locked.” P’s response or message is understood and accepted within the context. As there are no overt linguistic cues, one can assume that both teacher and pupil rely on a shared understanding that the interaction takes place at school and on their expectations of what normally goes on in classrooms.

The above illustration supports Gumperz’s (1982a:5) assertion that conversational exchanges

have certain dialogic properties which differentiate them from isolated sentences or written text. Two such properties which are illustrated in the example above are: (a) interpretations are jointly negotiated by both the interlocutors and judgements are either confirmed or changed by the reactions they evoke - they need not be inferred from a single utterance; and (b) that conversations in themselves often contain internal evidence of what the outcome is i.e. of whether or not participants share interpretative conventions or succeed in achieving their communicative ends. The given illustration also supports Gumperz's (1982a:5) statement that "there is no question that the effective employment of communicative strategies presupposes grammatical competence and knowledge of the culture." This principle of the interactional model has direct relevance to this study as learners' utterances in the L2 might not always be grammatically correct, yet well understood by the participants of the discourse. Consider the following extract from a lesson recording of learners involved in group-work :

The author **ye Animal Farm shuthi wathatha abantu** [The author of *Animal Farm* took people] and turned them to animals because of the way they acted. The novel is based on a true story. Listen! The animals were real human beings who were treated like **amapigs** where the humans who were lazy were referred to the pigs..... [Appendix C1b, LL120-3].

Although the above utterance is not grammatically correct and the speaker does not appear to have the appropriate vocabulary to express her ideas, the message that the novel, *Animal Farm*, is an allegory is understood.

(c) Code choices comprise a contextualizing cue :

Gumperz (1977:199) describes contextualizing cue as "any aspect of the surface form of

utterances which, when mapped onto message content, can be shown to be functional in the signalling of interpretative frames.” Contextualizing cues which can take a number of forms depending on the historically given linguistic repertoire or communicative styles of participants (Corsaro 1981:142; Gumperz 1982b:131), refer to specific communicative elements viz. linguistic elements (i.e. phonemic, syntactic and semantic elements); paralinguistic elements (i.e. intonation, stress and pitch); and extralinguistic elements (i.e. gestures and manipulation of physical objects in the ecological setting) which are employed in the interactive process (Gumperz 1981a:14-15). Of relevance to this research are the linguistic elements and to a small extent, paralinguistic elements. Although all cues carry meaning, the meanings are conveyed in the course of interactive events. The meanings of contextualizing cues, unlike words, cannot be discussed out of context (Gumperz 1976b:17; Gumperz 1982b:131). They are, as Gumperz (1976b:17) notes, “implicit and cannot be directly talked about. Their signalling value depends on the participants’ tacit awareness of their meaningfulness.” Gumperz also points out that when *all* participants understand and notice the relevant cues, interpretative processes are then taken for granted and tend to go unnoticed. However, when a listener does not react to a cue, or is unaware of its functions, interpretations may differ and misunderstanding may occur. Gumperz (1977) and Gumperz and Tannen (1979) have shown that systematic problems develop in communication when speakers of different speech cultures interact and that these problems are the result of differences in systems of conversational inference and the cues for signalling speech acts and speakers’ intent. Miscommunication and negative evaluation often arise when participants do not share the same cultural and linguistic background, and therefore use different strategies to signal ‘interpretative frames’. When this happens and when a difference in

interpretation is brought to a participant's attention, it tends to be seen in attitudinal terms. A speaker is perceived as being unfriendly, impertinent, rude, uncooperative, or to fail to understand. Interactants do not ordinarily notice that the listener may have failed to perceive a shift in rhythm or a change in pronunciation (Gumperz 1982b:131-2). Gumperz states that miscommunications of this type is regarded as "a social *faux pas* and leads to misjudgements of the speaker's intent; it is not likely to be identified as a mere linguistic error." However, a major advantage of the interactional model is that it does not assume that problems are the result of bad faith, but rather sees them as the result of individuals wrongly interpreting cues according to their own rules (Gumperz 1977).

The issue of contextualizing cues is of relevance to this study as bilingual participants choose code-switching from their linguistic repertoire as a contextualizing cue to signal information on communicative intent. They choose to use code-switching probably because they think they would be most effective in conveying exactly what and how they want to say something, and be accurately interpreted by their listeners. Thus, for example, in the context of this study, bilingual teachers might choose to say something in Zulu or Afrikaans in the English classroom, or English in the Afrikaans classroom, not because they do not have the vocabulary to do so in the target language, but because they believe that using the mother tongue or the primary language of the school would be more effective in driving a point home. In Chapter Four of this thesis, I discuss, with examples, how bilingual teachers and learners use CS to fulfill various social and pedagogical functions which are interpreted within the context of literature teaching in the LLCE (L2) and LLCA (L2) classrooms.

(d) There are no assumptions about sharedness of rules or evaluative norms :

As already stated, conversation is a negotiated activity. It progresses in large part because of shared assumptions about what is going on. However, linguistic anthropologists using ethnographic methods of survey have shown that language usage and norms for what counts as appropriate speech behaviour, vary from culture to culture and context to context (Gumperz 1982a:3). Hence, the tendency to take for granted that conversational involvement exists, that interlocutors are cooperating, and that interpretative conventions are shared, may not fit in modern, urban societies where languages and cultures are diffused. People might speak the same language but show significant differences in background knowledge. However, because the Interactional Model makes no assumptions about sharedness or rules or evaluative norms, it is particularly revealing in modern urbanized societies where social boundaries are diffuse, where intensive communication with speakers of differing backgrounds is the rule rather than the exception, and where signalling conventions may vary from situation to situation. Hence, interlocutors must overcome or take account of the communicative symbols which signal these differences to sustain meaningful conversation. They must be able to negotiate meaning to sustain interaction and have their goals and motives understood (Gumperz 1982a:6). This principle is of particular relevance to my own study as, in the wake of a democracy, the scrapping of the group areas act saw the gradual influx of all peoples of Port Shepstone, the so-called Whites (English and Afrikaans speakers), Blacks (mostly Zulu speakers), Indians (predominantly English speakers) and Coloureds (predominantly English speakers) merge gradually into the town of Port Shepstone so that Port Shepstone has truly become a culturally and linguistically diffused society. More pertinently, this diffusion is clearly visible (and audible) in the previous HOD and NED

schools where pupils from previously so-called Black, Coloured and Indian communities have merged. This principle is of significance to my study as the teacher participants of the exHOD school, School E, and their learners share the same language, English, but some learners come from different social and cultural backgrounds. Of further significance to this study is the fact that with the merging of most cultural groups, code-switching has become a natural feature among Zulu-English learners at this school. As a result, as the teacher of English is a monolingual, the use of English-Zulu code-switching by her pupils could result in a lack of understanding on the part of the teacher. Similarly, although Afrikaans-English CS is the norm in the Afrikaans L2 classroom, English-Zulu or Afrikaans-Zulu CS by Zulu speaking learners could also contribute to a lack of meaningful communication. The language differences between the various cultures of learners play an important, positive role in signalling information and, as Gumperz (1982a:6) points out, “in creating and maintaining the subtle boundaries of power, status, role and occupational specialization that make up the fabric of social life.”

(e) The choice of a linguistic code is mostly an unconscious one :

Gumperz (1982a:61) notes that although CS is perceived as “highly salient, participants immersed in the interaction itself are quite unaware which code is used at any one time.” The main concern of speakers is with the communicative effect of what they are saying. Gumperz (1982a:61) says that “selection among linguistic alternants is automatic, not readily subject to conscious recall.” The social norms which govern language use here form part of the underlying knowledge which speakers use to convey meaning. This view of CS within the Interactional Model is of significance to this study as the data obtained from questionnaires and interviews

shows that CS for some of my subjects is an unconscious choice, particularly in informal situations, and for others, it appears to be a conscious one, particularly in formal situations. I shall, however, return to this issue in Chapter Three.

To conclude, Gumperz's (1982) 'Interactional Model', as discussed thus far, is of relevance to this study as the participants - the bilingual teachers and learners - share a common linguistic background (English and Zulu, English and Afrikaans, and Afrikaans and Zulu) that makes CS possible. By looking at CS as a discourse mode or a communicative option which is available to the Zulu-English bilingual participants within the classroom, I shall demonstrate how switching serves an expressive function and has pragmatic meaning. In addition, as I have already mentioned, Gumperz's (1982) 'Interactional Model' posits that meaningful interaction between interlocutors transcends grammatical competence. This is also of particular relevance to this investigation as learner responses should be evaluated for the message conveyed rather than for the form employed.

2.1.2 MYERS-SCOTTON'S (1993) MARKEDNESS MODEL

Myers-Scotton's proposal of a model of the functions of code selection i.e. the 'Markedness Model' is motivated by the notion that actual choices interlocutors make when speaking depend on the personae they wish to project, both to identify themselves as members of particular groups or to negotiate their position in interpersonal relations (Myers-Scotton 1992:165; 1993b:75). Myers-Scotton's argument for her model of code-switching is related to five developments within pragmatics, sociopragmatics and social psychology. What follows is a very brief overview of the

principles that underpin the Markedness Model.

Firstly, the model has its roots in Austin's (1962) basic insight that linguistic utterances can do something in addition to conveying referential information. Myers-Scotton developed this idea to show that bilinguals may use switching between languages as a tool and as a symbol of social relationships (Myers-Scotton 1992:165; 1993b:96). Secondly, Myers-Scotton builds her argument on Grice's (1975) 'Co-operative Principle' which holds that utterances have intentional as well as referential meaning. Gumperz (1982b:94) (see 2.1.1) touches upon Grice's discussion of conversational implicatures and the co-operative principle in relation to interpreting code choice. However, the Markedness Model rests on a negotiation principle which holds that conversation is an interactive behaviour i.e. whether a speaker's strategy is achieved depends largely on the addressee's response (Myers-Scotton 1992:166; 1993b:77). Thirdly, the model is based on the idea that code choices reflect the fact that speakers are rational actors, and as such, they have motivations for their choices; their choices minimize costs and maximize rewards for the speaker (Myers-Scotton 1992:166; 1993b:100). Fourthly, the model draws on a tradition from the school of conversation analysis (Sacks et al. 1974) that the social meaning of a talk exchange is accomplished by the exchange itself. Like this tradition, the Markedness Model sees switching as a negotiation of a social relationship and that whether that negotiation is successful depends on the addressee's own code choice as a response. Thus, the interactive and dynamic nature negotiating social meaning is stressed in this model (Myers-Scotton 1992:167). Fifth, the Markedness Model explains the social functions of CS within Hyme's concept of 'communicative competence' (see 2.1.1) (Myers-Scotton 1992:167; 1993b:79).

Clearly, the function of the Markedness Model is to explain the social motivation of code-switching. The aim of the model, is to account for the socio-psychological motivations of speakers when they engage in CS. It claims to have universal, predictive validity for all bilingual and multilingual communities. Although her own studies have focused on CS, particularly in the African context, Myers-Scotton explicitly wants her theory to be applicable for all phenomena of linguistic choices beyond CS (Wei 1998:158).

Within the Markedness Model, the choice of a linguistic code may be expected or normal i.e. unmarked, or unexpected or abnormal i.e. marked. This markedness has a normative basis within a speech community and speakers are aware of the consequences of making unmarked or marked choices. This is so because all linguistic choices, including code-switching, are indices of projected rights and obligations (RO) balances that exist between participants of a conversational exchange. These RO sets are derived from whatever situational features are salient for the community for that speech event, such as the status of the participants, the topic and the setting (Myers-Scotton 1992:167; 1993b:84; Goyvaerts 1995:175; Kamwangamalu 1997b:285). In some ways, Myers-Scotton's model is similar to Gumperz's distinction of situational and metaphorical switching. In Gumperz's model meaning is generated by situational switching, becomes associated with two codes, and is then used in those cases of language alternation that cannot be interpreted situationally i.e. metaphorical switching. I shall return to this distinction in Section 2.5 of this chapter. In the markedness theory, meaning is the accumulation of the associations between linguistic varieties and conventionalized conversational exchanges (Myers-Scotton 1987:69; Auer 1995:159; Wei 1998:159). However, Myers-Scotton (1993b:115) emphasises that

“no matter what the situational factors, it remains up to the speaker to make the choice to act upon them.”

The Markedness Model of CS rests on the principle,

“Choose the *form* of your conversation contribution such that it indexes the set of rights and obligations which you wish to be in force between speaker and addressee for the current exchange” (Myers-Scotton 1983:116; 1993b:113),

and the maxims following from this principle. These are: (a) the ‘un-marked choice maxim’; (b) the ‘marked-choice maxim’; and (c) the ‘exploratory-choice maxim’ (Myers-Scotton 1993b:113-4). A discussion of each of these follows.

(a) Code-switching as an unmarked choice :

Unmarked choices refer to code-switching that is both normal and expected by the participants, based on the RO set derived from whatever situational factors are salient for the community for that interaction (Myers-Scotton 1987:67; 1992:175; 1993b:84; Peires 1994:15). Unmarked choices are not chosen by speakers; they are used to establish the status quo (Myers-Scotton 1987:67). Myers-Scotton identifies two types of unmarked CS viz. CS as a sequence of unmarked choices (hereafter sequential unmarked CS) and CS itself as the unmarked choice (hereafter unmarked CS). These two types occur in different circumstances. Sequential unmarked CS is triggered by a change in situational factors during a talk exchange. In unmarked CS, the situational factors remain more or less the same but its presence depends more on the participants’ attitudes toward themselves and the social attributes which the codes and their

alternation index. In both cases however, CS is the unmarked choice for the unmarked RO set.

In all communities, the use of a particular code becomes identified as one of the unmarked indices of RO balances. According to Myers-Scotton (1992:169) this could mean that: (i) given all the codes that exist in a speech community, the most frequently occurring code will be isolated as the unmarked index of a specific interaction type; and (ii) when speakers use an unmarked code it signifies that they accept the RO balance for which that code is unmarked and they trust that their communicative intentions are, in general, received as intended. However, although code choices are generally unmarked for a given RO set, the same choices are not necessarily equally unmarked for all participants; this depends on their social identities (Myers-Scotton 1992:169).

Speakers in bi/multilingual communities may follow the unmarked choice maxim by speaking two languages in the same conversation; often the switching includes switches at the sentence level and clause level, and in certain communities even at the intraword level (Myers-Scotton 1987:62; 1993b:117). More recently, however, a switch within the same word (e.g. *siyafona*, we are phoning) is no longer regarded as an instance of CS, rather it is thought to be a case of integrated borrowing (Kamwangamalu 1999:259,260). Myers-Scotton (1987:62) also notes that CS as an unmarked choice encodes dual identities for the speaker - in each of the groups associated with the code. The following conversation that occurs between English-Zulu bilinguals i.e. the teacher and pupil of School Z of this study, serves as a point of illustration of CS as the unmarked choice :

EXAMPLE 1 :

- T So what do you think she wants to do? Does she really need the firewood?
 Uyazi dinga ngempela izinkuni zoku basa [Does she really need firewood?]
- L No. Ufuna ukumbulala [She wants to kill him].
- T Yes! She wants to kill him. Ufuna ukumbulala [She wants to kill him]. So this man at the top of the tree is screaming for help. What would you do? If you were this man what would you do? [Appendix C3b, LL50-5].

In this example, mixing codes have become part of the unmarked choice of RO set for these speakers.

Unmarked choices can also be used by Zulu-speaking pupils and teachers when referring to, for example, certain scientific terminology (particularly in subjects such as Biology, Physical Science, Maths. and Computer Studies) that have no Zulu equivalents, or for which such equivalents would be rather cumbersome. One interviewee of this research, a subject advisor, made the following comment on this issue :

EXAMPLE 2 :

"Ja, they will use English as they are supposed to, but sometimes the isiZulu teachers they switch to Zulu just to accommodate learners but in some cases it is not easy to use Zulu because there is no terminology in Zulu, for technology. So it is not always easy to use only Zulu. The English terminology must come in....." [Appendix B2a, SA4].

The use of CS as an unmarked choice is of particular relevance to my study. Firstly, CS is the unmarked choice for bilingual educators and learners both in the community in general (as the data from questionnaires and interviews shows) and in the domain of the school, and more especially in the classroom itself (as the data from questionnaires and interviews as well as lesson

recordings reveals). Secondly, using English only with English monolingual teachers and English monolingual learners has also become the unmarked choice for bilingual learners. This is clearly illustrated in the following responses of two Zulu-English bilingual interviewees of School E :

EXAMPLE 3 :

- R Do your Zulu friends switch between languages in their conversation?
- L That's only if it is a group of only Blacks they will talk in Zulu, but if the group is mostly Indians or it's mixed with Coloureds, then everything is in English. [Appendix B4b, EL5].

EXAMPLE 4 :

- R What language do you use when you have only English speaking pupils in your group?
- L In our groups, if there is only Zulu children then we use some Zulu but if we have Indians and Coloureds then we don't use Zulu. Because Mam, the Indian pupils and the Coloureds mam, they won't understand. That's not nice. [Appendix B4b, EL7].

At 'my' own school too, intersentential switching is clearly an unmarked choice. It is commonplace, for example, at a teacher-parent-pupil interaction for an English-Zulu bilingual teacher to address a Zulu speaking parent in Zulu, and a Zulu-speaking pupil, in English. Consider the following example of such an exchange concerning a pupil who has been playing truant and who has been lying to his parent about his report card :

EXAMPLE 5 :

- Teacher [to parent] : **Sithumela amareport card sonke isikhathi.** [We send a report card every term].
- [to pupil] : Who signed the report card huh?

Because the unmarked choice indexes an expected interpersonal relationship, and as such is not unusual or surprising in any way, it is the 'safer' choice and speakers will generally make this choice.

(b) Code-switching as a marked choice :

Marked choices refer to a "deviation from the expected or unmarked choice" (Myers-Scotton 1992:172). It is a deliberate action on the part of the speaker who, for one reason or other, dis-identifies him/herself with, or goes against the expected, unmarked RO set. The conversation takes place in a relatively conventionalized interaction, for which the unmarked RO set between the participants is clear, but, one of the speakers, rather than follow the unmarked choice maxim, chooses a different path i.e. the marked choice maxim, and in so doing calls for a new unmarked RO set. In other words, CS as a marked choice is always a negotiation to change the social distance holding in the current talk exchange, to change the RO balance between participants (Myers-Scotton 1987:62; 69; 1993b:131). Marked choices usually occur under two conditions: (a) Choices encoding deference - when the speaker wishes special consideration from the addressee, or when the speaker wishes to perform a face-threatening act, but still maintains good relationships with the addressee (Brown and Levinson 1978). For example, to encode a request, a speaker may switch to an ingroup identity; and (b) choices motivated by a participant's lack of ability to speak the unmarked choice (Myers-Scotton 1987:69). The marked-choice maxim directs speakers to :

"Make a marked code choice which is not the unmarked index of the unmarked RO set in an interaction when you wish to establish a new RO set as unmarked for the current exchange" (Myers-Scotton 1993b:131).

Researchers have demonstrated that speakers engage in marked choices to indicate a range of emotions from anger to affection, and to negotiate outcomes ranging from demonstrations of authority or of superior educational status to assertions of ethnic identity, and even excluding others. The effect in all cases is to negotiate a change in the expected social distance holding between participants, either increasing it or decreasing it. However, Myers-Scotton states that one of the most common uses of marked CS is to express authority, along with anger and annoyance (Myers-Scotton 1993b:132). Myers-Scotton (1993b:133) illustrates how English is a medium of a marked switch in an interaction (which is otherwise in Swahili) between a passenger (P) on a bus in Nairobi and a bus conductor (C), to express an authoritative and angry stance :

P Nataka kwenda Posta [I want to go to the Post Office].

C Kutoka hapa mpaka posta nauli ni senti hamsini [From here to the post office the fare is 50 cents].

(Passenger gives the conductor a shilling, from which he should get 50 cents in change).

Ngojea *change* yako [Wait for your change].

(Passenger says nothing until some minutes have passed and the bus is nearing the post office where the passenger plans to get off).

P Nataka *change* yangu [I want my change].

C *Change* utapata, Bwana [You'll get your change].

P *I am nearing my destination.*

C *Do you think I could run away with your change.*

CS as a marked choice is also evident in the following examples extracted from lesson recordings of the LLCA [L2] of School E and School Z :

EXAMPLE 6 :

T [loudly] Wat gaan aan daar? Krishen, *get on with your work*. Moenie 'n geraas maak nie! [What is going on there? Krishen,Don't make a noise]. [Appendix C4b, LL27-8].

EXAMPLE 7 :

T Ja, dit is klein. Die olifant is groot maar systertjie is klein. Die stertjie is kort. [Yes, it is small. The elephant is big but his tail is small. The tail is short]. *Excuse me you people, you are late*. [To the rest of the class] *Baleythi* [They are late]. Gaan na die personeelkamer! [Go to the staff room!] [Appendix C5b, LL74-6].

In Example 6, the teacher makes use of a marked choice by switching from Afrikaans to English to assert her authority as facilitator and influence the learner's behaviour. Similarly, in Example 7, the teacher makes a marked choice by switching from Afrikaans to English to express his annoyance at the learners who have arrived late to class. Peires (1994:19), however, notes that code-switching is likely to be unconscious on the part of the speakers and reveals "the social nuances the speakers have learnt to manipulate through the use of code-switching."

Another reason for marked CS is as an ethnically-based exclusion strategy. Myers-Scotton (1993b:135) notes that while there are instrumental values in keeping ethnicity salient, "out-group members suspect members of the same ethnic group of gross favouritism." Interviews with English monolinguals and Afrikaans-English bilinguals clearly indicate this to be so when Zulu is spoken in their presence. Consider the following snippets from interviews with an English monolingual subject advisor and an Afrikaans-English bilingual learner :

EXAMPLE 8 :

- R How do feel about [your teachers who switch to Zulu at workshops]?
- SA Well at the beginning I used to feel a bit suspicious whether, whether the speech was in the context of the workshop or whether it was going beyond..... that they were talking on personal matters, or even racial divides that came through....." [Appendix B2a, SA2].

EXAMPLE 9 :

- R Could you tell me why [you would rank English first, Afrikaans second and Zulu third]?
- L And then Zulu.... it's nice to know Zulu so when they say something you know what they're saying about you. So you know if they are talking about you. [Appendix B4a, AL5).

Myers-Scotton (1993b:136) adds, "in a variety of circumstances, speakers take a gamble and use their ethnic languages in front of others as marked CS." In addition, she states: "Invariably, those who are excluded are also offended; but again, such a choice is a matter of weighing the costs and rewards. And some speakers decide the rewards are great enough to make the marked choice" (Myers-Scotton 1993b;136).

Yet another reason for CS as a marked choice is the use of repetition, whereby content is repeated by switching to another language. In such a case, in addition to emphasising something, the purpose may also be to convey some kind of social meaning intended by the speaker (Myers-Scotton 1992:175). Consider the talk from the lesson recording on the poem, *An Irish airman foresees his death*, by the LLCE (L2) teacher of School Z, as a point of illustration :

EXAMPLE 10 :

If he is not forced by the law, if he is not bound by duty, if there are no public matters, if there are no cheering crowds that are forcing him to fight . You see, **ulwelani uma izizathu zokuthi alwe zingekho?** [if there are no reasons for him to fight, then, why does he fight?] Why does he go to war? It's because "A lonely impulse of delight." In other words, there's something that pleases this guy. He likes to do it. **Kuyamujabulisa** [It makes him happy]. He likes flying. He likes to be in the air in an aeroplane. His country is not on war. The war is between other countries It does not affect him. **Into eyenza ukuthi andize ukuthi uyakuthanda** [The only reason he is flying is that he likes it]. He loves it. *A lonely impulse of delight/ Drove to this tumult in the clouds.* Tumult? What do we mean by tumult? [Appendix C3d, LL116-124].

The switch to Zulu in each instance is for reiterative purposes, mostly for emphasis. I shall, however, discuss this function of CS in greater depth in Chapter Four. A marked choice then, derives its meaning from two sources viz. (i) it is a negotiation against the unmarked RO set, and (ii) the marked choice is a call for another RO set in its place (Myers-Scotton 1993b:131). According to Peires (1994:19) reasons for the marked choice can be understood if one is familiar with the social context.

CS as a marked choice is also of relevance to this study in that my data reveals: (i) that certain monolinguals feel excluded from certain CS conversations (suggesting that bilinguals' choice of code in the presence of English monolinguals might be a marked one); (ii) that bilingual learners and teachers resort to either Zulu, English, or Afrikaans to increase or decrease the social distance between them; and (iii) that CS as a marked choice is used to express some form of emotion. Further discussion will follow in Chapter Four.

(c) **Code-switching as an exploratory choice :**

Code-switching as an exploratory choice occurs when an unmarked choice is not obvious and speakers themselves are not sure of the expected or optimal communicative intent, or are unsure which code will help achieve their social goals. In these cases, speakers follow the exploratory-choice maxim :

"When an unmarked choice is not clear, use CS to make alternate exploratory choices as candidates for an unmarked choice and thereby as an index of an RO set which you favour" (Myers-Scotton 1993b:142).

Here, speakers negotiate one code first as a medium for the exchange and, depending upon the outcome of the negotiation, they may negotiate another code until they are satisfied that they have reached the balance of roles and obligations required for that particular conversational exchange (Myers-Scotton 1992:176; Kamwangamalu 1998:285). In cases where speakers do not know what norms apply and therefore do not know what the RO balance for themselves and other participants would be (Myers-Scotton 1993b:143) speakers engage in an exploratory choice. Myers-Scotton (1993b:143) notes that because of the interactive nature of the conversation when exploratory CS is used, CS as an exploratory choice best illustrates how CS is a 'true' negotiation. As a point of illustration, Kamwangamalu (1998:289) provides the following example of how, at the University of Natal, a security guard (SG) asks a lecturer (L) in Zulu to give a lady a ride :

EXAMPLE 11 :

SG : *Uyangakuphi Mnumzane. Ungangisiza uphe losisi u-lift uya e-King Edwards Hospital. [Which way are you going, Sir? Can you please give this lady a lift.*

She is going to King Edwards Hospital].

L : Sorry, I don't understand.

SG : Oh, I'm sorry, Sir. I was saying can you please give this lady a lift. She is going to King Edwards Hospital.

L : I'm sorry. I'm not going that way. I'm going to Windmere.

Speakers also engage in an exploratory choice when the overall norms of the society are in a state of flux. This is the case, for example, when there is a change in language policies. This was apparent in South Africa in 1994 with the birth of the additional nine official languages. It is only through the process of negotiation, by testing the responses of addressees, that code-choices are made. Myers-Scotton (1992) states that when such situations occur, the speaker may use CS to propose first one code and then another, before deciding which is received more favourably by the addressee. CS as an exploratory choice, however, is of no relevance to my study as participants are familiar with each other and know the linguistic repertoire and expectations of their conversational partners.

Myers Scotton's 'Markedness Model', within which CS can be seen as a means to encode both power and solidarity, a means to negotiate either greater or less social distance than is normative in a given situation, is of relevance to this study for a number of reasons, as I have noted in the fore-going literature. The participants in this research probably share norms for such features as status of participants, topic (aspect of the lesson) and setting (the classroom). In terms of the 'Markedness Model', teacher and learner code-choices would fall within the markedness continuum of unmarked and marked choices as both teacher and pupils would engage in negotiation of meaning to achieve certain goals. This is to say that even though CS is largely an

unconscious phenomenon (Gumperz 1982a; Adendorff 1993; Peires 1994) bilingual participants resort to CS to fulfill specific social and pedagogical functions such as achieving solidarity, emphasising ideas, explaining vocabulary and concepts and so on, evidence of which appears in Chapter Four.

To conclude, even though Myers-Scotton's contributions to CS is colossal it has not escaped criticism. Meeuwis and Blommaert (1994), for example, systematically delineates some of the limitations of the markedness model. Of relevance to this study, to echo these limitations succinctly, are that: Firstly, the model provides a framework for the understanding of CS at the interpersonal level of individual participants of a speech situation and does not consider "the level of relationships between categories beyond the individual, such as social groups". Secondly, the model constitutes a micro-ethnic approach to CS in that, as a communicative strategy, it is limited to the context of the conversational situation; it fails to introduce the whole structure of the speech community, within which the functions of CS might not be cooperative in the sense that it can exclude overhearers (Meeuwis and Blommaert 1994:411, 412). Hence, the authors maintain that because the markedness model is underpinned by the principle that speakers make their code choices exclusively in terms of interpersonally and situationally negotiable RO sets, it fails to account for the macro-level which constitutes the entire speech community. Nevertheless, as my study examines CS interpersonally (i.e. teacher-learner and learner-learner levels) and situationally (i.e. within the LLC, OBE classroom), Myers-Scotton's 'Markedness Model', as discussed above, is of relevance to this research.

2.1.3 WILLIAM SPADY'S (1994) MODEL OF OUTCOMES-BASED EDUCATION (OBE)

In addition to the literature review on code-switching, this study examines the literature on Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) as it investigates CS practices within the framework of OBE. In this section of the literature review, I explore Spady's principles of OBE and relate them to the OBE framework that has been established by the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA). From the literature on OBE it is clear that it has both advocates and critics. On the one hand, advocates see OBE as an innovative alternative to traditional academic-oriented education that develops active involvement of all people focusing on the idea of collective consciousness, offering a balance between school autonomy and accountability (McNeir 1993). They see the reality of current educational practices and picture how it will be if OBE works: everything will be focused on the outcomes, learning activities will be authentic, and more students will succeed (Brandt 1994). On the other hand, critics see it as a cunning manoeuvre to ultimately gain socio-political power over generations of children, conditioning them to be co-operative and pliable workers and citizens who will go along with the New World Order (Bonville 1988). They also emphasise how badly they think OBE will *actually* work: teachers will pursue soft issues such as self-esteem rather than academics, students will put off doing their work, and standards will drop (Brandt 1994). In the context of this study however, I do not question the *status quo* of OBE in the South African Education system. Rather, as I have stated at the outset, this study explores the use of learners' native language in the form of CS behaviour, more pointedly, within the framework of OBE in the senior phase at the secondary schools. Thus, this section of the literature review is intended to serve as a backdrop to the main focus of my study. I therefore

present an account of the principles that underpin Spady's (1994) model of OBE, and thereafter, I present an overview of the outcomes-based curriculum (Curriculum 2005) in South Africa.

2.1.3.1 THE BASIC PRINCIPLES OF OBE :

(a) What is OBE?

According to Spady (1994:1), OBE means “clearly focusing and organizing everything in an educational system around what is essential for all students to be able to do successfully at the end of their learning experiences. This means starting with a clear picture of what is important for students to be able to do, then organizing the curriculum, instruction, and assessment to make sure this learning ultimately happens.” This approach to education assumes that someone can determine what things are “essential for all students to be able to do”, and that it is possible to achieve these things through appropriate organization of the education system and through appropriate classroom practices (Killen 2002:3). According to Spady, the goal of education is to prepare students for a future as competent individuals in various life-performance roles, a brief discussion of which follows in the next part of this section. Hence, he maintains that the results of learning are of utmost importance, and his premise is that *all* students can learn, and it is not important how long it takes, as long as the desired learning takes place. The ultimate goal of OBE is for “education not to teach, but to revamp society” (Bonville 1986). According to McNeir (1993) there is no single, authoritative model for OBE. Frameworks for OBE share an emphasis on systems-level change; observable, measurable outcomes; and the belief that all students can learn. However, OBE has been interpreted in many different ways, paving the way for confusion among educational stake-holders. To clarify the confusion that might exist, Killen (2000:1;

2002:3) explains that OBE can be viewed in three different ways - as a theory of education, or as a systemic structure for education, or as classroom practice. 'True' OBE is an alignment of systemic structure and classroom practice with the theory. As a theory of education, it embodies and expresses a certain set of beliefs and assumptions about learning, teaching and the systemic structures within which these activities take place. The focus of my own study however, is on classroom practice. Crucial to the model of OBE is the concept of 'outcomes', a discussion of which follows.

(b) 'Outcomes' in OBE :

OBE comprises a dual focus: Firstly, the focus is on the desired end result of each learning 'outcomes'. Spady's definition of 'outcomes' is the acceptable, culminating demonstration of a significant learning behaviour i.e. they are the desired end results of each learning process. They are performances rather than curriculum content (Spady 1994:18; Brandt 1992; van der Horst and McDonald 1997:7). As such learners need to demonstrate that they have attained them. Therefore, as I shall discuss further on, learners must be continuously assessed to ascertain whether they are making any progress (van der Horst and McDonald 1997:7). Secondly, the focus is on instructive and learning processes that will guide the learners to these end results. Teachers are required to use the learning outcomes as a focus when they make instructional decisions and plan their lessons (van der Horst and McDonald 1997:7).

In the South African version of OBE C2005, the critical outcomes (see DOE 2002:1-2, for the set of 12 critical outcomes for South African schools) were designed to "ensure that learners gain

the skills, knowledge and values that will allow them to contribute to their own success as well as to the success of their family, community and the nation as a whole (DOE 1997c). For teachers in the South African education system, this has taken a more graphic form of statements of intention, written in terms of student learning. For Spady, learning is not significant unless the outcomes reflect the complexities of real life and give prominence to the life-roles that learners will face after they have finished their formal education. This is to say that the learning outcomes comprise the knowledge, understanding, skills and attitudes that learners should acquire to enable them to reach their full potential and lead successful and fulfilling lives as individuals (Killen 2000:2). Learning outcomes particularly, are of relevance to my own study as it will show that CS may be employed as a strategy towards achieving these outcomes.

Spady (1994:21) suggests 10 categories of outcomes, based on “fundamental life performance roles”. He suggests that these life performance roles “require complex applications of many kinds of knowledge and all kinds of competence as people confront the challenges surrounding them in their social system.” He proposes that no matter what life role learners face after formal education they would need to be competent in the 10 inter-related life performance roles he proposes. The life performance roles Spady suggests are :

- learner and thinker
- listener and communicator
- implementer and performer
- problem finder and solver
- planner and designer
- creator and producer
- teacher and mentor

- supporter and contributor
- team member and partner
- leader and organizer

Spady suggests that one way to prepare students for these life roles is to “continually engage students in both individual and team activities that explore important issues or phenomena; use multiple media and technologies; create products that embody the results of students’ explorations; and call for students to explain their work and products to adult and student audiences” (Spady 1994:22). This study will reveal that as CS is a natural feature among the bilingual learners, it is employed in facilitating the learning process and aids in better preparing learners for the above-mentioned life roles which are crucial for their self-development. The outcomes of significance to this study are those of LLC. I present a discussion of these outcomes in Section 2.2, *LLC in the OBE South African Curriculum*.

In addition to the idea that outcomes should describe long-term significant learning, OBE is underpinned by three basic premises: (i) All students can learn and succeed, but not all at the same time or in the same way; (ii) successful learning promotes even more successful learning; and (iii) schools (and teachers) control the conditions that determine whether or not students are successful at school learning (Killen 2000:3; 2002:5). From these three premises, Spady developed four essential principles of OBE viz. (i) clarity of focus; (ii) expanded opportunity; (iii) high expectations; and (iv) designing down (Brandt 1992; Killen 2000:3-5, 2002:5-6).

(i) **Clarity of focus :**

According to Spady, the principle of “clarity of focus” means that “all curriculum design, all instructional delivery, all assessment design is geared to what we want the kids to demonstrate successfully at the ‘real’ end - not just the end of the week, the end of the semester, the end of the year - but the end of their time with us” (Brandt 1992). In other words, everything that teachers do must be clearly focused on what they want learners to know, understand and be able to do successfully. Thus, when teachers plan and teach they should focus on helping learners to develop the knowledge, skills and dispositions that will enable them, ultimately, to achieve significant outcomes that have been clearly articulated. This principle obligates teachers to make both their short-term and long-term intentions for student learning clear to the learners at every stage of the teaching process. It also obligates teachers to focus all learner assessment on clearly defined important outcomes. Every learning episode should have a purpose; teachers must know why they are teaching whatever they are teaching. Teachers must inform their learners of the outcomes they are supposed to achieve, they must be able to explain to learners the purpose of everything they are learning so that they will have a better chance of achieving them (Killen 2000:3,5; 2002:5). The principle of ‘clarity of focus’ is significant to this study as “the *real ends*” (mentioned above) is that learners will have to function competently in a multilingual society (as that of Port Shepstone where this study is based). My own study will show that as CS is a natural linguistic behaviour among bi/multilingual speakers of this community, the alternate use of language in the classroom can be employed as a learning skill to maximize learners’ potential to communicate competently in realistic situations. I shall, however, return to this issue in Chapter Five.

(ii) **High expectations :**

The second basic principle of OBE is that teachers should have high expectations for all students so that they are able to do significant things well at the end (Brandt 1992). Teachers should encourage learners to engage deeply with the issues about which they are learning. Helping learners to achieve high standards is linked very closely with the idea that successful learning promotes more successful learning and that learners rise to their teachers' expectations of them (Spady 1994; van der Horst and McDonald 1997:7). When learners experience success, it reinforces their learning, builds their confidence and encourages them to accept further learning challenges. As such, teachers must structure learning so that learners can experience success. If necessary, learners should be given more than one chance to receive instruction and demonstrate learning. My own study will show that one of the strategies that bilingual teachers use in helping their learners experience success is by drawing on learners' NL in the classroom; the study will show that the use of learners' NL in the classroom by means of CS, among other values, aids in boosting learners' self-esteem.

In line with these underlying principles is that learning needs to be challenging in order to engage learners. Teachers should therefore ensure that outcomes are challenging, and all learners should be expected to achieve them at high performance levels (Killen 2000:4). Teachers should be concerned with helping learners to apply their knowledge, skills and values rather than encouraging them to memorize facts and simply accumulate knowledge. This study will show that, as knowledge, skills and values are usually first acquired in one's mother tongue, switching strategically to the learners' mother tongue in the classroom facilitates the acquisition of this

outcome of OBE. Using the OBE approach, intellectual learning is not something reserved for a few learners; it is something that should be expected for all learners (Killen 2000:5, 2002:6). However, van der Horst and McDonald (1997:7) point out that expectations must be realistic. In South Africa we have to guard against stereotyping learners from different groups in this regard. This is particularly so in schools such as School E of this study, where there are learners from different racial, cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

(iii) Expanded opportunity :

Linked to the second principle is the principle of ‘expanded opportunity’. This third principle is that teachers must strive to expand the ways and number of times learners get a chance to learn and demonstrate, at a very high level, whatever they are ultimately expected to learn (Brandt 1992). This principle is based on the idea that not all learners can learn the same thing at the same time (Spady 1994). An underlying notion is that learners have different characteristics and dispositions that influence what and how they learn. They are also capable of achieving complex outcomes if they are given appropriate opportunities and time. Teachers should therefore expect learners to learn in *different ways* (my emphasis - as this study focuses on how CS can be employed as one of the ways in facilitating the learning process) and at different rates and they must try and allow for these differences. Teachers must also accommodate the different learning styles of learners and give them multiple opportunities to learn, rather than label them as failures if they do not learn on the first opportunity (Killen 2000:4; van der Horst and McDonald 1997:7). This principle has relevance to my own study in that it will show that where learners experience difficulty with the L2, for example, in unpacking textual information, CS may be used as an

effective means of doing so. The study will show that when learners are given opportunities to explore the L2 using their NL strategically, they are better equipped to deal with the various issues that are raised in their L2 learning. However, I shall discuss this issue extensively in Chapters Three and Four.

(iv) Designing down :

The fourth principle of ‘designing back’ means that the starting point for all school curriculum design must be a clear definition of what the learner is expected to achieve by the end of their formal education (Brandt 1992). Thereafter, instructional designs are made by tracing back from the “desired end result” and identifying the “building blocks” that will be required to achieve that end. What this ultimately means, is that there should be direct and explicit links between all planning, teaching and assessment decisions and the significant outcomes that learners must achieve (Killen 2000:3; 2002:5-6). In other words, when applied to South African schools, the significant outcomes that all learners are to achieve by the end of their compulsory schooling (i.e. grade 9) must be clearly defined. These outcomes would then have to be used to derive a set of outcomes for each Key Learning Area (hereafter, KLA). The learning areas in the senior phase, the phase in which this study is based, are Language, Literacy and Communication (LLC); Human and Social Sciences (HSS); Technology (TECH); Mathematical Literacy, Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences (MLMMS); Natural Sciences (NS); Arts and Culture (A&C); Economics and Management Science (EMS); and Life Orientation (LO). As stated at the outset, this study focuses on the KLA, LLC and whether or not CS is used in this KLA, and if so, the forms and functions of it in enhancing learning. Within OBE C2005, the outcomes are defined

for each subject within each KLA and lessons are developed to enable students to achieve the outcomes of each unit (Killen 2000:3 - 4). Christensen (2002) sums this principle in: “Outcomes are important goals, not curriculum. You start with where you want to end up.” The relevance of this principle to this study is, as it will show, that CS might be a useful starting point for L2 learners in a variety of lessons to achieve desired ends. I return to this point in Chapters Four and Five.

2.1.3.2 OUTCOMES-BASED CURRICULUM IN SOUTH AFRICA :

As already stated, the principles that underpin OBE are of relevance to this study as it explores CS practices within the framework of OBE in the South African situation. South Africa is one of the most complex, heterogeneous and unique countries in the world. Having survived a regime of segregation, the aftermath of unsound educational policies is still being felt in schools that were victims of apartheid ideologies and practices. In an effort to overcome the injustices of the divisions that existed in the educational domain, the new government has proposed an educational policy that is intended to “simultaneously overturn the legacy of apartheid education and catapult South Africa into the 21st century” (DOE 2000a:1). The government’s decision was to implement a curriculum based on the tenets of OBE. Indeed, official documentation links C2005 to national goals and does not distinguish clearly between C2005 and OBE. In 1997, the Department of Education, for example, defined C2005 as :

“... an OBE curriculum derived nationally agreed on critical cross-field outcomes that sketch our vision of a transformed society and the role education has to play in creating it” (DOE 1997a).

C2005 and the outcomes framework are in turn also linked with the vision and goals of the National Qualifications Framework (NQF). The Department of Education's teachers' manual for Grade 7 describes OBE as "the vehicle to deliver the critical outcomes defined in the NQF". According to van der Horst and McDonald (1997:5), the new education policy promotes "a balanced view, by developing learners' critical thinking powers and their problem-solving abilities". The new outcomes-based curriculum in South Africa is aimed at developing a thinking, problem-solving citizen who will be empowered to participate in the development of the country in an active and productive way (van der Horst and McDonald 1997:6). Crucial to OBE and more specifically, C2005, are the issues of methodology. Although my own study does not explore these issues I present a brief overview of principles informing curriculum design with regard to methodology as a background to a better understanding of CS practices in the classroom. Stemming from the four major principles that underpin OBE is, among other things, that teaching should be learner-centred. I focus only on this aspect in this section as it is of special significance to my own study in that it examines the role of CS in facilitating learner-learner interaction, more particularly during group work, in meeting the various outcomes outlined for LLC.

(a) The adoption of the learner-centred approach :

The literature on effective teaching is extensive and diverse. However, what is agreed on is that *no single teaching strategy is effective all the time for all learners*. The reason is that teaching and learning are very complex processes that are influenced by many different factors such as learners' attitudes, abilities and learning styles; teachers' beliefs, knowledge and abilities; and the learning context (Killen 2000:6-7). As such, this study, as will be seen, suggests that CS by

drawing on the learners' NL is one of the effective teaching strategies in the KLA, LLC. In adopting the learner-centred approach, the OBE model de-emphasises traditional teaching methods where the teacher is the authoritative figure and transmitter of knowledge and emphasises methods where the learner is not a passive recipient of knowledge but an active participant in the teaching-learning process.

The two approaches to teaching (teacher-centred and learner-centred) differ in ways such as what the teacher does, how the lessons are organized, how much the learners are actively involved in learning, and how learning is assessed. OBE is a learner-centred, results-oriented approach to learning where the focus is on the learner. In this approach the teacher relinquishes his traditional role as transmitter of knowledge and embraces the new role of facilitator. This approach is based on the 'high expectations' principle of OBE. Learners must be allowed to learn to their full potential. They should be motivated by providing them with positive learning experiences, by affirming their worth and demonstrating respect for their various languages, cultures, and personal circumstances. This should be combined with the regular acknowledgement of learners' achievements and the development of their ability and will to work both co-operatively and independently. My own study will demonstrate that one of the ways in which teachers acknowledge learners' achievements is by using the learners' NL to complement them and so provide positive reinforcement. Indeed, this study will show that, in addition to promoting academic goals, the strategic use of CS fulfills psychological goals as well.

In addition, as the learning environment is responsible for creating and controlling the conditions

under which learners can succeed, teachers are charged with the responsibility of creating learning environments which are “inviting, challenging and motivating” (Killen 2000:8). The classroom atmosphere should be positive, thereby promoting a culture of learning. Here too, my study will show that where learners’ knowledge of the L2 is very limited, one of the ways in creating a positive learning environment is by acknowledging the learners’ NL and permitting its use where and when necessary so that learners do not feel remote from the L2 learning experience. Furthermore, it is expected that all the different stake-holders in education, such as the teachers, learners and parents share in the responsibility for learning (van der Horst and McDonald 1997:7; Gultig et al. 1998:4; Killen 2000:8). However, lesson recordings from my own study reveal that not all the teacher participants adopt this approach. Two teachers in particular, have maintained their traditional role as transmitters of knowledge with very little learner participation [see appendices C3 and C5].

Finally, crucial to the issue of learner-centred teaching and learning within the framework of OBE C2005, is the notion of ‘competence’. According to the integrated conception of competence advocated by OBE, competence is conceptualized in terms of “knowledge, abilities, skills and attitudes displayed in the context of a carefully chosen set of realistic professional tasks which are of an appropriate level of generability” (Hager et al. 1994). Hence, and in addition to the various principles underlying OBE, it is clear that learners need to acquire grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse and strategic competences, as proposed by Canale and Swain (1980) to become functioning, competent citizens who can contribute meaningfully to the development of society. A discussion of Canale and Swain’s (1980) model of communicative competence follows.

2.1.4 CANALE & SWAIN'S (1980) MODEL OF COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE

The above literature on the principles undergirding OBE and its South African offspring, C2005, together with an insight into the outcomes formulated for Language, Literacy and Communication (which is discussed in the next section, 2.2) clearly point to the communicative way of teaching in both first and second language acquisition. It is not within the scope of this study to explore the principles and practices of the communicative language teaching (CLT) approach to teaching and learning - the reader may wish to refer to Johnson and Morrow (1981) and Larsen-Freeman (1986) for a discussion of these issues. Suffice to say that the CLT focuses on the collaborative nature of meaning making (Canale and Swain 1980:1-2; Savignon 1991:261) and is underpinned by the principle of 'communicative competence'. Thus, this part of the literature is organized in the following way: First, I provide a background to 'communicative competence', distinguishing between the linguistic approach and communicative approaches to second language teaching and briefly discuss commonly accepted definitions of communicative competence. Second, I present a discussion of the model of communicative competence proposed by Canale and Swain (1980) and its relevance to C2005, more specifically, to the Key Learning Area (KLA), Language, Literacy and Communication (LLC).

2.1.4.1 BACKGROUND

(a) Grammatical and communicative approaches :

In the 1970s research on communicative competence distinguished between linguistic or grammatical approaches and communicative approaches e.g. Hymes (1972b). The grammatical

approach is often thought of as synonymous with Chomsky's (1965) rule-governed grammar. It refers to an approach that is organized on the basis of linguistic forms (i.e. phonological forms, morphological forms, syntactic patterns and lexical items) and emphasises the ways in which these forms may be combined to form grammatical sentences. In this view, the accurate use of language plays an important role in clear communication of the message. Thus, learners were trained in the recognition and the use of structure and grammar in the teaching of the target language (Canale and Swain 1980:2-3; Hartley 1982:15). On the other hand, the communicative approach, advocated by C2005, is organized on the basis of communicative functions (i.e. using appropriate social language, gestures or expressions in the culture of the target language) that learners need to know and emphasises the ways in which particular grammatical forms may be used to express the functions appropriately (Canale and Swain 1980:2). The ultimate goal of CLT is for learners to develop a functional ability to use language as an effective instrument in a given situation, that is, to use language appropriately (Hartley 1982:15). This means that learners should be able to communicate with other speakers focusing on speaking and listening skills, on writing for specific communicative purposes, and on 'authentic' or real-life situated reading texts. The specific relevance of the CLT to this study is that even though extensive use should be made of the target language in lessons at a level appropriate to the class, for instructions to be clearly understood, they could be given in the native language of the learner. If the teacher does switch to the learners' NL, s/he should repeat the instructions in the target language once s/he is satisfied that the instructions are fully understood (*Communicative Language Teaching* 2000).

The goals of CLT are clearly reflected in the assessment criteria and range statements for the

various critical outcomes of LLC of C2005. *Critical outcomes*, as discussed in the preceding part of the literature review, refers to the type of behaviour it is hoped that learners will demonstrate by the 'end' of particular learning experiences i.e. the skills, knowledge and values that will allow them to realize their potential of the various life-roles as individuals and members of the community. As I shall discuss in the literature review of LLC, there are seven outcomes and each of these outcomes has assessment criteria and range statements which serve as goals to language teaching and learning. *Assessment criteria* provide evidence that the learner has achieved the specific outcomes. They indicate "the observable processes and products of learning which serve as culminating demonstrations of the learner's achievement" (DOE 1997c:12). *Range statements* "indicate the scope, depth, level of complexity and parameters of the achievement" (DOE 1997c:12). Some of the assessment criteria and range statements that pave the way for a communicative way of teaching and their relevance to my own study are indicated in the discussion of the different types of competences proposed by Canale and Swain (1980) in their model of communicative competence. This is so because CLT is underpinned by the theoretical principle of communicative competence, a definition of which follows.

(b) On defining communicative competence :

Campbell and Wales (1970) and Hymes (1972b) were among the first to point out the inadequacies of Chomsky's (1965) version of competence. They maintained that it did not consider the appropriateness of sociocultural significance of an utterance in the situational and verbal context in which it was used. For Campbell and Wales (1970:247) "by far the most important linguistic ability (is that of being able) to produce or understand utterances which are

not so much grammatical but, more important, *appropriate to the context in which they are made*" (their emphasis). Similarly, Hymes (1972b:278) asserts that "there are rules of use without which the rules of grammar would be useless." His argument leads to a greater awareness of the relationship between linguistic and sociocultural competence :

"From a finite experience of speech acts and their interdependence with sociocultural features, (children) develop a general theory of speaking appropriate in their community which they employ, like other forms of tacit cultural knowledge (competence) in conducting and interpreting social life" (Hymes 1972b: 279);

and

"From a communicative standpoint, judgements of appropriateness may not be assigned to different spheres, as between the linguistic and the cultural; certainly the spheres will interact" (Hymes 1972b: 286).

In view of Chomsky's (1965) claim that competence is to be associated exclusively with knowledge of rules of grammar, both Campbell and Wales (1970) and Hymes (1972b) propose a broader notion of competence i.e. communicative competence. Communicative competence transcends Chomsky's linguistic approach to embrace "the tremendous variety of ways of speaking which are found within the individual and within the community" (Hartley 1982:15). This includes not only grammatical competence (i.e. explicit and implicit knowledge of the rules of grammar) but also contextual or sociolinguistic competence (i.e. knowledge of the rules of language use) which includes a learner's ability to convey and interpret messages in specific contexts (Canale and Swain 1980:6; Brown 1993:227). In adopting the view that grammatical competence is an essential component of communicative competence, Canale and Swain (1980) maintain that in normal conversation native speakers will focus more on language use than on

grammar. Thus, for them, communicative competence refers to “the relationship and interaction between grammatical competence and sociolinguistic competence” (Canale and Swain 1980:5).

Similarly, Savignon (1983:9) notes that “communicative competence is relative, not absolute, and depends on the co-operation of all the participants involved.” She states that communicative competence is characterized by the ability of learners to interact with other speakers, and to make meaning, as distinct from learners’ ability to perform on discrete-point tests of grammatical knowledge. For her, the notion of communicative competence is to be found in the use of communicative strategies: “..... encouraging students to ask for information, to seek clarification, to use circumlocution and whatever other linguistic and non-linguistic resources they could muster to negotiate meaning” (Savignon 1991:264). This approach to communicative competence holds significance for my own study as well as for OBE C2005. For the former, this approach accounts for the use of CS as a linguistic resource in negotiating meaning. Its significance for OBE C2005 is that the principles of syllabus design must integrate aspects of both grammatical competence and sociocultural knowledge. This can be seen in the outcomes, assessment criteria and range statements for the various KLAs, more significantly, LLC. For example, for Outcome 1, “*Learners make and negotiate meaning and understanding*” one of the assessment criteria is:

“Ways in which construction of meaning varies according to cultural, social and personal differences are identified ” (DOE 1997c:22).

This specific assessment criterion clearly demonstrates the integration of grammatical competence and sociocultural knowledge. In addition, the DOE (1997c) calls for ‘authentic’ or

real-life texts or situations for the teaching and learning of LLC, which, in turn, calls for the development of sociolinguistic competence.

In Canale and Swain's (1980) model of communicative competence and later in Canale's (1983) definition, four different components make up the construct of communicative competence. A discussion of each of these components follows.

2.1.4.2 CANALE AND SWAIN'S (1980) COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE

In defining *communicative competence*, Canale and Swain (1980) initially proposed three components viz. grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence (which included discourse competence) and strategic competence. However, subsequently they modified it to four components i.e. grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse and strategic competences (Canale and Swain 1980:29-31; Canale 1983:272-273; Brown 1994:227). In proposing their theoretical framework, Canale and Swain (1980) have in mind several general assumptions about the nature of communication and of a theory of communicative competence. For example, following Morrow (1977, cited in Canale and Swain 1980:29) they understand communication to be based in sociocultural, interpersonal interaction to involve unpredictability and creativity, to take place in a discourse and sociocultural context, to be purposive behaviour, to involve the use of authentic (as opposed to textbook-contrived) language, and to be judged as successful or not on the basis of behavioural outcomes. They assume with Candlin (1978, cited in Canale and Swain 1980:29) that the relationship between proposition (i.e. the literal meaning of an utterance) and its social meaning is variable across different sociocultural and discourse contexts, and that

communication involves the continuous evaluation and negotiation of social meaning on the part of the participants. Finally, in keeping with the integrative theories of Morrow (1977) and Candlin (1978), among others, for Canale and Swain, communication is understood to involve verbal and non-verbal symbols, oral and written modes, and production and comprehension skills (Canale and Swain 1980:29; Canale 1983:268). According to Canale and Swain (1980), a theory of communicative competence interacts with a theory of human action and with other systems of human knowledge (e.g. world knowledge). Hence, the model of communicative competence proposed by Canale and Swain (1980) is an integrative one, incorporating (a) grammatical competence, (b) sociolinguistic competence, (c) discourse competence, and (d) strategic competence - all of which can be seen in the syllabus design of C2005 for both first and second language acquisition. In this study, more particularly in Chapters Four and Five, I will show how CS can be used as a teaching and learning strategy in accomplishing, especially, grammatical, sociolinguistic and strategic competences.

(a) Grammatical competence :

Grammatical competence involves the “computational aspects of language” (Schachter 1990:40) i.e. the knowledge of lexical items, the rules or formulations or constraints of morphology, syntax, sentence-grammar semantics, and phonology. For Canale and Swain (1980) and Canale (1983), grammatical competence is an important concern for any communicative approach whose goals include providing learners with the knowledge of how to determine and express accurately the literal meaning of utterances (Canale and Swain 1980:29-330; Canale 1983: 273). The role of linguistic competence in language acquisition is clearly expressed by Savignon (1991:268):

“Communication cannot take place in the absence of structure, or grammar, a set of shared assumptions about how language works....” Hence, any suggestion that grammatical competence is unimportant in CLT is a fallacy. Rather, as Savignon (1991:268) asserts: “....the replacement of language laboratory structure drills with meaning-focused self-expression was found to be a more effective way to develop communicative ability *with no loss of morphosyntactic accuracy*” (her emphasis). This is the approach adopted by C2005. The role of grammatical competence in language acquisition in the KLA, LLC of C2005 is made quite lucid in the assessment criteria and range statement of, for example, Outcome 5, “*Learners understand, know and apply language structures and conventions in context*” :

The assessment criteria are :

- i. “Knowledge of grammatical structures and conventions is applied to structure text.”
- ii. “Incorrect and/or inappropriate language usage by self and others is edited.”

The range statement is:

“.... learners study and apply a range of grammatical structures and conventions in a range of texts” (DOE 1997c:30).

These assessment criteria are of relevance to my study as it is based in the LLC classrooms. It is also significant in that teachers could make use of CS in teaching grammatical competence. For example, the teacher could point out the difference between grammatical structures between the learners’ NL and that of the target language. As a point of illustration, in the teaching of Afrikaans L2 to English L1 speakers in School E, the teacher provides the following examples of how she makes use of English to explain grammatical structure and vocabulary :

- i. In the teaching of prepositional use, in English for example, one would say: “Climb *up* the tree.” The Afrikaans equivalent of this statement is: “Klim *in* die boom” and not “op” which is the direct translation of “up”.
- ii. Lexical items could also be pointed out by contrasting the English and Afrikaans versions. For example, the Afrikaans equivalents of the English words “photograph” and “photographer” are “foto” and “fotograaf” respectively. Learners’ attention is drawn to the fact that ‘fotograaf’ is *not* ‘photograph’ but photographer.

Similarly, the lesson recordings of the teacher clearly demonstrate how she draws on learners’ NL in teaching grammatical structure in the L2 (see appendix C4a).

(b) Sociolinguistic competence :

According to Canale and Swain (1980:30) and Canale (1983:273) sociolinguistic competence “addresses the extent to which utterances are produced and understood appropriately in different sociolinguistic contexts depending on contextual factors such as status of participants, purposes of the interaction and norms or conventions of interaction.” Appropriateness of utterances refer to both appropriateness of meaning and appropriateness of form. *Appropriateness of meaning* concerns the extent to which particular communicative functions (e.g. commanding, complaining, inviting, requesting etc.), attitudes (including politeness and formality) and ideas are judged to be proper in a given situation (Canale and Swain 1980:30; Canale 1983: 273). For example, in the school situation it would be quite improper and unacceptable for a learner to command a teacher to explain a concept s/he does not understand but it would be proper and acceptable for him/her to request it. *Appropriateness of form* concerns the extent to which a given meaning

(including communicative function, attitudes and propositions/ideas) is represented in a verbal and/or non-verbal form that is proper in a given context (Canale and Swain 1980:30; Canale 1983: 273). For example, once again in the context of a school, it would be improper for a learner to greet his/her teacher with: “Howzit?” although the same greeting is perfectly acceptable with a friend.

According to Canale, this notion of appropriateness is what is called “interactional competence”, which also addresses appropriateness of non-verbal behaviour. In Canale’s (1983:274) view, sociolinguistic competence is crucial in interpreting utterances for their “social meaning” (i.e. communicative meaning and attitude) when this is not clear from the literal meaning of utterances or from non-verbal cues. As such, this component of communicative competence should not be perceived as being of less importance than grammatical competence in language acquisition. Blum-Kulka (1980:40) emphasises the importance of sociolinguistic competence for second language pedagogy: “It is quite clear that as long as we do not know more about the ways in which communicative functions are being achieved in different languages (second languages) learners will often fail to achieve their communicative ends in the target language, and neither they nor their teachers will really understand why.” While Blum-Kulka (1980) as well as Canale and Swain (1980) focus on sociolinguistic competence for L2 acquisition (and is thus of relevance to my own study), Shaw (1992:12) points out that NL speakers themselves might lack knowledge of appropriate rules for effective discourse. Thus, sociolinguistic competence for L1 acquisition, such as English L1 in School E of this study, cannot be under-emphasised. Indeed, the need for sociolinguistic competence for both L1 and L2 acquisition is recognized and

promoted by C2005. This can be clearly seen in, for example, the assessment criteria of Outcome 1, "*Learners make and negotiate meaning and understanding*" :

- i. "Ways in which construction of meaning varies according to cultural, social and personal differences are identified."
- ii. "Ways in which context affects meaning and understanding are identified" (DOE 1997c:24).

My own study will show that the strategic use of CS by teachers in the LLC (L2) classrooms facilitates the attainment of Outcome 1, a discussion of which follows in Chapters Four and Five.

(c) Discourse Competence :

Canale (1983:275) describes this type of competence as "mastery of how to combine grammatical forms and meanings to achieve a unified spoken or written text in different genres" (i.e. the type of text e.g. oral and written narrative, an argumentative essay, a scientific report, a business letter etc.). Unity in text is achieved through cohesion (i.e. grammatical links) in form and coherence (i.e. appropriate combination of communicative functions) in meaning. Cohesion deals with how utterances are linked structurally and facilitates interpretation of a text (Canale and Swain 1980:30) while coherence deals with relationships among the different meanings in a text (Canale 1983: 275). As the LLC component of C2005 stresses both oral and written discourse, discourse competence plays a key role in both L1 and L2 acquisition and is thus of relevance to this study. The role of discourse competence in language acquisition can be seen in the criteria assessment and range statement of Outcomes 2 and 4 :

For Outcome 2, “*Learners show critical awareness of language usage*” one of the assessment criteria is :

“Awareness of how language changes over time and place is demonstrated”;

and the range statement is:

“(At the senior level) learners engage with a wide range of texts, forms of discourse and a variety of contexts.”

For Outcome 4, “*Learners access, process and use information from a variety of sources and situations,*” the assessment criteria are :

- i. “Organizational skills are applied.”
- ii. “Reasoned arguments are developed in the course of applying information” (DOE 1997c:24, 28).

(d) Strategic competence :

This component is composed of mastery of verbal and non-verbal communication strategies that may be called into action for two main reasons: (i) to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to limiting conditions in actual communication (e.g. momentary inability to recall an idea or grammatical form) or to insufficient competence in one or more of the other areas of communicative competence; and (ii) to enhance the effectiveness of communication (e.g. deliberately slow and soft speech for rhetorical effect) (Canale and Swain 1980:30-31; Canale 1983: 276-277). One example of one compensatory strategy for not remembering or not knowing a given grammatical form can be paraphrase. Thus if a learner does not know the term ‘train station’ s/he might try a paraphrase such as ‘the place where trains go’. Strategic competence is

not limited to repair work in grammar but can extend to resolving problems of a sociolinguistic and/or discourse nature (Canale 1983: 277). Similarly, it is my view that, in developing strategic competence, learners need not necessarily use paraphrasing in the target language only, as suggested by one interviewee :

Once you start translating, we must expect translations. There are other ways you can do it.... by rephrasing, by simplifying, even through gestures for a learner to make sense. [Appendix B2a, SA7];

the learner could also use paraphrasing as a learning strategy by switching to the mother tongue. Indeed, as a discussion of the lesson recordings in Chapter Four reveals, CS as paraphrasing is an effective strategy that fulfills a variety of pedagogical goals.

Canale and Swain's (1980) model of communicative competence has implications for both methodology and teacher training and is therefore of direct relevance to my own study. More pertinently, Savignon (1983) describes communicative competence as a creative ability, rather than habits. To me, learners should be given ample opportunity (one of the principles of OBE, discussed in 2.1.3) for learning - this includes opportunities for them to make use of code-switching if it means developing their creative potential and communicative competences. In addition, Krashen (1984:24) asserts that as communicative competence is deeper and vaster than rule-governed linguistic behaviour, the teacher cannot impart all of it directly. Much of it must be acquired i.e. *figured out from input through experience with the language* (my emphasis). This also, to me, suggests that CS is a crucial language learning strategy - it is only through manipulation of the language, possibly through CS, that learners realize their full potential in the

various components of communicative competence. Furthermore, it is worth noting that Canale and Swain's (1980) model of communicative competence is closely aligned to Gumperz's (1982) *Interactional Model* (discussed in 2.1.1) which sees code-switching as an integral part of language acquisition. Gumperz (1981b) defines communicative competence as "the knowledge of linguistic and related communicative conventions that speakers must have to initiate and sustain conversational involvement." He maintains that communication always presupposes some sharing of signalling conventions, *but this does not mean that interlocutors must speak a single language or dialect* (my emphasis) in the sense that linguists use the term (Gumperz 1981b:325-326). It therefore follows that CS can be used as a technique in developing grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse and strategic competences among learners in the LLC classroom. Indeed, this is the stance that this study adopts and will be discussed in the next chapter. What follows, however, is the literature on Language, Literacy and Communication within the framework of C2005.

2.2 LANGUAGE, LITERACY AND COMMUNICATION (LLC) IN OBE-C2005

In section 2.1.3, a discussion of the principles that underpin OBE, I stated that of the eight Key Learning Areas (KLA) that comprise the senior phase of C2005, Language, Literacy and Communication (LLC), more specifically LLC English (LLCE) and LLC Afrikaans (LLCA), is of relevance to my study. In KZN, and the context of this study, LLC comprises English, Afrikaans and Zulu, each of which must be studied as either a primary or additional language. This is in line with the Department of Education's policy for language learning and teaching :

"(An approach to multilingualism in South Africa) assumes that the learning of two or more languages should be the general practice and principle in our society" (DOE 1997g:1).

As stated at the outset, the schools at which this study is based study English and Afrikaans as either primary or additional language, and Zulu in one of the schools is studied as a primary language. As also stated, the focus of this study is not to examine whether or not classroom practices advocated by OBE C2005 are adhered to but rather the focus is on attitudes of education stake-holders toward the three languages and the CS practices that contribute to language acquisition in the LLC classroom. A discussion of the key features, outcomes and other rubrics of LLC in this section is thus meant to serve as a backdrop to the focus of my study. In this section of the literature review I present an overall view of LLC by discussing the rationale for its inclusion in the curriculum; the issue of literacy; the specific outcomes of LLC (more specifically SO1, SO2, SO3, SO5 and SO7 as my study shows that CS by bilingual teachers and learners is used mostly to facilitate the acquisition of these outcomes); language across the curriculum; and skills-related assessment criteria.

2.2.1 RATIONALE

LLC, which is intrinsic to human development and central development to life learning, forms one of eight parts of KLA but 20% of the learners' total time of instruction and total aggregate. The time is divided between a primary language (60%) and additional language (40%). At a LLC meeting held by DOE on 16 September 2002 in Port Shepstone, educators of LLC were informed that a new promotion requirement was to be implemented at the end of 2002; the learner had to

pass the primary language at 50% and the additional language at 40%. The inclusion language (which includes sign language, and alternative and augmentative methods of communication) and language learning is intended to empower people to make meaning; negotiate learning and understanding; access education; access information and literacies; think and express their thoughts and emotions logically, critically and creatively, and respond with empathy to the thoughts and emotions of others; interact and participate socially, politically, economically, culturally and spiritually; understand the relationship between language and power, and influence relationships through this understanding; develop and reflect on values and attitudes; and communicate in different contexts by using a range of registers and language varieties (DOE 1997b:15; 1997c:18). In my own study, the lesson recordings of the various LLC lessons clearly indicate that the teacher participants, in their individual ways, promote many (if not all) of the above aims. For example, by engaging pupils in short texts (such as a comprehension passage and a poem) and long texts (such as the study of a novel), teachers fulfill almost all of the above goals of language learning. The relevance of the use of literary texts of different genres will be seen in my discussion in Chapter Five, in which I conclude that the combination of literary texts and CS is a powerful tool in fulfilling the aims mentioned above. In addition, by including more than one language in the curriculum, the DOE aligns itself to the national language policy of multilingualism. By including both the learners' NL as well as a language of the community, multilingualism is advanced as a major resource which affords learners to develop and value not only their mother tongue, cultures and literacies but the language(s) of others in a multilingual country. It also promotes a shared understanding of a common South African culture (DOE 1997c:18). This is of particular significance to this study as it will show that CS can be a useful

resource in acknowledging and valuing learners' NL, thereby fulfilling psychological effects.

2.2.2 LITERACY AND LITERACIES

Initially, the term 'literacy' was seen as a cognitive process that enables reading, writing, and numeracy. Currently, the use of the term has expanded to include several kinds of literacies. According to the document on LLC, 'literacies' "stresses the issue of access to the world and to knowledge through development of multiple capacities within all of us to make sense of our worlds through *whatever means we have* (my emphasis), not only texts and books." In advancing LLC skills, the teacher may therefore draw on various kinds of literacies, for example *cultural literacy* [my emphasis] (i.e. cultural, social and ideological values that shape one's 'reading' of texts); critical literacy (i.e. the ability to respond critically to the intentions, contents and possible effects of messages and texts on the reader); visual literacy (i.e. the interpretation of images, signs, pictures and non-verbal language); *media literacy* [my emphasis] (i.e. the 'reading' of e.g. television and film as cultural messages); and computer literacy (i.e. the ability to use and access information from computers (DOE 1997c:20). My interpretation of the concept 'literacies', with particular attention to the words/phrases that I have emphasised, together with the Department of Education's policy of multilingualism :

"(The right of the learner to choose the language of learning and teaching) must be exercised within the overall framework of the obligation on the education system to promote multilingualism" (DOE 1997g:2),

is that CS by learners should be a natural linguistic behaviour for learning and teaching. My own study demonstrates the use of mostly cultural and critical literacies. However, the reader needs to bear in mind that the recording of lessons was done within a short time frame and does not

mean that the other forms of literacies have not been tapped in other lessons. For example, in School E, in the LLCE (L1) class, although only a tape recording of a group discussion of one part of the text, *Animal Farm*, by George Orwell, was done, on conclusion of the study of the text, learners were given the opportunity to watch the film and compare and contrast the film with the text, among other activities. My study also demonstrates that in Schools E and Z, the teacher participants explored written textual forms of literacy through code-switching.

2.2.3 SPECIFIC OUTCOMES OF LLC

In a discussion of Spady's (1994) model of OBE and the South African version (C2005) in this chapter, 2.1.3, I presented a detailed account of the concept 'outcomes' and referred to the fact that each KLA has its own specific outcomes. In LLC, the outcomes are directed at "an ideal language user" in that they relate to all languages and all levels of language learning (DOE 1997c:20). However, because language *per se* is multi-dimensional and highly dynamic, it cannot be directly expressed in a set of linear statements as found in the rationale, outcomes and assessment criteria (a discussion of which follows shortly); different language outcomes overlap. The function of an outcome is more likely to emphasise a certain feature of a language activity. Therefore, an outcome and its associated assessment criteria and range statements should not be viewed in isolation (DOE 1997c:20). Nevertheless, as a guideline, seven specific outcomes have been constructed for LLC, which must be achieved through the integrated use of the four basic skills of learning viz. listening, speaking, reading and writing. The seven outcomes are presented in the table below. However, as mentioned earlier, I present a brief discussion on only SO1, SO2, SO3, SO5 and SO7 as they are of specific relevance to my own study in that an analysis of the

lesson recordings reveals that CS may be used to facilitate the acquisition of these outcomes.

SPECIFIC OUTCOMES	
OUTCOME 1	Learners make and negotiate meaning and understanding.
OUTCOME 2	Learners show critical awareness of language usage.
OUTCOME 3	Learners respond to the aesthetic, affective, cultural and social values in the text.
OUTCOME 4	Learners access, process and use information from a variety of sources and situations.
OUTCOME 5	Learners understand, know and apply language structures and conventions in context.
OUTCOME 6	Learners use language for learning.
OUTCOME 7	Learners use appropriate communication strategies for specific purposes and situations.

(DOE 1997c:19).

2.2.3.1 OUTCOME 1 - Learners make and negotiate meaning and understanding :

As meaning is central to communication, this specific outcome aims at the development of a learner's ability to understand, create and negotiate meaning in various contexts by using appropriate communication strategies and by using listening, speaking, reading and writing skills. These strategies and skills are developed and refined by constantly being exposed to a variety of situations which afford language users opportunities to interact in different ways (DOE 1997;22). My own study, as I will discuss in the next chapter, will show that one of the strategies used to negotiate meaning and understanding is code-switching. In addition, I will demonstrate that one of the "appropriate communication strategies" is speaking in the mother tongue as well as the L2.

2.2.3.2 OUTCOME 2 - Learners show critical awareness of language usage :

This specific outcome aims to develop a learner's understanding of the way in which language is used as a powerful instrument to reflect, shape and manipulate people's beliefs, actions and relationships. The complexity and sensitivity of a multi-lingual context specifically requires the development of a learner's skills to interpret and consciously reflect on language usage. For this reason the development of the decoding skills (reading and listening) is emphasised (DOE 1997c:24). In my view, this outcome directly promotes CS as a learning strategy in the classroom, particularly if the class is a multi-lingual one. This is so because people do not live in isolation, learners in class do not function in isolation, and in order to display critical awareness of language use, not resorting to CS would be an unnatural linguistic behaviour.

2.2.3.3 OUTCOME 3 - Learners respond to the aesthetic, affective, cultural and social values in the text :

The aim of this outcome is to develop a learner's appreciation, use and creation of text as an artistic expression of thoughts, feelings, attitudes and values through exposure to a wide variety of genres. The development of learners' listening, reading and viewing skills to recognize and use literary devices enriches the quality of their own language use and lives (DOE 1997c:26). This specific outcome also draws attention to CS practices, more specifically in texts - both textbooks and real-life situation materials. As an example, there are many literary texts e.g. *The Suit* (by Can Themba), *Nectar in a Sieve* (by Kamala Makandaya), *Things Fall Apart* (by Chinua Achebe), *At the Edge and other Short Stories* (Ronnie Govender) and a host of poems which make use of CS. Even the colonial English classics such as *The Mayor of Casterbridge* (by Thomas Hardy) and *Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn* (by Mark Twain), to name just two, reflect switches

between language varieties - all of which clearly indicate that any form of switching is a natural feature of communication. In my view, if the texts reflect real-life situations, and students are to be given opportunities to explore real-life situations, then it is only logical that CS by both teachers and learners be accepted as a natural feature of teaching and learning, most certainly it should be a normal feature in unpacking the aesthetic, affective, cultural and social values in a text.

2.2.3.4 OUTCOME 5 - Learners understand, know and apply language structures and conventions in context :

This specific outcome aims to develop a language user's understanding and knowledge of grammar. The development of grammatical competence empowers the learner to communicate clearly and confidently by using grammatical structures (e.g. word order) correctly. Clarity of communication is improved through the development of a learner's editing skills which includes a conscious awareness of the learner's own language (DOE 1997c:29; 30). The relevance of this outcome to my own study is its alignment with Canale and Swain's (1980) definition and relevance of sociolinguistic competence discussed in 2.1.4. Clearly, depending on the demands of the context of the study, use of the learners' mother tongue might be a necessity. Indeed, as the analysis of lesson recordings of grammar lessons (Chapter Four) reveals, CS can be used as a powerful technique in the teaching of grammatical structure.

2.2.3.5 OUTCOME 7 - Learners use appropriate communication strategies for specific purposes and situations :

This specific outcome aims at the development of the learner's ability to apply communication

skills and strategies appropriately to a specific purpose and a defined situation (DOE 1997c:32). This outcome clearly points to the *appropriate* use of language(s) by the learner which may or may not include CS. SO7 is of particular significance to this study as it will reveal that bilingual learners do not use CS at random; they use CS responsibly in the sense that, for example, while they engage in its practice during group discussion, it is *not used* for report back purposes. This, to me, means that learners use CS as an appropriate communicative strategy for specific purposes and situations.

2.2.4 LANGUAGE ACROSS THE CURRICULUM

The outcomes in this learning area (i.e. LLC) emphasise that language is not an end in itself. Language is a means to acting in the world in order to establish relationships, to engage with others in reciprocal exchange, to integrate new knowledge into existing knowledge, and to obtain and convey ideas and information. Competence in the language of learning and teaching (LOLT) is thus crucial for academic mastery across the curriculum. Hence, it is the teachers' responsibility across the subjects to assist learners' development of terminology and language relevant to the specific subject (DOE 1997c:20). Of relevance to this study is that Zulu-English speaking interviewees across the curriculum indicate that one of the reasons that they might use CS as a strategy in the classroom is to help develop learners' terminology in a specific subject. In addition, this study will show that one of the reasons that educators employ CS in the classroom is to explain vocabulary and concepts as a means in developing terminology in a given subject. I shall, however, return to this point in the next chapter.

2.2.5 SKILLS-RELATED ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

The learning programme in LLC includes written and spoken assessment. This, in OBE C2005 means that assessment is an on-going process which involves evaluating the extent to which learners have achieved the specific outcomes or desired results for a particular programme organizer. The following table is an example of the assessment criteria and range statements for the outcomes of the senior phase, provided by the Department of Education :

OUTCOME 1 : LEARNERS MAKE AND NEGOTIATE MEANING AND UNDERSTANDING	
ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	RANGE STATEMENT
1. Original meaning is created through personal texts.	At this level learners create a wide range of texts of different kinds. Learners also interact with and respond to a wide range of texts. Interaction with other language users takes place with a wide range of audiences from both familiar and unfamiliar contexts.
2. A key message is identified and clarified.	
3. Inferences are made from texts.	
4. Meaning is constructed through interaction with other language users.	
5. Ways in which construction of meaning varies according to cultural, social and personal differences are identified.	
6. Ways in which context affects meaning and understanding are identified.	
7. Writer's/speaker's point of view is critically reflected on.	
8. Reasoned arguments about interpretation and meaning are developed.	
9. Discourse is sustained.	

(DOE 1997c:22-3).

The assessment criteria and range statements for each of the remaining six outcomes can be found in the document, DOE 1997c, pages 23 - 37.

Of particular significance of the outcomes, assessment criteria and range statements of LLC, is that, according to the discussion document by the Department of Education (DOE 1997d), learners are actively encouraged to code-switch, primarily, it seems, to facilitate learning :

- (a) For Outcome 2, *Learners show critical awareness of language usage* two of the assessment criteria require that :
 - i. "Awareness of power relations between different languages and between varieties of the same language is demonstrated by suitable responses", and
 - ii. Biased attitudes toward languages and language varieties are explained, challenged and responded to (DOE 1997c:24,25; 1997d:30).

- (b) For Outcome 5, *Learners understand, know and apply language structures and conventions in context*, one of the assessment criteria requires that :

"Common features and patterns of different languages are identified, explained and applied" (DOE 1997c:30; 1997d:36).

- (c) For Outcome 6, *Learners use language for learning*, one of the assessment criteria requires :

"The ability to transfer terminology and concepts from one language to another is demonstrated" (DOE 1997c:31; 1997d:38).

Since the outcomes, assessment and range statements are part of a generic language syllabus, the above-mentioned requirements can be interpreted as attempts to put into practice the principle

of multilingualism and additive bilingualism promoted by the Department of Education (1997c:1,2; 1997d:22). Hence, the use of learners' native language in the form of CS by most of the teacher and learner participants of this study are in line with the requirements of the Department of Education and the Language in Education Policies. Yet, not everybody perceives the use of more than one language in the classroom favourably. A discussion of the attitudes towards Zulu, Afrikaans, English and CS between these languages follows.

2.3 ATTITUDES TOWARD LANGUAGES AND CODE - SWITCHING

In this section of the literature, I examine the issue of attitudes from four perspectives: (i) attitudes toward African languages as Zulu is the native language of the majority of learners of this study; (ii) attitudes toward Afrikaans (previously described as a colonial language but under the new dispensation, an African language) as Afrikaans is either the first or second language of all the learner participants of this study; (iii) attitudes toward English as this is either the first or second language by all the participants of this study; and (iv) attitudes toward CS which is the behaviour being explored at the schools in which this study is based. Firstly, however, I present a brief overview of the concept 'attitude' and some of the difficulties experienced by linguists in objectively assessing people's attitudes toward languages.

2.3.1 INTRODUCTION

'Attitude', a term in common usage, is a hypothetical construct used to explain the direction and perspective of human behaviour and is thought to be crucial to language growth and decay (Baker

1992:9,10; 1988:112). It involves an emotional element and is thus rather subjective. As the definition of 'attitude' varies from discipline to discipline, and mindful of the classic study by Gardner and Lambert (1972) on language attitudes and Gardner's (1985) comprehensive model of second language acquisition in school situations, for the purposes of my own study I adopt Ajzen's (1988) and Cluver's (2000) definitions. Ajzen (1988:4) sees attitude as "a disposition to respond favourably or unfavourably to an object, person, institution or event." This study measures the disposition of persons in an educational domain towards certain languages. Cluver (2000:79) states that the term 'language attitudes' refers to a consciously held belief system about a specific language or an orientation (positive or negative) towards a specific language. When different speakers of different languages come into contact (as is the case particularly in School E of this study) they attempt to create some sort of image or stereotype of members of the other speech community. One of the difficulties of measuring attitudes, however, is that a person's thoughts and feelings are covert and cannot therefore be directly observed. It is therefore conceivable that 'attitudes' is not one of those variables that can be directly or accurately measured. Hence, Baker (1992:17) notes that the use of attitude as a research variable depends, among other things, on satisfactory measurement devices.

In order to measure language attitudes, three main methods are generally employed: content analysis of documents of various kinds; questionnaires and interviews; and experiments with the matched-guise technique (Cargile et al. 1994; Hyrkstedt et al.1998, cited in Romanov n.d.). My own study uses questionnaires, using the Likert scale using multiple items rather than a single item, as this technique, according to Baker (1992:18), enhances internal reliability. It also uses

interviews to assess attitudes toward Zulu, Afrikaans, English and code-switching between these languages. Clearly, eliciting peoples' attitudes and opinions toward language use would not be without difficulties. Romaine (1989:289), Gumperz (1982a:62) and Baker (1992:19) outline some of the difficulties that linguists experience in assessing this arbitrary concept: (i) the concept 'attitude' itself is a subjective issue and cannot be easily translated to an objective unit of measure; (ii) whether they do so consciously or not, participants may respond in a way that makes them appear in a good light (i.e. the halo effect); (iii) bilinguals might experience difficulties in remembering which language was used in a particular event as selection of one or the other language is automatic and not subject to conscious recall; (iv) respondents may be affected in their response by the researcher and the perceived purpose of the research; thus, ethnic identity, gender, status and language used in the questionnaire or interview may affect how an individual responds to the questions; and (v) the subjects might not have the vocabulary or terms with which they can evaluate speech. This is to say that respondents' reports might not be accurate or effective in reflecting attitudes. Hence, Baker (1992:18) states that attitude testing "is unlikely to reveal (individuals') attitudes perfectly". As an example, in her study of students at Vista, Sebokeng, Sarinjieve (1999:133) observes that students appear to give answers that they think they should; when asked if they spoke English outside the classroom they responded with a unanimous 'yes', yet her observation shows otherwise. Similarly, my own study shows, for example, that some learner interviewees claim that no CS occurs in the LLC classroom, yet the lesson recordings demonstrate otherwise. Hence, Romaine (1989:37) notes that we need to be careful not to confuse peoples' claims about their behaviour with their actual behaviour. As such, the reader needs to bear this in mind when provided with a discussion of attitudes that emanate

from my own study as it is also affected by these difficulties. I shall however, return to this issue in Chapters Three and Five.

A discussion of the general attitudes of people toward Zulu follows.

2.3.2 ATTITUDES TOWARD ZULU

Zulu, a Nguni language, is an agglutinative language (i.e grammatical information is conveyed by attaching prefixes and suffixes to roots and stems) which is spoken by the majority of people in South Africa. According to the statistics provided by *Statistics South Africa* (2001) there are approximately 10.7 million people in South Africa who speak Zulu, the main concentration being in KwaZulu Natal (KZN). In this sense, Zulu may be considered the *lingua franca* of KZN. Even when Zulu was not recognized as an ‘official’ language prior to the new political dispensation, it was considered a ‘national’ language by virtue of its dominant number of speakers. In spite of this, in the context of this study, Zulu may be perceived as a ‘minority language’ in the sense that it does not convey positive connotations of superiority, mark of education, power, prestige, language of opportunity and the like, as does English. I shall, however, return to this issue in Chapter Three. In addition, even though Zulu has been recognized as one of the eleven South African languages, its role is still complex and ambiguous. Its use in education has been governed by legislation beginning with the Bantu Education Act of 1953 and has been revised over the years to reflect a transforming political climate. During the apartheid era, the use of Zulu as a medium of instruction was rooted in education policies which insinuated that African language speakers were going to be given inferior education. For instance, in his speech to the Senate in

1953, Vervoed argued :

"The Bantu must be guided to serve his own community in all respects. There is no place for him in the European community above the level of certain forms of labour For that reason it is of no avail for him to receive a training which has as its aim absorption in the European community" (Cited in Grobler 1988:103).

Samuels (1995) also notes that the African languages were not only systematically undeveloped and marginalised in terms of central economy and political participation, but were also perceived as inferior languages not worthy of attention by the state. Similarly, in an extensive discussion of this issue, Kamwangamalu (2001) shows the language and sociopolitical changes that have emerged as a result of the statutory death of apartheid.

