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Abstract

This study investigates current pedagogical practices in teaching in English as a language of learning and instruction. The study seeks to examine whether current teachers are in need of re-training or whether they possess relevant content pedagogical knowledge to use English as a medium of instruction. At present, the Governing Bodies of schools have the authority to choose the language of learning and instruction according to the provisions of the Constitution. The language chosen as the medium is critical since it assumes the role of mediator between text and learner, and teacher and learner.

The research uses the interpretive paradigm and in particular engages (Vygotsky 1978) and Chomsky (1986) as theorists of language acquisition who write from a constructivist perspective. Methods of data collection are drawn largely from the qualitative methods and to a lesser extent from quantitative methods. Instruments for data collection included questionnaires, interviews and lesson observations.

The research study focuses on foundation phase teachers and learners in four purposefully selected schools, comprising former Model C and public township primary schools.

The findings of the study suggest that learners, especially from township schools, find it difficult to learn in English as a medium of instruction probably because of limited exposure to English in both the school and home environment. On the contrary, learners from former Model C schools seem to be at an advantage because they use English in all spheres of school life, in and out of the class, resulting in more exposure and repetition.

The findings seem to indicate that teachers’ limited proficiency in English negatively affects quality of pedagogical practises in the language of learning and instruction. Lesson observations support findings that teachers’ limited proficiency do affect education. This study further suggests that most non-native English teachers are inadequately prepared to use English as the medium of instruction. This inadequacy consequently results in some teachers failing to meet the language-related needs of learners due to their limited proficiency in the language of learning. This point is demonstrated by evidence from the observed lessons, recorded interviews and reviewed literature.
The study further reveals that most teachers have difficulties with pronunciations, terms and vocabulary appropriate for grade two learners in this instance.

Additionally, four factors affecting pedagogic practises were reflected in the study. These were class inequalities, different distribution of knowledge, differences in access to knowledge and social class differences. These factors were experienced through different pedagogic practices employed by different participants.
Uittreksel

Hierdie studie ondersoek die huidige opvoedkundige praktike in onderrig in Engels as ’n taal van leer onderrig. Die studie poog om vas te stel of die huidige onderwysers ‘n behoefte het aan her-opleiding en of hulle oor toepaslike pedagogiese kennis beskik om Engels as ’n medium van onderrig te gebruik. Op die oomblik blik die beheerliggame in skole oor die gesag om die taal van onderrig, volgens die bepalings van die Grondwet, te kies. Voormalige model C-skole en openbare primêre skole uit voorheen benadeelde gebiede is getoets vir hierdie navorsing.

Die navorsing maak gebruik van die interpretatiewe-paradigma en kyk in die besonder na (Vygotsky 1978) en Chomsky (1986) as teoretici wat skryf vanuit ’n konstruktivistiese perspektief. Die kwalitatiewe metodes van data-insamel word grootliks gebruik en tot ’n mindere mate die kwantitatiewe metodes. Instrumente vir data sluit in vraelyste, terugvoering uit onderhoude en lesse waarneming.

Die bevindinge van die studie dui daarop dat leerders veral in voorheen benadeelde skole dit moeilik vind om in Engels te leer as ’n medium van onderrig en dit is waarskynlik as gevolg van beperkte gebruik en gebrek aan oefening. Die voordeel vir leerders van voormalige model C-skole is die feit dat Engels in en om die klaskamer gebruik word, wat lei tot meer blootstelling en herhaling. Die bevindinge dui daarop dat onderwysers se beperkte taalvaardigheid die kwaliteit van opvoedkundige praktike in die onderrigtaal negatief beïnvloed. Die observering van lesse dui daarop dat onderwysers onvoldoende voorbereid is wanneer hulle in Engels onderrig. Die onderrigaal word beskou as instrumenteel want dit neem die rol van bemiddelaar tussen teks en leerder en onderwyser en leerder.

Die bevindinge dui verder daarop dat sommige onderwysers daarin faal om in die taalverwante behoeftes van hul leerders te voorsien en gevolg van hul beperkte vaardigheid in die onderrigaal. Die ge-observeerde lesse, onderhoude en literatuur, bevestig die kwessie van onderwysers se beperkte vaardigheid in die onderrigaal. Die studie toon aan dat daar ’n paar onderwysers is wat sukkel met uitsprake, terminologie en gepaste woordeskat vir graad twee's.

Laastens, die volgende faktore is weerspieël in die studie: klasse-ongelykhede, verskillende verspreiding van kennis, verskille in toegang tot kennis en sosiale klas verskille was ervaar deur verskillende pedagogiese praktike. Die verschillende pedagogiese praktyske het die gelei tot reproduksie van ongelykheid in taalverwerwing.
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Definition of Terms

Pedagogy

Pedagogy is the skill or art of orchestrating classroom learning

Content pedagogy

The pedagogical teaching skills that teachers use to transmit or impart specialised knowledge of their content areas.

Cultural capital

Cultural capital refers to those social aspects such as culture, habit, attitudes that children acquire in the home situation.

Elaborated code

Is a type of a language code which is necessary so that everyone can understand it, and it works well in situations where there is no prior or shared understanding and knowledge.

English Medium of instruction

The medium of instruction is the (Language of learning and teaching) used in the school situation. It is a language of learning and teaching and not the mother tongue of students. The medium of instruction is the language used by the teacher to deliver lessons.

Foundation Phase learners refers to learners from Grade R to Grade 3

Language

Language is a tool for thought and communication.

Language acquisition

Language acquisition is the process whereby humans acquire the capacity to comprehend language as well as to produce words for communication.
Quad angulation means

In research, it implies viewing and integrating data from four sources or four angles.

Restricted code

Is a language code shared and understood by a community. This type of code creates a sense of includedness, a feeling of belonging to a certain group. Restricted codes can be found among friends and families and other intimately knit groups.

Second language

A second language is a language other than the mother tongue or primary language of the learner, used as a dominant language in a particular environment and where it is regarded as International language for commerce and

Second Language acquisition

Second language acquisition is the ability to adopt and comprehend an additional language other than the first language

Sociocultural theory

A theory most closely linked to Vygotsky and which holds the view that our higher order functions like problem solving or languages are products of environmental exposure, social participation and interaction

Social constructivism

Social constructivism is a philosophical epistemology which places emphasis on the influence of the learner as an active participant in learning and as an active maker of meaning.
**Universal Grammar**

This is a term used in Chomsky’s theory to label the innate system that he believes is a genetic endowment that allows human beings to acquire the grammar of any particular language.

**The Language acquisition device**

This is a mental toolbox, which triggers the capacity to acquire a language.

**Zone of Proximal development**

This is a measure of one’s innate potential, which can develop with guidance from a mentoring environment.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

The history of education in South Africa is rooted in the hegemony and ideology of English as a language of communication and as a preferred medium of instruction in the education system. This has culminated in present situations about the role of and place of languages in the new democratic South Africa. There are perennial discussions on English as a media of instruction, and the search for the place of African languages, and the issue of when can foreign languages like English be introduced to learners as a medium of instruction to non-native speakers of that particular language. The issues highlighted above have historical, social, political and ideological baggage in the history of education in South Africa.

This broad coverage however, is beyond the scope of the research, which focuses on the medium of instruction as a contentious language issue within the current education system in South Africa since its first democratic elections of 1994. However, the research takes into account the language issues contained in the infamous Bantu Education Act of 1953, which led to student uprisings, resulting in policy changes and adoption of English as a medium of instruction for indigenous African population thereby replacing Mother Tongue Instruction (Union of South Africa 1953).

1.2 Background of the study

Although educationally sound, the policy of mother tongue instruction (MTI) introduced by the Bantu Education Act was a strategy of the Nationalist Party to exclude Africans from the ‘white capitalist’ economy and was also used to promote separatism. The Bantu Education Act therefore created separate schools along racial, linguistic, and even ethnic lines. In view of all other inequalities in South Africa in the 1970s, the introduction of the policy that forced the African population to use Afrikaans as a medium of instruction became the trigger of the Soweto uprising of 1976. Masses of school children took part in protests against this and other issues deriving from the Bantu Education Act (Union of South Africa 1953).
The initial spread of English among Africans took place during the colonial era. Language therefore played a major role in shaping the socio-political history of the country. The language shaped up nationalism and highlighted the struggle against inequality hence education issues were resolved using legislation and language policy (Cuvelier, Du Plessis and Tech 2003).

Thus, English became a dominant medium of instruction after the elections of 1994 (Uys, Van De Walt, Van Deer Berg & Botha 2007). English language is thus widely adopted as the medium of teaching and learning in most schools. However, the teachers appear to be inadequately prepared to use English as a medium of instruction since English is either a second or a third language to them. The same can be said about the learners resulting in learning difficulties being experienced using the English language.

There is limited exposure in the medium of instruction. This may be because the learners mostly use the medium of instruction at school only and then at home they switch on to their home language. In the South Africa context, learners in the foundation phase have still not perfected their first language. This results in semi-lingualism, in this case that is a state whereby learners are not fully conversant in the medium of instruction and they are not yet conversant in their own home language. The semi-lingual learner is thereby expected to master English, assimilate content and apply it across the curriculum. This situation becomes a challenge to the learners since they may transfer rules of the native language into rules of the instructional language. Consequently, if the medium of instruction used at school is different from the one at home, then the learners may become disadvantaged.

The medium of instruction therefore is a critical factor in the learners’ academic life for various reasons. Firstly, the medium of instruction mediates between the learners and text to enable the learners to read and understand for example expository texts. Secondly, competences in the medium of instruction enable the learners to communicate and present answers orally or as written work.

Lastly, but not least, the language competences promote the ability to interact with others and to partake in discussions. Therefore, there is need to examine current teaching methods, review, and implement those that enable learners to acquire fundamental language competences.
1.3 Problem statement

The issue of medium of instruction or learning instruction is an enduring concern, negatively affecting academic standards, especially in Africa. This has led to stakeholders and educators reviewing the status of English as a medium of instruction. The Department of Education in South Africa, for example, conducted two national systemic evaluations to establish literacy levels in English. The results were as follows: only 14% of learners tested were outstanding in language competence while 23% of learners were satisfactory and 63% were below required competence in literacy levels (Department of Education 2008). These results depict the low proficiency levels in the language of learning and instruction.

The following problems are acknowledged; firstly, the language of learning has proven to be a huge barrier to learning, as it affects literacy levels. English, as a school subject (a discipline) and medium of instruction, continues to be a challenge for non-native English speakers, be it learners or teachers.

Secondly, some teachers speak English as a second language but are expected to teach in English. Thus, obviously, the first language is noticeable in accent, intonation and, at times, in rule application. The lack of proficiency in English, affect the teachers’ preparation in the content pedagogical knowledge of the discipline and often result in learners adopting the wrong models of the language.

Thirdly, schools are populated with multilingual learners from diverse backgrounds. This creates a challenge since the learners lack the English language proficiency that may help them to learn in a second or third language like English (Du Plessis 2006; O’Connor & Geiger 2009).

Furthermore, the following challenges are cited; poor academic results, incompetence in language of instruction, illiteracy and mismatch between grade level and literacy rate, act as barriers to learning using English as the language of instruction. The issue of incompetency in language makes it difficult for the learner to succeed academically and even achieve the goals of education. Consequently the medium of instruction, acts as a barrier to knowledge assimilation. Lastly, most of learners cannot communicate proficiently in English but have to learn and comprehend learning material in that language which they do not understand.
The medium of instruction or the language of learning and teaching (LoLT) may consequently become a hindrance to the learner because it is difficult for the learner to improve academically that is if they cannot comprehend what they are learning.

1.4 Purpose of the study

The purpose of the study is to investigate current pedagogies that teachers from different schools (with different contextual backgrounds) employ when using English as a medium of instruction, and how their practices influence the learners’ acquisition of knowledge of English as the language of learning in their lessons.

1.5 Research Objectives

The objectives of this study are to:

- Examine the teachers’ frequency of code switching from English as the medium of instruction to the learners native language.
- Investigate whether the standard and quality of teaching English, as the medium of instruction differ according to contexts.
- Examine how theoretical knowledge of English impacts on pedagogical practices and how the teachers’ level of proficiency affects classroom practice.
- Investigate whether the teachers possess relevant pedagogical knowledge for the discipline and how language of instruction affects quality of education.

1.6 Propositions

- Level of teachers’ English language proficiency affects communication with learners.
- The quality of education is contextually relative.
- Teachers’ (theoretical) knowledge base acquired at school or college impacts on the pedagogical practice.
- Learners’ ability to use English as a second language and as medium of learning
influences academic achievement.

1.7 Research Questions

The study investigates the following questions:

- To what extent do teachers codes switch from English as the medium of instruction to the learners native language and how effective is code switching?

- Do the standards and quality of teaching English as a medium of instruction differ context by context?

- In what ways does English as language of instruction affect education quality in different contexts?

- In what ways does theoretical knowledge of English impact on pedagogical practices of teachers?

- How does the teachers’ level of English proficiency impact on their classroom practice?

1.8 Rationale of Theoretical Framework

The constructivist learning theory, which spells out that learning builds upon pre-existing schema and places emphasis on interaction and active engagement, guides the broader theoretical framework of this study. This implies that a learner’s previous experience is fundamental in learning and it is important to engage the learner in the learning process (Killen 2009). Therefore, the study is fore-grounded in Chomsky’s (1986) and Vygotsky (1962) perspectives on language acquisition. These scholars are part of the body of authors writing from a social constructivism perspective. Although their theories talk of children in language acquisition, their framework is also relevant at a later stage. Firstly, Chomsky (1986) hypothesises that all humans have an innate structure known as language acquisition device (LAD), which enables humans to acquire language easily. The theory further observes that everybody has a special mental mechanism, which enables humans to learn a language.
Secondly, (cf, Chomsky 1986) hypothesises that language is acquired naturally in the first few years of life and a child can compose novel sentences never previously heard. In other words, humans have an innate ability to comprehend grammatical relationships, extract the rules of the language, and then use the rules to create their own verbalisation (Chomsky 1986). Similarly, Vygotsky’s theory views language as a social concept which can be developed through social interactions; hence the theory has a bearing on the constructivist learning theory, which also explains that children acquire knowledge because of engaging in social experiences. This theory places emphasis on the social nature of language learning where the child’s environment is significant to language acquisition (Vygotsky 1978).

The use of Vygotsky’s (1962) theory as a framework will help in evaluating children’s work in relation to the schools they come from since the researcher will use schools from different contextual backgrounds. Vygotsky’s theory holds that for language development to take place there should be a two-way communication between the child and the adult or the significant other, so it is the duty of parents and teachers to guide the child through a process of guided discovery. This leads to identifying the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) Vygotsky (1978) which is the gap between what a child can do alone and what the child can accomplish with assistance. This means teachers must consider perspective-learning power before trying to expand the child’s grasp of language (Vygotsky 1962).

1.9 Literature review

Literature on the Bantu Education Act of 1953 cites that the Act stipulates that blacks in the lower and higher primary schools were to receive education in their mother tongue and then transition to Afrikaans and English thereafter.

The language policies of the time were characterised by tension, inconsistencies and disadvantages especially to the black community. Hence, the apartheid policies were considered oppressive and thus hindered blacks in accessing education and succeeding (Cuvelier et al. 2003). The post-1994 political changes in South Africa led to changes in the education system. This resulted in the new democratic government that consequently introduced English as a medium of instruction despite the fact that it is a first language to only a minority of the inhabitants (Chetty and Mwepu 2008).
Research, however, shows that any adopted medium of instruction is critical in the learning process since it is a tool for transmission of knowledge in the learning environment. In view of this, Probyn (2001:249) observes that:

Language and education are twin threads that run through the struggle against apartheid, intertwined, highly politicised and contested. Thus, any discussion about language in education in South Africa should be placed in a historical–political context.

The current South African Constitution prescribes to a new language policy, which aims to redress past injustices brought about by apartheid policies. The Constitution accords status to 11 official languages Afrikaans, English, isiNdebele, isiXhosa, isiZulu, Sepedi, SeSotho, SeTswana, SiSwati, Tshivenda and Xitsonga. Hence, the Bill of Rights accords all people an equal right to education in a language of their choice where such a right can be practised reasonably (RSA 1996a).

Pretorius’ (2000) research indicates that learners in South Africa seem to have low literacy levels as suggested by the results of an international evaluation of reading standards in English. This evaluation covered 45 countries (or 45 education systems) and South Africa scored lowest. These low literacy levels in English may pose as a barrier to learning for South African learners.

The findings above are substantiated by a report of the Department of Education, which established that South Africa’s literacy levels are low to such an extent that we even have university students studying languages like English, and yet are not proficient in reading to international standards (Department of Education 2008).

This research has been inspired by results the results of the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study. The findings indicated that compared to other countries South Africa’s education challenge is the low levels of literacy rate and poor reading proficiency (PIRLS 2006). Furthermore, the International Association for the Evaluation of Education Achievement in International Reading Literacy also concludes that South African learners are lacking in reading ability in English. The fact that South Africa has been identified as having low literacy rates in English have motivated the research study to explore the prevalent methodological practices.
1.9.1 English as a medium of instruction

The study briefly discusses the teaching of lessons in English since it is the language used as a medium of learning and instruction. Therefore, language relays information from the teacher to the learner and is a tool, which facilitates transmission and learning of content subjects. As a result, knowledge of the language, therefore, enables learners to reflect on different facts and viewpoints. In light of the above, research cites English as a language, which accords employment, and an economic opportunity as it is universally recognised as the significant communicative and learning language. Hence, some parents and teachers view English as the relevant language for learning and teaching, even though the learner’s inability to learn in English may resultantly create many challenges academically.

Pursuing this further, Probyn (2001) argues that like many developing countries and post-colonial countries, South Africa adopted a colonial language as the main medium of instruction in education. Adoption of English as the medium of instruction has its merits and demerits because in some countries, it has led to confusion, despair, and high dropout rates, and yet in other countries where sound principles are adopted success and sustainable outcomes have been registered.

1.9.2 The current language Policy in South Africa

The study reflects on the current language policies to determine whether schools follow agreed language policies. The government of South Africa, through legislation, has made strides to redress language inequalities by recognizing 11 languages and granting them an official status and by empowering Schools Governing Bodies (SGBs) with the power to choose and adopt the school language.

The following languages are accorded official status: Afrikaans, English, IsiNdebele, Sepedi, SeSotho, SeTswana, SiSwati, Tshivenda, Xitsonga, Xhosa and IsiZulu. The status is set in the Bill of Rights 29 (2), a subsection of the Constitution (RSA 1996a), which guarantees all people the right to be educated in any officially recognised language of their choice. However, there is a limitation to that language right; the language right is influenced by the state’s ability to provide for this right in any schools concerned.
The Constitution provides the principal legal framework, which guides the language provisions in schools; the provisions of the constitution allow the school governing body (SGB) or the school governing body to adopt the language of learning instruction for their school (Department of Basic Education 2010). However, with so many spoken and recognised languages, the issue of medium of instruction seems to be a prevalent problem, not only in South Africa but also in Africa as a whole Prah (2008:1) had this to say on this matter,

Of all problems we face in Africa today, the most nettlesome seem to be the question of language of instruction. In concrete terms, it boils down to the option between a colonially introduced language and a local language, preferably the mother tongue.

1.9.3 Language acquisition

Findings from studies (Markin, Campbell and Diaz 1995, cited in Du Plessis 2006) indicate that language acquisition is critical in ensuring cognitive developments in children. Molefe and Viljoen (2001) in Du Plessis (2006) suggest another aspect relevant in language acquisition is that the learners must first master the first language since this may facilitate a smooth transition in acquiring the second language (cf, Du Plessis 2006).

In this regard, learners who are good in their mother tongue find it easier to transition to the second language. Sadonvik (2001) paraphrasing Bernstein (1971) states that language also flourishes in a language-rich environment where there are many opportunities for language development.

In view of Bernstein’s assertion, learners who come from a rich environment, or in this case an English language environment like former Model C school learners are already conversant in the language and hence are able to refine the language. On the contrary, the learners from the public township schools come from restrictive environments. It is imperative to note that Former Model C school was used to refer to those schools that were reserved for white pupils under apartheid. The term is not officially used by the Department of Basic Education. This study will use the term to refer to former whites-only schools since the term is now persistently used in unofficial capacity. Model C schools are products of apartheid legacy, the aim was essentially privatisation, and the school controlled its own admission policy and was responsible for upkeep of its buildings and property. The affluent black had the opportunity to take their children to the Model C schools. To this day former Model C schools still typically
have the best facilities, best teachers and best educational opportunities for children. On the other hand, the public township schools are still characterised by poor infrastructure and facilities.

The language therefore has to be elaborated in the classroom due to poor language proficiency and unfamiliarity of text.

1.9.4 The notion of quality

The research investigates whether quality is contextual when teaching a universal discipline like English, which has same rules and which is defined in the same manner. Hence, the research uses two types of schools, the former Model C schools and the public township schools. It will be noted that the working class children from townships will ordinarily attend the township schools and that the middle class attend school at the former Model C schools.

In addition, the research seeks to assess the quality of teaching standards in English as the medium of instruction against the notion that poor pedagogic English practices may lead to unsatisfactory quality. Language of instruction is synonymous with academic success and pedagogic practices that are practised yet its context dependent.

1.10 Research Design

Research designs are plans and procedures in research, which start as broad assumptions comprising detailed methods of data collection. The study is fore-grounded in interpretive paradigm and its associated methodological procedures and approaches.

A paradigm provides a conceptual framework for viewing and making sense of the social world and it is like a lens through which one looks at a particular phenomenon under study, underlying assumptions and intellectual structure upon which research and development in a field of enquiry is based (Kuhn 1962; Paton 1990; Creswell 2009). The researcher writes from the interpretive perspective because teaching as a discipline is regarded holistically and on the other hand, learning is considered relational.

Learning is conceptualised as relational because the way a student learns is influenced by the learning context (Byrne, Flood & Willis 2002).
The interpretive ontology aspect means that individuals understand and comprehend reality according to the meaning that social actors give to their deeds. Therefore, the researcher will reflect on different pedagogical practices from different participants as events unfold naturally. The study desires to give an interpretation of what is seen, heard, and understood, the interpretation of lessons to be observed, teacher practices and learner responses.