At present, Zulu is used as the medium of instruction in all former DET primary schools up to Grade 4 in KZN, and thereafter it is replaced by English although it is studied as a subject in both the primary and secondary schools - as is the case of School Z of this study. This policy and practice in itself challenges the apparent equal status of the eleven official languages that is enshrined by the South African language policy. Hence, in his discussion of multilingualism in South Africa, Kamwangamalu (1998a:119) states :

"Although South Africa's multilingual language policy may have made headlines in academic circles around the world, not much is known about the life of the languages in the country's formerly segregated communities nor about the extent to which the new language policy has taken root in the country as a whole."

As a result attitudes toward Zulu are made by inference; by comparing it to, mostly, English, and

to a less extent, as I shall discuss in Chapter Three, to Afrikaans.

Msimang (1992:140) postulates some possible reasons for the generally negative attitudes toward Zulu in the formal sector. Firstly, despite its large number of speakers, Zulu is “inherently a regional variety” compared to English, which for all intent and purposes, is a ‘national’ language in that it has been acquired by a large number of South Africa’s literate citizens. Also, while Zulu is contained within the boundaries of South Africa, English is an international language which is paving its way for globalization. The perception of Zulu as a language of limited use in comparison to English, can be seen in the comments of the following subject advisor, educator and learner interviewees :

- I. In terms of trade and technological links the most important language has to be English. isiZulu stops at community levels and does not enter into higher levels.[Appendix B2a, SA2].
- II. English is the most important (language) You go anywhere they speak English and the books we are using, it's written in English. It is the best language I think. If you go throughout the world, people are speaking English. But isiZulu, it is only here. It's not going to take us anywhere. [Appendix B1c, ZT6].
- III. Everyone has to know English. Everywhere you go in the world, the main language is English. If you don't know English it is very hard to communicate with other people and you feel like an outcast and people will look down at you and today, er, people are making Zulu a bit inferior. Zulu is not important anymore. [Appendix B4b,EL1].

I shall, however, return to this point in the discussion of attitudes in Chapter Three.

Secondly, Msimang (1992:14) points out that in the economic and scientific world, Zulu does not satisfy the requirements of a vehicular language. On this note, Kamwangamalu (1998a:120) states that although nine African languages have been given official status, they do not have any “economic cachet both locally and internationally”. Similarly, in a report on a seminar on the role of African languages in education, held in Ghana, the following was cited in a newsletter of ADEA (1996:2-3): “African languages’ limited capacity to express technical concepts; the lack of reference books and reading and educational materials; negative attitudes toward African languages which continue to be widespread because the languages of the former colonial countries have remained the languages of power;” Likewise, Marivate (1993:59) states: “Among Blacks, preference for English as medium of instruction is induced mainly by economic considerations. They are aware that should they opt for the vernacular as medium of instruction throughout, the final product (the pupil) will be prevented from participating meaningfully in the economic field.” Alexander (2001:2) supports the need for English as the second language, “mainly because it is so obviously the key to economic empowerment”.

In addition, Kamwangamalu (1997:245) notes that compared to English and Afrikaans, the status of African languages is “rather low”. He adds: “It does not take one long for the language consumer to realize that education in an African language does not ensure one social mobility and better socio-economic life...” Hence, parents do not want their children to be educated in their mother tongue but in English (Slabbert 1994:4-7; Msimang 1992:143; Virasamy 1997:6). Martin (1997:133) states that in South Africa, English is the high status language and functions in formal situations such as in education and officialdom. By contrast, African languages are perceived as

lower status languages and function in informal contexts, such as talking with friends and in the home. This perhaps accounts for the influx of non- English mother tongue speakers into English medium schools. The low esteem that is attached to Zulu is evident in the following comment :

"(Zulu speakers) want to know how far they can get with (Zulu) in metropolitan areas and in the labour markets. They argue that the motive for mother tongue instruction was to deny them the opportunity to compete successfully against the Whites or even Indians and the so-called Coloureds in the job market. The pathetic consequence is that most of them have come to hate their (language) and consider it irrelevant in the education process" (Msimang 1992:142).

Furthermore, the low status attributed to African languages, including Zulu, is highlighted by Dagut (1999) in his research of attitudes toward languages in a Grade 8 classroom (engaged in the OBE curriculum) in Berea, Johannesburg. When these learners were asked whether they would like to study an African language structure and literature formally, as a school subject, they said: "No. That would be boring and there is no need - we speak it well already." The lack of educational value attached to African languages is also evident in the following report in *The Sunday Independent* (1998, cited in Dagut 1999): A Cape Town Xhosa-speaking mother, Patricia Njamalo, insisted that her four year old daughter be prevented from speaking any language but English at pre-school. She argued: "All you should be teaching them is how to be successful in a White man's world (because) they already know how to be Black." My study shows similar responses and attitudes by Zulu-speaking learners as will be discussed in Chapter Three.

In their study of English teaching in 3 exNED and 3 exHOD multi-ethnic schools in Durban, Chick and McKay (1999) also indicate that their data on the use of Zulu at the schools of their

study reveals that teachers and administrators have very ambivalent attitudes toward the use of Zulu in the classroom. They found that generally principals were not in favour of the use of Zulu in the class. One of the reasons proffered for this position included: “..... it is consistent with the ANC policy for promoting the use of English as a means of reconciling rival groups, in contrast with the IFP policy i.e. to promote the use of Zulu as a source of ethnicity, which creates division within the region.” One teacher claimed that the use of Zulu in the classroom is in conflict with school policy and that learners are reprimanded for its use in class. Another teacher proscribed Zulu because learners use it to insult adults and other learners. On the other hand, there are a number of teachers who discovered that the judicious use of Zulu in the classroom can be beneficial, and are permitting this even when it runs counter to school policy. My own study also reveals similar mixed responses as will be discussed in the next chapter. However, Chick and McKay (1999) also show that the inclusion of Zulu as a second or third additional language in the school curriculum can be seen as a recognition of the increasing status of Zulu. While my own study will show that this is the *desired* status of Zulu at the exHOD school of this research, it is not taught because of financial constraints. No doubt, the same can be said for many of the exHOD schools in the larger Durban and surrounding areas.

Zulu however, is not the only language used in KZN that is viewed mostly negatively. Afrikaans too, particularly by non-Afrikaners, is threatened by negativism, as the next part of this section shows.

2.3.3 ATTITUDES TOWARD AFRIKAANS

Afrikaans, a Germanic language which originated in South Africa about 200 years ago, is spoken by approximately 10 million people in the country (Murray-Smit 2001). To better understand current attitudes of most South Africans toward Afrikaans, it is necessary to provide a brief history of the language. Following the policy of *Anglicization* in around 1806 which “sought to replace Dutch in all spheres of public life” (Davenport 1991:40), in 1925, Afrikaans was constitutionally legalized as one of the two official languages (Young 1988:410). However, Young (1988:410) points out that: “Though *de jure* equal with English at the time, it was *de facto* an unequal partner, heavily overshadowed by English.” The fate of Afrikaans was then determined by the adoption of Bantu Education by the apartheid government in 1953. Briefly, this policy sought to impose Afrikaans as the medium of instruction devaluing the role of the mother tongue as medium of instruction while simultaneously reducing the influence of English in Black schools. It was this policy that led to the Soweto uprisings of June 16th, 1976, and Afrikaans became entrenched in the minds of the Blacks as the language of oppression and English was perceived as the language of liberation. Ironically, this marked the beginning of the end of Afrikaans as medium of instruction in Black schools (Kamwangamalu 1997:237-8; 2002:1-2) although it continued to reign as an official language and compulsory additional language at the schools until the change of government in 1994. More pointedly, Kamwangamalu (1997:242) observes that even the people of District Six, a predominantly Afrikaans speaking community, hold negative attitudes toward Afrikaans-medium education, more so now than before: “Afrikaans has lost the political clout and most of the privilege it had during apartheid.” However, like English, and unlike Zulu, Afrikaans by political determination could handle

educational, commercial and technological communication.

As Afrikaans was perceived as the language of oppression, attitudes toward it by Blacks were intensely negative, in turn influencing their attitudes toward their own mother tongue and English. Kamwangamalu (1997:238) states, “..... *the Blacks’ hatred towards Afrikaans* (my emphasis) and the poor image of African languages paved the way for English to become identified by Black South Africans as the language of advancement and democracy.” This view is also shared by some of the teacher participants of School E and School Z of my own study. Consider the following comments made by two interviewees with regard to the use of Afrikaans in KZN :

- IV. Ah... Afrikaans. Let me be honest - at the risk of not sounding politically correct. Afrikaans has done nothing for me. I respect it as a language but it was a language that was imposed on me er at school. I hated it at school. We never spoke it, we simply learnt it. That's of no value to me. But as I said I respect it as a language and now, well.... I don't need it in my life. My Afrikaans friends and colleagues can speak English very well...../ [Appendix B1b, ET10].
- V. You know you cannot change the attitude of people more especially the Blacks. So you can't tell them Afrikaans is better than Zulu. You can't do that . It's not right. You must look at Afrikaans where it came from to us. You can't forget the Soweto riots, you know, June16th. [Appendix B1c, ZT7].

I shall, however, return to this issue in Chapter Three.

In addition to this perception of Afrikaans, the negativism attached to it can also be seen by the dropping off of Afrikaans as an additional language in many exDET schools in the Port

Shepstone region. Clearly, the official status attributed to the nine African languages to the two existing colonial ones and the subsequent Language-in-Education Policy :

" whichever route is followed, the underlying principle is to maintain home language(s) while providing access to and the effective acquisition of additional language(s)" (DOE 1997f),

paved the way for these exDET schools to flex their muscles of linguistic freedom. Thus, many such schools maintain their home language (Zulu, in KZN and in the context of this study) studying it as the primary or first language, and have "punished" Afrikaans for its previously oppressive status by excluding it completely from its curriculum. In some exDET schools however, such as School Z of this study, Afrikaans continues to be studied as a second additional language (English being the first additional language). The position of Afrikaans in exHOD schools remains the same as it did during the apartheid regime. This study however, will show that the current status of Afrikaans as the *only* additional language at these schools is being challenged, details of which will follow in the next chapter.

While non-native speakers of Afrikaans tend to hold mostly negative attitudes toward Afrikaans, native speakers of the language themselves see Afrikaans as being, in some ways, inferior to English. Compared to English, the "high language", like Zulu, Afrikaans is perceived as a "low language" (Kamwangamalu and Virasamy 1999:61). For example, in his discussion of the status of African languages in Cape Town, Lekane (1993:55) states: "..... die ouers was ook in die besonder daarop gesteld dat hulle kinders 'n behoorlike kennis van Engels moes hê, aangesien dit die maatstaf van ontwikkeling en beskawing geword het" [... the parents were particularly

intent on having their children obtain a thorough knowledge of English, since it had become the measure of development and civilization]. This perception of Afrikaans in Cape Town is also illustrated in *Love, David* by Dianne Case, a literary text that was used by Mrs A, the teacher of School A, in one of her lesson recordings :

Mamsie and Dadda speak Afrikaans to each other, to the neighbours and to David, but they speak English to me and Baby. When I ask them about this strange habit all I hear is, "We want you to be better," from both of them. What's in a language?
[Case 1986:10].

However, for native speakers of Afrikaans, the language is also perceived as a powerful tool in establishing claims to identity. Adendorff (1992:52) states: "Language in itself is an area of struggle. People are hurt and angered when their language and what it symbolizes is kicked and they retaliate." This appears to be the case with Afrikaans in the post-apartheid era. For example, according to an article in *Weekly Mail and Guardian* (1994), South African poet, Adam Small, confessed being "hurt" by the suggestions that Afrikaans, his mother tongue, should be "downgraded". Similarly, Bas (2001) observes that in spite of Afrikaans being a "mature, modern language" of about 16 million mother-tongue speakers, "..... the present government does not like Afrikaans so the use of the language is actively abolished in schools, universities, courts and public places." He goes on to say that trying to get rid of Afrikaans in South Africa is counter-productive to the accommodating policy of '*simunye*' [we are one] and the idea of '*ubuntu*' [the 'caring for people' and 'the wish to reconcile']. Bas maintains that by downgrading Afrikaans "people start feeling themselves strangers in their own country".

Finally, most Afrikaner intellectuals argue that the ultimate aim is “to strip Afrikaans of its apartheid prominence while recognizing its stature as a language, the profound sensitivities which surround it and the fact that it is not the exclusive property of right-wing Whites” (*Weekly Mail and Guardian* 1994). In marked contrast to the mostly negative attitudes toward Zulu and Afrikaans, the literature shows that attitudes toward English are becoming increasingly positive by both native and non-native speakers alike. A discussion of attitudes toward English follows.

2.3.4 ATTITUDES TOWARD ENGLISH :

In his introduction to the text *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Teaching* Canagarajah (1999:1) quotes Derek Walter :

I who am poisoned with the blood of both
 Where shall I turn, divided to the vein?
 I who have cursed
 The drunken officer of British rule, how choose
 Between this Africa and the English tongue I love?
 Betray them both, or give back what they give?

(Derek Walcott, *A Far Cry from Africa*)

The conflict that Walcott expresses is an everyday experience for millions of South Africans who find themselves torn between the allure of the English language and their roots in their indigenous language(s). With time however, as this study will show, the possibility of making a choice eludes them as, as Canagarajah (1999:1) points out, “The English language has become too deeply rooted in their soil, and in their conscious.....”

The use of English in South Africa can be traced back to the first British occupation in 1795, the period of Dutchification. Since then, English has played a pivotal role in South Africa's transition from Dutchification (1652-1795) to Anglicization (1795-1948) to Afrikanerization (1948-1994) to democratization (1994-) (Kamwangamalu 2002:1) and has emerged as the language of the government, schools, academia, legal system, commerce, science, technology and, national and international communication. It is currently the home language of approximately 3,5 million people of all ethnic backgrounds in South Africa (Olivier 2002; Silva 2002) and is studied as either a primary language or additional language in every school in KZN. English has established itself firmly as the *lingua franca* of South Africa. It has acquired international status for 50 years and appears to be unprecedented in several ways: by the increasing number of users of the language; by its depth of penetration into societies; and by its range of functions (Hasman 2000:5). Presently, at least 750 million of the world's population speaks some variety of English (Hohenthal 1998) and although Hasman (2000:2) estimates that by 2010 the number of speakers of English as a second language or foreign language will exceed the number of native speakers of English, in 1996, Kachru stated that there are more non-native than native users of English. Fishman (1982:15) had, however, foreseen the spread of English almost two decades ago - he stated: "Not only is English spreading, but it is being spread by non-English mother tongue interests." This information points directly at the positive attitudes people have toward English, more particularly for its instrumental value (e.g. Poplack 1987:93,95).

Although, for some time, English was perceived with hostility by many Afrikaners (Silva 2002), for the majority of people, as my study will demonstrate, English is perceived as the language of

opportunity and power. In de Klerk's (1996:8) words: "English is perceived as the language of power: economic interests, political muscle and cultural concerns." The high value that is ascribed to English is clearly evident in Romaine's (1989:292-3) comments on an encounter in a small village school in the upper Markham valley of Papua New Guinea. She discusses the status that is accorded to English in comparison to the local languages: In one of the classrooms a notice relating to language (among other forms of behaviour) was categorized under the headings, 'good', 'bad' and 'worst'. To speak English was considered 'good'; to speak pidgin was 'bad' and to speak *tok ples* (the local language) was 'worst'. All the schools that Romaine visited had signs reminding them that English was the language of the classrooms. While the schools that are involved in my study do not adopt such drastic measures concerning Zulu, it is clear that for the majority of the respondents, both educators and learners of the study, English is the preferred medium of instruction. However, one Zulu-speaking respondent did suggest that English should be imposed upon pupils :

- VI. No, I mean, we sometimes at this school we tell them, this week is an English week. Wherever you are, perhaps it's break time, whether you are in the tuck shop, you must use English. If you are caught speaking a vernacular language, then you will be punished. But then we used to use some prefects but now things have changed through this er democracy. Now we no longer have those prefects we have the LRC and they say, no man, after all, all languages are official and now we are cut short.
[Appendix B1c, ZT4].

In addition to having differing attitudes toward different languages, people also have differing attitudes toward particular varieties of English. For example, Gibb (1998:1), in a comparative study of attitudes toward varieties of English held by professionals and tertiary level students in

Korea, shows that some of the subjects perceived American English to be more prestigious than other varieties of English. Adendorff (1992:52) suggests that people look down upon other people's English as a way of emphasising the status of their own variety.

In certain communities the use of English in a mother tongue discourse is viewed favourably, as is the case in India. As an instance, in his study of code-mixing in India, Kachru (1978:113) observes that when a multilingual speaker employs code-mixing with English, it is a mark of modernization, socio-economic position, and membership in an elite group. It is used in those contexts where one would like to demonstrate authority, power and identity with the establishment. Evidence for this attitude is found in various social contexts, in parents' language preference for their children, and in choice of preferred language in colleges. It appears that in India, the more educated a person is the more s/he tends to mix elements from English.

Studies in Africa also reveal that English enjoys a prestigious status. For example, in his investigation of English in Kenya, Tanzania and Zambia, Schmied (1995:6) demonstrates that there is greater support for English than against it. Some of the most significant reasons among Zambians for favouring English are for job acquisition purposes; and among Kenyans and Zambians, English is perceived as a 'link language' i.e. using English helps to avoid tribal differences. The Tanzanians perceive English as 'a superior language system'. Other arguments in favour of English in these African countries include the educational equality argument i.e. using English as a medium of education means equal chances for all children in the future because "English is the basis for further education"; the complex concepts argument i.e. that

complex concepts can be explained more easily in English; and the international technological argument i.e. that English is necessary to “keep science and learning in touch with world-wide developments”. My own study reveals similar attitudes among English, Afrikaans and Zulu speakers toward English. I shall, however, return to this point in the next chapter.

The status of English in South Africa is encapsulated by Sarinjieve (1999:129) who states: “English is still perceived as the panacea to solve all perceived language problems and the means by which to achieve all the goals of everyday living.” In her study of students from Vista, Sebokeng, aimed at investigating why in spite of the high failure rate students choose to learn in English, Sarinjieve shows that they see English as important for the future and the achievement of goals. This is confirmed by Polenis (1984, in Sarinjieve 1999:133) who distinguishes between the mother tongue and the spoken and written forms of English both at work and school. She states that English enjoys greater status than the home language and could be viewed as the language for ‘higher’ and ‘special occasions’. In addition, according to a report by the *Omnichek Division of Research Surveys* (1994), of the majority of the 2125 African men and women interviewees, English is the preferred language for all public notices and communications from the government. Kamwangamalu (1998b:280; 2002:162) notes that because of its role and its international status, and because it is perceived as the key to upward social mobility, English is the only language in which the majority of South African parents want their children educated. The perception of English as *the* language is clearly portrayed in Slabbert’s (1994:4-7) study of attitudes of South Africans toward English. She shows that most South Africans hold English on a pedestal and associate it with being educated. In addition, Granville et al. (1998:258) point out

that “South African parents believe correctly, however unfortunate this may be, that English also has material power. It provides entry to the middle class, to middle class jobs and to middle class pay packets.” Cluver (1990, in Marivate 1993:60) is more succinct on this issue; he states that Black South Africans must earn a living in a “White” language.

Similarly, Martin (1997:134) states that the black middle class who have academic ambitions for their children see proficiency in English as being important. The perception of English by many as the language of power, prestige and status is also evident in Samuels’ (1995) description of it as an “open sesame” by means of which one can acquire unlimited vertical mobility. In Pakir’s (1998:104) words, it is “a language with no sell-by-date attached to it”. My own study reveals similar attitudes toward English. For example, learner interviewees of each of the three schools of this study say that English is the most important language because :

- VII. when you go out of the country, you won't get Zulu or Afrikaans - but they speak English. And when you want to get a job you have to speak English so I think English is the best language. [Appendix B4c, ZL1].
- VIII. like everywhere in the world wherever you go it's English, English, English. It's the language people use to communicate. It's like you can be from different race groups but you can still communicate. [Appendix B4a, EL10].
- IX. my father told me that it is hard to get a job without English. [Appendix B4a, AL2].

In contrast, some negative attitudes toward English are also evident. Some of these include English being an impersonal language; a sign of neglecting national identity; making Africans

European-minded (Schmied 1995:6); and inappropriate for lying, joking, cursing, bargaining and unmediated prayer (Fishman 1982:19). In South Africa, even though English enjoys the status of power and prestige, Silva (2002) states: “....it is perceived only as a ‘neutral’ colourless *lingua franca*, not as a cultural and community language.” The stresses arising from this perception are illustrated in the recent restructuring of the English language radio station SAfm, as the ‘flagship’ of national radio. It is now the one station which attempts to cater for all communities, and in which non-mother-tongue speakers are employed as announcers and news-readers. The process has led to discontent and indignation among the White English speaking communities (Silva 2002).

In spite of being the *lingua franca* in South Africa, Silva (2002) also notes that there is much that is paradoxical in the way that English operates and is perceived in South Africa. Of relevance to this study is that, firstly, even though politicians and position papers condemn the hegemony of English, and call for development and modernization of the African languages as languages for higher education, in reality English continues to reign. English is clearly the official medium of most tertiary education and virtually all public services. Major newspapers are published in English and there is considerable exposure to English on the television. Secondly, as this study will reveal, even though the constitution entrenches eleven official languages as equals, the ten African languages do not share the same platform as that of English. Silva (2002) states that “impassioned conferences on the promotion of multilingualism have been conducted in English.” On this note, Pandor (1995:73) observes that in 1994, 87% of the speeches made in parliament were in English; less than 5% were in Afrikaans, and the rest, 8%, were in the other official

languages - that is, less than 1% in each of the African languages. Ironically, the post-apartheid situation appears to enhance the status of English even though it does not accord English special rights and privileges. Hence, Kamwangamalu (2002:162) notes that because of the multiple roles that English plays in South African society, it is unlikely to come under any threat from the other official languages. Socially and politically, English has secured its place in South Africa.

Perhaps the status of English in comparison to all of its Cinderella sister languages is best encapsulated in the coinage: *All South African languages are equal but English is more equal than others* (which I adapt from George Orwell's (1945) version)¹. The result is that by default English (as elsewhere in Africa) is becoming the *de facto* official language and the only language of teaching and learning (Alexander 2001:1). In the words of Mawasha (1993:53): "English has become an African language by adoption. If all the historically bedevilling factors such as the evils of colonization are buried, English and the indigenous African languages can be the children of one man..." Zotwana (1993:29) made a visionary comment almost a decade ago when he said "... when the spotlight isn't so much on ethnicity we will be looking for a language that is going to unite us and facilitate inter-group communication." Many participants of my own study support this view; they see English as a language of unity. Cluver (2000:81), however, notes that speakers who are educated in a dominant language (e.g. English) often overemphasise what they see as the positive aspects of that language while downgrading many aspects of their own culture and language. In view of the high esteem accorded to English by both native and non-native speakers

¹ The original which appears in George Orwell's novel, *Animal Farm* (page 85) reads: "All animals are equal but some are more equal than others."

of English, it is of no surprise that researchers such as Heller (1988), Nwoye (1993), and Finlayson and Slabbert (1997) show that many people have negative attitudes toward CS. Before continuing with a discussion of attitudes toward code-switching, I briefly examine attitudes toward bilingualism, as code-switching is a by-product of bilingualism (Kamwangamalu 1989:325).

2.3.5 ATTITUDES OF MONOLINGUALS AND BILINGUALS TOWARD CODE-SWITCHING

Fishman (1978:42) says that ‘modern’ man experiences great difficulty in conceiving bilingualism positively. The overwhelming majority of references to this phenomenon are in terms of ‘poverty’ or ‘disharmony’ or ‘disadvantage’. Weinreich (1953), for example, uses the term ‘bilingualism’ interchangeably with ‘linguistic interference’ and Myers-Scotton (1988:308) notes that some people use it as a euphemism for ‘linguistically handicapped’. Although some scholars argue that bilingualism is a handicap to the cognitive growth of the child, others deem this view to be misleading and groundless (Kamwangamalu 1989:326). Similar contentions have also been made about code-switching. As I have noted in the introductory chapter (1.2.2), the ultimate denial of CS is evident in Weinreich’s (1953:73) statement: “The ideal bilingual switches from one language to the other according to appropriate changes in speech situation (interlocutors, topics etc.) but not in an unchanged speech situation, and certainly not within a single sentence.” In addition, Weinreich (1953:73,74) notes that CS is perceived as some kind of ‘deviant’ behaviour. Evidence from current research hardly deviates from this view. Hoffmann (1991:109), for example, states that in spite of research which shows that “CS is potentially the

most creative aspect of bilingual speech” it is also considered by some as a sign of linguistic decay i.e. evidence that bilinguals are not capable of acquiring two languages properly or keeping them apart. My own study, however, provides conflicting views; while the majority of the educator respondents and interviewees claim that they recognize the value of CS in the classroom, when asked which language they would opt for if they were free to implement a language policy for the school, with the exception of School A, the Afrikaans medium school, they said that it would be English. I shall discuss this in detail in Chapter Three.

Code-switching is not valued by everyone. Whereas the use of only one language is considered normal, CS is seen as something to be explained (Heller 1988:1). Despite the fact that CS is employed “in some degree in the repertoires of most bilingual people in most bilingual communities” (Romaine 1989:2), there are those who feel that languages should be kept strictly demarcated in the classroom (Elridge 1996:303). The co-occurrence of English with another language is frequently viewed as ‘sub-standard’ language behaviour (Norrish 1997:2) and is normally disparaged as an inability to keep two languages separate or it is seen as an indication that the speaker is from a lower socio-economic group (Kieswetter 1995:2). Such attitudes leave teachers feeling ill at ease with this form of linguistic behaviour in the classroom (Norrish 1997:2). Finlayson and Slabbert (1997:419) note “..... the use of code-switching is unlikely to enjoy official blessing from all language authority purists. This is simply because any one language group would not like to openly concede that the use of a rival language in an accommodation event, would enhance not only communication but also the bridging of language separation.”

Various reasons have been given for the negative attitudes toward code-switching. In the case of monolinguals, the concern is that they are often unable to determine why the switching is taking place (Elridge 1996:303). Also, educators fear that CS might be an indication that a speaker is less than fully competent in either of the two languages involved (Faltis 1989:118). For example, in their argument against CS, Kgomoeswana (1993:13) states that CS is necessary because of “obviously, language incompetence”. They maintain that when a speaker is bereft of appropriate words in the main language, s/he tends to gesticulate or switch to another language. They state: “CS is usually not for the students’ sake but for the teachers. Unfortunately, it is easier and convenient for teachers to deny this, to others and to themselves.” They add: “..... a frustrated teacher with insufficient command of the language of instruction may be tempted to use mother-tongue equivalent to explain a technical concept. It must be noted, however, that this will not solve the problem (since such an equivalent may not exist) and that alternative explanations can be found in the very language of instruction.” My own research, however, provides evidence to the contrary.

Hoffman (1991:94) states that it is usually monolinguals themselves who argue against CS. My own study, however, as discussed in the next chapter, provides evidence to the contrary. Hoffman (1993:94) also states that those who advise against CS argue that the child “becomes confused, or his intelligence affected in some way or his speech impaired (by stuttering) and above all that he may end up not speaking any language properly.” Another reason for advising against CS is provided by Cummins and Swain (1986:108) who believe that by employing CS behaviour in the classroom, students will not make the effort to understand the second language

and may 'tune out' and wait for translation. van der Walt (2001:296), however, argues that CS as a sociolinguistic strategy does not generally fulfill the functions of translation. Indeed, the findings of this study support this stance in that it will show, as discussed in Chapter Four, that CS signals among other things a multitude of social and pedagogical functions. Gibbons (1994:6) suggests that negative attitudes toward CS occur because it does not sound conventional; because people do not understand the role CS plays in natural development and usage; and, because we have little control over this phenomenon, we tend to see them as aberrations.

However, it is not only monolinguals who hold negative attitudes toward CS. Bilinguals also differ among themselves in their attitude to CS, both their own and other people's. Some have a relaxed disposition towards it, others consider CS to be a linguistic impurity or a sign of laziness and therefore try to avoid it or correct themselves when they realize they have engaged in CS behaviour. The latter group is also likely to signal intolerance towards its bilingual interlocutors' CS (Hoffmann 1991:113). The notion that CS is some form of deviant behaviour can be so powerful that even those who use CS can be unaware about their behaviour and vigorously deny doing so (Gibbons 1994:6; Nwoye 1993:366; Wardhaugh 1992:109; Kamwangamalu 1989:326; Hatch 1976:201). In addition, Heller (1988:7) notes that some bilinguals even consider this type of talking as "not real language".

Gumperz (1982a:62-3) reports a range of differing attitudes to CS cross-culturally. Some characterize it as an extreme form of mixing attributable to lack of education, bad manners, or improper control of two languages. Others see it as a legitimate form of informal talk. Similarly,

Myers-Scotton (1993b:47) points out that those who do not recognize the systematicity of CS, or the fact that CS serves a variety of functions, may be negatively judgmental about this phenomenon. They regard CS as sloppy use of language, as a corruption of the mother tongues and an indication of the language deficiency of the speaker. The differing attitudes toward CS are also evident in Finlayson and Slabbert's (1997:405-6) study of CS in an urban township in South Africa. They found that opinions differ among respondents about the desirability of CS. One thing, however, was clear i.e. they saw CS as an effort to accommodate their listener and as a form of "destruction, dilution or simplification of the pure language". They show that the high regard that speakers have for the 'pure' languages is demonstrated by the fact that respondents would unconsciously switch towards the standard variety in reaction to a speaker using a pure variety on a tape recording. Similarly, Kamwangamalu (1989:326) notes that some people consider CS as "corrupt" and "impure". Likewise, Agheyisi (1977:97) shows that code-mixing with English in Nigeria is considered "corrupt, adulterated, bastardized and impure" linguistic behaviour. Furthermore, even though CS serves important communicative and cognitive functions, Duran (1994:5) states that in a number of communities, some social stigma is attached to CS by both in - and - out groups. As an example, she cites Gibbons' (1983) study of Cantonese and English in Hong Kong. Gibbons shows that Chinese speakers use English to create an impression of status and westernization, and Cantonese to create an impression of humility and solidarity. However, the use of a mix of Cantonese and English is considered "ill-mannered, show-off, ignorant, not good looking, aggressive, and proud" from the Cantonese point of view.

The phenomenon of CS has not only met with resistance in the educational arena, but has even

been disapproved of or, in certain cases, proscribed by school or education department rules (Peires 1994:15). For example, in a study of Zulu-English bilingual children in South Africa, Martin (1997:134) reports that the children said that they were not allowed to speak Zulu in class, although many admitted to speaking it on the playground. My own study reveals a similar scenario in School A, the Afrikaans-medium school; the switching from English to Afrikaans in the ESL classroom and to the teacher of English in and outside the classroom is proscribed although learners may switch between Afrikaans and English on the sports field. Not everybody however, attaches negative values to CS. For example, research conducted by ELTIC (cited in Peires 1994:16) shows that teachers in African schools have a positive attitude towards using two or more languages in class: 63% state that they would like to use more than one language in class in order to help pupils and about 33% actually do so. This study also reveals that teachers who have the linguistic facility to employ CS do so, to fulfill a variety of pedagogical and social functions.

In other instances, teachers and researchers of ESL have been concerned with minimizing CS in the classroom. Willis (1981:xiv), for instance, suggests that: "If the students start speaking in their own language without your permission it generally means that something is wrong with the lesson." Similarly, Adendorff (1993:4) reports that when Zulu-English teachers were questioned about the prevalence of CS and the purposes behind it in predominantly "Black" classrooms, their responses imply that CS is "an indecent, forbidden form of behaviour". Adendorff notes that it seems as if CS is something teachers are ashamed to admit to.

The above literature on attitudes toward CS clearly reveals that people have mixed attitudes toward CS. Some hold intensely negative attitudes toward it and denigrate it; others feel that it can be used as a communicative resource in both the social and pedagogical arenas; yet others feel that while it serves its purpose in the social or informal sector it should be proscribed in formal sectors such as the school. My own research will show that all of these views are reflected in the responses of the various participants.

2.3.6 CONCLUSION

The foregoing literature on attitudes toward Zulu, Afrikaans and English, and CS behaviour clearly indicates that people have differing attitudes toward the different languages and variations of languages. In addition, different communities differ in their attitudes toward language and its variations. Hence, Becker (1988:160) points out that one should not transfer findings from one bilingual context to another, particularly when there are differences in status and power from one setting to another. In addition, one needs to bear in mind that attitudes do not necessarily remain constant over time.

The literature on attitudes to language also shows that attitudes may be intentionally influenced by spreading negative connotations about a particular language such as “it does not give access to higher education” or “it is not capable of expressing higher thoughts”. Such negative attitudes may stigmatize a language i.e. the process in which negative attitudes toward a particular language are developed. The stigmatization process may be very explicit as in a proscribed language where the use of the language is banned or discouraged. On the other side of the coin,

certain languages may be promoted or enhanced by spreading positive connotations about them. For example, English is often described as a language that “is everything”, “will get you jobs”, “unites people” and so on.

With regard to CS, in view of the foregoing discussion and more especially with current research findings, one has to carefully consider whether there is any justification for the stigma associated with CS which has prevailed in the educational system. In his study of Spanish-English CS, Becker (1988:19) shows that linguistic borrowing is not “corruption” of a language but “an inevitable, natural process which happens in any contact situation and that language itself should not be regarded as a symbol of status but as a means of communication.” In addition, he maintains that the real nature of CS should be recognized as a natural striving by bilinguals for the fullest communication possible by using the entire range of expressive devices available in the linguistic repertoire. Blommaert (1992:57) too, declares that CS should be recognized not as an imperfect speech but rather as speech that is both linguistically and sociolinguistically consistent.

In spite of the negativism towards CS behaviour in the classroom, there is an abundance of literature that provides evidence supporting the use of the native language in the form of code-switching. A discussion thereof follows.

2.4 USE OF THE NATIVE LANGUAGE IN ESL CLASSROOMS

As I have discussed in the preceding chapter, attitudes toward CS from majority language (in

this context, English) to minority language (in this context, Zulu) generally meets the derogatory eye. Because of this and the general concern for promoting English as a second language, both communicatively and academically in South Africa, there is need to re-examine approaches in teaching, particularly insofar as the ESL speaker and native language (NL) are concerned. At this point I would like to clarify that this study does not investigate the issue of mother tongue education but rather the use of the learners' NL in the form of CS in ESL acquisition. Although this study includes an investigation of CS from Afrikaans to English in Afrikaans L2 classrooms, I do not examine the switch to English as a NL as my study (as will be discussed in Chapter Three) reveals that CS to English is both acceptable and encouraged. Rather, the focus in this part of the literature is on the role of ESL learners' NL in the classroom. Firstly, I provide a brief definition of 'native language'; secondly, I present an overview of the on-going controversy between those who favour the 'English-only' policy and those who favour the inclusion of the NL in the classroom; and thirdly, I examine more pertinent contributions made by various researchers that support using the NL in the classroom.

2.4.1 INTRODUCTION

The term 'mother tongue' appears to have caused some confusion among a few of the interviewees for whom the 'inherited' or 'root' language of the historical family is not the learned language and actually spoken language in the home or elsewhere. In response to the question: "What is your mother tongue?" the following were the responses of some of the English first language interviewees :

- I. Hindi.... Actually, we only speak English at home, but supposedly my home language is Hindi. [Appendix B4b, EL6].
- II. My parents can speak Tamil but I speak English. [Appendix B4b, EL10].
- III. Tamil, but I don't really speak it I'm basically English. [Appendix B4b, ET9].
- IV. Well, I would like to say it's Tamil but it's really my mother's mother tongue. Unfortunately I was brought up speaking only English, so English has - regretfully - become my mother tongue. [Appendix B4b, ET10].
- V. Ah, that's a difficult question to answer so much so that I'm foreign to my own mother tongue. Way back when my parents looked forward to our education.... although I'm a Tamilian by birth (laughter) I was forced to go into the languages in school, namely, English and Afrikaans. We all came through that our parents were envisaging the window to a better world through English but so much so through the detriment of our own language. Therefore I say I'm a foreigner to my own mother tongue. At this moment of time it has to be English. [Appendix B2a, SA2].

Hence, it is necessary to clarify the term 'mother-tongue' (MT). Skutnabb-Kangas (1988:16) provides several different ways in defining a mother tongue. She uses four different criteria for the definitions: Origin, Competence, Function and Identification, described in the following table :

Definitions of Mother Tongue	
Criterion	Definition
Origin	The language(s) one learned first
Competence	The language(s) one knows best
Function	The language(s) one uses most
Identification	
(a) internal	The language(s) one identifies with
(b) external	The language(s) one is identified as a native speaker of by others

In the context of this research, I adopt the view that ‘native language’, ‘first language’ and ‘mother tongue’ are used interchangeably (Romaine 1989:19) and refer to an individual’s first learned or primary language, i.e. the language of origin but not in the historical sense, and the language which normally has become his/her natural instrument of thought and communications i.e the language of function.

Despite the confidence of the UNESCO proclamation that “it is axiomatic that the best medium for teaching a child is his mother tongue” (UNESCO 1953:11), mother tongue use in the classroom, albeit in the form of CS, remains controversial. Whether learners’ NL should be used in the L2 classroom or not has been the subject of contention by educators, politicians, applied linguists and policy-makers, among others, over the years (Atkinson 1987; Kharma and Hajjaj 1989; Schinke-Llano 1991; Auerbach 1993; Lucas and Katz 1994; Schweers 1999). The on-going controversy is between those who hold assimilationist views (favouring English only) and those who hold cultural pluralist views (favouring inclusion of the NL) (Secada and Lightfoot 1993:40-41). Hence the on-going debate: “Does bilingual education work?” and “When, how and to what extent should learners’ native languages be

part of their formal education?” The concept ‘bilingualism’ as used in this research refers to the use of two languages, the learners’ NL (English, and Zulu; Afrikaans; and Zulu in Schools E, A and Z respectively), and their L2 (Afrikaans; English; and, English and Afrikaans in Schools E, A and Z respectively) - which might include code-switching in the domain of the classroom.

2.4.2 THE ENGLISH-ONLY POLICY

In the teaching of English, the development of monolingual approaches took hold around the beginning of the twentieth century, and was more a result of political factors than pedagogical ones (Phillipson 1992; Auerbach 1993). Proponents of the English-only policy maintain that English should be the sole medium of communication as the use of learners’ NL or L1 was “a hindrance in foreign language learning” (Phillipson 1992:187); it caused language handicaps, cognitive confusion, emotional conflicts among children, and impedes progress in ESL acquisition (Cummins 1989:19; Auerbach 1993:10). One of the proponents of the English-only policy is Noel Epstein (1977) who extrapolates that there is no evidence for the educational effectiveness for using the L1. Among the claims made by advocates of the ‘English-only’ argument, Phillipson (1992:185) and Garrett et al. (1994:372) list the following :

- (i) English is best taught monolingually;
- (ii) the greater the exposure to English, the better the development of skills and results;
- (iii) negative transfer (interference) from the mother tongue is minimized if it is banned from the classroom;
- (vi) using the L1 will impede the development of thinking in English; and
- (v) the extensive use of other languages results in a drop of standards.

Phillipson (1992:187) describes the total avoidance of the NL as ‘the monolingual tenet’, tracing its historical roots to the situation in some colonial countries where “monolingualism in English teaching was the natural expression of power relations in the colonial period.” Within the communicative approach advocated by the OBE curriculum however, advocacy for the use of mother tongue in the classroom is, arguably, less political than pedagogic. The support that the English-only policy appears to enjoy is evident in a survey of attitudes among ESL educators in the United States conducted by Auerbach (1993). Auerbach found that only 20% of her respondents indicated unqualifyingly, that ESL students should be allowed to use the L1 in the ESL classroom. She found that “despite the fact that 80% of the teachers allowed the use of the L1 at times, the English only axiom is so strong that they didn’t trust their own practice. They assigned negative value to ‘lapses’ to the L1, seeing them as failures or aberrations, a cause for guilt” (Auerbach 1993:14). To me, this suggests that such views are based on ideology rather than pedagogy. Thus the issue of MT use in the classroom appears to have taken on an emotive flavour rather than a sound, pedagogical one.

Likewise, Kharma and Hajjaj (1989:230), in a survey of attitudes of educators and students toward the use of Arabic in the ESL classroom, report that a small minority of educator subjects see the use of the MT as a teaching and learning aid. These teachers who supported monolingualism expressed the belief that MT use in the classroom increases expectations of more use of MT, hinders fluency, destroys motivation and distracts students. My own study reveals similar opinions by educator participants: although most of them include learners’ NL in their lessons and state that they allow their pupils to use their mother tongue, they nevertheless prefer English to be the language of the schools.

Views that support the English-only policy are based on the premise that the more learners are exposed to English, the more quickly they will learn and the only way one will learn English is if one is forced to use it (Auerbach 1993:14). Some teacher participants in a study of Spanish in the English classroom lend support to this view (Schweers 1999:9). They felt that not only did students need as much exposure as possible to the L2 input during limited class time, but also that if only English is used, students would be forced to communicate in that language thereby providing them the opportunity to produce comprehensible output and negotiate meaning. Similarly, Ellis (1984:131) mentions that classroom management and organization, as well as more obvious pedagogic goals, should be carried out in the target language. He suggests that using the MT will “deprive the learners of valuable input in the L2”. However, he does not exemplify why this might be so. Some learners and educators of my study, as I shall discuss in Chapter Three, appear to share similar views. For example, one interviewee, a subject advisor, states that only English should be used in the teaching of both English main language as well as additional language. He says :

- VI. There are other ways you can do it (i.e. teach English without using learners' NL) by rephrasing, you can do it by simplifying, you can do it by gestures, through creating (unclear) for a learner to make. [Appendix B2a, SA7].

Learners too, who do not use only English in their classrooms, responded to questionnaires and interview questions with such remarks as: “I like using English because practice makes perfect.” Auerbach (1993) and Hawks (2001) argue that the reasons proposed for using only English in the classroom are neither conclusive nor pedagogically sound. Hawk asserts: “..... concrete reasons as to why the mother tongue should be avoided in the classroom are hard to

find.” My own research, as will be discussed in Chapter Four, supports the views of Auerbach and Hawk. The value of the MT for pedagogy cannot be undermined as the following part of this section, a discussion of the value of the NL in the classroom, reveals.

2.4.3 EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF USING THE NL IN CLASSROOMS

Contrary to the claims held by English-only proponents more recent studies suggest that far from being a negative or detrimental force in learners’ personal and academic development, the use of the NL can positively affect both intellectual and linguistic progress. For example, Schinke-Llano (1991:381) reports that although there are conflicting views in disfavour and in favour of using learners’ NL in the classroom, results from longitudinal studies suggest that using the students’ NL in the classroom does work; Lucas and Katz (1994:539) make the point that contrary to the view that maintaining and developing one’s NL prohibits L2 acquisition, research findings show that “one of the best predictors of L2 proficiency is proficiency in the mother tongue”; and Schneider (1979:114) argues that, to a certain extent, the use of learners’ NL is both unavoidable and desirable, and that any L2 learning “must be built on the bedrock of the L1”. Some of the more salient benefits of using the NL in the classroom are: (i) NL promotes L2 acquisition; (ii) NL promotes cognitive and linguistic development; (iii) NL fulfills pedagogical functions; (iv) NL facilitates teaching and influences learner behaviour; (v) NL serves as a communicative strategy; and (vi) NL has psychological benefits for the learners. A discussion of these benefits follows.

2.4.3.1 NL PROMOTES L2 ACQUISITION :

Although it may appear contrary to common sense, maintaining and developing one's NL does not interfere with the developing of L2 proficiency. Indeed, research findings show that strong L1 literacy is a key factor in successful SLA and academic success (Cummins 1981; 1999). Cummins (1999) states: "The level of development of children's mother tongue is a strong predictor of their second language development." Similarly, Walqui (2000) stresses that the student's level of proficiency in the NL - including not only oral language and literacy, but also metalinguistic development, training in formal and academic features of language use, and knowledge of rhetorical patterns and variations in genre and style - affects acquisition of a second language. The more academically sophisticated the student's NL knowledge and abilities, the easier it will be for that student to learn a second language. In presenting a case against the notion of 'maximum exposure', Garrett et al. (1994:372) point out that one of the principal counter-arguments promoting the use of the mother tongue is that learning takes place by building on what is already known - the greatest body of knowledge that children bring to school is their language, set of cognition and schemata etc. acquired through their mother tongue. This view is supported by Swain (1983:41) who asserts that the first principle of successful bilingual education is that the child should receive a strong grounding in his L1, which in turn will promote the development of the L2. Moreover, contrary to the views that the L1 hinders SLA, Schinke-Llano (1991:381) reports that Spanish ESL students who had limited English proficiency show that using their NL does not impede progress in either subject matter or English development.

2.4.3.2 NL PROMOTES COGNITIVE AND LINGUISTIC DEVELOPMENT :

It is claimed that to deprive bilingual children of the use of their mother tongue at schools not only deprives them of the opportunity of acquiring the L2 proficiently but hinders their cognitive and linguistic development as well (Garrett et al. 1994:372). In their study of children of Finnish migrant workers, Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukoma (1976) provide support for this argument. In comparison with children born in an environment where the majority language was not their own, or who move countries at an earlier age, older children have demonstrated an advantage in mastering the cognitively more demanding aspects of their L2, i.e. the linguistic skills needed to operate successfully in the classroom where helpful contextual cues are lacking. Cummins (1981) attributes this to their greater mother tongue proficiency.

2.4.3.3 NL FULFILLS PEDAGOGICAL FUNCTIONS :

Various studies have shown that using the learners' NL in the ESL classroom serve a multitude of pedagogical functions (e.g. Atkinson 1987; Kharma and Hajjaj 1989; Schinke-Llano 1991; Auerbach 1993; Lucas and Katz 1994; Schweers 1999). I discuss those functions that are relevant to this study viz, that use of the MT promotes academic success and gives way to increasing use of the L2; enhances writing skills; and promotes access to content area development.

(a) NL promotes academic success and gives way to increasing use of the L2 :

In her insightful article which addresses the situation of immigrant ESL learners studying in

the United States, Auerbach (1993) draws on various researchers who demonstrate the values of using learners' NL in the classroom. As an instance, she cites Gracia's (1991) study of effective instructional practices for linguistically and culturally diverse students: Gracia concluded that when students are initially allowed to use their NL to communicate with each other and the teacher, they are academically successful. Use of both the NL and L2 facilitates the transition to English and is critical to later success. Auerbach (1993:19) supports this view: she notes that teachers at Centro Presente report that use of the NL "naturally gives way to increasing use of English." These teachers argue that students think in their NL and that allowing for the exploration of ideas in the NL "supports a gradual, developmental process in which use of the L1 drops off naturally as it becomes less necessary." Similarly, Kharma and Hajjaj (1989:230) state that in their study the use of the MT appears to decrease with the students' increasing L2 language learning experience. Data gathered from interviews with learner participants and their responses to questionnaires in my study reveals that by resorting to CS learners better pave the way to English acquisition. The question that therefore arises and that which I discuss in Chapter Four, is whether the alternate use of Zulu, the learners' NL, and English, their L2, can be perceived as an interlanguage (a concept that I shall define later in my discussion).

(b) Use of NL in the classroom enhances writing skills :

Strohmeier and McGrail (1988), Garcia (1991) and Osborne and Harss-Covaleski (1991) (quoted in Auerbach 1993:20-21) conclude from their studies that allowing learners to explore their ideas in their L1 enhances their writing skills in English. Similarly, in his study of the

use of the learners' mother tongue in ESL classes at the Invergarry Learning Center in Vancouver, Canada, Shamash (1990) concludes that allowing learners to use their L1 in their class - including writing, first in the L1 and then in the L2 - helps to create "a natural bridge for overcoming problems of vocabulary (and) sentence structure", and helps boost learners' confidence in language use.

(c) NL promotes access to content area development :

The benefits of using the NL in the classroom also include promoting access to content area development. This is clearly revealed in the argument presented by Lucas and Katz (1994). They point out that by adopting an English-only policy at school, ESL students suffer an educational or academic set-back of about four years. The rationale behind this is that it takes 2 to 3 years to acquire proficiency in basic communication skills and about 4 to 10 years to become proficient at academic skills. As a result, the English-only approach would prevent ESL students from having access to content area knowledge and academic skills that their English-speaking peers are learning. The ESL students are likely to get further and further behind in their academic development while they are focusing on learning English (Peires 1994:538). By discussing content in their own NL students have access to their own experiences and knowledge and are therefore able to interact more effectively in social and academic fields (Moll 1992:21-23). In addition, Bolitho (1983) states that an important role of the MT is to allow students to say what they really want to say. Once the teacher has established what it is learners want to say, they can be encouraged or helped to express this in English. The relevance of Bolitho's view to my own study can be seen in the following

comment made by an English-Afrikaans bilingual teacher of Afrikaans additional language:

VII. R. : So what happens when you pose a question in Afrikaans and your pupils respond in English?

T. : I would ask them to try and speak in Afrikaans to put it into Afrikaans because I know that they have understood it in English. If they try and can't succeed in getting it ... a correct response in Afrikaans, I would help them translate into Afrikaans. The important thing is they've understood the content. Now it's trying to get them to say it in Afrikaans. [Appendix B4b, ET8].

Thus, the use of the NL is the only effective means of providing access to content area development. Furthermore, Lucas and Katz (1994:538-9) maintain that where students share a common NL, the development of NL skills and NL instruction in academic content area give learners “the best hope for building a solid foundation in content and cognitive development and support the growth of their self-esteem and their English abilities.” My study will show that this is true not only when learners share a common NL, but when teachers and learners share the NL as well. Related to fulfilling pedagogical functions, use of the NL in the classroom also facilitates teaching and influencing learner behaviour, as follows.

2.4.3.4 NL FACILITATES TEACHING AND INFLUENCES LEARNER BEHAVIOUR :

In their study of both teachers' and learners' use and attitude toward the use of the NL in the classroom, Kharma and Hajjaj (1989:228-9) report that majority of the teachers and students in their study believe that the NL facilitates teaching and learning a second language.

According to the teacher participants of their study, some of the functions of teachers using learners' NL include providing new or difficult vocabulary; explaining grammatical structures and difficult questions; explaining instructions; conducting part of a discussion; explaining reading passages and lesson procedures; saying what could be difficult to say in English; eliciting student reaction; and in greetings and leave-taking. Similarly, Piasecka (1988:99) and Schweers (1999:7) show that the use of the MT in the classroom as used by teachers includes classroom management; setting the scene; giving instructions and prompts; presenting rules concerning grammar; explaining errors; resolving individual areas of difficulty; discussing cross-cultural issues; and assessing comprehension. Collingham (1988:83-84) agrees with many of these uses and adds the following: to develop ideas as a precursor to experiencing them in the L2; to reduce inhibitions or affective blocks in L2 production; to elicit language and discourse strategies for particular situations; to provide explanations of grammar and language functions; and to teach vocabulary. In my own study, an analysis of lesson recordings (in the class in which both the teacher and learners included the use of the NL) reveals similar uses. I shall, however, explore the uses of the NL in the classroom in later chapters.

In addition to reports by teachers on the benefits of using learners' NL in the classroom, students too provide favourable views. For example, the student participants of the study by Kharma and Hajjaj (1989:228) report that they used the NL to explain undesirable behaviour; to ask about new items; to express a lack of comprehension; speaking with or explaining to their peers; responding to daily instruction; explaining activities; guessing meaning; for

greetings and leave-taking; and for inserting the NL in the L2 utterance. Students also felt that the NL was useful in that they could give correct answers which they found difficult to express in English. The learners of my study reveal similar views. Many state that one of the main reasons for switching to Zulu, their NL, is to provide answers which they find difficult to express in English, their L2. Bolitho (1983:238) provides evidence to support the view expressed by Kharma and Hajjaj (1989). He notes that the NL is of particular use to students who know what they want to say but are unable to do so in English. Once teachers establish what students want to say, they can encourage them to explore their meaning in English.

In their study of the use of the NL in teaching a second/foreign language, Kharma and Hajjaj (1989:228-9) also report that both teachers and students felt that the use of the L1 “presented genuine opportunities for practising the use of the second language in authentic situations.” Significantly, this study reveals that the alternate use of two languages does not occur haphazardly or simply to get any message through either by the students or teachers. Rather, it seems to be used systematically and purposefully, whenever the participants feel a specific need for it.

More recent evidence that shows that the mother tongue can be used in the acquisition of English language skills is apparent in the Molteno project, based at Rhodes University. This research shows that the mother tongue and culture could be used in order to advance the English language (Sarinjeive 1999:130).

2.4.3.5 NL SERVES AS A COMMUNICATIVE STRATEGY IN THE ENGLISH CLASSROOM :

The use of the NL also serves as a communicative strategy in the ESL classroom. It can be used for simple explanation; to explain difficult abstract concepts; to elicit responses and maintain a sense of cooperation; and to bridge information gaps when these cannot be achieved in the L2 (Kharma and Hajjaj 1989:231). Similarly, in his study of the attitudes of students and teachers toward the use of learners' NL in the classroom, Schweers (1999:6) reports that most of the student participants felt that their NL should be used in the ESL classroom by both themselves and their teachers. They felt that in addition to explaining difficult concepts, the L1 could be used to make them feel more comfortable and confident; to check comprehension and explain new vocabulary; to facilitate comprehension of what is happening in class; and most importantly, it could be used as an aid in learning English. The teachers added that the use of the L1 was beneficial in that it established rapport with their students; increased students' enthusiasm for learning; and showed that students' NL was valued as a communicative resource (Schweers 1999:6-9).

Likewise, Martin (1996:129) points out that the use of the NL includes clarification and checking comprehension, giving procedures and directions, and for acting as a "we-code". Furthermore, Sticchi-Damiani (1985:375) demonstrates that non-native teachers of English use their L1 for specific purposes: for translation; to check for understanding and for clarification; as a "we" code, indicating group membership and personal connections; and for procedure and directions. Interestingly, neither the teachers nor the learners in Schweer's

study saw the use for the L1 in testing. My study will also show that teacher(s) responses to questionnaires and interviews support the evidence provided by Kharma and Hajjaj (1989) and Schweers (1999) to a large extent: this study will reveal that teachers resort to the NL for explanation purposes; to elicit responses from learners; for procedure and directions; and to check for understanding, among others. Significant too, is the fact that no attention is given to the role of the NL in testing.

2.4.3.6 NL HAS PSYCHOLOGICAL BENEFITS FOR LEARNERS :

The use of the NL in the classroom is also thought to reduce affective barriers to the acquisition of language and have many psychological benefits for learners. As an instance, in his study on ESL teaching among refugees, Hemmingdinger (1987), cited in Auerbach (1993:19,22), demonstrates that use of the NL in the classroom allows pupils to discuss vital issues in their lives which they were then able to express in English. In addition to educational benefits such as promoting learning of the L2 and improving access to further education, the use of learners' L1 aids in developing learners' self-confidence (Corson 1997:151), reduces anxiety and enhances the affective environment for learning (Auerbach 1993:20). By contrast, when children are encouraged to reject their mother tongue, their personal and conceptual foundation for learning is undermined (Cummins 1999).

Fishman (1977), Das (1987) and Martin-Jones (1990) (quoted in Martin 1996:130) assert that the classroom is not an independent cultural domain but rather a microcosm of the socio-cultural patterns that exist outside it. As such the learners' NL needs to be both recognized

and valued. On this note, Cummins (1999) asserts: "To reject a child's language in schools is to reject the child." When learners feel this rejection, they are much less likely to become the active and confident participants that the OBE curriculum encourages. Garrett et al. (1994:372) suggest that the use of the mother tongue signals to students that their language and culture have value which will have "a beneficial effect on self-perceptions, attitudes, motivation and, consequently, on achievement." Lucas and Katz (1994:559) and Collingham (1988:82) also lend support to this view. They observe that learners' self-esteem and identity are strengthened when their MT is valued as a language that has communicative power. Auerbach (1993:19,21) and Lucas et al. (1990) note that using and valuing students' NL in schools and classrooms support and enhance the students' learning because they themselves are indirectly valued. By using their MT in the classroom, more specifically in the OBE curriculum, it conveys to the learners that their language is acknowledged, acceptable and valuable.

Shamash (1990:72,75) shows that use of the NL instills a willingness in the learner to experiment and take risks with English. It also "provides them with a sense of security and validates (their) lived experiences, allowing them to express themselves." In addition, using the L1 is a way to value cultural diversity as students teach each other vocabulary or experiences of their own language. This is of particular relevance to my own study, more pointedly to School E which comprises learners of different cultural backgrounds. Shamash's view is explicitly expressed by Ngugi (1981:13) who says: "Language, any language, has a dual character: it is both a means of communication and a carrier of culture." Hence, a

monolingual approach to ESL is rejected not just because it may slow the acquisition of English but because it denies learners the right to draw on their own resources and strengths (Auerbach 1993:22).

The use of learners' NL also increases their openness to learning and reduces the degree of language and culture shock they are encountering. Moreover, it allows for language to be used as "a meaning-making tool and for language learning to become a means of communicating ideas rather than an end in itself" (Auerbach 1993:20). As such, according to Piasecka (1988:97) teaching bilingually is a standpoint which accepts that both the cognitive and affective areas of a learner are deeply rooted in his/her mother tongue. She seconds Auerbach's position when she states: "One's sense of identity as an individual is inextricably bound up within one's NL If the learner of a second language is encouraged to ignore his/her language, he/she might well feel his/her identity threatened."

2.4.4 CONCLUSION

The above literature is a clear indication that the advantages of using the mother tongue in the classroom outweighs the possible disadvantages of doing so. Auerbach argues that teachers should incorporate students' NL into ESL classes in ways that help students develop English abilities and consider the implications of and the motivations for *not* doing so. This is particularly so in the current adoption of the OBE model of education which advocates a communicative approach. This requires, among other things, that teachers recognize the needs of their learners, acknowledge their mother tongue, and adopt teaching styles which might

incorporate the use of learners' first language to promote language proficiency. This, as my discussion in Chapter Four will show, includes encouraging learners to use their NL when and where they deem it necessary, calling upon more proficient learners to tutor the less proficient ones, and by teachers using the learners' NL themselves. Littlewood (1981:44,45) argues that uses of L1 by teachers for social interaction and classroom management would provide ample communication opportunities.

This however, does not mean that teachers and learners should be free to use the NL extensively - one should always keep in mind that the ultimate goal of acquiring any L2 is to acquire L1 proficiency (Auerbach 1993; Piasecka 1988:98). The same view is expressed by Atkinson (1987) and Kharma and Hajjaj (1989:231) who maintain that the goal to acquire L1 proficiency cannot be achieved by extensive and intensive practice in the target language only. They purport that avoiding overuse of the mother tongue would make its use more relevant and beneficial. In other words, prolonged use of the mother tongue or over-dependence on it, so that the language most used in the classroom is not English, can hinder the fluency of ESL and even demotivate the using of it. On this note, Ardendorff (1993:20) remarks: "...teachers need to be warned against romanticizing the role of the mother tongue because too uncritical a view of its role can adversely affect the pupils later." Hence, in response to the question: "When is the use of the mother tongue desirable in the classroom?" French (1963:94) suggests: "...when (it is) inevitable, when (it is) helpful, when (it is) quicker." In addition, one should expect that its use would decrease with a corresponding increase in students' second language experience (Kharma and Hajjaj 1989:230), particularly

if the goal for using the NL is to achieve additive bilingualism (a concept I return to in Chapter Five).

Using the NL presupposes that teachers would be bilingual, sharing the learners' NL. However, researchers show that this is a fallacy. For example, Lucas and Katz show that the incorporation of students' NL in instruction need not be an "all-or-nothing" phenomenon. They maintain that monolingual teachers who do not share their students' L1 can incorporate students' L1 into instruction in many ways to serve a variety of educationally desirable functions. For example, teachers can have learners who share the same NL work in pairs or groups. This suggestion is supported by Kamwangamalu and Virasamy (1997) who show that in schools such as the ex-HOD and ex-NED schools in South Africa, ESL students themselves can be used as a resource. The authors suggest that through the method of peer-tutoring, an activity which involves using students to help other students learn, the NL can be used effectively in classes of monolingual teachers. In my study, it is evident that in classes where educators do not share learners' NL, they allow their pupils to use their NL in group work, thus acknowledging the benefits of using learners' NL in the classroom. Atkinson (1987:247) warns that "to ignore the mother-tongue in a monolingual classroom is almost a certainty to teach with less than maximum efficiency."

To conclude, those who hold cultural-pluralistic views show that using the NL in the classroom has educational, socio-cultural and psychological or affective benefits. When one weighs the wealth of evidence in favour of this view, it is certain that Zulu-speaking and other

ESL learners of South Africa would benefit from such use. The overwhelming evidence in support of the use of the NL in ESL classrooms also has implications for principals and educators who choose to ignore or who are in ignorance of the gazetted recommendations of recent documents and position papers which advocate multilingual/ multi-cultural classrooms as resources for learning. It is, as Peires (1994:16) points out, imperative that a student makes use of his/her full linguistic skills for maximum input. This is noted in the report of the ANC Education and Training Policy Conference (1994) :

"Pursuing a multilingual policy on language in education will involve ensuring the right of the individual to develop the linguistic skills, *in the language or languages of his/her choice*, which are necessary for full participation in national, provincial and local life."

In addition, the report from the Centre for Education Policy Development (1994) is even more specific on the use of the native language in the classroom :

"Code-switching during group discussions, workshops, practicals, seminars and lectures should be acknowledged as a normal feature of teaching and learning."

Finally, my research will show that contrary to the beliefs held by those who hold assimilationist views, the use of learners' NL in the classroom has pedagogical, sociocultural and affective benefits.

The various functions of CS, in both the social and pedagogical arenas, follow.

2.5 FUNCTIONS OF CODE-SWITCHING

This section reviews the literature on the functions of CS. It is divided into three parts. The first part, the introduction, presents a brief overview on the rationale for CS and examines the reason postulated for motivations for CS. The second part, as a foreground to the discussion of CS in the educational arena, presents a brief discussion of situational, metaphorical and conversational code-switching and mentions some functions of CS in the social context as the school is viewed as a microcosm of society at large and as such there are many overlaps in the roles of CS between the social and pedagogical domains. The third part focuses on the role and functions of CS in the educational context.

2.5.1 INTRODUCTION

Poplack (1980:585) and Kamwangamalu (1999:257) point out that in the twentieth century researchers e.g. Espinosa (1917) and Lance (1975), perceived CS as a random mixture of the languages maintaining that bilinguals engage in CS because there are no restrictions as to what they can or cannot mix in their speech. More recently, however, several studies of CS have convincingly demonstrated that, contrary to the claims made by Espinosa (1917) and Lance (1975), CS is not random; rather, the alternation of two (or more) languages is a structured, rule-governed mechanism (Poplack 1980:585; Jacobson 1998:1) despite the fact that there is little agreement on the precise nature of the rules involved (Poplack 1980:585). The occurrence of CS is governed by a number of factors, both linguistic and extralinguistic (Poplack 1980:581; Kamwangamalu 1999:257). The linguistic and extralinguistic factors which are of relevance to this study are the attitudes of English monolinguals, English-Afrikaans bilinguals, and Zulu-

English bilinguals toward English, Afrikaans, Zulu, English-Zulu CS and Afrikaans-English CS; the participants in the speech situation; the topic or goal of the interaction; and the setting. Taking these factors into account, it is now commonly agreed that, far from being an “undesirable, indecent form of behaviour”, CS is highly functional (e.g. Adendorff 1993; Merritt et al. 1992; Meeuwis and Blommaert 1994). Kamwangamalu (1992:175; 1998:286), Blommaert (1992) and Duran (1994:4) add that CS can be perceived as a linguistic capital and can be used by bilingual speakers not as an end in itself but that which can serve quite a range of functions in bilingual interactions.

Although various reasons have been postulated for the motivations for CS, Baker (1980) suggests that one of the more salient is lexical gaps. Three types of lexical gaps have been identified, namely, (a) gaps in denotation; (b) gaps in connotation; and (c) gaps in register.

(a) Gaps in denotation :

In *gaps in denotation*, lexical gaps may exist in either the lexicon of a language or the lexicon of the speaker. In either case the speaker “has no choice” but to fill these gaps with words from another language. This, as this study will show, has particular relevance to the teaching of sciences and technology where there are no Zulu equivalents for certain terminologies. As my discussion in the third part of this section will show, Barnes (1993) describes the use of CS for gaps in denotation as “culture-specific switches”. Usually, this will account for only a few single item switches (Huerta 1978:47; McCormick 1995:202).

(a) Gaps in connotation :

In *gaps in connotation*, Huerta (1978:101) points out that terms in two languages which are apparently equivalent may not have the same connotations. Thus the speaker will resort to a term from the other language to convey his/her intended meaning. She states :

"Often two terms . . . which are dictionary equivalents are not so for the native bilingual, for whom use of either term will actually connote subtle differences in meaning."

In her study of English-Zulu CS in the literature classroom, Moodley (2001: 127) shows how the teacher uses the word 'tsotsis' instead of its denotative equivalent 'hooligan' in the following sentence :

Example 1 :

In such cases we see people who misbehave or cheat other people, **tsotsis**

In the context of this utterance, the English 'hooligan' would convey a different notion and not be appropriate for labelling an adulteress whereas its counterpart 'tsotsis' has different connotations and appropriately describes the woman in the context of the short story being studied. Similarly, one of the multilingual interviewees of this study gives the following explanation for sometimes switching from English to Zulu :

Example 2 :

Sometimes there's a term which is very culturally bound, that doesn't translate in English very well. For example, "**ubuntu**" alright. If you ask for a translation, it means humanity but this is not what **ubuntu** truly refers to. In the South African context it also means sharing with your neighbours, sharing what you have within your culture.

Ubuntu in this concept where nobody will starve in the Zulu community because we will look after the others. There's almost a sense of tribal feeling - you know what I mean? [Appendix B2a, SA9].

(b) Gaps in register :

Finally, in *gaps in register* while a speaker may have access to a dictionary equivalent of a term it may have a different register to the one the speaker wishes to convey. Baker (1980:14) provides the following made-up example of Spanish-English CS :

Example 3 :

Voy con mis cuates a boogie en el nuevo bar.
[I'm going with my buddies to boogie at the new bar].

In this example, the colloquialism 'cuates' (buddies) requires a less formal word than 'bailar' (to dance) so that the speaker might make a single-word switch to the English slang 'boogie'. In the next part of this section I present a brief discussion of situational, metaphorical and conversational code-switching and mention some functions of CS in the social context as a foreground to my discussion of CS in the pedagogical context.

2.5.2 SITUATIONAL, METAPHORICAL AND CONVERSATIONAL CS

2.5.2.1 SITUATIONAL CS :

In the earlier studies concerned with the meaning and function of CS a distinction was made between situation and metaphorical CS on the basis of the relationship between the topic, participants, role and setting of the discourse (Blom and Gumperz 1972:424-26). In situational CS distinct varieties are employed in certain settings (e.g. the home, school, church, work place)

that are associated with separate, bounded kind of activities (e.g. special ceremonies, public speaking, games) or spoken with different categories (e.g. of friends, family members, strangers) (Gumperz 1982a:60-1; Barnes 1993:270). Situational CS is normally triggered by changes, or perceived changes in the situation. Fishman and Giles (1978:383) define a 'situation' by the "co-occurrence of two (or more) interlocutors related to each other in a particular way, communicating about a particular topic, in a particular setting." Thus, a social network or community may view a party between educators as a quite different situation from a staff-meeting involving the same persons. The topics of the talk in the two situations, their locations and times, and the relationship or roles of the interlocutors vi-á-vis each other are likely to be different. Any one of these differences may determine the use of a different language in each case. The following conversation, which occurred at the regional education office on my first visit with a colleague who is a teacher of Afrikaans (Mr V), demonstrates how CS occurs as a result of a change in participant and topic. The 'stranger' (Mr S) is an African, whom I (Mrs M) later learned is a Zulu-speaker.

Example 4 :

- Mr S. : (in passing at the offices) *Good morning.*
- Mrs M. : *Good morning.*
- Mr S. : (on seeing Mr V) : *Goeie môre meneer! Wat doen jy hier?* [What are you doing here?]
- Mr V. : *Hello! This is Mrs Moodley. Om Mnr. Bongwe te besoek. Het jy aansoek om matriekbepunting gedoen?* [To visit Mr Bongwe. Did you apply for matric marking?].
- Mr S. : *Ek het my aansoek ingestuur. Verlede jaar is ek nie aanvaar nie, dus weet ek nie wat vanjaar sal gebeur nie.* [I sent in my application. Last year I was not accepted therefore I don't know what will happen this year.]

- Mr V. : *Ek ook. Ek wag nog vir my antwoord. Vanjaar is ek glad nie seker nie want daar is nie weer 'n stelwerk vraestel nie.* [Me too. I am still waiting for my answer. This year I'm definitely not sure because there is no longer a composition paper].
- Mr S. : *Ons moet wag en sien.* [We must wait and see].
- Mr V. : *Tot siens.* [Goodbye].
- Mr S. : *Tot siens.* [Goodbye].
- Mr V. : *Bye.*
- Mr S. : *Goodbye.*

Having greeted me (a stranger) out of courtesy, in English, Mr S. on recognizing Mr V. switches to Afrikaans to greet him. This is to say that CS occurs, in this example, as a result in a change in situation regarding the participant. Situational CS is of relevance to my own study as Zulu-English bilingual learners of School E use Zulu-English CS when conversing with each other in informal situations (e.g. outside the classroom, with each other in the classroom) but English only once the formalities of teaching and learning begin in the classroom. In this situation, codes change as a result in change of setting (formal situation vs. informal situation) and participants (bilingual learners with each other vs. bilingual learners with the teacher and English monolingual learners). This is evident in the comments of both an educator and learner interviewee of this study :

Example 5 :

- R. In your classroom, do your pupils switch between English and Zulu?
- T. No, not during the actual lesson, formal lesson. But as you're walking into the class you hear them, and during groupwork sessions. But when I'm teaching they don't switch. [Appendix B1b, ET7].

Example 6 :

- R. Okay. Do your Zulu speaking friends ever use Zulu in the classroom?
- L. Sometimes, when they are talking to one another. But they don't use Zulu when the teacher is teaching. [Appendix B4b, EL10].

2.5.2.2 METAPHORICAL CS :

Unlike situational CS, metaphorical switches (as called by Gumperz and Hernández-Chávez 1971:286) occur within the same situation, and are triggered by a change in the topic and concern “the communicative effect the speaker wishes to convey” (Romaine 1989:148). In metaphorical switching, the language switch relates to particular kinds of topics or subject matters rather than a change in social situation and there is no significant change in definition of participants’ mutual rights and obligations. Thus, for example, if a poetic phrase is used in normal conversation, it gives the conversation a poetic flavour thus adding special social meaning of confidentiality or privateness to the conversation (Blom and Gumperz 1972:425). Metaphorical switching sometimes serves as a rhetorical device used to achieve special effects, or to mark certain moods - it may include emphatic or emotional utterances (Baker 1980:14). The following extract obtained from a group-work session, involving two Zulu-English bilinguals and two English monolinguals in School E, serves as an example :

[The topic for discussion, in preparation for a debate, is whether HIV positive children should be in mainstream schools. The entire session was in English, except for a single utterance. All 3 participants are in favour of the topic except ZE2].

Example 7 :

- L1. What I want to know is what if we were HIV positive, would we want people to treat us like this? Would you like them to tell you 'Don't come to this school because you are HIV positive.' Would you like it if people have to say that?
- L2. No, I won't.
- L1. So you get our point?
- L2. Ja but they must not be allowed because they will get other children who are teasing them. I think they must go to their own schools you know - no one will be teasing anyone, you see?
- L1. No, I don't. You just don't see our point, Sanele. **iKhanda lakho ilikhuni!** [You are so stubborn!] [Appendix C1a, LL1-8].

The switch in this example indicates the exasperation or frustration of L1 at L2's refusal to change his mind about his point of view.

Fishman and Giles (1978:385) note that metaphorical switching is utilized for purposes of emphasis or contrast. They state that this type of switching can be risky: "It is a luxury that can be afforded only by those that comfortably share not only the same *set* of situational norms but also the same view as to their inviolability." Since most people are members of several speech communities with somewhat different sociolinguistic norms (particularly in a multi-cultural society such as Port Shepstone, the area in which this study is based) the chances that situational and metaphorical switching could be misunderstood and in conflict is probable (Blom and Gumperz 1972).

However, Myers Scotton and Ury (1975:5) felt that this distinction between situational and metaphorical switching explained the *how* of CS but did not adequately explain *why* it occurred.

They proposed that CS be perceived as a change which influences the social distance between interlocutors (see section 2.1.2 of this chapter). In addition, individuals adapt to each others speech patterns on a number of linguistic levels and in a manner that is not fully explicable in terms of situation or metaphorical switching alone. In order to account for the complex diversity of CS, Gumperz (1976) proposes a third type of switching which he terms ‘conversational CS’ (which many authors regard as CS proper) in which no switch of situation or topic necessarily occurs.

(c) CONVERSATIONAL CS :

Conversational CS, according to Gumperz (1982a:59), is a term which refers to “the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems.” Most frequently the switch takes the form of two subsequent sentences, as when a speaker uses the L2 either to reiterate his/her message or to reply to someone else’s statement. Consider the following examples extracted from the lesson recordings of this study:

Example 8 :

T Yes! She wants to kill him. Ufuna ukumbulala [She wants to kill him]. [Appendix C3b, L53].

Example 9 :

- L1 and they feel that they have been slaves for the humans, they have been giving them milk and/
 L3 Obviously ngobanaku uMajor waye yingulube [because Major was a pig]. (Pupils laugh).
 L1 Ja, ngoba izingulube zingamavila [Yes because pigs are lazy]. [Appendix C1b, LL6-9].

Each of the above exchanges forms a single unitary interactional whole. In Example 8 there is no hesitation or changes in sentence rhythm to mark a shift in code, and in Example 9, both speakers communicate fluently, maintaining an even flow of talk.

In discussing conversational CS, Gumperz (1982a), Hoffmann (1991), McClure (1981), Gxilishe (1992) and McCormick (1995) among others, propose a range of functional taxonomies of CS. CS is such a dynamic phenomenon and its functions so vast and various that I do not pretend to present an exhaustive range of it. Rather, my aim is to examine the more common purposes that CS might serve in KZN, and more particularly in Port Shepstone where this research takes place. Some of the more relevant functions to this study include CS as quotation i.e. for reported speech (e.g. Martin-Jones 1995; Ncoko 1998); CS as addressee specification and accommodation i.e. switching to another code to accommodate a new speaker (e.g. Goyvaerts 1995; Finlayson and Slabbert 1997); CS as reiterative i.e. repetition of a message in the other code (e.g. Gila 1995; Ncoko 1998); CS for elaboration (e.g. McClure 1981); CS for explanation purposes (Adendorff 1993); CS as a device to express solidarity (e.g. Nwoye 1993; Flowers 2000); and CS for closure (e.g. Blommaert 1992; Nwoye 1993; Martin-Jones 1995). Various researchers (e.g. Merritt et al. 1992; Peires 1994; Martin-Jones 1995) have also shown that CS in the educational field fulfills certain functions, both social and pedagogical. I shall present a discussion of these functions below. However, I must reiterate that these functions are by no means an exhaustive account. I examine only those which I consider to be more applicable to this study.

2.5.3 THE FUNCTIONS OF CODE-SWITCHING AND CODE-MIXING IN EDUCATIONAL CONTEXTS

Although much attention has been devoted to the role and functions of CS in informal, social contexts, more recently, research has examined the significance of CS in the domain of the school (e.g. Merritt et al.1992; Adendorff 1993; Elridge 1996; Marawu 1997; Ncoko 1998; van der Walt 2001). In this part of the chapter I examine closely the salient functions of CS in the domain of the school, particularly in the classroom. I draw mostly from Merritt et al.'s (1992) study of CS in Kenyan primary school classrooms; Adendorff's (1993) study of CS in the classroom of four different situations (namely, a teacher of English, a Biology teacher, a Geography teacher and a school principal) in a KZN school; Gila's (1995) study of CS in the classroom in Transkei junior secondary schools; Elridge's (1996) study of CS in a Turkish secondary school; Ncoko's (1998) study of CS among junior primary pupils in multiracial schools; and Ndayipfukamiye's (1998) study of Kirundi-French CS in primary classrooms in Burundi, situated in a hinterland of Africa.

Mindful of the fact that a discussion of a typology of the various functions of CS is a tedious endeavour; and as Auer (1995:99) points out, "impossible to compile a comprehensive inventory of the functions of CS", I present only those functions that are directly relevant to this study, viz.:

(i) CS as a communicative resource; (ii) CS as a referential function; (iii) CS as reiterative; (iv) CS for explanation purposes and for introduction of new subject matter; (v) CS for class management and influencing learner behaviour; (vi) CS as a phatic function; (vii) CS as an emblem for group solidarity; (viii) CS for quotation; and finally, (ix) CS as a metalinguistic function. The reader must however bear in mind that these functions cannot be clearly

distinguished from the role and functions of CS in social contexts in general and that in fact there may be overlaps. In addition, as my study will reveal, the various instances of CS may also be multi-functional, a point I return to in 2.5.4. In this section, I do not draw on examples from my own study as I present these in my analysis and discussion in Chapter Four.

2.5.3.1 CODE-SWITCHING AS A COMMUNICATIVE RESOURCE :

Various studies have shown that code-switching and code-mixing serve as a valuable communicative resource even though English is the dominant language of learning and instruction in the educational domain. In discussing CS as a communicative resource, I draw on the studies of Adendorff (1993), Ndayipfukamiye (1998) and de Mejia (1998). In his study of three high school teachers with their pupils in a KZN high school, Adendorff (1993) demonstrates that CS is a communicative resource which allows teachers and pupils to accomplish many educational and social objectives. He shows that switching from English to Zulu allows teachers and pupils to interpret academic goals, intentions and social relations, and in so doing gives additional meaning to what is said and done in a conversation (Adendorff 1993:5). As an example, he observes that while the teacher of English was teaching the poem "*Death be not proud*" by John Donne to his matric class, he switched from English to Zulu without adding any new information to that which was already said in English :

Example 10 :

Therefore death would not have killed him. Therefore one would be asleep and dreaming. When we are asleep we dream and *yonke* into *oyiphuphayo* is recorded [...all that we dream about is recorded in our minds] (Adendorff 1993:9).

This, according to Adendorff (1993: 11) was communicatively significant because the switches constitute a meta-message of some kind. Similarly, by drawing on data obtained from recorded lessons of various LLC lessons in the junior secondary phase, I shall later demonstrate how the teachers concerned switch from English to Zulu and Afrikaans to English without adding any new information.

In his study of Grade 5 pupils in Burundi during French lessons, Ndayipfukamiye (1998) also shows that switching from French (the medium of instruction) to Kirundi (pupils' mother tongue) fulfills a communicative function. Some of the communicative functions are explaining vocabulary items, doing an aside to comment on pupils' behaviour, checking understanding and evaluating a response. The following illustrates how the teacher resorts to CS to elicit the meaning of a French word from the pupils :

Example 11 :

Teacher : **Brouter n ukuvuga iki?** [What does to graze mean?]

Pupil : **Kurisha** [to graze].

Teacher : **Kurisha. Donc il ya des animaux qui broutent.**

[To graze. Thus there are animals that graze].

In this example, by employing CS in his/her question i.e. **Brouter n ukuvuga iki?** [What does to graze mean?] the teacher is able to elicit an appropriate response from a pupil.

Similarly, in her study of English-Spanish bilingual storytelling in early immersion classroom contexts in Columbia, de Mejia (1998:9) demonstrates that CS may be seen as a vital communicative resource to learners and teachers who share proficiency in learners' L1. By

engaging in CS, teachers are able to encourage and successfully engage pupils in the ongoing interaction and ensure comprehensible input. In doing so, teachers acknowledge learners' right to participate in the storytelling event and promote understanding among pupils as to what is happening in the story. Through the skillful and flexible use of CS, these pupils have appropriate access to their L1 in the process of learning another language. The use of CS also helps maximize learning opportunities in the classroom. Likewise, this study will show how the teacher participants who switch to Zulu and to English, the learners' L1, encourage pupils to meaningfully interact with a literary text.

2.5.3.2 CODE-SWITCHING AS A REFERENTIAL FUNCTION :

In addition to using CS for explanation purposes CS can also serve a referential function because it often involves a lack of knowledge of one language or lack of facility in that language on a certain subject (Appel and Muysken 1987:118; Gxilishe 1992:94; Goyvaerts 1995:174; Elridge 1996). On the same note, Weinreich (1953) observes that switching occurs more frequently in situations in which the designative quality of the vocabulary in a particular language is inadequate to name new things, persons and personal experiences. It therefore follows that certain subjects may be more appropriately discussed in one language, and the introduction of such a subject can lead to a switch. Weinreich (1953:58) also notes that some affective words tend to lose their expressive force in a given language. Hence the speaker switches to the 'other' language to convey his/her intended meaning more effectively. Likewise, Gxilishe (1992:94) asserts that a specific word from one language may be semantically more appropriate for a given concept.

Appel and Muysken (1987) add that speakers who resort to this type of switching are thought to be conscious of their switches. They show that when their subjects were asked for reasons for their use of CS they tend to say that it is because they do not know the word for it in the other language, or because the language chosen is more fit for talking about a given subject (Appel and Muysken 1987:118). The following example provided by Gila (1995:20) serves as a point of illustration :

Example 12 :

Teacher : **OK. Namhlanje sizakuthetha ngelesson entsha.**

[Today we are going to talk about a new lesson].

Yintoni icolonization? [What is colonization?]

In this example, because there is no Zulu equivalent for “colonization”, the word is used within this context.

2.5.3.3 CODE-SWITCHING AS REITERATIVE :

Yet another frequently used function of CS in the educational context is CS as reiterative. CS for reiterative purposes refers to the repetition of a message uttered in one code, in another code. Gumperz (1982a:78) states: “Frequently a message in one code is repeated in the other code, either literally or in somewhat modified form.” Within the social context CS as reiterative is often meant to resolve ambiguity or clarify a potential or apparent lack of understanding (McClure 1981:82; Gumperz 1982:78; McCormick 1995:202), reinforce, emphasise, or amplify the message that has already been transmitted in one code but may not have been understood (Gumperz 1982a:75; McClure and McClure 1988:38; Ncoko 1998:42). Within the socio-political

arena, Barnes (1993:276-7) provides the following example which is typical of the rhetoric of South African politicians :

Example 13 :

Ons moet saamstaan om 'n nuwe Suid-Afrika te bou -**together we will build a new South Africa**. [We must stand together to build a new South Africa -].

In this example, the repetition serves a dual function: Firstly, to emphasise the message, and secondly, to create a closer sense of solidarity with the audience. Within the educational domain CS fulfills the same function (e.g. Hatch 1976; Adendorff 1993; Gila 1995; Elridge 1996; Marawu 1997; Ncoko 1998). While Hatch (1976:209) and Elridge (1996:305) provide apt examples of how teachers in their studies use CS as reiterative, I shall discuss the evidence provided by Adendorff (1993) and Gila (1995) as these studies relate more closely to my own study.

In his study of English-Zulu CS in a KZN high school, Adendorff shows that the teacher of English and the principal did not add any new information to what was said already. Consider the following example of how the principal made use of CS for reiterative purposes :

Example 14 :

You cannot start doing anything without being psychologically and spiritually prepared to work. **Kufanele umqondo wakho uwunikele futhi usemukele isikhathi se-examination**. [Your mind should be psychologically prepared to accept the examination]. **I-examination yisikhathi sokuthandaza** [The examination period is a time for which we must pray]. When you do this you will become collected (Adendorff 1993:16).

In this example the principal uses CS as means of reiterating his message and thereby clarifies

and reinforces his message.

Further support is provided by Gila (1995) who observes that the teachers in her study of CS at a junior secondary school in Transkei, repeated information for emphasis and clarification. She provides the following example from a history lesson :

Example 15 :

No wars, no marches during the revolution. When it is violent, there are wars. When it is nonviolent there are no wars, it just happens smoothly. **Akukho zingwaba, akuliwa, kanti ukuba kuyaliwa**, it is violent. **Niyayiva lento ndiyithethayo?** [There are no conflicts, no fights, whereas if there are fights Do you hear what I say?] (Gila 1995:15).

In this example also, no new information is provided. The teacher uses CS for the purposes of clarification and emphasis.

Similarly, my own study, as I will illustrate in Chapter Four, shows that some of the functions that reiteration serve include clarifying questions, understanding vocabulary and for vocabulary building, for emphasis, for elaboration, acknowledging the value of learners' NL, achieving solidarity with learners, reinforcing learners' responses thus enhancing learning and motivating the learner, and as a cue for what is going to follow in the lesson. This array of functions that CS as reiterative fulfills clearly demonstrates that even though nothing new is echoed in the switch, reiteration is a powerful strategic tool for teaching and learning.

2.5.3.4 CODE-SWITCHING FOR EXPLANATION PURPOSES AND FOR INTRODUCTION OF NEW SUBJECT MATTER :

The literature shows that CS can also be used for explanation purposes and for introduction of new subject matter based on the assumption that comprehension would be easier in the mother tongue. Although there are various studies which draw attention to these particular functions of CS in the classroom, I shall make reference to the studies of only Merritt et al. (1992), Adendorff (1993), and Ndayipfukamiye (1998). In their study of bilingual English-Swahili Kenyans, Merritt et al. (1992:109-117) reveal how teachers of different schools use CS with their pupils. They show that teachers who use CS are successful in teaching their pupils of the codes and their significance i.e. whether they are expected to direct their attention to content or to management (Merritt et al. 1992:109). The following serves as an illustration of how a science teacher in their study uses CS to either instruct or redirect the attention of his Grade 3 pupils as the lesson progresses :

Example 16 :

Siweka maji mingi [Don't put a lot of water]. Just so the soil is wet.(Merritt et al. 1992:115).

In this example the teacher uses the NL to instruct his/her pupil and then switches to English to emphasise how much water is required.

Adendorff (1993) also observes that in his study of teachers with their pupils in a KZN high school, the Geography teacher switches to Zulu to draw attention to important content information and to exercise classroom management. Both these functions are illustrated in Examples 17 and 18, respectively :

Example 17 :

Today we are going to revise the work that we did yesterday. Yesterday we looked at the formation of flood plains, **ukuthi akheke kanjani** [how the flood plains are formed].

Example 18 :

Musani ukuvula izincwadi zenu [Do not open your books]. (There is laughter from the class. When the teacher switches he raises his voice). **Hhayi bo, vala wena** [Close your book over there!] (Scolding tone. The pupils laugh) (Adendorff 1993:14).

In the Example 17, the teacher uses CS i.e. **ukuthi akheke kanjani** [how the flood plains are formed], to repeat what s/he had just said in English i.e. formation of flood plains and in so doing draws learners' attention to content information. In Example 18, the teacher uses Zulu to influence learner behaviour and in so doing maintains some control in the classroom.

Similarly, in his study of Burundi classrooms, Ndayipfukamiye (1998:86) shows that switching to Kirundi facilitated pupils' understanding of new materials that teachers were presenting in the maths and biology lessons. Ndayipfukamiye maintains that had the teacher not resorted to CS in the classroom, some concepts and procedures would not have been understood.

Through an analysis of lesson recordings of lessons in the LLC classroom, this study will also show how the teacher participants resort to CS for explanation purposes and for the introduction of new material. I shall now examine yet another pertinent function of CS in the classroom, namely, CS for classroom management and influencing learner behaviour.

2.5.3.5 CODE-SWITCHING FOR CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT AND INFLUENCING LEARNER BEHAVIOUR :

In addition to the functions discussed above, research shows that teachers resort to switching to influence learners' behaviour (e.g. Merritt et al. 1992; Adendorff 1993; Gila 1995; Ndayipfukamiye 1998). Merritt et al. (1992) note that even in first language instruction, teachers develop a 'modality splitting' to more effectively manage the classroom. Canagarajah (1995:179) defines 'modality splitting' as "the reservation of specific codes or channels of communication for distinct functions." The learners, over time, become sensitive to this splitting and are able to read the appropriate cues of the teacher to orientate their classroom behaviour. As an instance, Merritt et al. (1992:110,115) note that when teachers employ Swahili-English CS on a one to one basis, such as addressing a pupil privately in his/her NL, they hope to evoke a specific desired behaviour from the pupil. In this sense, CS can function analogously i.e. while one code is reserved for a specific set of functions (e.g. for instructing) another can be reserved for a different function (e.g. for greeting, affective expressions and asides). In his study of Tamil-English CS in India, Canagarajah (1995:179-80) illustrates how the teacher uses CS in the opening of the class to instruct pupils, for example, in the arrangement of the classroom and to negotiate directions. In the South African context, research by Adendorff (1993) and Gila (1995) illustrate how teachers use CS to manage their classes and influence learner behaviour :

Example 19 :

.... Very good *Sigqemezana, uyasebenzake silwane*. [*Sigqemezana*, you are really working very well] (Adendorff 1993:14).

Example 20 :

Yes! Songezo (the tone is strong, mocking and threatening). *Benditshilo ndathi ulele kwedini*. [I told you that you are asleep little boy] (Gila 1995:21).

Example 21 :

In what parts or sections of the river do flood plains form? **Ama-flood plains akheka kuphi emfuleni?** [In what parts or sections of the river do flood plains form?]...../ **Wena... Wena... Wena** [You... You... You]. **Abantu abangibuke abangabheki phansi** [People should not look away from me. You must look at me] (Adendorff 1993:14).

In all of these examples the teachers hope to elicit some specific pupil behaviour. In Example 19, it is to encourage the pupil in his work; in Example 20, it is to alert the pupil to the lesson; and in Example 21, it is to nominate pupils to respond to the teacher's question. In addition, Adendorff (1993:11) notes that by asking provocative questions in Zulu, the teacher of English also succeeds in engaging even the most passive pupil to become involved in the activity. My study will also show how the teacher who employs CS in the LLC classroom switches to influence pupil behaviour. For example, I shall demonstrate how the teacher having asked a question in Afrikaans without successfully eliciting a response from pupils resorts to a switch to English with success. In addition to using CS to influence pupil behaviour, teachers also use CS as a phatic function, as discussed below.

2.5.3.6 CODE-SWITCHING AS A PHATIC FUNCTION :

Various researchers in the educational domain (e.g. Appel and Muysken 1987:119; Gxilishe 1992:94; Adendorff 1993; Gila 1995; Goyvaerts 1995:174;) show that CS serves a phatic function. CS as a phatic function, which Gumperz and Hernández-Chávez (1971) call metaphorical switching, refers to a change in tone of the conversation or a change in pitch of the speaker's voice either higher or lower than before. As an instance, Gila (1995:21) points out that the pitch can also be high and forceful to express certain emotions such as anger or joy. She also notes that

the variation of pitch coupled with CS is significant in that it not only enables the speaker to achieve specific desired effects, but also intensifies the message conveyed.

In her study of CS in a classroom in Transkei, Gila (1995:21) shows that teachers make use of pitch change in combination with CS to carry out various speech acts, such as, reprimanding inattentive pupils, providing humour, pledging solidarity and identifying with pupils. In this respect, Gila notes that CS can be seen as serving a social role in the classroom. She provides the following example as a phatic function of CS by a teacher in a History lesson :

Example 22 :

In France people are divided into two classes. We are going to talk about the nobles.
Which group do we get under the privileged class?

[Teacher points at an inattentive pupil who is asleep, the pupil mumbles something, he does not know the question].

Yes! Songezo [The tone is strong, mocking and threatening]. **Benditshilo ndathi ulele kwedini.** [I told you that you are asleep little boy] Gila (1995:21).

In this example, the teacher's use of CS coupled with a change in tone serves to express his displeasure at the pupil's inattentiveness and the seriousness of the situation. Similarly, Adendorff (1993:13-14) shows that the Geography teacher in his study, spoke more loudly when he switched to Zulu, which Adendorff interprets as a marked choice employed to assert his authority. The teacher also praised a pupil by switching to Zulu coupled with raised volume :

Example 23 :

Very good **Sigqemezana, uyasebenzake silwane.** [Sigqemezana you are really working very well.] (Adendorff 1993:14).

In this example, in addition to encouraging the pupil, the teacher strives to signal solidarity with

his pupil.

My own study also demonstrates that the teacher and learner participants often use CS for phatic reasons, especially for rhetorical effect. I shall return to this point in my discussion of the various functions of CS in Chapter Four.

2.5.3.7 CODE-SWITCHING AS AN EMBLEM FOR GROUP SOLIDARITY :

Teachers have also been observed to engage in CS to achieve solidarity with their pupils (e.g. Hatch 1976; Adendorff 1993; Elridge 1996:306; Ncoko 1998). Switches in this category function as in-group identity markers or tags which are emphasised (Elridge 1996:306; Hatch 1976:209). Ncoko (1998:44) states: "It is quite normal that one is more positive and closer to one's group member than to those of another group. When strangers meeting for the first time realize that they have the same language background they switch to their mother tongue." They are also stressing the fact that they all belong to the same group which shares values and experiences (Grosjean 1982:117). As an example, Hatch (1976:210) notes that in English-Japanese CS teachers used CS to display affection, good-humoured teasing and swearing. Similarly, Adendorff (1993:11-12) observes that by "over-exaggerating, teasing and generally indulging in tension-relieving (and relationship building) banter" with his pupils, the Biology teacher in his study was expressing solidarity with them. He also notes that as Zulu is the language of the pupils, it is accessible to everyone in the classroom thereby becoming a code of "teacher-pupil unity". Similarly, my own study, as will be discussed in Chapter Four, shows that teachers often resort to CS for jesting purposes, even those teachers who have a very limited facility in the learners'

NL. Clearly, the intention of these educators is to achieve solidarity with their learners.

However, Martin-Jones (1995:98) asserts that whilst the languages used in a bilingual classroom are bound to be associated with different cultural values, it is too simplistic to claim that whenever a bilingual teacher who has the same kind of background as the learners switches to a shared code, s/he is invariably expressing solidarity with the learners. CS is employed in more subtle and diverse ways in bilingual classroom communication. Teachers and learners employ CS “to demarcate different types of discourse, to negotiate and renegotiate joint frames of reference and to exchange meanings on the spur of the moment.” While in many instances, there is no doubt that the teachers who employ CS in my study do so to achieve solidarity with their pupils, I shall, in Chapter Four, provide evidence that supports the view adopted by Martin-Jones (1995).

2.5.3.8 CODE-SWITCHING FOR QUOTATION :

McClure (1981:81), McClure and McClure (1988:35), Gumperz (1982a:75-6) and Barnes (1993:274-5) note that one of the most common ways in which CS occurs is through reported speech in the form of a direct quotation in the original language. Barnes cites an example taken from the speech of a bilingual member of the South African anglophone community in Paris, in a social context :

Example 24 :

I asked the woman behind me if she wanted to go first as I had a full trolley and she only had a bottle of milk, and the rude cow said: '**Je peux attendre, madame**' [I can wait madam] and gave me a haughty look. (Barnes 1993: 264).

Similarly, in an educational context, Moodley (2001:130, 138) illustrates how the teacher makes use of CS for quotation purposes :

Example 25 :

Let me tell you the whole thing about the word '*maye, maye*'.

Example 26 :

Even the Bible says: "*Ukuze uhlakaniphe, kufanele uzifundise ukulalela kuqala.*" [To grow wise you must first learn to listen].

In Example 25, the teacher uses CS to create a realistic scenario of the character's behaviour in the context of a short story, and in Example 26, to reinforce his message by quoting from the Bible. Similarly, my own study reveals that the teacher uses CS for quotation, more especially, to capture the atmosphere of a story.

2.5.3.9 CODE-SWITCHING AS A METALINGUISTIC FUNCTION :

The literature also shows how CS fulfills a metalinguistic function. CS as a metalinguistic function comes into play when it is used to comment directly or indirectly on the languages involved. As an instance, Merritt et al. (1995:110) note that CS is more effective in cases where teachers point out differences between the two languages used in the classroom than those who ignore them, as the former behaviour helped to avoid confusion. In addition, Elridge's (1996:306) study of Turkish-English CS among 11-13 year old high school children, shows that learners perceive that while tasks themselves should be performed in the target language, comment, evaluation and talk about the task may occur in the mother tongue. For example :

Example 27 :

Pupil 1: *Where did Gary go?*

Pupil 2: *Ben sorucagim* [I will ask]. Where did Gary go?

In this example, Pupil 2 uses his/her mother tongue to talk about the task s/he is about to perform. The analysis of lesson recordings of this study shows that CS as a metalinguistic function is used quite frequently; mostly to talk about the language being studied. A discussion of this function of CS is presented in Chapter Four.

2.5.4 CONCLUSION

From the above literature on the functions of CS, it is clear that bilinguals employ their languages efficiently and effectively by expressing their feelings, ideas, knowledge etc. by choosing their codes as desired, either consciously or unconsciously. However, one has to keep in mind that it is by no means certain that CS has the same functions within each community. On this note, Franceschini (1998:64) points out that speakers have some freedom to vary their roles, reflecting different footings with different interlocutors. She states: "In the course of an interaction, the focus can change several times, and speakers can take on various roles." She adds that CS can therefore be seen as a *dual focus*; in an interaction, CS speakers may use several varieties simultaneously. A further complexity is that many switches may be multi-functional or open to different functional interpretations (Elridge 1996:305). This is clearly evident in my own study which reveals that instances of CS serve more than one function simultaneously. For example, as I point out in Chapter Four, CS as a phatic function often accompanies that of classroom management and influencing learner behaviour. It is also clear that CS plays a pertinent role in the educational domain and therefore has implications for all teachers. This is

of particular significance to my study, as it will show that CS is the norm in the school community of English L2 and Afrikaans L2 learners in KZN. On this note, McCormick (1995:203) asserts: "In a community where it is the norm, speakers are able to draw on a bigger linguistic pool than they would if they and their interlocutors were monodialectal or monolingual."

Thus far I have presented the literature review on the theoretical frameworks that form the basis of this study; the role of Language, Literacy and Communication (LLC) in the OBE curriculum; attitudes toward the languages that form the basis of this study and code-switching between these languages; the role of learners' mother tongue in the classroom; and functions of code-switching in both the social and educational arenas with a focus on the latter. In the next chapter, I present data collection procedures and analysis of questionnaires and interviews.

CHAPTER THREE

DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES AND ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRES AND INTERVIEWS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter I focus on how I set about gathering information in an effort to find answers to the central questions of this study as outlined in Chapter One. Firstly, I discuss the approach I employed in accumulating my information. Secondly, I present the domain and participants of the study i.e. the data sources. Thirdly, I discuss how I gained access to my research situation and ethical considerations of school-based research. Fourthly, I present the various methods I employed in gathering the data. Finally, I present an analysis of the data gathered through :

- (a) questionnaires given to educators, subject advisors, parent component of the school governing body (hereafter, SGB), and learners; and
- (b) interviews with a sample of educators, subject advisors, parent component of the SGB, and learners.

The data analysis focuses on questionnaires and interviews as they are intended to provide information on the attitudes on the languages presented in this chapter. The analysis of recorded lessons which provides information on code-switching practices (or not) is presented in the next chapter. A discussion of methods of data collection follows.

3.2 DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

3.2.1 THE ETHNOGRAPHIC APPROACH

Saville-Troike (1982:1) defines *ethnography* as “a field of study which is primarily concerned with the description and analysis of culture.” Similarly, Watson-Gegeo (1988:576) writes that ethnography is “the study of people’s behaviour in naturally occurring, ongoing settings, with a focus on the cultural interpretation of behaviour.” She notes that ethnographic research is essentially qualitative rather than quantitative. By this she means that it aims to reveal the nature and distinguishing features of people’s behaviour, rather than to measure it. My major purpose in what follows is to show how my methods of data collection can be seen as an ethnographic approach using the criteria given by Hammersley (1994). For Hammersley (1994:1) and, McDonough and McDonough (1997:51), the term ‘ethnography’ is not clearly defined in common usage, and in language learning ‘ethnography’ is seen as synonymous with qualitative approach. Hitchcock and Hughes (1995:44) define qualitative research methodology as “the systematic attempt to generate and use non-quantitative techniqueswhich will facilitate understanding of everyday socio-cultural contexts of educational processes and institutions.” Through qualitative research one is able to acquire ideas, views, opinions and attitudes through questionnaires, interviews and recordings. Thus, the methods I have used to gather data for this research can be seen as qualitative in nature and are in line with the view of Hammersley (1994) as well as that of McDonough and McDonough (1997). Ethnography, in the context of my own study can be seen as a distinctive method of data collection in that it satisfies the three characteristics that Hammersley (1994: 1-2; 5-9) identifies as descriptive of the ethnographic approach. These are naturalism, understanding and discovery.

The first characteristic is that the data comes from ‘real world’ contexts, rather than being produced under experimental conditions created by the researcher. This means that the data gathered should be naturalistic i.e. based in real life situations where the aim is to capture naturally occurring human behaviour (Watson-Gegeo 1988:576; Hammersley 1997:5). Hammersley (1997:5) states that this is particularly the case in the study of language(s) and analysis of “naturally occurring talk in everyday situations”, as for example, in the ethnography of communication (Gumperz and Hymes 1972). My own method of data collection can be described as naturalistic as it captures the natural, everyday talk of teachers and learners in the classroom. However, one needs to keep in mind what Labov (1972:209) termed “the observer’s paradox” i.e. the mere act of observing people’s language behaviour is inclined to change that behaviour. While, in observing language use in the classroom, I was a non-active participant in that I was not present at the time of the recordings, the knowledge that the lessons were being recorded for a specific reason might have, to some degree, influenced what was going on in the classroom. Nevertheless, Hammersley (1994:5) notes that one of the most important advantages of naturalism in ethnography is that in studying natural settings, the researcher is able to minimize his/her effects on the behaviour of the participants. This in turn increases the chances that what is discovered in the setting will be generalized to other similar settings that have not been researched.

Central to the second characteristic “understanding” is that human behaviour does not consist of fixed responses or learned responses to stimuli, but involve *interpretation* of stimuli and the *construction* of responses [author’s emphasis] (Hammersley 1994:6). Hammersley maintains that

from this point of view, “if we are to explain human actions effectively we must gain an understanding of the cultural perspectives on which they are based.” This follows Wolcott’s (1987:42-3) view that the purpose of ethnographic research is “to describe and interpret cultural behaviour.” What this means for my own method of data collection is that the classroom itself has its own distinctive cultural flavours in at least two ways, viz.(i) each classroom has a specific culture of teaching and learning, and (ii) each group of learners in this study belongs to a specific cultural and linguistic background. Thus, my interpretation of the data collected is based on these distinctions, particularly so when interpreting attitudes toward the languages which form the bases of this study.

The third important feature of ethnographic thinking is the conception of the research process as inductive or discovery-based (Hammersley 1994:6-7). This means that one should begin research with minimal assumptions so as to maximize one’s capacity for learning. To me, this means that research is explorative in nature rather than deductive. This can be clearly illustrated in my own study where I *explore* code-switching behaviour rather than assume that all bilinguals necessarily engage in this specific form of behaviour in formal settings such as the school. Indeed, as my findings will show, not all bilingual speakers engage in code-switching behaviour in the classroom. I shall, however, return to this issue in both this chapter and the next one.

These three methodological principles are closely related to each other and might even overlap. In spite of the advantages of this method, ethnographic observation and interviewing have been criticized for its subjectivity in the sense that they are not guided by a structure (in the form of

a questionnaire) that would maximize the chances that another observer or interviewer could replicate. As a result, ethnographic data are particularly subject to bias. Another criticism of this method is that “ethnographic research suffers from a lack of precision as a result of the absence of quantification” (Hammersley 1994:6-9). However, this research counteracts these downfalls in that, in addition to using ethnographic observation, it makes use of the quantitative approach, in the form of questionnaires, a discussion of which follows further in this section of the study.

3.2.2 THE DATA SOURCES

As discussed in the introductory paragraph, Chapter One, three schools in Port Shepstone, in the lower south coast of KwaZulu Natal, were selected. This choice was determined by the following factors :

- (i) Each of the three schools differed in its linguistic demographics :
 - School A is an Afrikaans medium school which comprises Afrikaans NL speakers.
 - School E is an English medium school which comprises both English NL speakers and Zulu NL speakers.
 - School Z is an English medium school which comprises predominantly Zulu NL speakers.
- (ii) English is studied as a primary (i.e. first) language by both English NL and Zulu NL speakers at School E.
- (iii) English is studied as an additional (i.e. second) language at School A and School Z.
- (iv) Afrikaans is studied as an additional (i.e. second) language at School E and School Z.
- (v) The schools were following the OBE curriculum in its junior secondary phase.
- (vi) The principals, teachers and learners agreed to participate in the research.

- (vii) The schools were easily accessible to me.
- (viii) The subject advisors are based in Port Shepstone and were easily accessible to me.

3.2.3 NEGOTIATING ENTRY INTO THE FIELD STUDY AND ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS OF SCHOOL-BASED RESEARCH

Although the field (i.e. the schools) is immediately present, it would appear that the field of entry ought not to be a problem. However, Hitchcock and Hughes (1995:40) note that in ethnographic naturalistic research and the need for the researcher to develop a credible note in the field, the problem surrounds the ability of the researcher to develop a reasonable argument for doing a particular piece of research and gaining acceptance and co-operation from the parties concerned. In contemplating how to best gain entry into each of the three schools I had chosen and how to best deal with the ethical issues associated with school-based research, I was guided mostly by Erikson (1986), Hitchcock and Hughes (1995), Corsaro (1985), Cameron et al. (1994) and Duranti (1997).

Erikson (1986) and, Hitchcock and Hughes (1995) warn that inadequate negotiation of entry into the field setting can compromise one's research and therefore encourage researchers to approach field entry with consideration. Erikson (1986:142) argues that access is likely only if the researcher has consent of key informants and gains access "under conditions of trust and rapport". The first step is therefore to make points of contact with individuals from whom it is necessary to gain permission, and to establish exactly what activities are going to be observed or engaged in. Following this, I first negotiated entry into each of the three schools and the Regional

Department of Education that form the basis of this research by contacting the principals and the Chief Superintendent respectively, to set an appointment with each of them to discuss my research intentions. Next, I contacted the Chief Superintendent of the Regional Department of Education to do the same. The next step was to gain consent from the key participants i.e. the educators and subject advisors. Having gained permission by both the principals and Chief Superintendent on condition of approval from the Regional Chief Director of Education, I then sought permission from the latter. Only when I had received consent from the Regional Chief Director of Education, did I proceed with my research. However, it was at this point that I met with difficulties - the lesson recordings of one of the key educator participants, the Afrikaans teacher of School Z, was of very poor quality and could not be transcribed. The said teacher displayed great reluctance in continuing to be a participant in the research and other teachers had to be approached. Most of the eligible teachers of Afrikaans were unwilling to be active participants of the research. It was only late into the study that a Zulu NL teacher of Afrikaans agreed to partake in the study "as a favour".

In discussing ethical considerations of school-based research, Erikson (1986), Hitchcock and Hughes (1995) and Corsaro (1985) recommend openness with gate keepers (such as principals and teachers) and about one's research intentions. Hitchcock and Hughes (1995:40), for example, recommend that the researcher must be "clear and straightforward as possible in articulating the nature and scope of the projected study." Corsaro (1985) reminds the researcher that the most vulnerable informants are those who have least power (e.g. learners in my research) but that other focal informants (e.g. SGB members, subject advisors and teachers of my research) are also

vulnerable. Similarly, Cameron et al. (1994:18) stress that researchers should not exploit participants by, for example, deliberately misleading them as to the nature and purpose of the research. To secure the co-operation of the participants of the research, it is therefore necessary to negotiate what use will be made of the findings which emerge from one's research and who will have access to the findings. Following these recommendations, I clearly outlined the area of my investigation, and discussed the scope of the questionnaires and interviews with each key participant. In the questionnaires, this took the form of a note as a prologue to the questionnaire (see appendix A) and in the interviews, each participant was informed, verbally, of the purpose of the interview.

On the other side of the coin of openness, Cameron et al. (1994:147) warn that expressing one's views on the topic being researched could vitiate the findings. Similarly, Duranti (1997:86) emphasises the necessity of controlling or "putting between brackets one's value judgement" so as not to influence participant responses. Hence, when I discussed the area being investigated, I explained to the participants that I was "exploring" attitudes toward code-switching and the languages without elaborating on these and without presenting any views I might have had.

Another ethical issue of concern to my own research deals with what Cameron et al. (1994:119) describe as "abuse of subjects". These researchers stress that the researcher ensures that the participants' privacy is protected. Similarly, Corsaro (1985) stresses that the researcher should provide reassurances that any data collected will be treated confidentially and that informants will be protected from risks. In my own research, I have reassured each participant that his/her identity

will remain anonymous; I use pseudonyms for key participants (e.g. Mr ZA, Mr ZE, Mrs AE etc. in the case of the Zulu-Afrikaans teacher, Zulu-English teacher and Afrikaans-English teacher respectively); blanket labels for interviewees (e.g. L1, T1, SA1, GB1 etc. for learner, teacher, subject-advisor and SGB member respectively); and have informed respondents of the questionnaires that their identity will remain anonymous (see appendix A). Finally, I acknowledge the participants' contributions in this study.

3.3 METHODS OF COLLECTION

The methods I employed in collecting the data are questionnaires, interviews and tape-recording of lessons, a discussion of which follows.

3.3.1 QUESTIONNAIRES

In contemplating the method that would best suit my purpose i.e. to measure attitudes of the various stake-holders of education toward the languages taught at school and toward CS, I was mainly influenced by Baker (1992) and Cohen et al. (2001) who recommend Likert's (1932) scaling method. As indicated in Chapter Two, 2.2.3, my own study uses questionnaires, using the Likert scale multiple items rather than a single item, as this technique, according to Baker (1992:18), enhances internal reliability. In Likert scaling, the categories need to be discrete; a range of responses varying in degrees of intensity may be provided for respondents to choose from, for example, *strongly agree*, *agree*, *neither agree nor disagree*, *disagree* and *strongly disagree*. In using this method, Cohen et al. (2001:253) note that notwithstanding the problems of interpretation which arise - one respondent's 'strongly agree' may be another's 'agree' - "the

greater subtlety of response which is built into a rating scale renders this a very attractive and widely used instrument in research.” Another reason that influenced my choice of rating scales is that it afforded me the freedom to fuse measurement with opinion, quantity with quality. In designing the questionnaires for the various groups of respondents i.e. learners, SGB members, subjects advisors, principals and educators, I provided four sets of alternatives viz. *strongly agree*, *agree*, *disagree* and *strongly disagree*. I deliberately omitted the ‘middle’ alternative ‘neither agree nor disagree’. The reason for this is that Cohen et al. (2001:254) point out that many respondents might not wish to be called extremists and so avoid the two extreme poles at each end of the continuum of the rating scales. Providing an even number scale e.g. a four-point scale, as I have done, requires a decision on rating to be made.

In addition, Cohen et al. (2001:254) caution that in the rating scale, “we have no way of knowing if the respondent might have wished to add any other comments about the issue under investigation.” Hence, in designing the questionnaire, at the end of each section aimed to assess the attitudes of respondents toward a specific language, an open-ended question was incorporated. Similarly, a few open-ended questions were provided in the measurement of attitudes toward code-switching (see appendix A). According to Cohen et al. (2001:255), the open-ended question is an attractive device “for those sections of a questionnaire that invite an honest, personal comment from the respondents in addition to ticking numbers and boxes” and “might contain the ‘gems’ of information that otherwise might not have been caught in the questionnaire”. This value of including open-ended questions in what is otherwise a close-ended questionnaire is clearly evident in the analysis of my own questionnaires for educators, as will

be discussed later.

Furthermore, in sequencing the questions in the questionnaire, Cohen et al. (2001:257) stress that the ordering of the questionnaire is important, for early questions may set the tone of, or the mind-set of the respondent to, the other questions. Hence, heeding the recommendation of these researchers, I commenced the questionnaire with non-threatening questions that could be readily answered (Section A), then moved to closed questions and finally to open-ended questions (for each of Sections B, C, and D) [Appendix A].

Moreover, Cohen et al. (2001:258-260) emphasise the need for a lay-out that is non-intimidating and that which in fact will encourage the respondent to complete the questionnaire. I therefore began with a covering note that informed the respondent of the purpose of the research and the value of his/her input, broke down the questionnaire into subsections, and included a statement requesting the respondent to continue with the questionnaire at the end of each subsection. The questionnaire for each of the five stake-holders of education comprised 5 subsections, as follows:

- (i) Section A: An overview of the respondent's status, mother tongue and other personal details that help to provide a brief background of him/her.
- (ii) Section B: Attitudes toward English
- (iii) Section C: Attitudes toward Afrikaans
- (iv) Section D: Attitudes toward Zulu
- (v) Section E: Attitudes toward code-switching.

While Section A differed for learners, educators, principals, subject advisors and governing body members, Sections B, C, D and E were the same. I found the technique of employing subsections

particularly useful in that the total number of incomplete sections were so few that they were omitted from the analysis.

Once the questionnaire was designed, it was, as suggested by numerous researchers such as Cohen et al. (2001) and, Seliger and Shohamy (1989), piloted with the principal, educators and Grade 8 learners from the school at which I teach. The main reasons for this was to check the clarity of the questionnaire items, instructions and layout; to gain feedback on the validity of the questionnaire items; to eliminate ambiguities or difficulties in wording; to identify redundant questions; and to identify commonly misunderstood or non-completed items. My pilot study revealed that certain terminologies had to be simplified and that the questions, particularly in the final section that assesses attitudes toward CS, had to be rephrased to ensure that they were accessible to all the learners. However, the reader must bear in mind, as Seliger and Shohamy (1989:172) caution, that there is “no assurance that the questions used in a questionnaire have been properly understood by the subjects and answered correctly.”

A total of 293 persons responded to the questionnaires; 17 subject advisors, 78 educators, 10 governing body members and 188 learners.

3.3.2 INTERVIEWS

According to Duranti (1997:102), interviews are a common form of interaction by ethnographers during fieldwork as they are continuously asking questions about various issues such as attitudes. Similarly, McDonough and McDonough (1997:182) state that interviewing is “the very basic

research tool” in social science. Cannell and Khan (1968:527) define an interview as “a two-person conversation initiated by the interviewer for the specific purpose of obtaining research-relevant information, and focused by him [*sic*] on content specified by research objectives of systematic description, prediction, or explanation.” Unlike the questionnaire which requires the respondent to record in some way his/her responses, the interview involves direct verbal interaction. Kvale (1996:11) states that the use of the interview in research marks a move away from seeing “human subjects” as simply manipulable and data as somehow external to individuals, and towards regarding knowledge as generated between humans, often through conversations. As such, Cohen et al. (2001:267) note that interviews are neither exclusively subjective nor objective, rather it is intersubjective. Interviews enable participants - both the interviewer and interviewee - “to discuss their interpretations of the world in which they live, and to express how they regard situations from their own point of view.”

Most commonly, interviews are divided into (a) structured, (b) semi-structured and (c) unstructured (Seliger and Shohamy 1989:166-168; McDonough and McDonough 1997:182). These are, however, not discrete categories but rather a spectrum from formal and controlled at one end to more open and less predictable at the other end. I used the semi-structured interview rather than either the structured or unstructured interviews. I was influenced primarily by McDonough and McDonough (1997), Hitchcock and Hughes (1995) and, Seliger and Shohamy (1989) to adopt the semi-structured technique. McDonough and McDonough (1997:183) state that interviews in this category have a structured overall framework i.e. there are specific core questions, but allow for greater flexibility than the structured interview, within that, for example

in changing the order of questions and for more extensive follow-up responses. According to Hitchcock and Hughes (1995:157) the semi-structured interview “allows depth to be achieved by providing the opportunity on the part of the interviewer to probe and expand the respondent’s responses.” Similarly, Seliger and Shohamy (1989:167) note that it allows the investigator to “[branch] off from the key questions to explore in-depth information, probing according to the way the interview proceeds, and allowing elaboration within limits.” Yet, it is not as “loose” as the unstructured interview. In addition, according to Altricher et al. (1993:102), the structured approach tends to take the interviewer’s attention from the interviewee and the dynamics of communication. By using the semi-structured technique I found that I remained in control of the direction of the interview but with much more leeway than a structured interview allows. McDonough and McDonough (1997:184) note that although the unstructured interview “has characteristics from both the structured and unstructured interviews, it is usually regarded as being closer to the qualitative paradigm because it allows for richer interactions and more personalized responses than the quasi-automaton interviewer armed with entirely predetermined questions.”

The interviews, on a one-to-one basis with subject advisors, principals, teachers, learners and SGB members, were geared at eliciting the perceptions, thoughts, attitudes and opinions toward English, Afrikaans and Zulu, and CS, particularly in the classroom. In discussing the ethical issues concerned with conducting interviews, Cohen et al. (2001:279) state that “the researcher must be at pains to conduct the interview carefully and sensitively.” Kvale (1996:147) adds that, as the researcher is the research instrument, the effective interviewer is not only knowledgeable

about the subject matter but is also an expert in interaction and communication. The interviewer will need to establish an appropriate atmosphere such that the participant can feel secure to talk freely. Heeding this, prior to each of the interviews, I introduced myself; stated what the purpose of the interview was; informed the interviewee that his/her identity would remain anonymous and that I would use labels when making reference to her/him; that s/he could seek clarification of a question at any point of the interview if I was not too clear; and asked for permission to have the interview recorded. I also informed each interviewee that there were no 'right' or 'wrong' answers and that his/her feelings, views and opinions were of importance and "count" for me, the interviewer. As such, I appealed for honesty in their responses. A total of 72 participants were interviewed; 3 principals, 27 teachers, 10 subject advisors, 5 SGB members and 27 learners. After the interviews, the recordings were transcribed. However, I provide only those sections of the transcriptions that are significant to this study in the appendices [Appendix B2].

Although Labov (1984:29) states: "Face to face interviews are the only means of obtaining the volume and quality of recorded speech that is needed for quantitative research", Duranti (1997:103) points out that although interviews are useful, they "rarely provide the richness of information needed for a culturally informed linguistic analysis." He maintains that there is no substitute for the observation and recording of actual interactions among the actual persons involved. This is of importance to my own research as it draws significantly on the recordings of interactions between teachers and learners in the classroom situation. A discussion of this method of data collection follows.

3.3.3 RECORDING OF LESSONS

According to Swann (1994:36) audio-recordings allow for the making of a permanent record of spoken language and “provide excellent evidence for discussion with pupils.” However, Altrichter et al. (1993:92), as well as Swann (1994:37), point out that while tape-recorders capture the sounds of a situation, compared with direct observation, some information, in particular non-verbal communication such as facial expressions and gestures, is lost. The lessons that were tape-recorded for the purposes of this study are :

(a) **School A, the Afrikaans medium school :**

- **Grade 8, LLCE (English L2) :**
 - (i) Oral work [Group work]
 - (ii) Vocabulary
 - (iii) Comprehension
 - (iv) Language study
 - (v) Literature study [Novel (extracts): *Love, David* by Dianne Case]

(Appendix C2a, C2b, C2c, C2d and C2e respectively).

(b) **School E, the English medium school :**

- **Grade 9, LLCE (English L1) :**
 - (i) Oral work [Group work]
 - (ii) Literature study [Novel (an extract): *Animal Farm* by George Orwell - Group work]

(Appendix C1a and C1b respectively).

• **Grade 8, LLCA (Afrikaans L2) :**

- (i) Language study
- (ii) Comprehension

(iii) Literature study [Poetry: *As Boetie Bad*, Anoniem (Anonymous)]

(Appendix C4a, C4b and C4c respectively).

(c) **School Z, the Zulu-English speaking school :**

• **Grade 8, LLCE (English L2) :**

(i) Oral work [Group work]

(ii) Comprehension

(iii) Language study

(iv) Literature study [Poetry: *An Irish airman foresees his death* by W. B. Yeats]

(Appendix C3a, C3b, C3c and C3d respectively).

• **Grade 8, LLCE (Afrikaans L2) :**

(i) Literature study [Poetry: *Olifant* by J. Kromhout]

(ii) Comprehension

(iii) Language study

(iv) Literature study [Short story: *Volstruis se Vuur* by A. van der Merwe - Group work]

(Appendix C5a, C5b, C5c and C5d respectively).

Each of the five teachers was given a tape-recorder, an extension cord and audio-cassettes to record their lessons on tape. They were advised to place the tape-recorder strategically in the classroom to maximize the capturing of the lessons. The teachers were asked to record complete lesson sessions of the different components of the language being studied i.e. oral work (group work), language study, comprehension and literature. As each teacher's approach to teaching differs, the number of lessons taped differed. For example, the teacher of LLCE (L2) of School A taped 5 lessons while the teacher of LLCA (L2) of School E taped 3 lessons, yet, as the

transcriptions show, all aspects of study are covered. The lessons were taught over a period of one school term. The purpose of the recordings was to investigate whether CS was used by teachers and learners in the classroom and if so, the functions they fulfill in attaining the goals within the OBE curriculum. A professional English-Afrikaans speaker, English-Afrikaans-Zulu speaker and English-Zulu speaker was employed to transcribe and translate the Afrikaans-English lesson, Afrikaans-Zulu lesson and English-Zulu lessons respectively, to English. The transcriptions were then given to each teacher who recorded the lessons for verification and accuracy.

In presenting the transcriptions, I use the conventions that appear on page vii. As written down speech is not the same as writing and is difficult to punctuate (Swann 1994:39) the translators were asked to punctuate the speech as closely to the speaker's intention as possible by assessing the tone of the voice. Therefore, a reading of the sample of transcriptions might be punctuated inaccurately. In laying out the transcript, I have used what Swann (1994:41) describes as a 'standard' layout, which is set out rather like a dialogue in a play, with speaking turns following one another in sequence. Sample transcriptions of the various lessons are provided in Appendix C.

Finally, it is necessary to mention that although every effort was made to collect data as the various researchers have recommended to ensure validity of the findings, one must bear in mind, as Seliger and Shohamy (1989:39) point out, that "no data collection procedure is foolproof and that the investigator must be aware of the consequences of using any procedure." For example, because the interviewer knows that s/he is participating in a research, s/he might provide

responses which s/he thinks are 'right' rather than what s/he truly believes. Similarly, the presence of the tape-recorder in the classroom might affect, to some degree or the other, the actual interactions of the participants.

A discussion of the analysis of data obtained from questionnaires follows.

3.4 ANALYSIS

According to Hitchcock and Hughes (1995:295) analysis refers to "the ways in which the researcher moves from a description of what is the case to an explanation of why what is the case is the case." Analysis involves discovering and deriving patterns in the data, looking for general orientations in the data, deciphering what the data is about, and drawing possible conclusions from them. In this section of the study I present an analysis of questionnaires followed by a discussion thereof.

3.4.1 ANALYSIS OF DATA OBTAINED FROM QUESTIONNAIRES

In presenting the data obtained from the questionnaires, I use the basic format of the questionnaire itself. Using a comparative table I present the data of each of the schools as well as the data of the combination of the three schools. In Section A (intended to provide background information on each respondent) and questions 1 to 5 of Section D (intended to provide information on the use of CS) I provide the frequency and percent to each variable. I also present the frequency of scores and percent for each of the four alternatives, *strongly agree*, *agree*, *disagree* and *strongly disagree*, for each of the questions of Sections B, C, D and

questions 6 to 16 (for educators, subject advisors and SGB members), and questions 10 to 19 (for learners) of Section E. The alternatives *strongly agree*, *agree*, *disagree* and *strongly disagree*, are represented by the values 4, 3, 2 and 1 respectively on the table. I also provide a total for each of the value columns. The formulae used to determine the percentages are :

- (i) to each question per group of respondents :

$$\frac{\text{Number of responses per value for each question} \times 100}{\text{Number of respondents per group}}$$

- (ii) to the total percentage to each value per group of respondents :

$$\frac{\text{Total number of responses per value for total number of questions} \times 100}{\text{Total number of respondents per group} \times \text{number of questions per section}}$$

- (iii) to the total percentage of values 4 and 3 :

$$\frac{\text{Total number of responses per values (4+3) for total number of questions} \times 100}{\text{Total number of respondents per group} \times \text{number of questions per section}}$$

- (iv) to the total percentage of values 2 and 1 :

$$\frac{\text{Total number of responses per values (2+1) for total number of questions} \times 100}{\text{Total number of respondents per group} \times \text{number of questions per section}}$$

The discussion of the data is based on the results of each of the questions as well as the summation of scores of values 4 and 3, and values 2 and 1. The reason for this is that, as stated earlier, one respondent's *strongly agree* may be another's *agree* (Cohen et al. 2001:253). Hence, I base my discussion on distinguishing between the combination of values *agree* and *strongly agree* (i.e. values 3 and 4 respectively), and that of values *disagree* and *strongly disagree* (i.e. values 2 and 1 respectively). In Section A, questions 1 to 5 of Section E, and the totals of each

value of Sections B, C and D, the percentages are calculated to the nearest first decimal point. All other questions are calculated to the nearest whole. A summation of scores for the Likert scaling type questions of Section E is not provided as it would not necessarily reflect the general attitude of the respondents towards CS as a whole. All blanks in the table are indicative of a 'nil' response. Those respondents who 'spoiled' their questionnaires by either leaving parts of the questionnaire blank or choosing more than one variable per question have been omitted from the analysis. This is to say that only unspoiled questionnaires are included in the analysis. The question numbers in presenting the data are exactly as the numbers of the actual questionnaire. However, for the convenience of the reader, a key to Sections B, C, D and questions 6 to 16 (for questionnaires to educators, subject advisors and SGB members) and 10 to 19 (for questionnaires for learners) of Section E are provided.

KEY TO QUESTIONS: SECTIONS B, C, D & E :

SECTION B :

- Q1** : It is necessary for every learner to speak English in KZN.
- Q2** : It is necessary for every child to be able to read and write in English.
- Q3** : English is necessary to obtain jobs or pursue a career.
- Q4** : English is necessary to pursue one's studies.
- Q5** : English is necessary to join social circles, clubs etc.
- Q6** : Those who cannot speak English should not get high position jobs e.g. in management or be allowed to become a professional e.g. doctor, teacher.
- Q7** : Every teacher must know how to speak English.
- Q8** : If a person cannot speak English then s/he is really uneducated.
- Q9** : The most important language in South Africa is English.
- Q10** : The most important language in the world is English.
- Q11** : When English is spoken it must not be mixed with any other language - it must remain 'pure'.
- Q12** : English is the best language for expressing certain concepts e.g. in Maths, Science, Technology.
- Q13** : All schools should become English medium schools.
- Q14** : If a learner does not pass English in any grade s/he must not be promoted to the next grade.
- Q15** : Every school must insist that English be taught at least as a second language.

SECTION C :

- Q1** : It is necessary for every learner to speak Afrikaans in KZN.
- Q2** : It is necessary for every child to be able to read and write in Afrikaans.
- Q3** : Afrikaans is necessary to obtain jobs or pursue a career.
- Q4** : Afrikaans is necessary to pursue one's studies.
- Q5** : Afrikaans is necessary to join social circles, clubs etc.
- Q6** : Those who cannot speak Afrikaans should not get high position jobs e.g. in management or be allowed to become a professional e.g. doctor, teacher.
- Q7** : Every teacher must know how to speak Afrikaans.
- Q8** : If a person cannot speak Afrikaans then s/he is really uneducated.
- Q9** : The most important language in South Africa is Afrikaans.
- Q10** : When Afrikaans is spoken it must not be mixed with any other language - it must remain 'pure'.
- Q11** : Afrikaans is the best language for expressing certain concepts e.g. in Maths, Science, Technology.
- Q12** : All schools should insist that Afrikaans be taught at least as a second language.

SECTION D :

- Q1** : It is necessary for every learner to speak Zulu in KZN.
- Q2** : It is necessary for every child to be able to read and write in Zulu.
- Q3** : Zulu is necessary to obtain jobs or pursue a career.
- Q4** : Zulu is necessary to pursue one's studies.
- Q5** : Zulu is necessary to join social circles, clubs etc.
- Q6** : Those who cannot speak Zulu should not get high position jobs e.g. in management or be allowed to become a professional e.g. doctor, teacher.
- Q7** : Every teacher must know how to speak Zulu.
- Q8** : If a person cannot speak Zulu then s/he is really uneducated.
- Q9** : The most important language in South Africa is Zulu.
- Q10** : When Zulu is spoken it must not be mixed with any other language - it must remain 'pure'.
- Q11** : Zulu is the best language for expressing certain concepts e.g. in Maths, Science, Technology.
- Q12** : All schools should insist that Zulu be taught at least as a second language.

SECTION E [for educators, subject advisors and governing body members]

- Q6** : Switching between languages indicates that the speaker cannot speak either language well.
- Q7** : A person switches between languages because s/he wants to show off how well s/he can speak both languages.
- Q8** : Switching between languages does not have a place in public places e.g. TV, government forums, formal meetings etc.
- Q9** : If one wants to switch between languages then one must do so only in informal places e.g. parties/ pubs etc.
- Q10** : Switching between languages does not have a place in the classroom.
- Q11** : It is necessary to switch to the learners' mother tongue to help pupils understand the lesson/ concept etc.
- Q12** : It is 'okay' to switch to English when teaching Afrikaans to English first language speakers.
- Q13** : It is 'okay' to switch to Zulu when teaching English to Zulu speakers.
- Q14** : It is 'okay' to switch to Zulu when teaching Afrikaans to Zulu speakers.
- Q15** : The switching between languages is a degenerative form of language.
- Q16** : We must aim at keeping each language pure.

SECTION E [for learners]

- Q10** : People who 'mix' their languages do so because they can't speak either one of the languages well.
- Q11** : A person switches between languages because s/he wants to show off how well s/he can speak both languages.
- Q12** : Switching between languages does not have a place in public places e.g. TV, government forums, formal meetings etc.
- Q13** : It is okay' to switch between languages in informal places etc. parties/ pubs etc.
- Q14** : I like it when my teacher switches to my own language in the classroom.
- Q15** : The teacher should use some English when s/he is teaching Afrikaans to learners who can speak only English.
- Q16** : The teacher should use some Zulu when s/he is teaching Afrikaans to Zulu speakers.
- Q17** : The teacher should use some English when s/he is teaching Afrikaans to Zulu speakers.
- Q18** : The teacher should use some Afrikaans when s/he is teaching English to Afrikaans speakers.
- Q19** : The switching between languages is not good - we must keep each language separately.

In an attempt to avoid any repetition of information, I present a brief summary of what each section reflects. Section A was aimed at obtaining some background information of the respondent and was strategic in that I wanted, following the recommendations of Cohen et al. (2001:254), to ease the respondent into responding to the more crucial sections of the questionnaire which are aimed at determining language attitudes. Section B, C and D were aimed at determining attitudes toward English, Afrikaans and Zulu, respectively. More specifically it was intended to determine attitudes toward each of these languages in regard to their role and status in education, social circles, job opportunities and in the province itself. Finally, Section E, was aimed at ascertaining the attitudes of monolinguals and bilinguals toward code-switching, more specifically in the educational domain; at investigating whether CS was a conscious or unconscious phenomenon; and determining whether or not it is considered as a derogatory form of language behaviour. In addition, in analyzing the data obtained from the respondents, I present a comparative table of the three groups of speakers to see if there are any significant differences in their attitudes toward English, Afrikaans and Zulu, and CS. Furthermore, as the word 'switch' in this study is linguistic jargon, its use was explained by means of example on the cover page of the questionnaire [see Appendix A]. I present the data and discussion of questionnaire for, firstly, educators; secondly, subject advisors; thirdly, governing body members; and fourthly, the learners.

3.4.1.1 QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EDUCATORS [Appendix A1]

The questionnaire was given to educators of each of the three schools that formed the basis of this study, i.e. School A, School E and School Z. The respondents include predominantly Afrikaans

NL speakers, English NL speakers and Zulu NL speakers. The number of respondents for School A is 29, School E, 22, and School Z, 27 i.e. a total number of 78 educator respondents.

SECTION A :

1. Position held at educational institute :

	Principal	Deputy Principal	H.O.D.	Level 1 Educator	Total
School A	1	1	7	20	29
	3.4%	3.4%	24.2%	69%	
School E		1	2	19	22
		4.6%	9%	86.4	
School Z	1	1	4	21	27
	3.7%	3.7%	14.8%	77.8%	
Total	2	3	13	60	78
	2.6%	3.8%	16.7%	76.9%	

2. Number of years of teaching experience :

	1 - 3 years	4 -8 years	10 - 20 years	over 20 years	Total
School A	3	3	10	13	29
	10.3%	10.3%	24.5%	44.8%	
School E	5	1	7	9	22
	22.7%	4.6%	31.8%	40.9%	
School Z	5	6	9	7	27
	18.5%	22.2%	33.3%	25.9%	
Total	13	10	26	29	78
	16.7%	12.8%	33.3%	37.1%	

3. What is your first language/ mother tongue?

	English	Afrikaans	Zulu	Other (please state)	Total
School A	4	24		1(both Eng & Afrik)	29
	13.8%	82.7%		3.4%	
School E	22				22
	100%				
School Z			25	2 (Xhosa)	27
			92.6%	7.4%	
Total	26	24	25	3	78
	33.3%	30.8%	32%	3.8%	

4. What other language(s) can you speak?

	None	English	Afrikaans	Zulu	Other (please state) :
School A		24	4	4	
		82.7%	13.8%	13.8%	
School E	4		15	3	5 (Indian languages)
	18.2%		68.2%	13.7%	
School Z		27	3	2	1 (Xhosa)
		100%	11.1%	7.4%	3.7%
Total	4	51	22	9	6
	5.1%	65.4%	28.2%	11.5%	7.7%

5. If you are an OBE teacher, tick the learning area(s) you teach. If not, please move on to question

6. [Please see chapter one, page viii for explanations of abbreviations].

	LLC			MLM-MS	NS	TECH	HSS	EMS	A & C	LO
	E	A	Z							
School A	4	4		3	4	7	4	5	1	2
	13.8%	13.8%		10.3%	13.8%	24.1%	13.8%	17.2%	3.4%	6.9%
School E	5	3		2	2	1		2	2	2
	22.7%	13.6%		9.1%	9.1%	4.6%	18.2%	9.1%	9.1%	9.1%
School Z	3	2	2	1		1	1			2
	11.1%	7.4%	7.4%	3.7%		3.7%	3.7%			7.4%
Total	12	9	2	6	6	9	5	7	3	6
	15.4%	11.5%	2.6%	7.7%	7.7%	11.5%	6.4%	9%	3.8%	7.7%

6. What subject(s) do you teach in the senior classes?

	Eng 1st Lang	Eng 2 nd Lang	Afrik 1st Lang	Afrik 2 nd Lang	Zulu	Maths	Scienc e	Geog	Hist	Com- merce	Other (state)
School A	1	4	5			7	4	2	1	3	3
	3.4%	13.8%	17.2%			24.1%	13.8%	6.9%	3.4%	10.3%	10.3%
School E	5			3		1				5	4
	22.7%			13.6%		4.6%				22.7%	18.2%
School Z		8		1	1	3	2	1	1	10	
		29.6%		3.7%	3.7%	11.1%	7.4%	3.7%	3.7%	37%	
Total	6	12	5	4	1	11	6	3	2	18	7
	7.7%	15.4%	6.4%	5.1%	1.3%	14.1%	7.7%	3.8%	2.6%	23%	9%

7. What language(s) do you use to teach?

	English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu	Any lang.	Tot.
School A	5	13		10			1		29
	17.2%	44.8%		34.5%					
School E	18			3			1		22
	81.8%			13.6%			4.6%		
School Z	9		1		16		1		27
	33.3%		3.7%		25.9%		3.7%		
Total	32	13	1	13	16		3		78
	41%	16.7%	1.3%	16.7%	20.5%		3.8%		

8. What language(s) do you recommend that learners use in the classroom?

	English only	Afrik. only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu	Any lang.	Total
School A	2	11		14			2		29
	6.9%	37.9%		48.3%			6.9%		
School E	16			2			4		22
	72.7%			9.1%			18.2%		
School Z	13		1		13				27
	48.1%		3.7%		48.1%				
Total	31	11	1	16	13		6		78
	39.8%	14.1%	1.3%	20.5%	16.7%		7.8%		

9. *What language(s) do your learners use in the classroom?

	English only	Afrik. only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu	Any lang.	Total
School A		11		16			2		29
		37.9%		55.2%			6.9%		
School E	8			1	11		2		22
	36.4%			4.6%	50%		9.1%		
School Z	7		3		13	1	1	2	27
	25.9%		11.1%		48.1%	3.7%	3.7%	7.4%	
Total	15	11	3	17	24	1	5	2	78
	19.2%	14.1%	3.8%	21.8%	30.8%	1.3%	6.4%	2.6%	

* As an open-ended question to section A, respondents were invited to comment on the use of language by pupils in their classes. Some of the responses from each of the three schools follow :

SCHOOL A : [There were three responses to this question].

- i. "Afrikaans being their first language I want them (the learners) to speak the language."
- ii. "It is a language class and we prefer learners to speak good Afrikaans."
- iii. "This is an Afrikaans medium school so they should speak in Afrikaans - except in the English class."

SCHOOL E: [There were a number of responses to this question. However, I record only those that are significant to this study].

- i. "Zulu is only spoken amongst pupils especially when they do not understand the concept being taught."
- ii. "When work is set and pupils need to borrow something from friends, they will however, ask their friends in Zulu."
- iii. "With the present grade 10's, 11's and 12's I guard against encouraging them to switch from Afrikaans into English or another language, and make them understand I do so because they have to be prepared to write the traditional matric exam. However, I use code-switching to convey meaning."
- iv. "Zulu speakers speak in English and Zulu with each other."
- v. "Zulu speakers, speak Zulu among themselves; but this is not encouraged."
- vi. "They use English when they speak to me - but there is the odd exchange between the Black pupils. I ignore it - but if they speak in Zulu during their group work and there are other pupils in the group then I remind them that it is only courteous to speak the language that all the pupils understand. Otherwise I prefer my pupils to speak only English - after all this is an English medium school and this is an English classroom."
- vii. "They generally speak in English, but during interactive lesson - mother language is encouraged for mutual respect."

- viii. "Black pupils understand better when spoken to in their own language. Pupils who understand, explain to their friends in their own language."
- ix. "Regardless of this being an English based school, learners still tend to use their mother-tongue when communicating with each other."
- x. "Using Zulu in the classroom can be racist, offensive and can lead to conflict."
- xi. "The pupils do try to talk, answer questions or explain points of view in Afrikaans - when they experience difficulty they switch to English or use English words. I accept this because I feel the idea is for pupils to express themselves freely and have confidence when they speak."

SCHOOL Z : [There were two responses to this question].

- i. "I strongly recommend English as to improve their vocabulary in English as it is the medium of instruction."
- ii. [On using both English and Zulu in the teaching of Commerce] "Because their first language is isiZulu, they prefer and are capable of communicating better in isiZulu."

DATA ANALYSIS: RESPONSES OF EDUCATORS - ATTITUDES TOWARD ENGLISH

SECTION B :

	SCHOOL A								SCHOOL E								SCHOOL Z								TOTAL							
	4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Q1	15	52	12	41	1	3	1	3	13	59	9	41					11	41	11	41	4	15	1	4	39	50	32	41	5	8	2	6
Q2	16	55	13	45					14	64	7	32	1	5			8	30	14	52	4	15	1	4	38	49	34	44	5	6	1	1
Q3	9	31	18	62	2	7			14	64	7	32	1	5			12	44	12	44	3	11			35	45	37	47	6	8		
Q4	8	28	16	55	4	14	1	3	13	59	7	32	2	9			6	22	16	59	4	15	1	4	27	35	39	50	10	13	2	6
Q5	5	17	9	31	13	45	2	7	7	32	10	45	5	23			3	11	19	70	5	19			15	19	38	49	23	29	2	6
Q6	2	7	5	17	12	41	10	34	5	23	9	41	6	27	2	9	7	26	9	33	7	26	4	15	14	18	23	29	25	32	16	20
Q7	8	28	18	62	3	10			14	64	6	27	2	9			19	70	6	22	2	7			41	53	30	38	7	9		
Q8			4	14	16	55	9	31	2	9	10	45	10	45			5	19	8	30	10	37	4	15	5	6	14	18	36	46	23	29
Q9	3	10	7	24	12	41	7	24	10	45	5	23	6	27	1	5	12	44	7	26	6	22	2	7	25	32	19	24	24	31	10	13
Q10	5	17	15	52	6	21	3	10	12	55	4	18	6	27			11	41	9	33	5	19	2	7	28	38	28	36	17	22	5	6
Q11	3	10	10	34	11	40	5	17	6	27	5	23	7	32	4	18	6	22	16	59	4	15	1	4	15	19	31	40	22	28	10	13
Q12	1	3	9	31	11	40	8	28	8	36	6	27	6	27	2	9	11	41	10	37	4	15	2	7	20	26	25	32	21	27	12	15
Q13			3	10	10	34	16	55	5	23	9	41	7	32	1	5	3	11	16	59	7	26	1	4	8	10	28	36	24	31	18	23
Q14	3	10	5	17	18	62	3	10	7	32	8	36	5	23	2	9	1	4	7	26	15	56	4	15	11	14	20	26	38	49	9	12
Q15	5	17	21	72	1	3	2	7	15	68	7	32					8	30	12	44	4	15	3	11	28	36	40	51	5	6	5	6
Tot	83	19	165	37.9	120	15.4	67	15.4	143	43.3	101	30.6	64	19.4	22	6.7	123	30.4	172	42.5	84	20.7	26	6.5	349	29.8	438	37.4	268	22.9	115	9.8
	248				187				244				86				285				110				787				383			
	57				43%				73.9%				26.1%				72.1%				27.9%				67.3%				32.7%			

Figure 1

In response to the open-ended, optional question to Section B which requested a comment on the English language, some of the more significant responses follow :

SCHOOL A : [There was only one response to this question]

- i. "Mother tongue must be given priority but English must be seen as a second language."

SCHOOL E : [There were 11 responses to this question; only those that are significant to the study are given].

- i. "English is the most widely used language in the world therefore I strongly agree with English being made a compulsory language at school."
- ii. "It should not be promoted at the expense of the other languages."
- iii. "English is a universal language and as our country strives to promote tourism to boost it's economy, it's important for it's people to be able to communicate in English."
- iv. "English is a universal language and everyone should attempt at mastering it."
- v. "I think English is the one unifying, global language and everybody should learn to speak it."
- vi. "Being the language of international commerce, science, technology, communication etc., English is deserving of the title of lingua franca."

SCHOOL Z : [There were three responses to this question]

- i. "Wherever you go you have to express yourself in English. It is an international language to be taught at schools and should not be mixed up with other languages."
- ii. "Although English is regarded as an international language, it should, however, not receive overemphasis at the expense of other languages."
- iii. "Although English is important it must not be used to disadvantage those whose home language is not English."

DATA ANALYSIS: RESPONSES OF EDUCATORS - ATTITUDES TOWARD AFRIKAANS

SECTION C :

	SCHOOL A								SCHOOL E								SCHOOL Z								TOTAL							
	4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1		4		3		2		%		4		3		2		1	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Q1	3	10	13	45	12	41	1	3			4	18	12	55	6	27	1	4	3	11	14	52	9	33	4	5	20	26	38	49	16	21
Q2	4	14	9	31	15	52	1	3			4	18	13	59	5	23			8	30	12	44	7	26	4	5	21	27	40	51	13	17
Q3	1	3	8	28	19	66	1	3			2	9	11	50	9	41			7	26	10	37	10	37	1	1	17	22	40	51	20	26
Q4	1	3	8	28	19	66	1	3	1	5			13	59	8	36			3	11	15	58	9	33	2	3	11	14	47	60	18	23
Q5	1	3	6	21	20	69	2	7			2	9	13	59	7	32			4	15	17	63	6	22	1	1	12	15	50	64	15	19
Q6	1	3	6	21	15	52	7	24					14	64	8	36			4	15	10	37	13	48	1	1	10	13	39	50	28	36
Q7	3	10	15	52	10	34	1	3	1	5	4	18	12	55	5	23	1	4	9	33	7	52	10	37	5	6	28	36	29	37	16	21
Q8	1	3	3	10	16	55	9	31			1	5	7	32	14	64			3	11	7	26	17	63	1	1	7	9	30	38	40	51
Q9	1	3	5	17	19	66	4	14	1	5			7	32	14	64			4	15	7	26	16	59	2	3	9	12	33	42	34	44
Q10	5	17	9	31	12	41	3	10	4	18	4	18	9	41	5	23			12	44	9	33	6	22	9	12	25	32	30	38	14	18
Q11			7	24	20	69	2	7			1	5	7	32	14	64			1	4	13	48	13	48			9	12	40	51	29	37
Q12	3	10	19	66	6	21	1	3			8	36	11	50	3	14	1	4	6	22	10	37	10	37	4	5	33	42	27	35	14	18
Tot	24	6.9	108	31	183	52.6	33	9.5	7	2.6	30	11.4	129	48.9	98	37.1	3	0.3	64	19.8	131	40.4	126	38.9	34	3.6	202	21.6	443	47.3	257	27.5
	132				216				37				227				67				257				236				700			
	37.9%				62.1%				14%				86%				20.7%				79.3%				25.2%				74.8%			

Figure 2

In response to the open-ended, optional question to Section C which requested a comment on the Afrikaans language, some of the more significant responses follow :

SCHOOL A : [There were two significant responses to this question]

- i. "(Afrikaans) needs more attention at schools."
- ii. "It is a common language in South Africa and is spoken and understood by everybody."

SCHOOL E : [There were eight responses to this question]

- i. "In my opinion Afrikaans was forced upon us for political reasons but I quite enjoyed it as a new language. I believe pupils should be given options - if possible they should be taught in the language of their choice."
- ii. "Any significance that Afrikaans may possess is confined exclusively to the South African context. It's value on an international level is minuscule."
- iii. "There is a need for learners to be offered a choice of 2nd language at school, not for Afrikaans to be prescribed or for that matter, any language forced upon them."
- iv. "Being a language that was imposed upon us, I can't help but feel negatively about it. I have no doubt however that it is significant to Afrikaners and respect it as such but no language should be imposed upon another."
- v. "This is the language of the oppressor and really has no place in my or my children's lives."
- vi. "Afrikaans is a minority language and therefore should be an option rather than a compulsory subject."
- vii. "It should not be made compulsory in schools." / "It should not be a compulsory pass requirement in grades 10 to 12."
- viii. "Afrikaans is not a widely used language and should therefore be a language used by preference."

SCHOOL Z : [There were two response to this question]

- i. "I strongly believe that learners should at least be taught how to communicate in Afrikaans, since Afrikaans is one of the languages spoken in KZN/South Africa."
- ii. "Afrikaans is just like any other language except for English which is the medium of instruction."

DATA ANALYSIS: RESPONSES OF EDUCATORS - ATTITUDES TOWARD ZULU

SECTION D :

	SCHOOL A								SCHOOL E								SCHOOL Z								TOTAL							
	4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Q1	1	3	15	52	11	38	2	7	4	18	12	55	5	23	1	5	8	30	12	44	4	15	3	11	13	17	39	50	20	26	6	10
Q2	1	3	11	38	15	52	2	7	1	5	7	32	8	36	6	27	9	33	12	44	4	15	2	7	11	14	30	38	27	35	10	13
Q3			2	7	23	79	4	14	1	5	9	41	8	36	4	18	3	11	8	30	12	44	4	15	4	5	19	24	43	55	12	15
Q4			1	3	23	79	5	17			2	9	13	59	7	32	1	4	10	37	11	41	5	19	1	1	13	17	47	60	17	22
Q5			4	14	21	72	4	14			4	18	13	59	5	23	1	4	12	44	9	33	5	19	1	1	20	26	43	55	14	18
Q6			2	7	19	66	8	28			1	5	12	54	9	41	1	4	6	22	13	48	7	26	1	1	9	12	44	56	24	31
Q7			5	17	22	76	2	7	1	5	17	77	3	13	1	5	6	22	12	44	7	26	2	7	7	9	34	44	32	41	5	6
Q8					19	66	10	34					8	36	14	64	2	7	2	7	12	44	11	41	2	3	2	3	39	50	35	45
Q9					18	62	11	38					14	64	8	36	7	26	6	22	6	22	8	30	7	9	6	8	38	49	27	35
Q10	3	10	9	31	13	45	4	14	3	14	4	18	12	55	3	14	8	30	9	33	7	26	3	11	14	18	22	28	32	41	10	13
Q11	2	7	10	34	13	45	4	14	5	23	8	36	3	14	6	27	5	19	12	44	6	22	4	15	12	15	30	38	22	28	14	18
Q12	3	10	8	28	15	52	3	10	1	5	13	59	6	27	2	9	4	15	8	30	11	41	4	15	8	10	29	37	32	41	9	12
Tot	10	2.9	67	19.3	212	60.9	59	17	16	6	77	29.2	105	39.8	66	25	55	17	109	39.1	102	31.5	58	18	81	8.7	253	27	419	44.8	183	19.6
	77				271				93				171				164				160				334				602			
	22.1%				77.9%				35.2%				64.8%				50.6%				49.4%				35.7%				64.3%			

Figure 3

In response to the open-ended, optional question to Section D which requested a comment on the Zulu language, some of the more significant responses follow :

SCHOOL A : [There were two significant responses to this question]

- i. "(Zulu) is not a multiracial *[sic]* language like Afrikaans or English."
- ii. "It would be wonderful if one could communicate in Zulu."

SCHOOL E : [There were five significant responses to this question]

- i. "Zulu is widely spoken in KZN and should be introduced at least as an optional subject in all schools."
- ii. "The majority of the people in KZN is Zulu speaking and they are all around us. It would be good to be able to speak the language."
- iii. "Except for mother-tongue speaking learners, all other learners should be given an opportunity to learn Zulu at a 'conversational' level."
- iv. "Since Zulu is the most commonly spoken Black languageevery citizen of this country should be at least able to speak the language."
- v. "Because of the dynamics of our country - predominantly African - it is important that everyone at least be able to speak Zulu."

SCHOOL Z : [There were three significant responses to this question]

- i. "Where else you can seek employment and you have to express yourself in Zulu other than in the kitchen, houses or cleaning streets or gardens."
- ii. "Zulu is not being recognized as an important language, because even in job situations interviews are not being conducted in Zulu."
- iii. "Zulu is alright for the house and your people but in jobs, schools, university even going on holidays you must speak English. Zulu will not take you anywhere."

SECTION E : [Questions 1 - 5]

1. Do you ever switch between languages when you speak with friends, family members, colleagues etc.?

	SCHOOL A		SCHOOL E		SCHOOL Z		TOTAL	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
No.	23	6	8	14	18	9	49	29
%	79.3	20.7	36.4	63.6	67	33	62.8	37.2

2. Do you ever switch between languages when teaching?

	SCHOOL A		SCHOOL E		SCHOOL Z		TOTAL	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
No.	19	10	7	15	19	8	45	33
%	65.5	34.5	31.8	68.2	70.3	29.6	57.7	42.3

3. For me, the switching between languages is mostly something that is :

	SCHOOL A		SCHOOL E		SCHOOL Z		TOTAL	
	con-scious	uncon-scious	con-scious	uncon-scious	con-scious	uncon-scious	con-scious	uncon-scious
No.	13	10	16	6	18	9	47	25
%	56.5	43.5	72.7	27.3	67	33	65.3	34.7

* School A : Percentage calculated on the 23 respondents who indicated "yes" to question 1.

4. What are your feelings/ attitude towards others who switch between languages?

	NEUTRAL		POSITIVE		NEGATIVE	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
SCHOOL A	17	58.6	7	24.2	5	17.2
SCHOOL E	10	45.5	5	22.7	7	31.8
SCHOOL Z	6	22.2	16	59.3	5	18.5
TOTAL	33	42.3	28	35.9	17	21.8

For monolinguals only: If you were a bilingual speaker would you switch between languages

- 5.1 when speaking with your friends, colleagues etc.?
 5.2 in your classroom/ office/ working place?

* There were no monolinguals in this group of respondents.

DATA ANALYSIS: RESPONSES OF EDUCATORS - ATTITUDES TOWARD CODE-SWITCHING

SECTION E [Questions 6 - 16]

	SCHOOL A								SCHOOL E								SCHOOL Z								TOTAL							
	4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Q6			2	7	17	59	10	34	1	5	3	14	14	64	4	18	3	11	7	26	14	52	3	11	4	5	12	15	45	58	17	22
Q7	1	3			16	55	12	41			3	14	12	55	7	32	2	7	14	52	9	33	2	7	3	4	17	22	37	47	21	27
Q8	1	3	7	24	15	52	6	21	5	23	3	14	13	59	1	5	4	15	11	41	6	22	6	22	10	13	21	27	34	44	13	17
Q9			12	41	12	41	5	17	2	9	6	27	12	55	2	9	1	4	10	37	14	52	2	7	3	4	28	36	38	49	9	12
Q10	1	3	3	10	17	59	8	28	2	9	1	5	15	68	4	18			16	59	6	22	5	19	3	4	20	26	38	49	17	22
Q11	8	28	16	55	5	17			6	27	11	50	5	23			3	11	18	67	5	19	1	4	17	22	45	58	15	19	1	1
Q12	2	7	18	62	4	14	5	17	6	27	13	59	2	9	1	5	4	16	14	52	6	22	3	11	12	15	45	58	12	15	9	12
Q13	2	7	17	59	5	17	5	17	5	23	12	55	4	18	1	5	2	7	17	63	6	22	2	7	9	12	46	59	15	19	8	10
Q14	2	7	17	59	5	17	5	17	5	23	12	55	4	18	1	5	3	11	12	44	8	30	4	15	10	13	41	53	17	22	10	13
Q15	1	3	10	34	13	45	5	17			5	23	15	68	2	9	1	4	18	67	8	30			2	3	33	42	36	46	7	9
Q16	6	21	16	55	6	21	1	3	3	14	11	50	6		2	9	6	22	15	56	4	15	2	7	15	19	42	54	16	21	5	6

Figure 4

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF EACH SCHOOL TOWARDS ENGLISH, AFRIKAANS AND ZULU
BASED ON TOTALS OBTAINED FROM TABLES 1, 2, AND 3

VALUES	ENGLISH		AFRIKAANS		ZULU	
	4 + 3	2 + 1	4 + 3	2 + 1	4 + 3	2 + 1
SCHOOL A	56.9%	44%	37.9%	62.1%	22.1%	77.9%
SCHOOL E	73.9%	26.1%	14%	86%	35.2%	64.8%
SCHOOL Z	67.3%	32.7%	25.2%	74.5%	50.6%	49.4%
TOTALS	66%	34%	26%	74%	36%	64%

Figure 5

Data obtained from the questionnaire for educators reveals that neither educational status nor teaching experience influences the language(s) used in the classroom and language attitudes. The most determining factors in influencing the former are the subjects being taught and whether or not the teacher has the linguistic repertoire to use CS in the classroom. The principal determinants that influence language attitudes are the educator's NL and what is already accepted as the *lingua franca* in the country. The data obtained from Section A merely provides background information regarding the home language, second language(s), subject(s) taught, and the language(s) used by the teacher and learner in the classroom. The data reveals that Afrikaans is the L2 for majority of the English NL speakers, 68.2% in School A, and a minority, 11.1%, for the Zulu NL speakers of School Z. This response is particularly interesting in that the educators of both these schools studied Afrikaans as a L2 in their own schooling career. This is as a result of the imposition of Afrikaans at all schools during the pre-democratic days of South Africa. The majority of the

English NL respondents therefore perceive themselves as English-Afrikaans bilinguals even though, except for the teachers of Afrikaans, they might not be speaking Afrikaans on a day to day basis. On the other hand, even though their Zulu NL colleagues have also acquired Afrikaans as a L2 at schools, the majority, 88.9%, do not see themselves as Zulu-Afrikaans bilinguals.

Compared to the 28.2% who speak Afrikaans as a L2, only 11.5% of the educator respondents are able to speak Zulu. One of the reasons for this is that even though Zulu is spoken by the majority of the people of KZN, unlike Afrikaans which is spoken by the minority, it has not been imposed on learners. The data in Section C of the questionnaire, as discussed later in this section, shows that the historical-educational inheritance of Afrikaans is one of the main influences of attitudes toward Afrikaans by English NL and Zulu NL educator-speakers. English, on the other hand, enjoys an overwhelming 100% as a L2 by both the Afrikaans NL and Zulu NL speakers. The possible reasons for this (among others), as reflected by the data, are that (i) like Afrikaans, English was (and currently is) imposed at every school; (ii) English is perceived as *the* language for education, jobs, recreation and so on; and (iii) English is accepted as the *lingua franca* of the country. I shall however, return to these points later in this section.

The data to questions 5 and 6 of Section A indicates a representation of respondents across all learning areas and subjects of the curriculum. In School A, those educators who indicate that only English is used in the classroom are the teachers of English and those who switch between English and Afrikaans are the Computer and Technology teachers. All others claim to use only Afrikaans in the classroom. In School E, all the subjects except Afrikaans (where the teachers of

Afrikaans switch between Afrikaans and English) are taught through the medium of 'English only'. In School Z, 48.1% of the teachers indicate that they use 'English only' and 48.1%, use both English and Zulu in the classroom. In response to question 9 which is intended to glean information on the language used by learners in the classroom, it is clear that, the majority of the bilingual learners switch between their NL and English; 55.2% in School A, 50% in School E and 48.1% in School Z.

Figure 1, data for Section B, reflects attitudes toward English among educators who belong to different linguistic groups in the Port Shepstone area and who teach in historically segregated schools. The data reveals that the overwhelming majority, between 90% and 100% of each of the Schools A, E and Z, either 'agree' or 'strongly agree' that all learners should become fully literate in English and that every teacher should be able to speak English. Similarly, the large majority, an average of 87%, indicate that every school should offer English, either as a first or additional language, at schools. Likewise, the large majority of the educator-respondents, 92%, indicate that English is necessary to obtain jobs and/or pursue a career. This is particularly evident in the open-ended responses of School Z respondents to Section D; for example, by contrasting Zulu with English, one respondent states: "Zulu is alright for the house and your people but in jobs, schools, university even going on holidays you must speak English. Zulu will not take you anywhere." The data also reveals that the large majority, 85%, of the educator-respondents feel that English is necessary to pursue one's studies. The average response of School A is particularly interesting - and contradictory - in that even though School A is an Afrikaans-medium school which promotes Afrikaans-mother-tongue education, the large majority of the Afrikaans NL respondents believe

that it is English that is necessary to pursue one's studies.

Responses to question 5, however, differs among the educators; while the majority, 77% and 81% of Schools E and Z respectively, indicate that English is necessary to join social circles, only 48% of School A believe so. Similarly, while only 25% of School A respondents indicate that those who cannot speak English should not get high position jobs, 64% and 59% of School E and School Z respectively, indicate otherwise. Similarly, differing views are expressed by the respondents of School A, and Schools E and Z regarding the importance of English at the national and international levels. While only 35% of the Afrikaans NL respondents indicate that English is the most important national language, 69% indicate that it is the most important international language. On the other hand, the data for Schools E and Z, 76% and 72% respectively, see English as the most important national and international language.

Differing responses among the three groups of educator-respondents are also evident with regard to question 11 which is intended to ascertain whether people should aim at keeping English "pure". 43%, 50% and 81% of Schools A, E and Z respectively, feel that English, when spoken, should remain 'pure'. The data for School Z is of particular significance to this study in that the data to Section E, intended to explore the practice of and attitudes toward CS, indicate that an average of 63% of the educator respondents engage in CS both informally and in the classroom. I shall, however, return to this point later in this section. Differing results are also revealed with regard to question 12; while 68% of School A disagree that 'English is the best language for expressing certain concepts e.g. in Maths, Science, Technology,' 63% and 78% of the

respondents of School E and School Z respectively, indicate that it is. Similarly, while a very small minority, 11%, of the School A respondents express the view that 'All schools should become English-medium schools,' the majority, 64% and 70% of Schools E and Z respectively, indicate that it should. In addition, differing results are evident in the next statement: 'If a learner does not pass English in any grade s/he must not be promoted to the next grade' (which is the current criterion for promotion in the senior secondary phase). While the ESL educator-respondents of School A and School Z, 72% and 71% respectively, disagree with the statement, 68% of their English NL counterparts indicate otherwise. The data for the totals (i.e. values 4 and 3, and 2 and 1) reveal that the majority of educator respondents, 67.3%, hold English in high esteem.

The questions to Section C, intended to reveal attitudes of respondents toward Afrikaans, reveal data that is quite different from that of Section B. The data for Schools E and Z indicate that the large majority of the educators, 86% and 79.3% respectively, either 'disagree' or 'strongly disagree' with *every* statement in this section. Clearly, the majority of the educator-respondents attach very little value to Afrikaans in KZN. The data for School A reveals similar opinions. However, while the majority of the Afrikaans NL respondents indicate that, unlike English, Afrikaans does not enjoy any consideration for literacy, employment, educational upliftment, socializing and so on, in KZN, the small majority, 55% and 62%, indicate that it is necessary for every learner and teacher respectively, to speak Afrikaans in KZN. In addition, 76% of these respondents feel that Afrikaans should be taught at all schools. The summation of values reveals that only 37.9%, 14% and 20.7% of Schools A, E and Z respectively (i.e. a total of 25.2%) view

Afrikaans positively. One of the main reasons for this attitude, particularly among the educator respondents of School E, is rooted in the language policy of the apartheid era which imposed Afrikaans as a compulsory language for all learners in South Africa. This is clearly evident in the following open-ended response by one respondent :

"Being a language that was imposed upon us, I can't help but feel negatively about it. I have no doubt however that it is significant to Afrikaners and respect it as such but no language should be imposed upon another";

and another writes :

"This is the language of the oppressor and really has no place in my or my children's lives."

Later in this section, I shall return to the issue of a language being forced upon its people by a government with non-democratic ideologies.

The data to Section D, Figure 3, which provides information on the attitudes of the educator respondents toward Zulu, differs from that of Section C (English) and is similar to that of Section D (Afrikaans). With the exception of the small majority, 55% of the educators of School A who indicate that it is necessary for learners to speak Zulu in KZN, the large majority of the respondents disagree with all other questions. The summation of values for School A reflects that while 22.1% favour Zulu for the various reasons reflected in the questionnaire, 77.9% disfavour the language for these reasons. The data for Schools E and Z however reflect that these educators hold similar views and differ from that of School A in questions 7, 11 and 12. For example, while 83% of respondents of School A maintain that it is not necessary for every teacher to know Zulu in KZN, 82% and 66% of those of School E and Z respectively indicate that it is necessary. In

addition, while the respondents of both Schools A, 62%, and Z, 53%, indicate that they do not agree that every school in KZN should insist that Zulu should be studied, the respondents of School E, 64%, indicate otherwise. The data, as reflected in Figure 3, clearly reveals that the majority, 64.3% of the educator respondents, do not perceive Zulu as important a language as English. However, the data in Figure 5 clearly reveals that Zulu is viewed more favourably than Afrikaans by the English NL and Zulu NL educator-respondents.

The data in Section E, is aimed at investigating the use of CS in and outside the classroom and the attitudes of the educator respondents toward this linguistic form. While the majority of the respondents of School A, 79.3%, and School Z, 67%, indicate that they engage in CS behaviour with friends, family members and colleagues, only 36.4% of School E respondents indicate that they do so. Fewer School A respondents, 65.5%, however (compared to the 79.3% who indicate switching in informal situations) indicate that they switch between languages when teaching. On the other hand, more respondents of School Z, 70.3% (compared to the 67% who indicate switching in informal situations) reflect that they use CS in the classroom. As with question 1, only a minority, 31.8% of School E respondents, indicate that they switch between languages in the classroom. These respondents are teachers of Afrikaans who engage in Afrikaans-English CS practices. 65.3% of the total number of educator respondents who switch between languages maintain that they are conscious when they engage in CS practices and the remaining 34.7% state that, for them, it is something that is unconscious. With regard to question 4 which enquires about educators' feelings or attitude towards those who use CS, the majority of the respondents, 58.6% of School A, and 45.5% of School E, indicate a "neutral" feeling; 59.3% of School Z

reflect a “positive” feeling; and a total of 21.8% reflect a “negative” feeling.

With regard to question 6, the majority of educators from each of the schools i.e. 80% in total, disagree that switching is an indication of incompetence at either of the spoken languages. However, while Schools A and E, 96% and 87% respectively, indicate that a person does not switch between languages because s/he wants to show off his/her linguistic skills, 59% of respondents of School Z feel that they do. Similarly, while Schools A and E, 73% and 64% respectively, show that switching between languages does have a place in formal public places, 59% of the respondents of School Z maintain that it does not have a place in public places. Consistent with this view, Schools A and E, 58% and 64% respectively, indicate that switching between languages should not be restricted to informal places whereas those of School Z, 59%, indicate that it should. Of particular significance to this study, however, is that the majority of each of the three schools, an average of 80% in total, indicate that CS has a place in the classroom. The data to questions 12, 13 and 14 (see key) also indicates that majority of the educators, 80% of School A, 73% of School E and 71% of School Z, respectively, reveal that switching to the learners’ mother tongue helps learners understand lessons, concepts and so on and that it is necessary to switch to learners’ NL in any language learning classroom. Lastly, while the majority of respondents of Schools A and E, 62% and 77% respectively, indicate that CS is not a degenerative form of a language, and 76% and 64% of Schools A and E, respectively, show that one should not aim at keeping each language “pure”, 71% of School Z saw CS as a degenerative form of a language and 78% indicate that one should aim at keeping each language “pure”.

3.4.1.2 QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SUBJECT ADVISORS [Appendix A2]

The questionnaire was given to the subject advisors of the Port Shepstone region. The respondents include Afrikaans NL, English NL and Zulu NL speakers. In analyzing the data obtained from the subject advisor respondents, I present a comparative table. The total number of subject advisors for all the learning areas and/or subjects is 17.

NB. KEY TO QUESTIONS: SECTIONS B, C, D & E, are the same as those of questionnaire for educators :

SECTION A :

1. Number of years of teaching experience :

1 - 3 years	4 -8 years	10 - 20 years	over 20 years
	1	9	7
	5.9%	52.9%	41.2%

2. Number of years of experience as subject advisors :

1 - 3 years	4 -8 years	10 - 20 years	over 20 years
10	6	1	
58.9%	35.3%	5.9%	

3. What is your first language/ mother tongue?

English	Afrikaans	Zulu	Other (please state)
6		11	
35.3%		64.7%	

4. What other language(s) can you speak?

None	English	Afrikaans	Zulu	Other (please state)
2	11	10	3	3
11.8%	64.7%	58.9%	17.6%	17.6%

5. If you are supervising teachers of OBE, tick the area(s) you are supervising. If not, please move on to question 6.

[Please see chapter one, page viii for explanations of abbreviations].

LLC			MLMMS	NS	TECH	HSS	EMS	A & C	LO
E	A	Z							
3	1		1	4	2	4	1		
17.6%	5.9%		5.9%	23.5%	11.8%	23.5%	5.9%		

6. What subject(s) in the senior classes do you supervise?

Eng 1st Lang	Eng 2 nd Lang	Afrik 1st Lang	Afrik 2 nd Lang	Zulu	Maths	Science	Geog	Hist	Com- merce	Other (state)
1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	2	1	3
5.9%	5.9%	5.9%	5.9%	5.9%	11.8%	5.9%	11.8%	11.8%	5.9%	17.6%

7. What language(s) do you recommend that learners use in the classroom?

English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu	Any lang.
6				4		5	2
35.3%				23.5%		29.4%	11.8%

8. What language(s) do you recommend that teachers use in the classroom?

English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu	Any lang.
9				2		5	
52.9%				11.8%		29.4%	

DATA ANALYSIS: RESPONSES OF SUBJECT ADVISORS

SECTIONS B, C and D: ATTITUDES TOWARD ENGLISH, AFRIKAANS AND ZULU RESPECTIVELY

	SECTION B								SECTION C								SECTION D							
	4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Q1	12	71	5	29					1	6	2	12	9	53	5	29	5	29	8	47	4	24		
Q2	12	71	5	29							6	35	8	47	3	18			12	71	4	24		
Q3	11	65	6	35							3	18	11	65	3	18			1	6	13	76	3	18
Q4	12	71	5	29							1	6	9	53	7	41			2	12	12	71	3	18
Q5	4	24	10	59	2	12	1	6			3	18	12	71	2	12			7	41	9	53	1	6
Q6	3	18	6	35	6	35	2	12					10	59	7	41			5	29	8	47	4	24
Q7	11	65	5	29			1	6	1	6	3	18	9	53	4	24	2	12	6	35	8	47	1	6
Q8			3	18	8	47	6	35					7	41	10	59					8	47	9	53
Q9	4	24	7	41	4	24	2	12					8	47	9	53			1	6	14	82	2	12
Q10	5	29	6	35	4	24	2	12			3	18	11	65	3	18	1	6	4	24	9	53	3	18
Q11	1	6	5	29	10	59	1	6			1	6	9	53	7	41	2	12	3	18	6	35	6	35
Q12	3	18	7	41	6	35	1	6	2	12	1	6	10	59	4	24	5	29	7	41	5	29		
Q13	1	6	8	47	6	35	2	12																
Q14			4	24	10	59	3	18																
Q15	6	35	10	59	1	6																		
Tot	85	33	92	36	57	22	21	8	4	2	23	11	11	55	64	31	16	8	56	28	100	49	32	16
	175				80				27				177				72				132			
	69%				31%				13%				87%				35%				65%			

Figure 6

SECTION E : [Questions 1 - 5]

1. Do you ever switch between languages when you speak with friends, family members, colleagues etc.?

	BILINGUALS		MONOLINGUALS
	YES	NO	NO
No.	13	2	2
%	87	13	100

2. For me, the switching between languages is mostly something that is :

* For bilinguals only.