The interpretations will thus give the researcher an opportunity to integrate data and to allow readers to make their own interpretations.

The chosen paradigm enables clarity as the researcher considers a holistic account through reporting multiple factors involved in the situation. This consequently accords the researcher the chance to use different lenses and to highlight multiple views of the problem rather than being limited by cause and effect relationships (Kuhn1962; Paton 1990; Creswell 2009).

1.10.1 Methods and Approaches

The chosen interpretive paradigm is the offspring of grounded theory, ethnography, phenomenology, and discursive theories. This research adopts a qualitative design with a phenomenological strategy in order to unravel the phenomena that occur in natural settings. This approach is thus preferred since it enables the researcher to have an in-depth understanding of how things happen and why they occur as such, while at the same time the researcher is maintaining a physical presence (Denzin & Lincoln 2005; Armitage 2007; Creswell 2009).

Additionally, the strategy enables the researcher to develop patterns and relationships, for example, the teaching approaches that teachers use and how they interact with learners, will best suit the researcher’s intended results. The methods and approaches used are those that are derived from the interpretive paradigm. Although the research will primarily use qualitative data collection approaches, this research will also use the quantitative approach, which falls under the transformative paradigm. This allows use of mixed methods that is interpretive and normative paradigm as observed by (Creswell 2009; Armitage 2007). The mixed method approach allows for multiple data collection including video recording of lessons, face-to-face interviews with teachers, and use of close-ended questionnaires to collect statistics on teacher biography.
Multiple methods of data collection are used to increase the chances of understanding the phenomena under study from various points of view.

1.10.2 Instruments

The research uses the following four instruments for data collection: observations, questionnaires, document analysis and interviews. Two types of interviews - focus interviews and face-to-face semi-structured interviews will be used (Devos 1998; Creswell 2009; Denzin & Lincoln 2005). Semi-structured interviews will be used to collect data for the pilot study as part of the main research.

Furthermore, the researcher will observe and video record lessons and analyse the teaching approaches of the teachers using a lesson observation schedule for all teachers involved. The researcher will carry out face to face interviews with different teachers to find out their rationale for use of certain methodologies when teaching, as captured on video.

Questionnaires will be used to collect teacher biographical data with the aim of assessing teacher background training and level of theoretical knowledge acquired at college or university. The research will analyse documents on language policies, legislation, and prevalent documents on the teaching and learning of English will be analysed.

The four instruments have been selected to enable the researcher quad-angulate all data collected and evaluate for consistencies and contradictions.

1.10.3 Sources of data

The researcher will engage the following sources for data. The Constitution and other legislation on national and provincial language policies; the foundation phase teachers since the researcher intends to use only the grade two learners for the study; and existing literature on the current English pedagogical practices to enable evaluation and comparison with previous studies.

The foundation phase teachers will provide data on the teaching methodologies, and how the methods impact on pupils’ learning. The Constitution document will be used to gather data on
the constitutional provisions on status of languages in South Africa. The national and provincial language legislation provides information on the policies that guide teachers’ actions in language teaching while the status of language in education will be obtained from legislation and policy.

1.10.4 Sampling

The study uses purposive sampling technique to provide the researcher with the opportunity to select participants who can provide required data. The selection of participants is based upon the purpose of that research (Denzin and Lincoln 2005; Creswell 2009). The study will be conducted within Motheo District, one of the seven districts in the Free State province of South Africa. Four schools will be sampled within the district in Bloemfontein: two former Model C schools and two public schools located in the township. The population comprises of classes of grade two learners and eight foundation phase teachers.

1.10.5 Pilot study

A pilot study is used to give the researcher an opportunity to explore and field-test the instruments to be used in the pilot study so that if there are any problems or techniques that need revising the researcher will be able to refine them before going into the field. The researcher distributed two pilot questionnaires to conveniently selected non-participating teachers; one teacher, also not participating in the study, was video-recorded and interviewed to test the interview questions and the observation technique.

1.10.6 Data reduction and analysis

In this study, the data will be coded and analysed using open coding and axial coding. Open coding implies naming and placement of phenomena into categories through close examination of collected data. On the other hand, axial coding the researcher identifies the cause of the occurrence in the phenomena. That is how the participants behaved and how participants’ behaviour was influenced by the phenomenon (Devos 1998; Strass and Corbin 1990 as cited in Creswell 2007). Data will be clustered, and analysed in terms of emerging common themes and patterns from the data collected.
The data will then be reduced by subjecting it to analysis where the researcher looks at patterns and themes drawn from questionnaires, interviews and video-recorded lessons to identify contradictions and patterns discovered in learning and teaching.

When reducing data, one presents a summary then the data analysis is used to tabulate the frequency of each characteristic discovered in the phenomenon studied. Content analysis can either be quantitative or qualitative (Devos 1998; Omrod & Leedy 2001; Creswell 2009). The researchers will video record lessons that will be analysed. This enables researcher to compare individual teacher approaches, teaching methodologies and their language proficiency in lesson observed. Themes and patterns will be drawn based on observations of various teachers’ habits, teaching approaches and lesson presentation.

For example, the research may come up with emerging themes, like teacher frequency in switching to mother tongue when introducing new words or use of mother tongue to enhance understanding emerging patterns and themes will thus be recorded. The researcher will also use an observation schedule as an instrument to compare participants’ approaches. The results will be tabulated and accompanied by descriptive scenarios. The data from questionnaires will be analysed and evaluated as frequency and information will be tabulated.

The data from interviews will be transcribed and then put in categories denoting generated themes. The researcher will compare materials across categories to look for variations and nuances as generated from the interviews, the aim being to integrate themes and concepts.

1.11 Ethical issues

The study has no serious ethical implications that need vetting. However, permission will be sought from the Free State Department of Education, the principals of the concerned schools, the teacher participants and the parents of the learners involved. Ethical clearance will therefore be sought in all those aspects of the study that require interviews, video recording and direct contact with participants.
1.12 Delimitation

The study is only being confined to grade two teachers and their learners in the chosen four schools. The research will not cover all language acquisition theories as proposed by various theorists but prefers to stick to theorists who write from the constructivism perspective in teaching English.

1.13 Organisation of chapters

Chapter one gives a brief introduction of the topic and background to the intended study and the adopted research design. It sets the arena for the research in context thereby giving a brief background to the study. The chapter introduces the main themes in the study including the general scope of the project.

Chapter Two

The chapter reviews the literature on the topic. The place of medium of instruction in South Africa, previous studies and shortcomings on the previous studies and the hegemonic position of English as the language of learning and instruction are also included.

Chapter Three

The chapter introduces the reader to research design, the theoretical framework and hence discusses who was involved in the study, the population, the context and issues of credibility and believability in the study. In addition, it discusses the instruments used, data sources, types of data collected, the operational theoretical framework and the rationale for the selected research design.

Chapter Four

The chapter deals with analysis of collected data in forms of questionnaires received from respondents.

The chapter deals with analysis of collected data in forms of questionnaires received from respondents. The researcher generates frequencies and modes from questionnaire data and expresses these as percentages in tables and graphs.
The data is tabulated to give more meaning. The data from observations will be transcribed on an observation schedule, patterns, and themes drawn and presented to the reader.

**Chapter Five**

The chapter reports on findings and themes and patterns generated from the interpretive study. The chapter integrates all data through quad angulation.

**Chapter Six**

This chapter summarises the study and reflects on the limitations, conclusions drawn from literature, from the study thereby citing recommendations.

**1.14 Summary**

This chapter provided the general overview of the study including brief overview of language policy and practice in South Africa during the previous political dispensation and the present situation. The place of English in South Africa is also discussed the literature review about the medium of instruction is also included. It indicates the purpose of the study, objectives, propositions and the research questions guiding the study. It discusses the paradigm that has been selected, including the research design, data collection methods and how the data will be analysed. The chapter discusses the instruments to be used, the delimitations, ethical issues and the notion of quality.
2.1 Introduction

The issue of language in education has always been a contentious issue in the history of South Africa since it has a bearing on academic quality and achievement. Before 1948, English was used as the medium of instruction until the Bantu Education act of 1953; (Union of South Africa 1953) was introduced enforcing the switch to education in the native languages. The apartheid National Party used the Act to codify several aspects of apartheid education and to use education as a vehicle to advance racial segregation. This act was racist in that it denied blacks opportunities enjoyed by their white counterparts (cf, Union of South Africa 1953).

Accordingly, Alexander (2002) speaks of language as a state apparatus that can be used to empower or to disempower the masses. This means the elite or the powerful impose their ideologies and hegemony on the weaker ones. The hegemony of English is a reality and accordingly (Alexander 2002) further identifies English as a language of power in South Africa. This assertion is similar to Gramsci’s view of hegemony: that is, the spontaneous consent given by the great masses of the population, to the general direction that is adopted by the dominant group (Jiang 2011).

In academic spheres, the English language can influence an individual’s academic success since it is the key to communication between the teacher and the learner. Learners that fail to grasp the language of instruction face academic challenges. Therefore, this statement is confirmed by the views of Qorro (2006:3) who stresses the importance of the medium of instruction by giving the following example:

> The role of language of instruction can be likened to that of pipes in carrying water from one destination to another just, as a pipe is an important medium in carrying water, and a copper wire an important medium for transmitting electricity.

Myburg, Poggenpol and Van Rensberg (2004) suggest that if learners do not speak the language of instruction, authentic teaching and learning cannot take place. Chetty and Mwepu (2008) further contend that English marginalizes learners within the complexity of language teaching and learning.
If the methods are not up to date, language becomes an impediment to learning. The focal point of this study is on English, as a medium of instruction and not on ideology and hegemony. This aspect will be highlighted later in the chapter. This chapter is arranged as follows, the first part briefly gives an outline of the history and adoption of English in South Africa, the provisions of the Constitution on language and the language policy, and how English as a medium of instruction affects learning.

The second part discusses language issues affecting pedagogical issues. The third part gives a brief history of English as a medium of instruction and highlights the problem of English education in South Africa, and Africa as a whole. Issues of second language acquisition and methods of teaching involved are also discussed. Lastly, the chapter gives a detailed explanation of methods of language learning.

2.2 The problem of English medium of instruction in education in Africa and South Africa

According to a paper presented by Svein, Aspen, Tefera and Bekele (2009), English is viewed from the same perspective in Ethiopia and South Africa because it is similarly regarded as a foreign language that pupils rarely use outside the classroom. In this paper, it is also stated that Ethiopia, like other African countries, recognises more than two languages that create a trilingual and multilingual context.

Another similarity between Ethiopia and South Africa is that both countries constitute multilingual societies that have educational language policies in place. Svein et al (2009) further assert that implementation of policies in Ethiopia is more of a theoretical aspect and does not reflect the actual intent of laid down policies. In the South African context, English is a universal language but may be a second or third language for some learners in the classrooms; this means the learners are taught in a language other than their home language.

Historically, in South Africa the use of English and Afrikaans was dominant and created an unequal relationship between these languages and the African languages. This was due to the influence from the initial Christian settings and the subsequent dominance of the British followed by the apartheid regime.
English was declared the sole official language of the Cape Colony in 1822, when the British gained control, replacing Dutch, which was the language of the first European settlers from 1652. The use (and conflict) between English and Afrikaans (which evolved from Dutch) continued during the era of Afrikaner nationalism and apartheid following the establishment of the Republic of South Africa in 1961, during which the African languages were not accorded any official status. Afrikaner nationalism and the apartheid system led to a new education system through the Bantu Education Act of 1953, which stipulated that blacks in the lower and higher primary schools were to receive education in their mother tongue and then transition to Afrikaans and English thereafter (Union of South Africa 1953).

According to De klerk and Gough (2002), the language policies were highly segregational and were characterised by tensions, inconsistencies and disadvantages that translated into gross injustices especially against the black community. The apartheid policies were oppressive and hindered blacks in accessing quality education and in succeeding or excelling.

The segregationary policies and the discriminatory Bantu education policy in particular, resulted in a poor acquisition context, with restricted access to English and little opportunity to develop appropriate abilities in the language. The segregational policies resulted in having teachers who were exposed to poor acquisition contexts and who consequentially had poor language abilities. Currently, English, in the South African context, is an influential language, which has thus been adopted as the primary language of the government, business, commerce and education. English in the education context is a compulsory subject offered in schools and is the medium of instruction in most schools and universities (Du Plessis 2006). The majority of learners in South Africa are either bilingual or multilingual resulting in a sizeable percentage of learners acquiring education in a language other than their first language. According to Census (2011), the English population constitute only about 9.6% of the total South African population. Even though English is a first language to a minority group, it is the widely used and adopted medium of instruction in education (Chetty & Mwepu 2008).

In defining the medium of instruction, the following researchers’ definitions corroborate. (Kyeyune 2003; Qorro 2006) who describe the medium of instruction as an enabling tool, which facilitates transfer of learnt content across different contexts. The medium of instruction enables the learner to construct a new view of the world.
Nelson (1998) as cited in Du Plessis (2006) also uphold the above view by explaining that formal language is responsible for relaying instruction in reading and writing and conveying content in the classroom. Therefore, failure to reach sufficient language proficiency levels will affect the learning process. In other words, language development influences learner academic performance.

2.3 The language policy of South Africa in Schools

The democratic space that followed the elections of 1994 led to the recognition of cultural diversity and the adoption of 11 official languages in the new South Africa through the Constitution and the South African Schools act (SASA) Act (84 of 1996). The 11 official languages include Sepedi, SeSotho, SeTswana, Xitsonga, Afrikaans, English, isiNdebele, isiZulu, isiXhosa, SiSwati and Tshivenda. Section 6 of the act (SASA) Act (84 of 1996) empowers SGBs to determine the language policy of schools within set guidelines, provincially and nationally (RSA 1996a: Section 30).

The legal framework of the South African Schools Act provides a strong foundation for the protection and advancement of the country’s diverse cultures and languages. The recognition of all these languages is a move to redress the injustices in schools where learners’ could not choose a preferred medium of instruction (RSA 1996a). The legislation and the constitution under the Bill of Rights give parents and learners the right to select a preferred medium of instruction at their school. According to literature reviewed, English in South Africa operates paradoxically. This is because in as much as the In reality, the cost factor and general preferences all favour the use of English although the constitution gives regard to 11 official languages as equal in education. Politicians and some scholars condemn the hegemony of English; on the contrary, they support learning instruction in indigenous languages but using literature written in English. In reality, the cost factor and general preferences all favour the use of English although the constitution gives regard to 11 official languages as equal in education. Interestingly, the motions to support multilingualism and the presentations are done in English (Alexander 2002; Chetty & Mwepu 2008).
In a study by De Wet & Wolhuter (2009), the two concluded that although the education policy of 1997 promotes multilingualism and recognizes everybody’s right to be educated in a language of their choice.

The majority of black parents prefer their children to be educated in English as a medium of instruction and not educated in their native home language. Although the study discusses legislation and language, this research mainly focuses on pedagogical practices in the teaching of languages as a medium of instruction.

2.3.1 The Constitution of South Africa on language

Since the first occupation of South Africa by the Dutch in 1652, through to the creation of the Union of South Africa and subsequently the establishment of the Republic of South Africa and the apartheid regime, the language policies of those times failed to recognize South Africa’s linguistic diversity. This situation was reversed only with the advent of democracy in 1994 and the Constitutional provisions that promoted multilingualism. These provisions were aimed at using language as a way of redressing past colonial injustices and as a unifying factor in society. In this context, language is expressed as a factor of democratic values, social justice and fundamental values (Alexander 2002).

It is, therefore, a constitutional right for one to be educated in a language of their choice. These language rights are included in the Bill of Rights in the constitution and are explained. The policy spells out that every person is entitled to basic education and equal access to instruction in the language of one’s choice.

Although one has freedom of choice in language of instruction, there is a limitation to that right. This limitation is effected by a clause, which stipulates that one can choose a medium of instruction where it is contextually and reasonably practical, based on the school’s common culture and religion in a non-discriminatory way, especially on the grounds of race (RSA 1996b).

Although the Government recognizes language legislation, which promotes commitment of multilingualism, that policy ironically also promotes English as a medium of instruction. This is because reviewed literature shows that (L1) education is insufficient and that; all South Africans are entitled to use a language that easily networks them socially, politically, economically and educationally (Du Plessis, 2006:33)
The new language policy integrates and facilitates communication to all South Africans, regardless of colour, language, religion or political affiliation (cf, RSA, 1996b)

2.4 Language position in education

The major aim of education is to develop an all-round individual who can become a useful member in society and is able to function without any limitations. The fact that most people worldwide are educated in a second language, which is English, poses a threat to the functioning of one as a member of society.

Language is defined as a means by which a person learns to organise experiences and thoughts. It becomes difficult for teachers to help learners to organize experiences and thoughts in a language, which they rarely speak at home. In view of this, Myburg et al (2004) assert that:

> Where learners do not speak the language of instruction authentic teaching and learning cannot take place. It can be purported that such a situation largely accounts for the school ineffectiveness and low academic achievement experienced by students in Africa.

This observation agrees with Nelson’s (1998) perception, as cited in Du Plessis (2006), who refer to formal language as being responsible for relaying instruction in reading and writing and conveying content in the classroom. The consequence of failure to reach sufficient language levels is the negative impact on the learning process, as expressed by (Schlebush, 2000 in Schlebush & Thobedi 2004). Nel and Theron (2008) also cited learners in previously disadvantaged black schools in South Africa as learners who experience language difficulties and as a result fail to comprehend learnt matter. All the above perceptions are indicative of the need to revisit the education dispensation and pedagogical practices in order to improve the quality of education in South Africa.

A paper presented by Chetty & Mwepu (2008) on the challenges of English as language of teaching and learning concluded that challenges faced by English learners lies more with the quality of pedagogical practices. Teachers’ different notions about their discipline influence the different methodologies and how it should be taught and this influences the quality of education dispensation.
2.5 English as a medium of instruction in Schools

Table 2.1 shows the distribution of languages in South Africa.

**Table 2.1: Language distribution in South Africa**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number of speakers*</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>6 855 082</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4 892 623</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isiNdebele</td>
<td>1 090 223</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isiXhosa</td>
<td>8 154 258</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isiZulu</td>
<td>11 587 374</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepedi</td>
<td>4 618 576</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesotho</td>
<td>3 849 563</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setswana</td>
<td>4 067 248</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign language</td>
<td>234 655</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiSwati</td>
<td>1 297 046</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tshivenda</td>
<td>1 209 388</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xitsonga</td>
<td>2 277 148</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>828 258</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>50 961 443</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source Census (2011)* Spoken as a home language

The data on the table reflects that only 9.6 % are first language speakers of English (Census2011). The language distribution reflects a diverse nation, characterised by multilingualism, yet English has become the predominant language of learning and instruction.
The census data shows that the learners’ use of English is situational in that it is more of a school language, with the learners switching to their home languages when at home or any other place than School.

It is understood from research that the transmission of meaning can only take place in a learning situation if the learner possesses the relevant language skills and has the ability to control the language. The medium of instruction is a key factor in the academic life of a learner because it facilitates, optimize access, or pose as a barrier to accessing the content of the curriculum (Probyn 2001; Cuvelier et al 2003).

Therefore, if the medium of instruction is the second language this poses challenges, as learners have to separate set system rules of the first and second languages systems, as explained by Du Plessis (2006). When children learn their native language there is no interference but when another language is introduced, there are challenges. Their knowledge of the rules of one system interferes with their acquisition of the rule system of the second language. This becomes an insurmountable task since learners are still struggling to master rules of their mother tongue language. Some researchers regard this failure as being a result of mother tongue interference.

It is thus imperative to look for solutions, which are workable in the classroom if the use of English as a medium of instruction creates learning challenges in accessing the curriculum. Literature indicates that most researchers cite the medium of instruction as a challenge to assimilation in learning. In spite of all this the researcher does not regard the language of instruction as the only barrier to learning.

This study focused on the pedagogic practices prevalent in different school settings and different teachers, and how they teach language as a medium of learning and instruction. In theory, assertions imply that both the teacher and learner should understand the medium of instruction and must use it to access content and communicate using the medium of instruction. The adopted medium of instruction is the tool that learners use to access knowledge; therefore teachers must have a very good command of the language to ensure that effective teaching and learning takes place.
Teacher language proficiency is instrumental to learner success because if a teacher is not proficient in the medium of instruction the learners may end up having learning difficulties. Dippenaar and Peyper (2011) regard language proficiency as the ability to communicate effectively in the desired language using all four skills that is reading, writing, listening and speaking effectively in the desired language. The skills are used as mediating tools. If the teachers are not proficient in the target language, they tend to be wrong role models for the learners therefore passing inaccurate information.

Teachers also face challenges with language proficiency as observed by Neil and Muller (2010) who asserts that teachers contribute to inadequate language input. When using a foreign language as a medium of instruction we need to reflect on the following issues: do teachers’ teaching approaches promote or frustrate the learners and does the medium of instruction hinder or promote quality in education. Dippenaar and Peyper (2011) cite the works of Hugo and Nieman (2010:60) who express support for the above information when they point out that:

Where a second language is used as a medium of instruction by a teacher who is a second language speaker of the language there are issues that are paramount to a successful learning environment. These include, the ability to use the four language skills, knowledge about language use and culture and an understanding of how second languages are learned.

Consequently, when teachers feel that the medium of instruction is acting as a barrier they tend to resort to code switching. The language policies in public township school schools do accept and have adopted code switching in order to accommodate learners who cannot communicate in the language of learning and instruction. Cook (1996) expressed that teachers' code switch for the following reasons: firstly, in lessons where English is the medium of instruction and the learners fail to comprehend; secondly as a way of reporting what someone has said; thirdly, to give meaning from language of instruction to language of comprehension; and lastly, to express ideas.

The disadvantage of code switching is that teachers cannot and are not conversant in all the 11 official languages hence this approach may benefit some children and at the same time disadvantage others. This study views code switching as great challenge foreign children in the classrooms considering that there has been an influx of mostly refugees in South Africa.
The foreign learners may be struggling to master their own language, the medium of instruction and the schools home language.