	Conscious	Unconscious
No.	9	6
%	60	40

3. What are your feelings/ attitude towards others who switch between languages?

	NEUTRAL	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
No.	9	5	3
%	53	29	18

4. *For monolinguals only:*

[There were 2 monolingual respondents]

If you were a bilingual speaker would you switch between languages :

- 4.1 when speaking with your friends, colleagues etc.?

	YES	NO
No.		2
%		100

- 4.2 in your classroom/ office/ working place?

	YES	NO
No.		2
%		100

DATA ANALYSIS: RESPONSES OF SUBJECT ADVISORS

SECTION E [Questions 6-16]

	4		3		2		1	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Q6	1	6	1	6	10	59	5	29
Q7			2	12	11	65	4	24
Q8	3	18	3	18	8	47	3	18
Q9			6	35	8	47	3	18
Q10			2	12	12	71	3	18
Q11	5	29	9	53	3	18		
Q12	3	18	11	65	2	12	1	6
Q13	3	18	11	65	2	12	1	6
Q14	3	18	11	65	2	12	1	6
Q15			7	41	8	47	2	12
Q16	1	6	9	53	6	35	1	6
Tot	19	10	72	39	72	39	24	13
	91				96			
	49%				51%			

The data for Section A reveals that the majority, 64.7%, of the respondents are Zulu NL speakers, all of whom speak English as an additional language. The remaining 35.3% of the respondents are English NL speakers. Of the total number of respondents, only 11.8% are monolinguals. The rest of the respondents could speak Zulu and/or Afrikaans and/or Tamil as additional languages. The subject advisor respondents to this questionnaire covered the different learning areas and/or subjects offered at the three schools that form the basis of this study. The data also reveals that while the majority, 52.9%, recommend that learners use CS in the classroom, 35.3% recommend that only English be used and 11.8% indicate that the learners could use the language of their choice. However, the majority of the respondents, 52.9%, feel that teachers should use only

English when teaching while 41.2% recommend that teachers use CS in the classroom.

The data for Section B, clearly reveals that the majority of the subject advisor respondents in the Port Shepstone region perceive English very positively. 100% indicate that not only should English be spoken by every learner in KZN but that they should also be able to read and write in English. In addition, 100% of the respondents maintain that English is necessary for job opportunities and to pursue one's studies. Furthermore, the overwhelming majority, an average of 90.3% of the respondents, indicate that English is necessary to join social circles, that every teacher must know how to speak English, and that English be taught at every school. The majority, 53%, also indicate that English is essential for management positions. In addition, 59% indicate that English is the best language for expressing certain concepts (interestingly, one interviewee [see Appendix B1b, ET1] states that there are certain things that are best expressed in the vernacular); and 53% indicate that all schools should become English medium schools. However, the large majority, 77%, indicate that English should not be a criterion for promotion, and 82% indicate that the ability to speak English should not be equated with education. Furthermore, the majority, 65%, indicate that English is the most important language both nationally and internationally. Finally, unlike the majority of the educator respondents who indicate that English should not be mixed with other languages when spoken, the majority of the subject advisor respondents, 65%, indicate otherwise. This is of particular significance to this study as the attitudes of the subject advisors may influence the educators whom they supervise. I shall, however, return to this point later in the discussion.

The data for Section B, however, is almost an inversed image of that of Section A; the majority of the subject advisor respondents indicate a response of either 'disagree' or 'strongly disagree' to every question in this section of the questionnaire. The only similarity of responses to that of Section A is that the majority indicate that Afrikaans, like English, can be 'mixed' with other languages when spoken; that the ability to speak Afrikaans cannot be equated with education; and that Afrikaans should not be a criterion for promotion. Like the majority of the educator respondents of this study, 75%, the subject advisor respondents, 96.8%, do not perceive Afrikaans as being of much value for educational and economic purposes.

The data for Section C, reveals similar results as that of Section B. However, while the majority of the respondents, an average of 74%, indicate that it is not necessary for learners to speak, read or write Afrikaans in KZN, the same percentage indicate that it is necessary for learners to speak, read and write Zulu in KZN. Another significant finding is that while 83% of the respondents indicate that Afrikaans should not be insisted upon as a second language, the majority, 70%, indicate that Zulu should be a compulsory additional language. The majority of the subject advisor respondents indicate total disagreement with all the other questions of this section. However, compared with Afrikaans, like the English NL and Afrikaans NL educator respondents, these respondents tend to favour Zulu above Afrikaans in KZN.

The data for Section E shows that the majority of the bilingual respondents i.e. 86.7% of the 15 bilinguals, indicate that they switch between languages when they speak with friends, family members and colleagues. Of these, 60% claim that they are conscious when they switch between

languages. When asked how they felt about others who switched between languages, the majority, 53%, indicate a “neutral” response, 29%, a “positive” response, and 18%, a “negative” response. 100% of the monolingual subject advisor respondents indicate that if they had the linguistic repertoire to switch between languages they would. With regard to questions 6 and 7, the large majority, 88% and 89% respectively, indicate that they do not think that bilinguals use CS because they cannot speak either one of the languages well, nor do they think that the speakers want to show off. The majority of the respondents, 65%, also disagree that the switching of languages does not have a place in public arenas, nor do they believe that CS should be reserved for only informal domains. In addition, the majority of the respondents, 83%, indicate that teachers should engage in switching to the mother tongue in the classroom, or to another language in the teaching of languages. There seems, however, to be some inconsistency in the responses to the last two questions; while only the minority, 31% agree that CS was a degenerative form of a language, the majority, 59%, indicate that one should aim at keeping a language ‘pure’.

3.4.1.3 QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SGB [Appendix A3]

The questionnaire was given to the parent component of each of the three schools that formed the basis of this study. The respondents include Afrikaans NL speakers, English NL speakers and Zulu NL speakers. As with the questionnaire for educators and subject advisors I present the data using a comparative table followed by a discussion of the findings. The total number of respondents for School A is 4, School E, 3, and School Z, 3. The total number of the parent component of the SGB respondents is 10.

SECTION A :

1. What is your profession?

School A	1 doctor, 1 pharmacist, 1 ex-educator, 1 retired
School E	2 educators, 1 businessman
School Z	1 mechanic, 2 spoils (unanswered question)

2. What is your first language/ mother tongue?

	English	Afrikaans	Zulu	Other (please state)
School A		4		
		100		
School E	3			
	100			
School Z			3	
			100	
Total	3	4	3	NIL
	30	40	30	

3. What other language(s) can you speak?

	None	English	Afrikaans	Zulu	Other (please state) :
School A		4		1	
		100		25	
School E			3	3	2 Hindi
			100	100	66.6
School Z		3	1	1	1 Xhosa
		100	33.3	33.3	33.3
Total		7	4	4	3
		70	40	40	30

4. Are you familiar with the concepts and ideas of OBE?

	School A	School E	School Z	Total
YES	4	3	2	9
	100	100	66,6	90
NO			1	1
			33.3	33.3

5. As far as you know, if your school has a language policy, what is it?

	English only	Afrik. only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu
School A		2		2			
		50		50			
School E				3			
				100			
School Z							3
							100
Total		2		5			3
		20		50			30

6. As far as you know what language is used to teach :

6.1 English?				6.2 Afrikaans?			
	Eng only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik only	Eng & Afrik	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu
School A	4			4			
	100			100			
School E	3			2	1		
	100			66.6	33.3		
School Z			3		2	1	
			100		66.6	33.3	
Total	7		3	6	3	1	
	70		30	60	30	10	

6.3 Other subjects?							
	Eng only	Afrik only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu
School A		4					
		100					
School E	3						
	100						
School Z	1				2		
	33.3				66.6		
Total	4	4			2		
	40	40			20		

7. As far as you know, what language(s) do the learners use in the classroom?

	English only	Afrik only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu	Any lang.
School A		1		3				
		25		75				
School E	2				1			
	66.6				33.3			
School Z					3			
					100			
Total	2	1		3	4			
	20	10		30	40			

8. In what language(s) would you prefer your child to be taught :

8.1 English?

	English only	Afrik only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu	Any lang.
School A	3			1				
	75			25				
School E	3							
	100							
School Z	1				2			
	33.3				66.6			
Total	7			1	2			
	70			10	20			

8.2 Afrikaans?

	English only	Afrik only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu	Any lang.
School A		4						
		100						
School E		2		1				
		66.6		33.3				
School Z				2			1	
				66.6			33.3	
Total								

8.3 Zulu? [Leave blank if your child does not learn Zulu at school]

	English only	Afrik only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu	Any lang.
School A								
School E								
School Z			2		1			
			66.6		33.3			
Total			2		1			
			66.6		33.3			

8.4 Other subjects?

	English only	Afrik only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu	Any lang.
School A		4						
		100						
School E	3							
	100							
School Z	3							
	100							
Total	6	4						
	60	40						

9. Does your child learn Zulu at school?

	School A	School E	School Z	Total
YES			3	3
			100	30
NO	4	3		7
	100	100		70

10. If 'no', would you like to learn Zulu at school?

	School A	School E	Total
YES	1	3	4
	25	100	57.1
NO	3		3
	75		42.9

DATA ANALYSIS: RESPONSES OF PARENT COMPONENT OF SGB

SECTION B :

	SCHOOL A								SCHOOL E								SCHOOL Z								TOTAL							
	4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Q1	1	25	3	75					3	100							1	33	2	67					5	50	5	50				
Q2	1	25	3	75					3	100							1	33	2	67					5	50	5	50				
Q3	1	25	3	75							3	100					1	33	2	67					2	20	8	80				
Q4	1	25	3	75					1	33	2	67					1	33	2	67					3	30	7	70				
Q5	1	25			3	75					2	67	1	33			1	33	2	67					2	20	4	40	4	40		
Q6			1	25	1	25	2	50					2	67	1	33	3	100							3	30	1	10	3	30	3	30
Q7	2	50	2	50					2	67	1	33					2	67	1	33					6	60	4	40				
Q8					3	75	1	25					2	67	1	33	2	67	1	33					2	20	6	60	2	20		
Q9			2	50	1	25	1	25	1	33	1	33	1	33			1	33	1	33	1	33			2	20	4	40	3	30	1	10
Q10			3	75	1	25			1	33			2	67					2	67	1	33			1	10	5	50	3	30	1	10
Q11	1	25	2	50	1	25			1	33	2	67							2	67	1	33			2	20	6	60	2	20		
Q12					3	75	1	25	2	67	1	33							3	0*					2	20	4	40	3	30	1	10
Q13					1	25	3	75	1	33			2	67			1	33	1		1	33			2	20	1	10	4	40	3	30
Q14			2		1	25	1	25			1	33	2	67			1	33			1	33	1	33	1	10	3	30	4	40	2	20
Q15			4						1	33	1	33	1	33			2	67	1						3	30	6	60	1	10		
Tot	8	13	28	47	15	25	9	15	16	36	14	31	13	29	2	4	17	38	21	47	5	11	2	4	41	27	69	46	29	19	11	7
	36				24				30				15				38				7				110				40			
	60%				40%				67%				33%				84%				16%				73.3%				26.7%			

Figure 7

DATA ANALYSIS: RESPONSES OF PARENT COMPONENT OF SGB

SECTION C :

	SCHOOL A								SCHOOL E								SCHOOL Z								TOTAL								
	4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1										
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%			
Q1			2	50	2	50							1	33	2	67			2	67	1	33					4	40	4	40	2	20	
Q2			2	50	2	50					1	33	1	33	1	33			2	67	1	33					5	60	4	40	1	10	
Q3			1	25	3	75							2	67	1	33			1	33	2	67					2	20	7	70	1	10	
Q4			1	25	3	75							2	67	1	33			1	33	2	67					2	20	7	70	1	10	
Q5					4	100							2	67	1	33			2	67	1	33					2	20	7	70	1	10	
Q6			1	25	2	50	1	25					1	33	2	67			1	33	1	33	1	33			2	20	4	40	4	40	
Q7	1	25	1	25	2	50							2	67	1	33			3	100					1		4	40	4	40	1	10	
Q8					3	75	1	25							3	0*			2	67	1	33					2	20	4	40	4	40	
Q9					4	0*							1	33	2	67					3	100							8	80	2	20	
Q10	1	25	2	50	1	25						2	67			1	33			2	67			1	33	1		6	60	1	10	2	20
Q11	1	25			3	75							1	33	2	67					3	100			1				7	70	2	20	
Q12			2	50	2	50			1	33			1	33	1	33			1	33	2	67			1		3	30	5	50	1	10	
Tot	3	6	12	25	31	65	2	4	1	3	3	8	14	39	18	50			17	47	17	47	2	6	4	3	32	27	62	52	22	18	
	15				33				4				32				17				19				36				84				
	31%				69%				11%				89%				47%				53%				30%				70%				

Figure 8

DATA ANALYSIS: RESPONSES OF PARENT COMPONENT OF SGB

SECTION D :

	SCHOOL A								SCHOOL E								SCHOOL Z								TOTAL									
	4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Q1	1	25	1	25	2	50					3	100							1	33	2	67					2	20	6	60	2	20		
Q2	1	25			3	75					3	100									2	67			1		1	10	5	50	3	30	1	10
Q3	1	25			2	50	1	25			2	67					1	33	1	33	1	33	1	33	1	10	3	30	3	30	3	30		
Q4	1	25			2	50	1	25					1	33	2	67					1	33	1	33	1	33	1	10	1	10	4	40	4	40
Q5					2	50	2	50			1	33	2	67							1	33	2	67					2	20	6	60	2	20
Q6					2	50	2	50					2	67	1	33							3	100					7	70	3	30		
Q7			1	25	2	50	1	25			1	33	2	67							3	100							5	50	4	40	1	10
Q8							4	100							3	100							3	100					3	30	7	70		
Q9					2	50	2	50					2	67	1	33					1	33	1	33	1	33			1	10	5	50	4	40
Q10	1	25	2	50	1	25			1	33	2	67									1	33	2	67			2	20	5	50	3	30		
Q11	2	50			2	50					1	33	1	33	1	33	1	33	1	33	1	33	1	33			3	30	2	20	4	40	1	10
Q12					3	75	1	25			1	33	2	67							1	33	2	67					2	20	7	70	1	10
Tot	7	15	4	8	23	48	14	29	1	3	14	39	12	33	9	25	2	6	14	39	16	44	4	11	10	8	32	27	51	43	27	22		
	11				37				15				21				16				20				42				78					
	23%				77%				42%				58%				44%				56%				35%				65%					

Figure 9

SECTION E : [Questions 1 - 5]

1. Do you ever switch between languages when you speak with friends, family members, colleagues etc.?

	SCHOOL A		SCHOOL E		SCHOOL Z		TOTAL	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
No.	2	2		3	3		5	5
%	50	50		100	100		50	50

2. For me, the switching between languages is mostly something that is :

	SCHOOL A		SCHOOL E		SCHOOL Z		TOTAL	
	con- scious	uncon- scious	con- scious	uncon- scious	con- scious	uncon- scious	con- scious	uncon- scious
No.	3	1				3	3	4
%	75	25				100	43	57

3. What are your feelings/ attitude towards others who switch between languages?

	NEUTRAL		POSITIVE		NEGATIVE	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
SCHOOL A	2	50			2	50
SCHOOL E	2	67			1	33
SCHOOL Z	2	67			1	33
TOTAL	6	60			4	40

4. *For monolinguals only:* If you were a bilingual speaker would you switch between languages

5.1 when speaking with your friends, colleagues etc.?

5.2 in your classroom/ office/ working place?

[As all the respondents were bilinguals, these questions were unanswered]

DATA ANALYSIS: RESPONSES OF PARENT COMPONENT OF SGB

SECTION E : [Questions 6-16]

	SCHOOL A								SCHOOL E								SCHOOL Z								TOTAL							
	4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Q6			2	50	2	50							2	67	1	33										5	50	4	40	1	10	
Q7					1	25	3	75			1	33	1	33	1	33			1	33	2	67				2	20	4	40	4	40	
Q8			2	50	1	25	1	25			1	33	2	67			2	67	1	33					2	20	4	40	3	30	1	10
Q9	1	25	2	50	1	25					1	33	2	67					2	67	1	33			1	10	5	50	4	40		
Q10			1	25	3	75					1	33	1	33	1	33			1	33	2	67				3	30	6	60	1	10	
Q11	1	25	2	50			1	25	2		1	33							3	0*					3	30	6	60			1	10
Q12					3	75	1	25			2	67	1	33					2	67	1	33				4	40	5	50	1	10	
Q13					3	75	1	25			2	67	1	33					2	67	1	33				4	40	5	50	1	10	
Q14					3	75	1	25			2	67	1	33					3	0*						5	50	4	40	1	10	
Q15	1	25	1	25	2	50					2	67	1	33					2	67	1	33			1	10	5	50	4	40		
Q16	1	25	1	25	2	50					2	67	1	33					2	67	1	33			1	10	5	50	4	40		

Figure 10

As with the data for educators, that for the School Governing Body (SGB) members indicates that the NL of the respondent is a determining attitudinal factor. The professions of the 10 GB respondents are a medical practitioner, a pharmacist, 3 educators, 1 retired educator, 1 mechanic and 1 businessman (2 respondents did not indicate their profession). The respondents include Afrikaans NL (40%), English NL (30%) and Zulu NL (30%) speakers. English is the L2 for the English non-NL speakers. Other additional languages for the respondents are Zulu and/or Xhosa and/or Hindi. As one of the purposes of this study is to investigate attitudes toward CS practices in the OBE classroom, question 4 was aimed at finding out whether SGB members are familiar with the concepts and ideas of OBE. The majority of the respondents, a total of 90%, indicate familiarity with OBE.

80% of the respondents interpreted the question on language policy at school to mean the languages taught at the school and 20% interpreted it to mean the medium of instruction at school. Nevertheless, it is clear that the SGB members are fully aware of the language policy of the school and the language(s) being used to teach English; 'English only' in Schools A and E, and English and Zulu, in School Z. This information correlates with that given by the educators of the respective schools. However, there appears to be some inconsistency with regard to the language(s) used in the teaching of Afrikaans in Schools E and Z. In School E, 66.6% indicate that 'Afrikaans only' is used and 33.% indicate that Afrikaans and English are used. In School Z, 66.6% and 33,3% indicate that Afrikaans and English, and Afrikaans and Zulu are used respectively. What is clear in School Z, however, is that CS is employed in the teaching of Afrikaans. The majority of the respondents of School Z, 66.6%, also indicate that CS is used in

the teaching of other subjects. On the other hand, 100% of the SGB respondents of each of Schools A and E indicate that the monolingual approach is employed in teaching all other subjects. However, while the majority of the SGB respondents, 70%, indicate that as far as they know bilingual learners use CS in their classrooms, the majority of the respondents of School A, 75%, and School E, 100%, show a preference for the 'English only' medium in the teaching of English. On the other hand, the majority of respondents of School Z show a preference for English-Zulu CS in the teaching of English. Similar results are indicated for the teaching of Afrikaans; 100% and 66.6% of the respondents of School A and School E respectively, indicate that only Afrikaans should be used, while 100% of the respondents of School Z indicate that Afrikaans must be taught by means of CS. The majority of the SGB respondents of School Z, 66.6%, however, indicate that only Zulu be used in the teaching of Zulu. Interestingly though, 100% of the total number of respondents prefer all other subjects to be taught monolingually, Afrikaans in School A, and English in Schools E and Z. As Zulu is not studied at Schools A and E, the large majority of the respondents of these schools indicate that they would like the learners to study Zulu at the respective schools.

The data for the Section B clearly indicates that, like the educator and subject advisor respondents, the large majority of SGB respondents, 73%, perceive English as the most important language for teaching and learning, for job opportunities and so on. Interestingly, it is the large majority of the respondents of School Z, 84%, who feel this way compared to those of School A, 60%, and School E, 67%. Interestingly too, the respondents of all three schools (including the Afrikaans NL speakers), a total of 70%, do not perceive Afrikaans to be as valuable as English.

Similar results are indicated for Zulu; the majority (including the Zulu NL speakers), 65% of the total number of SGB respondents, do not perceive Zulu as being as important as English. With regard to the questions intended to determine attitudes toward CS, for the 50% of the Afrikaans-English bilinguals and 100% of Zulu-English bilinguals who indicate that they do use CS in their everyday speech, 75% of the former indicate that they switch between languages consciously, and 100% of the latter indicate that for them CS is something that happens unconsciously. Most of respondents, 60%, perceive others who use CS with neutrality, 40%, negatively, and 0%, positively. The data for questions 6 to 16 shows varied responses between the three groups of respondents. For example, while the majority of the respondents of School E, 100%, indicate that CS by bilinguals is not an indication of a lack of competence in either of the languages spoken, 50% and 100% of Schools A and Z respectively, think otherwise. Similarly, while 67% of the SGB respondents of School E (who do not engage in CS) feel that CS does have a place in public places and should not be reserved for informal places only, the majority of those who use CS, 75% and 67% of School A and School Z respectively, indicate otherwise. In addition, while 100% of the School A respondents indicate that it is 'not okay' to switch to another language when teaching any one language, 67% of each of the other two schools think otherwise. However, the majority of the total number of these respondents agree that the switching between languages is a degenerative form of a language and that one should aim at keeping each language pure.

3.4.1.4 QUESTIONNAIRE FOR LEARNERS [Appendix A4]

The questionnaire was given to learners of each of the classes of each of the principal educator participants of each of the three schools that formed the basis of this study. These include Grade

8 LLCE (L2 learners) of School A; Grade 9 LLCE (L1) and Grade 8 LLCA (L2) learners of School E; and, Grade 9 LLCE (L2) and Grade 8 LLCA (L2) learners of School Z. The learner respondents include Afrikaans NL, English NL and Zulu NL speakers. In analyzing the data obtained from the learner respondents, I present a comparative table as I have done with the previous respondents. The total number of respondents for School A is 36 (one class unit), School E, 61 (two class units), and School Z, 91(two class units). The total number of learner respondents is 188.

SECTION A :

1. What is your first language/ mother tongue?

	English	Afrikaans	Zulu	Other (please state)	Total
School A		36			36
		100%			
School E	34		24	3 (Xhosa)	61
	55.7%		39.3%	4.9%	
School Z			89	2 (Xhosa)	91
			97.9%	2.1%	
Total	34	36	113	5	188
	18%	19%	60%	3%	

2. What other language(s) can you speak?

	None	English	Afrikaans	Zulu	Other (please state) :
School A		36			
		100%			
School E	15	27	19	5	5 (either an Indian language or Xhosa)
	24.6%	44.3%	31.1%	8.2%	8.2%
School Z		91		2	15 (Xhosa)
		100%		2.2%	16.5%
Total	15	154	19	7	20
	8%	82%	10%	4%	11%

3. What language do you use when you speak :

3.1 with your parents and other family members?

	English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu
School A		16		20			
		44.4%		55.6%			
School E	34		10		17		
	55.7%		16.4%		27.9%		
School Z			46		45		
			50.5%		49.5%		
Total	34	16	56	20	62		
	18.1%	8.5%	29.8%	10.6%	33%		

3.2 to your friends who belong to the same language group as you, *in* the classroom?

	English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu
School A		13		23			
		36.1%		63.9%			
School E	39		5		17		
	63.9%		8.2%		27.9%		
School Z			30		61		
			33%		67%		
Total	39	13	35	23	78		
	20.7%	6.9%	18.6%	12.2%	41.5%		

3.3 to your friends who belong to the same language group as you, *outside* the classroom?

	English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu
School A		8		28			
		22.2%		77.8%			
School E	37		7		17		
	60.6%		11.5%		27.9%		
School Z			50		41		
			55%		45%		
Total	37	8	57	28	58		
	19.7%	4.3%	30.3%	14.9%	30.9%		

3.4 to your friends who belong to a different language group from yours?

	English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu
School A	12			24			
	33.3%			66.7%			
School E	46		15				
	75.4%		24.6%				
School Z	20				71		
	22%				78%		
Total	78		15	24	71		
	41.5%		8%	12.8%	37.8%		

4.1 What language(s) does your teacher of English use when s/he teaches?

	English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu
School A	9			27			
	25%			75%			
School E	61						
	100%						
School Z	47				44		
	51.6%				48.4%		
Total	117			27	44		
	62.2%			14.4%	23.4%		

4.2 What language(s) would you like him/ her to use?

	English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu
School A	6			30			
	16.7%			83.3%			
School E	49				12		
	80.3%				19.7%		
School Z	61				30		
	67%				33%		
Total	116			30	42		
	61.7%			16%	22.3%		

5.1 What language(s) does your teacher of Afrikaans use when s/he teaches?

	English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu
School A		36					
		100%					
School E				61			
				100%			
School Z		18		15		21	37
		19.8%		16.5%		23.1%	40.6%
Total		54		76		21	37
		28.7%		40.4%		11.1%	19.7%

5.2 What language(s) would you like him/ her to use?

	English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu
School A		30		6			
		83.3%		16.7%			
School E		2		49	2	2	6
		3.3%		80.3%	3.3%	3.3%	9.8%
School Z		9	4	26	30	7	15
		9.9%	4.4%	28.6%	33%	7.7%	16.5%
Total		41	4	81	32	9	21
		21.8%	2.1%	43%	17%	4.8%	11.2%

6.1 What language(s) does your teacher of Zulu use when s/he teaches? [Leave blank if you do not learn Zulu].

	Zulu only	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu
School A				
School E				
School Z	66	25		
	72.5%	27.5%		

6.2 What language(s) would you like him/ her to use?

	Zulu only	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu
School A				
School E				
School Z	86	5		
	94.5%	5.5%		

7.1 If you do not learn Zulu at school - would you like to learn Zulu?

	SCHOOL A		SCHOOL E		SCHOOL Z		TOTAL	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
No.	21	15	57	4			78	19
%	58.3%	41.7%	93.4%	6.6%			80.4%	19.6%

7.2 Please give a reason for your answer.

[There were no responses to this question].

DATA ANALYSIS: RESPONSES OF LEARNERS

SECTION B :

	SCHOOL A								SCHOOL E								SCHOOL Z								TOTAL							
	4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Q1	3	8	15	42	12	33	6	17	23	38	21	34	14	23	3	5	28	31	46	51	16	18	1	1	54	29	82	44	42	22	10	5
Q2	13	36	21	58	2	6			41	57	20	33					31	34	55	62	4	4	1	1	85	45	96	57	6	3	1	1
Q3	15	42	11	31	7	19	3	8	26	43	29	48	6	9			33	36	53	58	4	4	1	1	74	39	93	49	17	9	4	2
Q4	4	11	18	50	14	39			23	38	29	48	9	15			15	16	54	59	18	20	4	4	42	22	101	54	41	22	4	2
Q5			12	33	20	56	4	11	11	18	24	39	24	39	2	3	14	15	56	82	15	16	6	7	25	13	92	49	59	31	12	6
Q6	1	3	4	11	7	19	24	67	5	8	10	16	16	26	30	49	37	41	21	23	19	21	14	15	43	23	35	19	42	22	68	36
Q7	9	25	23	64	3	8	1	3	30	49	23	38	8	13			47	52	42	46	1	1	1	1	86	46	88	47	12	6	2	1
Q8			4	11	24	67	8	22	2	3	8	13	20	33	31	51	13	14	39	43	23	25	16	18	15	8	51	27	67	36	55	29
Q9	2	6	11	31	11	31	12	33	19	31	25	41	13	21	4	7	38	42	38	42	12	13	3	3	59	31	74	39	36	19	19	10
Q10	8	22	10	28	11	31	7	19	14	23	31	51	14	23	2	3	37	41	39	43	12	13	3	3	59	31	80	43	37	20	12	6
Q11	6	17	6	17	13	36	11	31	5	8	15	26	29	48	12	20	18	20	36	40	32	35	5	5	29	15	57	30	74	39	28	15
Q12	3	8	5	14	15	42	13	36	23	38	24	39	12	20	2	3	26	29	49	44	12	13	4	4	52	28	78	41	39	21	19	10
Q13			3	8	16	44	17	47	10	16	37	61	14	23			5	5	59	65	19	21	5	5	18	10	99	53	49	26	22	12
Q14					15	42	21	58	8	13	22	36	17	28	14	23	7	8	18	20	37	41	29	32	15	8	40	21	69	37	64	34
Q15	11	31	20	58	3	8	2	6	36	59	15	25	5	8	5	8	27	30	46	51	12	13	6	7	74	39	81	43	20	11	13	7
Tot	75	13.9	163	30.2	173	32	129	23.9	276	30.2	333	36.4	201	23	105	11.5	379	27.8	651	47.7	236	17.3	99	7.3	730	25.9	1147	40.7	610	21.6	333	11.8
	238				302				609				306				1030				335				1877				943			
	44.1%				55.9%				66.6%				33.4%				75.5%				24.5%				66.6%				33.4%			

Figure 11

DATA ANALYSIS: RESPONSES OF LEARNERS

SECTION C :

	SCHOOL A								SCHOOL E								SCHOOL Z								TOTAL									
	4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1		4		3		2		%		4		3		2		1			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Q1	6	17	16	44	13	36	1	3			8	13	36	59	17	28			12	13	47	52	32	35			6	3	36	19	96	51	50	27
Q2	11	31	19	53	5	14	1	3	1	2	27	44	18	30	15	25			25	27	51	56	15	16			12	6	71	38	74	39	31	16
Q3	4	11	17	47	14	39	1	3	3	5	10	16	33	54	15	25			16	18	41	45	34	37			7	4	43	23	88	47	50	27
Q4	2	6	23	64	10	28	1	3	3	5	8	13	37	61	13	21			17	19	56	62	18	20			5	3	48	26	103	55	32	17
Q5	3	8	15	42	18	50			2	3	6	10	29	48	24	39			16	18	56	62	19	21			5	3	37	20	103	55	43	23
Q6	2	6	2	6	19	53	13	36	2	3	2	3	14	23	43	70			6	7	58	64	27	30			4	2	10	5	91	48	83	44
Q7	11	31	19	53	4	11	2	6	2	3	11	18	29	48	19	31	7	8	23	25	53	58	8	9			20	11	53	28	86	46	29	15
Q8			5	14	23	64	8	22			2	3	14	23	45	74			7	8	53	58	31	34					14	7	90	48	84	47
Q9	9	25	3	8	20	55	4	11			3	5	28	46	30	49			3	3	45	49	43	47			9	5	9	5	93	49	77	41
Q10	6	17	11	31	12	33	7	19	2	2	9	15	32	52	18	30	4	4	22	24	43	47	22	24			12	6	42	22	87	46	47	25
Q11	14	39	12	33	7	19	3	8	1	2	1	2	30	49	29	48	4	4	4	4	46	51	37	41			19	10	17	9	83	44	69	37
Q12	16	44	13	36	6	17	1	3	11	18	25	41	18	30	7	11			9	9	42	46	40	44			27	14	47	25	66	35	48	26
Tot	84	19	155	36	151	35	42	10	27	4	112	15	318	43	275	38	15	1	160	15	591	54	326	30			126	6	427	19	106	47	643	29
	239				193				139				593				175				917				553				1703					
	55.3%				44.7%				19%				81%				16%				84%				24.5%				75.5%					

Figure 12

DATA ANALYSIS: RESPONSES OF LEARNERS

SECTION D :

	SCHOOL A								SCHOOL E								SCHOOL Z								TOTAL							
	4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Q1			7	19	18	50	11	31	6	10	26	43	21	34	8	13	27	30	43	47	19	21	2	2	33	18	76	40	58	31	21	11
Q2	2	6	5	14	20	56	9	25	4	7	19	31	28	46	10	16	23	25	49	54	14	15	5	5	29	15	73	39	62	33	24	13
Q3	1	3	4	11	22	61	9	25	9	15	20	33	24	39	8	13	6	7	27	30	47	52	11	12	16	9	51	27	93	49	28	15
Q4			4	11	24	67	8	22	3	5	16	26	29	48	13	21	5	5	46	51	34	37	6	7	8	4	66	35	87	46	27	14
Q5			4	11	16	44	16	44	6	9	16	26	23	38	16	26	2	2	29	32	52	57	8	9	8	4	49	26	91	48	40	21
Q6					16	44	20	56	1	2	5	8	21	34	34	56	7	8	20	22	39	43	25	27	8	4	25	13	76	40	79	42
Q7			2	6	26	72	8	22	7	11	12	20	34	56	8	13	24	26	43	47	17	19	7	8	31	16	57	30	77	41	23	12
Q8					20	56	16	44					28	46	33	54	6	7	16	18	42	46	27	30	6	3	16	9	90	48	76	40
Q9					18	50	18	50	6	10	11	18	31	51	13	21	21	23	31	34	25	27	14	15	27	14	42	22	74	39	45	24
Q10	5	14	13	36	10	28	8	22	6	10	17	28	25	41	13	21	21	23	38	42	28	31	4	4	32	17	68	36	63	34	25	13
Q11	11	31	13	36	3	8	9	25	7	11	19	31	22	36	13	21	17	19	31	34	27	30	16	18	35	19	63	34	52	28	38	20
Q12	3	8	9	25	9	25	15	42	21	34	19	31	15	25	6	10	22	24	34	37	20	22	15	16	46	24	62	33	44	23	36	19
T	22	5.1	61	14.1	202	46.8	147	34	76	10.4	180	24.6	301	41.1	175	23.9	181	16.6	407	37.3	364	33.3	140	12.8	279	12.4	648	28.7	867	38.4	462	20.5
	83				349				256				476				588				504				927				1329			
	19.2%				80.8%				35%				65%				53.8%				46.2%				41.1%				58.9%			

Figure 13

SECTION E : [Questions 1 - 9]

1. Do you ever switch between languages when you speak with friends, family members, colleagues etc.?

	SCHOOL A		SCHOOL E		SCHOOL Z		TOTAL	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
No.	30	6	45	16	63	28	138	50
%	83.3	16.7	73.8	26.2	69.2	30.8	73.4	26.6

2. Do you ever switch between languages in the classroom with your friends e.g. during groupwork?

	SCHOOL A		SCHOOL E		SCHOOL Z		TOTAL	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
No.	24	12	34	27	60	31	118	70
%	66.7	33.3	55.7	44.3	65.9	34.1	62.8	37.2

3. Do you ever switch between languages in the classroom with your teachers?

	SCHOOL A		SCHOOL E		SCHOOL Z		TOTAL	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
No.	20	16	13	48	40	51	73	115
%	55.6%	44.4%	21.3	78.7	44	56	38.8	61.2

4. If YES: Are you aware that you switch between languages? [If NO, leave blank]

NB. School A : 30 learners responded to this question.

School E : 45 learners responded to this question

School Z : 62 learners responded to this question

Percentages are calculated accordingly

	Yes, all the time		Yes, sometimes		No, it is something that comes naturally	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
SCHOOL A	8	26.7	11	36.7	11	36.7
SCHOOL E	5	11.1	18	40	22	48.9
SCHOOL Z	2	3.2	31	50	29	46.8
TOTAL	15	10.9	60	43.8	62	45.3

5. Does your teacher switch between languages when s/he teaches English?

	SCHOOL A		SCHOOL E		SCHOOL Z		TOTAL	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
No.	27	9		61	64	27	91	97
%	75	25		100	70.3	29.7	48.4	51.6

6. Does your teacher switch between languages when s/he teaches Afrikaans?

	SCHOOL A		SCHOOL E		SCHOOL Z		TOTAL	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
No.		36	61		57	34	118	70
%		100	100		62.6	37.4	62.8	37.2

7. Does your teacher switch between languages when s/he teaches Zulu? [Leave blank if you do not learn Zulu at school]

	SCHOOL A		SCHOOL E		SCHOOL Z	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
No.					40	51
%					44	56

8. Does your teacher switch between languages in the other subjects?

	SCHOOL A		SCHOOL E		SCHOOL Z		TOTAL	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
No.	16	20		61	54	37	70	118
%	44.4	55.6		100	59.3	40.7	37.2	62.8

9. What are your feelings/ attitude towards others who switch between languages?

	NEUTRAL		POSITIVE		NEGATIVE	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
SCHOOL A	19	52.8	6	16.7	11	30.6
SCHOOL E	37	60.7	22	36	2	3.3
SCHOOL Z	85	93	4	4.4	2	2.2
TOTAL	141	75	32	17	15	8

DATA ANALYSIS: RESPONSES OF LEARNERS

SECTION E [Questions 10 - 20] :

	SCHOOL A								SCHOOL E								SCHOOL Z								TOTAL							
	4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1		4		3		2		1	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Q10			8	22	19	53	9	25	5	8	22	36	22	36	12	20	7	8	28	31	39	43	17	19	12	6	58	31	80	43	38	20
Q11	3	8	2	6	22	61	9	25	4	7	12	20	29	48	16	26	7	8	47	52	26	29	11	12	14	7	61	32	77	41	36	19
Q12	5	14	11	31	9	25	11	31	5	8	20	33	25	41	11	18	25	27	17	19	34	37	15	16	35	19	48	26	68	36	37	20
Q13	14	39	15	42	5	14	2	6	20	33	36	59	4	7	1	2	14	15	49	54	24	26	4	4	48	26	100	53	33	18	7	4
Q14	11	31	21	58	3	8	1	3	20	33	27	44	8	13	6	10	18	20	20	22	29	32	24	26	49	26	68	36	40	21	31	16
Q15	5	14	9	25	11	31	11	31	32	52	20	33	5	8	4	7	19	21	45	49	24	26	3	3	56	30	74	39	40	21	18	10
Q16	3	8	9	25	6	17	18	50	16	28	27	44	9	15	9	18	19	21	23	25	40	44	9	10	38	20	59	31	55	29	36	19
Q17	1	3	15	42	11	31	9	25	17	28	30	49	11	18	3	5	15	16	52	57	16	18	8	9	33	18	97	52	38	20	20	11
Q18	9	25	13	36	9	25	5	14	13	21	34	58	9	15	5	8	10	11	42	46	24	26	15	16	32	17	89	47	42	22	25	13
Q19	6	17	12	33	9	25	9	25	8	13	9	15	25	41	19	31	29	32	35	38	18	20	9	10	43	23	56	30	52	28	37	20

Figure 14

The data for question 1, Section A, reveals that the NL of the learner respondents of each of the three schools is as follows: School A, Afrikaans (100%); School E, English (55.7%) and Zulu (39.3%); and School Z, Zulu (97.9%) and Xhosa (2.1%). As for the educator, subject advisor and SGB respondents, English is spoken by 100% of the learner respondents either as a first or an additional language. Other additional languages include either Tamil, Hindi, Xhosa, Zulu and/or Afrikaans. The data also reveals that the majority of the learners, 56.4% in total, use a monolingual mode when speaking with parents and other members of the family i.e. 18.1% speak only English, 8.5%, Afrikaans, and 29.8%, Zulu. The remaining learners, 43.6%, use CS in their daily speech with family members. However, approximately 50% of the bilingual learner respondents indicate that they use CS with their friends who belong to the same language group as themselves. The large majority of bilingual learners, 66.7% of School A and 78% of School Z, indicate that they use Afrikaans-English CS and Zulu-English CS respectively, when they interact with friends who belong to a different language group from their own.

With regard to the languages used by the language teachers, there appears to be a lack of consensus among the learners of School A and School Z; some indicate that the teacher employs a single language and the others indicate that CS is used in the teaching of English. The lesson recordings of the class of School A however, as will be discussed in the next chapter, will perhaps provide an explanation for the conflicting results in this particular classroom whereas the lesson recordings of School Z will show that CS is a norm in the teaching of English in School Z. The possible reasons for the conflict in this case will be discussed later in this section of the chapter. The learners of School E agree unanimously that only English is used by their teacher in the

teaching of English. However, 50% of the 24 Zulu NL learners of School E indicate that they prefer their teacher to use both English and Zulu in the classroom. In School Z, only 33% of the Zulu NL speakers show a preference for English-Zulu CS in their English language classroom - the majority, 67%, indicate that they prefer their teacher to use English only. On the other hand, the large majority of the Afrikaans NL learners indicate a preference for English-Afrikaans CS in their English language classroom.

With regard to the language(s) used by the teacher of Afrikaans, the data shows that in School A where Afrikaans is studied as a first language, 100% of the learners indicate that only Afrikaans is used. 100% of the learner respondents of School E indicate that the teacher switches between Afrikaans and English - this, as will be revealed in the next chapter, is verified by the lesson recordings. There, however, appears to be a lack of consensus among the Zulu NL speaking learners as some indicate that only Afrikaans is used, others indicate that English and Afrikaans are used, and yet others indicate that Afrikaans, English and Zulu are used. The lesson recordings, evident in appendix C5, however, show that the teacher as well as the learners use English, Afrikaans and Zulu in the Afrikaans L2 classroom. The probable reasons for the conflicting responses are discussed later in this section of the chapter. The large majority of the learners of School A, 83.3%, and School E, 80.3%, indicate that the language(s) used by their respective teachers is the language(s) of their preference. The overwhelming majority, 85.8% of the Zulu NL learners, indicate that the preferred language(s) of teaching and learning Afrikaans L2 is switching between Afrikaans, and English and/or Zulu. With regard to the teaching of Zulu, again, there is a lack of consensus among the learners over the language(s) used by the

teacher - 72.5% indicate that only Zulu is used and the remaining 27.5% indicate that the teacher switches to English as well. This statistic is not verified by lesson recordings as it does not form part of my research study. However, the teacher of Zulu of this class indicates that while for the most parts only Zulu is used, there are occasional moments that he would resort to English. Finally, of the learner respondents of Schools A and E who do not study Zulu at their respective schools, 58.3% and 93.4% respectively, indicate that they would like to study Zulu at school.

The data for questions 1 and 2 of Section B, reveals that an average of 72%, 86% and 89% of the learner respondents of Schools A, E and Z respectively, indicate that it is necessary for every learner in KZN to speak, read and write in English. The overwhelming majority, 93%, also indicate that every teacher should be able to communicate in English. The data also reveals that the large majority of learners, a total of 88%, indicate that English is necessary for employment and career opportunities, and 76% in total indicate that English is necessary to pursue one's studies. However, unlike the 67% of the Afrikaans NL learners who indicate that English is not necessary to join social circles, 86% and 75% of School E and Z respectively, indicate otherwise. Differing views are also indicated with regard to the need for English for high position jobs; while the majority in Schools A and E, 86% and 75% respectively, indicate that English should not be a prerequisite, 64% of the respondents of School Z indicate that English is necessary. Similarly, while the majority of the respondents, 89% and 84% of Schools A and Z respectively, indicate that the ability to speak English is not a mark of education, 57% of the respondents of School Z think it is.

The data for questions 9 and 10, regarding the importance of English in the national and international arenas, shows that an average of 57%, 73% and 84% of Schools A, E and Z respectively, indicates that English is important as both a national and international language. However, unlike the majority of the learners of Schools A and E, i.e. 67% and 68% respectively, who indicate that it is 'okay' to switch between English and another language when speaking, the majority of the learners of School Z, 60%, indicate that English should remain 'pure' when spoken. This contradiction between their actual use of CS and desire to keep a language pure is discussed later in this section of the chapter. Differing views among the three schools are also held toward 'English is the best language for expressing certain concepts': while 78% of the School A learners disagree with this statement, the large majority, 77% and 73% of Schools E and Z respectively, agree. Similarly, while the majority, 77% and 70% of Schools E and Z learners respectively, maintain that all schools should become English-medium schools, the overwhelming majority, 91%, of the School A learners disagree. However, while the large majority, 100% in School A and 73% in School Z, indicate that English should not be a criterion for promotion into the next grade, the small majority, 51%, of School E respondents agree. A total of 77.5% of the learner respondents agree that English should be taught at all schools. Finally, the data for the summation of totals for attitudes toward English reveals that while the majority of the Afrikaans NL learner-respondents, 55.9%, do not perceive English as the prestigious language in South Africa, the majority, 66.6% and 75.5% of the English NL and Zulu NL learner-respondents respectively, do so.

Varying attitudes among the learner respondents toward Afrikaans are also revealed from the data

obtained from Section C. Unlike the majority of the Afrikaans NL learners of School A who 'agreed' or 'strongly agreed' with all the given statements except for questions 6, 8, 9 and 10, (i.e. that Afrikaans is not necessary for high position jobs; that Afrikaans is not indicative of a person's education; and that Afrikaans is neither the most important language nationally nor internationally, respectively), the large majority of the respondents of Schools E and Z either 'disagreed' or 'strongly disagreed' with all the statements except for question 12, to which 59% of the School E respondents indicate that Afrikaans should be taught at every school and the overwhelming majority, 90%, of School Z feel otherwise.

The data also reveals that the NL of the learners influences the attitudes held toward Zulu. While the majority of the Afrikaans NL learners held mostly favourable attitudes toward Afrikaans, they disagree with all the statements for Zulu, with the exception of questions 10 and 11. Likewise, while the majority of the Zulu NL learners display mostly disfavourable attitudes toward Afrikaans, they display mostly favourable attitudes toward Zulu. For example, while the learners of School A indicate that it is not necessary for learners to speak, read or write in Zulu in KZN, the large majority of the School Z learners indicate that it is necessary. However, what the majority of these two groups of respondents agree on is that Zulu should not be mixed with any other language when spoken. The majority of the learners of School Z also indicate that while it is necessary for learners to speak Zulu in KZN, it is not necessary to be able to read and write it. However, unlike the majority of the learners of School A, the majority of respondents of both Schools E and Z indicate that Zulu should be taught at least as a second language at every school in KZN. The summation of results for the three schools indicates that 80.8% of School A and

65% of School E do not perceive Zulu to have much status in KZN while 53.8% of the learners of School Z hold more favourable views.

With regard to Section E, the majority of the learners of each of the three schools, an average total of 73.4%, indicate that they switch between languages in informal sectors. Interestingly, fewer learners, 62.8%, indicate that they use CS in the classroom with their friends, and only 38.8% indicate that they use CS with their teachers. Of those who engage in CS practices, 10.9% indicate that they are aware, 'all the time' when they engage in CS, 43.8% indicate that they are aware 'sometimes', and 45.3% indicate that, for them, CS is 'something that comes naturally'. The majority of the learners, 75% in total, also indicate that they have 'neutral' feelings about others who use CS, while 17% hold 'positive' feelings and 8%, 'negative' feelings.

The majority of the learner respondents, an average of 82%, 65% and 60.5%, of Schools A, E and Z, respectively, indicate that CS is not indicative of a lack of competence in either of the languages spoken, neither is it indicative of speakers wanting to 'show off' their ability to speak more than one language. The respondents of all three schools also agree that CS has a place in informal domains. However, while the majority of the learner respondents, 81% and 92% Schools A and E respectively, also indicate that CS has a place in formal sectors, the majority of the respondents of School Z, 58%, indicate that CS does not have a place in formal sectors. In addition, the majority of the learners of School A, an average of 56%, indicate that the teacher should not switch to the learners' NL in the teaching of any language. On the other hand, an average of 77.8% and 61.3% of the respondents of School E and Z respectively, indicate that

the learners' NL should be used in the teaching of a language. Finally, there are differing views on whether the mixing of languages is 'good' or not; 50% and 70% of the respondents of Schools A and Z respectively, indicate that the mixing of languages is 'not good' and that each language should be 'kept separately' while 72% of the respondents of School E think otherwise.

INTERPRETATION OF DATA

The data clearly reveals that the large majority of respondents of this study are either bilingual or multilingual, contributing to the fact that KZN comprises a diverse group of peoples. The most telling observation is that the shared language is English; it is either the NL or L2 of each of the respondents. The attitudes of the educator respondents are most significant as they can influence the attitudes of learners in covert ways. On this note, Edwards (1982:27) states that since teachers are people too, we should not be surprised that they too have their own attitudes toward a language and/or varieties of languages. He also states: "In particular, we should not expect them to hold less than favourable views of varieties other than their own in many cases." This study attests to this view as it clearly reveals that there is a strong correlation between one's NL and attitudes toward that NL.

Firstly, the large majority of English NL speakers of this study - who have *acquired* English as a NL and is not their indigenous language in a true sense (the reasons for which have been mentioned elsewhere in this thesis) - embrace the identities that English champions. For them, English is at the helm of all languages in all walks of life. Hence, they strongly recommend English as the language of teaching and learning and the language upon which promotion to the

next grade should be based. However, as I shall discuss later in this section, the favours of English is also espoused by the Zulu NL respondents. Secondly, the Afrikaans NL respondents, while maintaining that English is important for communicative, economic and technological reasons, are firmly committed to Afrikaans mother-tongue instruction and believe that Afrikaans should continue being taught at all schools. The underlying reason for this is probably because Afrikaans is fast losing its status as it now shares the same platform as the nine other official African languages in the country. For the Afrikaans NL respondents, Afrikaans provides a strong sense of identity. Thirdly, the Zulu NL speakers, while perceiving English as the gateway of opportunity, acquire a sense of identity through Zulu which they believe is the 'language of the home'. However, unlike their Afrikaans-speaking counterparts, they want English to be the language of teaching and learning. The value that is attached to the mother tongue (MT), albeit in informal sectors only, and the legitimate anxiety among NL speakers that the MT might be displaced or even replaced over time, is evident in the following comments :

- (i) "(English) should not be promoted at the expense of the other languages."
- (ii) "Although English is regarded as an international language, it should however, not receive overemphasis at the expense of the other languages."
- (iii) "Although English is important it must not be used to disadvantage those whose home language is not English."

The data also clearly reveals that the majority of the respondents hold English in high esteem. It is perceived as the language of education, job or career opportunities, and as the language of the country's economy and technology. Except for the Afrikaans NL educators and SGB members, English, particularly with learner-respondents, is also associated with social standing and is the language which respondents want as the medium of instruction. Among all the respondents,

English is the undisputed language of literacy. Kamwangamalu (1998b:120) points out that this is probably so because all the other languages, although given official status do not have “economic cachet both locally and internationally”. Indeed, comments such as :

- (i) “English is a universal language and as our country strives to promote tourism to boost its economy, it’s important for its people to communicate in English”;

and

- (ii) “Being the language of international commerce, science, technology, communication etc. English is deserving of the title of lingua franca”

support this view. Furthermore, English is celebrated as the unifying language at the provincial, national and international arenas.

It is noteworthy that among the respondents, the Zulu NL learners attach the greatest value, for the reasons mentioned above, to English. They attribute so much prestige to English that, even though they admit to engaging in Zulu-English CS, they believe that English should not be ‘mixed’ with other languages when spoken, clearly illustrating the difference between what is actually practiced and what they would ideally like to achieve. Their quest for English is so strong that unlike their Afrikaans NL and English NL peers, the overwhelming majority of the Zulu NL learner-respondents feel that all schools should become English medium schools. This is one of the probable reasons that there is such an influx of Zulu NL speakers into English medium schools such as School E. To me, this demonstrates that the value(s) of English is gaining momentum with the younger generation and English is their language of choice, the gateway to a successful life.

While English enjoys an unchallenged position in KZN for the respondents of this study, Afrikaans and Zulu are devoid of any vying material. It appears that only the Afrikaans NL respondents of this study attach value to Afrikaans for both educational and identity reasons. The English NL and Zulu NL respondents attach no value to Afrikaans. In fact, the majority of these respondents hold strongly negative and even rebellious attitudes toward the language. One of the probable reasons for this, as mentioned earlier, is that Afrikaans was a language that was imposed upon the South African learners by a government that was, among other furnishings, linguistically self-serving. The majority of the respondents therefore feel that learners should be given a choice in the study of an additional language. Indeed, as stated in Chapter One, some schools in the Port Shepstone region have begun exercising their options and have removed Afrikaans from their curriculum.

Even though both Afrikaans and Zulu are perceived as “low languages” by the majority of the respondents, the attitudes toward Zulu do not appear to be as harsh as those toward Afrikaans. While Zulu is seen as having absolutely no value for education, career opportunities, economy or technology, it is valued by all as a means of promoting multilingualism in KZN, especially as Zulu is the most widely spoken language in the province. Like Afrikaans, Zulu should be offered as an additional language *of choice* and like Afrikaans should not be used as a criterion for promotion to the next grade.

Finally, there appears to be ambivalent and even contradictory views about CS among the respondents of this study. While the majority of respondents show a preference for monolingual

teaching and learning, they also indicate that they have “neutral” views about others who use CS; that CS has a place in both informal and formal sectors, including the classroom; that it is acceptable to switch between languages in L2 learning; and that CS should be used in the teaching of additional languages. More pointedly, the Zulu NL learner-respondents, provide conflicting information regarding language(s) by the L2 teachers - yet, the lesson recordings (as I will show in the next chapter) are proof that CS is a normal feature in both LLCE (L2) and LLCA (L2) teaching and learning. One probable reason for the conflicting data is that the learners want to provide responses which they consider desirable i.e. a monolingual speech; the data shows that they view CS as a degenerative form of linguistic code and that they believe that a language should be kept ‘pure’. Clearly then, even though the Zulu NL learners admit to using CS and would like to use CS in L2 acquisition, they hold inherently negative views about CS. This finding supports previous studies, for example, Gibbons (1994), Nwoye (1993) and Heller (1988).

What emerges clearly for the schools of this study is that the language policy of the school and whether or not the teacher has the linguistic repertoire determine whether CS is practised as a learning tool in the classroom. In School A, the Afrikaans medium school, even though the teachers and learners have the linguistic repertoire, they are prohibited from switching between languages in the classroom. This is further confirmed by the principal of the school as will be seen in the analysis and discussion of interviews, in the next part of this chapter. In School E, although the language policy is English as medium of instruction, the teachers are not prohibited from using CS in the classroom. The reason that they do not engage in CS practices is that they

do not have the linguistic repertoire to do so. The scenario in School Z is somewhat different; the school language policy does not prohibit CS and the teachers have the linguistic repertoire to engage in CS practices. In this school CS between English and Zulu is the norm. Finally, while CS is thought to be mostly an unconscious strategy (e.g. Adendorff 1993:4), mixed responses have been obtained from the various respondents: the majority of the educator and subject advisor respondents indicate that, for them, CS is mostly a conscious strategy; and the majority of the SGB members and learners indicate that, for them, CS is mostly something that “comes naturally”. I shall, however, return to this issue in the final chapter.

3.4.2 ANALYSIS OF DATA OBTAINED FROM INTERVIEWS

In addition to gathering data through questionnaires I interviewed a sample of educators, SGB members and junior secondary learners from the schools of this study as well as the subject advisors of the Port Shepstone District. As stated at the outset, I first informed each interviewee that the interview would be recorded; that there were no ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ answers; that s/he should respond as honestly as possible; and that her/his participation in the study was of importance to the research. I also assured the interviewees that their identity would not be revealed even though for the purposes of organization and control their names might be recorded on tape. Hence, I use, for example, the labels, AT1, ET1 and ZT1 to refer to the educator interviewees of Schools A, E and Z, respectively, in my discussion and omit their names from the transcripts. The sample of interviewees was determined by the following criteria: (i) that interviewees included NL speakers of English, Afrikaans and Zulu; and (ii) that interviewees were willing participants and were available at the times of the interview where appointments

could not be made. Using the semi-structured approach, the rationale for which I have explained earlier in this chapter, I focused on a set of questions or areas of questions which I provide at the presentation of the data, Figures 15, 16, 17 and 18, for each group of interviewees. These questions form the core questions of the interview - the actual questions asked are presented in Appendix B. In addition, as not all questions could be asked directly, inferences from responses are made. Furthermore, certain concepts such as 'switching' and 'mother tongue' were explained in the course of the interview as these could have been problematic in the context of this study. I use the focal questions to analyse the data. I first present an analysis of interviews with educators, subject advisors, SGB members and learners followed by an interpretation thereof. The key which appears on the next page is used in presenting the data which appears in Figures 15, 16, 17 and 18 for interviews with educators, subject advisors, SGB members and learners, respectively.

KEY:

Q1-10 : Question numbers

P : Principal

DP : Deputy Principal

H : Head of Department

L1 : Level 1 teacher

ZT : Teacher of School Z

AT : Teacher of School A

ET : Teacher of School E

L : Learner

O : Other (e.g. Hindi, Tamil, Xhosa)

Y : Yes

N : No

No : None

? : Qualified response

+ : Positive

- : Negative

: Neutral

• : Hinder learning

* : Promote learning

1 : First

2 : Second

3 : Third

X : not applicable

Blank : was not asked the question

SUBJECTS:

A : Afrikaans

B : Biology

C : Computers

Co : Commerce

E : English

G : Geography

H : History

M : Maths

S : Science

T : Technology

Z : Zulu

3.4.2.1 INTERVIEW WITH EDUCATORS [APPENDIX B1]

A total of 30 educators, 10 from each of the three schools, were interviewed. This comprised the principal of each school, language educators as well as educators across the different learning areas/subjects. When conducting the interview, I focused on the following questions :

- 1a. Status at school.
- 1b. Subject taught.
2. What is your mother tongue?
3. What other language(s) can you speak?
4. What is the language policy at school?
5. Do you recommend/ specify a specific language to be used in the classroom? If so, which one?
6. Do you switch between languages in everyday conversation?
7. Do you switch between languages in the classroom?
8. Are you aware that you switch between languages?
9. Do your pupils switch between languages in the classroom?
10. What do you feel about others who use CS?
11. In your view, does CS hinder or promote learning?
12. Does CS have a place in the 'OBE classroom' ?
13. Rank the three languages, Afrikaans, English and Zulu in order of importance.
Reasons for the ranking.
14. Is it necessary for learners to learn a second language? Why/ Why not?

A summary of the data obtained from the interviews with educators, Figure 15, follows.

SUMMARY OF DATA OBTAINED FROM EDUCATOR INTERVIEWEES

Q	SCHOOL A										SCHOOL E										SCHOOL Z									
	P	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8	T9	P	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8	T9	P	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8	T9
1a	P	L1	L1	L1	L1	L1	DP	L1	L1	L1	P	L1	P	L1	L1	L1	L1	L1	L1	H	L1	DP								
1b		C	E	E	SB	T	S	AE	A	Co		E	E	E	M	Co	Co	E	AE	MC		A	E	Co	Co	M	G	E	M	A
2	A	A	E	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	EO	EO	EO	E	E	E	EO	E	EO	EO	Z	Z	Z	Z	ZO	O	O	Z	Z	Z
3	E	E	EO	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	AZ	AZ	A	No	AZ	AZ	AZ	OZ	AZ	A	AEO	AEO	E	E	E	ZE	ZE	E	E	E
4	A	A?	A?	A	A	A	A	AE	A	A	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E
5	YA	YA	YE	YE	YA	YA	YA	Y?	YA	YA	YE	YE	YE	YE	YE	N	YE	YE	?	YE	YE	YA	YE	Y?						
6	Y?	Y?	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N?	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
7	N	Y?	N	N?	N	N	N	Y?	N	N?	N	N?	N	N	N	?	N	?	Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	?	?	Y	Y
8	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N?	X	X	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	X	Y	Y?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
10	#	#	+	#	#	#	+	#	#	+	#	?	+	?	?	+	-	-	#	-	+	+	#	?	-	-	-	-	?	?
11	•	*	*	*	?	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	?	/	*	•	?	*	•	*	*	*	*	?	•	•	?	?	?
12	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	*	*	?	?	*	•	?	*	•	?	*	*	*	?	•	•	?	?	?
13E	1	1?	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Z	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
A	2	1?	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
14	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Figure 15

Like the findings of the questionnaire for educators, the data for the educator interviewees reveals that each of the latter is either a bilingual or multilingual speaker, with English being the common language. However, while all the Afrikaans NL and Zulu NL interviewees were clear on what their mother tongue is, some of the English NL interviewees of School E gave either hesitant or qualified responses. For example, two such interviewees stated :

- (i) Er... English, er, my mother tongue is Tamil I was born a Tamil, I do understand Tamil but we speak English at home [Appendix B1b, EP]; and
- (ii) Well, I would like to say it's Tamil but this is really my mother's mother tongue. Unfortunately, I was brought up speaking only English, so English has, regretfully, become my mother tongue [Appendix B1b, ET1].

The reason for this is not because of the confusion that arises from the concept 'mother tongue', as I have discussed in Chapter 2, 2.4.1, but rather the consciousness of one's sense of identity based on the language of heritage rather than the language most spoken at home and elsewhere. It is for this reason that many Afrikaans NL and Zulu NL participants of this study, indicate that while they recognize the instrumental value of English, their own mother tongue should not be undervalued. Perhaps the covert fear expressed is that of the African languages meeting the same fate as that of the Indian languages (such as Tamil, Hindi and Telegu) in South Africa - a gradual dissipation.

The language policy and the language(s) recommended by all three schools are clear: in School A, Afrikaans across the learning areas and subjects except for English L2, Computers and Typing, where English is the medium of instruction; in School E, English is the only medium of instruction except for Afrikaans where the teacher may use Afrikaans-English (hereafter, A-E)

CS; and in School Z, although English is the recommended medium of instruction (except for Afrikaans and Zulu), CS is the norm. Of the three schools, however, School A appears to be the most forceful in the use of a monolingual mode of teaching. Consider the following comment made by the principal of School A in response to the question, *Do you prescribe or recommend the language that your teachers should use in the classroom?* :

- P Absolutely. Absolutely. In the Afrikaans medium classes they should speak only Afrikaans and in the English and Computer classes they must speak only English.
- R Would your teacher of Computers ever switch to Afrikaans in his teaching?
- P I don't think so because the policy is clear and that he must use only Englishand in the English classes the teachers may only speak English. The children outside the classroom, on the sports field, on the passageway, wherever they meet the English teacher they should speak English only and the teacher should speak only English. It happened, it happened in a year that I appointed an Afrikaans speaking English teacher and the parents were on me very quickly so I had to call the teacher in and reprimand her and tell her that the only language that is allowed in the English class is English and no Afrikaans [AppendixB1a, AP].

However, even though CS is prohibited in the classroom, 40% of the teachers indicate that some CS does occur in the classroom, a point to which I return further on.

The data to question 6 i.e. whether the educator-interviewees use CS or not in everyday conversation, shows that 70%, 20%, and 90% of the interviewees of Schools A, E and Z, respectively, give an unqualified positive response, and 20%, 10% and 10%, respectively, qualify their use of CS. Some of the reasons offered for using CS are as follows :

- (i) [I don't often use CS] because the people who visit me are either Afrikaans or English and it's seldom that I have both in my office. So it's, er, normally one medium [AppendixB1a, AP];

- (ii) No [I don't use CS] , not really. There would be some switch to an Indian vernacular when we want to emphasise something or when jesting and then of course there are some words that are best expressed in a vernacular or have become part of our vocabulary. Otherwise, no. I don't really switch [Appendix B1b, ET1]; and
- (iii) No [I don't use CS] but I use Zulu to stress certain things [Appendix B1c, ZP].

The contradiction in the comment made by the latter will be discussed further on. The data to the next question i.e. whether or not the interviewee uses CS in the classroom, shows that while the majority, 60% and 70% of Schools A and E respectively, do not use CS in the classroom, 100% of the teacher interviewees of School Z indicate otherwise. Even though CS is prohibited in the classroom in School A, 40% of its interviewees indicate that they use CS, qualifying their response. In School E, 10% give a positive response and 20% give a qualified response. Those who qualify their use of CS in the classroom state that they only do so for specific reasons: to ensure understanding of concepts and terminology by pupils; to provide vocabulary; to provide explanations; to elicit responses from unresponsive learners; and to jest [see Appendices B1a, AT1, AT2, B1b, ET1 and ET7]. Similarly, in addition to the afore-mentioned, some of the reasons provided by those teachers for whom CS is a norm in the classroom, include: to ensure understanding of instructions; to accommodate the weaker learners who have problems understanding the language of the medium of instruction; to emphasise a point; to ensure that learners do not lose attention; and to achieve solidarity with pupils [see Appendices B1b, ET1, ET8; B1c, ZP, ET1, ET2, ET4, ET5 and ET8].

Of the 32 educator interviewees who indicate that they engage in CS either on occasion or as a norm, 97% say that, for them, CS is a conscious strategy, and the remaining 3% say that while

it is a conscious strategy in the classroom, it is something that “comes naturally” in everyday conversation. The data also shows that while CS among the Afrikaans NL learners might occur, reservedly, either in the English L2 and Computer classrooms, it is a norm on the school grounds. In School E, CS is a norm by both English NL and Zulu NL learners in the Afrikaans L2 classroom, and a norm for Zulu NL learners during group-work, outside the boundaries of a formal lesson, and outside the classroom. In School Z, CS is a natural feature for learners in and outside the classroom. In determining the attitudes toward CS, differing attitudes were revealed among the educator interviewees: 33% stated that they felt neutral about it, 23% felt positive about it, 20% gave qualified responses, and the remaining 23% felt negatively. However, even though the interviewees provide the three former responses, in some cases they contradict themselves by suggesting that CS is something to feel guilty about or that which is a derogatory form of communication. Consider the following excerpts from the interview transcriptions as illustrations :

- (i) To me [CS] does not matter. So, I think the person must use the language he wants to, the language he is best acquainted with. Why should he use English if he's Afrikaans speaking and the person he is speaking to can understand both [English and Afrikaans] languages? But, but sometimes it does happen and I'm the guilty party there.... I'm doing it that er, I want to practice my English [Appendix B1a, AP].
- (ii) It [CS] doesn't bother me. I see it as their [learners] wanting to use the correct word, but I will try to let them say it in English [Appendix B1a, AT7].
- (iii) It is understood that we use English. Quite often er, to be honest I use some Zulu/
..... but I don't encourage them to use Zulu.... [Appendix B1b, ET7].
- (iv) No [I don't use CS] but I use Zulu to stress certain things. (At this point of the recording, the speaker is interrupted by a teacher who addresses him in Zulu. The speaker responds in Zulu but switches to English using the phrases “during the break” and “matric farewell”) / No, I don't encourage [the teachers] to speak Zulu.

[Later on in the interview the speaker says] :

I think I appreciate this [CS in the classroom] because the improvement of our results was through this exercise / I think that [CS] will promote learning.

[Yet, further into the interview the speaker says] :

I don't think this [CS in the OBE classroom] will bear fruits [Appendix B1c, ZP].

Two of the most common reasons given for the negative or qualified responses by the interviewees of Schools E and Z are: (i) that the examination papers are written in English and not in both English and the NL, and (ii) that it is rude to speak a language among people who do not understand that particular language. For example, one interviewee states :

On occasion I tell them it's rude to speak a language that is not understood by everybody in class. They would feel the same way if we spoke our mother tongue in class. It is rude to speak a language that not everybody understands [Appendix B1b, ET9].

In addition, two interviews state that CS has a place in informal settings but not in formal domains. For example, in response to the questions, *How do you feel about those who use CS?* one of the interviewees says :

It depends on the context in which the person is switching. In informal situations I think it's acceptable or even natural but in formal situations I think that the speaker should keep to one language. The ability to speak any language proficiently, any language, not just English, to me is a mark of what shall I say.... elegance and of course a good education. What is most annoying is the way in which SABC presenters have been given the liberty to switch. I think one has to realize that even though the majority of South Africans are Black er... not everybody can speak or understand an African language, er I just think that as a national broadcasting studio, I mean I'm sure that the switching is deliberate by the studio- the others who can't speak Zulu for instance are effectively left out. To me this is a lack of sensitivity to all race groups or language groups and a blatant disregard for minority groups such as the Indians [Appendix B1b, ET1].

With regard to questions 11 and 12 i.e. *Does CS promote or hinder learning?* and *Does the learners' NL have a place in the OBE classroom?* respectively, 80% of the interviewees of School A responded in the affirmative. This contrast between what they believe and what they practise clearly illustrates that the only reason that they do not resort to CS strategies in the classroom is that they are prohibited from doing so rather than not wanting to do so. Only 40% of the interviewees from School E, however, share this view. The majority state that it would hinder learning in the senior classes but could be used in the junior classes. While only 40% of the Zulu NL interviewees also feel that CS promotes learning, unlike their English NL colleagues, they indicate that CS has a place in the senior classes but not in the junior classes. The reason given for this is that the learners of the junior classes are more proficient at English - having been taught English at the primary school - unlike the senior pupils who find it more difficult to understand the language.

Finally, the data to the request to rank Afrikaans, English and Zulu in order of importance (the interviewees were asked to attach any value to the word 'importance'), shows that 100% of the English NL and Zulu NL interviewees rank English first, Zulu second and Afrikaans third. The data for the Afrikaans NL interviewees, however, differs; 60% rank English first; 30%, Afrikaans first; and 10% English and Afrikaans first. 30% rank Afrikaans second and 30% rank Afrikaans and Zulu an equal second. Some of the reasons for this ranking include :

- (i) Well, common sense will tell me that English will be the medium that most people can express themselves in / And on the other hand, I can't tell between Afrikaans and Zulu, for the Zulu speaker it will definitely be Zulu and for the Afrikaans speaker it will definitely be Afrikaans [Appendix B1a, AP].

- (ii) I will put English first/ Well, if you look at the media, when you go into the community, even my school leavers who are Afrikaans want their testimonials in English so that they can get a job, go to interviews. English is more recognized [Appendix B1a, AT2].
- (iii) English is the most important. It is the language for the universities and education at large. If you put just about everybody together, of all race groups and all religions, you will find that English will unify them all [Appendix B1b, ET7].
- (iv) English naturally. No matter how much you romanticize the other languages, English is the only language that will get you where you want to go [Appendix B1b, ET1].

In addition, as with the findings of the questionnaire for educators, other than English, the language next most valued by the Afrikaans NL and Zulu NL educator interviewees is the NL of the speaker; and the additional language most preferred by the English NL speakers is Zulu. The reason most given for this choice is that Zulu is the language spoken by majority of the people of KZN. Like the English NL questionnaire educator-respondents, Afrikaans is frowned upon by non-Afrikaans NL educator-interviewees - once again mostly because of its historical imposition upon non-Afrikaners. Two interviewees display strong negative feelings about Afrikaans as illustrated below :

- (i) You know you can't change the attitude of people [towards Afrikaans], more especially the Blacks. So you can't tell them Afrikaans is better than Zulu. You can't do that. It's not right. You must look at Afrikaans where it came from to us. You can't forget the Soweto riots - you know, June 16th. So it's just not right [Appendix B1c, ZT8].
- (ii) Ah... Afrikaans..... Let me be honest with you at the risk of not sounding politically correct. Afrikaans has done nothing for me. I respect it as a language but it was imposed upon us at school. We never spoke the language only learnt it. That's of no value to me. Besides, my Afrikaans friends and colleagues can speak English very well. And what really peeves me now is that a pupil has to pass Afrikaans to get a matric certificate. Why should a pupil have to pass any additional language? This is another reason that our pupils resist learning a new language - we should actually learn more

languages at school without the formality of tests and examinations [Appendix B1b, ET1].

Finally, 100% of the educator respondents feel that it is necessary for learners to acquire additional languages in KZN, but that the choice(s) of the L2 should be that of the learner. In addition, many express the view of the interviewee quoted above i.e. a L2 should not be used as a promotional tool and that Zulu should be introduced to all schools but not for examination purposes.

3.4.2.2 INTERVIEW WITH SUBJECT ADVISORS

A total of 10 subject advisors (hereafter, SA) were interviewed. When conducting the interview, I focused on the following questions/ area of questions :

1. Subject/ Learning area supervised.
2. What is your mother tongue?
3. What other languages can you speak?
4. Do you prescribe/ recommend a specific language for your teachers? If so, which one?
5. As far as you know do 'your' teachers switch from one language to another in a single conversation?
6. Do you ever switch from one language to another in your personal capacity i.e. with your friends and colleagues?
7. Do you ever switch from one language to another at meetings with the teachers whom you supervise?
8. [If "Yes" to questions 7 and/or 8] Are you aware that you do this?
9. In your view, does the switching to the mother tongue promote or hinder learning?
10. In your view, does the switching to the mother tongue have a place in OBE?
11. Attitude towards CS.
12. From the 3 languages that are offered at KZN schools i.e. English, Afrikaans and Zulu - how would you rank them in terms of importance? [Lead subject advisor to provide reasons for response].
13. In your view is it necessary for learners to learn a second language at school?

A summary of the data obtained from the subject advisor-interviewees, Figure 16, follows.

SUMMARY OF DATA OBTAINED FROM SUBJECT ADVISOR INTERVIEWEES

Q	SA1	SA2	SA3	SA4	SA5	SA6	SA7	SA8	SA9	SA10
1	S	H	B	T	M	Z	EL1	A	EL2	G
2	Z	EO	Z	Z	E	Z	E	A	E	Z
3	EA	AZ	EO	EO	AZ	EO	A	E	AZO	E
4	?E	?E	YE	YE	N	?Z	E	YA	?E	YE
5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
6	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
7	Y?	N	Y	Y?	N	Y	N	?	Y	Y
8	Y	X	Y	Y	X	Y	X	Y	?	Y
9	*	?	*	*	*	*	•	*	*	*
10	*	?	*	*	*	*	•	*	*	*
11	+	-	+	-	#	+	?	#	+	+
12E	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Z	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
A	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3
13	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Figure 16

The data for the SA interviewees shows that 50% are Zulu NL speakers, 30%, English NL speakers, 10% Afrikaans NL speakers, and 10% (i.e. 1 interviewee) indicates that his NLs are both English and Tamil. The latter's response is noteworthy as he clarifies his choice of the NL:

R What is your mother tongue?

SA Ah... That's a difficult question to answer so much so that I'm foreign to my own mother tongue. Way back when our parents looked forward to our education although I'm a Tamilian by birth [laughter] I was forced to learn the languages at school viz. English and Afrikaans, that took me out of my own language. We all came through that our parents were envisaging the window to a better world through English but so much so through the detriment of our own language. Therefore I say, I'm a foreigner to my own mother tongue. So how do I answer your question? It has to be English...../[Appendix B2, SA2].

This loss of the speaker's NL is the reason that some Zulu NL educator interviewees and questionnaire respondents indicate that English should not be taught at the expense of the mother tongue. In addition, as the preceding discussion reveals (and as the data of interview with SGB members will show) the fear that English will replace the mother tongue is one of the reasons that Afrikaans NL speaking parents want their children taught in the medium of the mother tongue. In addition, like the educator interviewees, the data for the SA interviewees shows that they are either bilingual or multilingual speakers with English as the shared language.

The data also reveals that 40% of the interviewees recommend that their teachers use a specific language i.e. English in the teaching of all subjects, except Afrikaans L1. 50% of the interviewees say that while they do not actually recommend any specific language, it is assumed that the medium of instruction would be English. One subject advisor of Mathematics, i.e. 10%, states that she does not recommend any specific language as understanding the concept is the main thing [AppendixB2, SA5]. In addition, the data reveals that the 90% of the SA interviewees are aware that their teachers use CS in the classroom. While the interviewees feel that the teachers do so mostly for explaining concepts, providing vocabulary and generally to ensure understanding among pupils, a few also express concern with regard to the extent that the mother tongue is used. Two interviewees, for example, express the following concern :

(i) SA They are supposed to use English because the exams are in English, all the assessments are done in English, but they might explain some things in isiZulu, important concepts and so on.

R How do you feel about the switching between English and Zulu in the Physical Science classroom?

SA While we encourage them to use English, but when somebody doesn't

understand what you're saying, it doesn't do any harm just to explain that particular portion in Zulu but it must not be a habit in teaching in Zulu...../ I think it [CS in the OBE classroom] is relevant but it must not be the whole address, only a particular part - sometimes you are lacking in a word, then he could use that word from his language. Not the whole speech. The main idea is to carry the message across and then somebody can tell him the English word...../ [Appendix B2a, SA1].

- (ii) R As far as you know, do your teachers switch to Zulu in the classroom?
- SA Very much so. And this is what we bring out in the workshops and we ask them to refrain from this practice because it is happening far too commonly.
- R Could you explain what you mean?
- SA When I just walk past classrooms, it is clear that the lesson is going on in Zulu. It is alright to switch to Zulu to explain concepts or terminology or aspects that pupils find difficulty in understanding but you can't use Zulu most of the time and English sometimes. It should be the other way round, then it's alright...../ [Appendix B2a, SA2].

I shall, however, return to the issue of over-use of the NL in the classroom in the final chapter.

The subject advisor of English [Appendix B2, SA7] states that no CS takes place in the classroom where English is studied as a main language. Furthermore, the data shows that 30% of the SA interviewees, all of whom are English NL speakers, do not engage in CS, while the majority, 70%, engage in CS both in their personal capacity and during professional meetings. However, 30% qualify their use of CS in the professional arena. Two of the reasons provided by the latter are :

- (i) Ja, you see, when you are addressing people you have prepared something but there are some examples you'd like to quote from people of a particular culture like my own...../ It is also easier to express certain things in your own language [Appendix B2a, SA1].
- (ii) Yes, I have to [use CS]. We have the problem of having unqualified or underqualified teachers teaching Afrikaans. Teachers who are forced to teach Afrikaans, that's

the big problem. There, I've got to switch to English otherwise they won't understand what I'm saying...../ [Appendix B2a, SA8]

Of the 70% of the SA interviewees who engage in CS practices, the overwhelming majority, 87%, claim that they are conscious when they use CS. The remaining 13% (i.e. 1 interviewee) states that for him/her, at times, particularly in the informal situations, CS is a spontaneous act, but that it is a conscious strategy in formal situations such as workshops. This study builds on the latter view in the sense that CS may be used as a conscious strategy in the classroom, to fulfill a variety of pedagogical functions. I shall, however, return to this issue in the following chapters.

Consider the following excerpt from the sample transcript as a point of illustration :

R Are you conscious when you switch between languages?

SA Er, there are occasions that I do it deliberately, sometimes I do it without being conscious at all.

R Okay, when you conduct workshops and so on, do you switch to Zulu?

SA Sometimes, yes, for a connection or a bit of humour. But not for the actual delivery..... Alright, what will happen sometimes too is that one of them will pass a comment to the other in Zulu, and I will respond in Zulu to let them know I understand. I earn a lot more respect that way, er, it's not that I go hunting for respecting, but it makes a difference that the people who are learning and teaching my language know that I have taken the trouble to learn theirs. I don't know what to call it It's a very useful tool...../ [Appendix B2a, SA9].

In response to questions 9 and 10 which calls for opinions on whether CS promotes or hinders learning and whether it has a place in OBE, respectively, the data reveals that the overwhelming majority, 90%, indicate that it promotes learning and has a definite place in OBE. Consider the following responses of interviewees who support the use of CS in the classroom :

- (i) Yes, I think so especially in OBE we expect learners to be active participants, to talk. At times, a learner knows something but because of the language he is not

comfortable in expressing, so now, if you prevent the learner from using another language, you are denying him the opportunity to express what he wants to express, what he knows [Appendix B2a, SA1].

- (ii) I don't have problem with that. It is in line with the language policy as long as they end up learning the language. But it's good to switch to the mother tongue, to explain or provide vocabulary. It will be almost impossible not to do so...../ ; and It promotes leaning in the sense that learning can only take place if the child understands. It would be a fruitless exercise if you er speak a language, using words they don't understand [Appendix B2a, SA8].

However, as stated earlier, this is not without reservation; the SA interviewees state that using the NL of the learner has value as long as it is not over-used.

The above discussion, as well as the data on the issue of attitude towards CS, question 11, shows that the majority of the SA interviewees adopt either a neutral or positive attitude towards CS. Indeed, the minority, 30%, indicate that they feel negatively about CS even though they themselves engage in it. To me, this is a clear indication that, for some, CS is a derogatory form of language behaviour. One interviewee, for example, states that when he uses CS, it is usually "a mistake" [Appendix B2a, SA4]. Only one interviewee, i.e. 10%, strongly believes that CS hampers learning and has no place in formal sectors such as the classroom although it is quite acceptable in informal arenas :

R If you were an English-Zulu bilingual would you switch to Zulu in the classroom?

SA No, I would never do that..... when I taught Afrikaans in the primary school and my pupils would use English. I would say to them , "Eksus tog, ek kan jou nie verstaan nie" [Excuse me, I cannot understand you] or something like that. And I used to say that I would fail them if they code-switched. I was very strict about that. Perhaps for the purposes for your research I would come across as an extremist, but I do feel

very strongly about that.

R Do you feel the same way about CS in the informal sectors?

SA I haven't a problem with that, I think that it makes for the richness of our society. But in the formal situations, I do have a problem because I think a different register is required in a formal situation and I think teachers ... there are ways of getting around a language problem and I think teachers are using CS as an easy way out [Appendix B2a, SA7].

As with the interviews with the educator participants, 100% of the SA interviewees perceive English as the most important language, chiefly because of its international status; the perception that it is the single unifying language which connects people of different cultures and race groups; and because it has secured its niche in the educational, economic and technological domains. However, unlike the findings from the questionnaires, i.e. the additional language most valued is the NL of the respondent, 90% of the SA interviewees say that the Afrikaans and Zulu are equally valued i.e. the SA interviewees believe that just as Afrikaans is important to the Afrikaans NL speaker, Zulu is important to the Zulu NL speaker. Finally, the data reveals that 100% of the SA interviewees are of the opinion that every learner should acquire a second, or even a third language, at school, to promote multilingualism, hence, tolerance across the cultures. Like the educator interviewees, the SA interviewees would like to see Zulu being taught as an additional language in KZN but feel strongly that it should not be imposed upon pupils.

3.4.2.3 INTERVIEW WITH SCHOOL GOVERNING BODY MEMBERS

A total of 5 parents of the SGB were interviewed. This comprised 3 parents of School A, all of whom are Afrikaans NL speakers, and 2 parents of School E, both of whom are English NL

speakers. All attempts at securing SGB member-interviewees of School Z, even though a Zulu NL educator of the school approached them and informed them that the interview would be conducted by her, in Zulu, were futile. Hence, the data presented here is representative of only Schools A and E. The questions that I focused on for this group of interviewees are :

1. What is your mother tongue?
2. What other languages can you speak?
3. Do you recommend a language for teaching and learning? If so, which one?
4. As far as you know do 'your' teachers switch from one language to another in a single conversation?
5. As far as you know do the learners switch from one language to another in a single conversation?
6. Do you ever switch from one language to another in your personal capacity i.e. with your friends and colleagues?
7. Do you ever switch from one language to another at meetings at school?
8. [If "Yes" to questions 7 and/or 8] Are you aware that you do this?
9. In your view, does the switching to the mother tongue promote or hinder learning?
10. In your view, does the switching to the mother tongue have a place in OBE?
11. From the 3 languages that are offered at KZN schools i.e. English, Afrikaans and Zulu - how would you rank them in terms of importance?
12. In your view is it necessary for learners to learn a second language at school?

SUMMARY OF DATA OBTAINED FROM GB INTERVIEWEES

Q	SCHOOL A			SCHOOL E	
	GB1	GB2	GB3	GB4	GB5
1	A	A	A	E	E
2	EZ	EZ	E	ZO	O
3	YA	YA	YA	YE	YE
4	N	N	N	N	N
5	N?	N?	N?	Y?	Y?
6	Y	N	N	N	N
7	N	N	N	N	N
8	N	X	X	X	X
9	•	•	•	•	*
10	•	•	•	•	*
11	1	1	1	1	1
Z	2	2	2	2	2
A	1	1	1	3	3
12	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Figure 17

The data for the interview with the Afrikaans NL and English NL SGB members reveals that like the preceding interviewees, English is the shared language. Importantly however, recordings of the interview show that even though the interviewees of School A are bilingual and are aware that their teachers and learners are bilinguals, they feel strongly that the only medium of instruction, except for the English L2 and Computer class, should be Afrikaans. They state that the teachers do not and *should not* use CS in their teaching. Their opposition to CS in the classroom is so strong that one interviewee provides the following example (as that quoted by the principal, discussed earlier, Appendix B1a, AP) of their dissatisfaction with one teacher who switched to Afrikaans in English L2 teaching :

It was one of the things we discussed when we appointed an Afrikaans speaker to teach English and she used Afrikaans to explain some English which is er.... it's a problem we discussed. She shouldn't speak Afrikaans in the English classroom [Appendix B3a, GB1].

The SGB interviewees of School E however, had opposing views. Although both feel that the medium of instruction should be English except in the Afrikaans L2 classroom, where CS could occur, while one interviewee expresses concern that CS to Zulu in the other subjects would be disadvantageous to the English NL speaking learners, the other approves of CS because of the pedagogical reasons it fulfills. Consider the following comment made by the former :

I won't like it [switching to Zulu]. It will be a disadvantage to the Indian children because they don't know Zulu. I mean the Zulu children would not like it if the teacher switched to his vernacular. So, I think to avoid the problems, the classroom should just remain English [Appendix B3a, GB4].

The interviewees of both Schools A and E are aware that the learners use CS at school, but not *in* the classroom. In addition, while only one interviewee states that for him CS is an unconscious practice in informal situations, the others state that they do not use CS, i.e. that they use only the language of the hearer when speaking. Consider the following as a point of illustration :

No [I do not use CS], if my client is English I address him in English and if my client is Zulu I address him in Zulu, and the same with Afrikaans [Appendix B3a, GB2].

No CS is used in formal situations, such as that of SGB meetings. All the interviewees (who are all businessmen/women), except one, GB5 (who is an educator by profession), are of the opinion that CS hinders the teaching and learning process. The latter, however, feels that CS could promote learning in the classroom :

I think it will promote learning. For one, many of the learners who do speak Zulu, they are hindered by English because er although they can speak English, there are certain things they do not understand. By switching languages, it will make them understand the English phrases and questions better. So switching between languages will definitely help learners comprehend better. Actually it will help English in the long run...../[Appendix B3a, GB5].

The responses to the question which called for the ranking of English, Afrikaans and Zulu, differed between the Afrikaans NL and English NL speakers. Understandably, all the Afrikaans NL interviewees feel that Afrikaans is the most important language as it is their mother tongue.

Consider the following comments made by two of the interviewees :

- (i) I'm going to say Afrikaans first because it is my mother tongue. You wouldn't like your mother tongue to just disappear..... English is important because it is an international language but it is also important to maintain your identity. Now, because I come from an Afrikaans background I would say, yes, I would say that any person from a specific background would say his mother tongue is the most important..... Your mother tongue is most important. If you haven't got a background or a history, then you are nothing [Appendix B3a, GB1].
- (ii) Ja, it would be Afrikaans. Children must learn their mother tongue [Appendix B3a, GB3].

These interviewees, however, add that English is 'also' important as it is "the language of business" [Appendix B3a, GB1] and because "all the world is speaking English" [Appendix B3a, GB3]. On the other hand, for the English NL speaking interviewees, English is unhesitatingly the most important language chiefly because of its international status, and its educational and economic worth. These interviewees say that Zulu is the second most important language in KZN, as it is spoken by the majority of its people; and Afrikaans follows last because it is spoken by the minority of the people in KZN. All the interviewees think that it is important for pupils to learn a second language, and would like to see them learning Zulu as well.

3.4.2.4 INTERVIEW WITH LEARNERS [APPENDIX B4]

A total of 27 learners, 7, 10 and 10 of Schools A, E and Z respectively, were interviewed. The questions/ area of questions that I focused on and on which the analysis is based are :

1. What is your mother tongue?
2. What other language(s) can you speak?
3. Do your teachers ask you to speak any specific language(s) in the classroom?
4. What language(s) do your teachers use in the classroom while teaching in the various learning areas except the language classroom?
5. What language(s) does your teacher use when s/he teaches English?
6. What language(s) does your teacher use when s/he teaches Afrikaans?
7. Do you switch between languages when you speak to your friends *outside* the classroom?
8. Do you switch between languages when you speak with your friends *in* the classroom?
9. Do you switch between languages when you speak with *your teachers* in the classroom?
10. Are you aware when you switch from one language to another?
11. Generally, how do you feel about people who use more than one language in a single sentence or conversation?
12. Ranking of the 3 languages.
13. In your view is it necessary for learners to learn a second language at school?

A summary of the data of the interview with learners, Figure18, follows.

SUMMARY OF DATA OBTAINED FROM LEARNER INTERVIEWEES

	SCHOOL A							SCHOOL E										SCHOOL Z									
Q	L1	L2	L3	L4	L5	L6	L7	L1	L2	L3	L4	L5	L6	L7	L8	L9	L10	L1	L2	L3	L4	L5	L6	L7	L8	L9	L10
1	A	O	A	AE	A	A	A	E	E	E	E	E	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z	Z
2	E	AEZ	E	No	E	E	E	No	No	No	No	No	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E
3	Y?	Y?	Y?	Y?	Y?	Y?	Y?	Y?	Y?	Y?	Y?	Y?	Y?	Y?	Y?	Y?	Y?	YE	YE	YE	YE	YE	YE	YE	YE	YE	YE
4	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	EZ	EZ	EZ	EZ	EZ	EZ	EZ	EZ	EZ	EZ
5	E?	E?	E?	E?	E?	E?	E?	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	EZ	EZ	EZ	EZ	EZ	EZ	EZ	EZ	EZ	EZ
6	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	AE	AE	AE	AE	AE	AE	AE	AE	AE	AE	AEZ	AEZ	AEZ	AEZ	AEZ	AEZ	AEZ	AEZ	AEZ	AEZ
7	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
8	Y?	Y?	Y?	Y?	Y?	Y?	Y?	Y?	Y?	Y?	Y?	Y?	Y?	Y?	Y?	Y?	Y?	Y	Y?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
9	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
10	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	X	X	X	X	X	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
11	#	#	#	#	+	#	#	+?	+?	#	#	+	#?	#	#	#	#	-	+	-	-	-	#	+	+	+	+
12	1	1	2	1?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	
Z	3	3	3	2?	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	1	3	2	3
A	2	2	1	2?	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	2
13	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

FIGURE 18

The data for the interview with the School A learners shows that while Afrikaans is the NL of all the interviewees, 2 indicate that English, and 1 indicates that Xhosa is also their mother tongue because it is the NL of each of their parents. In School E, 50% of the learners are English NL speakers and 50%, Zulu NL speakers. In School Z, all the learners are Zulu NL speakers. The common language among all the learners is English. The recordings also show that the learners of (i) School A are expected to speak only Afrikaans in all their subjects, except English L2 where only English must be spoken; (ii) School E are expected to speak only English except the Afrikaans L2 classroom where pupils use Afrikaans-English (A-E) CS; and (iii) School Z are expected to speak English although English-Zulu (E-Z) CS in all of the subjects is the norm, and in the Afrikaans L2 classroom, Afrikaans-English-Zulu (A-E-Z) CS is the norm, by both the teachers and learners.

Although only English is prescribed for LLCE (L2) teaching and learning in School A, 100% of the learners say that Afrikaans is spoken occasionally by both the pupils and teacher and that they believe that it is beneficial to them. The reserved use of CS is evident in the following responses of some of the learners of School A :

- (i) It is a [sic] English class we have to speak English but we speak Afrikaans too... softly, you know, with our friends [Appendix B4a, AL3].
- (ii) Yes, if you don't understand she'll use Afrikaans, but she doesn't like it...../[Appendix B4a, AL5].
- (iii) In the English classroom my teacher uses but we're supposed to speak only English but she uses some Afrikaans just to help us confer and stuff between English and Afrikaans, because many of the pupils can't speak English that well...../[Appendix B4a, AL6].

In contrast, although 100% of the learners of School Z show that E-Z CS is used to assist understanding of the learners, many say that the teacher switches to Zulu because “the *other* [my emphasis] children do not understand and that they prefer the lesson to be conducted in English only. Consider the following illustrations :

- (i) R Why do you think he uses Zulu?
L To make us understand. Sometimes the other children they don't understand so the teacher must say in Zulu so then they understand [Appendix B4c, ZL5].
- (ii) R How do you feel about your teacher [in the English classroom] using Zulu?
L I don't like it because we want to learn only English. But he must use it because the other children they don't understand English very nicely [Appendix B4c, ZL3].
- (iii) L Some of the children they don't understand English. For them he uses Zulu. If they don't understand English then he use Zulu to try and help them.
R How do you feel about your teacher using Zulu in the English classroom?
L But not really, he doesn't use so much Zulu. Because ... he must not use Zulu every time. He must use English then we will be able to talk in English. We must practice English [Appendix B4c, ZL4].

The data for School E shows that even though English is the only medium of instruction in the English L1 classroom, the Z-E bilingual learners use Z-E CS during group work and/or when conversing with friends, but not with the teacher and not for the report back of a lesson. The English NL interviewees of School E reveal conflicting views about the use of CS by their bilingual peers; it is clear that while they accommodate CS by the latter, they feel alienated from the conversation. Consider the following views on CS by English NL learners toward Z-E CS by their peers :

- (i) I don't mind it's just that maybe they don't want us to know what they are saying, sometimes you don't know what they are talking about..... [Appendix B4b, EL2].
- (ii) I feel bad and I feel left out. I feel like they are talking about me [Appendix B4b, EL3].

However, the recordings also reveal that the Z-E learners are sensitive about the feelings of their monolingual friends and refrain from CS during group work when the group comprises both English NL and Zulu NL speakers. For example, one English NL speaker says :

- (i) Only if it is a group of only Blacks they will talk in Zulu, but if the group is mostly Indians or it's mixed with Coloureds, then everything is in English [Appendix B4b, EL5]

and one Zulu NL speaker says:

- (ii) In our groups, if there is only Zulu children then we use some Zulu but if we have Indians and Coloureds then we don't use Zulu. Because Mam, the Indian pupils and the Coloureds mam, they won't understand. That's not nice [Appendix B4b, EL7].

In addition, the data reveals that only Afrikaans is used in the Afrikaans L1 classroom of School A, and in both Schools E and Z, A-E CS and A-E-Z CS is used respectively. The learner interviewees of both these schools feel that it is necessary for CS to occur to facilitate learning of a language they do not understand and which they find difficult. Consider the following comments on this issue by the learner-interviewees :

- (i) [The teacher switches] to make us understand. I have a better understanding of what's going on especially with certain words [Appendix B4b, EL3].
- (ii) Some of us don't really know how to speak Afrikaans. We are not very good at it. So she explains to us. Then we understand, it makes it easier for us. Because she can speak in Afrikaans but if you don't understand what she's saying, then I mean we'll fail. Because we don't understand. So she must explain [Appendix B4b, EL8].
- (iii) Using Afrikaans only is not right. As I say, he must use English because we don't understand Afrikaans. He can talk and talk but we don't understand Afrikaans, the class will make a noise [Appendix B4c, ZL4].

The data, as well as the foregoing discussion, clearly reveals that CS is a norm for the bilingual learner-interviewees; for those of School A it occurs almost exclusively outside the classroom;

and for those of School E it occurs mostly outside the classroom and used with some reservation in the classroom in that the speakers try to accommodate their English monolingual peers; and in School Z it is a norm both in and outside the classroom. However, the learner-interviewees hold differing opinions about its use. Of those who engage in CS, 22, 50% express 'neutral' feelings about it; 18% dislike it; 27% have positive feelings about CS, and 5% qualify their positive feelings about it. Of the 5 monolingual learner-interviewees, 40% indicate neutral feelings, 20%, positive feelings, and 40%, qualified positive feelings. The latter persons state that for the most part CS can be beneficial as long as everyone present in the conversation understands the language switched to. Unlike the findings for the educator and subject-advisor interviewees for whom CS is mostly a conscious strategy, for the majority of the learner-interviewees, CS is something that is spontaneous. For example, when asked whether they were aware when they switched between languages, one learner states :

(i) It [CS] has become a habit with me [Appendix B4a, AL4];

and another says :

(ii) It [CS] just comes [Appendix B4c, ZL5].

Finally, with regard to question 12 which calls for the ranking of English, Zulu and Afrikaans in order of importance, the data shows that an overwhelming 93% of the learner-interviewees rank English first. The reasons given for this include: getting an education; it is the language that everybody speaks; it is the language of everyday business matters (e.g. shopping, banking); to accommodate English monolingual speakers; and it is the language that unites people of the different race and cultural groups [Appendix B4]. However, two of these interviewees rank

English first with reservation, as seen in the comments below :

- (i) I won't really rank them in importance because everything is important because you really need to know your languages to be able to speak. So I can't say something is better than the other. But when we look at a career I would rather take English because that's what you need to get a job. And everybody knows English [Appendix B4a, L4].
- (ii) I wouldn't really rank them because they are three different languages for different people. In our province we must actually try and learn all three of those so when you come across people strangers who don't speak your language so you can make it easier for them if you can speak their language... But if I had to rank them, I suppose it would have to be English because it is the most popular language in the world, then Afrikaans because that's my mother tongue and then Zulu. But I don't really like to rank it [Appendix B4a, L6].

The two interviewees, who did not rank English first, rank their NL as being the most important as it is the mother tongue. For example, the Zulu NL learner says :

I think my home language first. Because nowadays children are running away from their roots. Our children, they learn English and Afrikaans, that's right, they must talk it but they must not stop talking Zulu because now children are stopping talking Zulu you can't talk English with your mother. Sometimes she don't know what you're talking about. It's not right. You must speak Zulu with your mother. In the English time you talk English, and in the Zulu time you must talk your Zulu [Appendix B4c, ZL7].

Afrikaans is placed second by 86% of the Afrikaans learner-interviewees and 40% of the Zulu NL learner-interviewees. The reason given by the latter is that they already know how to speak their mother tongue and that it is important to learn the language of others. 100% and 50% of the learner-interviewees of School E and School Z respectively, state that Zulu is the second most important language in KZN because the majority of the people of the province are Zulu-speaking. For the large majority of the learner-interviewees of Schools E and Z, 80%, Afrikaans has no

value. 100% of the learner-interviewees of this study, however, agree that it is necessary to learn an additional language at school.

INTERPRETATION OF DATA :

The data obtained from the question on the mother tongue of the interviewees as well as the ranking of English, Afrikaans and Zulu in order of importance, clearly indicates that for the educator and subject advisor interviewees, one's mother tongue endows one with a strong sense of identity. The role of the NL in reflecting identity is so powerful that even where one no longer has the linguistic repertoire of the language of one's heritage, it continues to be perceived as one's mother tongue. In addition, a given speaker will switch to the language of his/her roots, using the limited vocabulary that exists in his/her repertoire, as a mark of identity. Clearly, the infiltration of English, in the quest for education and liberation from the shackles of apartheid, has led to the dissipation of many Indian languages in South Africa. As discussed in the analysis of the questionnaires, the majority of the Afrikaans NL and some of the Zulu NL speakers express fear that Afrikaans and Zulu, respectively, too, might face a similar fate if not acted upon. Hence, the Afrikaans NL interviewees favour Afrikaans mother tongue education and the Zulu NL interviewees feel that while English is the language of education and economy, it should not replace Zulu. The latter issue, which this study refers to as "additive bilingualism" will be examined in the final chapter.

As with the questionnaire respondents, the data reveals that English is perceived as the language with the most prestige as it unlocks doors to a livelihood and a wider world of opportunities. The

responses by the interviewees also demonstrate that English is a self-perpetuating language in that it is valued and coveted because it is perceived as the *lingua franca* both nationally and worldwide. I shall, however, return to this point later in this section. Similar to the findings of the questionnaires, the data from the interviews with the English NL and Zulu NL interviewees shows that Zulu is perceived as the second most important language, not because it reflects power or social status as English does, and not for its educational or economic merit, but simply because it is the language spoken by the majority of the people of KZN. Hence, the various interviewees wish to see Zulu being taught at schools as an additional language without the constraints of formal grammar and/or examinations.

The data obtained from the questions concerning the use of CS indicates that it is the norm for those who have the linguistic repertoire to alternate between English and the NL in informal circles, and, where it is not prohibited by the language policy of the school, it is a conscious strategy in the classroom. The apparent conflict between the desire for a monolingual approach and the actual practice of CS by educators and learners in the classroom conveys an underlying negation of CS even though the value of employing CS in the classroom is recognized by the various stake-holders. In addition, even though the majority of the bilingual interviewees indicate that they engage in CS practices, not all of them perceive it positively - those who perceive CS positively, see it as a strategy to fulfill various social and pedagogical functions (which the data of the lesson recordings, discussed in the next chapter, supports) and yet others see its use as something to be guilty of and/or something that needs explaining. The use of CS in the classroom, however, is not favoured without caution; the message of the various educational

stake-holders of this study is unmistakable: CS will promote learning as long as the NL is not over-used. This supports the viewpoint adopted by Auerbach (1993) and Kharma and Hajjaj (1989) viz. that prolonged use of the mother tongue or over-dependence on it, so that the language most used in the classroom is not the language of instruction, can hinder learning, L2 acquisition, and even demotivate the use of the L2.

Furthermore, while Adendorff (1993), Nwoye (1993) and Wardhaugh (1992) demonstrate that CS is mostly an unconscious form of linguistic behaviour, this research shows that while this is so with the SGB and learner interviewees, for the educator and subject advisor interviewees, CS is mostly a conscious strategy which fulfills largely pedagogical functions. The latter is of particular significance to this study, as it will show, following Jacobson's (1981) New Concurrent Approach, that CS can indeed be used consciously as a strategy for teaching and learning in the classroom. I shall, however, return to this point in the final chapter.

3.5 CONCLUSION

While language attitudes may be examined in general terms, like Edwards (1982:27), it is my view that it is in the educational domain where language attitudes may have the most significant importance. Schools, such as those of this study, represent the single, most important point of contact between speakers of different languages and different language varieties. In particular, the school encourages the practices of a specific language and variety of that language, thereby, inadvertently influencing the practices and attitudes of the learners toward that particular language. This is especially notable in the Afrikaans medium school which attributes great

importance to Afrikaans, and Schools A and Z which perceive English as the most important language provincially, nationally and internationally.

The attitudes of authority figures such as the subject advisors, educators and SGB members, also have a cascading effect on the learners and therefore the community itself; subject advisors filter their attitudes to the teachers whom they supervise, who in turn filter these as well as their own attitudes to their pupils. In addition, parents, via the SGB, present their own views, and these too infiltrate the minds of the learners, which ultimately penetrate the community. This study clearly demonstrates that for the Afrikaans NL speakers, Afrikaans is valued both as a language of the home and the language of education. On the other hand, Zulu, for the Zulu NL speakers, is valued only as the language of communication among family members and friends - it has no educational, economic or technological cachet. In other words, for the Zulu NL speakers, English is the language of opportunity and social esteem. Similarly, the English NL speakers, while respecting the mother tongue of the various peoples of the province, perceive English as instrumental and prestigious.

Two years ago Hasman (2000:2) estimated that by the year 2010 the number of speakers of English as a L2 will exceed the number of native speakers of English. Indeed, the sample of English L2 speakers of this study fits this description; 100% of the English non-native language respondents of this study - educators, subject advisors, SGB members and learners - can speak some variety of English, exceeding the number of English NL respondents. This statistic is a fulfillment of Fishman's (1982:15) prediction over two decades ago; he stated: "Not only is

English spreading, but it is being spread by non-English mother tongue interests.” This study demonstrates that English, compared with Afrikaans and Zulu, is a high-esteem language which appears to be unprecedented in several ways: by its status as *the* language of education in tertiary institutes; as a gateway for employment and upward mobility in careers; as its status for what participants believe to be the best language for expressing scientific and technological concepts; and for its economic and technological *éclat*. This study also demonstrates that English appears to be a self-perpetuating language. This is to say that people attribute prominence to English because “it is the most widely spoken language in the world” and because it is the *lingua franca* of the country. Consider the following comments made by some of the educator and learner respondents of this study :

- (i) “English is the most widely used language in the world therefore I strongly agree with English being made a compulsory language at schools.”
- (ii) “English is a universal language and everyone should attempt at mastering it.”
- (iii) “I think English is the one unifying, global language and everybody should learn to speak it.”

Clearly, English is also perceived as the language of social unity. This is also evident in responses to questions regarding the language(s) used for speaking to persons who belong to a language group other than that of the speaker and even when using CS; English is the shared language, and invariably the language most switched to is English. However, what also emerges from this study is that although English is perceived as the key to life and livelihood, this does not mean that other languages should be sacrificed for its proliferation and prominence; each native language, such as Afrikaans and Zulu, should be respected for its values among its native speakers and should be promoted in an effort to create a *bona fide* multilingual nation that South Africa claims to be.

CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS OF LESSON RECORDINGS : FORMS AND FUNCTIONS OF CS IN THE CLASSROOM

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, firstly I examine the different forms that CS takes in the various lessons in the Language, Literacy and Communication, English (LLCE) [L2] and Language, Literacy and Communication, Afrikaans (LLCA) [L2] classrooms of School Z, and the LLCA (L2) classroom of School E. I do not present an analysis of the lesson recordings of the LLCE (L2) classroom of School A, as there is no evidence of CS in this class (see Appendix C2). Secondly, and more significantly, I focus on the various functions that CS fulfills in the teaching of grammar, comprehension and literature (poetry and short stories) by the bilingual teachers who use CS in the classroom. I use the labels, Miss EA, Mr ZE and Mr ZA to refer to the teachers of the LLCA (L2) of School E, LLCE (L2) of School Z and LLCA (L2) of School Z, respectively. In discussing the forms and functions of CS, I also draw on evidence from group work conducted in the various classrooms including LLCE (L1) where the teacher uses only English in her classroom, but where the learners draw on CS as a resource in their discussion. Although two groups of Grade 9 LLCE (L1) were recorded, which for easy reference I label Group A and Group B, the lesson recordings of Group A show only one instance of CS (see Appendix C1a).

Group B, however, which comprised only Zulu NL speakers, used CS to discuss answers to a set of questions in preparation for a study of a section of the novel *Animal Farm* by George Orwell (see Appendix C1b). As the functions of CS are more or less the same in the various lessons of LLCE and LLCA in both Schools E and Z, I do not present a separate analysis of CS of each LLC lesson in each school. Instead, I present an integrated discussion of the functions of CS by facilitators and learners of both the schools. It is also not my intention to elaborate a typology of CS functions to fit all exchanges; it seems tedious in principle to draw up an exhaustive list as there is much overlapping of the social and pedagogical functions that the CS each teacher employs, fulfills. As stated by Poplack (1980), it is the overall pattern of switching that is significant in the communities observed but it is not necessary to view each switch as fulfilling a specific function. In addition, as I draw on the 7 specific outcomes (hereafter, SO) of LLC (presented in Chapter Two, 2.2.3) in my discussion of the forms and functions of CS, I once again present these for easy reference.

SPECIFIC OUTCOMES	
OUTCOME 1	Learners make and negotiate meaning and understanding.
OUTCOME 2	Learners show critical awareness of language usage.
OUTCOME 3	Learners respond to the aesthetic, affective, cultural and social values in the text.
OUTCOME 4	Learners access, process and use information from a variety of sources and situations.
OUTCOME 5	Learners understand, know and apply language structures and conventions in context.
OUTCOME 6	Learners use language for learning.
OUTCOME 7	Learners use appropriate communication strategies for specific purposes and situations.

A discussion of the forms of CS follows.

4.2 FORMS OF CODE-SWITCHING

The data reveals that the teachers of the LLCE (L2) (except Mrs A) and LLCA (L2) classrooms and their learners, as well as the learners of the LLCE (L1) classroom, engage in the various forms of CS behaviour in their teaching and discussion. These forms, as I have addressed in Chapter One, are intersentential, intrasentential, lexical and tag switching. I shall, nevertheless, before presenting examples from my data, provide a brief definition of each of these forms of CS. I present the extracts first and discuss them thereafter. I also present a brief overview of each lesson where necessary.

4.2.1 INTERSENTENTIAL SWITCHING :

Intersentential switching occurs between sentences i.e. the speaker switches to the other code only after completing a sentence in one code (Nyowe 1993:365; Baker 1980:3).

EXTRACT 1 : POETRY, LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

[In the poem, *An Irishman airman foresees his death*, the teacher provides the reason that the airman flies in spite of the dangers].

It does not affect him. **Into eyenza ukuthi andize ukuthi uyakuthanda** [The only reason he is flying is that he likes it]. He loves it. [Appendix C3d, LL122-3].

EXTRACT 2 : GRAMMAR, LLCA (L2) - SCHOOL E

[The teacher addresses a group of learners who are discussing a situation on the topic *Kommunikasie* (Communication). She enquires what their specific topic is and provides an example thereof].

Wat is julle situasie? [What is your situation?] *Expressing a wish to visit some place.*
 Byvoorbeeld. Ek wens om na Durban toe te gaan [For example, I wish to go to Durban].
I wish to go to Durban. [Appendix C4a, LL52-4].

EXTRACT 3 : POETRY, LLCA (L2) - SCHOOL Z

[In discussing the poem, *Die Olifant [The Elephant]*, the teacher explains why the children like the elephant].

Die kinders hou om die olifant se rug te ry [They like to ride the elephant's back]. *They like to ride on his back.* Hulle geniet dit [They enjoy it]. [Appendix C5a, LL33-4].

Each of the above examples of intersentential switch is a clear indication that the switch occurs at the end of a sentence or sentence boundary. The speaker in each example makes alternate use of either English-Zulu or Afrikaans-English without interfering with the syntactic structure of either language used. In Extract 1, Mr ZE, the teacher of English of School Z, impresses upon his learners that the persona of the poem has no reason to fly his plane other than the love of it. In so doing, he fulfills SO1, identifying and clarifying the main theme of the poem. In Extract 2, Miss EA, the teacher of Afrikaans of School E, switches to English to clarify the topic the group has to discuss and, using intersentential switching, reiterates the example she provides to ensure understanding so that the learners could proceed with other examples, accurately. Similarly, in Extract 3, Mr ZA, the teacher of Afrikaans of School Z, reiterates his message i.e. the reason why the children like the elephant and thus fulfills SO1, tapping on an important theme of the poem, by switching to English.

4.2.2 INTRASENTENTIAL SWITCHING :

Intrasentential CS involves the embedding of syntactic strings of one code into the sentence of

another code (Nwoye 1993:369; Baker 1980:3).

EXTRACT 4 : LITERATURE (GROUP WORK), LLCE (L1) - SCHOOL E

[The learners attempt at unfolding the meaning of “propaganda” in the context of the novel, *Animal Farm*].

Er propaganda is just like how **Ukusho ukuthi uyabamisleader into ayenzayo yena, iyona lento ebezama ukuyisho** [That means (Old Major) was misleading them, it's something like that. That's what they are trying to say]. [Appendix C1b, LL50-2].

EXTRACT 5 : ORAL LESSON (GROUP WORK), LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

[In discussing the topic “Animal World”, one learner queries the other’s response of a frog as an animal that forms part of our daily lives].

Why **wishuza** ifrog **ke ishoni**? [Why have you chosen the frog, tell us]. [Appendix C3a, L17].

EXTRACT 6 : POETRY, LLCA (L2) - SCHOOL E

[The teacher provides the English reference to “babatjies” in the context of the poem, *As Boetie Bad (As baby brother has a bath)*. The poem deals with the reactions of everyone in the house when it is baby’s bath time].

As sy die babatjies, **the kittens**, **wegneem**, sy doen dit omdat sy dit nie nat wil maak nie [She takes her babies,, outside because she does not want them to get wet]. [Appendix C4c, LL194-5].

EXTRACT 7 : POETRY, LLCA (L2) - SCHOOL Z

[The teacher attempts at providing the meaning and duties of “oppasser” (caretaker) in the context of the poem, *Die Olifant (The Elephant)*].

Is iemand wat hierdie olifant **oppas**, oppas, **look after**, **wie gee** die olifant die kos, **ukudla kwayd ikunikezo ubani na** [Is someone who looks after the elephant, look after, look after, who gives the elephant food, who gives the elephant the food]. [Appendix C5a, LL50-2].

In each of these examples of intrasentential switching, the switch by the learners (Extracts 4 and 5) and the teachers (Extracts 6 and 7) involves the embedding of Zulu in the first two examples; English in the third example, and, Zulu and English in the fourth example. In all instances, one observes that the switch between codes is a harmonious blending of two (Extracts 4, 5 and 6), and even three (Extract 7), languages so that the linguistic structure of the codes remains intact. This suggests that CS at the intrasentential level is not some random, aimless phenomenon, but rather that it marks the high level of linguistic competence of bilinguals. However, this study demonstrates that intrasentential CS is also an emblem of the high level of linguistic competence of multilingual speakers in that the speaker displays sufficient knowledge about the grammar of each of the three languages used i.e. English, Afrikaans and Zulu, and the way they interact, such that the utterance is a sequential flow of syntactically correct sentences.

4.2.3 LEXICAL SWITCHING :

Lexical switching, which is an example of intrasentential switching, involves the incorporation of lexical items from one code to the other (Jacobson 1978).

EXTRACT 8 : LITERATURE (GROUP WORK), LLCE (L1) - SCHOOL E

Njengamanje ungayi thatha **iaction** [Like now, you can take action]. [Appendix C1b, L97-8].

EXTRACT 9 : ORAL LESSON (GROUP WORK), LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

Asiwubhalanga **icow** [We did not write cow]. [Appendix C3a, L69].

EXTRACT 10 : GRAMMAR, LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

Sometimes you go on holiday **Khisimusi** [Christmas] to your uncle's. [Appendix C3c, L37].

In each of the above illustrations of lexical switching, the switch is to a single item or word of another language within a single sentence; in Extracts 8 and 9 the L2, English, is embedded in the speaker's NL, Zulu, and in Extract 10, the NL is embedded in English, the medium of instruction i.e. the embedded items are *action* and *cow*, and *Khisimusi*, respectively. It can be noted that these items are nouns. This supports Poplack's (1980) observation that nouns account for the largest portion of lexical switches. They are frequently used during CS because they are free of syntactic constraints. Of particular significance is that the lesson recordings of School Z show that the Zulu NL speakers use 'i'¹ to precede each of the lexical items. Other examples from the lesson recordings are : "iwrong" (Appendix C1b, L59), "inovel" (Appendix C1b, L113), "ifrog" (Appendix C3a, L17), "ilong-toothed woman" (Appendix C3c, L59), "iEnglish" (Appendix C5d, L28), "ianswer", (Appendix C5a, L18), "icheckers" (Appendix C5b, L2) and "iRespect" (Appendix C5b, L15). In addition, the lesson recordings show that lexical switches may include the blending of a Zulu affix with an English word :

- (i) the prefix, "u", as in "uOld Major" (Appendix C1b, L69), "uMajor" (Appendix C1b, L81) and "uMam" (Appendix C4c, L74), and "ama" as in "amapigs" (Appendix C1b, L33), amatape (Appendix C3a, L8) and "amaquestion" (Appendix C5d, L6);
- (ii) the suffix "i", as in "fishi" (Appendix C3a, L53) and "discussi" (Appendix C3a, L60), and "a" as in "harvesta" (Appendix C1b, L66); or
- (iii) a combination of a prefix and suffix, as in, "amentione" (Appendix C1b, L69), "ufishi" (Appendix C3a, L53), "iyatapeka" (Appendix C3a, L95), "ifinisha" (Appendix C3b, L96) and "itesti" (Appendix C3c, L92).

¹ "i" is pronounced ē, as in 'easy' and 'mealy' and not 'I'

The incidents of blending an English word with a Zulu affix, such as the fore-mentioned, increase the occurrence of lexical switching of English items into the host language, Zulu. Similarly, a Zulu affix may be blended with an Afrikaans word, as in, “*utuintjie*” [a small garden] (Appendix C4c, L99).

4.2.4 TAG SWITCHING :

Tag switching refers to the insertion of a tag in one code into an utterance of another code at any point in a sentence (Poplack 1980:589). Although the lesson recordings show numerous incidents of tag switching, particularly at the beginning of the sentence, I provide only two examples of each - the beginning, the end and the middle of a sentence.

EXTRACT 11 : ORAL LESSON (GROUP WORK), LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

Besides, ufishi asiwugcini ekhaya [*Besides*, we don't keep fish at home]. [Appendix C3a, L53].

EXTRACT 12 : POETRY, LLCA (L2) - SCHOOL E

So, wat beteken 'drumpel? [*So*, what does 'drumpel' mean ?]. [Appendix C4c, L164].

EXTRACT 13 : LITERATURE (GROUP WORK), LLCE (L1) - SCHOOL E

Amapigs ngoba lana bebe uyabonake, *you see*. [Because the pigs were the supervisors, *you see*]. [Appendix C1b, L33].

EXTRACT 14 : GRAMMAR, LLCA (L2) - SCHOOL Z

Laat ons voor gaan, *okay?* [Let us continue, *okay?*] [Appendix C5c, L12-3].

EXTRACT 15 : ORAL LESSON (GROUP WORK), LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

Some of the..., *kodwa* [but then], we are better than animals. [Appendix C3a, L83].

EXTRACT 16 : POETRY, LLCA (L2) - SCHOOL E

This is how you will operate, *luister* [listen], going this way. [Appendix C4c, L21].

While the above illustrations demonstrate that tag switching may occur at any point in a sentence, my data reveals that the most frequent use of tag switching is at the beginning of a sentence. The purpose of a tag depends on the context in which it is embedded. For example, the tags *besides* and *so* at the beginning of the sentences of Extracts 11 and 12 respectively, differ in the functions they fulfill. In Extract 11, *besides* serves to prepare the hearer of the speaker's conviction of the latter's argument, and in Extract 12, *so* serves to mark a continuation of the preceding statement and alerts the learner to the question which follows. The tags, *you see* [Extract 13] and *okay* [Extract 14] at the end of the sentences draw the attention of the listener to what has already been said. The tags *kodwa* [but then] and *luister* [listen] of Extracts 15 and 16 respectively, which occur in the middle of the sentence, like the first two examples of tag switching, differ in their purposes. *Kodwa* [but then] prepares the hearer for a different point of view and *luister* [listen] draws the learners' attention to the teacher's instruction. Like the other forms of CS, the insertion of a tag within a sentence does not, as Appel and Muysken (1987) and Romaine (1989) note, violate the syntactical structure of the sentence.

Although examples of each type of CS have been provided, my data shows that a combination

of two or more of the four forms of CS may occur in a single discourse. Consider the following illustrations :

EXTRACT 17 : LANGUAGE, LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

Yes. Sometimes you go on holiday *Khisimusi* [Christmas] to your uncle's. He's got a big beautiful house but the time will come right? When you want to come back home because *ikhaya lakho indawo ekufunakala ubekuyona. Akukhatha lekile ukuthi umizi waking mungakanani kodwa indawo ekujunakala ubekuyona* [..... the best place to be is your home. No matter how small your house is, it doesn't matter. But it's the place to be]. East or west, home is best. Alright, let's continue. [Appendix C3c, LL37-42]

EXTRACT 18 : COMPREHENSION, LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

Alright, *omunye ifinisha ongayenza?* [....., is there any one else who can suggest a conclusion?] [Appendix C3b, L96].

Extract 17 supports Romaine's (1989:123) assertion that intersentential, intrasentential and lexical switching may be found within one and the same discourse. Extract 18 shows that both lexical and tag switching may occur in a single sentence. These various forms of CS, whether they occur in isolation within a sentence or in combination within a single discourse, serve to fulfill a variety of social and pedagogical functions, a discussion of which follows.

4.3 FUNCTIONS OF CS IN THE CLASSROOM

In this section, I closely examine the use of CS by the LLCE (L1) learners of School E (during group work); by the teachers and learners of the LLCE (L2) and LLCA (L2) classrooms of School Z; and by the teacher and learners of LLCA (L2) of School E, and present the functions that these switches serve. I shall provide only an outline of each function as a detailed definition and literature on each of the functions have already been explored in Chapter Two. As already

stated, it is also not my intention to comment on *every* example of CS used by the participants - I will, instead, present the more salient and obvious examples to illustrate the various functions. I also provide a brief background to each lesson topic where necessary.

4.3.1 CS AS REITERATIVE :

This function of “bilingual echoing” (Gibbons 1987:80) is a repetition of an utterance, either literally or in modified form, in another code from that which has been used. The lesson recordings show that Mr ZE, the facilitator of LLCE (L2) repeats in Zulu what he has already said in English, and the teachers, Miss EA and Mr ZA, the facilitators of LLCA of School E and School Z respectively, repeat in English and/or Zulu, in exact or modified form, for a variety of reasons: (i) for emphasis; (ii) to ensure understanding of what has been said; (iii) to verify and/or build vocabulary; (iv) for clarification purposes; and (v) for eliciting pupil response. An illustration and discussion of each of these uses of CS follow :

EXTRACT 19 : POETRY, LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

People get injured. **Abantu baya limala** [People get injured]. People get injured. There are many casualties, **C-A-S-U-A-L-T-I-E-S** (writes on board) of war. People become disabled because there has been a war. **Abantu bayu khubazeka ngenxa yezimpi** [People become disabled because of the war]. [Appendix C3d, LL38-41].

EXTRACT 20 : POETRY, LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

But now, now this pilot er, he tells us that he is not sent by law, he is not sent by duty, he is not sent by the cheering crowds so what right, so now the question comes why does he fight? **Ulwelani?** [Fight?] [Appendix C3d, LL113-5].

EXTRACT 21: POETRY, LLCA (L2) - SCHOOL Z

Ons noem hom die digter. Digter. [We call him a poet. Poet] *Poet*. Die olifant. Wat is 'n olifant? [The elephant. What is an elephant?] [Appendix C5a, LL5-6].

EXTRACT 22 : GRAMMAR, LLCA (L2) - SCHOOL E

Hoe sal jy a wens uitspreek? [How will you express a wish?] *How will you express a wish?* Voorbeeld. "Ek wens ek het a motor" [For example. "I wish had a car." [Appendix C4a, LL8-10].

EXTRACT 23 : POETRY, LLCA (L2) - SCHOOL E

T Watter woord is '*garden*'? Watter woord in die gedig?
[Which word means 'garden'? Which word in the poem?]

N>R

T [Loudly and deliberately] *Which word is garden?*

L Tuin. [Garden]. [Appendix C4c, LL225-9].

In the instance of CS in Extract 19, the switch to Zulu, in the discussion of the poem *An Irishman airman foresees his death*, is an exact echoing of what has been said in English. Although no new information is given, the use of CS here is significant in that the teacher emphasises one of the effects of war i.e. danger to the self. In so doing, he adds to the learners' existing schemata on war, preparing them for an understanding of the main theme of the poem viz. despite the danger of aviation during warfare, the persona flies his plane because of his passion for flying. CS as reiterative also aids in verifying or enhancing vocabulary as illustrated in the switch to the single word "*Ulwelani?*" [Fight?] in Extract 20. The switch to Zulu in this example, also prompts the learners to the focal point of the question, preparing them for the main theme of the poem. Similarly, in Extract 21, Mr ZA, the facilitator of Afrikaans of School Z, repeats only the last

word of the sentence, “digter” [poet], firstly in Afrikaans itself, and then in English to provide vocabulary. In Extract 22, CS by Miss AE, the teacher of Afrikaans of School E, is used to clarify what she has already said in Afrikaans as well as to ensure that her pupils understand the question so that the lesson may progress. In Extract 23, by reiterating the question in English, the teacher succeeds in eliciting a response from the learner. However, in this example, the combined effect of CS as reiterative and as a phatic function (i.e. she speaks loudly and deliberately) may have elicited the response. Clearly, CS for reiterative purposes fulfills pedagogical functions as pointed out by, for example, McClure (1981), Gumperz (1982a) and Ncoko (1998), details of which appear in the literature, Chapter Two, 2.5.3.3. The use of CS as reiterative also promotes the acquisition of SO1, in that, to ensure negotiation of meaning and understanding, learners need to, for example, understand vocabulary and what has been said.

4.3.2 CS FOR EXPLANATION PURPOSES :

Code-switching, as discussed in the literature, Chapter Two, may be used to explain a word, a phrase, an idea, concept or content information. Consider the following extracts :

EXTRACT 24 : POETRY, LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

It is fate. It is destiny. **Okudaliweyo ukungasoze kwashintshwa. Umnuntu akasoze wakubalekela ..njengokufa** [Something that is determined by God. No man can change or escape from it, like death]. [Appendix C3d, LL74-6].

EXTRACT 25 : GRAMMAR, LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

Good. Perseverance is the mother of success. **Zama uphinde uzame ungalahli ithemba ngoba uma uzama uziyi thola into uyifunayo.** [You must always try and try. You must not give up easily. If you keep trying you will get what you want]. You must persevere.

Ungalahli. iThemba [Keep trying. Don't give up]. If you fail you must try, and not run. [Appendix C3c, LL29-32].

EXTRACT 26: GRAMMAR, LLCA (L2) - SCHOOL E

Daars 'n partytjie en ek weet nie watter rok aan te trek nie. Wat dink jy? [There's a party and I don't know what dress to wear. What do you think?] *By simply saying*, "Wat dink jy?" [What do you think?] *you are asking for advice*. [Appendix C4a, LL61-3].

In discussing the poem, in Extract 24, the teacher of LLCE (L2) explains, in Zulu, the meaning of the word “fate” or “destiny”, drawing attention to the airman’s fearlessness and acceptance of death as an inevitable phenomenon. The use of CS in this instance is particularly significant in that one of the objectives of LLC is to prepare the learner for real events of the world through the experiences of the characters of a text; in this case, the learners are covertly encouraged to contemplate the issue of death in their own lives. In the grammar lesson, Extract 25, the teacher explains, in Zulu, the proverb “Perseverance is the mother of success” to ensure that learners understand its meaning. In addition, by switching to Zulu in this instance, the teacher aids in the character building of the learners themselves, teaching them never to succumb to failure. In so doing, the teacher, once again meets the objectives of the OBE curriculum in teaching learners life skills. Similarly, in Extract 26, the facilitator of Afrikaans uses CS to explain a grammatical structure and the connotations of the politeness marker “Wat dink jy?” [What do you think?] in Afrikaans. This example clearly illustrates how CS may contribute to the sociolinguistic and grammatical competences as defined by Canale and Swain’s (1980) model of *Communicative Competence* (discussed in Chapter Two). These examples of CS for explanation purposes support

that of Ndayifukamiye (1998) as they show that switching to the L1 facilitates learners' understanding of new materials that teachers present in lessons.

4.3.3 CS FOR ELABORATION :

The following extracts illustrate how CS may be used to embellish an idea :

EXTRACT 27 : GRAMMAR, LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

Sometimes you go on holiday **Khisimusi** [Christmas] to your uncle's. He's got a big beautiful house but the time will come right? When you want to come back home because **ikhaya lakho indawo ekufunakala ubekuyona. Akukhatha lekile ukuthi umizi waking mungakanani kodwa indawo ekujunakala ubekuyona** [The best place to be is your home. No matter how small your house is, it doesn't matter. But it's the place to be]. East or west, home is best.

[Appendix C3c, LL37-42].

EXTRACT 28 : POETRY, LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

We are all going to die. **Ukufa kuyinto engasoze wayibalekela. Wonke umuntu ayofa ngelinje ilanga** [Death is something that is unavoidable. We are all going to die someday]. [Appendix C3d, LL81-2].

EXTRACT 29 : COMPREHENSION, LLCA (L2) - SCHOOL E

Ja, **it has to do with music**. Sy kan goed klavier speel [She could play the piano well]. ***She could play something well.*** Watter instrument is dit? Klavier speel? [What instrument is it play the piano?] [Appendix C4b, LL113-4].

EXTRACT 30 : POETRY, LLCA (L2) - SCHOOL E

Almal is bang vir die water [Everyone is afraid of the water]. ***Nobody likes to get wet because bathtime is a real scene when kleinboet*** [little brother] ***is taking a bath. Everybody is afraid of the water. Nobody wants to get wet.*** [Appendix C4c, LL140-1].

EXTRACT 31 : POETRY, LLCA (L2) - SCHOOL Z

- T .../ Wat is 'n vloer? [Thank you. He sleeps in a cage on the floor. What is a floor?]
 L *Floor.*
 T *Goed [Good]. Floor. He sleeps on the floor. Ilala endaweni eqinile [It sleeps in a hard place]. [Appendix C5a, LL61-5].*

In Extract 27, the teacher of LLCE (L2) uses CS to elaborate on the meaning of the proverb “East or west, home is best”, ensuring that it is understood by the learners while simultaneously instilling in them life skill values, more specifically, appreciation of one’s own home no matter how humble it might be. In Extract 28, the teacher embellishes the idea of death as an inescapable occurrence. The use of CS in both these examples clearly illustrates that the teacher takes cognizance of one of the principles of OBE viz. that learning is not significant unless it reflects the complexities of real life, as discussed in Chapter Two, 2.1.3. In Extract 29, the teacher switches to English to provide clues to the English equivalent of “klavier” [piano]. The use of CS in Extract 30 expands on “Almal is bang vir die water” [Everyone is afraid of the water] by providing reasons for their fear, thus contributing to the main idea of the poem. The use of CS in Extract 31 aids in providing the connotations of “floor” thus contributing to the overall picture of the elephant as well as furnishing information on its sleeping habits. Clearly, CS is a communicative resource which, as Adendorff (1993) and de Mejia (1998) (among others) demonstrate, allows teachers and learners to accomplish many educational objectives.

4.3.4 CS FOR CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT AND INFLUENCING LEARNER BEHAVIOUR :

My study also shows that CS is often used by teachers for management control and eliciting

specific behavioural responses from learners. These two aspects are closely linked as influencing or motivating a learner to behave in a desirable way often contributes to class management, for example, in terms of discipline. The data reveals that the teachers of the LLCE (L2) and LLCA (L2) of School Z, as well as the teacher of LLCA (L2) of School E, use CS for (i) providing instructions; (ii) disciplining pupils; (iii) eliciting answers; and (iv) encouraging pupils. Although numerous examples may be found in the lesson recordings for each of these functions of CS, I use only those which are more distinct for discussion.

EXTRACT 32 : ORAL LESSON (GROUP WORK), LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

Er I want to record 2 or 3 groups while you are discussing these questions. **Ni bo khuluma phezulu nenzele amatape** [You must speak clearly for the tape recorder]. [Appendix C3a, LL7-8].

EXTRACT 33 : POETRY, LLCA (L2) - SCHOOL E

Kyk na die vrae op die bord oor die gedig *As Boetie Bad* --- Hier is jou vrae (a) tot (f). Julle werk in jou groepies, *in your groups as usual, except that (unclear) as you did last time. Work in your groups like this okay?* [Look at the questions on the board on the poem *As Boetie Bad*. Here are your questions from (a) to (f). Work in your groups.....]. Hier is al jou vrae. Julle gesels oor die vrae.....*Sit around like this in your groups okay*. [Here are your questions. You must talk about the questions]. Jy kan dit afskryf as jy wil of jy kan dit nie. *Someone can read the questions in your group..... speak loudly* [You can write the questions down if you like or not...]. Kyk na die vrae op die bord *or the one in your worksheets* [Look at the questions on the board..... [Appendix C4c, LL1-9].

EXTRACT 34 : ORAL LESSON (GROUP WORK), LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

Right, let us listen to him. Quiet! Quiet! You in the corner ... there ... **sithulili manje** [We are all quiet now]. **Silalela futhi qhubeka** [We are listening. Please proceed]. [Appendix C3a, LL110-11].

EXTRACT 35 : COMPREHENSION, LLCA (L2) - SCHOOL E

[Loudly] Wat gaan aan daar? Krishen, *get on with your work*. Moenie 'n geraas maak nie! [Don't make a noise!] [Appendix C4b, L28-9].

EXTRACT 36 : COMPREHENSION, LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

T Is she going to eat him?

N>R

T **Ngibuzile uzo mudla** [Well I asked is she going to eat him?] This woman she enters the house with the intention to do what?

L Eat the hunter (Pupils laugh). [Appendix C3b, LL 33-7].

EXTRACT 37 : ORAL LESSON (GROUP WORK), LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

No, one person. Okay, let's give a big hand for Sipiwe. **Wenzekahle Sipiwe! Une sibindi**. [Well done Sipiwe. You are a brave boy!] [Appendix C3a, LL108-9].

EXTRACT 38 : GRAMMAR, LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

Okay. The last thing. **Nginiphathele izindaba ezimnandi. Kusasa nibhala itesti**. [I've got good news for you. You will be writing a test on this tomorrow]. (Class makes a noise). (Loudly) You will be writing a test on proverbs tomorrow. You must learn your proverbs and their explanations. Okay? **Nifunde kakhulu khona nizo kwenza kahle** [Learn hard so you can do well]. Okay class? [Appendix C3c, LL91-5].

Each of the above extracts illustrates how the teachers use CS to achieve specific responses from their learners. In Extracts 32 and 33, the teachers use CS to provide learners with instructions. In Extract 32, although the learners might have understood the instructions had they been delivered in English, by switching to Zulu, the teacher ensures that pupils will speak clearly so that their discussion will be recorded effectively for the purposes of this study - indeed, the lesson recordings reveal that the tape was clear, facilitating transcription. In Extract 33, through the skillful use of CS, Miss AE, the teacher of Afrikaans of School E, ensures that her instructions

are clearly understood in order to facilitate effective group discussion. The purpose of the switch in Extract 34 serves a different purpose; the teacher, by switching to Zulu, successfully disciplines his class, bringing them to a point of silence. In so doing, he inadvertently informs his pupils that language competence embraces not only speaking skills but listening skills as well - a crucial principle in language acquisition, as discussed in Chapter Two, 2.2. Similarly, the purpose of the CS in Extract 35, is to reprimand a learner while simultaneously influencing him to continue with the given task. The instance of CS in Extract 35 serves yet a different function; having failed to evoke a response to his question framed in English, the teacher succeeds in eliciting learner-responses. The use of CS in these extracts supports Adendorff's (1993) and Gila's (1998) findings that CS in the classroom serves to alert pupils to lessons and engage them in participative learning. Active pupil participation, as noted earlier in the discussion of Spady's (1994) model of OBE, is a vital principle of learning. Extracts 37 and 38, also serve a different purpose: In Extract 37, by complimenting the pupil in Zulu, the teacher provides positive reinforcement while simultaneously enriching his self-esteem. This example clearly illustrates that CS has, as Auerbach (1993) and Corson (1997) also show (see Chapter Two, 2.4.3.6), not only pedagogical benefits, but psychological benefits as well; the use of the learner's NL aids in developing his self confidence and he will be more equipped to take risks when speaking in English. Similarly, in Extract 38, the teacher hopes that by appealing, in Zulu, "**Nifunde kakhulu khona nizo kwenza kahle**" [Learn hard so you can do well], he would be able to enhance learners' motivation to learn. In addition, by foregrounding the instruction with "**Nginiphathele izindaba ezimnandi. Kusasa nibhala itesti**" [I've got good news for you. You will be writing a test on this tomorrow] the teacher, as elsewhere during lessons, creates a friendly rapport with the learners,

an essential principle of OBE. My own findings are similar to that of Piasecka (1988) and Schweers (1999) who show that the use of learners' NL in the classroom for classroom management, instructions and prompts, and creating atmosphere, facilitates the learning process.

4.3.4 CS FOR GROUP MANAGEMENT AND INFLUENCING PEER BEHAVIOUR :

Just as the teacher resorts to CS for classroom management and influencing learner behaviour, the data reveals that during group-work learners use CS to maintain order within the group and for influencing the behaviour of members of the group. This is illustrated in the following examples :

EXTRACT 39 : ORAL LESSON (GROUP WORK), LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

L2 Let's continue guys. **Khulumani** [Talk, talk]. [Appendix C3a, L52].

EXTRACT 40 : ORAL LESSON (GROUP WORK), LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

L3 Cow. **Asiwubhalanga icow** [We did not write cow]. [Appendix C3a, L69].

EXTRACT 41 : COMPREHENSION, LLCA (L2) - SCHOOL E

L3 Wie is dit? [Who is it?] **Hey, don't call my name.**

L1 **Come on man. You want mam to scold us?** Sy kon nie praat nie [She could not speak].

L2 **No, no.**

L1 **You're lost! Come on!** Sy kon nie eet nie, sy kon nie drink nie, sy kon nie sit nie, sy kon nie slaap nie [She couldn't eat, she couldn't drink, she couldn't sit, she couldn't sleep]. [Appendix C4b, LL50-4].

While Extract 39 illustrates how CS may be used to spur on a discussion, Extract 40 demonstrates how the learner's use of CS draws attention to an activity that requires completion. Both these

examples clearly demonstrate how CS may be effectively employed to promote (i) a sense of group responsibility; (ii) working co-operatively within a group; and (iii) concluding work within a specified time-frame - all of which reflect real life values, which, as stated earlier, is one of the principles that underpins the OBE curriculum. In Extract 41, the switch to English, appears to serve multi-layered functions: Firstly, L3 expresses his irritation at having his name shouted out; secondly, we learn that L1 attempts at creating order in the group and so avoid being “scolded” by the teacher; and thirdly, the use of CS by L1 in the last sentence of the extract is an attempt to get L1 to focus on the work at hand. Extract 41 clearly illustrates how CS can effectively contribute to team building and inculcating values such as group responsibility and leadership building - values advocated by OBE.

4.3.6 CS FOR PROVIDING CONTENT OR NEW INFORMATION :

CS may be used to provide content information or provide new information. Consider the following examples :

EXTRACT 42 : GRAMMAR, LLCA (L2) - SCHOOL E

- L Veels geluk op jou verjaarsdag [Congratulations on your birthday].
 T Nee. Veels geluk met jou verjaarsdag [No. Congratulations on your birthday].
Listen, everybody. In English "op" is "on" but we don't say "op jou verjaarsdag" we say "met jou verjaarsdag". Okay?" [Appendix C4a, LL18-21].

EXTRACT 43: POETRY, LLCA (L2) - SCHOOL E

Ons sê nie dat die baba bad alleen [We are not saying that the baby is having a bath all by himself]. *We are not saying that the baby is alone and that it is a bad mother that left him alone in the bath. He is being supervised.* Ons kan die reaksie van die huis troeteldiere sien. Die kat en die hond [We can see

the reaction of the house pets. The dog and the cat]. *The poem actually shows us the reaction of the different people as the baby splashes.* Wat doen die kat? [What is the cat doing?] [Appendix C4c, LL182-8].

EXTRACT 44 : COMPREHENSION, LLCA (L2) - SCHOOL Z

T Sy het gesê : "Wat het jy dan gebeur wys na my." Jy moet vir my wys. *You must show me. She is curious, you see, she wants to know what the boy has in the packet because he did not take it out* [She said, "What do you have" referring to me. You must show me]. Die seun get gesê dat dit 'n vis is. En wat is 'n vis mense? Vis? Vis? [The boy said that it is a fish. And what is a fish people? Fish? Fish?]

Ls **Inhlanzi** [Fish]

T Ja, *fish* [Yes, ...]. [Appendix C5b, LL7-12].

EXTRACT 45 : GRAMMAR, LLCA (L2) - SCHOOL Z

T Let us discuss a few examples]. Ons praat oor. [We speak of]. *Stand up. When we refer to a boy, we say Hy* staan op. *When we refer to a girl, we say Sy* staan op[He stands up..... She stands up]. Hy vir 'n seun. Sy vir 'n meisie. Hy *for a boy, sy* *for a girl* [He for a boy. She for a girl]. [Appendix C5C, LL3-6].

The instances of CS in the above examples are similar to those provided by Merritt et al. (1992) and Ndayipfukamiye (1998) in that they demonstrate their efficacy in introducing new subject matter. In Example 42, the teacher introduces new information by explaining the difference in the use of the prepositions "op" [on] and "met" [with] in Afrikaans and English, thus enhancing learners' grammatical knowledge. In Example 43, the effective use of CS provides detail about the baby being 'alone' in the bath by discussing the role of the mother, thus contributing to the main theme of the poem, which the teacher provides in English: "*The poem actually shows us the reaction of the different people as the baby splashes.*" The use of CS in both these examples therefore contributes to SO7 and SO1 respectively. By switching to English, in

Example 44, the teacher provides new information about the two main characters in the comprehension passage, viz. the lady and the boy, both of whom are at the roadside selling their wares. The switch alerts the learners to the lady's feelings of curiosity about what the boy has in his packet. This extract demonstrates how CS may be effectively used to exhort learners to respond to the affective and cultural values of a text i.e. SO3. In Example 45, by switching to English, the teacher succeeds in providing the rules to the use of personal pronouns. The use of CS in this instance aids in developing pupils' grammatical competence which, as already discussed, is in line with Canale and Swain's (1980) model of *Communicative Competence* and is essential to L2 acquisition.

4.3.7 CS FOR ASKING QUESTIONS AND PROVIDING RESPONSES :

Although this function of CS overlaps with that for influencing learner behaviour, I choose to treat it independently as the data reveals that it is a common feature among learners, both in learner-learner interaction and learner-facilitator interaction. The data shows that CS may be used for asking questions, seeking clarification of a question or topic, and for responding to questions.

Consider the following examples :

EXTRACT 46 : ORAL LESSON (GROUP WORK), LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

L1 **Khuso ukuthini kona ukuthi daily?** [What does daily mean?].

L2 **Zonke izinsuku. Namhlanje. Kusasa. Zonke izinsuku** [Everyday. Today, tomorrow, everyday]. Everyday. [Appendix C3a, LL14-16].

EXTRACT 47 : COMPREHENSION, LLCA (L2) - SCHOOL E

L1 **What's what's this word here mam? Wasgoed?** [Laundry?]

- T Wasgoed? Wasgoed, die klere, die klere. [Laundry? Laundry, the clothes, the clothes].
- L1 Ja, *that's right*, te was, *to wash*. [Yes, that's right, to wash, to wash]. [Appendix C4b, LL11-3].

EXTRACT 48 : COMPREHENSION, LLCA (L2) - SCHOOL E

- L1 Wat beteken? Wat beteken? [What does it mean? What does it mean?]*Hey I don't know what this questions means.*
- L2 Wat beteken 'het daarvan af gekom'? [What does 'het daarvan af gekom' mean?]
[Appendix C4b, LL69-71].

EXTRACT 49 : LITERATURE (GROUP WORK), LLCE (L1) - SCHOOL E

- L1 Hey Andile we need your cooperation here. Examine this speech closely, what elements of propaganda are evident in this speech - when Major was addressing the animals?
- L3 **Uqonde ukuthini** [What do you mean?]
- L1 **Kusa fanele sibheke lento eshiwo uMajor** [We must examine what Major said] and determine what was ... We must look at what Major is saying and what, where the propaganda words used on humans. [Appendix Cb1, L78-83]

EXTRACT 50 : LITERATURE (GROUP WORK), LLCE (L1) - SCHOOL E

Er propaganda is just like how **Ukusho ukuthi uyabamisleader into ayenzayo yena, iyona lento ebezama ukuyisho** [That means Old major was misleading them, it's something like that. That's what they are trying to say]. [Appendix Cb1, LL50-2].

Extract 46 illustrates the use of CS to seek help in understanding vocabulary. In response to the request by L1 in Extract 46, L2 offers an explanation in Zulu, thus ensuring that his/her peer understands the meaning of “daily”. This kind of negotiation and unwrapping of meaning during group-work, demonstrates how CS may be a communicative strategy in fulfilling SO1. In Extract 47, by framing the question in English, directed to the teacher, L1 indicates his lack of

understanding of the word “wasgoed” [laundry]. The teacher’s response by providing a synonym in Afrikaans, aids in L1's understanding of the word, but more importantly, it informs him/her that his/her NL is respected and acknowledged, and that it may be used to enhance vocabulary building in the L2. This is to say that the use of CS by learners for asking and responding to questions have both psychological and educational benefits. The use of CS in Extract 48 serves to enhance the learner’s reading skills, more specifically, word recognition. By reading the phrase in response to L1's question, L2's response indicates the effective use of CS for learner-learner interaction, one of the key principles advocated by OBE curriculum for learning. In Extract 49, the switch to Zulu by L3 is a clear indication that s/he does not comprehend the question for discussion and therefore seeks clarification. The switch to Zulu is a marked choice which is reciprocated by L1 who provides an explanation of what the question means. Similarly, in Extract 50, the learners use CS to offer a contextualized explanation of “propaganda” . More significantly, however, is that CS for seeking clarification and explanation purposes, during group activity, can be used as a strategy to develop one’s ability to negotiate meaning and understanding (SO1). In addition, CS can be used as a strategy to critically assess language usage (SO2) in that the learners are able to distinguish between the language of propaganda (as employed by the pigs) and the standard variety (as employed by the other animals).

4.3.8 CS FOR EXPRESSING ANSWERS AND POINTS OF VIEW :

This study shows that, during group work, one of the functions that CS serves is that it provides a comfortable platform for the expression of one’s point of view, particularly if the L2 learner does not have the linguistic competence or self confidence that the situational context demands.

Consider the following illustrations :

EXTRACT 51 : ORAL LESSON (GROUP WORK), LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

- L1 The answer is huh *siyathola inyama ngezinkukhu* [we get meat from the chicken].
[Appendix C3a, L48].

EXTRACT 52 : ORAL LESSON (GROUP WORK), LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

- L4 So what are we going to say?
L6 Some of the *kodwa* [but then] we are better than animals.
L5 A dog is better because ... *Inja,inja ingcono ngesinye isikhathi ngoba ibuye ekusize* [A dog, a dog is better because sometimes it can help you]. [Appendix C3a, L82-5].

In Extract 51, the switch to Zulu is preceded by “huh” suggesting that although the pupil knows the answer, he is unsure of how to best express himself in English. By using his NL, not only does he contribute meaningfully to the discussion, but he also facilitates an uninterrupted learner-learner interaction. Similarly, in Extract 52, the learner expresses his point of view, with substantiation, for the same reasons. Both these examples clearly illustrate that the use of CS may be an avenue for expressing the learners’ ideas and opinions confidently where s/he feels inadequate to do so in only English. Clearly, as Shamash (1990) notes, the use of learners’ NL in the classroom eases the way in overcoming problems with vocabulary and sentence structure, and helps boost learners’ confidence in language use. In addition, the above examples illustrate how CS facilitates the acquisition of SO6 i.e. *Learners use language for learning*.

4.3.9 CS FOR ‘CLAIMING THE FLOOR’ :

My study shows that when a speaker wants to be heard, s/he may switch to her/his NL to take a

turn at speaking, as observed in the following utterances :

EXTRACT 53 : LITERATURE (GROUP WORK), LLCE (L1) - SCHOOL E

- L3 Can I say something? I want to say something. **Imani ngicele ukubuza. Ngicela ukukhuluma ngaledaba ya leAnimal Farm. Agithi leAnimal Farm iginovel** [Wait can I say something? Can I talk about this Animal Farm. It is novel, isn't it a novel?]
- L1 But sometimes it is true/
- L3 But it's based on real life. Come listen to this. Listen to me. **Khona iphoyinti engifuna ukuye kulona** [There is a point I want to get to]. [Appendix C1b, LL103-9].

EXTRACT 54 : LITERATURE (GROUP WORK), LLCE (L1) - SCHOOL E

- L3 **Anithula. Ngicela ukukhuluma kule phoyinti? Ngicela ukubekakule phoyinti? Angithi kuthiwa novel, inovel. Ungathini kuthiwa lama animals ube lazy. Futhi ephethwe njenge zingulube?** [Be quiet. Can I say something on this point? Can I say something? Isn't Animal Farm a novel, a novel? What would you say if these animals were people, lazy and treated like pigs?]
- L2 Like the way it was during apartheid.
- L3 No. **Uzobona umasengi qhubeka** [You will see when I continue]. Let's say the pigs were referred to as lazy people/ [Appendix C1b, LL112-8]

In the discussion of Canale and Swain's (1980) model of *Communicative Competence* (Chapter Two, 2.1.4.2), I explained that one of the components of language acquisition is *strategic competence* i.e. the ability to make use of verbal and non-verbal strategies to compensate for breakdowns in communication or to enhance the effectiveness of communication. The above extracts demonstrate how the learner resorts to CS to negotiate entry for 'taking the floor'(i.e. have a turn at speaking) when she is not given a hearing when she speaks in English only. The switch to Zulu in both instances is effective in that the learner successfully claims a turn at being heard. The purpose of the CS in these instances also clearly indicates that the use of the learner's

NL effectively promotes ESL acquisition, more specifically strategic competence.

4.3.10 CS AS DIRECTIVE :

The function of CS as a directive may overlap with that of CS as influencing learner behaviour.

Consider the following extracts :

EXTRACT 55 : LITERATURE (GROUP WORK), LLCA (L2) - SCHOOL Z

L1 ... / *The next question*. Hoekom moes Heisib die vuur dotter? [Why must Heisib nurse the fire?] [Appendix C5d, L62].

EXTRACT 56 : LITERATURE (GROUP WORK), LLCA (L2) - SCHOOL Z

L1 *Guys, ubani ianswer ya number 14?* [Guys, what's the answer for number 14?] [Appendix C5d, L74].

Mc Clure (1981:81) describes CS as directive as “addressee specification”. Appel and Muysken (1987) and Gxilishe (1992) show that CS as a directive function can either serve to exclude certain persons from a portion of conversation or include a person in a conversation. In the above examples, CS is used for the latter; in Extract 55 it is used to direct the learners’ focus to the question and in Extract 56, “*Guys*”, it serves to attain the learners’ attention.

4.3.11 CS FOR QUOTATION :

As mentioned in Chapter Two, 2.5, CS for quotation involves an alternation of language when making a direct quotation. Consider the following examples :

EXTRACT 57 : COMPREHENSION, LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

Okay, the story says he called for his dogs: “Sangodema! Mherebwa! Ngise Manjanjari, Indawo yezikomo ezimplophe. Ngisize! Ngicine!” [“Sangodema! Mherebwa! I’m in

Manjanjari, The Land of the White Cows. Help me! Save me!"] [Appendix C3b, LL98-100].

EXTRACT 58 : GRAMMAR, LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

Don't say "Umsebenzi wami ngizowenza kusasa" ["I will do my homework tomorrow"]. Do it today, do it today. You don't know what tomorrow brings. What you can do today, you must do today. [Appendix C3c, LL74-76].

Mc Clure (1981) and Barnes (1993), among others, note that one of the most common ways in which CS occurs is through reported speech in the form of a direct quotation in the original language (see Chapter Two). In Extract 57, by quoting the actual words of the speaker in Zulu, in the story *The long-toothed woman*, the teacher contributes to the atmosphere of the story and promotes understanding of the plight of the speaker who shouts for help, thus fulfilling pedagogical functions. In Extract 58, the teacher presents the thoughts of those pupils who might procrastinate their homework, thus coaxing them to attend to it on the given day.

4.3.12 CS AS A METALINGUISTIC FUNCTION :

Consider the following use of CS as a comment on language use in view of the many comments that learners make in the course of their discussion on the difficulty they experience in the learning of Afrikaans.

EXTRACT 59 : LITERATURE (GROUP WORK), LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

- L1 *Only some. Ayi ikhuni lento bafwethu* [Hey guys this thing is hard]. *I can't pronounce these words.*
- L2 *I also can't pronounce these words because they are very difficult.* [Appendix C5d, LL7-9].

EXTRACT 60 : LITERATURE (GROUP WORK), LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

- L3 *Hey guys you must just talk Afrikaans.*
- L1 Ek nie praat Afrikaans nie. Jy verstaan hé? [I don't speak Afrikaans. You understand eh?] *I also don't like to use Afrikaans because I don't understand and I can't speak!*
- L2 *That's my problem ... so [how come you are not speaking Afrikaans] ... you are not even answering the questions.*
- L3 *Hayi it's impossible bafowethu [Hey it's impossible guys]. [Appendix C5d, LL42-7].*

Researchers, such as Merrit et al. (1995) and Elridge (1996) show that CS as a metalinguistic function comes into play when it is used to comment directly or indirectly on the languages involved. The above examples display its use in direct comments on Afrikaans, the learners' L2. In Extract 59, L3 expresses his frustration at his inability to pronounce the words in Afrikaans because of the level of difficulty. L2's response, in addition to fulfilling a metalinguistic function, serves as a bid for solidarity i.e. shared feelings about the difficulty of the language. The switch to English in Extract 60 indicates the learners' awareness that the language that *should* be spoken in their groups, is Afrikaans, as well as the difficulty they experience doing so. The recurring comment in each of these examples of switching is that the learners experience immense difficulty conducting the discussion in Afrikaans and any effort at understanding the passage is a frustrating one.

4.3.13 CS AS AN EMBLEM FOR GROUP SOLIDARITY :

The data on interviews with educators, as discussed in the preceding chapter, revealed that some teachers indicate that they switch to the learners' NL in the classroom to jest with pupils and generally, to create a tension-free classroom, in keeping with the principles of OBE. The

following extracts from the comprehension and grammar lessons demonstrate how the teachers of LLCE (L2) of School Z and School E use CS to fulfill a social function by switching to Zulu:

EXTRACT 61 : COMPREHENSION, LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

T So she doesn't like to eat her own kind? Okay but we've got a lot of women, they eat man (Pupils laugh). So why does this woman eat man? Judy, **wena ukoskazi uyawandla amadoda?** [Judy, you are a woman, do you eat man?] (Pupils laugh).

L I think man is delicious to eat because they are so powerful (Pupils laugh). [Appendix C3b, LL75-8].

EXTRACT 62 : GRAMMAR, LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

Yes. Like mother like daughter. Okay boys. **Kulungile bafana bheka umawentombi yakho-bese uyabona ukuthi intombi yakho izobanjani mase yikhulile** [Okay boys, look at your girlfriend's mother - then you will know what she is going to be like when she's old]. Just like her mother. (Pupils laugh). [Appendix C3c, LL55-8].

EXTRACT 63 : POETRY, LLCA (L2) - SCHOOL E

Ja, mooi [Yes good]. *Did you know, Cassandra, Theolin, the other class told me* hulle weet nie wat 'n Wagter is [... that they did not know what 'Wagter' is]. [Appendix C4c, LL113-4].

EXTRACT 64 : POETRY, LLCA (L2) - SCHOOL E

Wat doen Wagter? [What is Wagter doing?] *Come, I know you know the answer.* Wat doen Wagter? [What is Wagter doing?] [Appendix C4c, LL215-6].

In the instances of CS in Extracts 61 and 62, the teacher jokes with specific learners, creating both solidarity with his pupils and a tension-free learning atmosphere. In addition, the instances of CS show that the pupils are able to appreciate language in context, enhancing their L2 competence. The first example is particularly noteworthy in that the pupil, Judy, displays her wit

with an appropriate, quick retort. Similarly, in Extract 63, by addressing specific learners and switching to English to impart a “confidence”, the teacher indicates her desire to achieve solidarity and maintain good rapport with her pupils. Likewise, the switch to “*Come, I know you know the answer*” in Extract 64, serves to lessen the proximity of distance between the teacher and her pupils while simultaneously motivating them to respond. The literature on CS as an emblem for group solidarity is extensive, as discussed in Chapter Two, 2.5.3.7. However, one must bear in mind, as Martin-Jones (1995) notes, that it is too simplistic to claim that every switch by a teacher to the learners’ NL serves as an expression of solidarity. Indeed, my foregoing discussion on the various functions that CS serves, attest to this view.

4.3.14 CS FOR PHATIC PURPOSES :

As stated in Chapter Two, 2.5, CS may be accompanied by a variation in tone and pitch of voice to achieve specific effects. Consider the following examples where CS is used for this purpose:

EXTRACT 65 : LITERATURE (GROUP WORK), LLCE (L1) - SCHOOL E

(Firmly) **Thulani, thulani** [Be quiet, be quiet]. Humans are not animals. [Appendix C1b, L20].

EXTRACT 66 : GRAMMAR, LLCE (L2) - SCHOOL Z

Procrastination is Mbili, **uyaphi? Hlalaphansi. Imi ophethe la** [Mbili, where are you going? Sit down. I'm in charge here!] [Appendix C3c, LL68-9].

EXTRACT 67 : POETRY, LLCA (L2) - SCHOOL Z

Die olifant is groot maar sy stertjie is klein. Die stertjie is kort. **Yes, it is small.** [The elephant is big but he has a small tail. The tail is short...]. **Excuse me you people, you**

are late! Baleythi [They are late]. *Gaan na die personeelkamer!* [Go to the staff room!] *Come look at the poem.* Kyk na die poesie. Die olifant geniet dit. [Look at the poem. The children enjoy it]. [loudly] *Look at the poem pupils!* [Appendix C5a, L74-8].

In Extract 65, the group leader addresses her peers firmly and assertively to bring their rowdy group discussion to an end and to re-focus on the question under discussion. The use of CS in this instance is also effective in that it develops what Canale and Swain (1980) term *sociolinguistic competence* (i.e. the extent to which utterances are produced and understood appropriately in different sociolinguistic contexts depending on contextual factors such as status of participants and purpose(s) of the interaction) in that the learners within the group respect and accept both the form and meaning of the group leader's command to prevent the discussion from crossing the parameters of the topic of discussion. In Extract 66, the teacher reprimands a learner by switching to Zulu in a loud, composed voice and assertive tone. In so doing, he asserts his authority by commanding the pupil to be seated and informing him of his (the teacher's) role as the authoritative figure in the classroom. Clearly, the use of CS for phatic reasons in these examples is accompanied by that of classroom management and influencing learner behaviour. Finally, CS for phatic reasons is particularly telling in Extract 67 in that the lesson recording reveals four distinct tones in the teacher's voice at the point of each switch. In the first instance of switching from Afrikaans to English: "*Excuse me you people, you are late!*" the teacher uses a firm and threatening tone to express his shock at the pupils who have walked in the classroom in the middle of the lesson. The further immediate switch from English to Zulu, in his turn of address to the rest of the class "*Baleythi*" [They are late], is in a tone of disbelief. In addition to fulfilling a phatic function, the switch at this point, indicates the teacher's desire to win the

support of the rest of the class. In the third switch: "*Come look at the poem*", the teacher uses a softer tone in expressing a desire to return to the lesson after the disruption. However, when the pupils do not heed his call, he directs them to examine the poem in a firm and authoritative voice: "*Look at the poem pupils!*" In so doing, he succeeds in bringing order to the classroom. In addition, this extract clearly reveals that CS for phatic reasons generally accompanies some other function of CS; in this example, CS for phatic reasons accompanies: (i) CS for classroom management and influencing learner behaviour; (ii) as a directive; and (iii) as a bid for group solidarity. As such, CS for phatic reasons serves both social and educational functions. In this regard, Adendorff (1993) notes that, CS for phatic reasons is generally a marked choice and is usually coupled with a raised volume, as my own examples reveal.

4.4 CONCLUSION :

To summarise, in this chapter, I have presented the four forms of CS and numerous examples of CS in the LLCE and LLCA, OBE classroom. I have elucidated the various functions that CS performs in the classroom. The data and discussion reveal that CS as a resource used by bilingual participants in the classroom, conveys a range of both social and pedagogical functions. The more noteworthy social functions that CS, by teachers, serve include establishing solidarity with learners by :

- (i) the use of identity markers;
- (ii) drawing on shared cultural background;
- (iii) expressing personal comments in the learners' NL;
- (iv) repeating learners' responses in their NL;

- (v) acknowledging and accepting learners' use of the NL; and
- (vi) jesting in the NL of the learners.

In learner-learner interaction, the more frequently observable social functions are :

- (i) sharing feelings e.g. frustrations on the one hand and excitement on the other;
- (ii) seeking support and encouragement from one another;
- (iii) providing motivation to one another;
- (iv) negotiating a turn at speaking; and
- (v) engaging in light-hearted banter with one another.

However, as my discussion reveals, CS for pedagogical reasons is far more salient than for social reasons in the classroom. Some of the more recurrently used educational functions by both the teacher and learners are :

- (i) reiteration for emphasis; for clarifying or ensuring understanding of words, ideas and other information such as instructions; and for eliciting learner response;
- (ii) for explanation purposes such as explaining words, ideas and concepts; and explaining themes and characterization in literary texts;
- (iii) providing content information;
- (iv) for classroom management and influencing learner responses such as creating general discipline in the classroom; attaining learners' attention; eliciting verbal responses; inducing learners to work; and providing a comfortable platform for learners to express their answers confidently;
- (v) for elaboration purposes to ensure understanding, clarify ideas and to build upon learners' background schemata;

- (vi) for phatic reasons; and
- (vii) as directive.

Thus, we can certainly conclude that: (i) The use of the learners' NL holds an undisputed legitimate place in the LLCE and LLCA, OBE classrooms; and (ii) CS, as pointed out by Peires (1994), among many others, can facilitate learning in the classroom. However, it is also undeniable that the irresponsible use of CS, i.e. the over-use of the learners' NL, in the classroom, hinders L2 acquisition and therefore scholastic achievement. Finally, the conclusions on and implications of the data gathered from questionnaires, interviews and lesson recordings of the various participants of the study, as well as the limitations of this study, follow in the next chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this research was twofold: Firstly, it was to determine the attitudes of educational stake-holders i.e. the educators, subject advisors, school governing body members, and learners, toward English, Afrikaans and Zulu, and code-switching between these languages. Secondly, it was to investigate whether CS can be used effectively as a teaching and learning resource by bilingual facilitators and learners in the LLC, senior phase (in this study, Grades 8 and 9) OBE classrooms. I also set out to provide probable answers to some questions regarding the status of English, Afrikaans and Zulu in KZN, and the status and function of learners' NL in the classroom. However, the general focus of this study has been on CS involving English and Zulu, English and Afrikaans, and English, Zulu and Afrikaans. I do not pretend to provide profound answers or make overgeneralizations from my study. Instead, I merely comment on the issues that underlie this research based on my findings, discuss the pedagogical implications of the findings, point out the limitations of my study and make suggestions for future work.

5.2 CONCLUSIONS

In this section of the concluding chapter, I present my views based on the findings of the broad problems and issues that were investigated in this study. I therefore present my conclusions on

(i) the attitudes of school stake-holders toward English, Afrikaans and Zulu; (ii) the attitudes of the school stake-holders toward CS; (iii) whether CS in the classroom effectively enhances learning; (iv) whether a learner's NL can be effectively employed in promoting communicative competence; (v) the role of CS in the OBE curriculum and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) methodology; and (vi) the role of the NL in fostering L2 language development.

5.2.1 THE ATTITUDES OF SCHOOL STAKE-HOLDERS TOWARD AFRIKAANS, ZULU AND ENGLISH :

The results indicate that attitude appears to be connected to at least four influential variables viz. (i) what is already perceived to be the *lingua franca*, nationally and internationally; (ii) the NL of the person; (iii) the dominant language in terms of the number of speakers of the language of the community; and (iv) "forced-law" language policies. The correlation between language attitudes and any single variable is not a direct one; rather, it is a combination of these variables that appears to influence one's language attitudes.

5.2.1.1 ATTITUDES TOWARD AFRIKAANS :

The findings show that the three most puissant variables that influence attitudes toward Afrikaans are the NL of the respondent, the "forced-law" language policy and the language of the majority of the people of the province. While Afrikaans may be perceived as a "low-language" (Kamwangamalu and Virasamy 1999:61), this is clearly *not* the case in *all* circles; for the Afrikaans speaking community of this study, Afrikaans is undisputedly a "high-language". Even though the Afrikaans NL respondents of this study maintain that English is important for

communicative, economic and technological purposes, they deem it necessary that Afrikaans NL children receive mother tongue education in Afrikaans. There are a number of reasons for this - some of the more plausible include: Firstly, proficiency in one's mother tongue in both social and academic circles appears to endow one with a strong sense of ethnic identity; one's cultural roots, and therefore one's linguistic roots, nurtures one's sense of being and helps in preventing feelings of alienation that might be experienced as a result of what is perceived as the downgrading of Afrikaans by the current government. Secondly, in view of its current political impotence, there exists high levels of anxiety among Afrikaans NL speakers that Afrikaans is a threatened language. As such, I suggest, that the strive for Afrikaans mother-tongue education is a desperate bid to hold onto the remnants of its political worth, but more importantly, to ensure that it does not face the death-row as many of the Indian languages in South Africa have done. The compelling need for language preservation is in line with Adendorff's (1992:52) comments, as mentioned in Chapter Two, 2.3, viz. that "language itself is an area of struggle" and that when "people are hurt and angered when their language and what it symbolises is kicked", they retaliate.

While Afrikaans is perceived as a "high-language" for native speakers of the language, it is perceived as a "low-language" by English NL speakers and Zulu NL speakers. Indeed, the English NL and Zulu NL speakers of this study appear to bear strong negative feelings about Afrikaans; the single reason for this is that it was a language of enforcement by an apartheid government that was concerned with empowering only a small sect of its people without regard for the non-users of the language. Clearly, where people are not given a choice in the learning of

a language(s), they harbour feelings of resentment against what they perceive as the language of enslavement and retaliate with resistance, and because language is a powerful tool in establishing claims to identity, these feelings are, unfortunately, transmitted to the Afrikaans NL speakers themselves. This, as I shall discuss in the next section of this chapter, have obvious implications for school language policies.

Another reason for the perception of Afrikaans as a “low-language” by English NL and Zulu NL speakers is that it is not the language of the majority of the people of the province, nor is it the language most spoken in the province. As such, Afrikaans does not have much vehicular value in KwaZulu Natal (KZN). However, the findings of this study also show that, for especially those who have a high educational status, the value of Afrikaans is equated with that of Zulu. In other words, the value that is attached to an indigenous language is determined by the NL speaker of the language and should therefore not be devalued by non-native speakers of the language.

5.2.1.2 ATTITUDES TOWARD ZULU :

Like Afrikaans, Zulu is perceived as a “low-language”. However, unlike Afrikaans which is perceived as a “high-language” by its speakers, Zulu NL speakers themselves perceive Zulu as a “low-language”. Unfortunately, Zulu is assessed by not what it *can do* but rather what it *cannot do* in comparison to English. The findings of this study clearly reveal that even though Zulu is the ‘dominant language’ in KZN in terms of its number of NL speakers, it is really a ‘minority language’ in the sense that it does not convey power, prestige, opportunity, mark of education and generally all kinds of positive possibilities, as English does. Unlike English, which is powerful,

and empowering, both nationally and internationally, Zulu is confined mostly within the parameters of KZN, with some spillage across the boundaries. Zulu is, as Msimang (1992:140) points out, “a regional variety” which has none of the import that English does. In addition, Zulu does not have the readings - academic, scientific and technological, and for even just everyday use such as road signs - to satisfy the requirements of a vehicular language and that which presents a mark of education. Furthermore, as Kamwangamalu (1997b:245) notes, it does not ensure one social mobility and a better socio-economic life. The role of Zulu is undoubtedly reserved for home use.

Although Zulu is associated with such low esteem in formal sectors for the fore-mentioned reasons, for the native speakers of the language it establishes claims to a sense of identity and establishes its mark in informal sectors such as the home and situations with family and friends. It is the language that is associated with respect for the senior members of one’s family and the community. With the proliferation of English, however, there appears to be some anxiety by mother-tongue speakers that Zulu is being sacrificed for the promotion of English by non-native English speakers themselves, particularly by the younger generation. Clearly, Zulu NL speakers assign definite roles for English and Zulu: Zulu in informal sectors and English in formal sectors. Inherent in this paradoxical situation, is, of course, the inevitable conflict between this aspiration and the actual occurrence of linguistic behaviour; it is impossible to prevent the penetration of any language from one situation to the other. Hence, CS has become a feature in both formal and informal domains, establishing itself, in many ways, as a neutral code or as Kamwangamalu (1998b) calls it, the “code-in-between”. In addition, in view of the efficacy of English as an all-

purpose language, clearly it is English that will weave its way into the homes rather than Zulu finding a comfortable niche in the office. This is so in spite of all attempts of the current government at labelling isiZulu one of its eleven national languages. The confined status of Zulu negates the ideology that isiZulu shares the same platform of ten other languages; as mentioned elsewhere in the literature, it appears to be the case of: “All languages are equal but *one* language is more equal than others.”

Among non-native speakers of the language, Zulu is valued by all as a means of promoting multilingualism in KZN, predominantly because it is the ‘dominant language’ in the sense that it is spoken by the large majority of the people of the province. Unlike Afrikaans which is increasingly facing the axe by the exDET schools (as mentioned in Chapter Two, 2.3.3), Zulu is the preferred additional language at English medium schools. However, the emphasis is, once again, that the additional language of teaching and learning should be the choice of the learner and not a dictate of the political body in function. Paradoxically, while options in the study of an additional language are called for, the same does not apply to English; English, as I will discuss in the next part of this section, has secured an uncontested captainship of all and sundry - it is demanded as the language of study either as first or second language. Therefore, I must agree with Canagarajah (1999) that the possibility of making a choice between English and another language is an elusive one - English has anchored itself firmly in the consciousness of native and non-native English speakers alike. This study therefore calls for a consideration of *additive bilingualism*, a concept I shall return to later in this chapter.