The foreign learners may be greatly disadvantaged during code switching because in most cases they do not have a small clue about the local dialects, so the teacher may cause more harm to the child who may be already frustrated because he/she cannot socialise due to language barrier.

2.6 Pedagogic Practice

Bernstein (2003:198) suggests, “In any pedagogical relationship the transmitter has to learn to be a transmitter and the acquirer has to learn to be an acquirer”. This means there is need for the teacher to be proficient in the learning area in this case English.

In the educational context there is need to evaluate and see whether the teacher is able to create a conducive learning environment, which is structured in a manner that sustains quality in education. Language is a means by which a person learns to organize experiences and thoughts; so the teacher must be able to transmit knowledge, to apply sequencing rules and criteria rules. The pedagogic practice must pave way for children so that they are able to acquire knowledge. The above assertions in the teaching approach imply that there is need to apply order of concepts taught and relevant sequence in order to start from known to unknown; this is done through sequencing and pacing.

Sequencing is whereby content in the learning context is arranged such that there is a smooth progression; something must come first. For example, in foundation phase you may start with introducing the alphabet, then vocabulary then sentences one cannot teach sentences before introducing the alphabet how then learners will create words.

When pacing work the following questions will arise: how must I teach, how should I plan my work. Therefore, one must know the progression of learnt content. This involves calculation of volume of work (Bernstein 2003). After teaching, the teacher has to use a measurable standard to evaluate the teaching approach. The teacher has to have the knowledge of the fundamental concepts and principles of their subject area.
The teachers must also have an understanding of children’s learning and their developmental stages. The teacher has to be able to direct learners in appropriate ways of learning. Importantly also, the teacher must possess the ability to teach that particular subject such that the receivers understand. In order for the teacher to be able to transmit knowledge positively one has to possess pedagogical content knowledge of the subject and therefore receive relevant training in doing so. Killen (2009) states that for one to teach effectively one has to comprehend the following, subject knowledge, students’ knowledge acquisition, and general pedagogical knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge (PCK).

2.7 Previous studies on Medium of instruction

Teaching in English as a language of learning is not a new phenomenon. We have for example, a country like United States of America that uses English as a medium of instruction in teaching yet more than one fifth of learners are from non-native English backgrounds (McDonald 1991).

A native speaker of English in this case is traditionally defined as one who speaks English as his first or Native Language, also referred to as mother tongue (Medgyes 1992). Medgyes further point out that there has been controversial distinction between native speakers of English and non-native speakers. This distinction has a bearing on language pedagogy and methodology since both speakers come from divergent language background and divergent education background. This results in both the native and non-native speaker acquiring different language proficiency levels. Teachers consequently engage in different teaching behaviour with non-native speakers tending to select and teach only what they understand better. The above view is supported by (Myburg et al. 2004) who assert that South Africa currently faces a similar scenario where we have diverse differing ability levels in English as a medium of instruction due to multilingualism.

For instance, Neil and Muller (2010) in their mixed method research approach investigated the impact of teachers’ limited English proficiency on teaching English as a second subject and similarly pointed out that the low competence levels negatively affects academic achievement.
Their study revealed issues of mother tongue interference. As a result, various forms of English language errors were transferred to learners resulting in phonological errors, among other mistakes.

According to questionnaire findings, Neil and Muller (2010:643) state that “statistics on the language issues covered in the questionnaire clearly indicated that the teachers limited English proficiency affected their learners acquisition of English as a second language negatively and, consequently, their learning”.

Additionally, the teachers lacked the basic pedagogical knowledge relevant to positive transmission, thereby transmitting to learners an output of language errors. A further contributory factor may be the teaching methodology prevalent in our schools as claimed by Mwepu & Chetty (2008).

Lastly, Neil and Muller (2010:643) explained that “There has been little retraining of teachers with regards to multilingual nature of open schools (pre-1994) South African schools were largely segregational”. This assertion seems to indicate that the apartheid system was biased against black learners and giving preference to white learners, thereby deprived the black learners of a good education.

The other contentious point is the need to evaluate the calibre of teachers in our schools: whether the teachers are either adequately educated or qualified. The study also reflected upon the empirical study carried out by Andrew as cited in Hinkel (2011) whereby the researcher gave sixty-item language awareness to seventeen L2 teachers to test their ability in grammar. The resultant mean score was 71% for the test on explicit knowledge of grammar and grammatical terminology, but the same teachers performed poorly on a test that required them to explain their strategies in error correction where the resultant mean score was 43%.

This study also revealed that the issue of medium of instruction boils down to the quality of pedagogic practice. This may leave one asking rhetorically whether teachers who do not possess sufficient mastery of English successfully teach in that language. To sum up the above arguments in previous studies, Richards, Li, and Tang (1998:8) as cited in Hinkel (2011:23) explain that,
Without a thorough knowledge of the content of teaching, teachers will have difficulty turning content into appropriate plans for teaching. They have insufficiently developed content pedagogical knowledge to be able to make content comprehensible to others.

In this regard, Neil and Muller (2010) contend that there is need for a contextually based teacher training, not a one size fits all, and a need for a variety of models to meet different needs and circumstances of those teachers in training. This view concurs with Du Plessis’s (2006:2) on the assertion that “Theories and solutions for the acquisition and improvement of (ELoT) cannot be transferred from one context to another but their practicality in different circumstances needs to be considered carefully”.

Similarly, the learners themselves differ in language acquisition approaches since language theories point out that children’s language development is influenced by various factors. This means that there is need to find out how much teachers are being prepared in relation to theoretical knowledge and whether they know the methodology of teaching English as a second language.

The reviewed studies have highlighted that there is a growing concern among stakeholders pertaining to teachers’ inability to impart knowledge properly leading to unsatisfactory pedagogical practices and unsatisfactory educational performance. Teachers need to be empowered through training with skills that enable them to counteract learning barriers resulting from second language learning, and hence facilitate learners’ comprehension and class performance.

2.8 Methods of teaching English

This study is being confined to grade two (Foundation phase) teachers and their learners. Foundation phase is in the formative years of schooling and the children are still in the formative phase of acquiring language skills. Teaching in the chosen medium of instruction will still require the teacher to attend to language devices, rules, and grammar of that language, even if the objective is for concept acquisition not competency in a language.

Hence, the researcher will give an overview of methods of Language learning in this study. The study cites the works of Rodgers (2001:1) as cited in (Hinkel 2011) who defines methodology as:
two concepts that are methods and approaches, methods are viewed as fixed teaching systems with, prescribed techniques and practices, whereas approaches represent language teaching philosophies that can be interpreted and applied in a variety of different ways in the classroom.

2.8.1 The grammar translation method

The grammar translation method is considered conventional. It is used when learning foreign language or teaching other language speakers a language which they do not know. Its major focus is learning the rules of grammar and their application in translating passages, from one language to the other. Vocabulary in the target language is learnt through direct translation from the native language.

Methods of grammar translation include translation of text, comprehension questions and other language devices. The emphasis is on grammar and learning. The teacher instructs students in grammar, and then provides learners with vocabulary, which requires meaning and direct translations to memorize. This method was used long back around the 19th century.

2.8.2 The direct method

Sometimes also, called natural method is an approach whereby teachers straight away teach in the medium of instruction and only use the target language. The objective is that the learners must imitate correctness of language. Learning L2 is independent of L1. The direct method uses correct pronunciation and the target language from the outset. It advocates teaching of oral skills at the expense of every traditional aim of language teaching (Krashen 1987).

2.8.3 The audio-lingual method

This method implies that students listen to or view recordings of language models acting in situations. Students practice with a variety of drills, and the instructor emphasizes the use of the target language at all times.

Due to weaknesses in performance, audio-lingual methods are rarely the primary method of instruction today (Richards 2009).
2.8.4 Communicative language teaching (CLT)
This language teaching approach emphasizes interaction as both the means and the ultimate goal of learning a language since knowledge and language are viewed as socially constructed (Krashen 1987). This approach is learner centred and experience based in the class it involves use of tasks like group work and projects to create facilitation of communication for learners.

2.8.5 Task-based Language Teaching (TBLT)
In recent years, Task-based Language also known as Task-based Language Teaching (TBLT) or Task-based Instruction (TBI) has grown steadily in popularity (Mitchell & Myles 2004). It is language immersion where one puts students in a situation where they must use a foreign language regardless of their proficiency level.

2.8.6 Code switching
This is an approach where the teacher teaches using two languages simultaneously. The teacher alternates between medium of instruction and home language to explain and translate concepts. The teacher translates and alternates between languages and this is done at some point in a sentence or utterance; this is a commonly used communication strategy among language learners and bilinguals. The teachers may switch to learners’ native language in order to ensure a comprehensible input (cf. Mitchell & Myles 2004).

2.9 Quality in pedagogical practices
Macdonald (1991) and Qorro (2006) state that education in many countries takes place in multilingual contexts and multilingualism has somehow become a way of life than a challenge needing attention. The challenge now is for education to adapt to these complex realities and provide quality education.

The word quality implies distinguishing characteristics of something and is connected to properties considered valuable or significant. For us to have quality in our education we need to provide quality pedagogical practices. This is because stakeholders measure quality against societal goals and expectations.
The teachers must be cognisant of the fact that if they impart mislearnt English proficiency skills it results in negative consequences because learners are receiving wrong modelling from teachers. There will be transference of language errors. Qorro (2006) suggests that language of instruction is synonymous with quality of education because the language of instruction is an indispensable medium for carrying or transmitting knowledge from teachers to learners’, rather than among learners themselves. (De Wet & Wolhuter 2009) rightfully state that language is not about meaning only but is also about function.

The following factors have been identified as affecting quality of education and pedagogic practices in rural and township schools, illiterate teachers, teachers with poor subject knowledge, teachers low expectations of pupil ability, poor utilization of existing materials, less instructional time because of poor punctuality, inadequate methods of instruction and teachers’ lack of knowledge about the language (Fleisch in Jordaan 2011).

Additionally, Jordaan (2011) blames (OBE) outcome based education for depriving teachers the chance to teach language and literacy skills explicitly resulting in learner deprivation in scaffolding skills. This somehow has a direct impact on the quality of education being dispensed.

2.10 Summary

This chapter provided the history of English language and the language policies in education. According to the Census 2011, English is the home language to about 9.6% of the population and yet it has been adopted as the medium of instruction in South Africa. The Constitution of The Republic of South Africa (RSA 1996a), which is the supreme law, adopts and recognizes 11 official languages used in South Africa.

The literature suggests that knowledge of English is instrumental in learner achievement in school work, owing to the fact that English has been adopted as the medium of instruction in most schools. Teachers should also have a good command of the language to be able to ensure effective teaching and learning. The greatest dilemma in Africa today is whether teachers have an understanding of the various ways on how the discipline of English is organized.
The literature provided a conceptual framework on the theories relevant to second language acquisition. The framework will be used in reviewing the research findings in this study. The study so far has highlighted the link in language acquisition theories for example the link between Chomsky’s universal grammars approaches and how teacher affects learners approaches. The findings all appear to highlight the need for the teachers to have content pedagogical knowledge of English as a discipline and as a medium of instruction.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH DESIGN

3.1 Introduction
This chapter describes the research design covering the selected theoretical paradigm and perspectives and the methods of data collection. The chapter also covers the sample selection and procedures used in designing the instruments including data analysis, recording procedures, strategies for validating findings and the role of the researcher.

3.2 Theoretical and conceptual framework
The theoretical framework for this study draws on the works of two theorists who write from a social constructivist perspective. Considered first was Chomsky (1972) whose theory will be instrumental in the study in explaining the complex interacting factors that come into play in acquiring a language. Although Chomsky’s (1986) and Vygotsky (1978) differ in perceptions of language acquisition, they both similarly write from social constructivist perspectives.

The research is rooted in social constructivism, a concept that was developed by Vygotsky who rejected the notion of separating learning from the context. Social constructivism views learning as an active process where the participant constructs knowledge actively. The reason why this study is written from the social constructivist perspectives is its epistemological basis and relevance to interpretivism; hence, the chosen paradigm is interpretive. In interpretivism, knowledge is believed to be developed through interaction with the context. The researcher has adopted social constructivism a strand of interpretivism.

Social constructivism hold the worldview that participants interpret their own meaning from the environment through social human expressions and the enquirer in this case explores and gives an interpretation of the environment through interaction. This strand views the learner as an active participant, who constructs knowledge rather than reproduces. This approach places emphasis on the collaborative nature of learning and the importance of cultural social context.

Another view of social constructivism is that all learning is context dependant. The adoption of social constructivism enables the researcher to study how much interaction there is in
learning since cognitive development and cognitive aspects are viewed as products of social interaction. Social constructivism views the classroom as a community or learning environment where interactions with the teacher and peers enable learners to construct knowledge. Social constructivism places emphasis on the social context since it lies on the premise that the locus of knowledge lies within the individual; hence knowledge is prompted and supported by social interaction with peers and adults (Egged & Kolchak 2010).

Although the framework chosen for the study is social constructivism, the study also reflects a social realist strand. The two frameworks: social constructivism and social realist, share the social relation in language learning as they both view learning as a social learning phenomenon. Bernstein (2003) who writes from a social realist perspective holds the view that English exists as a reality because English as a discipline has its own rules and operates on rules. This is similar to Chomsky’s view (1986) when he observes that language is rule governed.

Bernstein (2003) talks of elaborated code and restricted code that influence language learning. The restricted code is defined as a language, which is context bound and bears meanings that are particularistic and are shared by a certain community. On the other hand, the elaborated code is described as less context bound and is mostly acquired in schools as conceptual or theoretical knowledge. According to Bernstein, children who are non-native English speakers will use restricted code which Bernstein calls everyday language whereas native English speakers will be able to understand English as a medium of instruction because the school content will be an extension of the language spoken at home.

The social realist strand becomes relevant later in the study when comparing rate of language acquisition between the township school learners that represent the working class children and former Model C school learners whose majority of learners represent the middle class children. Although Vygotsky and Chomsky’s theories differ slightly, their framework is also relevant at a later stage. Firstly, the study’s theoretical framework draws on the works of Chomsky (1986) who hypothesises that all humans have an innate structure known as language acquisition device (LAD), which enables humans to acquire language easily. The theory further observes that everybody has a special mental mechanism that enables humans to learn a language.
Therefore, language development follows the same pattern with biological developments. The innate language structure acts as a framework for all natural human languages to be learnt because it contains language universals. Language universals are the structures and sound common to all human languages and dialects. The Language acquisition device encodes the major principles of any language and the subsequent grammatical structure. Children cannot possibly learn language through imitation only since spoken language is irregular, Chomsky 1978 as cited by (Mitchell & Myles 2004).

Chomsky bases his hypothesis on the observation that language is acquired naturally in the first few years of life and a child can compose novel sentences never previously heard. In other words, Chomsky claims that humans have an innate ability to comprehend grammatical relationships, extract the rules of the language and then use the rules to create their own verbalisation. This theory goes on to state that every human child is endowed with an inner mechanism, which enables humans to detect and reproduce language. That is to say, children are born with an inherited ability to learn any human language; hence certain linguistic structures that children use are embedded in the child’s mind (Chomsky 1986).

Mitchell and Myles (2004) draw on the works of Chomsky’s theory (1986) which argues that children draw language from innate predispositions and that human language is a complex phenomenon to be learnt in its entirety. This theory entails that we must have some innate predisposition to expect natural languages to be organized in a particular way. The theory is based on the belief that children are not able to discover the disciplinary rules, word classes and nouns of a language without prior schema hence the Language acquisition device theory.

In Chomsky’s view the ability to adopt a language is a comprehensive process that integrates innate and external elements. The Language acquisition device enables this to happen. Chomsky justifies his theory by maintaining that language is not a set of habits but it is rule governed hence the mind processes language through the language acquisition device. Chomsky also asserts that children use the language acquisition device to systematically discover rules of a language system even within a short space of time since the device is genetically equipped to make language acquisition possible (Turuk 2008). Secondly, the study also draws on the works of Vygotsky, who views language as a social concept which can be developed through social interactions.
This theory has a bearing on the constructivist learning theory, which also explains that children acquire knowledge because of engaging in social experiences. Thirdly, this theory places emphasis on the social nature of language learning where the child's environment is significant to language acquisition. Vygotsky’s central concern is the influence between thought and language. The theory is referred to as the social cultural theory since it views language as social communication. The theory also promotes development of language and cognition simultaneously (Vygotsky 1978).

Vygotsky’s theory assumes that learning is a result of interactions. According to this theory social interaction is believed to mediate learning. Mediation is instrumental to Vygotsky’s theory because socio-cultural theory refers to the part played by people in the learner’s environment, that is people like parents, teachers and peers who enhance their learning by selecting and shaping the learners knowledge. In language acquisition, the socio-cultural theory implies that, language and cognition develop alongside hence, children build new concepts by interacting with significant others who either provide them with positive or negative feedback (cf, Vygotsky 1978).

The view that language and cognition simultaneously develop corroborates the works of (Donato 2000; Shayer 2002) as cited by (Khatib 2011) when they concur that language is a communicative tool that draws upon cultural historic contexts, hence, a child’s language acquisition is influenced as they communicate with peers or significant others.

Vygotsky’s socio-cultural theories which emphasizes social interaction in learning are thus relevant to second language learning since the medium of instruction used in most schools in South Africa is a second language to most children and even a third language to some. The socio-cultural theory holds the view that for children to learn a language there must be interaction, so in the social aspect, language interaction becomes instrumental. This can be the significant others or use of technology (Vygotsky 1978). The second concept is the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which is, the child’s ability to learn without assistance and to perform with the assistance of peers. In the case of medium of instruction the learner speaks to significant and capable adults and capable peers (Vygotsky 1978). Hence, teachers and learners must develop and assist each other in establishing the (the zone of proximal development (ZPD).
The zone of proximal development is stimulated and influenced by the social interaction that the child experiences in his environment and the collaboration between the child and peers and is also influenced by biological factors and the learner’s level of development (Khatib 2011).

Scaffolding is another process linked to socio-cultural theory. This refers to the process whereby the adult structures an interaction by building on what the child is capable of doing, and this makes adaptation successful and easy for the child. When the child has mastered the task the adult pulls back (Vygotsky 1978).

Lastly, Vygotsky’s theory implies that teachers and learners must develop and assist each other in establishing the zone of proximal development. The (ZPD) is stimulated and influenced by the social interaction that the child experiences in his environment and the collaboration between the child and peers. The (ZPD) is also influenced by biological factors and the learner’s level of development (Khatib 2011).

3.2.1 Rationale for adopting Vygotsky’s and Chomsky’s Theories

Vygotsky (1962) is relevant to the current study because the theory views learning as a developmental process, which is mediated by semiotic resources. Vygotsky views language as a primary mediator for humans. Language is therefore, acquired by the child’s participating in social interaction. For example, “if a child has been left with animals the child would not have a language of humans because of the absence of significant others”. Chomsky and Vygotsky are similar in that they both write from a social constructivist perspective. Vygotsky like Chomsky views learning as a process that requires environmental input (Khatib 2011). Chomsky also rejects the concept of context free language, context free grammar, meaning that new information has to be relevant, natural to the learner and boundary free, and this is what Vygotsky terms as the social nature of language learning and the significance of the environment.

3.3 Philosophical Assumptions

(Kuhn 1962, 1970) maintains that a research paradigm is a lens through which we perceive phenomenon as we define the nature of enquiry through analysis of the nature of reality.
(Guba) 1990; Creswell (2009) write from the same perspective. They assert that a paradigm is a conceptual framework, which shapes what we see and how we understand. In addition, literature reviewed generally express a paradigm as a guide to approaching research, which also sets the parameters for the researcher in the process of examining phenomenon. The lens that this study has adopted comes from post positivism.

3.3.1 Research Paradigms

Research paradigms address the philosophical dimension of social science and philosophical dimensions of ontology and epistemology distinguish them. The following four paradigms are the major paradigms used as lenses in research: post positivism, constructivism, transformative and pragmatic (Guba 1990; Creswell 2003; Armitage 2005).

The ontology of post positivism holds the view that reality is objective and exists independently of human thoughts and beliefs. The nature of reality of interpretivism or constructivism suggests that the individuals who participate in it socially construct reality. The transformative paradigm, which is an offshoot of the interpretive paradigm, rejects cultural relativism, but recognizes the fact that various versions of social reality are based on social positioning.

The pragmatic paradigm asserts that there is single reality and that all individuals have their own unique interpretation of reality (Guba 1990; Creswell 2003; Armitage 2005).

Interpretive paradigm was chosen for this study to guide the research and to be able to draw subjective meanings and thus allowing the research to focus on the situation and to compare multiple interpretations of realities from different schools and different locations. The paradigm is relevant in the study in that, when analysing how teachers teach in the particular medium of instruction, the researcher is investigating different contexts and different subjects so reality can never be the same to all teachers. The study seeks to understand teachers pedagogical practices based on case-by-case and individual participant action.

It does not rather than to generalise for all teachers in Motheo District. This is because, firstly, the study used schools from different contextual backgrounds and, secondly, these teachers are products of different training systems.
The other reason for choosing the interpretive paradigm is that it enables the researcher to draw meaning from observing and interviewing teachers and then interpret their meanings against their actions. The researcher will present participants’ version of reality, measure against researcher’s feelings, participants’ behaviour, and the interactions observed. This approach seems more suited to the study because it gives the meanings individuals ascribe to social structures. The researchers’ knowledge and quest for what is reality influences this research. This approach is supported by Creswell (2009) who perceives all research as being interpretive since it is guided by the researcher’s set of beliefs and feelings about the world.

The following assumptions underpinning the adopted paradigm are made; reality is derived from the experiences of the participants, which means the concept of reality is a socially constructed approach, which gives the inquirer in-depth perception of the world of the social actors through observation of social constructions.

Therefore, the enquirer is only able to extract reality through participant’s social constructions (Schwandt 1994; Creswell 2007; Denzin & Lincoln 2008). The characteristics of the interpretive paradigm are summarised as follows: Firstly, the interpretive paradigm assumes that the individuals who participate in events or situations construct social reality and people who participate in it construct it differently. This view of social reality is consistent with the constructivist movement in cognitive psychology.