5.2.1.3 ATTITUDES TOWARD ENGLISH :

Even though stigmas are generally attached to anything that has a distinct colonial flavour in post-colonial African societies, English has emerged relatively unscathed. On the contrary, it is perceived as the *lingua franca* of the country albeit, as de Klerk (1996:8) asserts, a “colourless” one and “not a cultural and community language”. Clearly, even though English is culturally bland in the sense that it is a language of adoption rather than one of inheritance in South Africa, it has acquired such omnipotence that it has emerged as the dominant language in all sectors of life. Indeed, even though position papers (e.g. Granville et al. 1998) condemn hegemony of English i.e. “any social practice that achieves a dominance that begins to appear natural or inevitable” (Granville et al. 1998:258), as already stated, one does not really have a choice when English enters the field of play. Now that English is accessible to all schools, the values of English, as mentioned earlier, have become deeply entrenched in the consciousness of people, especially the non-native language speakers of English. The prestigious value that is assigned to English is clearly articulated in the findings of this research, most especially for the following reasons :

- (i) it is associated with literacy and learnedness;
- (ii) it is necessary for obtaining jobs;
- (iii) it is necessary to obtain tertiary education;
- (iv) it provides one with a reputable education;
- (v) it is the only accessible language in South Africa in which all text books and other resources are available;
- (vi) it is necessary for upward social and economic mobility;
- (vii) it is the language for science and technology;
- (viii) it is spoken throughout the country and the world;

- (ix) it is the only unifying language across different language, ethnic, cultural, religious and racial groups; and that
- (x) it is already perceived as the *lingua franca*.

Above all, English is perceived as the key to a livelihood - it has the kind of material power that earns the bread and butter and pays the rent. English has come to be perceived as almost an assurance of good earnings and upward social mobility. This finding reinforces the view of Granville et al. (1998:259) viz.: “English is a language of the educated middle classes and acts as an effective social and economic gatekeeper.” However, my findings show that this value of English is not restricted to the middle class - School Z which comprises predominantly Zulu NL speakers is situated in a sub-economic area. It is therefore understandable that the language that Zulu NL parents, teachers and subject advisors want their own children and other learners to be instructed in, and learners themselves want as medium of instruction, is English.

As noted in my discussion in the preceding chapter, English appears to be a self-perpetuating language in that English is the most pursued language because it is “the most widely spoken language in the world” and because “it is the *lingua franca*”. The combination of English as the most accessible language in the country and its self-perpetuating properties enhance its status as a dominant language. In the years to come English will be a dominant language not only by virtue of the powerful role it plays in the country, but dominant in the sense that it will be the most widely spoken language by non-native speakers in the land.

Clearly, the surge towards English is so inexorable that it has infiltrated the homes of indigenous

language speakers even though they claim that they do not want their language to be undermined or replaced by English. Herein, of course, exists the paradoxical treatment of English; non-native language speakers want their children to achieve proficiency in English so that they can compete effectively with their English NL counterparts, yet, at the same time, they want to preserve their indigenous language(s). As mentioned earlier, this attempt to equate English with an indigenous language is an elusive task. The high levels of anxiety that exist among the non-native speakers of English regarding the fate of their native languages is indicative of the covert consciousness that the likelihood of the dissipation of the NL is a real and serious issue. With regard to this issue, Day (in Pennycook 1994:14), refers to the threat that English poses to other languages as “linguistic genocide”. Indeed, as already stated, one needs only to glance at the fate of the Indian languages in South Africa to appreciate the seriousness of the issue. As one subject advisor respondent reflects :

“I’m foreign to my own mother tongue. Way back when our parents looked forward to our education although I’m a Tamilian by birth [laughter] I was forced to learn the languages at school viz. English and Afrikaans, that took me out of my own language. We all came through that our parents were envisaging the window to a better world through English but so much so through the detriment of our own language.” [Appendix B2a, SA2].

The foregoing comment of the seriousness of the threat that English poses is also elucidated by Ronnie Govender (1996:89) in the short story, *An Incomplete Human Being*, which comments on the demise of Tamil, the language referred to by the interviewee above :

“Anyone who cannot speak his mother-tongue, who leaves his mother’s milk for dog’s milk, is an incomplete human being.”

The Afrikaans NL speakers of this study undoubtedly have the foresight and are taking measures to counteract the possibility of the demise of Afrikaans by promoting mother-tongue education; the Zulu NL speakers are aware of the likelihood of Zulu being displaced by English, yet, their quest for English is so compelling that it overpowers their anxiety that English might be detrimental to the continued existence of Zulu. However, this comparison is not as direct as it seems as one must take cognizance of the fact that for the Afrikaans community, English was an accessible language from the early days of apartheid, whereas, for the Zulu community, English has only truly become accessible in the post-apartheid period. This is to say, for the Afrikaans NL persons of this study, the ability to function adeptly in a variety of English-speaking situations has already been achieved, whereas, for the majority of the Zulu NL speaking persons of this study, the efficient use of English in various situations is something that is being strived for. As an effort to counter the effects of hegemony while simultaneously promoting Afrikaans-English and Zulu-English bilingualism, the position that this paper adopts is the promotion of *additive bilingualism*, a concept I mentioned above and will soon return to.

5.2.2 THE ATTITUDES OF SCHOOL STAKE-HOLDERS TOWARD CODE-SWITCHING :

Although researchers such as Hoffman (1991) and Norrish (1997) have shown that bilinguals generally perceive CS as a form of linguistic decay, my own research clearly reveals that the school stake-holders - educators, subject advisors, SGB members and learners - have mixed views. Certainly, there is a marked difference in attitudes between the adult participants and learner participants of this study. Contrary to the view that CS is perceived mostly negatively, the

majority of the adult participants (i.e. educators, subject advisors and SGB members) of this study hold mostly neutral views i.e. an indifferent disposition towards it - only a minority perceive CS negatively on the one hand and positively on the other. Thus, there appears to be a shift in attitudes among monolinguals and bilinguals toward CS in both the informal and formal domains.

Contrary to Norrish's (1997) findings that teachers generally feel ill at ease with using CS in the classroom, *where it is not proscribed*, the large majority of the adult education stake-holders of this study acknowledge the pedagogical values of employing CS strategies for L2 learning. However, while those who have the linguistic repertoire to do so, use CS in the classroom and accept its use by the learners, it is not actively encouraged. On the other hand, there are a few who believe that the languages should be kept strictly demarcated in the classroom - particularly in L1 acquisition. In addition, the findings of this study challenge the views of, for example, Kgomoeswana (1993) who equates CS with language incompetence and Selinker (1972) who perceives CS as an *interlanguage* i.e. an adaptive strategy by L2 speakers who have little proficiency at the target language. Contrary to these views, this study reveals that: (i) the questionnaire respondents of this study, both monolinguals and bilinguals, do not perceive CS as a mark of language incompetence; (ii) those teachers who employ CS in their language classrooms are professionals who are adept at the use of the target language (as the lesson recordings demonstrate); and (iii) the Zulu NL bilingual participants of this study are professionals who have obtained their college and/or university education through the medium of English. To me, this means that CS may be perceived neither as a result of language incompetence nor *necessarily* as a strategy for those who lack proficiency in the target language.

For those who are in the initial stages of acquiring a second language and who are struggling to speak coherently in the target language, CS might be an interlanguage. However, this does not fit the description of the ESL participants of this study. Rather, within the parameters of this study, CS may be perceived as a dexterous use of two or more languages by competent bilinguals or multilinguals.

Furthermore, Hoffman (1991) states that it is usually monolinguals themselves who argue against CS. However, this research demonstrates that even though monolinguals do not actively encourage CS behaviour in the classroom, they do not prohibit its use in the classroom. Indeed, the majority of the monolingual participants of this study indicate that, given the increasing number of linguistically and culturally diverse learners in the classroom, if they had the linguistic repertoire to employ CS in the classroom, they would certainly do so. Moreover, this study refutes the claims made by Cummins and Swain (1986) that when CS is employed in the classroom, pupils will 'tune out' and wait for translation in the NL. The findings show that CS does not fulfill the functions of translation, rather, in the educational domain, it signals many social functions and a host of pedagogical functions.

Unlike the large majority of the adult participants who adopt either a nonchalant attitude towards CS or value its numerous merits, particularly in the OBE classroom, the views of the learner participants are somewhat different, and contradictory. Although CS is a natural form of linguistic behaviour among the Afrikaans-English learner participants in informal sectors, and a norm for Zulu-English learner participants in both the informal and formal domains, and even

though they indicate that switching to the NL would have benefits such as enhancing understanding, the large majority of these learners indicate that: (i) they would prefer their teachers to use a single language as medium of instruction in all subjects except Afrikaans; (ii) English should not be 'mixed' with other languages when spoken; and (iii) CS has a place in informal sectors but not formal sectors. The contradiction between what learners say they prefer and what they actually practice points to their underlying negative views about CS. This is probably so because of the prestige that is attached to English. This is clearly seen in the evidence provided by the interviews with learners; while they indicate that they prefer their teachers to teach English L2 in English only, they think it essential for the teacher to switch to English in the teaching of Afrikaans L2. For learners, therefore it is more acceptable if a switch is made *to* English rather than *from* English to the NL.

Finally, from the fore-going discussion in this section of the study, it seems to me that the more educated and proficient a person is, the more accepting is s/he of CS. However, there are exceptions such as those of the Afrikaans-medium school, where CS is proscribed in the classrooms and in learner-teacher interaction both in and outside the classroom. To conclude, not everyone acknowledges the value of CS as a resource that fulfills a variety of social and pedagogical functions: a few hold intensely negative attitudes toward CS and denigrate it; others feel that it serves its purpose in informal arenas but should be proscribed from formal domains such as the school; but the large majority of the participants of this study espouse the merits of CS as a communicative resource, more especially in the OBE classroom.

5.2.3 DOES CS IN THE CLASSROOM ENHANCE LEARNING?

It is common knowledge that language is a vehicle for all learning and it is only natural for one to use a language to learn a language. It is this issue that has given rise to passionate contentions - the key questions that have had educationists and linguists in an ongoing theoretical tangle are: *Which language and whose language should be used as a means of acquiring a new language.* The debate, as I have shown elsewhere in this thesis, is between those who adopt the monolingual approach and those who argue for the benefits of the learners' NL in language teaching and learning. The languages of significance to this study are English, Afrikaans and Zulu in the acquisition of Afrikaans and English as second languages. For the purposes of this study, therefore, the questions that arise are: (i) *Should Afrikaans be the sole language in its teaching to English NL and Zulu NL speakers?* and (ii) *Should English be taught to Afrikaans NL and Zulu NL learners using English only?* The results of this study provide explicit evidence in favour of the strategic use of the learners' NL in L2 acquisition in the form of CS, despite the attitudes the participants might have toward each of the relevant languages and language use.

The findings show that CS is a natural phenomenon that occurs in the speech patterns of those who have the linguistic repertoire to do so both outside and inside the classroom. For the purposes of this study, however, I focus on CS in the classroom, more specifically, the LLCA (L2) and LLCE (L2) classrooms. The results of this research clearly reveal that the use of CS by bilingual educators and learners to fulfill a selection of specific functions, such as reiteration, explanation, elaboration, influencing learner or peer behaviour, providing content information, solidarity, and for directive and phatic purposes, as discussed extensively in the preceding

chapter, enhances learning in both the LLCA (L2) and LLCE (L2) classrooms. By the strategic use of learners' NL, by means of intersentential and intrasentential CS, the teachers who employed CLT methodology as recommended by the OBE curriculum, as well as the teachers who adopted teacher-fronted teaching methods, and learners themselves in learner-learner interaction were able to :

- (i) enhance learners' vocabulary by providing NL equivalents or synonyms or explanations;
- (ii) enable learners to grasp difficult ideas and concepts;
- (iii) embellish ideas and concepts, and provide meaningful and significant additional information, thus building on learners' existing knowledge;
- (iv) clarify questions and instructions to facilitate progress of a lesson;
- (v) ensure understanding of the outline, characters and themes of literary texts studied;
- (vi) exhort learners to think critically and creatively; and
- (vii) promote listening and speaking skills.

All of these functions that the alternate use of language in the LLC classroom serve, meet the requirements of the OBE curriculum. The findings clearly demonstrate that the use of learners' NL, by use of CS behaviour, promotes learning in the LLC, OBE classroom. In addition to enhancing learning, the findings reveal that CS helps to promote learners' acquisition of community values, tolerance and respect of each other's mother-tongue, and tolerance and respect of each other's views. This is directly in line with the inter-related life performance roles Spady (1994:21) proposes, as discussed in the literature on OBE in Chapter Two. Furthermore, the use of CS, particularly in the teaching of literary texts, aids in promoting learners' empathetic understanding of others and themselves; exhorts learners to contemplate the complex issues of

life portrayed in the text; and better prepare learners to deal with the emotional and moral challenges that face them in everyday living. Hence, CS contributes not only to language learning and academic success, but also to learning for life at large. Indeed, as I discuss in section 5.2.5, these are some of the outcomes proposed by the OBE curriculum. Clearly, CS for social and pedagogical purposes enhances learners' potential for attaining outcomes which comprise knowledge, understanding, skills and attitudes necessary for what Killen (2000:2) describes as "successful and fulfilling lives" in his discussion of the basic principles of OBE for South Africa.

5.2.4 DOES CS IN THE CLASSROOM PROMOTE COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE ?

As expostulated in Chapter Two, 2.1.4.2, the model of communicative competence adopted for the purposes of this study is that of Canale and Swain (1980) which is an integrated one, incorporating four aspects viz. (a) grammatical competence i.e. a knowledge of the structure of language; (b) sociolinguistic competence i.e. a knowledge of the appropriate use of language, in form and meaning, within a given context; (c) discourse competence i.e. the ability to combine grammatical forms and meaning to achieve a unified spoken or written text; and (d) strategic competence i.e. ability to use both verbal and non-verbal communication strategies to enhance the effectiveness of communication. In addition, as pointed out in the literature, Savignon (1983) describes 'communicative competence' as a creative ability, rather than habit. My findings show that when teachers employ CS in their various lessons of L2 teaching and when teachers allow learners to experiment with language, through the use of CS, they provide opportunities for learners to explore their creative potential and develop communicative competence, more

especially grammatical, sociolinguistic and strategic competences.

The findings demonstrate that by drawing on CS, the teachers (e.g. Miss EA of School E and Mr ZE of School Z) are able to promote learners' grammatical competence in both Afrikaans L2 and English L2. By the strategic use of CS for reiteration, explanation, elaboration and providing content information purposes, the teachers were able to :

- (i) draw learners' attention to the difference between the grammatical structures of the L2 and learners' NL so that the learners could more easily grasp the concepts taught;
- (ii) explain vocabulary so that it is employed appropriately in context;
- (iii) teach synonyms and antonyms either directly or indirectly; and
- (iv) explain proverbs, so that the string of words in English is not viewed as remote from the learners' own understanding and experience.

As already discussed elsewhere in this thesis, the role of grammatical competence in language acquisition in the LLC is clearly defined in the assessment criteria and range statement of Outcome 5 viz. *Learners understand, know and apply language structures and conventions in context*. My findings lead me to conclude that CS can be effectively employed in enhancing the kind(s) of grammatical competence outlined by the OBE curriculum.

In addition, the findings demonstrate that CS by both the teacher and learners facilitates the acquisition of sociolinguistic competence. The benefits of CS for teaching appropriateness of form and meaning is particularly apparent in the lessons "Kommunikasie" [Communication] by the teacher of Afrikaans in School E and "The Long-toothed Woman" by the teacher of English

in School Z. For example, by using CS the teachers were able to :

- (i) explain the appropriate forms of politeness markers (e.g. greetings, expressing a wish, extending an invitation) within the Afrikaans community;
- (ii) discuss the difference in meaning between Afrikaans and English forms of the different politeness markers;
- (iii) by example, mostly unconsciously, teach pupils the effects of voice modulation and tone variation; and
- (iv) demonstrate, mostly unconsciously, how the contextualized use of pun and jokes add colour to speech and create a tension-free atmosphere.

The above mentioned sociolinguistic skills are important for language acquisition as the learners are better equipped to face the linguistic challenges outside the classroom, more especially when they come face-to-face with the diverse cultures of our people. Not only will the learners be able to carry out the social graces with confidence but they will also recognize the value of using language for rhetorical effect. The functions that CS serve in promoting sociolinguistic competence is in line with the assessment criteria of Outcome 1, *Learners make and negotiate meaning and understanding* (as discussed in Chapter Two, 2.1.4.2), viz. (i) the ability to identify how meaning varies according to cultural, social and personal differences; and (ii) the ability to identify the ways in which context affects meaning and understanding.

Furthermore, as discussed in the preceding chapter, when learners are allowed to use their mother-tongue in the form of CS in learner-learner interactions, they learn how to negotiate language by compensating for breakdowns in communication (e.g. inability to recall an idea or grammatical form and enhancing the effectiveness of communication for rhetorical effect). The

findings reveal that the use of CS aids in promoting strategic competence in the following ways:

- (i) by providing cues to suggest hesitancy and ‘buy’ time for thinking out what one wants to say e.g. by using cues such as ‘huh’, ‘Er’, ‘Mmm’ and so on;
- (ii) by signalling cues such as ‘Okay’, ‘Ja’ and ‘Alright’;
- (iii) by seeking clarification;
- (iv) by directing an address;
- (v) by correcting oneself or another speaker;
- (vi) by using politeness markers such as, ‘Pardon?’ and ‘Sorry?’ to facilitate sustained spoken discourse;
- (vii) for negotiating turn-taking (for speaking); and
- (viii) for rhetorical effect e.g. using hushed tones, expressing frustration or excitement etc.

Clearly, strategic competence extends beyond merely ‘compensatory strategies’; as Brown (1994:228) aptly points out, it occupies a special place in an understanding of communication in that strategic competence is “the way we *manipulate* language in order to meet communicative goals.” The fore-going discussion, however, points to the need for learners to acquire grammatical, sociolinguistic and strategic skills (and no doubt discourse competence which I omit in my discussion as it did not feature as a salient component in my study) for effective communication. As such, if CS is the means by which learners acquire these skills, then teachers should not hesitate to draw on it as a resource for promoting communicative competence which is one of the principal goals of LLC in the OBE curriculum.

5.2.5 THE ROLE OF CS IN THE LLC CLASSROOM AND COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING (CLT) METHODOLOGY :

If OBE is, indeed, focusing on what is essential for all students to be able to do successfully at the end of a learning experience and the goal of education is to prepare learners for a future as competent individuals in various life-performance roles (Spady 1994), then surely, the *means* of attaining the goals should be left to the creative and flexible thinking of the education stakeholders. No doubt there are just as many techniques and methodologies as there are goals to be achieved. The findings of this study point to a justification of CS as a technique in fulfilling the specific outcomes of LLC.

At the outset, in presenting the literature on OBE, I explained in detail the specific outcomes of LLC and the assessment criteria for each of these specific outcomes as outlined by OBE curriculum. A re-address of assessment criteria and range statements for Grades 1 to 9, as outlined in a discussion document by the Department of Education (DOE 1997c), reveals that the use of code-switching is incorporated in the *generic* language syllabus, principally, it seems, to facilitate language learning :

- (h) For Outcome 2, *Learners show critical awareness of language usage*, two of the assessment criteria require that :
 - i. “Awareness of power relations between different languages and between varieties of the same language is demonstrated by suitable responses”, and
 - ii. “Biased attitudes toward languages and language varieties are explained, challenged and responded to” (DOE 1997c:24,25; 1997d:30).

- (i) For Outcome 4, *Learners understand, know and apply language structures and conventions in context*, one of the assessment criteria requires that :
 “Common features and patterns of different languages are identified, explained and applied” (DOE 1997c:30; 1997d:36).
- (j) For Outcome 6, *Learners use language for learning*, one of the assessment criteria requires :
 “The ability to transfer terminology and concepts from one language to another is demonstrated” (DOE 1997c:31; 1997d:38).

Clearly, as stated in the discussion of the literature, these requirements can be interpreted as attempts by the Department of Education to put into practice the principles of multilingualism and additive bilingualism. My own findings reveal that while one of the schools of this study, School A, the Afrikaans medium school, has chosen to ignore these principles in favour of a monolingual approach in language teaching, the principal participants of the remaining schools, School E and School Z, fall in line with these requirements. More pertinently, my findings show that in the teaching of Afrikaans L2 and English L2 at these schools, CS is used by both teachers and learners in fulfilling, specifically Outcomes 1, 2, 5 and 7 of LLC.

Firstly, for SO1, *Learners make and negotiate meaning and understanding*, CS is used as a means to: (i) unwrap meaning of vocabulary in context; (ii) explain words, ideas and concepts and apply them to real life situations; (iii) explore main ideas in comprehension passages; and (iv) discuss themes in literary texts and show their relevance to real life issues. Secondly, for SO2,

Learners show critical awareness of language usage, CS is used to: (i) distinguish between the different codes used, i.e. it serves a metalinguistic function (as discussed extensively in the preceding chapter); (ii) distinguish between varieties of the same language e.g. standard English and the language of propaganda; and (iii) to experiment with language for rhetoric effect e.g. speaking in hushed tones and issuing a command using a firm tone. Thirdly, for SO5, *Learners understand, know and apply language structures and conventions in context*, CS is used to: (i) provide information on grammatical structures; (ii) explain the differences between grammatical structures in the L2 and the learners' NL; and (iii) experiment with language by practising appropriate grammatical structures for specific situations. Fourthly, for SO7, *Learners use appropriate communication strategies for specific purposes and situations*, the strategic use of CS is particularly telling in that while the learners use CS for the various reasons mentioned above, they *do not* use CS for report back purposes or in writing out responses. To me, this indicates that learners use CS responsibly; they display that they are able to use appropriate codes as communication strategies for specific situations. In addition, the various uses of CS in the OBE classroom should alleviate the anxieties and fears of those who believe that CS will cause learners to 'tune out' or detract from effective learning.

In justifying the place of CS in language teaching and learning within the OBE curriculum, it is necessary to also briefly examine CLT, the methodology most recommended by OBE, as my data shows that the teachers have, in varying degrees, drawn on its techniques. Of the many principles that underpin CLT, of particular relevance to this study is that, *the processes are as important as the forms*, which incorporates three procedures viz. (i) information gap i.e. in discourse between

two (or more) people, one of whom knows something that is unknown to the other, the purpose of the communication is to bridge this information gap; (ii) choice, i.e. interlocutors have a choice, both in terms of what they will say and more particularly, the linguistic forms that are appropriate to express them; and (iii) feedback i.e. how a hearer responds to a speaker that further influences the communication process (Johnson and Morrow 1981:62-3). My findings show that by engaging pupils in group-work, one of the various techniques of CLT and teaching strategies for OBE (see Killen 2000), teachers provide opportunities for learners to use language for bridging information gaps, making choices and providing and responding to feedback. This, as my discussion has thus far revealed, has been achieved by means of CS for the numerous reasons outlined. In addition, Killen (2000:72) notes that group-work “relies heavily on input from learners”. Hence, the teacher must share control of the learning process with the learners so that learning becomes more learner-centred and less teacher-dominated. Group-work also facilitates co-operative learning i.e. working together to achieve shared goals (Killen 2000:100). My own findings show that CS during group-work facilitates co-operative learning which is useful in achieving both social and academic goals, particularly in circumstances where learners support each other in negotiating difficult content information. Furthermore, my findings support that of Canagarajah (1999) who shows that CS can function analogously i.e. in parallel fashion; while the teacher (Miss EA) walks around the classroom addressing each group, she simultaneously provides information to the whole class. When addressing the whole class, she uses mostly the target language, and when addressing a specific group she uses CS, more specifically, for reprimanding learners and giving instructions.

Doubtlessly, CS has a legitimate place in the Key Learning Area, LLC, in the South African OBE curriculum. When one reflects on the four key principles that underpin OBE, as discussed extensively in the literature, Chapter Two, 2.1.3, it is clear that CS forms an integral part in the scheme of teaching and learning. My findings show that the strategic and responsible use of CS can be exploited as a resource in helping a learner achieve success at the end of a learning experience, which is, in its most general terms, the focus of OBE. In addition, CS plays an integral role in CLT, more especially during group-work sessions, in that it can be used as a resource for using language to learn language.

5.2.6 THE ROLE OF THE NL IN FOSTERING L2 DEVELOPMENT :

The role of the NL in fostering L2 development has often been undervalued, more especially because of purists' belief that the use of learners' NL interferes with language learning and hampers the process of L2 development. My own study supports Ellis' (1985:40) view that "the L1 is a resource of knowledge which learners will use both consciously and subconsciously to help them sift the L2 data in the input and to perform as best as they can in the L2." This study shows that the learners' NL can co-exist with the target language in the form of CS, and that CS can be used as a pedagogical resource for negotiating, among other things, textbooks and materials. My study also shows that by employing learners' NL in the form of intersentential and intrasentential CS, L2 is promoted; as I have demonstrated in Chapter Four, the use of the learners' mother-tongue, in the form of CS, in both the LLCA (L2) and LLCE (L2) classes, serves as a vehicle for fulfilling both social and pedagogical functions.

My study also shows that teachers use CS to effectively enhance learner-teacher and learner-learner interaction. By engaging in CS they are better able to elicit responses from learners, and better able to elicit responses that extend beyond monosyllabic responses than when they use the L2 only. Specific examples have been discussed in the preceding chapter in the discussion of CS for classroom management and influencing learner behaviour. This, however, does not mean that when teachers ask questions they must always resort to the learners' NL or using CS behaviour. Doing so, will in fact, impede the learning process as pupils will grow to be dependent on the teacher's use of the NL; they will anticipate the teacher's use of the mother-tongue and learn not to attend to the L2 version of a question. In addition, one of the fears that educator-interviewees of this study expressed is that as tests and examinations are set and written in the target language, if learners are not familiar with questioning techniques and terminologies they would not know what to do. Thus, it is imperative that the frequent use of the NL be avoided, instead, CS should be used strategically i.e. by resorting to learners' NL, only when it is evident that pupils fail to respond to a question that is posed in the target language or using learners' NL as a springboard for sustained and animated discussion.

In addition, one of the most important principles of language learning, as noted by Mc Laughlin (1995), is that language is used to communicate meaning. Hence, effective teachers must constantly check for feedback from learners that indicate that what is being said by the teacher and other learners in the classroom is understood, in an attempt to foster language development. My findings show that one of the most effective means of both checking for and providing feedback is that of CS by the teachers. For example, by resorting to the use of the learners' NL,

teachers were able to either accept or reject learners' responses. When used to accept responses, the use of the learners' NL serves as positive reinforcement and learners are informed that their mother-tongue is acknowledged and valued as a learning resource in the classroom. When used to reject learners' responses, the use of learners' NL softens the embarrassment or sense of rejection that pupils usually feel when they provide 'wrong' answers and the bruise to the ego is considerably lessened. Clearly, while CS for providing feedback has educational benefits, it certainly has psychological benefits as well.

However, as mentioned earlier, and as Atkinson (1987:246) points out, there are inherent dangers in the irresponsible use of CS in the classroom i.e. overuse of the NL in the L2 classroom. Of relevance to this research is not over-use of the learners' NL by the teacher but by the learners themselves when they engage in unsupervised group-work. The data for group-work of the LLCA lesson, on the short story *Volstruis se Vuur* [Appendix C5d], shows that almost the entire discussion was in English and Zulu, and that the learners were generally unsuccessful in answering any of the questions adequately. This, in my view, is an indication of the degenerative use of CS and, as such, detracts from effective language learning. My findings therefore support Atkinson's (1987) assertion that the over-use of CS can hamper language learning and that CS can effectively foster L2 development if the matrix language is the target language.

Thus far, I have treated CS as a code in its own right that serves to fulfill a variety of social and educational functions. My study shows that additive bilingualism i.e. the means by which competence in a second language is acquired when the first language is maintained (Lockett

1993:20), as evident in my discussion in the preceding chapter and sections above, fulfills social, psychological and pedagogical functions. The role of additive bilingualism, this is to say that the L2 should not be learnt at the expense of the NL, is in keeping with the ANC Draft Policy for Education (1993:15) :

"The state will adopt a twin-pronged approach to the question of language for education in the new South Africa, i.e. access to English will be broadened whilst South African languages other than English and Afrikaans are developed for wider use in the whole range of educational contexts."

Faltis (1989:117) notes that there are two ways in organizing language use in the bilingual classroom: One is to organize language use in such a way that a strict separation of the two languages on the basis of time and subject matter is maintained (as adopted by School A, of this study). The other is to allow for both languages to be used concurrently - the approach that this study advocates. This study is also in line with Grosjean's (1985) contention that although students in bilingual programs need to have access to some separate language input if they are to adopt a monolingual speech mode in either of the two languages when circumstances demand, they need to be assisted to see the relationship between their languages and the possibilities for communicating appropriately in a bilingual speech mode, including CS, with other bilinguals. The community of learners of this study, as I have already noted, is predominantly a CS community, and it is therefore essential that learners are exposed to this form of learning, in preparation for the real sociolinguistic situation and not what purists might perceive to be real.

5.3 IMPLICATIONS

Thus far I have shown that CS is a norm in the L2 classrooms of this study, I have identified its forms and functions, and concluded that for effective L2 acquisition additive bilingualism should be perceived as a valuable learning tool. I now turn to what the implications of my findings are for: (i) principals, teachers and school governing bodies; (ii) L2 teachers and teaching; and (iii) methodology.

5.3.1 IMPLICATIONS FOR PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS AND SCHOOL GOVERNING BODIES :

The statement issued on the language policy for the language(s) of learning and teaching (LOLT) by the Advisory Panel on Language Policy of The Language Policy and Plan for South Africa, Final Draft (2000), is :

"Since language, as the fundamental instrument of learning and teaching, is at the heart of all education, learners should be strongly encouraged to use their primary languages as their main LOLT at all levels of schooling. In addition, all learners must have the opportunity to learn additional languages to high levels of proficiency [my emphasis]."

Nevertheless, my study shows that only the Afrikaans NL speaking community of the Port Shepstone region in KZN, want their children to use their primary language, Afrikaans, as their LOLT. It also shows that the Zulu NL speakers of this study have such an inexorable desire to acquire English that they have chosen English as their main LOLT or have become immersed in an English first language acquisition rich environment. In view of the statement issued by The Language Policy and Plan for South Africa, which no doubt is an attempt at promoting

multilingualism among a diverse populace, and the choices that parents make for what they want to be the LOLT for their children, the task of the principals, educators and the SGB is clear; they must do everything in their power to ensure that learners acquire their additional language or languages of pursuit “to high levels of proficiency”. As stated earlier, this study advocates additive bilingualism through the strategic use of CS as a means of acquiring first language proficiency.

The official status that has been accorded to CS in LOLT is evident in the Language-in-Education Policy document in the South African Schools Act 84 of 1996 :

“In terms of the new constitution of the Republic of South Africa, the government, and the Department of Education, recognizes that our cultural diversity is a valuable national asset and hence is tasked, amongst other things, to promote multilingualism, the development of the official languages.”

In addition, the report from the Centre for Education Policy Development (1994) specifically states that CS during group discussions, workshops, practicals, seminars and lectures should be acknowledged as a normal feature of teaching and learning. Furthermore, as discussed earlier in this chapter, the Department of Education (DOE 1997c) clearly indicates the active role that CS should play in the acquisition of the specific outcomes for LLC. To me, this is a clear indication that CS has been accorded official status and thus has implications for those principals, educators and SGB members who are either ignorant of the policies or choose to ignore them by vying for a monolingual approach by proscribing CS in the classrooms or perceive CS as an avoidance strategy. The implications for these education stake-holders are twofold: (i) for the role players

to become, as Adendorff (1993) suggests, engaged in consciousness raising; and (ii) to initiate a change in attitudes among role players toward CS.

If principals, teachers and the SGBs are indeed ignorant of the language policy acts, then, as a matter of urgency, subject advisors and education language policy authorities should alert them to the language policy of LOLT and ensure that every school has an *informed* language policy in place. This is to say, that the language policy of the school should be arrived at only after acquiring knowledge of gazetted language policies for education and by determining the needs of the learners of the community it serves. Principals, teachers and SGBs need to be alerted to the enabling values of CS and how it can be exploited, without abuse, to achieve educational goals. This can be done by means of workshops or cascaded by subject advisors who are empowered to do so. This, of course, calls for positive attitudes toward CS. In view of the socio-psychological reality in Port Shepstone society, CS is the widespread expression of bilingualism - Afrikaans-English among the Afrikaans speaking community, Zulu-English among the Zulu speaking community, and the different varieties of English among the English speaking community - and therefore ESL acquisition by means of CS should occupy an important place in the curriculum. Attitudes, however, are bred and nurtured over a long period of time and are therefore not easily altered. However, they can be altered, with informed knowledge and time.

Adendorff (1993:17-19) offers detailed suggestions on how teachers and teacher-trainees can become sensitive to the sociolinguistic scenario of a given community. Of relevance to this study is that teachers need to be aware of the various lects of English, such as Indian English and Black

English, and recognize that each of these codes has a function. Teachers and learners must be sensitized to the fact that bilingualism and multilingualism is a communicative rich resource and should be acknowledged and prized as such. Teachers and learners should be actively encouraged to exploit their linguistic repertoire to the fullest as they work together to achieve educational goals. Furthermore, teachers should also be disabused of “deficit notions such as CS is dysfunctional” (Adendorff 1993:19) or that CS is as a result of “language incompetence” as maintained by Kgomoewana (1993:13).

Moreover, what emerges from this study is that in spite of the attempts of the Department of Education at promoting multilingualism, evident in Language-in-Education policies, the schools of this study have not reviewed their own school language policies in terms of the additional language(s) offered. Rather, they have opted to carry forth the second languages that were inherited from the apartheid government. Thus, the principals, educators and SGB need to address this issue and reconsider the language(s) that should be offered as a second language and even consider offering a third language. This is particularly relevant to the exHOD schools that offer only Afrikaans as a second language. As the data from questionnaires and interviews clearly reveal that Zulu is the most favoured additional African language (for the various reasons already discussed), efforts should be made in creating a space for Zulu in the school curriculum. isiZulu should be, as many educators and learners indicate, introduced at schools, at least as a language for communication purposes i.e. not necessarily for test and examination purposes, as a third language. Alternatively, the school has to reconsider the African language of the community it serves and gradually phase in that language by allowing learners to make a choice between

additional languages. There are also implications for the exDET schools which study both English and Afrikaans as additional languages. The findings for questionnaires, interviewees and lesson recordings of learner-learner interaction of the learners of the exDET school clearly show that learners experience great difficulty with Afrikaans and display intense negativism and resistance towards studying it. exDET schools therefore need to reconsider compelling their pupils to study Afrikaans as a third language. Rather, Afrikaans should be offered as an optional (and not compulsory) additional language in the school curriculum.

On the issue of additional languages, because I do not devote a section to implications for language policy makers and examination promotion requirements, at this point of the study, I make mention of two significant implications that the findings of this research have for these education sectors. Firstly, education language policy makers should bear in mind that the additional language learnt at schools should be the choice of the learners and not one that is imposed upon them. If the Department of Education does decide to impose a language then it will be no different from its predecessors of the apartheid regime. In addition, education language policy makers should be wary of the negative attitudes and resistance that 'forced law' language policies have on its people. Secondly, my findings have clear implications for those establishing the promotion requirements for learners. Currently, as noted earlier, the passing of Afrikaans (L2) is a prerequisite for promotion to the next grade for Grade 10 and 11 learners, and to pass the matriculation examination. In addition, it is necessary for a matriculating student to pass Afrikaans at the higher grade to secure a pass with exemption. I share the view of many of the participants of this study that such a requirement is both unnecessary and crippling to the learner

as Afrikaans has no academic value for non-NL speakers. The current examination requirement needs to be urgently reviewed and new promotion requirements must be set in place.

These implications for the school stake-holders naturally have serious financial implications for schools that are already struggling to meet their various needs. It is therefore imperative that if the government is serious about promoting multilingualism and putting right past language-in-policy injustices, it must make available the necessary funds. The mere issuing of well dressed language policies without the necessary financial backup is a futile exercise - it is like a well groomed dog with no bite.

5.3.2 IMPLICATIONS FOR L2 TEACHERS AND TEACHING :

It is common practice for teachers to implement a language policy if they are fully aware of it. It is my view that every language subject advisor is *obliged* to fully inform schools - informing principals and/or the heads of the department of languages, and if possible, every teacher of language(s) - by highlighting pertinent excerpts from the various acts that advise on the use of LOLT and CS as a learning resource. Essential too is that workshops for language teachers be conducted to show that since CS is a norm in our linguistically diverse regions, it may be brought into our classrooms without guilt. Workshops are also the ideal platform where teachers can air their own views, fears and anxieties about using CS in the classroom. Informed discussions will do much at alleviating mostly groundless anxieties which often stem from misconceptions; fears of how others, especially first language speakers, will perceive them; and generally ignorance of the wealth CS as a communicative resource possesses. Savignon (1991:265) states that “language

teaching is inextricably tied to language policy.” Hence, if CS is accepted for the status it has been officially accorded in policy documents, the road is paved for helping learners realize the goal of ultimate success at the end of a learning experience.

In view of the influx of Zulu NL speakers in what is predominantly English NL speaking schools, English first language teachers should also be alerted to the values of accommodating and even encouraging CS, during pair or group-work where the learners share the same mother-tongue. Occasional lapsing into Zulu, for example, can go a long way in building teacher-learner relations, particularly if the teacher and learner belong to different cultural and linguistic groups. Even if the teacher is not fully bilingual, by resorting to some words or using pidgin Zulu for jesting purposes, teachers are informing learners that their NL is of value in the classroom and not an inferior language when pitted against English. Similarly, in the Afrikaans L2 classrooms where the learners are either English NL or Zulu NL speakers, English should not be the only code that the teacher switches to. The teacher needs to realize that for the Zulu NL speaking learner, English is his/her second language, therefore switching to English is more advantageous to the English NL speaker than it is to the Zulu NL speaker. As such the teacher should be considerate, in that, for the Zulu NL learners, Afrikaans is a third additional language, and if s/he has the facility to do so, should resort to some Afrikaans-Zulu CS as well. At the very least, the considerate teacher will not prohibit the use of Afrikaans-Zulu CS by the learners themselves. Of course, the situation is a complex one, as the data from interviews reveals; learners must not exploit CS for negative purposes such as deliberately speaking in Zulu for exclusion purposes. Therefore learners themselves must be conscientized about the *whys* and *whens* of CS. This, of

course, implies that CS can be used as a conscious technique - a point I return to, in the next section.

The implications for L2 teachers in ESL schools are far less complex in that the study shows that CS is a natural feature of communication both outside and inside the classroom. Nevertheless, some teachers, including language teachers, in spite of using CS in their personal capacity outside the classroom, still perceive CS as a degenerative form of language which should be avoided in the classroom. All L2 teachers should, therefore, be made aware of how CS can be used to build vocabulary; teach grammatical structure; ensure learners understand difficult concepts; explain new content information; check for feedback; boost learners' self-esteem and so on. Essential, too, is that teachers are made aware that this does not mean that *everything* that is said in the target language must be reiterated in the learners' NL and *vice versa*. Quite the contrary, teachers should be warned of the dangers of the irresponsible use of CS by over-use to language development. It is therefore imperative that group-work sessions, for example, are closely supervised. I shall, however, return to this point in my discussion of implications for methodology.

As all teachers of languages are teachers of literature, my findings also have specific implications for literature teaching. Literature presents language in discourse in which the parameters of the setting and role relations are defined. On this note, McKay (1982:530) notes: "Language that illustrates a particular register or dialect is embedded within a social context, and thus, there is a basis for determining why a particular form is used." Thus, literature presents an ideal vehicle

for developing awareness of language use - for its form and meaning. Firstly, however, schools should make informed choices when purchasing literary texts or choosing literary texts to be studied by pupils. There are a number of factors that need to be considered when choosing a poem, book or excerpt to be studied for literary purposes - of pertinence to this study is choosing texts that have cultural relevance to the learner. This is not to say that *all* texts must be culturally relevant; learners need to be exposed to a variety of texts which should include texts that they can identify with in terms of setting, culture, language, character and events. Many worthy literary texts of various genres, both imported and local, have evidence of the use of switching between the different languages, and switching between varieties of the same language. When readers see CS in written texts by renown authors and poets, they realize that CS is not something to be ashamed about but rather as a rich communicative device. For learners to feel this way, however, teachers themselves must feel the same. On this note, Edwards (1982:30) observes that teachers, like other members of the population, maintain stereotyped and often negative views of certain language varieties and their speakers. Hence, teachers are in a position to hamper learners' success by imposing their own negative perceptions and attitudes upon their learners. On the other hand, alert and sensitized teachers have the power to help learners overcome stereotype notions and misconceptions. Undoubtedly, an empowered teacher is an empowering teacher. Clearly, the combination of literature and CS is a powerful resource for promoting the four forms of communicative competence described by Canale and Swain (1980) and developing language learning in general, and should therefore be exploited by the language teacher in the classroom.

5.3.3 IMPLICATIONS FOR METHODOLOGY :

Having discussed the implications of CS in the classroom and for teaching, I go on to present implications of CS for methodology viz. the issue of cultural methodology, CS during group-work, peer group teaching, and Jacobson's (1981) New Concurrent Approach.

In conjunction with the various issues I have discussed concerning CS, CS in the classroom also raises the issue of a culturally relevant methodology. What this means for teachers, following the OBE principles of "high expectations" (i.e. teachers should have high expectations of achievement from their learners) and "expanded opportunity" (i.e. teachers must strive to provide maximum opportunities for learners to achieve specified outcomes), is that they must know where their learners come from in the sense of the knowledge they bring with them into the classroom and their level of language competence, and adopt attitudes of inclusivity. This means drawing on learners' own cultural values and home language(s). By including the learners' culture and language in the classroom learners will see how languages and real worlds meet as partners of equal worth.

CS also has implications for group-work in the classroom. While it is much easier to supervise and control learner talk in a one-to-one interaction in the classroom, this is no easy task during group-work, especially in large classrooms as those of this study. However, the skilled teacher will draw on his/her resources to ensure that each group does not escape supervision - unsupervised group-discussions, as this study reveals, facilitates irresponsible use of CS which is detrimental to the learning process. Indeed, unsupervised group-work might lend itself to

degenerative use of CS where the learners' NL becomes the matrix language and learners have no practice in speaking the L2 at all. Therefore, while teachers encourage learners to use their mother tongue when and where they deem necessary, they must also be informed that they are not to do so extensively. Hence, group-work activities must be closely monitored so that learner talk is mostly in the target language and not the mother-tongue. Learners must also be encouraged to assist one another in framing ideas initially conjured in the NL into L2 equivalents, so that, the presentation of the product is done in the L2. In this way, the L2 is promoted and learners are better equipped for test and examination requirements.

In classes of mixed language groups and/or varying linguistic abilities such as that of the English L1 classroom of this study, teachers can draw on the skills of the more proficient learners of the target language, who by resorting to CS with their peers, would help them achieve the specified outcomes of the lesson. Kamwangamalu and Virasamy (1999), for example, show that peer-tutoring which occurs towards the end of a lesson, intended to summarize a lesson, ensures that less proficient learners acquire complete rather than partial understanding of what was discussed. Where learners are unclear about what is being taught and uncertain about how to, for example, frame a question in the target language, a more proficient learner can help him/her phrase his/her question. Once again, learners must be encouraged to use the L2 as much as possible and be warned of the dangers of over-using the mother-tongue.

Finally, in view of the foregoing discussions on the role of CS in promoting language learning, enhancing communicative competence, fulfilling the specific outcomes of the LLC in the OBE

curriculum and CLT, and the role of learners' NL in fostering L2 development, it seems that for CS to be employed as a strategy in fulfilling social, psychological and pedagogical functions there needs to exist an element of consciousness when one engages in CS behaviour. My findings show, as discussed in Chapter Three, that for the majority of the subject advisors and educators, CS is mostly a conscious phenomenon that is employed to serve certain functions and thus has implications for methodology. Hence, I briefly examine Jacobson's (1981) *New Concurrent Approach* (NCA) which is a structured approach to using CS, based on the premise that CS is a conscious strategy, as a possible way of enhancing effective CS in the classroom. While I do not fully agree with the proposed structure of the NCA for using CS for pedagogical purposes (e.g. that switching patterns be controlled in two ways: (i) only inter-sentential switching is allowed, and (ii) all language switching is teacher-initiated), we can draw from the proposed strategies and incorporate language switching strategies that are endemic to the communities served by the school and adapt them for teaching the content and developing language skills. In the NCA approach, clear guidelines on when the use of learners' mother-tongue is appropriate, are given. Jacobson (1981:19) identifies 16 cues, under the broad categories of: (i) classroom strategies, (ii) curriculum, (iii) language development, and (iv) interpersonal relationships, for initiating switches to the mother-tongue. According to Ovando and Collier (1985:85), this approach coerces teachers to avoid direct translation and to develop natural flow from one language to the other at appropriate times without repetition. If such an approach is incorporated in curriculum planning, teachers, and more specifically, teacher trainees, will see that CS can be used creatively and effectively in the classroom. As the NCA presupposes CS as a conscious strategy, and my research shows that for the majority of the educators, CS is mostly a conscious phenomenon, this

technique can be considered in curriculum planning. Finally, although I have focused on implications for L2 teachers and teaching, my findings also have relevance and implications for teachers of the other Key Learning Areas, as ultimately, *every* teacher is in some way or the other a language teacher.

5.4 LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

As stated at the outset, my study is a relatively small one in that it is based only on three schools, one from each of the exNED, exHOD and exDET schools in the Port Shepstone region of the Sayidi district of KZN. Hence, my findings are directly relevant to the three schools where the study was conducted. In addition, certain unaccounted for factors could have influenced the findings of which the reader needs to be aware of. Firstly, with regard to the questionnaires, one cannot be overly confident that respondents answered 'honestly' as they were requested to, or whether they unconsciously provided responses in a way that presented them in what they perceived to be a favourable light, for example, by providing politically correct answers or what they thought I, as a researcher, approved of. Also, the questionnaires were designed in English and the majority of the respondents were non-native language speakers of English; one may not assume that every question was understood by every respondent although every effort was made to create an accessible questionnaire. More particularly, the learners, for whom the questionnaire was simplified, were more likely to have experienced varying levels of difficulty. In addition, the fact that the questionnaire was in English could have subtly affected participants' responses in favour of English.

Secondly, with regard to the interviews, like the questionnaires, the interviews were conducted in English with both English NL and non-NL speakers alike although some effort was made in conducting interviews with Zulu NL SGB members in their mother-tongue. Although every effort was made at ensuring a miscommunication-free interview, making the interviewee as comfortable as possible, and keeping the interviewee ignorant of my own views on the subject, there is no guarantee that my use of only English did not influence interviewees' responses. My own use of English and the fact that I am an English NL speaker, might have unconsciously influenced interviewees in providing English-favoured responses. In addition, as mentioned in the literature, the concept 'attitude' itself is a rather subjective one and cannot be easily converted to an objective unit of measure. Thus, there might be no correlation between what respondents claim about their feelings or opinions and their actual feelings or opinions. Furthermore, one needs to consider the issue of the *Observer's Paradox*; Labov (1972:209) states :

"The aim of linguistic research in the community must be to find out how people talk when they are not being systematically observed; yet we can only obtain these data by systematic observation."

The presence of the tape recorder during interviews would have, in varying degrees, affected the responses of the interviewees. For example, being conscious that they were being taped (especially those for whom being interviewed and/or tape-recording their voices was a first time experience), interviewees might have been more careful about how they framed their responses, their choice of words and so on, than they would otherwise have done had they been asked the same questions without their knowledge that they were being interviewed or that the interview was being recorded.

Thirdly, the issue of the *Observer's Paradox* (Labov 1972) is also applicable to the lesson recordings. The principal educator participants of the study i.e. the teachers who recorded the lessons, being fully aware that the recordings were required for research purposes, would have been, for example, more wary about implementing or incorporating methods recommended by OBE, and more conscious of their speech patterns. Indeed, I do believe that while this did not have significant impact on my findings based on the English medium and English-Zulu medium schools of this study, it did have a significant impact on my findings at the Afrikaans medium school. As I have discussed in Chapter Four, although the learner interviewees of School A indicated that *some* CS does occur in the LLCE classes, there was no evidence of it in the lesson recordings. The reason for this, as I have suggested, is that CS at the school is proscribed and any concrete evidence of it might jeopardize the position of the teacher.

Finally, my findings lead me to make the following suggestions: Firstly, there is need for extensive study to investigate language attitudes and attitudes toward CS: (i) More secondary schools should form the bases of study; (ii) as this study investigated the attitudes toward language and CS behaviour in the senior phase (i.e. Grades 7, 8 and 9) OBE classrooms, the Grade 7 learners who are based in the primary schools should also be incorporated; (iii) the study could be extended to the various Key Learning Areas (KLAs) of the GET¹ phase; and (iv) more parents should be involved as participants of the study. Secondly, as there is such an influx of Zulu NL speakers in English medium schools, there is need for further investigation of the role of the NL of ESL speakers in multilingual English L1 classrooms. Thirdly, in light of the phasing

¹ General Education and Training phase which comprises learners from Grade 1 to Grade 9

in of the FET¹ band, there is need for investigating the role of the NL in this phase as well. Fourthly, to my knowledge, none of the books on teaching methodology in the languages (and the other KLAS) show how CS can be used as a technique in the classroom. I firmly believe that it is imperative that authors of methodology include CS as technique in language teaching and bring these materials into the classroom. When educators see examples of CS in use in print, it will surely foreground CS as one of the many ways that language can be acquired in the OBE classroom. Lastly, where financial constraints are not a determining factor in methods employed in conducting research, the language used when designing questionnaires and conducting interviews should be that of the respondent and interviewee in an effort to overcome the limitations that the language employed might have on the findings of a study.

5.5 CONCLUSION

To conclude, I have, in this study, examined two main issues: Firstly, I have examined the attitudes of education stake-holders toward the languages studied for examination purposes in KZN, viz. English, Afrikaans and Zulu, as well as attitudes toward CS between these three languages. Secondly, I have investigated the use of CS in the LLC, senior phase classrooms of the secondary school. By presenting the data obtained from my investigation on both these issues I have shown that although Afrikaans and Zulu share equal status in KZN, Zulu is the most desired additional African language at schools. I have also shown that CS is a natural phenomenon in the educational domain of this study. I have elucidated the value of CS in LLCE

¹ Further Education and Training phase which comprises learners from Grade 10 to Grade 12

(L1 and L2) and LLCA (L2) classrooms facilitated by teachers who share learners' linguistic repertoire. I have also demonstrated that there appears to be a marked shift in attitudes towards CS, from negative to positive ones, particularly by the educator and subject advisor participants of this study, even though the majority of the English NL and Zulu NL participants of the study express their desire for English as LOLT. In addition, I have suggested that bilingual education, through the use of concurrent technique is of benefit to both L1 and L2 acquisition in the schools of my study and has implications for the various stake-holders of pedagogy. Furthermore, I have drawn attention to the limitations of this study and suggested the need for extensive studies in the senior phase in not only the LLC classroom but in other Key Learning Areas as well. Moreover, education stake-holders need to acknowledge that CS is a common linguistic feature in Port Shepstone, and no doubt in the province of KwaZulu Natal and the country itself, and promises to be the common way in which bilingualism is expressed in this context. This is because, even if learners' NL is proscribed at schools, learners will make use of it naturally. Finally, for multilingualism to be truly promoted at schools, the Department of Education must make funds available by investing in educators who can serve as resourceful vehicles for the promotion of both English and the indigenous languages.

REFERENCES

- ADEA. (Association for the Development of Education in Africa). 1996. "The role of African languages in education and the sustainable development." *Newsletter*, 18(4). Retrieved April 27, 2002 from <http://www.adeanet.org/newsletter/Vol 18 No 4/ en-n8v4-2.html>
- Adendorff, R. 1992. "The social meaning of English in South Africa (or: Don't you kick my teddybear!)." *CRUX*, 26(1): 50-62.
- Adendorff, R. 1993. "Code-switching amongst Zulu-speaking teachers and their pupils: Its functions and implications for teacher education." *Southern African Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 2(1): 3-27.
- Agheyisi, R. 1977. "Language interlarding in the speech of Nigerians." In Kotey, P.F.A. & Der-Houssikian. *Language and linguistic problems in Africa*. Columbia, SC: Hornbeam Press.
- Ajzen, I. 1988. *Attitudes, personality and behaviour*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Alexander, N. 1999. "English unassailable but unattainable: The dilemma of language policy in South African education." Retrieved April 26, 2002 from <http://www.und.ac.za/und/ling/archive/alex-01.html>
- Alexander, N. 2001. "Global English: Where English can serve but not empower." *The Guardian Weekly*. Macmillan Publishers Ltd. Retrieved April 27, 2002 from Onestop Forum. <http://www.onestopenglish.com/Culture/global/english.htm>
- Altrichter, H., Posch, P. & Somekh, B. 1993. *Teachers investigate their work: An introduction to the methods of action research*. New York: Routledge.
- Alvarez, A.I. 1979. *Code-switching among bilingual children*. PhD. University of Massachusetts. U.S.A.
- ANC (African National Congress). 1993. Education and Training Policy Conference. Draft Policy for Education. Pretoria.
- ANC. 1994. Education and Training Policy Conference. Document for adoption: Policy Commitments. Draft for discussion. Pretoria. (15-17 April 1994).
- ANC. 1994. Education Policy. Draft: For discussion purposes. A Policy Framework for Education and Training. (January 1994). Education Department. Pretoria. Retrieved

- April 26, 2002 from
http://www.sas.upenn.edu/African_Studies/Govern_Political/ANC_Education.html
- Appel, R. & Muysken, P. 1987. *Language contact and bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Atkinson, D. 1987. "The mother tongue in the classroom: A neglected resource?" *ELT Journal*, 41(4): 241-247.
- Auer, P. (ed.). 1998. *Code-switching in conversation, language interaction and identity*. London: Routledge.
- Auerbach, E.R. 1993. "Re-examining English only in the ESL classroom." *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1): 9-32 .
- Austin, J.L. 1962. *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baker, C. 1988. *Key issues in bilingualism and bilingual education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C. 1992. *Attitudes and language*. Multilingual Matters 83. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Baker, O.R. 1980. "Categories of code-switching in Hispanic communities: Untangling the terminology." *Working Papers in Sociolinguistics*, 74-80.
- Barnes, L.A. 1993. "Bilingual code-switching: Function and form." *South African Journal of Linguistics*, 20: 269-284.
- Bas, M. 2001. "An Introduction to Afrikaans." In *De Roepstem: An English introduction to De Roepstem*. Retrieved October 11, 2002 from
<http://members.tripod.com/roepstem/engels.html>
- Becker, C.B. 1988. "Reasons for the lack of argumentation and debate in the Far East." In Samovar, L.A. & Porter, R.E. (eds.). *Intercultural Communication: A Reader*. 5th edition. Newbury House: Rowley, MA.
- Bickerton, D. 1981. *Roots of Language*. Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers Inc.
- Blom, J.P. & Gumperz, J.J. 1972. "Social meaning in linguistic structure: Code-switching in Norway." In Gumperz, J. & Hymes, D. (eds.). *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Incorporation.
- Blommaert, J. 1992. "Code-switching and the exclusivity of social identities: Some data from

- Campus Kiswahili." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 13(1/2): 57-70.
- Blum-Kulka, S. 1980. "Interpreting and performing speech acts in a second language." Paper presented at the *9th Linguistic Symposium*. University of Wisconsin. Milwaukee. (March 1980).
- Bokamba, E.G. 1988. "Code-mixing, language variation, and linguistic theory: Evidence from Bantu languages." *Lingua*, 76: 21-62.
- Bolitho, R. 1983. "Talking Shop: The communicative teaching of English in non-English-speaking countries." *ELT Journal*, 37 (3): 235-242.
- Bonville, W. 1986. "Who's who in outcome based education (OBE)?" Retrieved April 11, 2002 from http://home.cdsnet.net/_bonville/Education/Who is Who in OBE.html
- Bonville, W. 1988. "What is outcome based education? A white knight to the rescue or a disaster in the making?" Retrieved April 11, 2002 from http://home.cdsnet.net/_bonville/Education/WhatIsOBE?
- Brandt, R. 1992. "On outcome based education: A conversation with Bill Spady." In *Educational Leadership*, 50(4): 66-70. Retrieved October 15, 2002 from <http://people.uncw.edu/rivenbarkk/301/outcomebs.html>
- Brandt, R. 1994. "The challenge of outcome-based education: Overview - Is outcome-based education dead?" In *Educational Leadership*, 51(6). Retrieved October 15, 2002 from <http://www.ascd.org/readingroom/edlead/9403/overview.html>
- Brice, A. 2000. "Language needs for culturally and linguistically diverse students." Workshop presented at the weekend with the experts. Retrieved June 09, 2002 from <http://asha.ucf.edu/weekendexperts.html>
- Brown, H.D. 1994. *Principles of language learning and teaching*. 3rd edition. Prentice Hall Regents. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. 1978. "Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena." In Goody, E. (ed.). *Questions and politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Byrnes, H. 1991. "In search of a sense of place: The state of art in language teaching

- methodology.” In Alatis, J.E. (ed.). *Linguistics and language pedagogy: The state of art*. Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics. Washington D. C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Cameron, D., Frazer, E., Harvey, P., Rampton, B. & Richardson, K. “Ethics, advocacy and empowerment in researching language.” In Coupland, N. & Jaworski, A. (eds.). 1997. *Sociolinguistics: A reader and coursebook*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Campbell, R. & Wales, R. 1970. “The study of language acquisition.” In Lyons, J. (ed.). *Problems of language and learning*. London: Heinemann.
- Canagarajah, A.S. 1999. *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Canale, M. 1983. “From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy.” In Stevenson, I.A. 1992. *Sociolinguistics for applied linguistics*. Reader for HSOPER-U. UNISA, 268-293.
- Canale, M. & Swain, M. 1979. “Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing.” *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1): 1- 47.
- Cannell, C.F. & Khan, R.L. 1968. “Interviewing.” In Lindzey, G. & Aronson, A. (eds.). *The Handbook of Social Psychology. Vol. 2: Research Methods*. New York: Addison Wesley.
- Case, D. *Love, David*. 1986. Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman (Pty). Ltd.
- Centre for Education Policy Development (CEPD).1994. Implementation plan for education and training. Report of the Language in Education Task Team. (April 1994).
- Chick, K. & McKay, S. 1999. “Teaching English in multiethnic schools in the Durban area: The promotion of multilingualism or monolingualism?” Paper presented at the *1999 Annual Conference for Language Teachers*. University of Natal. Durban.(August 1999). Retrieved April 12, 2002 from <http://www.und.ac.za/und/ling/archive/chic-04.html>
- Chomsky, N. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Christensen, D. 2002. “The ABC’s of OBE.” Retrieved March 08, 2003 from <http://members.tripod.com/bcbruns/obe.htm>
- Cluver, A.D. de V. 2000. “The stigmatization of Khoekhoegowap in Namibia.” *Language*

Problems and Language Planning, 24(1): 77-100.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. 2001. 5th edition. *Research methods in education*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Collingham, M. 1988. "Making use of students' linguistic resources." In Nicholls, S. & Hoadley-Maidment, E. (eds.). *Current issues in teaching English as a second language to adults*. London: Edward Arnold.

Communicative Language Teaching. 2000. Part 1-5. Retrieved April 11, 2002 from <http://www.aber.ac.uk/education-odl/clteach.html>

Corsaro, W.A. 1981. "Entering the child's world: Research strategies for field entry and data collection in a preschool setting." In Green, J.L. & Wallat, C. (eds.). *Ethnography and language in educational settings*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Corson, D. 1997. "Social justice in the work of ESL teachers." In Eggington, W. & Wren, H. (eds.). *Language policy: Dominant English, pluralist challenges*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Cummins, J. 1981. "The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students." In California State Department of Education (ed.). *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework*, 3-49. California State University. Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Centre. Los Angeles.

Cummins, J. 1989. "Language and literacy acquisition in bilingual contexts." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 10(1): 17-31.

Cummins, J. 1999. "Bilingual children's mother tongue: Why is it not important for education?" Retrieved September 13, 2003 from <http://www.iteachilearn.com/cummins/mother.htm>

Cummins, J. & Swain, M. 1986. *Bilingualism in education*. London: Edward Arnold.

Dagut, S. 1999. "Eleven won't go into one." *Focus 16: Language Policy*. Retrieved April 12, 2002 from <http://www.hsf.org.za/focus/f1Eleven-one.html>

Davenport, T.R.H. 1991. 4th edition. *South Africa: A modern history*. London: Macmillan Publishers.

- de Klerk, V. (ed.). 1996. "Focus on South African varieties around the world." *General Series*. Vol.15. Görlach, M. (series ed.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- de Mejía, A-M. 1998. "Bilingual storytelling: Code-switching, discourse control, and learning opportunities." *TESOL Journal*, 7(6): 4-10.
- DOE (Department of Education). 1997a. Curriculum 2005: Learning for the 21st century. Pretoria.
- DOE. 1997b. Curriculum 2005: Lifelong learning for the 21st century. A user's guide (March 1997). Retrieved October 17, 2002 from <http://www.polity.org.za/govdocs/misc/curr2005.html>
- DOE. 1997c. Curriculum 2005: Preface. Discussion Document: Specific outcomes, assessment criteria, range statements. (April 1997). Retrieved October 17, 2002 from <http://www.polity.org.za/govdocs/discuss/curric1.html>
- DOE. 1997d. Policy document. Senior phase (Grades 7-9). KwaZulu Natal.(October 1997).
- DOE. 1997e. Discussion document on the learning area Language, Literacy and Communication. Pretoria.
- DOE. 1997f. Language in education policy.(14 July 1997). Retrieved April 12, 2002 from <http://www.polity.org.za/govdocs/policy/edulangpolicy.html>
- DOE. 1997g. Language Policy in Education. Statement by Prof. SME Bengu, Minister of education. "A new language policy in general and further education." (14 July 1997). Retrieved April 26, 2002 from <http://www.polity.org.za/govdocs/misc/lnqpol.html>
- DOE. 2000a. A South African Curriculum for the twenty first century. Report of the review committee on Curriculum 2005. Presented to the Minister of Education, Professor Kader Asmal. Pretoria. (31 May 2000). Retrieved April 26, 2002 from <http://www.polity.org.za/govdocs/reports/education/curric2005/curric2005.htm>
- DOE. 2000b. A South African Curriculum for the twenty first century. Alexander and PRAESA submission. Appendix 2. Proposed scope of new learning areas. Pretoria.
- DOE. 2002. Curriculum 2005 and outcome-based education. Retrieved October 17, 2002 from <http://www.juta.co.za/academic/Schools/Copy/obe.htm>
- Duran, L. 1994. "Toward a better understanding of code-switching and interlanguage in

bilinguality: Implications for bilingual instruction." *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students*, 14: 69-88.

Duranti, A. 1997. *Linguistic Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eastman, C.M. 1992. "Code-switching as an urban language contact phenomenon." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 13(1/2): 1-17.

Edwards, J.R. 1982. "Language attitudes and their implications among English speakers." In Ryan, E.B. & Giles, H. *Attitudes toward language variation: Social and applied contexts*. London: Edward Arnold Publishers.

Eldridge, J. 1996. "Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school." *ELT Journal*, 50(4): 303-311.

Ellis, R. 1984. *Classroom second language development*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Ellis, R. 1985. *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Epstein, N. 1977. *Language, ethnicity, and the schools: Policy alternatives for bilingual-bicultural education*. Washington University: Institute of Educational Leadership. Washington D.C.

Erikson, F. 1986. "Qualitative methods in research on teaching." In Wittrock, M.C. (ed.). *Handbook of research on teaching*. New York: MacMillan.

Faltis, C.J. 1989. "Code-switching and bilingual schooling: An examination of Jacobson's new concurrent approach." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 10(2): 117-127.

Finlayson, R. & Slabbert, S. 1997. "I'll meet you halfway with language: Code-switching within a South African urban context." In Putz, M. (ed.). *Language choices, conditions, constraints and consequences*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Fishman, J.A. 1978. "Positive bilingualism: Some overlooked rationales and forefathers." In Alatis, J.E. (ed.). *International dimensions of bilingual education*. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Fishman, J.A. 1982. "Sociology of English as an additional language." In Kachru, B.B. *The other tongue, English across cultures*. New York: Pergamon Press.

- Fishman, J.A. & Giles, H. 1978. "Language in Society." In Tajfel, H. and Fraser, C. (eds.). *Introducing Social Psychology*. Hammondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Flowers, D.A. 2000. "Code-switching and ebonics in urban adult basic education classrooms." *Education and Urban Society*, 32(2): 221-237.
- Franceschini, R.1998. "Code-switching and the notion of code in linguistics: Proposal for a dual focus model." In Auer, P. (ed.). *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge.
- French, F.G. 1963. "Translation." In Byrne, D. (ed.). *English Teaching Extracts*. London: Longman.
- Gardner, R.C. 1985. *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold Press.
- Gardner, R.C. & Lambert, W.E. 1972. *Attitudes and motivation in second-language learning*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Garrett, P., Griffiths, Y., James, C. & Scholfield, P. 1994. "Use of the mother-tongue in second language classrooms: An experimental investigation of effects on the attitudes and writing performance of bilingual UK school children." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 15(5): 371-383.
- Gibb, M. 1998. "A comparative study of attitudes towards varieties of English held by professionals and tertiary level students in Korea." Retrieved March 29, 2001 from <http://www.survey.ac.uk/ELI/gibbm.html>
- Gibbons, J. 1979. "Code-mixing and koineising in the speech of students at the University of Hong Kong." *Anthropological Linguistics*, 21(3): 113-123.
- Gibbons, J. 1983. "Attitudes toward languages and code-mixing in Hong Kong." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 4: 129-147.
- Gibbons, J. 1987. *Code-mixing and code-choice: A Hong Kong case study*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Gibbons, J. 1994. "Depth or breadth: Some issues in LOTE teaching." *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 17(1): 1-22.
- Gila, B.N. 1995. *An investigation into the role of code-switching in classroom interaction in*

- Transkei junior secondary schools*. MA Thesis. Dept. of Linguistics. University of Natal. Durban.
- Govender, R. 1996. "An Incomplete Human Being." In *At the edge and other Cato Manor stories*. Pretoria: R.G. Govender and MANX.
- Goyvaerts, D. L. 1995. "Review article: Code-switching - The African connection." *JALL*, 16: 171-186.
- Gracia, E. 1991. *Education of linguistically and culturally diverse students: Effective instruction practices*. Santa Cruz CA: National Centre for Research on cultural diversity and second language teaching.
- Granville, S., Janks, H., Mphahlele, M., Reed, Y., Watson, P., Joseph, M & Ramani, E. 1998. "English with or without g(u)ilt: A position paper on language in education policy for South Africa." *Language and Education*, 12(4): 254-272.
- Grice, H.P. 1975. "Logic and conversation." In Cole, P. & Morgan, J.L. (eds.). *Syntax and semantics*, iii. New York: Academic Press.
- Grobler, J. 1988. *A decisive clash?* Pretoria: Arcadia.
- Grosjean, F. 1985. "The bilingual as a competent but specific speaker-hearer." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 6(6): 467-477.
- Gultig, J., Lubisi, C., Parker, B. & Wedekind, V. (eds.). 1998. *Understanding outcome-based education. Teaching and assessment in South Africa*. Reader. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Gumperz, J.J. 1976a. "Language, communication and public negotiation." In Sanday, P. (ed.). 1976. *Anthropology and the public interest: Fieldwork and theory*. New York: Academic Press.
- Gumperz, J.J. 1976b. "The sociolinguistic significance of conversational code-switching." In Cook, J. & Gumperz J.J. (eds.). *Papers on language and context*. Working Paper, 46: Language Research Laboratory. University of California.
- Gumperz, J.J. 1977. "Sociocultural knowledge in conversational inference." In Saviile-Troike, M. (ed.). 1977. *Linguistics and anthropology*. Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics. Washington D. C.: Georgetown University Press.

- Gumperz, J.J. 1981a. "Conversational inference and classroom learning." In Green, J.L. & Wallat, C. (eds.). *Ethnography and language in educational settings*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Gumperz, J.J. 1981b. "The linguistic bases of communicative competence." In Tannen, D. (ed.). *Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk*. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1981. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Gumperz, J.J. 1982a. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J.J. (ed.). 1982b. *Language and social identity: Studies in interactional sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J.J. 1997. "Communicative competence." In Coupland, N. & Jaworski, A. (eds.). *Sociolinguistics: A reader and coursebook*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Gumperz J.J. & Herasimchuk, E. 1975. "The conversational analysis of social meaning: A study of classroom interaction." In Sanches, M. & Blount, B.G. (eds.). *Sociocultural dimensions of language use*. New York: Academic Press. Inc.
- Gumperz J.J. & Hernandez-Chavez, E. 1971. "Bilingualism, biculturalism and classroom interaction." In Cazden, C., John, V. & Hymes, D. *The functions of language in the classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gumperz, J.J. & Hymes, D. (eds.). 1972. *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Incorporation.
- Gumperz, J.J. & Tannen, D. 1979. "Individual and social differences in language use." In Wang, W. & Fillmore, C. (eds.). *Individual differences in language ability and language behaviour*. New York: Academic Press.
- Gxilishe, D.S. 1992. "Conversational code-switching." *South African Journal of African Languages*, 12(3): 93-97.
- Hager, P., Gonczi, A. & Athanasou, J. 1994. "About assessing competence." In Gultig, J., Lubisi, C., Parker, B. & Wedekind, V. (eds.). 1998. *Understanding outcome-based education: Teaching and assessment in South Africa*. Reader, 55-57. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Hammersley, M. 1994. "Introducing ethnography." In Graddol, D., Maybin, J. & Stierer, B.

- (eds.). *Researching language and literacy in social context*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Hammink, J.E. 2000. *A comparison of the code-switching behaviour and knowledge of adults and children*. University of Texas. El Paso. Retrieved September 13, 2002 from http://hamminkj.tripod.com/babelCS_paper.htm
- Hartley, A.F. 1982. *Linguistics for language learners*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Hasman, M.A. 2000. "The role of English in the 21st century." *Forum*, 38(1). Retrieved April 03, 2002 from <http://e.usia.gov/forum/vols/vol38/no1/p2.htm>
- Hatch, E. 1976. "Studies in language switching and mixing." In McCormack, W. & Wurm, S.A. (eds.). *Language and man. Anthropological issues*. The Hague, Paris: Mouton Publishers.
- Hawks, P. 2001. "Making distinctions: A discussion of the use of the mother tongue in the foreign language classroom." *Hwa Kang Journal of TEFL*. Retrieved September 13, 2002 from <http://www.geocities.com/CollegePark/Classroom/1930/Journal/M.../Hawks-Tongue.htm>
- Heller, M. 1988. *Codeswitching, anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hitchcock, G. & Hughes, D. 1995. 2nd edition. *Research and the teacher: A qualitative introduction to school-based research*. New York: Routledge.
- Hoffmann, C. 1991. *An introduction to bilingualism*. U.K.: Longman Group U.K. Ltd.
- Hohenthal, A. 1998. *English in India: A study of language attitudes*. MA Thesis. University of Turku. South Asia. Retrieved September 03, 2002 from <http://www.thecore.nus.edu.sg/landow/post/india/hohenthal/1.html>
- Huerta, A.G. 1978. *Code-switching among Spanish-English bilinguals: A sociolinguistic perspective*. PhD dissertation. University of Texas. Austin.
- Hymes, D. 1972a. "Models of interaction of language and social life." In Gumperz, J. & Hymes, D. (eds.). *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Incorporation.
- Hymes, D. 1972b. "On communicative competence." In Pride, J.B. & Holmes, J. (eds.). *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

- Jacobson, R. 1978. "Code-switching in South Texas - Sociolinguistic considerations and pedagogical applications." *The Journal of the Linguistic Association of the Southwest*, 31: 20-32.
- Jacobson, R. 1981. "The implementation of a bilingual instruction model: The new concurrent approach." In Padilla, R.V. (ed.). *Ethnoperspectives in bilingual education research. Vol 3: Bilingual education technology*. Ypsilanti: M. I. Eastern Michigan University.
- Jacobson, R. (ed.). 1998. *Codeswitching worldwide*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Johnson, K. & Morrow, K. (eds.). 1981. *Communication in the classroom: Applications and methods for a communicative approach*. England: Longman Group Limited.
- Kachru, B.B. 1978. "Code -mixing as a communicative strategy in India." In Alatis, J.E. (ed.). *International dimensions of bilingual education*. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Kachru, B.B. 1982. *The other tongue, English across cultures*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Kachru, B.B. 1996. "Opening borders with world Englishes. Theory in the classroom." In *JAALT 96: Crossing Borders. The Proceedings of the 23rd Annual JALT International Conference on Language Teaching/Learning*. Hiroshima, Japan: 10-20.
- Kamwangamalu, N.M. 1989. "Code-mixing and modernization." *World Englishes*, 8(3): 321-332.
- Kamwangamalu, N.M. 1992 " 'Mixers' and 'Mixing': English across cultures." *World Englishes*, 1(2-3): 173-181.
- Kamwangamalu, N.M. 1994. "siSwati-English code-switching: The matrix language principle and linguistic constraints." *South African Journal of African Languages*, 14(2): 70-77.
- Kamwangamalu, N.M. 1997. "Multilingualism and education policy in post-apartheid South Africa." *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 21(3): 234-253.
- Kamwangamalu, N.M. 1998a. "Preface: Multilingualism in South Africa." *Multilingua*, 17(2-3): 119-123.
- Kamwangamalu, N.M. 1998b . " 'We-codes', 'they-codes', and 'codes-in-between': Identities of English and code-switching in post-apartheid South Africa." *Multilingua*, 17(2-3): 277-296.
- Kamwangamalu, N.M. 1999. "The state of code-switching research at the dawn of the new

- millennium (1): Focus on the global context." *South African Journal of Linguistics*, 17(4): 256-277.
- Kamwangamalu, N.M. 2002. "English in South Africa at the millennium: Challenges and prospects." *World Englishes*, 1: 161-163.
- Kamwangamalu, N.M. & Virasamy, C. 1999. "Zulu peer tutoring in a multi-ethnic English-only classroom." *Journal for Language Teaching*, 33(1): 60-71.
- Kgomoeswana, V.N. 1993. "The case against code-switching in multilingual classrooms." *ELTIC Reporter*, 17(2): 13-16.
- Kharm, N.N. & Hajjaj, A.H. 1989. "Use of the mother tongue in the ESL Classroom." *IRAL*, 27(3): 224-235.
- Kieswetter, A. 1995. "Code-switching amongst African high school pupils." *Occasional Papers in African Linguistics*. Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand Press.
- Killen, R. 2000. *Teaching strategies for outcome based education*. Juta and Company Ltd. Lansdowne. Orchard Publishing. Ndabeni, Western Cape: The Rustical Press.
- Killen, R. 2002. "Outcomes based education: Some issues to consider in the South African context." (Working document). University of Newcastle. Australia. Faculty of Education and Arts.
- Krashen, S.D. 1984. *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Kvale, S. 1996. *Interviews*. London: Sage Publications.
- Labov, W. 1972. *Sociolinguistic patterns*. University of Pennsylvania Press. Philadelphia.
- Labov, W. 1984. "Field methods of the project on linguistic change and variation." In Baugh, J. & Sherzer, J. (eds.). *Language in use*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. 1986. *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lawrence, D. 1999. "Kodewisseling: Engels in Afrikaans - 'n instrument tot effektiewe kommunikasie." *Journal for Language Teaching*, 33(3): 265-274.
- Lenake, J. M. 1993. "Die toekomstige status en funksies van die inheemse Afrikatale: Suid-Sotho." In Swanepoel, P.H. and Pietrse, H.J. (eds.). *Perspectives on language planning for*

South Africa. UNISA. South Africa.

- Likert, R.A. 1932. *A Technique for the measurement of attitudes*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Littlewood, W. 1981. *Communicative language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Local Government of South Africa: Official Yearbook*. 1999. Johannesburg: The Gaffney Group.
- Loveday, L. 1982. *The sociolinguistics of learning and using a non-native language*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Lucas, T., Henze, R. & Donato, R. 1990. "Promoting the success of Latino language-minority students: An exploratory study of six high schools." *Harvard Educational Review*, 60: 315-340.
- Lucas, T. & Katz, A. 1994. "Reframing the debate: The roles of native language in English-only programs for language minority students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(3): 537-561.
- Luckett, K. 1993. "Behind bilingualism." *Bau! (Formerly Language Projects Review)*, 8 (2): 20-21.
- Marawu, S. 1997. *A case study of English/ Xhosa code-switching as a communicative and learning resource in an English medium classroom*. M.Ed. Thesis. Dept. of English Second Language. Rhodes University.
- Marivate, C.T.D. 1993. "The cultural significance of the indigenous languages in a post-apartheid South Africa." In Swanepoel, P.H. & Pietrse, H.J. (eds.). *Perspectives on language planning for South Africa*. UNISA. South Africa.
- Martin, D. 1997. "Towards a new multilingual language policy in education in South Africa: Different approaches to meet different needs." *Educational Review*, 49(2): 129-138.
- Martin, P.W. 1996. "Code-switching in the primary classroom: One response to the planned and unplanned language environment in Brunei." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 17(2/4): 128-148.
- Martin-Jones, M. 1995. "Code-switching in the classroom: Two decades of research." In Milroy, L. & Muysken, P. (eds.). *One speaker, two languages. Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Mawasha, A.L. 1993. "The way they were, so they shall be again: The future of African languages in South Africa." In Swanepoel, P.H. & Pietrse, H.J. (eds.). *Perspectives on language planning for South Africa*. UNISA. South Africa.
- McClure, E. 1981. "Formal and functional aspects of the code-switched discourse of bilingual children." In Duran, R.P. (ed.). *Latino language and communicative behaviour*. New Jersey: ABLEX Publishing Corporation.
- McClure, E. & McClure, M. 1988. "Macro- and micro- sociolinguistic dimensions of code-switching in Vingard." In Heller, M. (ed.). *Codeswitching, anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- McCormick, K. 1995. "Code-switching, code-mixing and convergence in Cape Town." In Mesthrie, R. (ed.). *Language and social history, studies in South African sociolinguistics*. South Africa: David Philip Publishers Pty. Ltd.
- McDonough, J. & McDonough, S. 1997. *Research methods for English language teachers*. New York: St Martin's Press Inc.
- McKay, S. 1982. "Literature in the ESL classroom." *TESOL Quarterly*, 16(4): 529-536.
- McLaughlin, B. 1995. "Fostering second language development in young children: Principles and practices." Educational Practice: Report 14. Retrieved March 27, 2002 from <http://www.ncbe.gwu.edu/miscpubs/ncrcdssl/epr14.htm>
- McNeir, G. 1993. "Outcome based education." *ERIC Digest*, 85. Retrieved April 11, 2002 from http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed363914.html
- Meeuwis, M. & Blommaert, J. 1994. "Review article: The 'Markedness Model' and the absence of society. Remarks on code-switching." *Multilingua*, 13(4): 387- 423.
- Merritt, M., Cleghorn, A., Abagi, J. & Bunyi, G. 1992. "Socialising multilingualism: Determinants of code-switching in Kenyan primary school classrooms." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 13(1-2): 103-121.
- Milroy, L. & Muysken, P. (eds.). 1995. *One speaker, two languages. Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moll, L. 1992. "Bilingual classroom studies and community analysis: Some recent trends." *Educational Researcher*, 21: 20-24.

- Moodley, V. 2001. *Code-switching as a technique in teaching literature in a secondary school ESL classroom*. MA Thesis. Dept. of Linguistics. University of Natal, Durban.
- Msimang, C.T. 1992. "The future status and function of Zulu in the new South Africa." *South African Journal of African Languages*, 12(4): 139-143.
- Murray-Smit, S. 2001. "What is Afrikaans?" *The Afrikaans Crow's nest*. Retrieved September 03, 2002 from <http://www.geocities.com/afrikaanse/watis.html>
- Myers-Scotton, C. 1983. "The negotiation of identities in conversation: A theory of markedness and code choice." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 44: 115-136.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 1987. "Code-switching and types of multilingual communities." In Lowenberg, P.H. (ed.). *Language spread and language policy: Issues, implications, and case studies*. Washington. D. C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 1988. "Patterns of bilingualism in East Africa (Uganda, Kenya, and Tanzania)." In Paulston, C.B. (ed.). *International handbook of bilingualism and bilingual education*. U.S.A.: Greenwood Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 1992. "Code-switching in Africa. A model of the social functions of code selection." In Herbert, R.K. (ed.). *Language and society in Africa. The theory and practice of sociolinguistics*. South Africa: Witwatersrand University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 1993a. *Duelling languages: Grammatical structure in code-switching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 1993b. *Social motivations for code-switching. Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clevedon Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. & Jake, J.L. 2001. "Explaining aspects of code-switching and their implications." In Nicol, J.L. (ed.). *One mind, two languages*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Myers-Scotton, C. & Ury, W. 1975. "Bilingual strategies: The social functions of code-switching." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 13: 5-20.
- Ncoko, S.O.S. 1998. *Code-switching among Black junior primary pupils in multiracial schools*. MA Thesis. Dept. of African Languages. Rand Afrikaans University. Johannesburg.