In social reality, people continuously seek understanding and meaning of the world in which they live thereby developing subjective meanings of their experiences, meaning different people ascribe to different meanings of social reality (Cohen & Manion 2000; Creswell 2007; Denzin & Lincoln 2008). Secondly, the selected design has to engage in ways that provoke the participants to reveal or construct social realities attached to the phenomenon understudy. The meanings in the research are formed through interaction with others (Lincoln & Guba 2000; Creswell 2007).

The paradigm focuses on the researcher as the one influential in generating results and outlining exhibited behaviour yet relying as much as possible on participant's ascribed meaning. The researcher’s interpretation is instrumental since it provides an in-depth insight of people’s social experience.
Thirdly, the epistemology of interpretive research asserts that knowledge is gained through experience, the researcher can be more personally involved in data collection and it arises from particular situations. The researcher gains knowledge through a strategy, which treats people and situations differently. The knowledge is not reduced to simplistic interpretations. The research process is influenced by the epistemology of the researcher (Creswell 2007).

Lastly, in interpretivism, data is collected through interviews and text messages and the outcome of the research is the result of inquirer’s observation. The researcher is a participant observer who works with particulars before relating to the study and he/she gives an in-depth description of the context of the study (Creswell 2007).

3.3.2 Disadvantages of the interpretive paradigm

The researcher has chosen the interpretive paradigm despite the known inherent limitations. Mack (2010) explains that the interpretive paradigm abandons the scientific procedures of verification, and therefore its results are contextual. The results cannot be generalised to other situations. Even though there is this limitation, the results can still lead to a change in policy and practice so the results may just resonate with stakeholders. The other limitation is that the ontological assumption is subjective rather than objective, as cited again by (Mack 2010).

3.4 Methodology and approaches

In line with the chosen paradigm, phenomenological and discursive methods are used in this study. The phenomenological approach will be used to unravel the phenomena that occur in natural settings. The researcher has engaged phenomenology as a strategy of inquiry in the research collection to give specific direction in the study. The strategy draws from the qualitative research approach. Phenomenological research is a strategy of enquiry used to examine and investigate human reactions and prevalent phenomenon (Babbie & Mouton 2008; Denzin & Lincoln, 2008; Moustakas, 1994 as cited in Creswell 2009).

Moustakas as cited in Creswell (2009:21) has this to say “the constructivist worldview manifest in phenomenological studies in which the participants give an account of their experience”.
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When the researcher interviews teachers, the teachers will individually describe their experiences and hence will generate multiple participant meanings. The phenomenological strategy will thus enable the researcher to develop patterns and relationships for example the teaching approaches which teachers use and how they interact with learners will best suit the researcher’s intended results.

### 3.5 The adopted research design

The research uses qualitative data collection approaches although at some point this research uses the strategies drawn from normative and transformation paradigms, especially when dealing with the analysis of results and findings. The approach will be used for multiple data collection including video recording lessons, interviewing teachers face to face, and use of close-ended questionnaires to collect statistics on teacher biography, analyzing teacher lesson plans, and pupils written work.

![Figure 3:1: The research design](image-url)

Figure 3:1 shows the research design, including related paradigms, methodologies, sampling, and data sources and data collection instruments. Generally, the figure gives a summary of the
whole study. The interpretive paradigm acts as a framework whereas the research process is qualitative. In general, qualitative type of data research therefore means a study process, which investigates a social human problem in its natural context. Interpretivism will be used as the guiding paradigm and the qualitative aspect will be adopted as the research methodology whereby qualitative methods of data collection will be engaged.

The researcher has chosen qualitative collection methods because the epistemological assumptions of the qualitative component imply that the researcher has to get as close as possible to the participants. The types of the data to be collected in this study are primarily of a qualitative nature. Denzin and Lincoln (2008) argue that qualitative implies an emphasis on the qualities of entities and on processes and meanings that are not experimentally examined or measured.

This study uses qualitative paradigm because it enables me to examine, issues, theories or evidence that involves comparisons based on qualities. The researcher’s focus is on the natural context of the environment since one becomes intimately involved with what is being studied, and hence, the need to understand the whole phenomenon (Babbie and Mouton 2008; Denzin and Lincoln 2008; Creswell 2009). This therefore enables the inquirer to explore phenomenon from a naturalistic and holistic perspective (Creswell 2007).

The types of the data to be collected in this study are primarily of a qualitative nature since qualitative imply means used for exploring and understanding social human expressions exhibited as behaviour (Creswell 2009).

The researcher therefore seeks to investigate phenomenon without manipulating the prevalent teaching methodologies. In qualitative research, he/she is the one who generates theory from data collected in observations. In a qualitative approach, the inquirer views human behaviour as being situational and the common research objectives are to describe and to discover new patterns thereby narrating the findings at the same time transcribing verbatim participant views. The term qualitative is a broader term, which implies a type of data collection approach.
3.6 Pilot investigation

Pilot study was undertaken in order to pilot the data collection instruments to establish whether they will provide the intended data. Pilot study of instruments is used to determine whether the study sustains enough exploratory interest (Omro and Leedey 2001). The pilot study interviews helped the researcher establish the need to investigate prevalent pedagogic practices and also put strategies into perspective and to language edit unclear questionnaires and interview questions.

3.6.1 Pilot responses

During the pilot phase the researcher drafted questionnaire items based on the objectives of the research and three teachers who were not part of the targeted population were asked to respond to the questionnaires and interview questions as a way of testing clarity and relevance of listed items. The other reason was to establish the feasibility of the study and implement recommendations from the pilot study.

The questionnaires were proof read, edited and the researcher verified from the respondents whether all instructions were clear, straightforward, and easy to understand. This led to adjustment of the instructions and removal of ambiguous questions.

The input from the three teachers gave the research a foresight of what to anticipate and predicted limitations like time span in distributing and collecting questionnaires back from the participants. The researcher had to address and ensure participant confidentiality and participant period response. The questionnaires used in the pilot study are reflected in (Appendix D). Those questions that appeared ambiguous were changed during the piloting process and the researcher added explicit instructions (see Questions 2, 3, 6 and 10). The questionnaires were also adjusted for correct grammar and sense. The interview questions were also tested on the grade three teachers to ensure the questions were not ambiguous.

The researcher modified some questions and reduced the number of interview items. The findings of the pilot study revealed that at times participants can digress from topic under discussion and the researcher has to remain firmly in control by re-directing. This prepared the researcher well in advance for the main study.
The respondents from the pilot study asked to study the interview questions in advance. The researcher consented and, afterwards pilot participant asked for clarification on Questions 2, 3, and 7. From the responses, the researcher had to modify Question 9, which was grammatically incorrect.

The research used a video camera to capture the pilot lesson. The challenge experienced was with the scheduling of the lessons at the appointed times. In one case the researcher only discovered that the class was going to teach Mathematics mental work at the appointed time; the intended lesson was then given only eight minutes resulting in the researcher failing even to use an observation schedule. The short duration of the lesson meant restricted pupil involvement with the teacher using a teacher-centred approach. The teacher followed this by teaching reading for English Comprehension lesson.

These scheduling and appointment challenges prepared the researcher to make pre-arrangements with participants for the main study so that they present at least two 30 minutes lessons. Furthermore, teachers had to be asked to teach a concept during those lessons. In this respect, the pilot study was relevant because it gave the researcher insight into what to anticipate and how to contain tedious situations and unforeseen events (see Appendix E for pilot observation schedule).

The other pilot study was carried out at a former Model C school where English is the medium of instruction. Most of the children at this school speak SeSotho although it is a multiracial and multicultural school. The teacher is uses English as a first language.

The lessons were in English, and no code switching was experienced. The teacher’s language skills were good even from the oral discussion with the researcher, perhaps because her first language is English. However, it was observed that the teacher did most of the talking thereby depriving learners an opportunity to interact, since learners were restricted to minimal responses.

It is therefore difficult for the teacher to ensure every child understood the lesson. The lesson was also observed to be devoid of scaffolding from the teacher; there was no lesson build up. That is, activities to build on lesson presented and alternative explanations to aid comprehension.
In this case, the learners seemed to understand the medium of instruction but it was difficult to judge how much they are able to comprehend learnt matter in that medium of instruction.

In general, the responses from the pilot study revealed that for learners to be able to succeed with English as the medium of instruction there is need for sufficient interaction and the teacher and parents are instrumental as peers in language development.

3.7 Main study

3.7.1 Sampling

A population sample is defined as a few participants selected from a bigger group (Kumar, 2011, Sapsford and Juppe 2006). Sampling entails selection of a site and population of the participants from the larger population that will be representative of the larger population in characteristics and in all elements significant to study. The study uses purposive sampling, a technique that gives the researcher the opportunity to select participants who can provide required data. The selection of participants is based upon the purpose of that research (Denzin & Lincoln 2005; Creswell 2009).

The type of sampling chosen is in line with interpretive design. Babbie and Mouton (2008) and Kumar (2011) suggest that at times it is imperative for the researcher to select their own sample depending on their knowledge of the population, the elements in the population, and the goals of the study.

This strategy implies that the inquirer chooses a sample, which can purposefully and conveniently provide the inquirer with the goals and understanding of the investigation. The primary consideration is suitability and ability of participants to provide the researcher with information, which best assists in achieving the objectives of the study. The study will be conducted within Motheo District, one of the seven districts in Bloemfontein, Free Sate, and South Africa. Four schools will be purposively selected, and then sampled. These include two former Model C schools located in middle class suburbs and two public schools located in the townships (working class suburbs) were selected. The researcher has purposefully sampled the four schools.
The population of this research comprises the four schools and a total of eight teachers. Of the four schools three are primary schools and one is an intermediate school whose enrollment is grade one to twelve and has two (LoLT). Only grades two teachers will be used as participants as the research is primarily focused on grades two’s from the four selected schools.

The researcher selected grade two classes because it is in those formative years of schooling where the teacher lays a mark that will stand out for the rest of the learner’s life. Another reason is that at grade two levels the medium of instruction is taught as language skills and teachers mostly act as language models. It is the foundation phase teacher who introduces the target language to the child. The researcher is thus interested in observing whether they are English native or non-native teachers and whether they are able to teach in English as the medium of instruction and their impact on learner language competence.

Following the chosen purposeful sampling the researcher purposefully chose schools from 3 different categories that are former Model c schools, former Afrikaans medium schools and 2 public township schools.

These categories would reveal the difference in using English as a medium of instruction since English is regarded as an official medium of instruction. The schools are thus described in the following paragraphs. The schools shall be referred to as School A, B, C and D.

**School A** is a former Model C school in Bloemfontein. It is a multiracial public school located in a middle class suburb whose enrolment is grade one to seven. The learners are drawn from the middle class but the majority of learners are drawn from the townships where there are other township schools but for some reasons the parents bring them to the former Model C School. English is taught as a home language. The school offers English as the medium of instruction in all subject areas from grade one to seven.

**School B** is a school in Bloemfontein located in a middle class suburb and is a multiracial formerly Afrikaans combined Model C primary school and high school whose enrolment is from Grade R to Grade12 and offers co-education. The language policy of the school is English and from Grade 4 upwards English is a Language of learning and teaching (LoLT). It also draws a mixture of learners from both working class and middle class.
School C is a school located in Bloemfontein which is situated in one of the oldest township of Mangaung and the majority of learners come from poor and working class households; hence the school is referred to as quintile 1 because many parents are unemployed. Eighty-eight percent of the families in the township are SeSotho speaking and 12% are IsiXhosa or SeTswana speaking.

The languages taught are home language from grade R to grade 7 and the first additional language (English) is introduced gradually from grade R. In other words, the (LoLT) in the foundation phase will be the home language which is SeSotho. English is therefore taught as a learning area and not used as medium of instruction. English is gradually introduced as the medium of instruction or the (LoLT). The policy of the school C allows code switching to be used, but not code mixing. It emphasizes that teachers must always move from the concrete to the abstract, from known to unknown, from receptive to expressive and from informal language to formal language when trying to explain certain concepts. Furthermore, the policy states that English must be given extra time to cater for slow learners.

School D a public primary school in Bloemfontein also situated in Mangaung and located in one of the oldest townships; a working class community. At this school, SeTswana is regarded as the mother tongue since the majority of learners and the feeder communities speak SeTswana. SeTswana is the operational medium of instruction used in foundation phase content subjects and English is a discipline. English is introduced as the language of learning and teaching (LoLT) from grade four up to seven.

The backgrounds for the four schools are summarised in the Table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>LOLT</th>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>English all subjects</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Middle class suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>English all subjects</td>
<td>1-12</td>
<td>Middle class suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>English as a subject</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Working class suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>English as a subject</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Working class suburb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


3.8 Instruments

The research uses the following four instruments for data collection: observations, questionnaires, document analysis and interviews. These instruments were chosen because of their suitability to collect qualitative types of data required in this study (Creswell 2009). The face-to-face semi structured interviews will be used (Denzin and Lincoln 1994; Devos 1998; Creswell 2003). The researcher will also create close-ended questionnaires and will analyse documents related to the status of medium of instruction

A summary of the data gathering instruments is given in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2: Summary of data gathering instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument to be used</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Video recording; Written schedule</td>
<td>Teachers and pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>12 point questionnaires to be written</td>
<td>8 Teachers from 4 schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document analysis</td>
<td>Analysing policies and Curriculum</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>10 questions to be tape recorded</td>
<td>8 teachers participated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8.1 Observations

There are two types of observations, namely participant observation and simple observation. In participant observation, the researcher becomes a member of the group under study whereas in simple observation the researcher is a non-participant observer. The researcher in this case assumed the role of simple observer. Observation involves techniques like video recording and written descriptions. In two lessons, the researcher used an observation schedule (Appendix J).

Lessons will be video-recorded but the researcher will also use an observation schedule. In second language acquisition, video recording enables people to see who is speaking; it also has the advantage of being able to play back to participants so that they can reflect, clarify and elaborate (Dufon 2002).

A study by (cf, Dufon 2002) suggests that video recording in SLA can provide more contextual data than audio-recorded data. However, as Creswell (2007) observes, recording may raise issues such as researcher interruption through setting up equipment.
Furthermore, the actors may become too conscious thereby affecting results.

The observer will limit intrusion by fixing the camera at one place and limiting the range of possible observation. Lastly, the video is limiting in data collection since it only captures what is observable like action but cannot reveal the attitude or actions. Hence, it cannot portray a complete picture.

3.8.2 Questionnaires

The researcher compiled a questionnaire to collect the quantitative component of this research (Appendix G). The questionnaire addressed the research questions focusing on teacher background. “A questionnaire is a document that bares a collection of questions that are used to elicit information, which is appropriate to analysis” (Babbie and Mouton 2007:646). Babbie and Mouton (2005) suggest that when constructing questionnaires, items must be short and clear and the researcher must avoid double-barrelled questions. In addition, they also contend that the researcher must avoid bias and must ensure relevance of questions asked.

The aim of the questionnaire is to collect participants’ profile, educational background, teacher education experience and class compositions. In addition, a questionnaire is good in that it promotes confidentiality and people are likely to be truthful when answering the questions. Furthermore, the responses are collected in a standardised way. The questionnaires are relatively quick; they elicit fast return. Questionnaires have the disadvantage of inadequacy when trying to capture feelings and attitudes and they lack validity.

In order to ascertain face trustworthiness of the questionnaire, a pilot study was undertaken and the researcher evaluated the questionnaires with the assistance of the supervisor. This was done in order to establish whether the questionnaire was compatible with the presumed goals of the research. The researcher collected data from August 2012 to September 2012. This included a pilot study for the questionnaire and the interview questions.

3.8.3 Interviews

Interviews are a systematic way of talking and listening to people and can be defined as an interchange of views between two or more people. There are many types of interviews which
include the structured interview (see Appendix I), semi-structured, unstructured and non-directive (Creswell 2009).

This study has employed the semi-structured interview, which is an interview that comprise of non-standardised questions and is usually used in qualitative analysis. In this kind of interview, the researcher has a list of key themes, issues and questions to be answered.

The researcher can even change order of questions depending with the direction of the interview. Semi-structured interviews are good if the inquirer already knows aspects to cover. According to Patton (2002), it helps to explore, probe, and ask questions that will highlight the subject. An interview also enables the researcher to probe and prompt deeper into the given situation. The researcher can explain or rephrase the questions if respondents are unclear in their answers Semi-structured face-to-face interviews were also used to collect data for the pilot study. The researcher will then observe and video record lessons and analyse the teaching approaches of the recorded teachers. The research will also carry out face to face; interviews with different teachers will also be carried out to find out their rationale for use of certain methodologies when teaching, as captured on video.

Data will be collected from 20 minutes semi-structured interviews with each teacher. This will be follow up to video recording.

Creswell (2009), Babbie and Mouton (2008) observe the following limitations of the interview techniques. Firstly, they point out that it is a taxing approach especially for research like phenomenology where one has to collect thick descriptions. Secondly, there is the challenge of making transcriptions on collected data since one has to make thick notes.

Lastly, there is a problem in establishing rapport with the interviewee. After interviewing, the researcher has to transcribe the discussions. This means translating discussions into written data. The research will audio tape all interviews and transcribe them.

3.8.4 Document analysis

The researcher sought permission to use language policies of schools visited. The researcher also used the South African Schools Act, the Constitution.
These documents on language inform what is expected and this reveals whether schools teach according to laid down policies.

3.9 Data analysis

Data for each participant teacher in the study were collected over a three-month period of video recording, questionnaires, interviews and data analysis. The primary focus of the data analysis was to generate the influence of teachers’ methods and approaches of teaching in English. The research applied the Pearson Correlation Coefficient, which analyses data statistically. Data collected from interviews was analysed according to emerging themes.

The researcher will quad-angulate methods from the two paradigms to ensure trustworthiness of the research and document analysis will aid in strengthening trustworthiness. The researcher will observe lessons, video recorded and carry out interviews and distribute questionnaires in order to compare results from different viewpoints.

3.10 Dealing with Data: Credibility

Credibility refers to the sufficiency and depth of data presented from the study hence it implies whether there is established compatibility between the constructed realities that exist in the mind of the respondents and that attributed to them. The researcher aims to strengthen the aspect of credibility through adoption of well-recognised methods, using different participants from different contexts as has been proposed by (Guba & Lincoln 1985).

In order for researchers to come up with a credible research, there is need for persistent observation, prolonged engagement, and quad angulation and peer debriefing. In this study, the researcher cannot have a prolonged observation but will collect data from different perspectives. Hence, the researcher adopted the use of video recording, the questionnaires, interviews, and documents. The various methods will strengthen the credibility of the research. The video and audio recording will provide referential adequacy since they will document findings.

The research will ask a PhD student to do member checks and assess the intentionality of respondents as written by the researcher. The results are to be gathered and integrated to
ensure credibility through quad angulation.

3.10.1 Transferability

When research is carried out in place A and replicated in place B, the results must be similar thereby bringing the aspect of transferability. In line with this, Guba and Lincoln (1985) suggest that the inquirer must make thick descriptions about every aspect of the context so that others may make their own judgments.

This study will also provide background data to establish the context of study and the participants and include the detailed phenomenon in questions so that readers are able to make comparisons. The adopted instruments are detailed and the instructions of how they are used so clear such that anyone can replicate the study in a different setting.

3.10.2 Conformability

Conformability implies the degree to which the findings are free from the researcher’s values but exactly depict the focus of inquiry. Guba and Lincoln (1985) maintain that there must be a conformability audit trail. Whoever wants to carry an audit must verify raw data from the research findings, written field notes and the auditor must also compare the developed themes.

In addition the researcher will attach appendices, provide tables of raw data, give examples of tools used and describe comprehensively methods from normative and interpretive paradigms. This will enable other researchers to easily check on the coherence of results.

3.11 Permission to use schools and request for participation

The researcher undertook the study after seeking permission from the Free State Department of Education to conduct research in the sample schools (see Appendix A).

3.12 Ethical considerations

Qualitative research may pose special ethical issues because researchers grapple with the issues of confidentiality, getting consent and privacy of participants and other issues that arise along the way (Denzin & Lincoln 2008).
Creswell (2009) point out that some researchers who write from a qualitative perspective stress the importance of ethical considerations where researchers are obliged to protect the rights, values and needs of participants. This is because, as observed by Spradley (1980) in Creswell (2009:198) “participant observation invades the life of the informant and sensitive information is frequently revealed. The researcher must spell out the objectives of the study to the participant”. For example, in this case the researcher will explain the goals of the study, which are to enable a comparison of and review of the teaching processes to be able to make objective analysis, and make available to key stakeholders the observations, but not the video recordings.

The video recording will assist the researcher whose aim is to be able to compare the on-going pedagogic processes. The video will be useful in the study because the researcher can review it again later, and compare findings with reviewed literature and compare teachers’ varying pedagogical practices.

The video recording also brings out the aspect of trustworthiness and believability aspect of the research as primary evidence that indeed a study took place. The video footage can persuade the audience. The researcher sought participants’ written permission, and this consent was confirmed before the recording. In research, it is imperative for the participant to be aware of all data collection devices and activities to be used.

3.13 Delimitations

Delimitations are those characteristics which the researcher can control that limit the scope and define the boundaries of one’s study. The delimiting factors include choice of objectives, research questions, the theoretical perspectives adopted and choice of population under study. The study is based upon observations of four primary schools only and these schools are in Mangaung, Free State. This study is confined to grade two teachers and their classes only from the selected schools.

The research is not interested in evaluating reading levels as a measure of language comprehension, but is focused on the on-going teaching methodologies. The study engages the interpretive paradigm because of the observable nature of data, which can lead to credibility of the research study.
3.14 Summary

This chapter discussed adopted research designs and all its components. The chapter also gives an in-depth description of the theoretical framework adopted and the principles guiding constructivism.
CHAPTER FOUR
FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction and purpose of the investigation

Chapter four focuses on the findings and interpretation of the qualitative investigation done, and review the quantitative data collection method that was used to collect teacher background, and the quality of interaction in these lessons. The focal point is the impact of English as a medium of instruction and the extent to which teachers are able to mediate learning. The aim of this chapter is to provide answers to the questions posed in Chapter One, section nine. Although the research engaged both the interpretive and normative paradigm, the data findings were analysed separately.

The quantitative data section covered participants’ biographical data; this includes teachers’ background training, their experience, language background and learner background too. The study uses pseudonyms in order to protect participant identity.

4.2 Biographical data

The eight grade two-participant teachers from the four selected schools consented to participating in all procedures. The biographical data (Table 4.1) revealed a wide age distribution covering all age groups, except the 41-50 group that was not available. All (100%) of the participants were female. It would seem females mostly teach foundation phase level.

The ages of the participants are distributed as follows: 25% are in the 21-30 year group, another 25% are in the 31-40 age range. Fifty per cent of participants are over the age of 51 (and were likely products of the Bantu Education system). The age distribution is also illustrated in Fig. 4.1, showing that the teachers’ age distribution is quite wide but with 50% of the teachers over the age of 50. The foundation phase has only 25% novice teachers with 25% falling in the 31-40 age range. 25% of participants have teaching experience ranging from 1-5 years, 12.5% have experience of 5 to 10 years, and another 12.5% have experience of 15 to 20 years and of the remaining 50%, 25% have 25-30 years teaching experience and
the other 25% is 35 years and above.

**Table 4.1:** Summary of the biographical data of participating teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demography</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51&amp;over</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 and Above</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.1:** Teachers age distribution
Figure 4.2 shows that all teachers are trained although the qualifications vary from Junior Primary certificate to Honours in Education. 63% are teachers have the traditional teacher training, that is the Junior Primary Diploma and Junior Primary Certificate from Teachers colleges and the other 37% are teachers who have been trained at Universities.

Of all the teachers interviewed, and as shown in Figure 4.3, 75 % were trained to teach at foundation phase level and 25% are not specially trained to teach at foundation phase level, although they are trained teachers.

These statistics are significant since, from available literature, teachers trained in colleges are mostly trained to teach at primary level although universities do train the teachers too.
Figure 4.4 reflects that 37.5% of the teachers’ home language is Afrikaans, and 12.5% speak English, another 12.5% speak SeSotho and the 37.5% speak SeTswana.

**Figure 4.4:** Teachers Home Language Distributions

[Diagram showing language distributions with Afrikaans, English, SeSotho, and SeTswana]

Figure 4.5 indicates the results from a questionnaire on English proficiency and reveals that 12.5% claim to be fluent in English. This was, however, contradicted by the findings of the study where some of the concerned participants revealed low levels of competency in the language during the interviews.

**Figure 4.5:** Teachers English Languages proficiency

[Diagram showing English proficiency with Very Fluent and Fluent]

Figure 4.5 indicates the results from a questionnaire on English proficiency and reveals that 12.5% claim to be fluent in English. This was, however, contradicted by the findings of the study where some of the concerned participants revealed low levels of competency in the language during the interviews.
4.6 Teachers medium of instruction during training period

Figure 4.6 shows that 37.5% received their teacher training in Afrikaans, 37.5% in English and 25% received bilingual training (Afrikaans and English).

![Figure 4.6: Teachers medium of instruction during training period](image)

4.7 Learner first language distributions

The learner participants’ first language information revealed that 4% of learner participants speak Afrikaans as a first language, 2% English, 36% SeTswana, 19% isiXhosa, and 33% SeSotho. All the other official languages are not prevalent in the schools (Ndebele, Tshivenda, Xitsonga, Sepedi and isiZulu).

![Figure 4.7: Learner first language distributions](image)
4.6 Results of observed lessons: Tables 4.2 to 4.9

Table 3.1 is given again at this point for cross referencing.

**Table 3.1**: School background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>LOLT</th>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>English in all subjects</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>Middle class suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>English/Afrikaans</td>
<td>1-12</td>
<td>Middle class suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>English as a subject</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Working class suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>English as a subject</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Working class suburb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.1 Teacher A: (Teacher’s Home language: English)

Table 4.2 is the observation schedule for a lesson on punctuation taught by teacher A that was delivered in English with no code switching and this lesson was observed at School A. The lesson was introduced in English with a comprehension reading activity and then the teacher moved on to the lesson of the day which was punctuation and meaning of punctuation marks and where and when to put punctuation. The terminology was appropriate because most learners eagerly lifted up their hands and even participated responding correctly to teacher’s questions. The lesson had many illustrations and even involved scaffolding; the many examples given improved comprehension. The teacher’s home language is English.

**Table 4.2**: Teacher A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers ability</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Limited</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To introduce in medium of instruction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To sustain usage of medium of instruction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To explain in medium of instruction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To present lesson in English</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use appropriate terminology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To engage learners in interactive learning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain Lesson Sequence</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To capture learner attention</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve all learners in cooperative activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate explanations to aid comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide Scaffolding material</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teacher managed to provide alternative explanations to aid comprehension of concepts.
The lesson was fairly sequenced especially on punctuation where the teacher initially introduced the punctuation marks to children as figures then later on as writing symbols. Afterwards the learners were asked to punctuate given sentences. The teacher used questions as a way of interacting with learners. Although the teacher asked, questions and pupils responded the teacher did not use group work and the learner’s interaction was limited to one-word answers and the teacher’s presentation skills as a result were just satisfactory.

The learners seemed to understand the lesson but not all of them participated. According to language theorists like (Vygotsky 1978) in order for children to acquire a language there is need to interact with the environment and to practise interaction. Although the learners did understood the oral lesson they appeared as if they did not understand the fill-in exercise given in class. This is because when a few learners started writing more than half of the class was waiting for the teacher to explain again. This indicates that if learners interact to the maximum then the teacher can be able to identify those who need help so that the teacher can correct language mistakes and role model where possible.

4.6.2 Teacher B: (Teacher’s home language: Afrikaans)

Table 4.3 provides the observation schedule for a lesson that was introduced in English and the teacher did not code switch at all. The teacher could introduce lesson in English and was able to pitch terminology to suit grade level. Most of the pupils participated and were able to give answers in full sentences. The learners communicated like L1 speakers of English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers ability</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Limited</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To introduce in medium of instruction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To sustain usage of medium of instruction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To explain in medium of instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To present lesson in English</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use appropriate terminology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To engage learners in interactive learning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain Lesson Sequence</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To capture learner attention</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve all learners in cooperative activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate explanations to aid comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide Scaffolding material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The lesson was generally well presented in English and her presentation skills were good because the teacher was audible and clear and kept on emphasising to draw the learners to the major key points. The teacher was teaching about traffic lights and she asked the learners to give the colours of the lights and then give their meaning. The learners then read a story on traffic lights. The class also wrote a fill-in exercise and then looked around for objects in class bearing the same colours as shown by traffic lights. There was a lot of scaffolding and the teacher used learners to chant colours of the robots to create their own meaning. The teacher then used various explanations to aid learner comprehension. She also corrected language mistakes although this was a content subject.

The teacher was able to provide good language models and provided input to assist struggling learners. The teacher showed high language proficiency and this is evidenced by the many examples outside the textbook that she gave. The lesson sequencing was remarkable. This was one of the best lessons observed; although the teacher’s first language is Afrikaans, her English proficiency is quite commendable.

4.6.3 Teacher C: (Teacher’s home language: SeSotho)

Table 4.4 below illustrates the observation schedule for a lesson that was introduced in English. The teacher’s home language is Sesotho. The teacher managed to sustain usage of English for a short period, but unfortunately, almost no learners could respond and hence it appeared they were not familiar with the English medium of instruction. The teacher had to teach the lesson in English because the policy of the school states that it is compulsory to teach an English lesson in English as a medium of instruction but one can code mix in this case use Sesotho and English to aid comprehension.

The teacher tried to emphasise and make repetitions in English of the learnt content; the teacher seemed to be struggling to make an impression. It seems the teacher was more concerned with her performance; one could tell the teacher was trying to make an impression. The teacher had initially attempted not to code switch. The other challenge was some pronunciations were affected by the mother tongue interference; the intonation also changes the intended communication. For example, the teacher would say, “where is da car” instead of “where is the car”? 
The teacher’s presentations skills were satisfactory but at grade two level and as second language speakers of English, there is need for more interaction among the pupils themselves. The teacher can only know how much help the learners need if they speak to each other because when the learners spoke back to the teacher the learners spoke phrases, one-word answers and guided responses.

For example, the teacher asked, “Where is da car”? Which should have been where is the car? The pupils would respond like “car is under” or “under the table” or “on top” the teacher also showed a low level in English language proficiency; she taught a wrong preposition. She put the car behind a table and she said, “Class the car is at the back of the table” instead of behind because a table has no back.

**Table 4.4: Teacher C:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers ability</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Limited</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To introduce in medium of instruction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To sustain usage of medium of instruction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To explain in medium of instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To present lesson in English</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use appropriate terminology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To engage learners in interactive learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain Lesson Sequence</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To capture learner attention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve all learners in cooperative activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate explanations to aid comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide Scaffolding material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teacher could not use appropriate terminology. At one points the teacher translated directly “e kae koloi”. The teacher tried unsuccessfully to capture the learners’ attention. The discussion was one way where the teacher did most of the talking; it was more of telling method with no alternate activities to assist the children in understanding better the learning instruction. The teacher had to revise all written work beforehand because at the end of the oral lesson learners the teacher had to she switched back to Sesotho and emphasised instructions in Sesotho; that is when most children started writing. They teacher had to go to individual learners telling them in SeSotho one by one and indicating the answers they were supposed to fill in.
During the interview, Teacher C had indicated that she uses interactive activities when teaching and she also claimed to be fluent in reading, writing and oral skills but the lesson observed did not corroborate the assertion. The researcher observed her oral presentation and the teacher at times mixed tenses. For example when she asked the learners she said, “Did you saw the car?”.

4.6.4 Teacher D : (Teacher’s home language: SeTswana)

Table 4.5 shows the observation schedule for a lesson at School D, a public township school that teaches all content subjects in SeTswana including Mathematics. English is taught as a discipline. The teacher taught an English reading exercise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers ability</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Limited</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To introduce in medium of instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To sustain usage of medium of instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To explain in medium of instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To present lesson in English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use appropriate terminology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To engage learners in interactive learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain Lesson Sequence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To capture learner attention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve all learners in cooperative activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate explanations to aid comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide Scaffolding material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teacher did not speak English at satisfactory levels although she could introduce the lesson in English. The problem was that she did not pitch instruction to the level of the learners. The lesson appeared rehearsed because the learners would just blurt out answers to unasked questions considering that the vocabulary seemed advanced for grade twos. The teacher’s focus seemed to be on one child, seemingly because she knew what was required. The interaction therefore is limited because learners had no opportunity for spontaneous discussions and no opportunity for individual reading of the passage. The teacher read to the learners a difficult and long passage from a paper, of which the pupils did not have a copy. The teacher read at a fast pace which does not aid comprehension, especially for a grade two class that only learns English a few times in a week.
The teacher also had poor pronunciations, for example, the word “deaf” sounded like “Diffy” so it changes the whole meaning and the learners will construct meaning wrongly, and may end up spelling the words wrong.

The lesson was very brief it lasted for about ten instead of 30 minutes, according to curriculum and the timetable provisions. The teacher’s subject knowledge appeared not adequate. The teacher did not even provide visual aids to assist learners in “bridging the gap between concrete and abstract”. This is evidence of limited exposure in the medium of instruction. The lesson progression seemed to suggest that the children are more conditioned to learning in SeTswana every day but for purposes of researcher observation the teacher taught the content subject in English. The teacher used some gestures of which some children failed to comprehend the intended meaning.

4.6.5 Teacher E: (Teacher’s Home language SeTswana)

Table 4.6 provides the observation schedule for a Life Skills lesson taught in English although the language policy of the school dictates that all content subjects is taught in the home language. The topic was “healthy foods”. She introduced the lesson in English and sustained English usage throughout. When the researcher asked why she was teaching content subject in English, the participant had this to say, “My class is good in English plus the topic: Healthy Foods has some words which I can’t translate to SeTswana and to me this lesson is more of a reading comprehension exercise”.

This suggests that code switching or a translation has its own challenges. The teacher used the question and answer method as a way of interaction and as a method of teaching. The lesson looked very familiar to the learners such that one would say it was revision work, because the grade two learners do not use English as a first language in a life skills lesson. The teacher did not explain what healthy food means but she went straight to ask questions and the pupils knew exactly what was required. The lesson seemed very familiar to the learners because of the following pattern of responses to questions.

Teacher: What must you do to be healthy? The children spontaneously said the following:
Child: 1: We must eat vegetables

Child 2: We must eat healthy foods

Child 3: We must eat good food

Table: 4.6: Teacher E:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers ability</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Limited</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To introduce in medium of instruction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To sustain usage of medium of instruction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To explain in medium of instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To present lesson in English</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use appropriate terminology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To engage learners in interactive learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain Lesson Sequence</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To capture learner attention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve all learners in cooperative activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate explanations to aid comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide Scaffolding material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher: What are good foods?

Teacher: What must you do to be healthy?

Child 1: You must exercise everyday

Child 2: You must wash your teeth everyday

The most worrisome issue observed is that in a class of 25 learners only four children were asked to give answers even if the rest had their hands up. The children read new vocabulary without difficulty as if it was not a new lesson, although the teacher had expressed that it was a new unfamiliar lesson. From the observed interactions, it seemed that the children had done the lesson before because the answers were just coming spontaneously. The answers were coming from the same pupils meaning a few did comprehend. The teacher used gestures a lot to aid meaning and was able to scaffold. She read to the learners and introduced vocabulary. The learners showed ability in reading vocabulary introduced. In this lesson too, there was absence of pupil-pupil interaction meaning construction of meaning has to be through the teacher. The teacher made grammatical errors here and there meaning the teacher is not that fluent in English, but she used the language satisfactorily.
4.6.6 Teacher F: (Teacher’s home language: SeSotho)

Table 4.7 indicates the observation schedule for Teacher F from school C where SeSotho is the mother tongue and has been adopted as the medium of instruction in content subjects from grade one to three. The teacher introduced the lesson in English, which was about “Pronouns” and explaining in English what pronouns are. The teacher sounded “pronouns” like “bronouns”; she exhibited a lot of mother tongue interference. She said, “If we do not want to use names of people we can use she or he to refer to man and women”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers ability</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Limited</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To introduce in medium of instruction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To sustain usage of medium of instruction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To explain in medium of instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To present lesson in English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use appropriate terminology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To engage learners in interactive learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain Lesson Sequence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To capture learner attention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve all learners in cooperative activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate explanations to aid comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide Scaffolding material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, the lesson was scantily introduced considering the level and context of learners. The teacher did not pitch content to the correct level it was rather too abstract for grade two level. Learner participation was very limited and the teacher could sense the need to adjust hence she reintroduced the exercise and she even gave examples in English many times.

The lesson was not very interactive because the teacher did most of the talking and only two children kept on participating while the other learners appeared confused. The learners were supposed to give one word answers to choose and complete given sentences, the words included (they, she, it). The teacher’s language proficiency seems not so good, for example, when the teacher tried to demonstrate the use of pronoun it by asking the children the following, “Tell me things which are not alive in the class”.

This seems very ambiguous to a grade two learner; the teacher taught the learners that anything not alive we use the pronoun (it).
She could have even given examples of objects and animals. The other rule she forgot was that it could be used as a subject pronoun meaning it can be used when the pronoun is the subject of the sentence. For example, “It is just me”. In the case of her lesson, it was going to be used to replace dog.

Later on, in the written exercise the pronoun was used to refer to a dog running with children this creates confusion and problems to learners who are non-native speakers of English. The teacher wrote the following on the board “... ran with the children”: and there was a picture of the dog. The teacher wanted the answer ‘It’ so that it read, “It ran with the children”. When introducing it the teacher had said it’s a word used when we speak of dead things but in the picture, we see a dog running after the children. The dog is not dead yet the teacher drilled the concept of dead things; this only creates more confusion and ambiguity especially to learners whose English usage is minimal and only experienced in one subject.

The teacher is teaching wrong rules of the discipline of English. The lesson had little or no activities in sentence construction and was limited in interaction. The learners were very passive. The teacher revised the activity to be written by learners meaning, she knew they had not comprehended. Therefore, the learners were asked to keep on repeating and revising the sentences and answers. In spite of all this preparation, the learners still could not comprehend the revised lesson this was revealed in writing because almost half the class could not do the fill in activity without teachers’ assistance.

4.6.7 Teacher G : (Teacher’s Home Language Afrikaans)

Table 4.8 is the observation schedule for Teacher G. The lesson was short with the teacher teaching opposites. It seems the lesson was not prepared at all because the teacher would just ask for any opposites at random. The learners just responded with one-word answers.

The children were then given a written exercise, which they did very well without teacher’s assistance. The teacher would just say “the opposite of big is” then the children would shout back small. The children appear very conversant in English. The teacher introduced the lesson in English and did not explain anything and quickly asked the learners to open page 56 and match the opposites.
Table 4.8: Teacher G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers ability</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Limited</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To introduce in medium of instruction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To sustain usage of medium of instruction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To explain in medium of instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To present lesson in English</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use appropriate terminology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To engage learners in interactive learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain Lesson Sequence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To capture learner attention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve all learners in cooperative activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate explanations to aid comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide Scaffolding material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most learners gave correct answers. The lesson did not reflect proper sequencing; it was a bit haphazard because the teacher did not have a certain selection of opposites but various words denoting different terms and different opposites. This could make it difficult for learners to comprehend. The lesson again was just question and answer method thereby showing limited interaction; the learners just provided the one word answer. The teacher used the pictures in the book to express opposites. There were no alternative explanations. The lesson was too abstract. One would say the teacher used a lot of assumed knowledge since in the class some of the learners come from an English background. Although the lesson was not sequenced properly the pupils were so vibrant and knew most of the answers to given questions.

4.6.8 Teacher H: (Teacher’s Home language: Afrikaans)

Table 4.9 is the observation schedule reflecting the practices of Teacher H who is Afrikaans speaking and has a class composed of SeSotho, Afrikaans, SeTswana, English and isiXhosa learners. The teacher taught two lessons in twenty minutes, one in multiplication and the other English opposites. The lesson was introduced and taught in the medium English, and the teacher did not code switch. The learners did respond in the medium of instruction, English.

The teacher used appropriate terminology because the pupils could answer through the question and answer method.
The learners’ responses seemed to indicate that the learners were all attentive. The teacher introduced multiples of two, but then without warning switched to English reading. The lessons were just swopped without warning, this may imply teacher’s inability in lesson sequencing and teachers knowledge in the disciplines taught.

Table 4.9: Teacher H

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers ability</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Limited</th>
<th>none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To introduce in medium of instruction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To sustain usage of medium of instruction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To explain in medium of instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To present lesson in English</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use appropriate terminology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To engage learners in interactive learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain Lesson Sequence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To capture learner attention</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve all learners in cooperative activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate explanations to aid comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide Scaffolding material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, there was evidence of alternate explanations to aid comprehension. The teacher showed various examples but the learners did not have the chance to work out the sums or to interact as pupils. The teachers also just switched on to another subject; with the time taken in teaching both subjects, and the learners responses, it seems this was revision of previously learnt subjects. Although her English grammar seemed good, there was a trace of mother tongue interference in intonation and accent.

It seems impossible to introduce a concept, teach in ten minutes, and have a huge response from learners. The teacher in both cases used the question and answer approach, which is more suited to revision. According to the timetable, each lesson must be 30 minutes long.

4.7 The responses from teacher Interviews: Analysis and discussions of results

The results of the interviews are expressed in terms of the following themes.

- Teachers language proficiency

- Teaching methods
- Staff of Former Model C schools is more advantaged
- Staff of Public schools is disadvantaged.

-Translation and code switching

4.7.1 Language policy and the extent to which code switching is encouraged

Interview data showed that all schools have laid down language policies, which they use and follow. Most teachers interviewed showed that they know of the language policies in their schools and they are cognisant of the fact that they must follow the school policy on language.

The results generally show that the majority of the teachers are teaching according to laid down language policy except maybe a very small percentage, which tends to translate instead of code switching.

4.7.2 Code switching

The interview responses indicated that the public township schools have policies to code-switch while the former Model C schools have no code switching policy. A potential problem that arises with code switching is that some learners, unfortunately, will not benefit because their home language may be different from the school’s adopted home language.

Some of the teachers also are not L1 speakers of the school’s home language. For example, one may be Zulu speaking yet the school home language is SeSotho. When code switching in a lesson the tendency is to translate or mix languages and the educator is not worried about other language speakers, yet the Constitution says the learner has to receive education in a language of their choice. This means the clause, which states that “where it is reasonably appropriate” also limits the rights of those indigenous learners who are non-native speakers of English and non-native speakers of the indigenous languages. This study is concerned with situations whereby the learners may not understand for instance a story, do the teachers translate line by line or give a summary, when they give a summary do they still fulfil lesson objectives.
4.7.3 Interactive processes in English

All teachers stated that they use group work as a way of engaging learners interactively, but from the lesson observations, it was apparent that the teachers did not make use of group work. The interactive process was minimal and could only benefit a child who comes from a rich English oriented background in terms of English language usage.

The teachers also stated that they use group work as a way of engaging learners in peer interaction, but the lesson observation did not corroborate the teachers’ assertions. The teachers’ interview responses differed from what the teachers did practically in the classroom, despite their claims that they do give group work. The exception was maybe teacher B who stated that she engages learners when teaching and this was evidenced in the lesson observed. (Refer to Lesson observation schedule B).

4.7.4 Methods used when teaching

The lessons observations and interview responses on teaching approaches do not corroborate because in the interview sessions the teachers suggest that they use the constructivists approach methods where the learners take an interactive and active part in learning. However, findings suggested otherwise. There was a pattern of teachers dominating the lessons, which mostly excluded learners. The lesson observations did not include discussion of vocabulary (new words) as alleged by the teacher participants except maybe participant E who taught about healthy foods and used gestures to describe some of the vocabulary which the learners did not understand, for example words like (sleeping and wake up).

4.7.5 Teachers perceptions of their current teaching method

The teachers have adopted methods which they assume work for them. For instance, teachers B, G and H appeared able to interact with their learners.