- Ndayipfukamiye, L. 1998. "Code-switching in Burundi primary classrooms." In Rubagumya, C.M. (ed.). *Teaching and researching language in African classrooms*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Ngugi, wa Thiongo. 1981. *Decolonizing the mind*. Nairobi: Heinemann.
- Ngugi, wa Thiongo. 1986. "Literature in schools." In Brumfit, C.J. & Carter, R.A. (eds.). *Literature and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nicholls, S. & Hoadley-Maidment, E. (eds.). 1988. *Current issues in teaching English as a second language to adults*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Norrish, J. 1997. "English or English? Attitudes, local varieties and English language teaching." *TESL-EJ*, 3(1). Retrieved March 29, 2001 from <http://www.kyoto.su.ac.jp/information/tesl-ej/ej09/a2.html>
- Nwoye, O.G. 1993. "Codeswitching as a conscious discourse strategy: Evidence from Igbo." *Multilingua*, 12(4): 365-385.
- Olivier, J. 2002. "South African languages: English." Retrieved September 12, 2002 from <http://www.cyberserve.co.za/users-jako/lang/eng.htm>
- Omnichek Division of Research Surveys. Durban News. 1994. "Africans opt for English. Facts and Figures." *BAU! (Formerly Language Projects Review)* 9 (1): 2.
- Orwell, G. 1945. *Animal Farm*. London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.
- Ovando, C.J. & Collier, V.P. 1985. *Bilingual and ESL classrooms: Teaching in multilingual contexts*. USA: Mc Graw-Hill Book Company.
- Pakir, A. 1998. "Connecting with English in the context of internalization." *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(11): 103-114.
- Pandor, N. 1995. "Constitutional multilingualism: Problems, possibilities, practicalities." In *Constitutionally enshrined multilingualism: Challenges and responses. Proceedings of the 5th Annual Conference of the Southern African Applied Linguistics Association (SAALA)*. Stellenbosch, 57-74.
- Peires, M-L. 1994. "Code-switching as an aid to L2 learning." *South African Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(1): 14-22.
- Pennycook, A. 1994. *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. London:

- Longman.
- Pfaff, C.W. 1997. "Contacts and conflicts: Perspectives from code-switching research." In Putz, M. (ed.). *Language choices, conditions, constraints, and consequences*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Phillipson, R. 1992. *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Piasecka, K. 1988. "The bilingual teacher in the ESL classroom." In Nicholls, S. & Hoadley-Maidment, E (eds.). *Current issues in teaching English as a second language to adults*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Poplack, S. 1980. "Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English y TERMINO EN ESPANOL: Toward a typology of code-switching." *Linguistics*, 18(5): 581-618.
- Poplack, S. 1981. "Syntactic structure and social function of code-switching." In Duran, R.P. (ed.). *Latino language and communicative behaviour*. New Jersey: ALEX Publishing Corporation.
- Poplack, S. 1987. "Language status and language accommodation along a linguistic border." In Lowenberg, P.H. (ed.). 1988. *Language spread and language policy: Issues, implications, and case studies*. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Richards, J.C., Platt, J. & Platt, H. 1992. 2nd edition. *Dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. U.K.: Longman Group U.K. Ltd. Group.
- Romaine, S. 1989. 2nd edition. *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Inc.
- Romanov, A. (n.d.). Abstract: "Attitudes toward recent Americanisms in the Russian language." Retrieved September 03, 2002 from <http://clover.slavic.pitt.edu/~djb/aatseel/1999/abstract-85.html>
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A. & Jefferson, G. 1974. "A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation." *Language*, 50: 696-735.
- Samuels, J. 1995. "Multilingualism in the emerging educational dispensation." In *Proceedings of SAALA*, 15: 75-84
- Sarinjeive, D. 1999. "The mother-tongue, English and student aspirations and realities." *Journal for Language Teaching*, 33(2): 128-139.
- Savignon, S.J. 1983. *Communicative competence: Theory and classroom practice*. Reading,

- M.A.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Savignon, S.J. 1991. "Communicative language teaching: State of the art." *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(2): 261-277.
- Saville-Troike, M. 1982. *The Ethnography of communication: An introduction*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Schachter, J. 1990. "Communicative competence revisited." In Harley, B., Allen, P., & Swain, M. (eds.). *The development of second language proficiency*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schinke-Llano, L. 1991. "The shifting sands of bilingual education." In Alatis, J.E. (ed.). *Linguistics and language pedagogy: The state of art*. Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Schmied, J. 1995. "Analysing the role of English in African countries - and conclusions to be drawn for South Africa." Retrieved April 26, 2002 from <http://www.und.ac.za/und/ling/archive/schm-01.html>
- Schneider, R. 1979. "Biology and foreign language teaching. The principle of monolingualism in the light of biological foundations." Abstracted in *Language Teaching and Linguistics: Abstracts*, 14/2 (1981): 114.
- Schweers, C. W. Jr. 1999. "Using L1 in the L2 classroom." *English Teaching Forum*, 37(2): 6-9.
- Secada, W. & Lightfoot, T. 1993. "Symbols and the political context of bilingual education in the United States." In Arias, M.B. and Casanova, U. (eds.). *Bilingual education: Politics, practice and research*. National Society for the study of Education. Chicago.
- Seliger, H.W. & Shohamy, E. 1989. *Second language research methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Selinker, L. 1972. "Interlanguage." *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10: 209-231.
- Shamash, Y. 1990. "Learning in translation: Beyond language experience in ESL." *Voices*, 2(2): 71-75.
- Shaw, P. 1992. "Variation and universality in communicative competence: Coseriu's model." *TESOL Quarterly*, 26(1): 9-25.
- Silva, P. 2002. "South African English: Oppressor or liberator?" Retrieved September 03, 2002

- from
<http://www.ru.za/affiliates/dsae/MAVEN.HTML>
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. 1988. "Multilingualism and the education of minority children." In Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Cummins, J. (eds.). *Minority Education: From shame to struggle*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Toukoma, P. 1976. "Teaching immigrant children mother tongue and learning the language of the host country in the context of the socio-cultural situation of the migrant family." *Tutkimuska Research Projects*, Tampere. Finland.
- Slabbert, S. 1994. "What is the mother tongue of the Sowetan teenager? And is this same as home language?" *BUA (formerly Language Project Review)*, 9: 4-7.
- South African Schools Act 84 of 1996: Norms and standards for language policy in public schools. 2B12- 2B17.
- Spady, W. 1994. *Outcome-based education: Critical issues and answers*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Statistics South Africa. 2001. "Statistics and graphs: Percentage of speakers per language in South Africa." Retrieved August 02, 2003 from
<http://www.cyberserv.co.za/users/jako/lang/stats.html>
- Sticchi- Damiani, M. 1985. "The use of L1 in language classrooms." *Perspectives*, 9(1): 8-14. Abstracted in *Language Learning and Teaching*, 18(4): 375.
- Swain, M. 1983. "Bilingualism without tears." In Clark, M. & Handscombe, J. (eds.). *On TESOL '82: Pacific perspectives on language learning and teaching*. TESOL. Washington D. C.
- Swann, J. 1994. "Observing and recording talk in educational settings." In Graddol, D., Maybin, J. & Stierer, B. (eds.). *Researching language and literacy in social context*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- The Advisory Panel on Language Policy. 2000. Final Draft: Language Policy and plan for South Africa. By the advisory panel on language policy to the minister of arts, culture, science and technology. (6 November 2000).
- UNESCO. 1953. *The use of vernacular languages in education*. UNESCO. Paris.
- Valdes, G. 1981. "Code-switching as deliberate verbal strategy: A microanalysis of direct and

- indirect requests among bilingual Chicano speakers." In Duran, R.P. (ed.). 1981. *Latino language and communicative behaviour*. New Jersey: ABLEX Publishing Corporation.
- Valdes-Fallis, G. 1978. "Code-switching among bilingual Mexican-American women: Towards an understanding of sex-related language alternation." *International Journal of Social Language*, 17: 65-72.
- van der Horst, H. & McDonald, R. 1997. *OBE-Outcomes based education: A teacher's manual*. Pretoria: Kagiso.
- van der Walt, C. 2001. "Language status and covert prestige in the code-switching practices of Mathematics, Science and Biology teachers." *Journal of Language Teaching*, 35(4): 294-305.
- Virasamy, C. 1997. *An investigation into teacher-elicited Zulu-mother tongue use by Zulu speaking pupils in an English only classroom*. MA Thesis. Dept. of Linguistics. University of Natal. Durban.
- Walqui, A. 2000. "Contextual factors in second language acquisition." In *ERIC, Clearinghouse on languages and linguistics*. Washington DC. Retrieved April 14, 2002 from <http://www.ericfacility.net/ericdigests/ed444381.html>
- Wardhaugh, R. 1992. 2nd edition. *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Watson-Gegeo, K.A. 1988. "Ethnography in ESL: Defining the essentials." *TESOL Quarterly*, 22(4): 575-592.
- Weekly Mail and Guardian*. 1994. "Speaking in tongues but which one." (July 29, 1994).
- Wei, L. 1998. "The 'why' and 'how' questions in the analysis of conversational code-switching." In Auer, P. (ed.). *Code-switching in conversation, language, interaction and identity*. London: Routledge.
- Weinreich, U. 1953. *Languages in contact*. New York: Publications of the Linguistic Circle of New York.
- Willis, J. 1981. *Teaching English through English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Wolcott, H.F. 1987. "On ethnographic intent." In Spindler, G. & Spindler, L (eds.). *Interpretive ethnography of education: At home and abroad*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Young, R. 1988. "Variation and the interlanguage hypothesis." *Studies in Second Language acquisition*, 10: 281-302.
- Zotwana, S. 1993. "Six opinions on eleven languages." *BUA (Formerly language projects review)*. December 1993. 8(4): 29.

APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRES

N. B. Each of the questionnaires was preceded by the following note:

Dear Respondent

- This questionnaire is aimed at determining attitudes towards English, Afrikaans and Zulu as well as code-switching (i.e. the use of two languages within a single sentence or conversation e.g. Dit maak nie saak nie, I'll see you tomorrow/ Thula! Thula! You are far too noisy!).
- There are no 'right' or 'wrong' answers. As such, your honest responses are of extreme value to this research.
- Your identity remains anonymous.
- This questionnaire is subdivided into 5 sections. Kindly respond to all sections.
- Please mark with a "✓" or an "X" in the appropriate box.

APPENDIX A1: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EDUCATORS

Page 1

Section A :

Position held at educational institute:

Principal	Dep. princ.	H.O.D.	Level 1 Educator
-----------	-------------	--------	------------------

1. Number of years of teaching experience:

1 - 3 years	4 -8 years	10 - 20 years	over 20 years
-------------	------------	---------------	---------------

2. What is your first language/ mother tongue?

English	Afrikaans	Zulu	Other (please state) :
---------	-----------	------	------------------------

3. What other language(s) can you speak?

None	English	Afrik.	Zulu	Other (please state) :
------	---------	--------	------	------------------------

4. If you are an OBE teacher, tick the learning area(s) you teach. If not, please move on to question 6.

LLC (Eng)	LLC (Afrik)	LLC (Zulu)	MLMM S	Natural Sc.	Tech.	HSS	EMS	A & C	LO
--------------	----------------	---------------	-----------	----------------	-------	-----	-----	-------	----

5. What subject(s) do you teach in the senior classes?

Eng 1st lang	Eng 2 nd lang	Afrik 1st lang	Afrik 2 nd lang	Zulu	Maths	Science	Geog	Hist	Com- merce	Other (state)
-----------------	-----------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------	------	-------	---------	------	------	---------------	------------------

6. What language(s) do you use to teach?

English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu	Any lang.
--------------	----------------	-----------	--------------	------------	--------------	-------------------	-----------

7. What language(s) do you recommend that learners use in the classroom?

English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu	Any lang.
--------------	----------------	-----------	--------------	------------	--------------	-------------------	-----------

8. *What language(s) do your learners use in the classroom?

English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu	Any lang.
--------------	----------------	-----------	--------------	------------	--------------	-------------------	-----------

* If you would like to comment on question 9, please do so :

.....

.....

.....

☺ Thank you, please move on to Section B. ☺

Page 2

SECTION B:

Please “✓” or “X” in the appropriate column.

NB. There are no ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ answers. Simply indicate what you feel and/or think by choosing between

Strongly agree / agree / disagree/ strongly disagree

	Strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree
1. It is necessary for every learner to speak English in KZN				
2. It is necessary for every child to be able to read and write in English				
3. English is necessary to obtain jobs or pursue a career				
4. English is necessary to pursue ones studies				
5. English is necessary to join social circles, clubs etc.				
6. Those who cannot speak English should not get high position jobs e.g. in management or be allowed to become a professional e.g. doctor, teacher				
7. Every teacher must know how to speak English				
8. If a person cannot speak English then s/he is really uneducated				
9. The most important language in South Africa is English				
10. The most important language in the world is English				

11. When English is spoken it must not be mixed with any other language - it must remain 'pure'				
12. English is the best language for expressing certain concepts e.g. in Maths, Science, Technology				
13. All schools should become English medium schools				
14. If a learner does not pass English in any grade s/he must not be promoted to the next grade				
15. Every school must insist that English must be taught at least as a second language				
<i>Any comment on English?</i>				

☺ Please move on to Section C..... ☺

Page 3

SECTION C :

	Strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree
1. It is necessary for every learner to speak Afrikaans in KZN				
2. It is necessary for every child to be able to read and write in Afrikaans				
3. Afrikaans is necessary to obtain jobs or pursue a career				
4. Afrikaans is necessary to pursue ones studies				
5. Afrikaans is necessary to join social circles, clubs etc.				
6. Those who cannot speak Afrikaans should not get high position jobs e.g. in management or be allowed to become a professional e.g doctor, teacher				
7. Every teacher must know how to speak Afrikaans				
8. If a person cannot speak Afrikaans then s/he is really uneducated				
9. The most important language in South Africa is Afrikaans				
10. When Afrikaans is spoken it must not be mixed with any other language - it must remain 'pure'				
11. Afrikaans is the best language for expressing certain concepts e.g. in Maths, Science, Technology				
12. All schools should insist that Afrikaans is taught at least as a second language				
<i>Any comment on Afrikaans?</i>				

☺ Please move on to Section D.... ☺

SECTION D:

	Strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree
1. It is necessary for every learner to speak Zulu in KZN				
2. It is necessary for every child to be able to read and write in Zulu				
3. Zulu is necessary to obtain jobs or pursue a career				
4. Zulu is necessary to pursue ones studies				
5. Zulu is necessary to join social circles, clubs etc.				
6. Those who cannot speak Zulu should not get high position jobs e.g. in management or be allowed to become a professional e.g. doctor, teacher				
7. Every teacher must know how to speak Zulu in KZN				
8. If a person cannot speak Zulu in KZN then s/he is really uneducated				
9. The most important language in South Africa is Zulu				
10. When Zulu is spoken it must not be mixed with any other language - it must remain 'pure'				
11. Zulu is not the best language for expressing certain concepts e.g. in Maths, Science, Technology				
12. Every school in KZN must insist that Zulu is studied at least as a second language.				
<i>Any comment on Zulu?</i>				

☺ Please move on to Section E..... ☺

SECTION E:

1. Do you ever switch between languages when you speak with friends, family members, colleagues etc.?

YES	NO
-----	----

2. Do you ever switch between languages when teaching?

YES	NO
-----	----

3. For me, the switching between languages is mostly something that is :

conscious	unconscious
-----------	-------------

4. What are your feelings/ attitude towards others who switch between languages?

NEUTRAL	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
---------	----------	----------

5. *For monolinguals only:* If you were a bilingual speaker would you switch between languages

5.1 when speaking with your friends, colleagues etc.?

YES	NO
-----	----

5.2 in your classroom/ office/ working place?

YES	NO
-----	----

	Strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree
6. Switching between languages indicates that the speaker cannot speak either language well.				
7. A person switches between languages because s/he wants to show off how well s/he can speak both languages.				
8. Switching between languages does not have a place in public places e.g. TV, government forums, formal meetings etc.				
9. If one wants to switch between languages then one must do so only in informal places etc. parties/ pubs etc.				
10. Switching between languages does not have a place in the classroom.				
11. It is necessary to switch to the learners' mother tongue to help pupils understand the lesson/ concept etc.				
12. It is 'okay' to switch to English when teaching Afrikaans to English first language speakers				
13. It is 'okay' to switch to Zulu when teaching English to Zulu speakers				
14. It is 'okay' to switch to Zulu when teaching Afrikaans to Zulu speakers				
15. The switching between languages is a degenerative form of a language.				
16. We must aim at keeping each language pure				



Thank you for your co-operation! Have a blessed day!



APPENDIX A2: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SUBJECT ADVISORS

Page 1

SECTION A:

1. Number of years of teaching experience:

NIL	1 - 3 years	4 -8 years	10 - 20 years	over 20 years
-----	-------------	------------	---------------	---------------

2. Number of years of experience as subject advisor?

1 - 3 years	4 -8 years	10 - 20 years	over 20 years
-------------	------------	---------------	---------------

3. What is your first language/ mother tongue?

English	Afrikaans	Zulu	Other (please state) :
---------	-----------	------	------------------------

4. What other language (s) can you speak?

None	English	Afrik.	Zulu	Other (please state) :
------	---------	--------	------	------------------------

5. If you are “supervising” teachers of OBE, tick the learning area you are supervising. If not, please move on to question 6.

LLC (Eng)	LLC (Afrik)	LLC (Zulu)	MLMMS	Natural Sc.	Tech.	HSS	EMS	A & C	LO
--------------	----------------	---------------	-------	----------------	-------	-----	-----	-------	----

6. What subject(s) in the senior classes do you supervise?

Eng 1st lang	Eng 2 nd lang	Afrik 1st lang	Afrik 2 nd lang	Zulu	Maths	Science	Geog	Hist	Com- merce	Other (state)
-----------------	-----------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------	------	-------	---------	------	------	---------------	------------------

7. What language(s) do you recommend that learners use in the classroom?

English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu	Any lang.
-----------------	-------------------	--------------	-----------------	---------------	-----------------	----------------------	-----------

8. What language do you ask / recommend your teachers to use in the classroom?

English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu	Any lang.
-----------------	-------------------	--------------	-----------------	---------------	-----------------	----------------------	-----------

☺ Thank you, please move on to Section B. ☺

NB. Sections B, C, D & E are the same as for Appendix A1, questionnaire for educators, except question 2 of E which has been omitted.

APPENDIX A3: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARENT COMPONENT OF SGB

Page 1

SECTION A:

1. What is your profession?

--

2. What is your first language/ mother tongue?

English	Afrikaans	Zulu	Other (please state) :
---------	-----------	------	------------------------

3. What other language(s) can you speak?

None	English	Afrik.	Zulu	Other (please state) :
------	---------	--------	------	------------------------

4. Are you familiar with the concepts and ideas of OBE?

Yes	No
-----	----

5. As far as you know, if your school has a language policy, what is it?

English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu
--------------	----------------	-----------	--------------	------------	--------------	-------------------

6. As far as you know, what language(s) are being used to teach :

6.1 English?

Eng only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu
----------	--------------	------------

6.2 Afrikaans?

Afrik. only	Eng & Afrik.	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik. & Zulu
-------------	--------------	--------------	--------------------

6.3 Other subjects?

English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu
--------------	----------------	-----------	--------------	------------	--------------	-------------------

7. As far as you know, what language(s) do the learners use in the classroom?

English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu
--------------	----------------	-----------	--------------	------------	--------------	-------------------

8. In what language(s) would you prefer your child to be taught:

8.1 English?

English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu	Any lang.
--------------	----------------	-----------	--------------	------------	--------------	-------------------	-----------

8.2 Afrikaans?

English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu	Any lang.
--------------	----------------	-----------	--------------	------------	--------------	-------------------	-----------

8.3 Zulu?[Leave blank if your child does not learn Zulu at school]

English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu	Any lang.
--------------	----------------	-----------	--------------	------------	--------------	-------------------	-----------

8.4 Other subjects

English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu	Any lang.
--------------	----------------	-----------	--------------	------------	--------------	-------------------	-----------

9. Does your child learn Zulu at school?

Yes	No
-----	----

10. If no, would you like your child to learn Zulu at school?

Yes	No
-----	----

☺ Thank you, please move on to Section B. ☺

NB. Sections B, C, D & E are the same as for Appendix A1, questionnaire for educators, except question 2 of E which has been omitted.

APPENDIX A4: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR LEARNERS

Page 1

SECTION A:

1. What is your first language/ mother tongue?

English	Afrikaans	Zulu	Other (please state) :
---------	-----------	------	------------------------

2. What other language(s) can you speak?

None	English	Afrik.	Zulu	Other (please state) :
------	---------	--------	------	------------------------

3. What language do you use when you speak:

3.1 with your parents and other family members?

English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu
--------------	----------------	-----------	--------------	------------	--------------	-------------------

3.2 to your friends who belong to the same language group as you, *in* the classroom?

English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu
--------------	----------------	-----------	--------------	------------	--------------	-------------------

3.3 to your friends who belong to the same language group as you, *outside* the classroom?

English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu
--------------	----------------	-----------	--------------	------------	--------------	-------------------

3.4 to your friends who belong to a different language group from yours?

English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu
--------------	----------------	-----------	--------------	------------	--------------	-------------------

4.1 What language(s) does your teacher of English use when s/he teaches?

English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu
--------------	----------------	-----------	--------------	------------	--------------	-------------------

4.2 What language(s) would you like him/her to use?

English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu
--------------	----------------	-----------	--------------	------------	--------------	-------------------

5.1 What language(s) does your teacher of Afrikaans use when s/he teaches?

English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu
--------------	----------------	-----------	--------------	------------	--------------	-------------------

5.2 What language(s) would you like him/her to use?

English only	Afrikaans only	Zulu only	Eng & Afrik.	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu
--------------	----------------	-----------	--------------	------------	--------------	-------------------

6.1 What language does your teacher of Zulu use when s/he teaches? [Leave blank if you do not learn Zulu].

Zulu only	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu
-----------	------------	--------------	-------------------

6.2 What language would you like him/her to use?

Zulu only	Eng & Zulu	Afrik & Zulu	Eng, Afrik & Zulu
-----------	------------	--------------	-------------------

7.1 If you do not learn Zulu at school - would you like to learn Zulu?

YES	NO
-----	----

7.2 Please give a reason for your answer.

.....

.....

.....

© Thank you, please move on to Section B. ©

NB. Sections B, C, & D are the same as for Appendix A1, questionnaire for educators.

Although Section E has the same series of questions, the language has been simplified for learners.

SECTION E:

1. Do you ever switch between languages when you speak with friends, family members, etc. outside the classroom?

YES	NO
-----	----

2. Do you switch between languages in the classroom with your friends e.g. during group work ?

YES	NO
-----	----

3. Do you switch between languages in the classroom with your teachers?

YES	NO
-----	----

4. If yes: Are you aware that you switch between languages? [If no, leave blank].

Yes, all the time	Yes, sometimes	No, it is something that comes naturally
-------------------	----------------	--

5. Does your teacher switch between languages when s/he teaches English?

YES	NO
-----	----

6. Does your teacher switch between languages when s/he teaches Afrikaans?

YES	NO
-----	----

7. Does your teacher switch between languages when s/he teaches Zulu?
[Leave blank if you do not learn Zulu]

YES	NO
-----	----

8. Does your teacher switch between languages in the other subjects?

YES	NO
-----	----

9. What are your feelings/ attitude towards others who switch between languages?

NEUTRAL	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
---------	----------	----------

	Strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree
10. People who 'mix' their languages do so because they can't speak either one of the languages well.				
11. A person switches between languages because s/he wants to show off how well s/he can speak both languages.				
12. Switching between languages does not have a place in public places e.g. TV, government forums, formal meetings etc.				
13. It is 'okay' to switch between languages in informal places e.g. at home/parties/ pubs etc.				
14. I like it when my teacher switches to my own language in the classroom.				
15. The teacher should use some English when s/he is teaching Afrikaans to learners who can only speak English				
16. The teacher should use some Zulu when s/he is teaching Afrikaans to Zulu speakers				
17. The teacher should use some English when teaching Afrikaans to Zulu speakers				
18. The teacher should use some Afrikaans when teaching English to Afrikaans speakers				
19. The switching between languages is not good - we must keep each language separately				

Thank you for your co-operation! Have a blessed day!

APPENDIX B: INTERVIEWS**APPENDIX B1: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR EDUCATORS**

1. Status at school, subject and grades being taught.
2. What is your mother tongue?
3. What other languages can you speak?
4. What is the language policy at school?
5. Do you prescribe/ recommend a specific language to use in the classroom? If so, which one?
[Lead interviewee to provide reasons for response].
6. Do you ever switch from one language to another in a single conversation when conversing with friends or colleagues e.g. in the staff room?
7. Do you switch between languages in the classroom?
8. [For those who responded 'yes' to questions 6 and/or 7] Are you conscious when you switch between languages?
9. Do your pupils ever use two or more languages in a single conversation?
If "Yes": How do you feel about/ react to this?
10. What do you feel about others who use CS?
11. Do you think that the use of the mother tongue promotes or hinders learning?
[Lead interviewee to provide reasons].
12. In your view, does the switching to the mother tongue have a place in OBE? [Lead interviewee to elaborate on response].
13. From the 3 languages that are offered at KZN schools i.e. English, Afrikaans and Zulu - how would you rank them in terms of importance? [Lead interviewee to provide reasons for response].
14. In your view is it necessary for learners to learn a second language at school?
 - *If "Yes": Which language? Why?*
 - *If "no": Why?*

APPENDIX B2: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR SUBJECT ADVISORS

1. What subject/ learning area do you supervise?
2. What is your mother tongue?
3. What other languages can you speak?
4. Do you have a language policy in place for your teachers? How was this arrived at?
5. Do you prescribe/ recommend a specific language for your teachers? If so, which one?
6. As far as you know do 'your' teachers switch from one language to another in a single conversation?
 - *If "Yes": How do you feel about this?*
7. Do you ever switch from one language to another in your personal capacity i.e. with your friends and colleagues?
8. Do you ever switch from one language to another at meetings with the teachers whom you supervise? [Lead subject advisor to provide reasons for response].

9. [If "Yes" to questions 7 and/or 8] Are you aware that you do this?
What are your reasons for doing so?
10. In your view, does the switching to the mother tongue promote or hinder learning? [Lead subject advisor to provide reasons for response].
11. In your view, does the switching to the mother tongue have a place in OBE? [Lead subject advisor to elaborate on response].
12. From the 3 languages that are offered at KZN schools i.e. English, Afrikaans and Zulu - how would you rank them in terms of importance? [Lead subject advisor to provide reasons for response].
13. In your view is it necessary for learners to learn a second language at school?
If "Yes": Which language? Why?
If "no": Why?

APPENDIX B3: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR PARENT COMPONENT OF SGB

1. What is your profession?
2. What is your mother tongue?
3. What other languages can you speak?
4. What is the language policy at school?
5. Do you recommend a specific language for the teachers and learners to be used at school? If so, which one?
6. As far as you know do the teachers switch from one language to another in a single conversation?
If "Yes": How do you feel about this?
7. As far as you know do the pupils ever switch from one language to another in a single conversation?
 - *If "Yes":* How do you feel about this?
 - *If "No":* If pupils had to switch from one language to another in a single conversation in the classroom, how would you feel about it?
8. Do you ever switch from one language to another in your personal capacity i.e. with your friends and colleagues?
 - *If "Yes":*
Are you aware that you do this?
What are your reasons for doing so?
9. Do you ever switch from one language to another at meetings with the principal, teachers and other members of the governing body? [Lead interviewee to provide reasons for response].
10. In your view, does the switching to the mother tongue promote or hinder learning? [Lead interviewee to provide reasons for response].
11. In your view, does the switching to the mother tongue have a place in OBE? [Lead interviewee to elaborate on response].
12. From the 3 languages that are offered at KZN schools i.e. English, Afrikaans and Zulu - how would you rank them in terms of importance? [Lead interviewee to provide reasons for response].

13. In your view is it necessary for learners to learn a second language at school?
 If "Yes": Which language? Why?
 If "no": Why?

APPENDIX B4: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR LEARNERS

1. Grade and languages learnt at school.
2. What is your mother tongue?
3. What other languages can you speak?
4. Do your teachers ask you to speak any specific language in the classroom?
5. What language(s) do your teachers use in the classroom while teaching in the various learning areas except the languages?
 [Leading question].
- 5.1. *If teacher uses more than one language:*
 - Why do you think your teacher does this?
 - How do you feel about him/her doing so?
- 5.2. *If teacher uses only one language:*
 - Would you prefer your teacher to use your mother tongue as well or are you happy with the use of only one language in the classroom? [Lead pupil to elaborate].
6. What language does your teacher of English use in the classroom?
 [Leading question].
- 6.1. *If answer is 'only English':*
 Would you prefer him/her to use Afrikaans as well? [Lead pupil to elaborate on response].
- 6.2. *If answer is 'both English and Afrikaans':*
 How do you feel about this? [Lead pupil to elaborate on response].
7. Do you ever use more than one language in a single sentence or conversation when you speak to your friends outside the classroom?
8. Do you ever use more than one language in a single sentence or conversation when you speak with your friends in the classroom? [Lead pupil to provide situation]
9. Do you ever use more than one language in a single sentence or conversation when you speak with your teachers in the classroom? [Lead pupil to provide situation]
10. Are you aware when you switch from one language to another?
11. Generally, what do you feel about people who use more than one language in a single sentence or conversation?
12. From the 3 languages that are offered at KZN schools i.e. English, Afrikaans and Zulu - how would you rank them in terms of importance? [Lead pupil to provide reasons for response].
13. In your view is it necessary for learners to learn a second language at school?
 If "Yes": Which language? Why? If "no": Why?

Appendix B1-B4: SAMPLE TRANSCRIPTIONS**APPENDIX B1 : SAMPLE TRANSCRIPTIONS OF INTERVIEW WITH EDUCATORS:****APPENDIX B1a : SCHOOL A****PRINCIPAL [AP]**

- R Do you prescribe/ recommend a specific language for your teachers to use in the classroom?
- P Absolutely. Absolutely. In the Afrikaans medium classes they should only speak Afrikaans and/
- R Is this the case with all the subjects?
- P All the subjects - they must use only Afrikaans except there is one exception and that is computer typing because of the technology er mostly English and for the world outside the school we decided the parents decided that it will be offered in English. And the teacher is teaching only in English in the class although all the children are Afrikaans.
- R Does your teacher of computer typing ever switch to Afrikaans in the classroom?
- P I don't think so because the policy is clear and that is, he must use only English, and by speaking Afrikaans, he is denying the children the opportunity of acquainting themselves with the English terminology.... and in my English classes the teacher may only speak English. The children outside the class on the sports field, on the passageway, wherever they meet the English teacher they should speak English only and the teacher should speak only English. There's no such thing that they may speak Afrikaans. It happened, it happened in a year that I appointed an Afrikaans speaking English teacher and the parents were on me very quickly so I had to call the teacher in and reprimand her and tell her that the only language that is allowed in the English class is English and no Afrikaans.
- R Okay. In your personal capacity, do you ever switch from one language to another in a single conversation ?
- P Not often because the people who visit me are either Afrikaans or English and its seldom that we have both in my office. So it's er normally one medium.//
- R How do you feel about the switching of languages?
- P I'm happy with it. To me it doesn't matter. Er I think the person must use the language he wants to... the language he is best acquainted with. Why should he use English if he is Afrikaans speaking and the person he is speaking to can understand both languages? But, but sometimes that does happen and I'm the guilty party here I'm doing it I want to practise my English. When for example when the English teacher comes to my office although she can understand and speak Afrikaans I want to make use of every opportunity to practise my English.....//
- R Do you think CS promotes or hinders learning?
- P Er, I think so. I think so. Because the children, where do they hear the English, where do they learn to pronounce the words correctly, where do they learn it. They must hear it in the classroom. If the teacher is going to speak Afrikaans in the classroom it is to their disadvantage.....//
- R How would you rank the three languages in order of importance?
- P Well, common sense will tell me that English will be the medium that most people can express themselves in / And on the other hand, I can't tell between Afrikaans and Zulu, for the Zulu speaker it will definitely be Zulu and for the Afrikaans speaker it will definitely be Afrikaans.

AT1

- R How do you feel about your pupils switching between languages in the classroom?
- T I'm okay with that. If a pupil can't express himself in any specific language, it doesn't bother me. Even when we are teaching Afrikaans and he can't get a word out - they will ask you in English what the word is, and I'll explain in English. I mean that's the way to do it.
- R Do you think the switching between languages can promote learning?
- T Ja, it promotes it. Let's look at Maths for argument sake.... one can use different ways to get to Durban. Similarly with languages. Whatever language the pupil thinks in he must still get to the answer. It doesn't have to be way I'm doing it. I'm happy as long as they get to the end point...../
- R How would you rank the three languages in order of importance?
- T Obviously seeing that Afrikaans is my mother-tongue, it will be Afrikaans. But when you look at the outside world then English has to be the most important. It is an international language, you can communicate with anybody all over the world because everybody understand English. It is the common language...../

AT2

- R Do you think the use of the learners' mother-tongue promotes language?
- T Ja, it can promote learning, example, by reinforcing certain ideas...../
- R How would you rank the three languages in order of importance?
- T I will put English first/ Well, if you look at the media, when you go into the community, even my school leavers who are Afrikaans want their testimonials in English so that they can get a job, go to interviews. English is more recognized.
- R Why do you think there is so much hype about English?
- T Well, if you look at the media, when you go into the community, even my school leavers want their testimonials in English so that they can get a job, go to interviews. English is more recognized.

AT3

- R What language, or languages, do you use to teach?
- T Afrikaans. I use Afrikaans. But I have an English child in my class. If he asks me a question I will explain to him in English...../
- R Your pupils in the English classes, do they ever use English and Afrikaans, maybe during group-work?
- T No. No. You will find one or two children who are very weak, they don't speak it, or they shy away from English. But the others would quickly say 'I beg your pardon?' and then they'll try in English.//
- R How would you rank the three languages in order of importance?
- T Afrikaans. Because everybody tries to get rid of Afrikaans. My father is an Englishman but he also fought for Afrikaans. Er... I don't want one language to be above the other. I want them to be equal.

AT4

- R How would you rank the three languages in order of importance?
- T Definitely Afrikaans. I'm Afrikaans speaking. But I do know of Afrikaans speaking people who send their children to the English school because they feel that English is more important.

AT6

- R Do you switch between languages in your everyday conversation?
- T A lot of times, a lot of times. Especially when I speak English and I can't find the English word quickly I would switch to Afrikaans just to get the sentence going...../
- R How would you rank the three languages in order of importance?
- T English is the most important. English is the academic language in South Africa. As I said I'm Afrikaans speaking and I wrote my PhD in Afrikaans, but I got it translated to English. I'm very proud of my language and I'm promoting Afrikaans, but, but common sense, logic will tell you that to survive in KZN English is the most important language.

AT7

- R Do you ever switch to Afrikaans in your English classroom?
- T Er sometimes. Sometimes it's difficult for a child to understand a specific word or whatever I want to explain. And sometimes in Afrikaans it's more easily expressed and then they understand the concept or idea. For example, reported speech. I talk about the past tense and so on, but sometimes I must explain it in Afrikaans.//
- R How do you feel when your learners switch Afrikaans in the classroom?
- T It doesn't bother me. I see it as their wanting to use the correct word, but I will try to let them say it in English.

AT8

- R Do you ever hear your learners switch between languages?
- T Yes, they do switch. They use many English words. It's very common along the Natal coast down here.
- R And in the classroom?
- T Sometimes. Er, for example, they would say "Sorry?" instead of saying 'Eksus'. So I will reprimand them. But in their social conversation they mix their languages quite often. They say ... they use the word 'cool' to speak like that.

APPENDIX B1b : SCHOOL E**PRINCIPAL [EP]**

- R What is your mother-tongue?
- P Er... English, er, my mother tongue is Tamil I was born a Tamil, I do understand Tamil but we speak English at home...../
- R How would you feel if your teachers had to use Zulu in the classroom?
- T It's quite a difficult thing. I don't think that ... if you consider the ethos of the school and the language background of the community, it is largely English. So it's difficult to allow a situation like that simply because er.. There will be a number of learners who won't understand what's happening...../
- R Do you think switching to the mother tongue has a place in the OBE classroom?
- T Oh yes. Switching to the mother tongue definitely has a place.... obviously if you bring in some switch which is relevant you are enhancing language...../

R Would you like to see a change in the language policy at the school?

T Definitely. I would like to see Zulu introduced..... it's the lack of commitment by the department in giving us transformational teachers. I find that Zulu is a very important part of the curriculum but there's money to pay for it.

ET1

R What is your mother-tongue?

T Well, I would like to say it's Tamil but this is really my mother's mother tongue. Unfortunately, I was brought up speaking only English, so English has, regretfully, become my mother tongue...../

R Do you switch between languages in the classroom?

T No, not really. There would be some switch to an Indian vernacular when we want to emphasise something or when jesting and then of course there are some words that are best expressed in a vernacular or have become part of our vocabulary. Sometimes I will switch to Zulu or Afrikaans to ask a pupil to be quiet but mostly when I'm joking about something. And I have some pet names in Zulu and the vernacular. It's just light-hearted. Otherwise, no. I don't really switch. I don't switch at all in my actual teaching. I can't speak any of these languages.

R How do you feel about those who use CS?

T It depends on the context in which the person is switching. In informal situations I think it's acceptable or even natural but in formal situations I think that the speaker should keep to one language. The ability to speak any language proficiently, any language, not just English, to me is a mark of what shall I say.... elegance and of course a good education. What is most annoying is the way in which SABC presenters have been given the liberty to switch. I think one has to realize that even though the majority of South Africans are Black er... not everybody can speak or understand an African language, er I just think that as a national broadcasting studio, I mean I'm sure that the switching is deliberate by the studio- the others who can't speak Zulu for instance are effectively left out. To me this is a lack of sensitivity to all race groups or language groups and a blatant disregard for minority groups such as the Indians...../

R How would you rank the three languages in order of importance?

T English naturally. No matter how much you romanticize the other languages, English is the only language that will get you where you want to go.

R And Afrikaans?

T Ah... Afrikaans..... Let me be honest with you at the risk of not sounding politically correct. Afrikaans has done nothing for me. I respect it as a language but it was imposed upon us at school. We never spoke the language only learnt it. That's of no value to me. Besides, my Afrikaans friends and colleagues can speak English very well. And what really peeves me now is that a pupil has to pass Afrikaans to get a matric certificate. Why should a pupil have to pass any additional language? This is another reason that our pupils resist learning a new language - we should actually learn more languages at school without the formality of tests and examinations.

ET2

- R Do you find yourself switching between two languages in your personal capacity?
- T Yes, very often, between English and Hindi. Especially at home. My children don't understand Hindi very well. If I want to say something I don't want them to know, I'll switch to Hindi - with my mother and even my husband.

ET3

- R Do your pupils use their mother-tongue in the classroom?
- T Yes, that happens quite often.
- R How do you feel about this?
- T Usually I would encourage them to speak English. After all, I am in an English classroom and I am trying to teach the subject...../
- R What are your views about people who switch between languages when they speak?
- T That depends on the group of people they are communicating with. If there are people in the group that have problems understanding English maybe switching to English would be a good idea so that they get the message that is being communicated accurately. But if the group can understand and communicate in English then the whole conversation should be in English.

ET4

- T what we unofficially do is that, particularly with the junior classes, well I allow for language switching especially when it comes to the grasping of concepts. This is especially, I find, in Maths when a concept is difficult to grasp... you would rather have the child understand the concept even if it means speaking in his mother-tongue.
- R Do you switch to Zulu in your Maths classroom?
- T No, I would do them an injustice with my Zulu being so limited. But I would if I could. But my pupils do. Those pupils who have grasped the concept, I use them to help the others...../
- R How do you feel about learners who switch to Zulu in your English classroom?
- T In my English classroom, if it is a junior class it is not a problem but if it is a senior class it becomes a problem if they rely too heavily on CS, especially er we are preparing them for exams and all are written in English only.

ET5

- R Do you find your pupils using Zulu?
- T Perhaps when they are sharing a joke or em... when I'm teaching BE and I find that there's someone I can't reach... then I would use Zulu to put the message across or get somebody else to do it...../
- R How would you rank the three languages in order of importance?
- T It would be English, Zulu and Afrikaans. I think English, okay, to cater for the needs of ... when we look at the number of people in KZN I think that er ... since English is accepted throughout the world, it is the language that must be given priority. Zulu, I think that in terms of the number of Zulu speaking people in KZN Zulu is more important than Afrikaans.

ET6

- R Do they [pupils] ever switch between English and Zulu?
- T Not to me, but when they are speaking with their friends. But I ask them to refrain from it. They

must try and speak English as often as possible..... because that is the wrong way to upgrade themselves. The more they speak, the more familiar, proficient they will become in it. So actually, I scold them when they use the vernacular in class...../

R In your view does the use of the mother-tongue promote or hinder learning in the OBE classroom?

T I think it would help them but the teacher has to learn the language first. But I prefer not to use it. I mean in the working world if you go for an interview and you switch between languages you must speak only in English..... you will create a poor impression if you speak in both languages. It's better to know English in terms of job opportunities. Even if you look at a child who speaks English well, you have a higher esteem for that child. The ability to speak English is a mark of a higher standard of education.

ET7

R How do you feel when your learners switch to Zulu in the classroom?

T It is understood that we use English. Quite often er, to be honest I use some Zulu/

R Can you tell me why you use Zulu?

T Sometimes you find that they are unresponsive and if you speak to them in their own language they will respond to you.

R Even though you prefer your pupils to speak only English?

T Yes. Okay, it's minimal, it's not a lot. It's once in a while. Sometimes, er, you see they will know that you know their language, respect their language.//

but I don't encourage them to use Zulu. I don't encourage them to use Zulu because I feel that because not all our children in class can understand Zulu. If the Indian children want to speak in Hindi or Arabic or Teleg., they won't understand, they will be totally lost. It would be an insult to them, they would feel out of place so they should show consideration for those children who do not understand Zulu.

R Okay. In your classroom, do your pupils switch between English and Zulu?

T No, not during the actual, formal lesson. But as you are walking into the classroom you hear the, and during group-work sessions. But when I'm teaching they don't switch.....//

R How would you rank the three languages in order of importance?

T English is the most important. It is the language for the universities and education at large. If you put just about everybody together, of all race groups and all religions, you will find that English will unify them all.

ET8

R Okay, let's go into your Afrikaans classroom. You have both English and Zulu speaking pupils in your class... do you switch between languages in your classroom?

T Definitely, because I have many Zulu speaking children in my class, Afrikaans is now their third language and I find that they experience difficulty in understanding me if I speak only in Afrikaans. Much of my instructions and explanation of instructions is done in English. And in the odd occasion I hear some Zulu/

R Yes?

T which I acknowledge if I understand it, as I said I speak very little Zulu.

- R Why do you think you switch to English?
- T If I didn't switch, very little of what I teach would be understood. So I accommodate all my pupils when I switch to English. If I had to switch to Zulu then I will be leaving out those who don't understand it...../
- R So what happens when you pose a question in Afrikaans and your pupils respond in English?
- T I would ask them to try and speak in Afrikaans to put it into Afrikaans because I know that they have understood it in English. If they try and can't succeed in getting it ... a correct response in Afrikaans, I would help them translate into Afrikaans. The important thing is they've understood the content. Now it's trying to get them to say it in Afrikaans.

ET9

- R What is your mother-tongue?
- T Tamil, but I don't really speak it I'm basically English...../
- R What are your feelings about the school's language policy when you consider that you have many Zulu speaking pupils at this school?
- T Well, er, pupils who come here have a choice. There are Zulu medium schools in the area so they have a choice and in fact they choose to come specifically to an English medium school so I'm happy with the medium of instruction...../
- R And you pupils, do they ever use Zulu in your classroom?
- T Yes, they do so quite a bit with each other.
- R Yes? And how do you feel about this?
- T On occasion I tell them it's rude to speak a language that is not understood by everybody in class. They would feel the same way if we spoke our mother-tongue in class. It is rude to speak a language that not everybody understands. So, I think my pupils appreciate this.

ET10

- R What is your mother-tongue?
- T Well, I would like to say it's Tamil but it's really my mother's mother tongue. Unfortunately I was brought up speaking only English, so English has - regretfully - become my mother tongue.
- R And Afrikaans?
- T Ah... Afrikaans. Let me be honest - at the risk of not sounding politically incorrect. Afrikaans has done nothing for me. I respect it as a language but it was a language that was imposed on me at school. I hated it at school. We never spoke it, we simply learnt it. That's of no value to me. But as I said I respect it as a language and now, well.... I don't need it in my life. My Afrikaans friends and colleagues can speak English very well...../

APPENDIX B1c : SCHOOL Z**PRINCIPAL [ZP]**

- R Do you switch between languages in the classroom?
- P No but I use Zulu to stress certain things. (At this point of the recording, the speaker is interrupted by a teacher who addresses him in Zulu. The speaker responds in Zulu but switches to English using the phrases "during the break" and "matric farewell").

- R Do your teachers use Zulu in their classrooms?
- P Yes, they switch.
- R Do you encourage them to use some Zulu when teaching?
- P No, I don't encourage them to speak Zulu.
- R Could you tell me why?
- P Because we want them to practice more English and Afrikaans at school. Because when they get home, they use Zulu right through.
- R So, how do you feel about your teachers switching to Zulu?
- P I think I appreciate this because the improvement of our results was through this exercise .
- R In your view then, does the switching promote or hinder learning?
- P I think that it will promote learning...../
- R Do you think the mother-tongue has a place in the OBE classroom?
- P I don't think this will bear fruits. When you are going to allow this switching over, when the child is writing a piece of work, he is going to have a problem. He will have to translate it to the other language and he will jumble everything - three languages together which you cannot understand.

ZT1

- R In your view, does the use of the mother-tongue hinder or promote learning?
- T It can hinder and it can promote.
- R Mm Mm?
- T It can hinder because the children will become lazy. They know that you are going to explain in Zulu so they wait for that. They will not learn Afrikaans. But it also promotes. You can talk and talk in Afrikaans but they don't understand a word you're saying. So there's 's no learning going on. So you have to switch to make them understand...../
- R Okay. How would you rank the three languages in order of importance?
- T Although I'm teaching Afrikaans, I'll put English first because it is the language that will get you jobs, allows you to enjoy your holidays, go to the bank, you name it, if you know English, you can do it.

ZT2

- R Are you aware when you switch between languages?
- T Yes. Especially in your class because you know when they don't understand, you have to explain a word or what you are saying. You can see that they don't know what you are saying so you speak in Zulu to make them understand.
- R Do your pupils use Zulu in class?
- T Yes, they do. But I'm taught that they must not do it. So I tell them, "discuss this in English".
- R Okay, let's just say you pose a question in English, do your pupils ever respond in Zulu?
- T A lot.
- R How do you react to this?
- T Well, I listen to what they are saying and then I help them to say it in English. You have to translate it to English, because in the exams, you see, they have to write it in English.

ZT3

R Do you use Zulu in class?

T Yes. When they [pupils] don't understand, you must explain it in Zulu.

R Do your pupils use Zulu?/

T Yes, all the time because they fail to express themselves. But I find that in the senior classes we speak more Zulu. In our OBE classes it's not so much. Because the smaller children, they can understand English. Not the senior classes.

R How do you feel about your pupils switching?

T There is nothing wrong with it, but they must try and speak only English. Because you see in the exams papers no one is going to ask you the questions in this language Zulu. It is going to be English. So the children must learn to speak, to practice English. They must try to say it so that they can write the exams.

ZT4

R Do you ever switch between language in your everyday speech?

T Yes, it's a natural thing. It's a natural thing but I don't like it. I mean in certain circumstances I'm forced to do so even though I don't like it...../

As I said I'm forced to explain something, something very abstract. I use different examples, but if I can see they still don't understand it, then I have to use the mother-tongue...../

R How do you feel when your pupils switch between languages in the classroom?

T No, I mean, we sometimes at this school we tell them, this week is an English week. Wherever you are, perhaps it's break time, whether you are in the tuck shop, you must use English. If you are caught speaking a vernacular language, then you will be punished. But then we used to use some prefects but now things have changed through this er democracy. Now we no longer have those prefects we have the LRC and they say no man after all, all languages are official and now we are cut short...../

R In your view, does the use of the mother-tongue promote or hinder learning?

T In a way ... er, it does both. Depending on how you view it, it does both. Because the minute you switch to the mother-tongue you are trying to explain something that is too difficult for learners to grasp. So, in other words it's helping the learners okay. And meanwhile he is also hindered. He must learn English as a universal language. Once they know that a teacher is going to use the mother-tongue, they won't listen to the English because they know you are going to say it in Zulu.

R Do you think that Zulu has a place in the OBE classroom?

T Oh, I'm totally against OBE/

R Alright, but what do you think about the role of Zulu/

T One thing I can say from my experience, at our schools, I can see OBE is letting us down. It's the downfall of our education. I have seen some questions where they say that learners can use even Zulu to answer this question.

R How do you feel about that?

T That's very wrong. Mam, let me put it this way to you. We were the most disadvantaged people for so many years. In other words, what this means is that we are the job seekers, we are not the job

creators.

R Yes?

T So a person who does not English is a job seeker , not a job creator. So, as job seekers we need to master English. English is a very powerful tool for our generations to come. We need to master English. Now with this OBE thing I don't know what the department is trying to do.

ZT5

R What language, or languages, do you pupils use in class?

T I recommend English but I accept it even if they are answering in Zulu and they are unable to express themselves in English. But most of the time I try to make sure they use English. Even if the answer is in Zulu I translate for them, then I make them repeat after me...../

R Do you ever switch to Zulu in the maths classroom?

T I switch to Zulu because sometimes they can't understand what you expect from them. So you try and explain to them in their mother tongue. But I make it very clear to them that they have to learn to understand certain concepts so that they can make a connection.... so that they are able to answer in English...../

R In your view, does the use of Zulu in the classroom, promote or hinder learning?

T At some stage, it would hinder learning. But if you look at the other side it promotes learning. Sometimes the students can't understand. The problem they have when they switch the languages is when they are going of the other schools where there is no switching of languages. Then they will experience a problem. They have to speak only English. So when they are used to mixing the languages their competence in English is very low. It's not like when you are speaking English all the time. But at the same time it helps them to learn. Because when you translate a word for them, they understand the concept you use...../

R How would you rank the three languages of this province in terms of importance?

T In fact I would rate English as the number one language. I understand that even though we inherit English from the apartheid era, I feel to communicate internationally, we must use English. Also the books that the students are using are written in English.

ZT6

R How would you rank the three languages in order of importance?

T English is the most important You go anywhere they speak English and the books we are using, it's written in English. It is the best language I think. If you go throughout the world, people are speaking English. But isiZulu, it is only here. It's not going to take us anywhere.

ZT7

R What are your feelings about Afrikaans?

T You know you cannot change the attitude of people more especially the Blacks. So you can't tell them Afrikaans is better than Zulu. You can't do that . It's not right. You must look at Afrikaans where it came from to us. You can't forget the Soweto riots, you know, June 16th .

ZT8

R So you switch to Zulu?

T For the sake of those who don't know, don't understand what you're saying. Sometimes the child

will ask you to explain it in Zulu, so you don't have an option because it's like depriving him/her a chance to education, so you have to explain it in the mother-tongue...../

Also, some learners who don't understand English well, they will lose their attention if you don't use the mother-tongue...../

R What are your feelings about Afrikaans?

T You know you can't change the attitude of people [towards Afrikaans], more especially the Blacks. So you can't tell them Afrikaans is better than Zulu. You can't do that. It's not right. You must look at Afrikaans where it came from to us. You can't forget the Soweto riots - you know, June 16th. So it's just not right...../

R Why would you say English is so important?

T It is a world-wide language. I will call it the lingua franca. Even if you go to Japan, they will speak their language, but you can't, so you will English. It is the common language for communication and trade and all sorts of things. English is the common language. Even though you say you must learn other languages, but deep down in your heart, English is the most important language, it will be the first language.

ZT9

T The problem with Afrikaans is that they [the pupils] regard it as the language of oppression. They prefer English. So English is the most important.

R Why do you think English is the most important?

T It is the language of the world. Everywhere, interviews, jobs, you go on holiday, no matter where it has to be English.

APPENDIX B2a: SAMPLE TRANSCRIPTIONS OF INTERVIEW WITH SUBJECT ADVISORS:

SA1

R Do you recommend a specific language for your teachers?

SA The medium of instruction is English in most of the school. The subject [Physical Science] is taught through the medium of English.

R Is it the same in schools where English is the second language?

SA They are supposed to use English because the exams are in English, all the assessments are done in English, but they might explain some things in isiZulu, important concepts and so on.

R How do you feel about the switching between English and Zulu in the Physical Science classroom?

SA While we encourage them to use English, but when somebody doesn't understand what you're saying, it doesn't do any harm just to explain that particular portion in Zulu but it must not be a habit in teaching in Zulu...../

R Do you switch between languages during meetings with your teachers or other professional gatherings?

SA Er, very seldom, very seldom.

R Okay, in the times that do switch, are you aware of it?

SA Yes, I have a reason for switching.

R Mmm Mmm?

SA Ja, you see, when you are addressing people you have prepared something but there are some examples you'd like to quote from people of a particular culture like my own...../ It is also easier to express certain things in your own language.

R Okay. Do you think CS hinders or promotes learning?

SA Yes, I think so especially in OBE we expect learners to be active participants, to talk. At times, a learner knows something but because of the language he is not comfortable in expressing, so now, if you prevent the learner from using another language, you are denying him the opportunity to express what he wants to express, what he knows. I think it is relevant but it must not be the whole address, only a particular part - sometimes you are lacking in a word, then he could use that word from his language. Not the whole speech. The main idea is to carry the message across and then somebody can tell him the English word...../

R How would you rank the three languages in order of importance?

SA I would say English is the most important because it allows one to communicate across different cultures and different racial groups, and even internationally you don't have a problem. It is a unifying language. I can't be expected to use Zulu at a conference. / Then, I would say it's the mother tongue...../

R Which language would you recommend be taught as a L2?

SA I would say it depends on the people in a particular area. In KZN, the majority speaks Zulu. Therefore Zulu should be the L2 here. But it should not be forced.

SA2

R What is your mother tongue?

SA Ah.. That's a difficult question to answer so much so that I'm foreign to my own mother tongue. Way back when our parents looked forward to our education although I'm a Tamilian by birth [laughter] I was forced to learn the languages at school viz. English and Afrikaans, that took me out of my own language. We all came through that our parents were envisaging the window to a better world through English but so much so through the detriment of our own language. Therefore I say, I'm a foreigner to my own mother tongue. So how do I answer your question? It has to be English...../

R Do you recommend a specific language for your teachers?

SA The medium of instruction at schools is English..... For assessments, for exam purposes, it must be done in English...../

R Do you switch between languages at your workshops?

SA No, I don't but the teachers who are Zulu speakers, who teach English L2 pupils, they do have difficulty in understanding concept, terminology that comes through the material and you find that in workshops there is a lot of explaining to one another in Zulu.

R How do you feel about this?

SA Well at the beginning I used to feel a bit suspicious, whether the speech was in the context of the workshop or whether it was going beyond that, whether they are talking on personal matters and even the racial divides that comes through - it is a problem when you don't understand the language.....

- R As far as you know, do your teachers switch to Zulu in the classroom?
- SA Very much so. And this is what we bring out in the workshops and we ask them to refrain from this practice because it is happening far too commonly.
- R Could you explain what you mean?
- SA When I just walk past classrooms, it is clear that the lesson is going on in Zulu. It is alright of switch to Zulu to explain concepts or terminology or aspects that pupils find difficulty in understanding but you can't use Zulu most of the time and English sometimes. It should be the other way round, then it's alright...../
- R In your view, does CS promote learning?
- SA Well at this moment in time it is not because the teachers are using mostly Zulu. This is why we ask them to use the medium of instruction, English..... You can't teach in Zulu and expect the child to write the exams in English. You are crippling the child when you do this. As I said, the teacher should use English when he teaches and switch to Zulu when the need arises. But this is not being done, this is not being done...../
- R So, why would you rank English first?
- SA In terms of trade and technological links the most important language has to be English. isiZulu stops at community levels and does not enter into higher levels.

SA4

- R As far as you know, do your teachers use Zulu in the classroom?
- T Ja, but in most cases I encourage them to use English as a medium of communication.
- R Why do you think they do this?
- T Ja, they will use English as they are supposed to, but sometimes the isiZulu teachers they switch to Zulu just to accommodate learners but in some cases it is not easy to use Zulu because there is no terminology in Zulu, for technology. So it is not always easy to use only Zulu. The English terminology must come in..... /
- R Do you switch between languages when speaking with your friends, colleagues and so on?
- SA [Laughter] By mistake, by mistake, Maybe I don't have a good English word so I might use just one word.

SA5

- R How do you feel about your teachers switching to Zulu in the [Maths] classroom?
- SA It doesn't matter. Especially if they are explaining in the other tongue and the children are understanding them. The main thing is that they must understand. You know, whether they are understanding by a picture, a drawing on the board or explanation in their own language, it really doesn't matter

SA7

[The preceding transcription shows that the speaker disapproves of CS in the English main language classroom]

- SA Once you start translating, we must expect translations. There are other ways you can do it.... by rephrasing, by simplifying, even through gestures for a learner to make sense. Even in second language learning, the subject, the language must be the sole medium of teaching and

learning...../

R If you were an English-Zulu bilingual would you switch to Zulu in the classroom?

SA No, I would never do that..... when I taught Afrikaans in the primary school and my pupils would use English. I would say to them , “*Eksus tog, ek kan jou nie verstaan nie*” [Excuse me, I cannot understand you] or something like that. And I used to say that I would fail them if they code-switched. I was very strict about that. Perhaps for the purposes for your research I would come across as an extremist, but I do feel very strongly about that.

R Do you feel the same way about CS in the informal sectors?

SA I haven't a problem with that, I think that it makes for the richness of our society. But in the formal situations, I do have a problem because I think a different register is required in a formal situation and I think teachers ... there are ways of getting around a language problem and I think teachers are using CS as an easy way out.

SA8

R How do feel about the fact that your teachers switch between English and Afrikaans or Zulu and Afrikaans?

SA I don't have problem with that. It is in line with the language policy as long as they end up learning the language. But it's good to switch to the mother tongue, to explain or provide vocabulary. It will be almost impossible not to do so...../

R Do you switch during your meetings with teachers?

SA Yes, I have to. We have the problem of having unqualified or underqualified teachers teaching Afrikaans. Teachers who are forced to teach Afrikaans, that's the big problem. There, I've got to switch to English otherwise they won't understand what I'm saying...../

R In your view, does CS promote or hinder learning?

SA It promotes leaning in the sense that learning can only take place if the child understands. It would be a fruitless exercise if you er speak a language, using words they don't understand.

SA9

R Are you conscious when you switch between languages?

SA Er, there are occasions that I do it deliberately, sometimes I do it without being conscious at all.

R Okay, when you conduct workshops and so on, do you switch to Zulu?

SA Sometimes, yes, for a connection or a bit of humour. But not for the actual delivery..... Alright, what will happen sometimes too is that one of them will pass a comment to the other in Zulu, and I will respond in Zulu to let them know I understand. I earn a lot more respect that way, er, it's not that I go hunting for respecting, but it makes a difference that the people who are learning and etching my language know that I have taken the trouble to learn theirs. I don't know what to call it It's a very useful tool. Sometimes there's a term which is very culturally bound, that doesn't translate in English very well. For example, “**ubuntu**” alright. If you ask for a translation, it means humanity but this is not what ubuntu truly refers to. In the South African context it also means sharing with your neighbours, sharing what you have within your culture. Ubuntu in this concept where nobody will starve in the Zulu community because we will look after the others. There's almost a sense of tribal feeling - you know what I mean?/

R Why would you rank Zulu second?

SA I suppose to give you a really honest answer I must go back to my own roots. Language is the most important tool.... I speak Zulu because my father told us, when we were very small, that Natal is the kingdom of the Zulu people and out of respect for them we will learn the language. I didn't grow up on a farm **kodwa manje ngiyakwazi ukukhuluma isiZulu** [but now I am able to speak isiZulu].....

To go back to your question, we are a multilingual, multicultural country and I think anybody who knows only one language is denying themselves.

APPENDIX B3a : SAMPLE TRANSCRIPTIONS OF INTERVIEW WITH SGB:

GB1

R If the teachers switched to Afrikaans in the English classroom, how would you feel?

GB It was one of the things we discussed when we appointed an Afrikaans speaker to teach English and she used Afrikaans to explain some English which is er.... it's a problem we discuss. She shouldn't speak Afrikaans in the English classroom.

R Okay. In your personal capacity, do you switch between languages?

GB Ja, many times.

R Is it something that you are aware of or is it something that comes naturally?

GB You know, I've been on the South Coast for so many years, it sort of comes naturally...../

R How would you rank the three languages?

GB I'm going to say Afrikaans first because it is my mother tongue. You wouldn't like your mother tongue to just disappear.... English is important because it is an international language but it is also important to maintain your identity. Now, because I come from an Afrikaans background I would say, yes, I would say that any person from a specific background would say his mother tongue is the most important. Although I acknowledge that at the end of the day that you need English to conduct your business and that sort of thing..... And Zulu is most probably in the same position as Afrikaans where it is disappearing as the Zulu people are getting more educated. Most of them are educated in English so it is in the same danger as with Afrikaans...../ Your mother tongue is most important. If you haven't got a background or a history, then you are nothing.

GB2

R Okay, so how would you feel if the teacher switched between languages in the classroom?

GB Well, I think that's wrong. You teach the language in that language.

R And in your personal capacity do you switch between Afrikaans and English?

GB No, if my client is English I address him in English and if my client is Zulu I address him in Zulu, and the same with Afrikaans.

RHow do you feel about people who switch between languages when they speak?

GB I think we must understand er that some people are not fluent in a language and they try but I don't like it...../

R How would you rank the three languages?

GB Well, Afrikaans is my mother tongue, so that' first. Second is English because it is the international

language and the most widely spoken language and Zulu is also important because of our area.

R Do you think it is necessary for pupils to learn a second language at school?

GB Oh yes, definitely. Ag, you know, it is important in the new South Africa and what have you, that you must try and speak your fellow South African's language. In the area, especially where you stay, I think it's important that you speak the language.

GB3

R Do you switch between languages in your personal capacity?

GB In normal conversation no. I speak only English or only Afrikaans.

R How do you feel about people who switch between languages when they speak?

GB Er, I don't think it's the right thing to do.....

R How would you rank the three languages?

GB Ja, it would be Afrikaans. Children must learn their mother tongue. English is important, you need it to be literate you know, all the world is speaking English. and I don't think Zulu has any place in education.

GB4

GB No, they [the teachers] don't switch to Zulu in the classroom. It is an English medium school, the Black children, when they come to the school they know it. In fact, this is why they come to our schools.

R How how would you feel if the teacher switched to Zulu in the classroom?

GB I won't like it. It will be a disadvantage to the Indian children because they don't know Zulu. I mean the Zulu children would not like it if the teacher switched to his vernacular. So, I think to avoid the problems, the classroom should just remain English.

GB5

R Do you think CS promotes or hinders learning in the classroom?

GB I think it will promote learning. For one, many of the learners who do speak Zulu, they are hindered by English because er although they can speak English, there are certain things they do not understand. By switching languages, it will make them understand the English phrases and questions better. So switching between languages will definitely help learners comprehend better. Actually it will help English in the long run...../

R How would you rank the three languages?

GB English definitely. It is the number one language. For one, it has economic value. It is a global language, it is important for interaction in the world of business as well as if you're looking at most of the educational material, it is in English. The second language in our province is Zulu because it is the language of the majority. And Afrikaans last because it is the language of the minority. But if you go to the Cape then Afrikaans will be second.

APPENDIX B4 : SAMPLE TRANSCRIPTIONS OF INTERVIEW WITH LEARNERS:

APPENDIX B4a : SCHOOL A

AL2

R What language(s) do you use in the English class?

- L Within the English classroom we talk English to the Miss. If you speak in Afrikaans to her ... you can't ... you must try and speak in English...../
- R Why do you think you mix your languages?
- L Because I'm not so fluent in Zulu so I get stuck in some places so then I use English...../
- R Why would you rank English first?
- L I take English first because my father told me that it is hard to get a job without English.....
- R and second?
- L I'll place Afrikaans because when someone swears you in Afrikaans or when you're in a fight with a White man you can speak Afrikaans.... you can fix your problem with Afrikaans.

AL3

- R What language(s) does your teacher of English use?
- L English.... and sometimes Afrikaans.
- R Why do you think she uses Afrikaans?
- L When she's er speaking in English, then she will explain the difficult words, or some things in poetry in Afrikaans...../
- R Do the pupils ever switch to Afrikaans [in the English classroom]?
- L It is a English class we have to speak English but we speak Afrikaans too... softly, you know, with our friends.

AL4

- R So, do you find yourself switching between English and Afrikaans often?
- L Well, it's become a habit with me.... I can speak English really well and I can speak Afrikaans very well...../
- R Does your teacher of English use any Afrikaans in the class?
- L Er... yes, sometimes. Say sometimes someone doesn't understand an English word too well they would ask and the teacher will explain in Afrikaans...../
- R How would you rank the three languages in order of importance?
- L I won't really rank them in importance because everything is important because you really need to know your languages to be able to speak. So I can't say something is better than the other. But when we look at a career I would rather take English because that's what you need to get a job. And everybody knows English.

AL5

- R Does your teacher of English use any Afrikaans in the class?
- L Yes, if you don't understand she'll use Afrikaans, but she doesn't like it...../
- R Could you tell me why [you would rank English first, Afrikaans second and Zulu third]?
- L Because most of the people know English, everywhere you go people speak English. Then Afrikaans. But then Afrikaans is my language and I love it. And then Zulu it's nice to know Zulu so when they say something you know what they are saying about you. So you know if they are talking about you. Just the basic stuff. No high class words and so on. Just basic Zulu.

AL6

- R Does your teacher any Afrikaans in the English classroom/
 L In the English classroom my teacher uses but we're supposed to speak only English but she uses some Afrikaans just to help us confer and stuff between English and Afrikaans, because many of the pupils can't speak English that well...../
- R How do you feel about people who switch between their languages?
 L It doesn't really bother me but it would be nice if we could speak the language correctly.
 R Okay. How would you rank the three languages, Afrikaans, Zulu and English, in order of importance?
 L I wouldn't really rank them because they are three different languages for different people. In our province we must actually try and learn all three of those so when you come across people strangers who don't speak your language so you can make it easier for them if you can speak their language... But if I had to rank them, I suppose it would have to be English because it is the most popular language in the world, then Afrikaans because that's my mother tongue and then Zulu. But I don't really like to rank it.

APPENDIX B4b : SCHOOL E**EL1**

- R How do you feel when your peers switch to Zulu in the class?
 L Sometimes I feel worried because I don't know whether they are talking about me...../
 R Why do you think your teacher switches to English in the [Afrikaans] classroom?
 L Most of us don't understand Afrikaans well. It is a difficult subject so she explains in English and it becomes easier for us.
 R Does your teacher switch to Zulu as well?
 L No.
 R How would you feel if she did?
 L It's alright because there are many Zulu children in our class...../
 R So, why would you rank English first?
 L Because everyone has to know English. Everywhere you go in the world, the main language is English. If you don't know English it is very hard to communicate with other people and you feel like an outcast and people will look down at you and today, er, people are making Zulu a bit inferior. Zulu is not important anymore.

EL2

- R Does your teacher switch to Zulu in your class?
 L No.
 R How would you feel if she did?
 L Ja, maybe it would help the [the Zulu pupils]...../
 R How do you feel about the pupils switching to Zulu?
 L I don't mind it's just that maybe they don't want us to know what they are saying, sometimes you don't know what they are talking about.....

R And how would you rank the three languages?

L English first, definitely because er almost everybody speaks English, and then Zulu because the people who live in KZN are Zulu speaking. Last is Afrikaans.

EL3

R How do you feel about your Zulu friends switching to Zulu?

L I feel bad and I feel left out. I feel like they are talking about me...../

R Why do you think your teacher switches to English [in the Afrikaans lesson]?

L To make us understand. I have a better understanding of what's going on especially with certain words.

EL5

R Do your Zulu friends switch between languages in their conversation?

L That's only if it is a group of only Blacks they will talk in Zulu, but if the group is mostly Indians or it's mixed with Coloureds, then everything is in English.

EL6

R What is your home language?

L Hindi... actually, we speak English at home, but supposedly my home language is Hindi...../

R So why do you think switching is bad?

L For those children who can't understand Zulu they think that they are talking about them...../

R Why would you rank English first?

L English, because er when you go to apply for a job most managers or bosses will interview you in English. If you don't know English you won't get the job. If you speak Zulu some people won't understand you. English is easier to communicate with everybody.

EL7

R What language do you use when you have only English speaking pupils in your group?

L In our groups, if there is only Zulu children then we use some Zulu but if we have Indians and Coloureds then we don't use Zulu. Because Mam, the Indian pupils and the Coloureds mam, they won't understand. That's not nice.

R How does your teacher react when you use Zulu?

L No she doesn't say anything. But she hears us. She just listens. But sometimes when someone is speaking too much Zulu then she'll say "try and speak English".

R And the report back?

L No, we use only English. That has to be in English only...../

R Would you like your Afrikaans teacher to use Zulu as well?

L Yes. But not the other subjects. Only Afrikaans.//

R Do you ever switch between English and Zulu in your everyday conversation?

L Actually I always use both English and Zulu. Sometimes there are some English words that kind of confuse me si I'll just put in some Zulu.

R Are you aware that you switch between the languages?

L No. It just comes naturally.

EL8

- R How does your teacher react when you switch between languages [in the classroom]?
- L She doesn't. She hasn't said anything about it...../
- R Why do you think your [Afrikaans] teacher switches to English in the classroom?
- L Some of us don't really know how to speak Afrikaans. We are not very good at it. So she explains to us. Then we understand, it makes it easier for us. Because she can speak in Afrikaans but if you don't understand what she's saying, then I mean we'll fail. Because we don't understand. So she must explain.
- R Would you like her to use some Zulu as well?
- L I don't think there's a problem with it. But I think it's better this way. If she uses Zulu what about the Indian children - they won't understand. No, it's better this way.

EL9

- R Why would you rank English first?
- L Everyone has to know English. Everywhere you go in the world, the main language is English. If you don't know English it is very hard to communicate with other people and you feel like an outcast and people will look down on you.
- R Why do you rank Zulu second?
- L Because it's my people's first language and today er people are making Zulu a bit inferior. Zulu is not important anymore.

EL10

- R. Okay. Do your Zulu speaking friends ever use Zulu in the classroom?
- L Sometimes, when they are talking to one another. But they don't use Zulu when the teacher is teaching...../
- R Okay, why would you rank English first?
- L Because everywhere in the world wherever you go it's English, English, English. It's the language people use to communicate. It's like you can come from different races but you can still communicate.

APPENDIX B4c : SCHOOL Z**ZL1**

- R Why do you think your teacher switches to Zulu [in the English classroom]?
- L He wants other children to understand because those children can't understand English. So he use the Zulu language so they can all understand....Every time the children speak in Zulu to the teacher he must explain it in Zulu. I don't like that. We must speak only English.
- R Does this [the switching] help you in the classroom?
- L No, because for English we must speak only English and learn English in the classroom.....
- R Do you switch to Zulu in the English classroom?
- L Most of the time I use English but sometimes I use Zulu because the other children don't understand English properly...../
- R What language(s) does the teacher use in the Afrikaans classroom?

- L Afrikaans, English and Zulu.
- R How do you feel about this?
- L I think it's fine for Afrikaans because most of us don't understand Afrikaans. So he can explain it in English and sometimes in Zulu. Ja, it's fine...../
- R Why do you rank English first?
- L Because when you go out of the country you won't get Zulu or Afrikaans but they can speak English. And when you get a job you have to speak English so I think English is the best language.

ZL2

- R Do you switch between say Zulu and English when you talk?
- L When I talk Zulu I talk Zulu, when I talk English I talk English.... But it just happens, but not all the time. It is a problem when you do that. It is not nice./
- R Why do you rank English first?
- L First for school. You must learn your English. And for jobs, to talk to other people that are not our language. They do not understand what we mean.... and then Zulu. It is our language. If we come back in our homes we speak Zulu, our parents don't talk English. It's important to know our language because we are Africans.

ZL3

- R How do you feel about your teacher [in the English classroom] using Zulu?
- L I don't like it because we want to learn only English. But he must use it because the other children they don't understand English very nicely.
- R And in the Afrikaans classroom/
- L Wow! I dislike this subject. The teacher, he teaches, it's not necessary to me. Sometimes he comes in : "Goeie môre". Some students say "Goeie môre meneer." Some just stand and look around and listen to others what they say.../
- R Mmm Mmm. And what languages does your teacher use in classroom?
- L Afrikaans, English and Zulu.
- R How do you feel about this?
- L He must use English not Zulu. He must use English to help us with Afrikaans.

ZL4

- R Does your teacher use more than one language when she teaches?
- L Some of the children they don't understand English. For them he uses Zulu. If they don't understand English then he use Zulu to try and help them.
- R How do you feel about your teacher using Zulu in the English classroom?
- L But not really, he doesn't use so much Zulu. Because ... he must not use Zulu every time. He must use English then we will be able to talk in English. We must practice English.
- R Does your teacher switch between languages in the Afrikaans classroom/
- L Ja, he uses also English.
- R Why do you think your teacher does this?
- L You know us, we don't understand Afrikaans if he talks Afrikaans. When he comes to the class and he says "Goeie môre kinders" and the others are not saying "Goeie môre meneer". They don't know

what they must do so he must say "Good morning" to us and then we must all say "Good morning sir."

R And Zulu? Does he use Zulu in class?

L Yes, he must because sometimes they don't understand the English so he must use Zulu.

R How do you feel about your teacher using three languages in class?

L Using Afrikaans only is not right. As I say, he must use English because we don't understand Afrikaans. He can talk and talk but we don't understand Afrikaans, the class will make a noise. But they must not use Zulu. They must use English and Afrikaans only...../

R Do you switch between languages when you speak?

L What must I say now.. I can't speak ... mix up English and Zulu with you now. It will make you confused. Then you'll say, you'll say "Something is wrong. This girl she can't speak English". I speak English if I speak English and I speak Zulu when I speak Zulu. But sometimes, I know I'm mixing because there are other names of English I don't know it. Like what can I say ... like "madoembe". When I'm speaking I don't know the other word for "madoembe"...../

R Which of the three languages, Zulu, Afrikaans and English, do you think is the most important?

L English. And then Zulu and last Afrikaans.

R Why do you think English is so important?

L Many people speak English English. Many people understand English but not Zulu. Whites they don't understand Zulu and if you speak English you can communicate with many people together.

ZL5

R What language(s) does your teacher use in the English classroom/

L English.... and sometimes Zulu.

R Why do you think he uses Zulu?

L To make us understand. Sometimes the other children they don't understand so the teacher must say in Zulu so then they understand./

R What language(s) does your Afrikaans teacher use in the classroom?

L He uses English and Afrikaans.

R Why do you think he does this?

L Because nobody understand Afrikaans - it is so hard. SO he must use English.

R And Zulu? Does he ever use Zulu?

L Ja, he does. He explains in English and then in Zulu...../

R Do you switch between Zulu and English when you talk?

L Yes.

R Are you aware that you do so?

L Sometimes, ja., I know I'm switching. But when you are talking, talking with your friends or with your mother, no, it just comes...../

R How would you rank the three languages in order of importance?

L English first. You must know English everywhere you go. You go to Shepstone okay, you go to Checkers, what you going to say to the White man? He don't know Zulu. You must know English. And for interviews. And for jobs. You won't get a job you can't speak English. Nobody will give

you a job. So English must come first.

R And second?

L Zulu. Because you see, that's my mother tongue. You speak to your grandmother in English, she says "What! You White man now. You got no respect." So you must speak in Zulu.

ZL6

R How would you rank the three languages in order of importance?

L English. Because there are different people you know. Maybe, maybe I'll go to the bank. You saw the White people, I know to speak English and he know to speak English and you speak English together. English I know is a great language.

ZL7

R How would you rank the three languages in order of importance?

L I think my home language first. Because nowadays children are running away from their roots. Our children, they learn English and Afrikaans, that's right, they must talk it but they must not stop talking Zulu because now children are stopping talking Zulu you can't talk English with your mother. Sometimes she don't know what you're talking about. It's not right. You must speak Zulu with your mother. In the English time you talk English, and in the Zulu time you must talk your Zulu...../

R and what about Afrikaans?

L (very softly, in hushed tones) Afrikaans. I don't like Afrikaans.

R Why?

L I don't know. I just don't like it. To speak Afrikaans it's hard.

ZL8

R Are you aware when you switch between the languages?

L No, it just comes...../

R And second?

L Afrikaans.

R Why would you rank Afrikaans second?

L It's because I'm a Black person. I like to know English and Afrikaans. I already know Zulu.

ZL10

R Why do you think they [teachers] use Zulu as well?

L They want other children to understand what's happening in the classroom. For the children who don't understand English so they use the Zulu language so we can all understand...../

R How do you feel about your teacher using Zulu in the English classroom?

L In English we should only speak English. We must learn only English in the classroom...../

R Are you aware when you switch between languages?

L No, it just happens...../

R Why would you rank Afrikaans second?

L Because I want to learn another language. I know Zulu.

APPENDIX C: LESSON RECORDINGS**[SAMPLE TRANSCRIPTIONS]****APPENDIX C1: LLCE [L1]: SCHOOL E [GROUP WORK]****APPENDIX C1a:****GRADE** : 9**LESSON:** Oral work : Preparation for class debate**TOPIC** : Should HIV positive children be in main stream schools?

(Group comprised two English first language speakers and two Zulu-English speakers)

- The entire conversation was held in English except for the concluding part as follows:

- 1 L1 What I want to know is what if we were HIV positive would we want people to treat us like
2 this? Would you like them to tell you "Don't come to this school because you are HIV
3 positive"? Would you like it if people had to say that?
4 L2 No I won't.
5 L1 So now you get our point?
6 L2 Ja, but they must not be allowed because they will get other children who are teasing them.
7 I think they must go to their own school - you know, nobody will be teasing anyone you see.
8 L1 No, I don't. You just don't see our point, Sanele. **iKhanda lakho ilikhuni!** [You are so stubborn!]

APPENDIX C1b:**GRADE** : 9**LESSON:** Literature - Animal Farm, George Orwell**TOPIC** : Discussion of answers to questions based on chapters ??

(Group comprised four Zulu-English speakers)

- 1 L1 What else do we learn about Major?
2 (No response)
3 L1 He felt that he had a strong belief that they were not treated properly and they should be
4 maybe the animals should change their lives because they think that England belongs to them.
5 L4 Mmmm/
6 L1 and they feel that they have been slaves for the humans, they have been giving them milk
7 and/
8 L3 Obviously **ngobanaku uMajor waye yingulube** [because Major was a pig]. (Pupils laugh).
9 L1 **Ja, ngoba izingulube zingamavila** [Yes because pigs are lazy].
10 L3 **Zingamavila zidla ukudla kuphela** [They only eat food].
11 L1 Okay, okay. Let's get back to work alright. Turn to page 4, people open up your books. In your
12 understanding of chapter one, discuss the extent you agree with the comment/
13 L3 **Ukhulume nje uchaze** [Just talk and explain].
14 L1 Man is the only real enemy. That's the saying. What do you think about that? They felt that
15 man was their only real enemy. Andile, you want to say something?
16 L4 **Ngobe yona iyivila** [Because it is lazy].
17 L3 Obviously **ezukudliwa nje** [pigs are for eating]. (Pupils laugh).
18 P4 **Iyinuka futhi, ayiphumeli ngaphandle futhi ayigezi** [They are filthy, they don't go out and

- 19 they don't wash].
- 20 L1 (Firmly) Thulani, **thulani** [Be quiet, be quiet]. Humans are not animals.
- 21 L3 **Ngoba** [Because]/
- 22 L2 **Bebacabanga ukuthi** [They think that] everything will come easy.
- 23 L1 The only real enemy was man. So why do you think they would say that?
- 24 L4 They were not treated the way they should be treated/
- 25 L1 The way they wanted t be treated and/
- 26 L4 Ja/
- 27 L1 and man, they stole from them and made them slaves like the horses they pull the cart and/
- 28 L4 the cows/
- 29 L1 They marked the cows and once they were old and couldn't do anything they used to kill them so/
- 30
- 31 L2 I think the pig is being racist.
- 32 L1 Why?
- 33 L2 **Amapigs ngoba lana bebe uyabonake** [Because the pigs they were supervisors] you see.
- 34 P3 Ja.
- 35 L1 No, but still but still, the pigs the pigs, what happens to them? They get slaughtered and what happens to them, they make it have babies and they take the piglets.
- 36
- 37 L3 Obviously. What is the use of pigs?
- 38 L1 The pig. I don't quite blame the pig. They could do nothing. I mean the animals they are stupid let's look at them mentally. The pigs they could come up with the brightest ideas and give
- 39 **abantu** (people) advice.
- 40
-
- 41 L2 What's propaganda?
- 42 L3 It's like/
- 43 L1 Let's look in the dictionary.
- 44 L4 It's P R isn't it?
- 45 L3 Ja. P R O P A G A N D A (Pupils search in dictionary)
- 46 L1 You found it yet?
- 47 L3 Just wait a second I'm still looking for it.
- 48 L1 What does it mean?
- 49 L2 (Loudly) **Nayi sesiyitholile!** [Here it is, we found it!]
- 50 L3 Er propaganda is just like how **Ukusho ukuthi uyabamisleader into ayenzayo yena, iyona lento ebezama ukuyisho** [That means Old major was misleading them, it's something like that. That's what they are trying to say].
- 51
- 52
- 53 L1 **Awufunde futhi** [please read again].
- 54 L3 Propaganda means publicity to make people believe something.
- 55 L1 The question says the speech is an example of propaganda so it means that Old Major, this old pig he was trying to spread/
- 56
- 57 L3 rumours or something.
- 58 L1 No. He wanted to start a rebellion. So he gave all the animals the false information.
- 59 L1 **Ngoba ... ubatshelile izinto eziwong** [He told them wrong things] about the animals.
- 60 L3 **Nabo futhi** [They too] they listen to him. **Njengo Boxer** [Like Boxer] they so stupid.
- 61 L1 So propaganda is this thing that the pig, Old Major, wanted the animals to go fully against the humans and did not want (unclear) but then still he uses propaganda because he tells the
- 62

- 63 animals about all the wrong things humans did. But what about the animals, they feed them?
 64 **Mase bebanika ukudla** [When they give them food]. And they made all these barns for them.
 65 The animals couldn't do that for themselves.
- 66 L3 Ja, even **ngesikhathi se harvesta** [even the time when they were harvesting].
 67 L1 Ja, **ngesikhathi bevuna bebengakwazi ukuma** [Yes, when they were harvesting they could not
 68 stand] with their two legs.
- 69 L3 And **futhi uOld Major zange amentione ukuthi ama ani lokhuza amahumans ayafida ama**
 70 animals [Old major did not mention the fact that the ani... humans used to feed the animals].
 71 L1 And the animals they want to punish all those on two legs.
- 72 L2 **Impilo impilo** [It's life, it's life].
- 73 L1 So what do you understand about this term propaganda?
 74 L3 It's when people spread false information.
- 75 L1 **Umuntu asho into wrong ngomunye** [When people spread wrong information about someone].
 76 L3 not talking about the real facts.
 77 L4 [makes a sound of an animal].
- 78 L1 Hey Andile we need your cooperation here. Examine this speech closely, what elements of
 79 propaganda are evident in this speech - when Major was addressing the animals?
 80 L3 **Uqonde ukuthini** [What do you mean?]
 81 L1 **Kusa fanele sibheke lento eshiwo uMajor** [We must examine what Major said] and determine
 82 what was .. We must look at what Major is saying and what, where the propaganda words used
 83 on humans.
- 84 L3 **Kukhona le, nayi lento** [There is this thing, here it is]. Man is the only real enemy. Remove
 85 man from the scene and the root cause of hunger and overwork is abolished.
- 86 L1 Altogether what Major is saying is that man is the only enemy. That can't be because the
 87 animals are also the enemy to each other.
- 88 L3 **Ikhona futhi enye into** [There is this other thing] Old Major is right..... Because man he
 89 does not give milk, he does not lay eggs, he's too weak to pull the plough, to .. He cannot run
 90 fast enough to catch the rabbit, yet he was the lord of all the animals.
 91 L4 So he was right.
- 92 L1 He was right, Still, the point is he is saying that man is the only real enemy and when we come
 93 across this and read this we find out that the pigs also didn't interact properly. They wanted
 94 to eat each other.
- 95 L3 But the animals are sick and tired of the humans.
 96 L4 You have to take action.
 97 L3 You have to take action like now. **Njengamanje ungayi thatha iaction** [Like now, you can take
 98 action].
- 99 L1 But the animals were also at fault. Their fault is that they are wrong themselves.
 100 L3 Even men fight against themselves. Ja, **ngoba nani niyalwa nodwa** [Yes, even people fight
 101 amongst themselves].
 102 L1 You see/
 103 L3 Can I say something? I want to say something.
 104 **Imani ngicele ukubuza. Ngicela ukukhuluma ngaledaba ya leAnimal Farm. Agithi leAnimal**
 105 **Farm iginovel** [Wait can I say something? Can I talk about this Animal Farm. It is novel, isn't
 106 it a novel?]
 107 L1 But sometimes it is true/

- 108 L3 But it's based on real life. Come listen to this. Listen to me. **Khona iphoyinti engifuna ukuye**
 109 **kulona** [There is a point I want to get to].
 110 L1 **Unamange** [You are telling lies].
 111 L2 **Bane lizwi labo** [They have their own voice].
 112 L4 **Anithula. Ngicela ukukhuluma kule phoyinti? Ngicela ukubekakule phoyinti? Angithi**
 113 **kuthiwa** novel, inovel. **Ungathini kuthiwa lama animals ube lazy. Futhi ephethwe njenge**
 114 **zingulube.** [Be quiet. Can I say something on this point? Can I say something? Isn't Animal
 115 Farm a novel? What would you say if these animals were people, lazy and treated like pigs].
 116 L2 Like the way it was during apartheid.
 117 L4 No. **Uzobona umasengi qhubeka** [You will see when I continue]. Let's say the pigs were
 118 referred to as lazy people/
 119 L2 But **Boxer** was hard working/
 120 L3 The author **ye Animal Farm shuthi wathatha abuntu** [The author of Animal Farm took people]
 121 and turned them to animals because of the way they acted. The novel is based on a true story.
 122 Listen! The animals were real human beings who were treated like **amapigs** where the humans
 123 who were lazy were referred to the pigs.....

APPENDIX C2: LLCE [L2]: SCHOOL A

APPENDIX C2a:

GRADE : 8

TOPIC : Culture

LESSON: Oral work [Group work]

[N. B. The entire conversation is in English only, the only exception of a few words]

- 1 L1 What festivals do you have?
 2 L2 Our Afrikaners and there we celebrate our language and we have lots of fun.
 3
 4 L1 What music do you like?
 5 L2 We Afrikaners like *Boere musiek* but now it's a bit more modern.

APPENDIX C2b:

GRADE : 8

LESSON : Vocabulary

[A list of words, in English is given to pupils. Pupils are to provide the Afrikaans equivalent for each word].

- 1 T translate the word into Afrikaans or you may write an English sentence to show you
 2 understand the meaning. Okay, did you find the words? Did you find the meanings?
 3 Ls Yes.
 4 T What did you use to find the meanings?
 5 Ls A dictionary.
 6 T Okay. Initiation, the first one. Could you please give me the meaning or the Afrikaans word
 7 for that?
 8 L *Aanweiding. Aanweiding* [Initiation. Initiation].
 9 T Do you agree with that?