These teachers are at former Model C schools where English is the medium of instruction and where some learners speak English at home as their first language. It may seem as if the methods that they use indeed are working but the findings seem to suggest that the methods are effective with some learners since there was a tendency of the teachers seeking responses from particular learners during a lesson.
On the contrary, their counterparts from township schools seemed to be inadequately prepared in interacting with learners. For example, lesson observations from participants C, D and F from the township schools seem to suggest that teachers are failing to help learners to comprehend intended meaning to the language.

This is evidenced by lessons from C and F. During the lessons, the teachers initially had to revise the work to be written, and then later give learners the same work to write. Consequently, there is no learning because the teachers were correcting answers orally in advance. It seems the learners only understand if all work was rehearsed beforehand. As a result, some learners may just be memorizing content.

4.7.6 Teachers development

Almost all schools have continuous teacher development programmes but the programmes are not really language related and the credibility of the facilitators is questionable. This means the teachers are really short of essential language development programmes, which may build up the foundation, phase that is the backbone in a child’s life as a learner. In support of this, the teachers agree that there is need for constant development and upgrading of skills in the methodology of English as a learning instruction.

This undoubtedly seems to be an indirect admission from teachers that they are inadequately prepared in teaching the subject.

The responses in Appendices (A-1) support the need to develop teachers not only at foundation level, but also for all the teachers in the schools who teach in English as the medium of instruction. Some teachers seemed not to be up to date with current information on staff development in their school for example, participant D and E seem not to be aware of the existence of staff development sessions prevalent at their school.

4.7.7 Acquiring the language by children

The responses from the participants suggested that children acquire language from talking and modelling and interaction.
The teachers realize that their role is instrumental in modelling language in learners hence most teachers agree that they should play a key role in helping the children acquire the language of instruction and in modelling correct language.

4.8 A sample of questions in the interview questionnaire, and the responses thereto:

- **Question 9: During teaching, do you at times modify your lesson plans?**

  All participants concurred that lesson modification is an integral part to learning. However, the researcher is not so sure, whether the teachers understand what it implies because, even though the learners in some classes like C and F showed lack of comprehension, the teachers code switched, either translated, or revised the work to be done. Teacher C and F did not exactly modify the lessons but they did translate to the learners language.

- **Question 10: Explain whether you teach rules of English at grade level; justify your answer**

  The teachers seemed to indicate that they teach the rules of the language; the question now is, are teachers good at teaching the rules of another language since their first languages differ from the medium of instruction. The teachers may fail to distinguish rules of the first language (L1) from the second language (L2). The results also indicate that some teachers were not trained in the medium of English but were trained in the medium of Afrikaans.

  This may act as a challenge now translating Afrikaans theory to English practice; this requires that the teachers should have been trained in translations. In the Afrikaans subject, for example, letters are pronounced as they are in vocabulary whereas in English some words are silent. For instance, word like “arm” in English has a silent “r”. This was evidenced in participant H’s class. The same word in Africans will sound that ‘r’ as “aram”. The lessons seemed to indicate that teachers’ home language is dominant; that is through pronunciations, sentence structures tenses and intonation.
Question 11: Adequacy and preparation of teacher training

The findings on teacher background training are that teachers who were trained in colleges suggest that they were trained on how and what to teach, while those from the universities seem to suggest that the curriculum was based on the methodology only.

This therefore affects one’s ability to deliver significant lessons. The kind of training one has impacts on the teachers’ pedagogical knowledge, the teacher has to know how and what to teach.

Question 12: What was medium of instruction during your teacher training?

On the training aspect, most respondents were trained in Afrikaans except for D and E who received training in two languages namely English and Afrikaans. The curriculum previously was more Afrikaans oriented, so most of their pedagogic content during teacher training could have been Afrikaans. Consequently, this may result in application of L1 rules to L2, and even direct translation of words. The findings of this study revealed that there is a problem of mother tongue interference and this was evident in most teachers’ pronunciations.

The following were also discovered, use of incorrect adjectives, incorrect verbs, incorrect prepositions and adverbs (see appendices I teachers C and E).

Question 13: Is there any need to improve language proficiency of learners in the school?

The generated responses indicated that indeed there is need to develop language proficiency of learners. From the lessons observed and considering the learner background, the learners need a lot of practice in speaking and using the medium of instruction. This response reveals a unanimous concern regarding the level of English amongst learners.

Question 14: Do you think teachers need to be developed in language proficiency?

The responses given by the participants seem to support the idea that there is need to develop teacher language proficiency since it is the teachers who act as role models to learners. Only one participant asserted that there was no need to develop teachers (see Participant G).
4.9 Summary

Data were collected over a two-month period. During data collection, the researcher distributed questionnaires, carried out interviews and observed lessons. Findings from the biographical data seem to suggest that more than 50% of foundation phase teachers are generally in the same age range and they generally have the same number of years in teaching experience. In spite of the above facts the teachers approaches seem to differ in as much as they differ in English language background. The pedagogic practices also differ; hence, approaches appear to be affected by teachers’ divergent learning background, different experiences, and differing levels of language proficiency.

The findings also showed a pattern of different teaching approaches and the influence on learner responses. For this reason, observed lessons contradicted the answers generated from interviews and questionnaires.

Although the teachers had rated themselves as being very fluent in English however, evidence from interview responses did not support these. The teachers’ oral skills exhibited many grammatical mistakes. In teaching too, they would say wrong verbs or pronounce the words wrongly. Generally, the findings indicate that there is need to improve both learner and teacher language proficiency in the medium of instruction.
CHAPTER FIVE
REPORT ON FINDINGS

5.1 Introduction
This chapter discusses the findings, deductions and data quad angulation in addition to the themes generated from the study. It also assesses whether the study objectives were achieved

5.2 Emerging themes from the study
5.2.1 Themes from questionnaires
- Generation gap in participants
- Evidence of language errors and phonological errors
- Language diversity among learners and teachers

It was established that there is a generation gap in the ages of the grade two teachers. Most of the teachers were above 50 years of age with the rest below 40. This suggests fewer teachers in the 41-50 age group are teaching at foundation level. Teaching experience is widely distributed, from the novice to those with over 30 years’ experience.

As a result, two groups of educators could be identified and their backgrounds suggest they may have had limited exposure to English as a language. The previously disadvantaged black teachers, and the white Afrikaans-speaking teachers, may all have received education in their mother tongue (Afrikaans included) during primary schooling and later transitioned to English and/or Afrikaans in high school and at College. The above 50-year age group appear to be products of the same curriculum; their training backgrounds and qualifications are similar.

The foundation phase teachers in this age group were trained in teachers colleges and where taught what to teach and how to teach. There are important differences, though, as the previously disadvantaged black teachers went through the Bantu education system and the white teachers, who were the advantaged group, received the good education and had all the resources to facilitate learning. This means the white teachers in this age group had superior education compared to their Black counterparts).
In this study, the teachers were trained in Afrikaans medium colleges, English medium colleges and some received bilingual training of English and Afrikaans. When the teachers rated their language abilities in reading, writing and spoken English, about 88% rated themself as being fluent and only 12% rated themselves as being very fluent. Nevertheless, contrary to these claims, the teachers were found not as fluent in the language, judging from the interview responses and the practical lessons. This finding confirms Fleisch (2008) as cited in Dippenaar (2011) whose study indicated that teachers seem to rate themselves as being proficient in a language on questionnaire responses but practically the lessons revealed errors in speech, and pronunciations at times. Most of the participant teachers were non-native speakers of English as revealed by the fact that only 12.5% speak English as a first language.

There is a diverse range of first languages among the participants in selected schools, 37.5% speak Afrikaans, 12.5% speak Sesotho and 37.5% speak Tswana.

This indicates that we have bilingual, if not trilingual, teachers who are in fact supposed to teach English as a first or second additional language. The teachers also face the additional challenge of having to teach learners from diverse backgrounds, most of whose first language is not English. The language distribution was found to be as follows (in the participating schools combined): Afrikaans-speaking 4%, English 2%, SeSotho 35%, SeTswana 37%, isiXhosa 2%, and isiZulu 3%. Consequently, this begs many questions like what happens to the Zulu speaking learners whose teacher translates content to the mother tongue of the majority of learners, which could be Setswana? What happens to the isiZulu or the isiXhosa-speaking children who may not understand the translations?

The other dilemma is when the teacher code-switches, in which case some learners in the class may be disadvantaged; there is bound to be misunderstanding resulting in learners from various backgrounds interpreting the same content differently. A concern arising from this is whether the teacher is trained as a translator or how good the teacher is in translation between languages that may not include his/her first language.

It was found that there is no monitoring of the teacher’s translations to evaluate whether teachers are giving correct language translations. It seemed teachers are adopting individual approaches in translations based on their experiences and strengths.
approaches in translations based on their experiences and strengths. In summary, some biographic data do not corroborate evidence from lesson observations. That is, whereas some teachers claim to be very good in English, the interviews revealed evidence of grammatical mistakes and phonological errors.

5.2.2 Themes emerging from Lesson Observations

- Teachers’ poor language proficiency
- Frequency and prevalence of code switching
- Ineffective teaching methodology
- Translating instead of code switching
- Language discrepancy in proficiency

Lesson observations showed that most of the teachers did not use lesson plans they mostly relied on the textbooks except participant D who had a scant lesson plan. There was evidence of low levels in language proficiency grammatical errors during lessons, mispronunciations and misspellings. The teachers from the township schools exhibited many language errors whereas the former Model C school teachers presented traces of Afrikaans pronunciation.

There are marked differences amongst learners’ ability to comprehend language of instruction. Teachers from the township public schools tried to sustain usage of the medium of instruction but this was a challenge, as the teachers were not getting desired responses from learners. In contrast, the former Model C school learners had less difficulty in responding to given work; when the teachers gave instructions the majority showed ability to respond to content.

These (former Model C school) learners also speak better English and participate better in class; they seemingly have an advantage because of lengthy exposure to English through parental interaction and by having technology like television. The other advantage of former Model C school pupils is that, teachers can only communicate in English with learners.

The language policy of the school stipulates that English is the only language to be used. Hence, there is over exposure and more modelling opportunities.
The schools maintain usage of medium of instruction in all spheres of the school life. The township schools, however, use the home language of the school in all subjects except during English periods.

It appears that township schools tend to use indigenous language because their learners come from communities that do not use English as means of communication. This means even during sports they switch to their mother tongue so there is limited exposure and limited practice of usage of English. The language policies in the public township schools are the use of the home language that has been adopted by the school, parents and the School governing body. There seems to be lack of understating regarding code switching and translation. The study found that teachers were not code switching but instead translated directly from English to the home language of the school. Of concern is that in a class with multiple first languages, and the school policy adopts only one of these, it becomes difficult for teachers to ensure all learners are catered for.

Accordingly, the results seem to suggest that one has to be a native speaker of English in order to be able to teach learners fluently. Where the first language is not English, the speaker may unconsciously pronounce words with an accent that may result in wrong intonation and learners may adopt the wrong intonation leading to wrong spellings. The findings from this research are similar to those presented by Neil and Muller (2010) whose research revealed that teachers (in their study) presented basic errors, which included grammatical error, incorrect use of tense and spelling errors. They also report that teachers’ limited language proficiency affected the learners negatively.

There was lack of evidence of cooperative and interactive learning most lessons did not include group work, thereby depriving learners of pupil-to-pupil interaction that could have assisted in giving alternative explanation leading to better comprehension.

The views of (Brown 2001) indicate that interaction is instrumental to communicative competence; when a learner interacts with another learner; first the learner receives input and therefore produces output. In other words, language is acquired through active interaction of learners when they communicate with each other.
The lessons from teachers C, D, G, and H also lacked sufficient repetition and the teachers mostly took over the talking. This lack of cooperative learning did not really disadvantage the former Model C schoolchildren but could have improved their knowledge and usage of the language. The majority of teachers adopted the question and answer method and at grade two level one may not really be able to measure comprehension unless there is written work. The written work observed indicated that most children needed assistance because it is a difficult task to expect a child to be able to acquire, understand, read, write and use a second language in learning.

5.2.3 Themes emerging from interviews

- Language policies prevalent
- Consensus on the need for retraining
- Consensus on impact of teachers as being language models

The former Model C schools use English as a medium of instruction for all curriculum offerings (except Afrikaans) and as the home language. In contrast, the township schools use the mother tongue of the majority of the feeder community at foundation phase level with English as a language. At higher levels, English is the medium of instruction but code switching is allowed to the home language.

In the lessons observed, the teachers mostly used the question and answer method as the interactive process; there was no group work or pupil-to-pupil interaction. The teachers appeared mostly concerned with their performance in teaching rather than the learner comprehension.

Data from questionnaires and interviews suggest that the teachers generally lacked knowledge of pedagogy in teaching in English as a medium of instruction. Their teaching methods are more of a system of doing things. Despite lack of knowledge on teaching methods, the participant teachers held the perception that their teaching methods are working for them because the learners seem to understand.

This lack of teaching methods from some of the teachers might emanate from the impact of the Bantu education system where some teachers were prejudiced.
It would seem that we have teachers who acquired knowledge of teaching through different systems thereby creating teacher individual differences in teaching. Most of the teachers interviewed agreed that there is need to promote continuous development of teachers due to constantly changing policies in education and the fact that they seem to be running out of ideas with the current curriculum, and handling learners with diverse backgrounds. The teachers concurred on the issue of the need for training and refresher courses this may be acknowledgement of their inadequacies in their pedagogic practices.

It was also found that some schools do not have staff development programmes, for example (Participant D & E), or information is withheld from teachers. In addition, though the participant teachers concurred that they teach the rules of English, the lesson observations revealed the teachers could not teach successfully because of wrong modelling.

Most teachers corroborated that parents need to be involved in the education of the children, and help them with reading seeing that the medium of instruction is different from their home language. However, some teachers also feel that although they need the parents to be involved it may not be helpful because the parents may not be literate and have the ability to assist.

5.3 Integrating the four instruments used (Quad angulation)

The themes derived from the four instruments: questionnaires, observations, document analysis and interviews were compared. The data on lessons observation on teachers’ pedagogic practices, and data generated from questionnaires on teachers’ biographic background coupled with the data generated from interviews suggest that teacher’s pedagogical practices are not as effective.

These practices do not promote the medium of instruction. However, data quad angulation did not always corroborate some findings. For example, the teachers instead were translated from English to the school home language yet in interviews, they had stated that they do code switch to aid understanding. There is a difference between translating and code switching (see acronyms). In the school, policies of the two public township schools the policies provide that teachers may code switch to aid comprehension yet the teachers translate (participant D, E & F).
Some of the teachers are aware of the language policy on code switching and the teachers were able to explain when they can code switch and why.

With regard to language proficiency, the majority of teachers revealed language errors (see Appendices I-H) and (Table 4.1-4.6). The teachers seemed exhibited lack of proficiency in the language of learning and instruction, which in itself is a serious draw back because the language of instruction must be rightfully modelled so that the learners adopt the correct thing.

Responses from interviews and questionnaire biographic data suggest that the teachers’ experience, professional skills, background and their context do affect their practices.

Lastly, this study suggests that the former Model C schools have a certain standard which they maintain, since their learners have a high exposure in the medium of instruction consequently they have high expectations for the learners hence the lessons appear more elaborated. Lack of parental involvement in public township schools may affect learner attitude in work thereby lowering teachers’ expectations. The teacher attitude may directly or indirectly influences the quality of their practices.

5.4 Restated Research questions

5.4.1 Five research questions and related objectives

Research Question 1:

To what extent do teachers codes switch from English as the medium of instruction to the learners native language?

Some of the findings collected through questionnaires corroborate findings from interviews and lessons observation. Teachers in former Model C schools seem not to code switch at all thereby substantiating provisions of the school language policies. Thus English is the only means of communication between the teachers and their pupils in spite of the fact that the teachers and learners are from different socio-linguistic and racial backgrounds.
Similarly, in the public township schools the school teachers and learners come from the same racial and socio-linguistic background. However, the teachers are supposed to code switch to aid understanding, but regardless of laid down policy, they did not code switch as such, but instead translated content in the school home language. When one code switches it is a mixture of English and another language in this case a school home language and when one translates words or texts are translated to the native language of the learner. In this study, the teachers seemed to resort to translation when the learners did not understand the instructions.

In light of this in the public township schools, the integrated results of the study in questionnaires, interviews and classroom observations seem to reveal that the teachers divergent language background impact on their practice. This is evidenced by phonological errors, mispronunciations and some linguistic mistakes.

The study findings further suggest that some teachers used gestures to aid comprehension. Although gestures may be valid, the teachers must be aware that the learners come from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds, so gestures may imply different meanings to different people.

**Objective 1:** Examine the teachers’ frequency of code switching from English as the medium of instruction to the learners native language

The researcher argues that the objectives have been achieved because the research was able to observe lessons with the aid of an observation schedule to see the frequency of code switching in lessons. In the lessons observed it appears as if code switching was more of direct translation from English to the home language.

It was also observed, in two of the lessons, where learners appeared to be very confused and were lacking in comprehension. This seemed to highlight teachers’ inadequacies in using the language of learning instruction (Appendices I: refer to teachers C and F).

**Research Question 2:**

Do the standard and quality of teaching English as a medium of instruction differ from context to context?
The results of the research suggest that the standard and quality of teaching English as medium of instruction vary from one context to the other. The teachers in the former Model C School taught English like a home language and did not code switch. The former Model C school teachers’ language proficiency appeared much better compared to the township school teachers.

The former Model C school teachers seem more proficient in English as a medium of instruction. The staff seems to maintain the English policy and this may assist in maintaining quality and standard. The presence of native speakers of English may influence their practices because they may assist with some communication issues at class level.

According to Medgyes (1992) there is a difference between native speakers and non-native speakers of a language because non-native speakers can never reach native speakers competence level. The non-native speakers cannot be as creative and as original although they may be good. The contextual and social factors in different cultures may affect the standard and quality of teaching English as a medium of instruction. This may be because one has to possess general knowledge skills relevant to a particular culture in order to aid fluency in communication.

On the other hand data from interviews and questionnaires suggest that the township schools teachers have a concern about the township parents. They blame the parents’ illiteracy as contributing to learning challenges in the medium of instruction. This seems to be the reason why they do not set higher goals because there is low expectation on the side of the parents. For example part of the interview (teacher D&E refer to interview Question 7). Should teachers be constantly trained: “Yes we have the same problem about the kids how they are where they come from and the parents do nothing most of them don’t know anything the parents are illiterate, so it comes back to you as a teacher you apply your old techniques what you think is working for you”.

The teachers and the learners ultimately do not practice English a lot since it’s taught as a subject not as a learning instruction. The quality of education on this part is not as good as at the former Model C schools.
Indeed the teaching of English as a learning instruction is culturally relative because, admittedly in this study, the teachers and learners come from contrasting social contexts. The contexts are also different in terms of exposure to the medium of instruction and in terms of practice in the medium of instruction. The reasons for this seem to be supported by the assertions of (Bernstein 2003) who observes that working class children come from a restricted background; they enter school with a community code and do not have ready access to the schools language code.

The school code is not developed in the family prior to encountering formal pedagogy. On the other hand, the middle class children are advantaged and they come from elaborated codes where they are exposed to both language codes so when they go to school they are familiar with matter. Hence Spring (2002:3) explain that “The correlation between societal class and language codes shown here explains for the poor performance in language-based subjects by the working class students mentioned earlier”. The children of working class parents have little opportunity to acquire English outside the classroom. The children tend to adopt one language code depending on their social class. The differences observed in lessons reflect differences in language acquisition that may be caused by the conditions in which both groups were raised.

Additionally, Littleton (2002:79) indicates, “the middle class being more geographically, socially and cultural mobile has access to both the restricted codes and elaborated codes”. Indeed the findings seemed to highlight that quality and standard are influenced by the cultural contexts as evidenced by approaches from the participant schools. The schools are already divided by the school policies and diverse learner background, which subsequently translates into different cultural backgrounds.

Hence, the standard and quality of teaching appeared to be influenced by the context of the schools, the competency of the staff to teach English as a learning instruction and the student population in the schools. The township school teachers seem to be affected in fluency and proficiency level.

**Research Question 3:**

In what ways does language of instruction affect education quality in different contextual
environments?

According to Qorro (2006), education quality is regarded as the equation between societal expectations and the resultant changes in the learners. In this regard, different societies hold differing educational goals; so goals and objectives of education are weighed against societal expectations. The teachers may teach according to societal expectations: if the teacher thinks the community is illiterate they may not do their best but if the teachers feel the parent community is knowledgeable they will also raise their expectations thereby raising the quality of education. Quality in this case is the ability of the teacher to meet the goals and objectives of a particular society.

The following statements imply that quality is contextual because learners’ ability to understand content in the medium of instruction may imply academic achievement on the part of learners and achievement and ability on the part of the teachers. With regard to quality (Qorro, 2006:4) pointed out that “Language of instruction strongly determines quality of education since language acts as a vehicle through which education is delivered”. This means the language of instruction may either enhance or impede learning. The outcomes of the lesson observations highlight that the language of instruction influences the quality in learning.

This is because the medium of instruction acts as a yardstick to learning mastery and academic performance. The learners have to reach a certain threshold level in order to be able to discuss, enquire and apply learnt skills.

The public township school learners were limited to one-word answer responses but still they faced challenges in responding, whereas learners in the former Model C the learners could at least respond to the questions. The former Model C learners were better able to make sentences and respond to answers spontaneously even though the methodology was mostly teacher centred.

“…just as the discussion of quality of education cannot be divorced from goals of education, it is equally important not to divorce the language of instruction from quality of education” (Qorro, 2006:4).
Qorro goes on to argue that, African teachers’ pedagogical practices in the medium of instruction are affected by their background and insufficient exposure to the medium of instruction.

This results in teachers having unsatisfactory levels in language capacity. When they teach, they employ limited strategies and cannot have native like competences in English as a medium of instruction. In support of this assertion, the study observed that the lesson duration in some cases was too brief and not in accordance with laid down policies and stipulated time.

Generally, when learners are deprived of adequate language skills there is a possibility that the learners may fail to comprehend learnt content thereby resulting in inadequate language competences. In other words, there is no quality in that education.

**Objective 3**: Examine how theoretical knowledge of English impact on pedagogical practices and how the teachers level of proficiency impact on classroom practice.

This also may assist in addressing challenges faced by learners because curricula changes change with times and learners may differ in their approaches. Theoretical knowledge is therefore important in that it acts as a compass for the teacher, the teachers under study were not familiar with language acquisition theories and how then can they teach learners from diverse background.

This view is supported by Qorro (2006) who cited the studies by (Anderson, 1975, and Murray, 1982) which revealed that the medium of instruction is central in learning and in education performance.

Inability to master the medium of instruction leads to underperformance in all subjects taught through the medium of instruction.

That study by Anderson (1975) and Murray (1982) in Qorro (2006) discovered that the teachers did not possess relevant theoretical knowledge suited for foundation phase level henceforth the teachers lay the foundation of the learners’ academic life and their practices may have lasting consequences. This lack of theoretical knowledge seemed to be the reason why teachers’ quality in pedagogy seems not good enough.
Research Question 4

In what ways does theoretical knowledge of English impact on pedagogical practices of teachers?

The teacher has to appreciate that language is an important element of development and is therefore a powerful tool, which underpins the thinking process and helps individuals to develop socially and cognitively. The teacher’s theoretical knowledge base is therefore instrumental in their pedagogical practices.

Teachers who were inadequately prepared in English as a language and in teacher training may have resultantly acquired inadequate pedagogical content knowledge and they may have inappropriate approaches when teaching the discipline. Participant B showed good theoretical knowledge since she was able to provoke thought and interacted very well with learners even if there was no cooperative learning.

It is observed that theoretical knowledge acts as a guiding frame of teaching methodologies and is an integral part in quality education dispensation. The theoretical knowledge base helps one to measure and adjust learning. In some of the lessons observed, the vocabulary used was above level of learners. Therefore, teachers’ theoretical knowledge base acquired at college impact on their classroom pedagogical practice.

In the lessons observed and compared the former model C school learners seem more articulate and where able to communicate orally than the township schools. This seems to be because the township schools learners do not frequently use English.

It is the medium of instruction, which is at the core of learning since it mediates between the learner and the environment and it acts as a facilitation tool, which enables the learner to understand and to decontextualize the learnt matter.

Objective 4: Investigate whether the teachers possess relevant pedagogical knowledge for the discipline and how language of instruction affects education quality.

This objective was not wholly achieved; the results could have been more convincing if the research had managed to observe at least three different lessons per teacher in order to come
up with their pedagogic practices. This would help to evaluate whether the teachers possess relevant pedagogical knowledge.

**Research Question 5:**

How does the teachers’ level of English proficiency impact on their classroom practice?

According to findings, teachers (C, D and F) demonstrated inadequacies in language proficiency. An incompetent teacher may consequently teach wrong grammar to learners. For instance if a learner says a sentence wrongly in the manner that the teacher usually says for example “I was went” the teacher cannot correct that because that is how the teacher perceives the sentence structure too.

From the lesson observed for (teacher F) as previously stated the teacher said ‘Tell me things which are not alive in this class---”, the intention was to teach the pronoun (it). The language terms chosen are ambiguous to a grade two level child. The implication of this sentence is that there are things, **which were once alive but are now dead** and when one refers to those things we use the pronoun (it). **The teacher showed inability to** follow the correct rules of the language. This confuses learners of when to use the pronoun it, because at times one can just refer to a picture and **(say it is good)** yet the picture cannot be described using terms like dead and alive.

Teacher F also sounded words wrongly for instance the word pronouns was sounded as **bronouns** even though the spelling was correct, so next time a child sees the consonant “pr” they may sound it a” br”.

The teacher may not realise that mistakes made at foundation phase level have lasting negative consequences. The foundation phase teacher lays the first bricks so if the foundation is not so good it leads to lack of mastery and underperformance academically.

The lesson observation from participant C was characterised by mispronunciations and linguistic errors. This teacher taught prepositions then, as if to demonstrate, put the object, which in this case was a toy car, behind the table and emphasised to the class the following **“Class the car is at the back of the table”**. This is a direct translation from mother tongue straight to the medium of instruction.
In fact, the correct terminology would have been **behind**. This seemed like a direct translation from mother tongue to English. The same term (behind) and (at the back) in SeSotho has only one SeSotho word. The wrong term was drilled to twenty-five learners. When the learners did not respond at one point she says “e kae kolo” meaning (where is the car) the whole sentence was translated but the translations does not imply preposition where the car is. Some learners said, “It’s there,” pointing at where the car was. Teacher E read a difficult passage to a grade two class; although the passage was for grade two it did not match the level of these particular learners judging from learner responses, or lack of it. The passages seemed difficult to learners who do not normally learn in English. Moreover, the teacher had the story on a single page and the learners where just listening.

The children were fidgeting showing a seemingly bored group, the teacher also had many mispronunciations; for example she read the word “deaf as diffy”, this automatically changes the meaning.

Therefore, it seems that teachers are not teaching English as a Medium of instruction but have lessons in the medium of instruction. The teachers seem unaware of their pedagogical inadequacies when teaching because in the interviews they all stated that their methods are working and they implied they did not have any problems with the teaching of lessons in the medium of English. Yet in reality, there were notable challenges. The teachers in the township schools are seemingly not code switching as such; they translate the whole statement to the mother tongue. This may change the whole meaning and the translations become a barrier to learners whose mother tongue is different from that of their peers at school.

### 5.5 Relevance and impact of the theoretical framework

The theoretical framework is relevant in that social constructivism regards learning as an active process.

Vygotsky (1978) who assert that a learner is an active being and the teacher is the creator of social contexts that are conducive to learning. This means children learn in contexts, which allow dialogue and interaction, because knowledge is constructed within the constraints and offerings of the environment.
This supports the assertions of (Chomsky 1968; Bernstein 1971). Chomsky goes on to say the children use the (LAD) to discover the rules of language. This (LAD) can be influenced by interaction with and modelling from significant others. Vygotsky (1978) and Chomsky (1968) also support the significance of the environmental input.

Vygotsky’s (1978) theory offers this research study the theoretical perspectives, which examine language learning as a social practice. The theory also helps in evaluating children’s work and quality of interaction in relation to the schools they come from, as the researcher will use schools from different contextual background. Vygotsky further observes that for language development to take place there should be a two-way communication between the child and the adult. It is the duty of parents and teachers to lead the child through a process of guided discovery. This means that the constructivist perspective lays emphasis on interaction.

The theoretical framework is important in that it acts as a guide for teachers in understanding the processes in language acquisition. This may thus help educators in adjusting their teaching methods accordingly.

5.6 Summary

The research findings indicate that the majority of teachers seem to lack the theoretical knowledge on the ways in which learners acquire the target language. The information collected suggests that the methods and approaches teachers use negatively impacted learning. This means that our teachers cannot help learners achieve academically if they cannot teach lessons in the medium of instruction.

The teachers may end up teaching only what they know and not according to the curriculum. Consequently, the teachers may lay a wrong foundation to the foundation phase learner. This seems to compromise the quality of education in schools if inadequate pedagogical practices are engaged in our classrooms.

The study has discovered that quality is contextual in that the approach used in schools is different. This means strengths of the pedagogical practices vary in strength and influence differently on learner academic achievement. For example, duration of some lessons as observed and teaching behaviours noted.
Lastly, Vygotsky (1978) and Chomsky (1968) highlight the significance of the environmental input since language requires environmental input this will also influence teachers presentation of learning environment.
CHAPTER SIX
CONCLUSION

6. Introduction

This chapter draws conclusions from the study.

6.1 Overview

This study has yielded the following conclusions: The children in the sample of the study were selected from diverse contexts comprising the working class and the middle class. The contexts are also different in terms of exposure to the medium of instruction and in terms of practice in the medium of instruction. Resonating with Bernstein's (1971) theory, working class children come from a restricted background, enter school with a community code and do not have ready access to the schools code.

Thus, the school code is not developed in the family prior to encountering formal pedagogy furthermore the language spoken is context bound. This picture was reflected by the two schools from the township. The learners were responsive with just one-word answers and this is supported by Bernstein’s (1971) observation that the restricted code is less formal. The speakers of a restricted code generally use shorter phrases interjected into the middle or end of a thought to confirm understanding.

At the former Model C schools, learners are exposed to primary processes of socialisation, using processes similar to the school codes. In other words, the middle class children have an exposure to both the restricted and elaborated code.

The middle class children seem more advantaged because of opportunity and exposure. In view of this Littleton (2002:79) had this to say “the middle class being more geographically, socially and culturally mobile has access to both the restricted codes and elaborated codes”. Spring (2002:3) supports the above statement by saying “The correlation between societal class and language codes shown here explains for the poor performance in language-based subjects by the working class students mentioned earlier”.
Understandably, the children of working class parents have little opportunity to acquire English outside the classroom. The children tend to adopt one language code depending on their social class.

It could be argued that differences in language acquisition are caused by the conditions in which both groups were raised and the socialisation process the groups experienced. Learners need social interaction to develop language abilities because, coming from diverse backgrounds, language rules is different from those in the medium of instruction. For example if a learner is a product of an incompetent English teacher who could be a product of the Bantu education system the child is disadvantaged.

The segregational and the discriminatory Bantu education policy in particular, resulted in a poor acquisition context, with restricted access to English and little opportunity to develop appropriate abilities in the language. That teacher or some of those teachers cannot set good language models because the system resulted in having teachers who were exposed to poor acquisition contexts and who consequentially had poor language abilities, which they are now transferring to their learners in the classroom as mislearnt rules.

Owing to seeming inadequate subject knowledge, teachers may reinforce wrong language acquisition and consequently the product may end up teaching and reinforcing wrong models of language. In view of the above, one’s background learning the context of education and the educator involved become the conditions influencing socialisation. The evidence presented in the study suggests that quality of pedagogy is contextual because of the staff competencies and experience when teaching in English.

The results suggested that teachers background training and qualifications in particular subjects influence subject knowledge and ultimately determine the quality of lessons offered. In addition, the quality can be influenced by culture diversity; racial make-up of both teachers and learners and the schools’ language distribution analysis (see Appendices G).

The schools context and culture impact on practice and this means educators must understand key developments in learner language learning to be able to teach effectively in the medium of instruction regardless of context.
6.2 Limitations of the study

The researcher initially had set out to observe at least two lessons per participant from twelve participants, but only eight teachers were willing to be observed but only once. The participants were reluctant and not comfortable with video recording so the researcher had to minimize the time taken.

The researcher had initially set out to collect pupils’ written work but some of the teachers expressed disapproval. Schools B and C were not forthcoming with the language policy for their schools and the researcher had to obtain the information through interviews with the teachers. All this had an impact on the assessment of the level of teachers’ pedagogical knowledge.

6.3 Summary and conclusion

This study set out to generate procedural knowledge; that is, knowledge on how to use English as a language of learning and instruction. Evidence from the study seems to suggest that the children are facing challenges in using English as the medium of instruction. The predicament facing South African education system today is whether teachers have the relevant knowledge to teach in a second language to diverse learners who are non-native English speakers.

Teachers’ lesson presentations were generally abstract (reference lesson for teacher F) this is an indicator that there is need for retraining of teachers so that when they teach English they must be relational and interactive. There is need for a contextually based teacher training not a one size fits all because people may interpret the same content differently, depending on socio economic circumstances. This is because socio economic differences normally influence prior knowledge.

There is need to consider use of interactive approaches because this can help the learners to master language easy. Interaction gives the learner the chance to learn from peers and get immediate feedback. The teacher can also model and help in speaking the correct words. The findings presented in lessons observed revealed traces of mother tongue interference in pronunciation of certain words, phrases and sentences.
It was observed that, in general, most participants have problems with pronunciations; the teachers’ pronunciations have a hint of first language accent. Therefore, this may affect learners with regard to spellings and phonemic sounds because sometimes children tend to pronounce and write as they hear. In this instant where the participants are foundation phase teachers who are supposed to lay the educational foundation the study argues that the intonation and mispronunciations result in phonological errors thereby resulting in misspelling on the part of the learners and wrong language modelling on the part of the educator.

The pedagogical practices seem to vary since English is used sparingly in the public township schools whereas in the former Model C schools learners are literally immersed in the language. Children from the townships schools seem to lack sufficient exposure and practice because to them English as a medium of instruction is only used at particular times and class level. They also experience lack of parental support to reinforce learnt matter. The methodologies employed are not varied enough in a diversified class as the ones presented where there are various children from various linguistic backgrounds who are exposed to a variety of language rules.

The findings suggested that the teaching approaches differ from one teacher to the other and from one school to the other and the use of different teaching methodologies resulted in different knowledge acquisition rates. In the study, it seems that teachers’ differing approaches and ability levels also corroborate this because the teachers were trained differently and in addition, even their socio economic circumstances differ because they were exposed to different contexts.

The teachers’ working context also affects their pedagogical practises because some schools are well equipped and have a consistent approach of doing things.

The learners from the former Model C school are rather immersed in the medium of instruction formally and informally, in class and outside during sporting activities. The theoretical knowledge introduced in the class is therefore local and familiar to learners at former Model C schools since the learners come from both restricted and elaborated language codes.
On the other hand, the township schools are generally disadvantaged because the learners do not have ready access to the school elaborated code, and when they go to school, everything is unfamiliar and threatening. The public township schools seem less informed than former Model C schools. For example, some respondents from the township schools did not know what a language policy is, and they seem not to know about issues of staff development whether their schools do hold the educational sessions or not.

The above factors are what distinguish quality in education in the process highlighting whether quality is contextual. The following factors cited in Hoadley (2002) were also reflected in this current study that is, class inequalities, and different distribution of knowledge, differences in access to knowledge and social class differences being experienced through different pedagogic practices. This is why (cf, Hoadley’s 2002) study indicates that different pedagogic practices result in reproduction of inequality through pedagogy.

It is suggested that, in order to improve learning in English as a learning instruction, the teachers could use a wider range of teaching strategies, which involve the learners more thereby prompting the zone of proximal development. For example the use of group work, shared reading drama anything that promotes learner involvement.

Moreover, the individual’s language development is mediated by the more knowledgeable significant other, in this case a good speaker and teacher in the language of learning instruction.

Coupled with the above suggestion, Richards (2009) included the works of (Bailey 2006; Kamhi-Stein 2009) who suggested the following language competences that a language teacher must possess:

- Ability to provide good language models
- Maintaining the use of target language in the classroom
- Give correct feedback on learner language abilities and errors
- Provide input at an appropriate level of difficulty.

Accordingly, the foundation phase teachers has to possess the above cited abilities in the sense that, although the teachers are not referred to as language teachers; they do assume the role of
language teachers because they are most likely to be the ones introducing a medium of instruction to the learners.

Indeed, it is at the foundation level where it is imperative for learners to acquire adequate language skills so the teachers must possess relevant pedagogical content knowledge. The question is how the medium of instruction is created and how it is transferred into the borders of society. Children from the public township schools seem to struggle even though the medium of instruction is transferred to them because they lack what we call cultural capital (Bourdieu 1986).

Consequently, the non-native speakers of English will always face challenges because of inadequate exposure. The researcher discovered other factors, which influence on teacher practices, which the researcher had not intended to investigate. For example, issues like learner demography, which has revealed that huge numbers are learning in a second or third language as the medium of instruction, and yet the teachers only translated or code switched to the home language of the school. This suggests that teachers’ approach to language learning with the knowledge that language cannot be studied separately from the environment, and that language is a result of the interaction between the learner’s mental abilities and the linguistic input.

This draws us to the point that teachers should view the acquisition of a language not only as a matter of nature but as an instance of nurture. It is also necessary for teachers to plan lessons, involving interaction as much as possible. This is because language is socially acquired and knowledge is acquired through interaction with people, the environment, and context (Kiymazarslan 2002).

The following conclusions have been derived from the study; firstly, the findings in the study seem to suggest that there are two educational systems in South African schools. This is because there are schools, which teach in English only as a medium of instruction and the concerned educators do not code switch.

Secondly, there are (public township) schools that use English but do code mix or code switch as a way of translating English language. Some teachers used gestures as an additional aid to
comprehension. This results in education being a reproductive mechanism of social class differences because the learners produced are differentiated in terms of knowledge, opportunity and achievement. Accordingly, past inequalities in education are reinforced or reproduced and tend to limit economic opportunities of learners from township schools and some non-native speakers of English in the former Model C schools.

Thirdly, most non-native English teachers use their native language pronunciation when teaching English as a medium of learning instruction. Some teachers lack near native like fluency yet it is critical to have near native fluency at the foundation phase level. Some teachers transferred articulation habits of first language to second language for example teachers who mislearned English rules are transferring the mislearned rules to learners.

Lastly, the teachers have to be ideally good language models. The focus should be in improving the teachers approaches not changing text books, because the issue lies with how our teachers are being trained and whether they know how to teach and what to teach in a discipline like English. Indeed there is need to improve the quality of pedagogical practices in English as a language of learning instruction. This study suggests that it is the language of instruction, which is the key to unlocking knowledge.

The findings in this study suggest that in order for teachers to be able to improve the quality of pedagogical practices there is need for training and retraining the non-native English teachers on how to teach the non-native English learners in South Africa, a country with a record of 11 official languages.
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Mrs B. Manditereza
163 Nelson Mandela Dr
Loch Logan Park
BLOEMFONTEIN
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REGISTRATION OF RESEARCH PROJECT

1. This letter is in reply to your application for the registration of your research project.
2. Research topic: IMPROVING QUALITY OF PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICES IN TEACHING ENGLISH.
3. Your research project has been registered with the Free State Education Department.
4. Approval is granted under the following conditions -
   4.1 The name of participants involved remains confidential.
   4.2 The questionnaires are completed and the interviews are conducted outside normal tuition time.
   4.3 This letter is shown to all participating persons.
   4.4 A bound copy of the report and a summary on a computer disc on this study is donated to the Free State Department of Education.
   4.5 Findings and recommendations are presented to relevant officials in the Department.
5. The costs relating to all the conditions mentioned above are your own responsibility.
6. You are requested to confirm acceptance of the above conditions in writing to:

   DIRECTOR: STRATEGIC PLANNING, POLICY AND RESEARCH,
   Old CNA Building, Maitland Street OR Private Bag X20555, BLOEMFONTEIN, 9301

We wish you every success with your research.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

DIRECTOR: STRATEGIC PLANNING, POLICY AND RESEARCH
APPENDIX B: REQUEST LETTER TO PRINCIPAL

Loch Logan Park
163Nelson Mandela Drive
Bloemfontein.
Date……………
The Principal
…………………school
Box…………………

Dear Sir/Madam

RE: APPLICATION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH AT YOUR SCHOOL

I am a Master’s in Education student at the Central University of Technology (CUT). I do hereby seek permission to carry out my research with Grade two educators and learners at your school.

The study seeks to investigate prevalent pedagogical practices and teachers copying mechanism in classes. The topic understudy is entitled: Improving Quality of Pedagogical practices in English as a language of learning instruction.

The researchers seeks to video record one English lesson and one lesson taught in the medium of instruction of English and interview teachers as to why they select particular teaching approaches and record the interviews purely for academic purpose . The interviews will be held outside learning time.

All information will be treated with utmost confidentiality, all names will be withheld and participants will be identified by pseudo names.

Yours Sincerely

B. Manditereza.
APPENDIX C: REQUEST LETTER TO TEACHERS

Loch Logan Park

163Nelson Mandela Ave

Bloemfontein.

Dear Colleague,

RE: REQUEST TO INVOLVE YOU IN MY RESEARCH

I am a Masters in Education student at the Central University of Technology and do request your participation in my research. My study is entitled: Improving quality of pedagogical practices in teaching English as a language of learning instruction.

I would like to record two lessons as you teach one lesson in English and one English lesson. I would also want to have a follow up interview with you having observed you teaching. I would like to record the interview as evidence that indeed I carried out the research and so as to keep proper record of information. I do promise that all information collected will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

Your participation in the research is voluntary. Your identity will therefore remain anonymous.

Information is intended to reveal challenges that are faced when teaching in the medium of English which is a language for learning Instruction.

Thank you in anticipation

.................................................. (Manditereza) 20-08-12

Indicate whether you agree disagree

I...........................................do agree ..............................................................

Do not consent.................................................................
APPENDIX D: PILOT QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire: To be completed by the class teacher

Title: Improving quality of Pedagogical Practices in Teaching English as a Language of Learning and Instruction

Instructions: Answer all the questions indicating by means of a cross where applicable and provide required information where necessary

Please do not write your name or that of the school since no identity is required. This is a confidential questionnaire where your responses will be treated anonymously. Your cooperation in responding to the questionnaires will be highly appreciated, as it is instrumental to the success of this study.

Thank you in anticipation for your cooperation in this regard.

Q1. Gender

| Male | Female |

Q2: State your age range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 and above</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3. How qualified are you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor in education</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Technology</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Grad certificate in education</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced certificate in Education</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Primary Teaching Diploma</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Primary Diploma</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Of. Department</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4. Where did you obtain your teaching qualifications?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers college</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In service Training</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5. What is the range of your teaching experience?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novice teacher</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20 years</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 years</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 and above</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q6. What language do you speak at home language?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sotho</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zulu</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tswana</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepedi</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xhosa</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsonga</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndebele</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiSwati</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venda</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q7. What medium of instruction was used during your training.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q8. How good are your English skills?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPEAKING</th>
<th>WRITING</th>
<th>READING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Fluent</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluent</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q9. Are you trained to teach at foundation phase?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q10. How many learners do you teach in your class?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25 and below</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-50</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q10. Indicate number of learners and their ages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than 6years</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7years</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8years</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9years</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q11. Indicate number of learners and their home language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>isiZulu</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isiXhosa</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepedi</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setswana</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XiTsonga</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tshivenda</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isiNdebele</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiSwati</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX E: PILOT OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers ability</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Limited</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To introduce in medium of instruction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To sustain usage of medium of instruction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To explain in medium of instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To present lesson in English</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use appropriate terminology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To engage learners in interactive learning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain Lesson Sequence</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To capture learner attention</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve all learners in cooperative activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate explanations to aid comprehension</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide Scaffolding material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F: PILOT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS AND RESPONSE

Question 1. Does the school have a language policy?