- 10 L (unclear).
- 11 T That's right. When you go to the high school for the first two weeks they call it *ontgroening*
- 12 that is supposed to make you feel welcome and to show you (unclear) after school. Okay, the
- 13 next one.
- 14 L *Jaloesie*. [Jealousy].
- 15 T *Jaloesie. Dis reg* [Jealousy. That's right]. Okay, the next one?
- 16 L *Maqsig* [Powerful].
- 17 T *Maqsig* [Powerful]. Okay. Did everyone find the Afrikaans for powerful? Okay, it's
- 18 *maqsig*. The next word. Yes Lindsie?
- 19 L *Ek het dit nie* [I do not have it].
- 20 T You must look it up in the dictionary. Yes Rudie can you help us?
- 21 L (unclear) fostered in human.
- 22 T Could you repeat it again?
- 23 L (unclear) fostered in human.
- 24 T Why would you say that?
- 25 L I'm not sure Mrs only that they would have a shorter life span than humans.
- 26 T Yes, that's right. For every year that a human has a dog has seven years. That's right.
- 27 Ancestral?
- 28 L *Voorvaderlik* [Ancestral].
- 29 T *Voorvaderlik* [Ancestral] okay. Can you explain to us what is *Voorvaderlik* [Ancestral]?
- 30 L It's as er our life the people who lived before you/
- 31 T who will be your ancestors. Separate?
- 32 L *Verskei* [Separate].
- [Teacher continues in a similar way until the list of words is exhausted].

APPENDIX C2c:**GRADE** : 8**LESSON** : Comprehension

[Pupils have been given the passage and questions to discuss in groups. In the recorded lesson, they are asked to read aloud the question and answer. The entire lesson is in English only except for translation of vocabulary].

- 1 T Okay. The last one. Auxiliary verb. What is an auxiliary verb?
- 2 N>R
- 3 T Tell me what's the Afrikaans word for auxiliary verb.
- 4 N>R
- 5 T Let's look it up in the dictionary.
- 6 [Pupils look up dictionary].
- 7 T It's a u x ...
- 8 L *Hulpwerkwoord*.
- 9 T *Hulpwerkwoord*. Yes, that translated to English ... in your own words what does it mean?
- 10 N>R
- 11 T It's a *hulpwerkwoord* in Afrikaans. It means helping the verb. It is the verb that helps the?
- 12 L [Unclear].
- 13 T No.

- 14 L [unclear].
 15 T Almost but it's not. Okay, it would be words like/
 16 L May.
 17 T May. That's right. Okay you find any other one in that paragraph? See if you can find another
 18 one. May is one.

APPENDIX C2d:**GRADE** : 8**LESSON** : Language study

[Class engages in group work. Teacher goes around from group to group. Teacher's voice can be heard above that of the learners as she goes around. Some of the comments she makes as she goes around follows].

- 1 T No. no. Don't write. Discuss first.
 2 T Underline underline.
 3 T You must write it in the past tense.
 4 T This group. You must sit in a circle. Face each other.
 5 T Ja, that changes I'm coming back to you.
 6 T What's wrong there?,
 7 (After about 5 minutes):
 8 T Alright, let's have a look. I now it's a long way but it's better for you to underline your changes
 9 because then you won't get mixed up. Okay. Look at the board. Boys and girls where you have
 10 a specific indication of the introduction... Susan said to Nell .. Now I'm going to work in the
 11 past tense. Everything must be written in the past tense. First you'll underline the pronouns.
 12 In this case what will you underline?
 13 L I.
 14 T You are right. Because Susan said to Nell, I then we have others the introduction. There
 15 are no funny introductions am I right? Because she says to Nell... The introduction is already
 16 given to you. Am I right? Then we have ... could you find any time relation there? Is there any
 17 time? No. No time. Then you go to the third stage ... changing your verbs. Remember if your
 18 word is in the present tense/
 19 L It must go in the past tense.
 20 T Yes. Alright. Want will change to? Will change to?
 21 L would.
 22 T would. And then you've got I'm, the apostrophe. Right. The apostrophe 'm meaning am so it
 23 must change to? Must it remain the same?
 24 N>R
 25 T She was now in the end have a look it goes like this. Susan said to Nell that - you can sue
 26 that- that she wanted to become - why didn't I change become to became?
 27 L You can't you've got to/
 28 T Yes, remember after the word to ... you cannot say to become after to. You must use the
 29 infinite verb - to become- when she left school but she was not very good at typing. You
 30 all understand this?
 31 N>R

- 32 T Anybody with a problem?
 33 N>R Okay. Do the next one now.
 34 [Rest of lesson continues in a similar vein. The entire lesson is in English only. Teacher goes around
 35 from group to group].
 36 T Listen. Listen not always is the introduction given. That you can provide, find your own
 37 introduction.
 38 [Pupil sneezes]
 39 L *Ag*, bless you.

APPENDIX C2e:

GRADE : 8

LESSON : Literature, *Love David* (Dianne Case) [Chapters 7-10]

[Pupils were given a worksheet with questions to answer as homework. The lesson begins with pupils being asked to read out their summaries on each chapter. This is done in English only. The following is a transcription of the discussion of the questions that appear in the worksheet].

- 1 T Finding supportive evidence. We are given further insights into David's character in these
 2 chapters. Using each trait that is given, find a sentence which supports each adjective. Okay.
 3 Thoughtful, page 24. The word thoughtful describes David. Is there anything there, anyone
 4 who can find the sentence there or the idea that David is thoughtful?
 5 L1 David bought her a lollipop every afternoon when he came from school.
 6 T When he came straight from school, ja. He bought her a lollipop. Who did he give the lollipop?
 7 L2 He gave it to baby.
 8 T Okay, why do you think he gave it to baby?
 9 L3 She liked sweets.}
 10 L4 She cried for it.}
 11 L5 She won't get it otherwise. The adults can't afford it. They are always drunk.
 12 T Okay, so where do you think David got the money to buy the lollipop?
 13 L6 He used to steal car radios and things.
 14 L7 He would sell it.
 15 L8 (unclear)
 16 T Okay, on page 26, we are told that David is unforgiving. Is there any evidence that David is
 17 unforgiving?
 18 L9 I saw the look of revenge in his eyes.
 19 T Okay, what happened there?
 20 L10 The other boys wanted to sow friendship but David he shook their hands but there was a look
 21 of revenge in his eyes.
 22 L11 I think David was just jealous because Oupa got along with the boys (unclear). He had a
 23 problem
 24 with the whole group idea.
 25 T Okay, let's look at page 30.
 [Lesson continues in a similar fashion with only English being used]

APPENDIX C3: LLCE [L2] : SCHOOL Z**APPENDIX C3a:****GRADE** : 9**TOPIC** : Animal World**LESSON:** Oral work [Group work]

(Teacher introduces the lesson).

- 1 T Morning class.
 2 L Morning Sir.
 3 T Today we are going to talk about animal rights. Class keep quiet. Today we are going to talk
 4 about animal rights. Take your seats. [Much shuffling can be heard]. **Thula! Thula!** (Quiet!
 5 Quiet!) Let's begin with the work. Animal world. Mmm What animals do you know?
 6 Ls [Pupils shout out the various names of animals]...../
 7 T Er I want to record 2 or 3 groups while you are discussing these questions. **Ni bo khuluma**
 8 **phezulu nenzele amatape** [You must speak clearly for the tape recorder]. And don't make a
 9 noise. Understand?
 10 L Yes.

.....
[Groupwork : Group 1- group of 3, Learners 1 - 3]

- 11 L1 Let us start with number one.
 12 L2 "What kind of animals, if any are part of your daily life?"
 13 L3 Frog. [Pupils laugh].
 14 L1 **Khuso ukuthini kona ukuthi daily?** [What does daily mean?].
 15 L2 **Zonke izinsuku. Namhlanje. Kusasa. Zonke izinsuku** [Everyday. Today, tomorrow, everyday].
 16 Everyday.
 17 L1 **Why wishuza ifrog ke ishoni?** [Why have you chosen the frog, tell us].
 18 L3 The reason, reason.....
 19 T Okay. Okay. Would you say that the frog is part of your life?
 20 L1 **Ilento ebengiyibuzake** [Yes, it is just the question I was asking].
 21 T How many of you say an animal is part of your life? What is it? Yes?
 22 L2 The thing that you see everyday.
 23 T You see it everyday. Yes. Like the.....?
 24 L1 Dog.
 25 T The dog yes. You know, er some of the boys have to take out the cattle before they come to
 26 school? It's part of their daily life.
 27 L2 Yes, yes.
 28 L3 Some of us have to feed the chickens sir.
 29 L2 And the cat.
 30 L1 A lizard. Lizard.
 31 T Okay. Okay. **Isi khathi soku khuluma nga lendaba 10 minutes kuphela.** [We have only 10
 32 minutes for the discussion so get on with the topic].
 33 L2 Number 2. Are these animals useful or do you have them simply as pets for company and
 34 affection?

- 35 L1,3 (in unison) I don't understand this}
 36 What does this mean?}
- 37 L2 Anyone knows what this means? (Calls pupils from another group). Christopher (L4), come with
 38 it here boy. Come with a solution.
- 39 L1 **Thina asiwetholi lambuzo** [We don't understand this question]. Would you please explain the
 40 meaning of this question?
- 41 T Are the animals that are part of your life useful to you?
- 42 L4 How do they help you.
- 43 T Yes Christopher. **Wenzekahle** [Well done]. Do the animals help you in any way? Is there
 44 anything you get out of them or you have them because you love them.
- 45 Ls Okay. Okay.}
 46 We understand now.}
 47 Thank you sir}
- 48 L1 The answer is huh **siyathola inyama ngezinkukhu** [we get meat from the chicken].
- 49 L2 And the dog.... **zisigadela izigebengu** [The dog keeps us safe from criminals]. **Njenga iPhoyisa**
 50 [They are like the police].
- 51 L1 Okay. Let's continue.
- 52 L2 Let's continue guys. **Khulumani** [Talk, talk].
- 53 L3 **No fishi, no fishi siyawudla**. Besides, **ufishi asiwugcini ekhaya**. [Even fish, we eat fish.
 54 Besides, we don't keep fish at home].
- 55 L1 Oh please talk English.
- 56 L2 Speak English please.
- 57 L3 (loudly) **Sikhuluma kajena**. **Ngiyahleba mina futhi akuzwakali** [That is the way we speak. I
 58 am speaking softly and you can't hear me].
- 59 L2 **Wena, noma ungahleba kuzwakala kakhulu** [Even if you speak softly we can hear you loudly].
- 60 L3 **Akushiwongo ukuthi singa discussi ngesi Zulu** [We were not told not to discuss in Zulu].
- 61 L2 (laughs)
- 62 L3 You are laughing now. Stop laughing.
- 63 L1 Let's go on..... The dog and cat. The dog is useful to me and to us because it helps us to/
 64 L2 They are our body guards.
- 65 L3 **Ngicela ukupelele** bodyguard [Please spell body guard].
- 66 L2 **BODYGUDI**
- 67 L1 Body guard not garden guards our house from thieves. **G U A R D S**. And chickens/
 68 L2 They help us with eggs by giving and supplying meat and eggs.
- 69 L3 **Cow. Asiwubhalanga icow** [We did not write cow].
- 70 L1 Okay. Let's get to number three. If you don't have animals where are you now?
- 71 T Okay. I want the tape recorder now.....
- 72 Ls Thank you sir.

.....
[Groupwork : Group 2- group of 3, Learners 4-6]

- 73 L4 Do you think animals are inferior compared to people?
- 74 L5 Inferior? What does inferior mean?
- 75 T Are you already at number 5? Inferior means it is lower.. We are better than it.
- 76 Ls Okay.

- 77 T It is a lower standard..... you understand group?
 78 L4 Yes. Are they better than us anyway?
 79 L5 Some of them are better than us.
 80 L6 **Njengani?** [Like what?]
 81 L5 **Njengani? Njengenja** [Like what? Like a dog].
 82 L4 So what are we going to say?
 83 L6 Some of the **kodwa** [but then] we are better than animals.
 84 L5 A dog is better because ... **Inja,inja ingcono ngesinye isikhathi ngoba ibuye ekusize** [A dog,
 85 a dog is better because sometimes it can help you].
 86 L6 Even a cat/
 87 L4 **ne snake** [and a snake].
 88 L6 **Zisisiza ngani izinyoka?** [How do snakes help us?]
 89 L4 **Inyoka hayi ukuthi iyasisiza** [It's not that snakes help us].
 90 L5 **Inyaka iyukwazi ukuluma** [It can bite you].
 91 L6 **Hayi..** [No...].
 92 L5 Huh, yes **iyakwazi** [it can].
 93 (unclear) (laughter)
 94 L6 **Sowenza lokhu ngamabomu** [You are doing that deliberately].
 95 L4 (softly) **Noma yini oyishoyo iyatapeka** [Whatever you say is being taped]. Okay, what number
 96 did we not do?
 97 L6 **Uyazi izophuma nawe loyo oyishoyo** [You too, what you say is being taped].
 98 L5 Shhhh the teacher is looking at you.
 99 L6 Are we finished?
 100 L4 No.
 101 L6 Then let's finish..... Do you have them simply as pets or for company and affection?
 102 L4 **Nalokhu** [That too].

.....

- 103 T Alright class. I think we have come to the last question So even though you have not come you
 104 must stop now. So let's have one person from each group. So who wants to start?
 105 N>R Come on come on time is going. **Asinayo isikhathi. Ngubani uzo qala?** [We don't have time to
 106 waste. Who is going to start?] Any group?
 107 L Whole group?
 108 T No, one person. Okay, lets give a big hand for Sipiwe. **Wenzekhahle Sipiwe! Une sibindi.** [Well
 109 done Sipiwe. You are a brave boy!]
 110 Right, let us listen to him. Quiet! Quiet! You in the corner ... there ... **sithulili manje** [We are
 111 all quiet now]. **Silalela futhi qhubeka** [We are listening. Please proceed].

[Report back : Teacher calls for the leader of each group to report back. The entire report back is done in English].

APPENDIX C3b:**GRADE** : 9**LESSON:** Comprehension**TOPIC** : The long-toothed woman

- 1 T Good morning Class.
- 2 Ls Good morning Sir.
- 3 T Okay. Let's do the reading. [Teacher reads first paragraph]. Alright. Notorious. When you say
- 4 someone is notorious what do we mean?
- 5 N>L
- 6 T It means for doing bad things. **Bayamazi ngogugebenga**. [When you get well known for doing
- 7 bad things]. Notorious. Everybody knows you because of your bad deeds. So why was this
- 8 woman notorious? What did she do?
- 9 L (Reads from text) For killing men who dare cross into her land.
- 10 T Yes. For killing men who crossed her land. And the women? Did she do anything to the women?
- 11 N>R
- 12 T **Ukoskazi? Umenzeni omunye ukoskazi?** [The women? Did she do anything to the women?]
- 13 L No, she killed the man. Women are allowed into her territory.
- 14 T Yes. Good. She did not kill the women, only the men.
- 15 [Reads paragraph 2].
- 16 Okay. So this hunter, what do you know about the hunter?
- 17 L (Reads from text) He is a good spears-man and a good shot.
- 18 T Okay, we are told he's got skills using a spear. We are also told that he is a good shot. What
- 19 else tells you that he was a good shot?
- 20 L He never misses.
- 21 T He never misses when he takes aim. He never misses. **Uyayishaya** [He hits accurately]. "The
- 22 long-toothed woman cannot kill him." Why can't she kill him?
- 23 N>R
- 24 T Yes? Why can't she kill him? **Akakwazi ngani ukubulala lendoda?** [Why can't this woman kill
- 25 this man?]
- 26 L Because he's good with spears.
- 27 T Because he is a good shot. So in other words there are no women who can counteract him.
- 28 (Reads to end of paragraph 2). (Pupils laugh). (Reads paragraph 3). Alright er who do you think
- 29 this man-eater who enters the hunter's house is?
- 30 N>R
- 31 T At midnight the man-eater enters the house.... Come on who do you think is the man eater?
- 32 N>R
- 33 T Is she going to eat him?
- 34 N>R
- 35 T **Ngibuzile uzo mudla** [Well I asked is she going to eat him?] This woman she enters the house
- 36 with the intention to do what?
- 37 L Eat the hunter (Pupils laugh).
- 38 T Yes. She wants to kill, eat the hunter. The writer says man-eater. "But the hunter shouts at
- 39 the woman." What does she say? What does the woman say?

- 40 L (Reads) "I have only come to see that you are sleeping nicely."/
- 41 T Why is she happy?..... Why do you think she is happy?
- 42 L Because she is going to get the firewood.
- 43 T Does she need the firewood? *Ucabanga ukuthi uyazindinga izikuni zoku basa?* [Do you think she really need the firewood?]
- 44
- 45 N>R
- 46 T Okay. Let's read a little further on (Reads). Alright, does she need the firewood? Why is she so happy?
- 47
- 48 N>R Alright she begins to chop the bottom of the tree with her long tooth. The man is up there on the tree chopping down the branches. The woman is down there with her teeth chopping away at the bottom of the tree. So what do you think she wants to do? Does she really need the firewood? *Uyazi dinga ngempela izinkuni zoku basa* [Does she really need firewood?]
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52 L No. *Ufuna ukumbulala* [She wants to kill him]
- 53 T Yes! She wants to kill him. *Ufuna ukumbulala* [She wants to kill him]. So this man at the top of the tree is screaming for help. What would you do? If you were this man what would you do?
- 54
- 55
- 56 L I'll shoot her with my spear.
- 57 T Okay, you'll shoot her with a spear because he is a good shot isn't? And climb down. Okay Judy, what would you do?
- 58
- 59 L I will try to reason with her or plead with her to stop.
- 60 T Yes? What would you do? Is there any other solution?
- 61 L I will release myself in her mouth so that she will stop chopping. (Pupils laugh).
- 62 T Okay okay. Quiet now. So why do you think he did not release himself?
- 63 L Because he thought she liked him and wanted to marry him.
- 64 L Because he must kill her.
- 65 L He thought he was going to be finished.
- 66 T Okay. He must try and kill her before she kills him. Okay, the second question. Why do you think she is called 'The Queen of the Land of White Cows'?
- 67
- 68 L Because she is notorious.
- 69 T Okay. Because she is notorious. Now we all know that queens are known for good things but this woman is known for bad deeds. Now why do you think she wants to eat a man from all the things in the continent why would she choose a man?..... Yes? Why does she eat every man that comes to her land, why doesn't she eat women? *Yini indaba adle amadoda wodwa?* [Why does she eat man alone?]
- 70
- 71
- 72
- 73
- 74 L Because she's a woman.
- 75 T So she doesn't like to eat her own kind? Okay but we've got a lot of women, they eat man (Pupils laugh). So why does this woman eat man? Judy, *wena ukoskazi uyawandla amadoda?* [Judy, you are a woman, do you eat man?] (Pupils laugh).
- 76
- 77
- 78 L I think man is delicious to eat because they are so powerful (Pupils laugh).
- 79 T So she decides to kill him?
- 80 L She does not love this man.
- 81 T Yes. Why? What do you think this man did to her? *Ucabanga ukuthi kukhona akwenzile?* [Do you think he did anything to her?]
- 82
- 83 L He didn't want to marry her.
- 84 T So she decided to kill him. Okay. Why do you think this man did not want to marry her?

- 85 L Because she had a long tooth. She was ugly.
- 86 T The long tooth made her look ugly! But Sanale, **wena ucabanga ukuthi muhle, unqo funa ukushada naye** [for you she is beautiful and you will want to marry her!] (Pupils laugh). Okay
- 87 okay now! Quiet! Okay, in one version of this story, it says that she was not straight, she was
- 88 gay, so she wanted to kill all the men so all the women would belong to her. (Pupils laugh). What
- 89 do you think about this?
- 90
- 91 Ls (Noisy/ laugh).
- 92 T Okay now. What happened to the man? Did he save himself? How will you finish the story?
- 93 L The hunter will save himself. He will rule.
- 94 T Okay. Any idea how the story will end? Madiba?
- 95 L Everyone is happy because the woman is going to eat man (Pupils laugh).
- 96 T Alright, **omunye** ifinisha **ongayenza?** [...., is there any one else who can suggest a conclusion?]
- 97 L After the woman died the hunter became the ruler of The Land of White Cows.
- 98 T Okay, the story says he called for his dogs "Sangodema! Mherebwa! Ngise Manjanjari,
- 99 **Indawo yezikomo ezimplophe. Ngisize! Ngicine!**" ["Sangodema! Mherebwa! I'm in Manjanjari,
- 100 The Land of the White Cows. Help me! Save me!"] And the story ends with the dogs killing the
- 101 woman and saving the hunter. Okay. Now class. Listen carefully. This is what I want you to do.
- 102 I want you to rewrite the story - read it but rewrite the story from any point of view, from
- 103 the hunter's, the woman or even the dogs. **Phinda ghuphda inganengwane uyivale**
- 104 **nkokucananya kwanho. Uyitholile?** [Rewrite the story with your own ending from someone
- 105 else's point of view. Do you understand?] Who doesn't understand what to do? You must
- 106 provide your own conclusion, your own ending. Okay. Good. Be quiet and get on with your work.

APPENDIX C3c:**GRADE** : 9**LESSON** : Language study**TOPIC** : Proverbs

- 1 T Good morning class.
- 2 L Good morning sir.
- 3 T Okay. Today we are going to do a lesson on proverbs. Proverbs. Do you know what a proverb
- 4 is?
- 5 Can you give me an example of a proverb?
- 6 L **Indlu yegagu iyanetha** [Never laugh at other people, it may happen to you].
- 7 T Yes. Good. **Indlu yegagu iyanetha** [Never laugh at other people, it may happen to you]. Never
- 8 laugh at other people, it may happen to you.
- 9 L **Akulahlwa mbeleko ngaku felwa** [Never give up hope].
- 10 T Okay, but can you give me an English proverb?
- 11 N>R
- 12 T English proverbs? many hands....?
- 13 N>R
- 14 T Empty vessels...?
- 15 L make lot noise.
- 16 T Empty vessels make the most noise. Okay, let's look at your worksheet, the two boxes. Okay

- 17 the first box has the explanation and the second one has the proverbs. You must match the
 18 explanation with the proverb. Understand?
- 19 Ls Yes.
- 20 T The meanings are jumbled up the proverbs are on the right hand side of your sheet while
 21 the meaning is on the other side. Okay? A new broom sweeps clean. Who can match this up
 22 with the meaning?
- 23 N>R Okay, match any ones that you know. **Qala ngokwaziyo** [Take the ones you know first]. Okay
 24 Onkhanya?
- 25 L Er ..Like father, like son. He behaves quite like his father.
- 26 T Yes. Er Patrick?
- 27 L Perseverance is the mother of success. If you fail once, you must not give up. Keep on trying
 28 hard: you will surely win in the end.
- 29 T Good. Perseverance is the mother of success. **Zama uphinde uzame ungalahli ithemba ngoba
 30 uma uzama uziyi thola into uyifunayo.** [You must always try and try. You must not give up
 31 easily. If you keep trying you will get what you want]. You must persevere. **Ungalahli. iThemba**
 32 [Keep trying. Don't give up]. If you fail you must try, and not run. Phuma?
- 33 L East or west, home is best. It doesn't matter what you do or where you go, home is best.
- 34 T Okay, before you go on I want you to think about a place you went to a place you really
 35 liked/
- 36 L Like on holiday?
- 37 T Yes. Sometimes you go on holiday **Khisimusi** [Christmas] to your uncle's. He's got a big
 38 beautiful house but the time will come right? When you want to come back home because
 39 **ikhaya lakho indawo ekufunakala ubekuyona. Akukhatha lekile ukuthi umizi waking
 40 mungakanani kodwa indawo ekujunakala ubekuyona** [... the best place to be is your home. No
 41 matter how small your house is, it doesn't matter. But it's the place to be]. East or west, home
 42 is best. Alright, let's continue.
- 43 L A fool and his money are soon parted. It is easy to be tempted into parting with your money.
- 44 T Yes. Another one?
- 45 L One good turn deserves another. People should always be good to those who have been good
 46 to them.
- 47 T People should always be good to those who have been good to them. Good. You must return a
 48 kindness. **Umangabe wenza okuhle komunye naye uzokwenza okuhle kuwena** [If you do
 49 something good for someone he will do something good for you]. They will repay you with
 50 kindness. Okay. The next one?
- 51 L Like mother, like daughter. She behaves quite like her mother.
- 52 T Alright. She behaves like her mother. Do you know what they say it in Zulu? Like mother, like
 53 daughter?
- 54 L **Ukhamba luchithwe yimbiza** [Like mother, like daughter].
- 55 T Yes. Like mother like daughter. Okay boys. **Kulungile bafana bheka umawentombi yakho-bese
 56 uyabona ukuthi intombi yakho izobanjani mase yikhulile** [Okay boys, look at your girlfriend's
 57 mother -then you will know what she is going to be like when she's old]. Just like her mother.
 58 (Pupils laugh).
- 59 L (shouts) **Nje nge ilong-toothed woman** [Just like the long-toothed woman!] (Much laughter).
- 60 T (laughs). Okay. Okay. Let's get on, let's continue. Alright, another says an apple does not fall
 61 far away from the tree to which it belongs. This means like mother, like daughter. Like father,

- 62 like son. Patrick?
- 63 L Pro... pro
- 64 T Pro - crast - in - ation. Procrastination (pronounces the word slowly and deliberately)
- 65 L is the thief of time.
- 66 T Okay. So how do you explain this one? Procrastination is the thief of time?
- 67 N>R
- 68 T Procrastination is Mbili, **uyaphi? Hlalaphansi. Imi ophethe la** [Mbili, where are you going?
- 69 Sit down. I'm in charge here]. Okay, Mbili, what does this mean? Procrastination is the thief
- 70 of time?
- 71 N>R
- 72 T You musn't /
- 73 L put off until tomorrow what can be done today.
- 74 T Yes.yes. Don't say "**Umsebenzi wami ngizowenza kusasa**" ["I will do my homework tomorrow"].
- 75 Do it today, do it today. You don't know what tomorrow brings. What you can do today, you
- 76 must do today. Okay? You musn't put off for tomorrow what you can do today. Procrastination
- 77 is the thief of time.
- 78 L (unclear)
- 79 T Isn't **uyakwazi lokho** [you know that] is that the correct match? No it is not the correct
- 80 match. Perseverance is the mother of success. We've done that already. Nonhle, **Ulele? Vuka!**
- 81 [Are you sleeping? Wake up!] Another one? Another one?
- 82 L A fool and his money are soon trapped. It's easy to be tempted into parting with your money.
- 83 T Okay, and the last one? Focus, boys and girls there's only one left.
- 84 L A new broom sweeps clean. He has just taken on that job. No wonder he works so hard.
- 85 T Yes. When someone is new in a job **akasho ukuthi sebezomxosha kuqala** [it does not mean that
- 86 he will be retrenched first]. He will do his work very well. But we must wait and see. We must
- 87 wait and see if he is working well all the time. Alright. Is that all? Okay class. Pay attention.
- 88 **Lalelani kahle manje** [Listen carefully now]. There is something else you must know. Did you
- 89 notice that about proverbs is that they are always little verbs and they are always in a
- 90 simple tense. A new broom sweeps clean. Procrastination is the thief of time. Perseverance
- 91 is the mother of success. One good turn deserves another. Okay. The last thing.
- 92 **Nginiphathele izindaba ezimnandi kusasa nibhala itesti.** [I've got good news for you. You will
- 93 be writing a test on this tomorrow].(class makes a noise). (Loudly) You will be writing a test
- 94 on proverbs tomorrow. You must learn your proverbs and their explanations. Okay? **Nifunde**
- 95 **kakhulu khona nizo kwenza kahle** [Learn hard so you can do well]. Okay class?
- 96 Ls Yes sir.
- 97 T Any questions?
- 98 Ls No sir.

APPENDIX C3d :**GRADE** : 9**LESSON** : Poetry**TOPIC** : An Irish Airman Foresees his Death, *W. B. Yeats*

- 1 T Good morning class.
- 2 Ls Good morning sir.
- 3 T Er,,, today we are going to do a poem. Before we read the poem I've got some questions to ask you. Why do people go to war?
- 4
- 5 Ls N>R
- 6 T Why do people go to war?
- 7 Whatever things make people to murder, fight? Yes? **Kwenziwa yini ukuthi abantu beya empini?** [Why do people go to war?] Why do people go to war?
- 8
- 9 L They want money.
- 10 T Money? Alright. Other reasons why people go to war?
- 11 L Apartheid.
- 12 T They go to war because of apartheid what can you tell me about that?
- 13 Ls N>R
- 14 T They want jobs. If they want jobs they do fight. **Mlungu**, what do you say?
- 15 L They want to rule the country.
- 16 T Come again.
- 17 L They want to rule the country.
- 18 T Yes. Good. **Wenzekahle** [Well done]. They want to rule some other country so they fight those countries. When they defeat them, **mengabe bephumelela** [when they win], they rule them. Is there any other reason why people go to war? To war (write on board).
- 19
- 20
- 21 They want to gain power.
- 22 T Good (writes learner's response on board).
- 23 L Because of jealousy.
- 24 T Okay. Right now, to the second question. What are the effects of war? What are the results of war?
- 25
- 26 L N>R
- 27 T What happens to the people? **Kwenzekani ebantwini?** [What happens to the people?] What happens to the country? Yes **Sthembiso**?
- 28
- 29 L Lots of people die.
- 30 T (Writes on board). Impact of war many people die.
- 31 L People lose er er place to live (T writes on board)
- 32 T Yes? What else happens? ----- It leads to hunger. People not being able to eat. Anything else?
- 33
- 34 L People become homeless.
- 35 T People become homeless - same as this one - people lose their place to live. Are these the only things that happen at war? Think pupils. Think.
- 36
- 37 Ls N>R
- 38 T People get injured. **Abantu baya limala** [People get injured]. People get injured. There are many casualties, **C-A-S-U-A-L-T-I-E-S** (writes on board) of war. People become disabled because there has been a war. **Abantu bayu khubazeka ngenxa yezimpi** [People become
- 39
- 40

- 41 disabled because of the war].
- 42 Er, what happens to the children? **Izingane zona?** [The children?]
- 43 L The children become orphans.
- 44 T The children become orphans. Very good.
- 45 L The children lose their parents.
- 46 T Children lose both their parents so they become orphans. Okay. Now I want you to look at the
- 47 poem. The poem is entitled *An Irish airman foresees his death. An Irish airman foresees his*
- 48 *death.*
- 49 Ls *An Irish airman foresees his death.*
- 50 T Who is an airman?
- 51 L An airman is a pilot.
- 52 T An airman is a pilot. So this airman is said to be Irish. Irish because his country is?--- From
- 53 which country does he come? Yes?
- 54 L He comes from Ireland.
- 55 T He comes from Ireland. Where is Ireland?
- 56 L It is closer to England.
- 57 T It is closer to England. Yes. Where is England? Yes?
- 58 L Overseas.
- 59 Ls (laugh)
- 60 T Yes, yes?
- 61 Ls N>R
- 62 T Overseas Sfiso? **Ngizokuphoxa Sfiso** [I'll embarrass you Sfiso]. Where is overseas eh? Okay.
- 63 Ireland is in Europe. Okay. Now this Irish airman foresees / yes what is 'foresees' ?
- 64 Ls N>R
- 65 T It is to know something before it happens. **Ukwazi into ukuyibhula ukuthi izokwenzeka** [You
- 66 can predict that something is going to happen].
- 67 In other words, this airman if seeing his death before he dies. He knows he is going to die.
- 68 He knows what kind of death he is going to have. **Uyazi ukuthi uzofa kajani** [He knows how
- 69 he is going to die]. Okay. I'm going to read the first stanza. (T reads the whole poem). Okay.
- 70 Mmmm let us look at some of the words. What if fate? Pretty?
- 71 L Power, power that will rule what will happen.
- 72 T What do you call that in Line 1?
- 73 L N>R
- 74 T It is fate. It is destiny. **Okudaliweyo ukungasoze kwashintshwa. Umnuntu akasoze**
- 75 **wakubalekela ..njengokufa** [Something that is determined by God. No man can change or
- 76 escape from it, like death].
- 77 In other words I know that I shall meet my destiny. What is the destiny of all mankind?
- 78 **Kuyogcina kwenzekeni ebantwini bonke?** [What is going to happen to all of them?]. What is
- 79 going to happen to all of us?
- 80 Ls N>R
- 81 T We are all going to die. **Ukufa kuyinto engasoze wayibalekela. Wonke umuntu ayofa ngelinje**
- 82 **ilanga** [Death is something that is unavoidable. We are all going to die someday].
- 83 The Irish airman knows that he is going to die one day. He foresees his death so he knows he
- 84 is going to die one day. *Somewhere among the clouds above.* He is looking at the place where
- 85 he is going to die. Among the clouds. **Uyofela esibhakabhakeni** [He is going to die in the sky].

- 86 He is going to die among the clouds. What will he be doing when he dies?
- 87 Ls N>R
- 88 T If he dies in the clouds what will he be doing in the clouds?
- 89 Ls N>R
- 90 T Come on guys. This man, what he'll be doing in the clouds? **Chabangisisa** [Think carefully now].
- 91 What will he be doing in the clouds?/
- 92 Ls N>R
- 93 T He will be flying his aeroplane. "Those that I fight I do not hate, Those that I guard I do not love."What sort of a job? What sort of a career? He fights with aeroplanes ... and that requires to guard people? Sthembile?
- 94
- 95
- 96 L He's a soldier.
- 97 T *My country is Kiltartan Cross/ My countrymen Kiltartan's poor. Where is Kiltartan? Yes?*
- 98 L It is on higher land.
- 99 T Very good. Kiltartan is on higher land..... My countrymen Kiltartan's poor. So this means
- 100 he is also poor. So they are not going to be affected by anything and they are not going to be
- 101 happier than before. So you see this family is in the war ... that does not concern them. These
- 102 farmers got nothing to lose. Right so we move on to the next stanza. (T reads lines 9 to 12).
- 103 Right, we said there are things that drive people to war, isn't? What are they? First, it is the
- 104 law. ... people go to fight because of the law. If they don't want to fight they can be forced
- 105 to by the law. Second, duty. When we are bound by duty, for example, when the countries go
- 106 to war you are bound by duty that you will also serve. What else? Public men. The public men,
- 107 what do you think the public men is?
- 108 L Community man.
- 109 T Community man. In other words the public policies. The next one is the cheering crowds.
- 110 People don't go to fight because of the crowds. Cheering crowds. **Niyakwazi lokho?** [Do you
- 111 know?] There are the crowds/
- 112 L Shouting, the people (Learners laugh).
- 113 T But now, now this pilot er, he tells us that he is not sent by law, he is not sent by duty, he is
- 114 not sent by the cheering crowds so what right, so now the question comes, why does he
- 115 fight? Ulwelani? [Fight?]
- 116 If he is not forced by the law, if he is not bound by duty, if there are no public matters, if
- 117 there are no cheering crowds that are forcing him to fight . You see, **ulwelani uma izizathu**
- 118 **zokuthi alwe zingekho?** [if there are no reasons for him to fight, then, why does he fight?]
- 119 Why does he go to war? It's because "A lonely impulse of delight." In other words, there's
- 120 something that pleases this guy. He likes to do it. **Kuyamujabulisa** [It makes him happy]. He
- 121 likes flying. He likes to be in the air in an aeroplane. His country is not on war. The war is
- 122 between other countries. It does not affect him. **Into eyenza ukuthi andize ukuthi**
- 123 **uyakuthanda** [The only reason he is flying is that he likes it]. He loves it. *A lonely impulse of*
- 124 *delight/ Drove to this tumult in the clouds. Tumult? What do we mean by tumult?*
- 125 L Chaos/
- 126 L Commotion.
- 127 T So this tumult, this commotion, drives him to flying. I balanced all, **ngikuqalale konke**[thought
- 128 about it all at first]. He thought about everything carefully at first, balanced, he thought
- 129 about everything, *brought all to mind/ The years to come seemed waste of breath/ A waste*
- 130 *of breath the years behind.* Er, he is now balancing his life with his death. He was not

- 131 impressed with his life before. **Ubengayi jabuleli impilo yakhe** [He was not happy with his
 132 life]. So he chooses to go up there. He doesn't see the difference at all for living. Whether
 133 he lives or dies, it doesn't make a difference **Awukho umehluko noma angaphila noma angafa**
 134 [It makes no difference whether he lives or dies]. So he foresees his death in the sky. Z -
 135 He is not afraid to die. He is prepared, ready to die. Okay. Now for some questions. The first
 136 one is, what.....
 137 What is loneliness?
 138 L Destiny.
 139 T Destiny? **Abanye abasazi** (in a loud voice, dragging the word emphatically) [Some of you have
 140 forgotten). [Teacher dictates a list of questions for pupils to discuss in groups and then write
 141 out answers to. The rest of his speech is in English only].

APPENDIX C4: LLCA [L2] : SCHOOL E

APPENDIX C4a:

GRADE : 8

LESSON : Taalwerk [Grammar]

TOPIC : Kommunikasie [Communication]

- 1 T Julle is alreeds in groepe van twees, of dries of een. Goed. Kom ons gee vir Mohamed se groep
 2 dieselfde een wat die ander groep gedoen het as voorbeeld.[You are already in groups of
 3 twos, threes and one. Good. Let us give Mohamed's group the same one which the other group
 4 has done as an example]. Dit is Michelle se versjaarsdag . Wat sê jy vir haar? Skryf al die
 5 voorbeelde. Ons het net twee gedoen. [It is Michelle's birthday. What will you say to her?
 6 Write out all the examples. We have only done two.] Wat sal jy sê as jy iemand groet en jy wil
 7 weet hoe dit gaan? [What will you say if you want to greet someone and you want to know how
 8 he is doing?] Hoe sal jy a wens uitspreek? [How will you express a wish?] **How will you express**
 9 **a wish?** Voorbeeld. "Ek wens ek het a motor." Elkeen gee 'n voorbeeld. [For example, "I wish
 10 I had a car." Everyone must give an example]. Wat sal jy sê as jy iemand uitnooi? [Wat will you
 11 say if you want to invite somebody?] **Invite somebody?** Nooi jou vriend om na 'n
 12 sokkerwedstryd te kom. Hoe sal jy iemand bedank? [Invite a friend to a soccer match. How
 13 will you thank somebody?

14 [Teacher addresses group 1]

- 15 Mohamed, wat was julle situasie? Wat dink jy wat moet ons vir Rishal sê as dit sy verjaarsdag
 16 is? [Mohamed, what was your situation? What do you think what we must say to Rishal if it is
 17 his birthday?]
 18 L Veels geluk op jou verjaarsdag [Congratulations on your birthday].
 19 T Nee. Veels geluk met jou verjaarsdag [No. Congratulations on your birthday]. **Listen,**
 20 **everybody. In English "op" is "on" but we don't say "op jou verjaarsdag" we say "met jou**
 21 **verjaarsdag. Okay?"** En dan die tweede een... tweede... **second one** [And then the second one].
 22 "Ek wens jou 'n gelukkige verjaarsdag" [I wish you a happy birthday]. **It's a bit of a long**
 23 **winded one but if I translate that for you - I am wishing you a happy birthday. You can**
 24 **chop it up by saying "Rishal, gelukkige verjaarsdag." [Rishal, happy birthday].**

25 [Teacher addresses Group 2]

- 26 T **Situation. To greet a person and to find out how they are.** As jy skool toe kom in die môre,
 27 wat sê jy? [When you arrive at school in the morning, what do you say?]
 28 L Goeie môre juffrou, hoe gaan dit? [Good morning mam, how are you?]
 29 T Goeie môre Basil, hoe gaan dit met jou? [Good morning Basil, how are you?] **Not just** "hoe
 30 gaan dit" **you must also say** "met jou". Hoe gaan dit met jou. [How are you?]. Okay? As jy vir
 31 Gertrude groet in die middag, **afternoon**, hoe sal jy vir haar groet?
 32 L Goeiemiddag Gertrude.
 33 T If you were interested to know how she is, what would you say?
 34 L Hoe gaan dit met jou?
 35 T Goed! [Good!]

36 [Teacher addresses Group 3]

- 37 T **What was your situation? Wishing for something.** Jy spreek 'n wens [You make a wish].
 38 **Let's hear Zaheer.**
 39 L Ek wens ek kon 'n mooi motor kry [I wish I could get a nice car].
 40 T Goed. And you?
 41 L Ek wens ek het 'n groot, mooi huis [I wish I could get a big, beautiful house].
 42 T Baie mooi! [Very good].

43 [Teacher addresses Group 4]

- 44 T Wat was julle situasie? Jy nooi iemand uit. Leona, as jy vir enige vriend wil nooi om na jou huis
 45 toe te kom, al wat jy doen is sê "Sal jy na my huis toe kom, asseblief?" [What was your
 46 situation? You must invite someone out. Leona, if you want to invite someone to your house,
 47 what will you say? "Will you come to my house please?"] "**Will you come over to my home?**"
 48 L Kom na my huis toe [Come to my house].
 49 T Wil jy na [Would you like], **would you like**, wil jy na my huis toe kom [Would you like to come
 50 to my house?] **Would you like to come over?**

51 [Teacher addresses Group 5]

- 52 T Wat is julle situasie? [What is your situation?] **Expressing a wish to visit some place.**
 53 Byvoorbeeld. Ek wens om na Durban toe te gaan [For example, I wish to go to Durban]. **I wish**
 54 **to go to Durban.**
 55 L Ek wens om Cape Town toe te gaan.
 56 T Ek wens om Kaapstad toe te gaan. Okay.

57 [Teacher addresses Group 6]

- 58 T Your activity? Asking somebody for advice. What example are you doing/
 59 L My vriend, ek het 'n probleem, kan jy vir my asseblief help? [My friend, I have a problem, will
 60 you help me please?]
 61 T Daars 'n partytjie en ek weet nie watter rok aan te trek nie. Wat dink jy? [There's a party
 62 and I don't know what dress to wear. What do you think?] *By simply saying, "Wat dink jy?"*
 63 *you are asking for advice.*

64 [Teacher addresses Group 7]

- 65 T Jou pa het 'n nuwe motor gekoop. Hoe sal jy hom gelukwens? [Your father has bought a car,
 66 how will you congratulate him?] *Congratulate him? He's bought a new car.*
 67 L Pa, ek is baie bly oor jou nuwe motor.
 68 T Okay klas. Luister mooi. [Okay class. Listen carefully]. *Quiet now, and listen carefully.*
 69 [Teacher addresses class].
 70 T Ons groet iemand deur te sê. In die môre, Goeie môre. In die aand, goeienaand, In die nag,
 71 goeienag [We greet someone by saying. In the morning, good morning. In the evening, good
 72 evening. At night, good night]. Julle bedank iemand vir 'n present. Baie dankie vir die mooi
 73 presentjie [You thank someone for a present. Thank you very much for the lovely present].
 74 "Mooi" *can be replaced with* pragtige[pretty], wonderlike[wonderful], skitterende[splendid],
 75 *any adjective. Thanking someone for a favour.* Dawood, bair dankie vir die guns [Dawood,
 76 thank you very much for the favour]. What can you add to that? To show that you appreciate
 77 the favour?
 78 L Jy was baie gaaf [You were very kind]. *You are very kind.*
 79 T Dawood, baie dankie vir die guns. Dit was gaaf van jou [Dawood, thank you very much for the
 80 favour. It was kind of you]. *It was kind of you.*

APPENDIX C4b:

GRADE : 8

LESSON : Comprehension

TOPIC :

[Pupils read passage, having turns]

1 T *Very nice reading.*

2 Group 1:

3 L1/ Daardie tyd [At that time] *what's that?*

4 L2 *At that time. At that time there was many/*

5 L1 *Very wise animals on the farm}*

6 L2 *animals on the farm}. The boys can almal goed steel [all steal well].*

7 L1 *Steal very well.*

- 8 T Hoe ver is julle? Julle lees nog. [How far are you? You are still reading].
 9 L1 *We are done with reading. We are trying to explain it to ourselves.*
 10 T *Okay.* Daar is baie aktiwiteit [There is a lot of activity].
 11 L1 *What's what's this word here mam? Wasgoed?*
 12 T Wasgoed? Wasgoed, die klere, *the clothes* [Laundry? Laundry, the clothes, the clothes].
 13 L1 Ja, *that's right*, te was, *to wash*.
 14 L2 [unclear]
 15 T Skiet met 'n geweer [Shoot with a gun].
 16 L2 *Shoot well with a gun.*
 17 L1 *Shoot well with a gun. Yes, that's right.*
 18 T *There might be expressions ...* Die seuns kon goed skiet maar sy het nie by hulle agter
 19 gestaan nie. Het nie by hulle agter gestaan nie [The boys could shoot well but she did not stand
 20 behind them]. *That is to say she was not left behind. That means she competed well.*
 21 L1 *Oh, okay. And dikwels/*
 22 T Dikwels is baie veel, elke keer [many, every time], *frequently.*
 23 L1 *Often.*

24 Group 2:

- 25 L1 *We've really gone ahead.* Dikwels het sy jong manne uitgedaag. [Often, she challenged young
 26 men].
 27 T [loudly] Wat gaan aan daar? Krishen, *get on with your work.* Moenie 'n geraas maak nie! [Don't
 28 make a noise].
 29 L2 Dikwels, *I don't know what this means, the whole sentence.*
 30 L1 *She challenges young men to races..... /*
 31 L1 Ongeluk gehad [Had an accident]. *Something happened here.* Sy het 'n ongeluk gehad. [She
 32 had an accident].
 33 L2 *No. Mag, that's may, mag.* [could have]
 34 L1 *Alright, the horse was a wild horse. It was a big one. That was a scary big one.*
 35 L2 *Something happened.*
 36 L1 *She got scared.* Sy was ernstig beseer [She was seriously injured].
 37 L2 *She was hurt badly.*
 38 L1 Ja. *She could not talk, she was... couldn't see well/*
 39 L2 *She couldn't see, she couldn't eat/*
 40 L1 *She couldn't see, she couldn't eat/*
 41 L2 *She couldn't/*
 42 L1 *drink.*

43 Group 3:

- 44 L1 He beats the horses right.
 45 L2 The young man, jong manne [young men].
 46 L1 Ja, because here he says he's serious.
 47 L3 [Pupil speaks in Zulu but the words are unclear]
 48 L1 *Maar eendag het hy [But one day he]/*

- 49 L3 Wie is dit? [Who is it?] *Hey, don't call my name.*
- 50 L1 *Come on man. You want mam to scold us?* Sy kon nie praat nie [She could not speak].
- 51 L2 *No, no.*
- 52 L1 *You're lost! Come on!* Sy kon nie eet nie, sy kon nie drink nie, sy kon nie sit nie, sy kon nie slaap nie [She couldn't eat, she couldn't drink, she couldn't sit, she couldn't sleep].
- 53 L2 This paragraph...
- 54 [Pupil reads the paragraph].
- 55 L1 *This paragraph is about* wat dinge kon Anna goed doen. Sy het baie interessante dinge gedoen [... what things Anna could do. She did many interesting things].
- 56 L2 Ja..
- 57 L1 *What's this word?!*
- 58 [A pupil shouts from across from another group]
- 59 L4 *What are you'll doing there?*
- 60 Ls [Laughter] *We're taping.*
- 61 L1 *Okay, next question is* Wat kon sy goed doen [What can she do well?] *What could she do that was good. What was she good in? That's number 2 right?!*

65 Group 4:

- 66 L1 [Speaks in Zulu but the words are unclear]
- 67 L2 *Hey, speak in English please.*
- 68 L1 Wat beteken, wat beteken, [What does it mean, what does it mean] *hey I don't know what this questions means.*
- 69 L2 Wat beteken 'het daarvan af gekom'? [What does 'het daarvan af gekom' mean?]
- 70 L3 *Okay, let's do number one.*
- 71 L1 *Number one, number one.*
- 72 L2 Wat dinge kon Anna doen?
- 73 L3 Baie interessante dinge. As 'n jong dogter moet sy alles in die huis doen [Many interesting things. As a young girl she must do everything in the house].
- 74 L1 *Ja, but we're only answering from!*
- 75 [Something crashes onto the floor]
- 76 T [loudly] *What's happening there?*
- 77 L2 *Pencil case mam.*
- 78 L3 Okay, read question 3 people.
- 79 L1 Wat kon sy ook doen?[What can she also do?]
- 80 L3 *Guys, wat beteken met naaldwerk? [... what is the meaning of 'naaldwerk'?] I thought it was needlework, anybody knows? Line 5?*
- 81 L2 *Nobody knows.*
- 82 L3 *Is it needlework?*
- 83 L1 Ja, *I think needlework.*
- 84 L3 *Hey, I don't understand this.*
- 85 L2 *What you don't understand?*
- 86 L3 *She made this cake/*
- 87 L1 Mam, wat beteken "met daarvan"? [Mam, what does 'met daarvan' mean?]
- 88 T Wat beteken? [What does ...?]

- 92 L1 *Mam, I'm just curious*
 93 T *About what?*
 94 L1 Daarvan [about it].
 95 T Daarvan? *About it.* Ek het die storie gehoor. Ek hou daarvan. [I heard the story. I like it]. I
 96 like it.
 97 L1 *Okay.*
 98 T Ek hou daarvan. *Did you hear this story? Have you heard the story?* Het jy did gehoor?
 99 [Did you hear it?]
 100 L1 No.
 101 T *Tell me about it.* Vertel my daarvan [Tell me about it]. *You can use it in a few contexts.*
 102 L2 Okay, iemand lees nommer twee [Okay, someone read number two].
 103 L3 Wat beteken 'afgekom'? [What does 'afgekom' mean?]
 104 L1 *Ai, Afrikaans is the worst subject!*

105 Group 5:

- 106 L1 *Okay Deepak, start reading.*
 107 L2 [Reads] *The second word in the last paragraph. Mam, what's this?*
 108 T Klavier? [Piano?]
 109 L2 Ja.
 110 T Sy kan goed sing en sy kan mooi sing en goed klavier speel.
 111 L2 *Music, music.*
 112 T Ja, it has to do with music. Sy kan goed klavier speel [She could play the piano well]. *She*
 113 *could play something well.* Watter instrument is dit?Klavier speel? [What instrument is
 114 it- play the piano]

[Teacher addresses the class]

- 116 L Wat het haar perd eendag gedoen? [What did her horse do one day?]
 117 T Wat het haar perd eendag met haar gedoen? [What did her horse do to her one day]. *Okay,*
 118 *what were the consequences of her riding?*
 119 L Perd het geskrik en haar afgegooi [Horse got frightened and threw her off].
 120 T Verstaan julle? Sy het gery en die perd het haar afgegooi. Nommer tien.
 121 L Waarna het die jong span verwag? [What did the youngsters look forward to?]
 122 T *Verwag is to look forward to.* Jongspan *is all the youngsters.* Wat het hulle geniet? [What
 123 did they enjoy?]
 124 L Al haar avonture [All her adventures].

APPENDIX C4c:

GRADE : 8

LESSON : Literature : Poetry

TOPIC : As Boetie Bad, Anoniem

- 1 T Kyk na die vrae op die bord oor die gedig *As Boetie Bad*--- Hier is jou vrae (a) tot (f). Julle
 2 werk in jou groepies, *in your groups as usual, except that (unclear) as you did last time.*
 3 *Work in your groups like this okay?* [Look at the questions on the board on the poem *As*
 4 *Boetie Bad*. Here are your questions from (a) to (f). Work in your groups.....]. Hier is al jou vrae.
 5 Julle gesels oor die vrae..... *Sit around like this in your groups okay* . [Here are your
 6 questions. You must talk about the questions]. Jy kan dit afskryf as jy wil of jy kan dit nie.
 7 *Someone can read the questions in your group..... speak loudly* [You can write the
 8 questions down if you like or not...]. Kyk na die vrae op die bord *or the one in your*
 9 *worksheets*. Wie wil die vrae lees? Die vrae op die werkbladsy? Hoekom is dit belangrik om
 10 dit te lees? [Look at the questions on the board Who will read the questions? The
 11 questions in the worksheet? Why is it important to read this?]
 12 L The questions tell you more about the poem.
 13 T Yes, besides that?
 14 N>R
 15 T *To give you a bit of understanding about the poem*. Lees dit wat op die bord is en gesels
 16 daaroor. Kry 'n opinie van iemand, byvoorbeeld, sê wat sy dink ... *if you are looking at (a)*,
 17 Wie is Boetie? Miskien sê Boetie [Read what's on the board and discuss it. Get an opinion
 18 from someone, for example, say what she thinks, Who is Boetie? Perhaps Boetie is
 19 saying....].
 20 L *I think ... Boetie is/*
 21 T In julle groepe. *This is how you will operate*, luister, *going this way* in julle groepe [In
 22 your groups In your groups]. Wie van julle, wie van julle sal dit lees? Ja, 'n leerling van
 23 elke groep moet die gedig lees. En die vrae daarop [Which of you, which of you will read? Yes,
 24 a pupil from each group must read the poem. And then the questions].
 25 *[Groups begin their discussion. Teacher moves around from group to group].*
- 26 Group 1:
- 27 T Anyone wants to read the poem?
 28 L Yes mam.
 29 [Pupil reads a few lines the poem]/
 30 T *Loudly*.
 31 [Pupil reads the poem loudly].
 32 /
 33 T Wat sê jy vir '*splashes water*'?
 34 L Spat (Splash).
 35 T Spat. Goed (Splash. Good).
 36 L [Answers by reading a line from the poem] *As Boetie bad hy spat 'n breë poel tot teen die*
 37 *drumpel aan* [When Boetie baths he splashes a big pool so that the water goes out the door].
 38 T *Okay*. Wat beteken dit? [What does this mean?]

- 39 L Die water gaan na die drumpel [The water goes to the doorstep].
 40 T *He splashes so much water that the water goes out the door. As iemand daar staan? [If*
 41 *someone stands there?]. It means he will get wet.*
- 42 Group 2:
- 43 [Pupil reads poem].
 44 L1 *Questions. Hoe lyk alles as Boetie bad? [How does everything look as Boetie baths?]*
 45 L2 *Everything is wet.*
 46 /
 47 L3 *Wie is Wagter? [Who is Wagter?] Okay, let's look for answers to these questions. Let's*
 48 *look for the answers.*
 49 L2 *Wagter is/*
 50 L1 *Okay, you got the answers for 2.4 guys?*
 51 L3 *Ja, but I can't pronounce most of the words.*
 52 L1 *But we are trying our best right?*
 53 L2 *We have to try our best What about you Rugs? Let's see if our answers are*
 54 *right. Let's try again.*
 55 L2 *Wagter is 'n hond [Wagter is a dog].*
 56 L1 *Okay. Let's go to 2.5 now. The answer you got..... right? Got it? Hoe lyk alles? [How*
 57 *does everything look?]*
 58 L2 *Alles is nat [Everything is wet].*
 59 L1 *Goed [Good].*
 60 L3 *Hy spat in die water [He splashes in the water].*
 61 L1 *Ja, hy spat in die water. Okay, wie is Boetie? [Okay, who is Boetie?]*
 62 L2 *What does 'Boetie' mean?*
 63 L3 *'Boetie' means small boy.*
 64 L1 *It means a small baby.*
 65 L2 *If you say it means a small baby, baby can be a girl, baby can be a boy.*
 66 L3 *Brother, brother, small brother and 'kleintjies' mean babies.*
 67 L2 *And 'alles'. Wat is die betekenis van 'alles'? [What is the meaning of 'alles'?]*
 68 L1 *Alles, alles, alles means*
 69 L2 *Eh?*
 70 L1 *All, 'alles' means all.*
 71 L3 *Yes, 'alles' is all.*
 72 L1 *Alles is nat [Everything is wet].*
 73 L2 *'Nat'? Wat beteken 'nat'? [Nat? What does 'nat' mean?]*
 74 L3 *Busa Umam [Ask mam]*
 75 L2 *Ayibo mbuze wena [You must ask].*
 76 L3 *Mam, Wat is 'nat'? [What is 'nat'?]*
 77 T *Nat? Wie weet wat is 'nat'? ['Nat'. Who knows what is 'nat'?]*
 78 /

79 Group 3:

- 80 /
- 81 L3 Wat is jou opinie? [What is your opinion?]
- 82 L1 Wagter is 'n hond [Wagter is a dog].
- 83 L3 Ja, Wagter is 'n hond [Wagter is a dog]. *He is a dog.* 'Wagter' is inja [Wagter is a dog].
- 84 L2 Kodwa akabhalwanga [But it's not written].
- 85 L3 Iya understandeka isentence yokuqala [The first sentence is understandable].
- 86 L1 *Okay, the answer for number one?*
- 87 L3 Sy is alles nat [She is wet].
- 88 /
- 89 L1 *And 'drumpel'?*
- 90 L3 'Drumpel' is by die deur ['Drumpel' is by the door].
- 91 L1 *Okay Zoë, you explain.*
- 92 L2 Doorway, by the doorway.
- 93 L3 *Mangabe ugena ngase sicabeni* [It's that part when you are coming in from the door]. *It's that part.*
- 94
- 95 L1 'Tuintjie'?
- 96 L3 *Nika uPromise acacise something* [Give Promise to explain something].
- 97 L1 Okay, Promise, wat is 'tuintjie'?
- 98 L3 *Promise, awusha. Isho noma ucabanga ukuthi uqonde ukuthini utuintjie. Uqonde ukuthini utuintjie?* [Promise, explain. Tell us what 'tuintjie' means. What does 'tuintjie' mean?]
- 99
- 100 L4 *I think it's a garden.*
- 101 [Pupil from another group makes a sound]
- 102 *Ubalawo? u Cynthia?* [Who is that? Is it Cynthia?]
- 103 L1 *Ja, it's a small garden. Okay, hoe oud is Boetie, die seun?* [... how old is Boetie, the boy?]
- 104 L2 *Ja, how old is this boy? How old is he?*
- 105 /

106 Group 4:

- 107 T Watter nommer doen julle? [What number are you at?]
- 108 L Drie punt drie [3.3]
- 109 T Wat doen Wagter? [What is 'Wagter doing?]
- 110 N>R
- 111 T Wie is Wagter? [Who is Wagter?]
- 112 L Wagter is 'n hond [Wagter is a dog].
- 113 T Ja, mooi. *Did you know, Cassandra, Theolin, the other class told me hulle weet nie wat 'n Wagter is [... that they did not know what 'Wagter' is]. They did not know what 'Wagter' is. Wagter, in Afrikaans, in all the readers and junior literature, 'Wagter' is given as the name of a dog. So when you speak about 'Wagter' in Afrikaans, it is nothing but a dog. A popular name for a dog.* Wat doen Wagter? Wat was Wagter se reaksie? [Wagter? What is Wagter's reaction?]
- 114
- 115
- 116
- 117
- 118
- 119 N>R
- 120 T Kyk in die gedig [Look in the poem]. Theolin?

- 121 L Wagter loer net aan sleg skuins en soek, en soek die tuintjie [Wagter watches from across and
122 looks after the garden].
- 123 T Goed. Wat is 'tuintjie'? [Good. What is 'tuintjie'?]
- 124 N>R
- 125 T Is 'tuintjie' binne of buite? [Is 'tuintjie' inside or outside?]
- 126 L Binne [Inside].
- 127 T Nee, ons is binne. Ons is in die klas [No, we are inside. We are in the class].
- 128 L Die huis. [The house].
- 129 T Die tuin is..... Die tuin het blomme, pragtige blomme en plante [The garden is..... The garden
130 has flowers, pretty flowers and plants].
- 131 L *Garden?*
- 132 T *Yes, 'tuin' means garden. So answer the question. Wat doen Wagter?*
- 133 N>R
- 134 T Wagter loop in die/ [Wagter walks into the/]
135 L tuin. Hy hardloop in die tuin [garden. He runs off into the garden].
- 136 T *He runs off into the garden. So, waaroor is Wagter bang? Cassandra?*
- 137 L Hy is bang vir die water [He is afraid of the water].
- 138 T Ja, hy is bang vir die/ [Yes, he is afraid of the/]
139 Ls water.
- 140 T Almal is bang vir die water. *Nobody likes to get wet because bathtime is a real scene when
141 kleinboet is taking a bath. Everybody is afraid of the water. Nobody wants to get wet.*
- 142 [Teacher addresses the class]
- 143 T *Okay class, Let's discuss the poem. Who will read for us?*
- 144 L1 *Wena nxa kuthiwe akufundwe, uvele ayisho kakhulu* [When they say read, read loudly].
- 145 L2 *Lithini legama?* [What is this word?]
- 146 [Pupil reads poem].
- 147 T *Okay, Group one, wat gaan on? [.... what is happening?] Wie se badtyd is dit? [Whose
148 bathtime is it?] Gaston?*
- 149 L Boetie se badtyd [Boetie's bathtime].
- 150 T Dit is Boetie se badtyd. As Boetie bad, wat doen hy? [It is Boetie's bath time. What does he
151 do when he baths?]
- 152 [Class is generally noisy]
- 153 L *Class, keep quiet.*
- 154 T Dankie Patience. *Everyone*, luister mooi [Thank you Patience. Everyone, listen carefully]
155 [shouts at class]. *Don't make such a noise. Just raise your hand to answer the question.*
- 156 *As Boetie bad, wat doen hy? [What does he do when he baths?]*
- 157 L Hy spat baie water [He splashes lots of water].
- 158 T Goed. As die water spat, hoe ver gaan die water? [When the water splashes, how far does it
159 go?]
- 160 L Tot teen die drumpel [As far as the doorstep].
- 161 T Ek weet dat in julle groepe julle het die word 'drumpel' bespreek [I know that you discussed
162 the word 'drumpel' in your groups]. *You were going on about that word 'drumpel' because
163 I didn't let you use a dictionary. Now, as I walked about I heard that some of you had
164 it, others did not, some asked me. So, wat beteken 'drumpel'?*
- 165 Ls Doorway.

- 166 T *So*, as Boetie se bad is hier..... *assuming the bath is here*, en as hy bad, die water gaan so
 167 ver as die drumpel [So, if Boetie's bath was here and when he bathed, the water got as
 168 far as the doorway]. Vir Boetie, is dit baie lekker, *absolute heaven for him*. Hy geniet dit
 169 want hy is 'n kind [For Boetie, it is very nice ... He enjoys it because he is a child]. *By the*
 170 *way, I had this one preparatory question*. Hoe oud, dink jy, is Boetie? [How old do you think
 171 Boetie is?]Thembe?
- 172 L Two or three.
- 173 L Sewe maande [Seven months].
- 174 T Sewe maande, Pretty? [Seven months, Pretty?]
- 175 L Vyf jaar oud [Five years old].
- 176 L Nee [No].
- 177 T Dink julle dat vyf is 'n bietjie te groot om te spat? [Do you think five is a little too old to
 178 splash?]
- 179 Ls Ja [Yes].
- 180 T *Do you think five or six years is too big to be splashing?*
- 181 L Yes.
- 182 T My opinie, twee of drie, *two or three* [In my opinion, two or three ...]. Ons sê nie dat die baba
 183 bad alleen [We are not saying that the baby is having a bath all by himself]. *We are not*
 184 *saying that the baby is alone and that it is a bad mother that left him alone in the*
 185 *bath. He is being supervised*. Ons kan die reaksie van die huis troeteldiere sien. Die kat en
 186 die hond [We can see the reaction of the house pets. The dog and the cat]. *The poem actually*
 187 *shows us the reaction of the different people as the baby splashes*. Wat doen die kat?
 188 [What is the cat doing?]
- 189 N>R
- 190 T Wat doen die kat? Wat doen die kat? [What is the cat doing? What is the cat doing?] *What*
 191 *is the cat doing, Lawrence?*
- 192 L Die kat gryp al haar katjies, katjies, haar babatjies *the kittens, the babies* [The cat
 193 grasps all her kittens, kittens, babies....].
- 194 T As sy die babatjies, *the kittens*, wegneem, sy doen dit omdat sy dit nie nat wil maak nie [She
 195 takes her babies,, outside because she does not want them to get wet]. *Obviously, she*
 196 *does not want her babies to get?*
- 197 L Wet.
- 198 T Wat doen Susie? Die sustertjie? Wat doen die sustertjie? [What is Susie doing? The sister?
 199 What is the sister doing?] Pratisha? Thabile?
- 200 L Susie speel met haar pop [Susie plays with her doll].
- 201 T Wat is 'n pop? Wat is 'n pop? Wie speel met poppe? Seuns of meisies? [What is a 'pop'? What
 202 is a 'pop'? Who plays with dolls? Boys or girls?]
- 203 L Meisies. [Girls].
- 204 T Meisies. Goed [Girls. Good]. Hoe lyk 'n pop? [What does a doll look like?]
- 205 N>R
- 206 T Soos 'n meisie. In die ou dae die pop lyk soos 'n meisie, maar hierdie dae lyk dit ook soos seuns
 207 [Like a girl. In the old days, dolls used to resemble girls, but nowadays, they also look like
 208 boys].
- 209 L *Like a baby, like a girl.*
- 210 T Lang hare, pragtige rokke, linte, skoene en alles mooi. Dit is 'n meisie se speelgoed [Long hair,

- 211 pretty dresses, ribbons, shoes and everything lovely]. *It is a girl's toy*. Susie gryp haar pop,
 212 *she does not want her doll to get wet*. Sy wil dit nie nat word nie [She does not want it to
 213 get wet]. Wat doen Wagter? [What is Wagter doing?]
 214 N>R
 215 T Wat doen Wagter? [What is Wagter doing?] *Come, I know you know the answer*. Wat doen
 216 Wagter? [What is Wagter doing?]
 217 L Wagter is looking, peeping.
 218 T Ja, Wagter loer. Hy loer. [wagter peeps. He peeps] *Peeps, right?* Wagter?
 219 Ls loer.
 220 T *Before we understand that*, wie is Wagter? [..... who is wagter?]
 221 L A dog}
 222 L A dog}
 223 L Wagter is 'n hond}
 224 T *So you can see the reactions of the pets, the cat, the dog, the cats and it's kittens.*
 225 *The dog making headway for the garden*. Watter woord is 'garden'? Watter woord in die
 226 gedig? [Which word means 'garden'? Which word in the poem?]
 227 N>R
 228 T [Loudly and deliberately] *Which word is garden?*
 229 L Tuin.[Garden]
 230 T *Yes, tuin. 'A little garden?*
 231 L Tuintjie.[A little garden].

APPENDIX C5: LLCA [L2] : SCHOOL Z

APPENDIX C5a:

GRADE : 8

LESSON : Literature : Poetry

TOPIC : Die Olifant, Jan Kromhout

- 1 T So in Afrikaans ons noem dit 'n pöesie of 'n gedig. Wat noem ons die persoon wat die gedig
 2 geskryf het? [So in Afrikaans we call it a 'pöesie' (poem) or 'gedig'(poem). What do we call the
 3 person who wrote the poem?
 4 N>R
 5 T Ons noem hom die digter. Digter. [We call him a poet. Poet] *Poet*. Die olifant. Wat is 'n
 6 olifant? [The elephant. What is an elephant?] Die olifant is 'n [The elephant is an]
 7 *elephant or indlovu* [elephant]. Daar is 'n olifant of elephant [There is an elephant]. Olifant
 8 in Zulu is *indlovu* [elephant].
 9 Kom ons begin lees. Hoveel strofe? [Let us begin reading. How many stanzas?]
 10 N>R
 11 T Daar is een, twee of drie strofes? Ons sê in Zulu *izitatha*. [There are 1, 2 or 3 stanzas? In
 12 Zulu we say stanzas]. Hoveel strofes is daar? [How many stanzas are there?]
 13 N>R
 14 T Een, twee of drie strofes? Hoveel strofes? [1, 2 or 3 stanzas. How many stanzas? *Zingaphi*
 15 *izitatha*? [How many stanzas?]
 16 L Three.

- 17 T Drie. Strofe een. Daar is een, twee, drie strofes. Daar is drie strofes. Kom ons lees die eerste
 18 strofe [Three. Stanza 1. There are 1, 2, 3 stanzas. There are 3 stanzas. Come, let us read the
 19 first stanza] [Teacher reads stanza 1]. Die olifant slaap. Strofe een, dit is die olifant. Hoe
 20 loop die olifant?[The elephant sleeps. Stanza 1, this is the elephant. How does the elephant
 21 walk?]
- 22 N>R
- 23 T Hoe loop die olifant? Hy loop stadig. Loop stadig. Onderstreep die word stadig. *Underline*
 24 *the word* 'stadig'. Wat bedoel die word 'stadig'? [How does the elephant walk? ... He walks
 25 slowly. Walks slowly. 'slowly'. What is the meaning of 'stadig'(slowly)?]
- 26 N>R
- 27 T Die olifant loop nie vinnig nie [The elephant does not walk fast]. *The elephant does not walk*
 28 *fast*. Vinnig [fast]. *Fast*. Hy loop stadig [He walks slowly]. *He walks slowly*. Hy kan nie ver wag
 29 dat hy ver loop nie. *He cannot expect to walk far*. *He walks stadig*. *Stadig* [..... He cannot
 30 expect to walk far. He walks slowly]. Dwebela [Underline]
- 31 Ls *Sesidwebelile* [We underlined]
- 32 Hy loop nie verder nie omdat hy stadig loop. Hy wys hierdie kant en daardie kant. Die kinders
 33 hou daarvan. Hulle hou van die olifant. Die kinders hou om die olifant se rug te ry. *They like*
 34 *to ride on his back*. Hulle geniet dit. [He does not walk far because he walks slowly. He shows
 35 this side and that. The children like this. They like the elephant. They like to ride the
 36 elephant's back..... They enjoy this]. Geniet? In Engels is dit? Ja, wat is geniet?
 37 [Enjoy? In English this is? Yes what is enjoy?]
- 38 N>R *Enjoy*. Geniet is *enjoy*. [Enjoy is...]
- 39 Dit is kos dat hulle die olifant gee. Hulle gooi die neute omdat hulle baie van die olifant hou.
 40 Neute? Neute? *Nuts*. *They throw him nuts*. Kom ons kyk na die tweede strofe [This is food
 41 that they give the elephant. They throw the nuts because elephants love it. Nuts? Nuts?
 42 Come let us look at stanza 2]. Ngingathi kukhona amakinati lawa aqinile adiyasa nako
 43 *Shoprite* [They say there are hard peanuts for sale at Shoprite]
 44 [Pupils laugh]
- 45 L *Kukhona amakinati angidliwa izindlovu* [Elephants do not eat those peanuts]
- 46 T *Kushuthi indlovu uyawathanda* [Elephants like peanuts]. *Okay, let's read stanza 2*.
 47 [Teacher reads stanza 2]. Die oppasser. Wie is 'n oppasser? Is iemand wat [The herdsboy.
 48 What is a herdsboy? Is someone who ..
- 49 N>R
- 50 T Is iemand wat hierdie olifant oppas, oppas, *look after*, wie gee die olifant die kos, *ukudla*
 51 *kwayo ikunikezo ubani na* [Is someone who looks after the elephant, look after, look after,
 52 who gives the elephant food, who gives the elephant the food]. In die aand, lê hy in 'n hok.
 53 Hy slaap nie in 'n kamer nie. Hy slaap in 'n hok. Die olifant slaap in 'n hok. Dit bedoel dat hierdie
 54 olifant is nie vry nie. Waar slaap die olifant? [In the evening he sleeps in the cage. He does
 55 not sleep in a room. He sleeps in a cage. This means that the elephant is not free. Where does
 56 the elephant sleep?]
- 57 L *Hayi Ngehok* [Not the cage].
- 58 T Kinders, waar slaap die olifant? Ja? *Where does the elephant sleep?* In 'n kamer, 'n hok of
 59 'n bed? [Children where does the elephant sleep? Yes? In a room, a cage or a bed?]
- 60 L In 'n hok. [In a cage].
- 61 T Dankie. Hy slaap in 'n hok op die vloer. Wat is 'n vloer? [Thank you. He sleeps in a cage on the

- 62 floor. What is a floor?]
- 63 L *Floor.*
- 64 T Goed [Good]. *Floor. He sleeps on the floor. Ilala endaweni eqinile* [It sleeps in a hard
65 place]. In die môre is hy vry. Die kinders ry op sy rug. Waarmee ry die kinders die olifant in
66 die oggend, vroeg in die oggend? Waarmee ry die kinders *kushuthi* [early in the morning], *early*
67 *in the morning?* [In the morning he is free. The children ride on his back. Where do the
68 children ride the elephant in the morning, early in the morning?]
- 69 Hulle ry hom. In die laaste strofe - lees [They ride ride. In the last stanza - read]. [Pupil reads
70 the last stanza]. Wat is 'n stertjie? In Engels, 'n stertjie *is a tail*, *umsila* [What is a tail? In
71 English, a 'stertjie' is a tail, a tail]. Hoe lank is die olifant se stertjie? Is dit baie kort of lank?
72 [How long is the tail? Is it very short or long?]
- 73 L Dit is klein [It is small].
- 74 T Ja, dit is klein. Die olifant is groot maar sy stertjie is klein. Die stertjie is kort. *Yes, it is*
75 *small.* [The elephant is big but he has a small tail. The tail is short]. *Excuse me you people,*
76 *you are late. Baleythi* [They are late]. Gaan na die personeelkamer! [Go to the staff room!]
77 *Come look at the poem.* Kyk na die poesie. Die olifant geniet dit. [Look at the poem. The
78 children enjoy it]. [loudly] *Look at the poem pupils!* Die olifant geniet dit [The elephant
79 enjoys it]. He likes it when the children ride him. *Geniet?* [Enjoy?] *Enjoy.* Hy geniet dit met
80 plesier. *He enjoys it with pleasure* [He enjoys it with pleasure.....]. *Dwebelani amagama*
81 *engiwashilo* [Underline the words I am saying].
- 82 L *Eyiphi edwe tshelayo* [Which one should we underline?]
- 83 T *Geniet. Geniet. Met die grooste plesier.* [Enjoy. Enjoy. With the greatest pleasure]. Kom ons
84 kyk weer na strofe drie. Die kinders hou baie om op die olifant se rug te sit. Hy loop. Hoe is
85 'n olifant - 'n slegte dier of 'n goeie dier? *A bad animal or a good animal?* Sleg of goeie?
86 [Come let us look at stanza 3. The children really like to sit on the elephant's back. He walks.
87 How is an elephant - a bad or a good animal? Good or bad?]
- 88 L *Goeie* [Good].
- 89 T Ja, hy is 'n goeie dier. Waarom sê ons dat hy 'n goeie dier is? Omdat die kinders ry op sy
90 rug. *Because he allows the children to ride on his back. This makes him a good animal.*
91 'n *Goeie dier* [Yes, he is a good animal. Why do we say that he is a good animal? Because
92 the children ride on his back..... a good animal] Okay, verstaan julle die gedig? Het julle enige
93 vrae? *Nee?* [Do you understand the poem? Have you any questions? No?] *Okay*, antwoord die
94 vrae wat op jou bladsy is. *Answer the questions on your pages. You can work with your*
95 *neighbour.*
- 96 *Moenie 'n geraas maak nie, okay?* [... answer the questions on the page.... Don't make a noise].

APPENDIX C5b:**GRADE** : 8**LESSON** : Comprehension**TOPIC** : 'n Tuisnywerheid langs die pad [A home industry along the road]

[The passage is about hawking alongside the road. Teacher explains the passage almost completely in Afrikaans]

- 1 T Die vroue was besig om produk langs die pad te verkoop. Ons het gesê dat een van die
2 vroue het gevra : "Wat het jy daar in die *checkers*?" *What do you have in the checkers?*
3 [The women were busy selling their produce alongside the road. We said that one of the
4 women asked: "What do you have in that packet?]. Sy het reeds haar goed uitgepak het, en
5 agter die pynappels, pineapples, en papajas, papajas? pawpaws, op die grond gesit het. [She had
6 already unpacked her goods and was sitting on the ground behind her pineapples and pawpaws].
7 Sy het gesê : "wat het jy dan gebeur wys na my." Jy moet vir my wys. *You must show me. She*
8 *is curious, you see, she wants to know what the boy has in the packet because he did*
9 *not take it out* [She said, "What do you have" referring to me. You must show me]. Die seun
10 get gesê dat dit 'n vis is. En wat is 'n vis mense? Vis? Vis? [The boy said that it was a fish. And
what is a fish people?]
- 11 Ls **Inhlanzi** [Fish]
- 1 T Ja, *fish* [Yes, ...]. Hou julle van visse? [Do you like fish?] *Okay, okay*. Die seun was baie skaam.
2 Hy was baie skaam. *He was very shy* [The boy was very shy. The boy was very shy.....]. "Kom
3 hier en wys," sê die vrou vir die kind. Hy stap nader en kniel voor haar. *Wayinikeza ini?*
4 *I Respect Waguqa kuphi?* ["Come here and show me," the woman said to the child. He stepped
5 closer and knelt before her. What did he show her? Respect. Where did he kneel?]
- 6 L **Eduze kwakhe** [Near her]..... /
- 7 T/ Die vrou leun vooroor met haar voorarms op haar knieë om na die vis te kyk. Haar bene
8 is wyd uitmekaar geplant om haar balans te hou. *She must balance herself carefully when*
9 *she kneels, otherwise she will fall* [The woman leans forward with her arms on her knees to
10 look at the fish. Her legs are apart, planted firmly on the ground to keep her balance].

APPENDIX C5c:**GRADE** : 8**LESSON** : Language study**TOPIC** : Persoonlike Voornaamwoorde [Personal Pronouns]

- 1 L Linda Paul, *ngizoyicisha mina* [Wait Paul, I'll erase it myself].
- 2 T *Okay!* Laat ons kyk verder die persoonlike voornaamwoorde. Kom ons bespreek 'n paar
3 voorbeelde [Let us look further at personal pronouns. Let us discuss a few examples]. *Ons*
4 praat oor. [*We speak of*]. *Stand up. When we refer to a boy, we say Hy* staan op. *When*
5 *we refer to a girl, we say Sy* staan op [*He stands up..... She stands up*]. *Hy* vir 'n seun.
6 *Sy* vir 'n meisie. *Hy for a boy, sy for a girl* [He for a boy. She for a girl]. Kom ons oor 'n meisie
7 praat. *Sy* skryf op *haar* boek. Okay. *Zama* skryf op *haar* boek [Let us talk about a girl. She
8 writes in her book. Zama writes in her book]. Dan kan ons verder gaan [Then we can go
9 further]. Dit is *my* boek. Die boek is *myne*. Myne is 'n persoonlike voornaamwoord. Dit is *haar*
10 boek. Dit is *hare*. *But if we want to refer to us, we will say, Die boek is ons'n* [The book

- 11 is ours]. *Your book, yours*, Dit is julle boeke [It is your books]. *Okay*. Soos hier kom die man.
 12 Dit is die man se boek [Like, here comes the man. It is the man's book]. Laat ons voort gaan
 13 *okay* [Let us continue].
 14 Met wie het jy gepraat? Wie se boek is dit? Dit is ook voorbeelde van voornaamwoorde [With
 15 whom did you speak? Whose book is this?] Het julle enige vrae? *Geen nie?* Julle verstaan die
 16 werk? *Okay*, doen julle die volgende voorbeelde in jou taalwerkboeke. Lees die paragraaf en
 17 onderstreep net die persoonlike voornaamwoorde [Do you have any questions. None? You
 18 understand the work? *Okay*. Do the following examples in your grammar books. Read the
 19 paragraph and underline only the personal pronouns].

APPENDIX C5d:**GRADE** : 8**LESSON** : Literature : Short Story**TOPIC** : *Volstruis se Vuur*, Annarie van der Merwe

[Group Discussion. Pupils have been given 4 questions, based on the story, for discussion]

..... /

- 1 L2 *I'm just going to answer these questions right now.* Hy hou aan... [He likes to]. Hou? Same
 2 thing as what? [Pupils search in the dictionary]
 3 L3 *Hoe... what.*
 4 L1 *I think the best thing to do is find the meanings. Then we can like... actually we speak*
 5 *Zulu most of the time not Afrikaans.*
 6 L3 *Wawenza amaquestion akho?* [Did you do your questions]
 7 L1 *Only some. Ayi ikhuni lento bafwethu* [Hey guys this thing is hard]. *I can't pronounce these*
 8 *words.*
 9 L2 *I also can't pronounce these words because they are very difficult.*
 10 L3 *Okay. So answer question 11. Wat is die woord vuur?* [What is the word fire?]
 11 L1 *Vuur is fire or flame. Wat is vuur this one here? And first find the word like this and*
 12 *then the second word. It's more easily..... vuur.... fire/flame. This one here there are*
 13 *many things with fire and flame.*
 14 L3 [whispers] *Uyadlala wena* [You are playing].
 15 L1 [whispers] *Joe, uyadlala* [Joe, you are playing].
 16 L2 *Legama leli* [This word]
 17 L3 *Okay, ultholile* [he found it].
 18 L1 *Hersisib is the name of the ostrich. Hy sê [he says]... I think... I don't find the word it's*
 19 *not in this dictionary.*
 20 L2 *Are you sure?*
 21 L1 *Ja I'm sure. It's here no, it's not here. It's a name.*
 22 L2 *iKalahari ila ihlala khona* [At Kalahari, it's where it stays]. *Where he lives and all that*
 23 *stuff.*
 24 L1 *You sure Boetie? This is a name?*
 25 L2 *Ja, I think so.*
 26 L1 *Die vuur means, the fire means, fire or flame the same thing. Ek het die strand geseë* [I
 27 *saw the beach].*

- 28 L3 Yazi singa yi hlanganisi iEnglish ne Afrikaans [We must not mix English and Afrikaans].
- 29 L1 Ya, sengithanda ukubamba kancane [Yes, I know. I'm understanding a little bit]. *Let me*
- 30 *check the dictionary ja and then find the word*gesteel means ... steal... gesteelgesteel
- 31 L3 *Just look for steel*
- 32 L1 *Let's just find steel ... I think I'm lost guys..*
- 33 L2 Steel
- 34 L1 *Yes stuur...*
- 35 L2 *No not stuur ... steel*
- 36 L1 Daar is it dit [Here it is] *It is 'n yellow stalk or flower.*
- 37 L2 *Can't be steel steel gesteel* Kyk in die ander kant [Look in the other side]
- 38 L1 Steel ... steel ... *where are you? Ge .. Ge... Ge where are you?*
- 39 L2 *Ge ... Uge uchaz ukuthini?* [What does ge mean?] *What does ge mean?* Umuntu funa azame
- 40 ukulithola lonke legama [We must try and find this whole word]
- 41 L1 *Mina sengi zamile ngangalitholi* [I tried but I couldn't find it].
- 42 L3 *Hey guys you must just talk Afrikaans.*
- 43 L1 Ek nie praat Afrikaans nie. Jy verstaan hé? [I don't speak Afrikaans. You understand eh?]
- 44 *I also don't like to use Afrikaans because I don't understand and I can't speak/*
- 45 L2 *That's my problem ... so* [how come you are not speaking Afrikaans] ... *you are not even*
- 46 *answering the questions.*
- 47 L3 *Hayi it's impossible bafowethu* [Hey it's impossible guys].
- 48 L1 *Come on, let's look for gesteel/*
- 49 L2 *Isn't you said geslaap/*
- 50 L1 *No no gesteel gesteel chop, chop, chop, it's like stealing something ... wait gesteel*
- 51 *... okay gesteel...*
- 52 L3 *Hey China, we have only 15 minutes left.*
- 53 L1 Yazi angi kakayitholi *answer* kanumber one [I have not yet found the answer for number
- 54 one]..... Sasifunda lestory eskoleni [We read this story at school].
- 55 L3 Fanekele kube yinto enjengo 'volstruis' bese kubekhona no 'gesteel' bese sizokwazi ukuthi
- 56 lento esiyifunayo siyithole [We must find something like 'volstruis'and 'gesteel' so we can
- 57 get what we want].
- 58 L1 *I think that it 'stole'. Let's look for the next answer.*
- 59 L2 *So this is the first answer? Heisib stole fire.*
- 60 L1 *Ja, he stole the fire. Okay, let's do number 12.*
- 61 L2 Sy het twee vrouens en dogters [He has two wives and daughters].
- 62 L1 *Perfect! The next question.* Hoekom moes Heisib die vuur dokter? Vertel ook how hy dit
- 63 gedoen het [Why must Heisib nurse the fire? State also how he did this]. Yini kungathi
- 64 umuntu oyedwa azame ianswer oyodwa [I think one person should find one answer].
- 65 L2 *Mina sengizamile eya number one* [I tried to find the answer to number one].
- 66 L3 *Angithi nawe owusasi khulumi i isiZulu?* [Isn't you don't talk Zulu?]
- 67 L1 *Funa sikhulume isiZulu kancane* [We speak Zulu a little bit].}
- 68 L2 *That's a perfect plan. Okay, 12, 13, 14. I'll do 12, you do 13, and you 14.}*
- 69 L3 *Number 14 is so hard.* Hayi bafowethu ikhuni lento [Hey guys, this thing is so hard].
- 70 L2 *Answer for number 12 is* Die volstruis vertel die dogter ek is nie 'n dogter nie [The ostrich
- 71 tells the daughter, I'm not a daughter]. *Okay?*
- 72 L1 *The answer for number 14?*

- 73 L2 *We know the answer for number 14.*
- 74 L1 *Guys, ubani ianswer ya number 14?* [Guys, what's the answer for number 14?]
- 75 L3 *Sy kan nie voel nie* [She cannot feel].