Respondent: Yes it does, our language policy is English

Question 1.1 does the school encourage code switching?

Respondent: Not at all, it’s an English medium school we have to speak in English.

Question 1.2. Do you understand what code switching is?

Respondent: Code switching is moving from English to Sesotho. Our school is an English medium of instruction.

Question 2. To what extent do you engage learners in an interactive process?

Respondent: Throughout the day ---

How important is it?

It’s very important actually, they have to interact otherwise they can’t develop their language communication skills

Question 3. How do you teach you’re English?

Respondent: mostly question and answer and group work is mostly what I do and I believe my methods do

---when its vocabulary I still explain in English

Question 4. What do you think about your current teaching approaches considering reaction coming from the learners?

Respondent: good

Question 4.1 Do you think children understand when you are teaching in the medium of English?
Respondent: Many of them do most of them you can say.

**Question 5.** Is there any need for teachers to adjust their approaches when teaching English as a medium of instruction?

Respondent: Yes, because children are different throughout all ages we are now in the technological era so children need to be taught in a technological manner.

**Question 6.** What forms of continuous teacher development programmes are in place at your school, are they school based or department based, and are the courses compulsory?

**Question 7.** Do you at times modify your lesson plan in the process of teaching?

**Question 8.** Do you understand anything about theories of language acquisitions like how do children acquire a language?

Respondent: like what?

(Researcher had to explain on the theorists and their propositions).

Respondent: Through listening, media reading, interacting with other people because if you pronounce something wrongly someone will say this is the way we do it. You can’t learn English if you can’t interact with somebody else.

**Question 9.** Do you teach the rules of English at grade two explain why or why not?

Respondent: Yes I do, pronunciations plurals etc.

**Question 10.** Did your training prepare you adequately in the theory of teaching English, where you taught how?

Respondent: I was trained adequately, and I was trained in an English environment and I come from an English medium background.

**Question 11.** Is there any need for teachers’ development programmes?
Respondent: Yes, because children are different throughout all ages they develop in different ways, we are now in the technological era they need to be taught in a technological manner.

Question 12. Any continuous development programme to improve teachers pedagogic practices in the teaching of English.

Respondent: “like what “(the researcher had to clarify and give examples we have had CAPS training at departmental level-----At school level they just report the results but I don’t think they have ever asked anybody else to come and improve or consolidate. We give didactic classes to children in the afternoons to those who do not do well during the day or during the term that’s as far as I know that’s it.

Question 13. Lastly, what is the way forward for children to be able to use the medium of instruction?

Respondent: Children have to speak in English, more English at schools, speak and read English and parents have to be involved in English.

Question 14. In addition, Teachers?

Respondent: Teachers also have to be English, you cannot speak Afrikaans and then go expect to teach English. The Afrikaans in you is stronger than your English you cannot improve them in English even Sotho teachers too it does not matter your language.
APPENDIX G: MAIN: QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS - TO BE COMPLETED BY CLASS TEACHER

Title: Improving quality of Pedagogical Practices in Teaching English as a Language of Learning and Instruction

Please do not write your name or that of the school since this is a confidential questionnaire. Your cooperation in responding to the questionnaires will be highly appreciated, as it is instrumental to the success of this study.

Thank you in anticipation for your cooperation.

Q1. Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2: Age range

| 21-30 | A |
| 31-40 | B |
| 41-50 | C |
| 51 and above | D |

Q3. Professional Qualifications

| Bachelor in education | A |
| Bachelor of Technology | B |
| Post Grad certificate in education | C |
| Advanced certificate in Education | D |
| Senior Primary Teaching Diploma | E |
| Junior Primary Diploma | F |
| Head Of. Department | G |
| Other | H |

Q4. Where did you obtain your teaching qualifications?

| University | A |
| Teachers college | B |
| In service Training | C |
| Other | D |
Q5. What is the range of your teaching Experience?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novice teacher</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20 years</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 years</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 and above</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q6. What is your home language?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeSotho</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isiZulu</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeTswana</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepedi</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isiXhosa</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XiTsonga</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isiNdebele</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiSwati</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tshivenda</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q7. What medium of instruction was used during your training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium of Instruction</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue education</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual education</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q8. How good are your English skills?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Fluent</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluent</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q9. Are you trained to teach at foundation phase?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q10. How many learners do you teach?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25 and below</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-50</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q11. Indicate number of learners and their home language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>isiZulu</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isiXhosa</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepedi</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setswana</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xitsonga</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tshivenda</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isiNdebele</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SiSwati</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H: MAIN INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Does the school have a language policy and if to what extent does it encourage code-switching?

2. To what extent do you engage learners in an interactive process?

3. Which method do you prefer in teaching English explain the process and what do you think of the current method?

4. What do you think about your current teaching approaches? Do you feel teachers need to be constantly trained to update teaching approaches?

5. What forms of continuous teacher development programmes are in place at your school, are they school based or department based, and are the courses compulsory?

6. Do you at times modify your lesson plan in the process of teaching?

7. Do you understand anything about theories of language acquisitions?

8. Do you teach the rules of English at grade two explain why or why not?

9. Did your training prepare you adequately in the theory of teaching English, where you taught how?
APPENDIX I: MAIN TEACHERS INTERVIEWS RESPONSES: A------I

SEMI -STRUCTERED INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR EDUCATORS

Interviewer: Researcher

Interviewee: A School A

Date: 17-09-12

Question 1: Does the school have a language policy and if so to what extend does it encourage code switching?

Respondent A: Yes, it does our policy is English

Question 2. Does the school allow for code switching?

Respondent A: No –no- code switching strictly English

Question 2.1: But you have learners coming from the locations where English is a second language?

Respondent A “Their home language is not English but we teach English.

Question 3. To what extend do you engage learners in an Interactive process when you teach in English?

Respondent A: When teaching English, the learners are constantly in an interactive process because they read with me and when I ask questions ,they answer it, back they are very excited to give an answer when they know it. When I am talking, they talk with me new words or anything.

Question 4. What methods do you use when teaching English?

Respondent A: For example, when you were going to read a new story, I will first read the new story myself, then they will follow with me and then I will point out any difficult words and then I will start explaining what they mean and then have to pronounce words that are
unknown to them and then pronounce it a few times for them to understand. If I have to teach grammar, I have to make them repeat sentences with good structures.

Question 5. What do you think of your current teaching method?

Respondent A: I think they understand what I am saying, because I explain thoroughly every word when I speak in English they seem to understand me because they speak back with me.

Question 6. Do you think teachers need to be constantly developed?

Respondent: A: Yah, I do think we need new ideas to be trained and to be reminded of the things that we learnt. How to teach English and how to approach English.

Question 7. How are children acquiring the language?

Respondent A

Question 8. What forms of continuous teacher development programmes are in place at your school, are they school based or department based, and are the courses compulsory?

Respondent: A: No, I have not had any opportunity to attend even from the department---no.

Question 9. Do you at times modify your lesson plan in the process of teaching?

Respondent A: Yes every day because you have to meet the needs of the children in your class so if your child is a bit back you need to go back because a lesson plan is a guideline.

Question 10. What do you do if a passage has difficult words?

Respondent: You have to break up the words—that does happen we discuss slowly maybe write out the words and make a game out of the words.

Question 11. Do you teach rules of English at grade two explain why or why not?

Respondent: Of course, children have to be taught from the beginning they are taught adequate they are able to learn the rules they are able to apply the rules always taught the
correct manner from the right start. It does not have to be assessed formally but it can be taught.

**Question 12.** Did your training prepare you adequately in the theory of teaching English, how where you taught, and what was the medium of instruction?

**Respondent A:** I had very good training where they taught us exactly; we had subjects that were dedicated to stories, dedicated to how to tell stories, how to develop vocabulary.

**Question 13.** Where you taught what to teach and how to teach?

**Respondent A:** Exactly what to teach and how to teach.

**Question 14.** Is there any need to improve language proficiency of learners in the school?

**Respondent A:** Yes there is a need, there is too much of their home language they speak and the only way I believe you can develop a language is by speaking along. You have to make mistakes and learn from your mistakes and you have to hear other people speak in order for you to develop a language.

**Question 15.** Do you think teachers need to be developed in language proficiency?

**Respondent A:** Yes-Yah I think the teachers also need to speak proper English because we often tend to speak like what we hear so we often speak to children like we hear them speak English to us ,Even I often do it so—that is not correct we must speak the right English in order to set an example.

**Participant B: School A**

**Date:** 17-09-12

**Question 1.** Does the school have a language policy and if to what extend does it encourage code Switching?

**Respondent B:** Yes it does

**Question 2.** Does the school allow for code switching?
Respondent B: No no no we are only allowed to speak English it is an English medium school.

Question 2.1: But you have learners coming from the locations where English is a second language?

Respondent B:

Question 3. To what extend do you engage learners in an Interactive process when you teach in English?

Respondent: You know what, we work in groups and yes normally, .I start the conversation but then I let the children follow up so it’s like interactive all the time follow up some of the kids they really know the language ,other kids they learn from friends from peers all the time.

Question 4. What methods do you use when teaching English?

Respondent B: When I teach we use the discussion method most of the time I discuss it with the kids and explain to them what they have to do actually, that is my role is actually to—yaa I play a big role in that because I do the talking the whole time.

Question 5. What do you think of your current teaching method?

Respondent Yes I really think so, it is working for me I am happy now.

Question 6. Do you think teachers need to be constantly developed?

Respondent: Yah ,you know what, I will not say every term but once a year will be fine just to help us handle the kids’ better you know but yah there is definitely requirement for that.

Question 7. : How are children acquiring the language?

Respondent B: They definitely learn it from me at home they never get to speak English it’s definitely through me.

Question 8. What forms of continuous teacher development programmes are in place at your school, are they school based or department based, and are the courses compulsory?
Respondent B: Yes we have got a staff development, I am not sure I think it’s about quarterly, once a quarter I can’t remember now but I think it’s once a term to do that.

Question 9. Do you at times modify your lesson plan in the process of teaching?

Respondent B: No, I change it I need to change it. It depends on the kids moods. So yah I got a plan but sometimes I need to change everything to adapt the kids.

Question 10. What do you do if a passage has difficult words?

Respondent: you have to break up the words-that does happen we discuss slowly maybe write out the words and make a game out of the words.

Question 11. Do you teach rules of English at grade two explain why or why not?

Respondent: B

Question 12. Did your training prepare you adequately in the theory of teaching English, how where you taught, and what was the medium of instruction?

Respondent: B: I had very good training

(Language of instruction in training)

Respondent B: It was Afrikaans but I can speak English as well

Question 13. Where you taught what to teach and how to teach?

Question 14: Is there any need to improve language proficiency of learners in the school?

Question 15. Do you think teachers need to be developed in language proficiency?

**Participant: C Grade 2 Date: 11-09-12**

Question 1. Does the school have a language policy and if to what extent does it encourage code switching?
Respondent C: The language policy for the school for English since they are mother tongue is Sesotho.

Question 2. Does it encourage code switching?

Here and there if they didn’t understand I have to change to Sesotho. I have to code switch to Sesotho so that learners can understand.

Question 3. To what extent do you engage learners in an interactive process?

Respondent C: Yes, I do involve learners because first I ask them questions so that I can get their prior knowledge.

Question 4. How much does it help?

It does help coz now I can see which children can understand and which ones they are struggling.

Question 5. Which method do you prefer in teaching English explain the process and what do you think of the current method?

Respondent C: First I start with this dictionary. I will take these words which are not being problematic I start with the words they don’t understand. I help them to read those words before I continue with my lesson. I explain the words to them in English as well as in their Sesotho language so that they can understand.

Question 6. What do you think about your current teaching approaches? Do you feel teachers need to be constantly trained to update teaching approaches?

Respondent C: My approach I think it’s helping them because they can now understand words in English as well as their mother tongue.

Question 7. Is it necessary to train teachers?
Respondent C: Yes that we really need, I think that one we really need because policies keep changing in the beginning we had OBE now we are in CAPS, so each time a new thing comes teachers must be trained.

Question 8. What forms of continuous teacher development programs are in place at your school, are they school based or department based, and are the courses compulsory?

Respondent C: We do have staff development but we do not regularly attend, even if it’s once in a while we do have they do help.

Question 9. Do you at times modify your lesson plan in the process of teaching?

Respondent C: Yes so that it can help those learners for example remember in class there are those which are slower and those which are faster.

Question 10. Do you understand anything about theories of language acquisitions?

Respondent C: No

Question 11. Do you teach the rules of English at grade two explain why or why not?

Respondent C: I teach the rules and I do see the learners applying the rules as they speak.

Question 12. Did your training prepare you adequately in the theory of teaching English, where you taught how to teach or what to teach?

Respondent C: Yah I think so, yah my training prepared me but I know .At College they only taught us what to teach not how to teach.

Question 13. Do you think some teachers at your school need help in teaching in English as a medium of Instruction?

Respondent C: I really think we really need that because now sometimes we tend to compromise a lot for those children because sometimes in class we end to speak Sesotho more than English
Interviewee: G  
School:  B  
Grade 2  
Date 04-09-12

Question 1. Does the school have a language policy and if to what extend, does it encourage code switching?

Respondent G: Only home language

Question 2. To what extent do you engage learners in an interactive process?

Respondent: Group work

Question 3. Which method do you prefer in teaching English explain the process and what do you think of the current method?

Respondent G: Phonics approach –Learn from Grade R to Grade 3 Reading writing spelling will improve.

Question 4. What do you think about your current teaching approaches? Do you feel teachers need to be constantly trained to update teaching approaches?

Respondent G: 2 times a year

Question 5. What forms of continuous teacher development programmes are in place at your school, are they school based or department based, and are the courses compulsory?

Respondent G: We have department clusters and school courses 2 times a year

Question 6. Do you at times modify your lesson plan in the process of teaching?

Respondent G: Lessons modified to suite the learners.

Question 7. Do you understand anything about theories of language acquisitions?

Respondent G: I don’t understand anything about how children acquire a language

Question 8. Do you teach the rules of English at grade two explain why or why not?
Respondent G: We teach ordinary language rules because of language barriers.

Question 9. How did your training prepare you adequately in the theory of teaching English, where you taught how to teach or what to teach? (....in how to teach and what).

**Interviewee: H**  
**School: B**

**Grade 2**  
**Date 04-09-12**

Question 1: Does the school have a language policy and if to what extend does it encourage code switching?

Respondent H: Only home language

Question 2: To what extend do you engage learners in an interactive process?

Respondent H: Group work

Question 3: Which method do you prefer in teaching English explain the process and what do you think of the current method?

Respondent: H Phonics approach –Learn from Grade R to Grade 3 Reading writing spelling will improve.

Question 4: What do you think about your current teaching approaches? Do you feel teachers need to be constantly trained to update teaching approaches?

Respondent H: 2 times a year

Question 5: What forms of continuous teacher development programmes are in place at your school, are they school based or department based, and are the courses compulsory?

Respondent H: We have department clusters and school courses 2 times a year

Question 6: Do you at times modify your lesson plan in the process of teaching?
Respondent H: Lessons modified to suite the learners.

Question 7: Do you understand anything about theories of language acquisitions?

Respondent H: Does not understand anything about how children acquire a language

Question 8: Do you teach the rules of English at grade two explain why or why not?

Respondent H: We teach ordinary language rules because of language barriers

Question 9: How did your training prepare you adequately in the theory of teaching English, where you taught how to teach or what to teach (H: ----in how to teach and what to teach.

**RESPONDENT D and E**

**Interviewee:** Focus Interview (D &E) School D Grade 2

**Date: 11:09:12**

Question 1. Does the school have a language policy?

E: Yes, our school is a Tswana medium

Question 2. To what extent does it encourage code switching? I mean are you allowed to teach in Setswana?

D: Yes we can teach

E: No, we only teach English in English as a language, but other subjects we teach it in Tswana, we are doing Maths in Tswana we are doing life skills in Setswana .We are not allowed to speak Tswana in English but we use gestures and at least pictures so that they can understand .Remember in my lesson I used gestures to explain work up .I said I am sleeping now I wake up, I use gestures.

Question 3. So do you translate when you teach English?
E: When I teach maybe it’s a comprehension, I use gestures or show pictures –the boy is running to school then I show them the boy. They see the boy running then they understand. What am I saying?

D: I always start with words which I derive from the passage then I explain to them let’s say I can see no other words in English for them to understand. I go to Tswana then I scan. Say something about the book outside after scanning I go back then I read the story to them.

Question 4. To what extend do you engage learners in an interactive process? Respondent D&E:

Question 5. Which method do you prefer in teaching English explain the process and what do you think of the current method? Respondent D&E:

Question 6. What do you think about your current teaching approaches? Do you feel teachers need to be constantly trained to update teaching approaches?

E: I think we need a refresher course because our children do not have basics we really find it difficult when we teach them this language. We need to be worked how to go about because some they will say translate some will say do not explain in the mother tongue some will say do we do not really know what to do.

D: You know the style that I am using is an old style and I am comfortable with it some of this nonsense do not work for me.

Question 7. Should teachers be constantly trained?

D: Yes, we have the same problem about the kids how they are where they come from and the parents do nothing most of them don’t know anything the parents are illiterate so it comes back to you as a teacher you apply your old techniques what you think is working for you.

Question 8. What are those teacher techniques?

D: Respondent laughs) This curriculum change is confusing us, the OBE, the CAPS, and we do not know what we must do. Long back we did three languages at once we knew “table tafel tafula English Afrikaans Sesotho and Afrikaans were together and we never had a problem.
Question 9. What is the difference now?

D: The difference is nowadays, because it was a law not to be taught in English Afrikaans and Tswana were together. We knew English from Sub A that this is table chair and it was law. And now OBE Says this and that. Now when the child comes to grade four the child has to do EMS, Technology what they don’t know about Tafela and chair they do lack the basics they don’t know anything yet they meet new technology in EMS they are lacking in the basics of the language.

Question 10. What forms of continuous teacher development programs are in place at your school, are they school based or department based, and are the courses compulsory?

E: We don’t have them we see by ourselves I will ask that this one. We ask each other we are blank all teachers are complaining about this curriculum the thing is this curriculum is really making a disaster even in the high schools its really confusing that’s why there is a problem with grade twelve all the teachers are complaining even what they bring from department the exams it’s not what we did with the children.

Question 11. And the Department?

D: Those books does not even have manuals, we just pass if you see you does not know this one.

Question 12. Do you at times modify your lesson plan in the process of teaching?

E: As I said teachers need to be work shopped because we have manuals, we have went to be trained for Maths, Life skills as mother tongue we have not went for teaching of English as a language. We just used our methods. In the past it was easy I remember in the 90s we used to teach these learners life skills in English. We didn’t translate to Tswana. Tswana is very difficult. In the 90s learners did understand English as a medium of instruction but now the learners have difficult counting numbers in their mother tongue.

Question 13. Why continue teaching in Mother tongue?

E: It’s a directive from the department we just do it, we translate
Can all teachers translate to Tswana? Yes

Question 14. Have you put it across that the new policies are confusing?

E: We are speaking it to Learning Facilitators but they tell you they are not the people doing this. They say when they come they have just come for training our complains are for the Government.

Question 15. Do you understand anything about theories of language acquisitions?

E: I think the process it’s very hard, we have to be flexible and you have to take notes do your best. If you talk to them and discuss with them its then that they understand a language, they come from home knowing nothing the parents are not educated they know nothing.

T2: Use of rhymes can help in learning a language.

Question 16. Do you teach the rules of English at grade two explain why or why not?

Responder D&E:

E: We do but use pictures for example comparisons and past tense. I eat now but yesterday I ate.

Question 17. Did your training prepares you adequately in the theory of teaching English, where you taught how to teach or what to teach?

E: We were trained in English and Afrikaans but Tswana was there as a subject. We had methods and methodology. Old methods worked not this nonsense. It was easily understandable but these methods now are really confusing you learn learners with these methods you learn with them.

Interviewee: F School C

Date 05:09:12

Question 1. Does the school have a language policy?
Respondent: Yes it does and it says that we must teach our learners in Sesotho as the new curriculum CAPS currently require us to teach in Sesotho as our First additional language.

Are you allowed to code switch?

Respondent: Yes we code switch to Sesotho

Question 2. To what extend do you engage learners in an interactive process?

Respondent F: I think on a scale is 50%.

Question 3. Which method do you prefer in teaching English explain the process and what do you think of the current method?

Respondent F: The methods I prefer is to teach is the work cards and also to give the learners time to express themselves.

Question 4. What do you think about your current teaching approaches? Do you feel teachers need to be constantly trained to update teaching approaches?

Respondent: I can see that most of the learners understand when I am teaching.

Question 5. Is there any need to train teachers?

Respondent F: I think so because in foundation phase we have team work whereby we gather together and try to help those who are having problems. There is need to constantly train teachers at least twice a term.

Question 6. What forms of continuous teacher development programmes are in place at your school, are they school based or department based, and are the courses compulsory?

Respondent F: Yes we work as a team one other thing we have a cluster whereby we work with other schools and so yes we attend the staff development.

Question 7. Do you at times modify your lesson plan in the process of teaching?

Respondent F: No, I effect some changes by using the charts so that children can understand.
Question 8. Do you understand anything about theories of language acquisitions?

Respondent F: You know the learners they learn better when they are with the other learners so I think when the Sothos speak to the Xhosa the Xhosas also learn something from the Sothos.

Question 9. Do you teach the rules of English at grade two explain why or why not?

Question 10. How did your training prepare you adequately in the theory of teaching English, where you taught how to teach or what to teach?

Respondent F: I was adequately prepared I was taught how to teach.

**APPENDIX J: MAIN OBSERVATION SCHEDULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers ability</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Limited</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To introduce in medium of instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To sustain usage of medium of instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To explain in medium of instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To present lesson in English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use appropriate terminology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To engage learners in interactive learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain Lesson sequence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To capture learner attention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve all learners in cooperative activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate explanations to aid comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide Scaffolding material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>