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Abstract

The application of dual-medium and parallel-medium models of bilingual education at two primary schools in the Western Cape

Quentin E. Williams

MA thesis, Department of Linguistics, University of Western Cape

This study is an investigation of the application of dual-medium and parallel-medium models of bilingual schooling as implemented at two historically disadvantaged primary schools in the Western Cape. I assume that parallel-medium in practice uses only one language of learning and teaching (LoLT), and thus lead to monolingual classroom practice. Moreover, I believe that dual-medium offer the best route to bilingualism but in practice it is applied haphazardly so that its benefits are lost in the process.

I used qualitative research techniques (observations, interviews, and document analyses), the triangulation method, to understand the application of dual-medium and parallel-medium instruction and the support of principals and teachers in their understanding of the design of the models. Observations were made in Grade 7 classrooms at selected schools and document analyses, triangulated with interviews conducted with principals and teachers to expound the effective practice of bilingual education at school and classroom level. Document analyses were made of classroom materials (various literacy artefacts) used for the development of language proficiency. In addition, how it contributes to the Grade learners academic performance and language development in dual-medium and parallel-medium classrooms.

The findings indicate the practice of bilingual education at both schools was fraught with misunderstanding by the very experts encumbered to ensure the successful implementation of the respective models. In the case of parallel-medium schooling careful and thoughtful
analysis reveal that this model as it is currently applied cannot be classified as bilingual education because of its monolingual bias. It promotes monolingualism which asphyxiates learners’ ability to utilize their bilingual repertoire at best. On the other hand, although dual-medium schooling does come closer to promoting bilingualism through the use of two languages for instruction, the manner in which it is applied seem too haphazard for learners to actually benefit from the process of dual-medium teaching: the reason stems from teachers confusing dual-medium instruction to mean code-switching.
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Chapter 1

Introduction and Background

1.0 Introduction

This study examined the application of dual-medium and parallel-medium models of bilingual education at two primary schools in the Western Cape. In this chapter, I will discuss the background, the objectives of the study and the motivation for doing such a study. As a point of departure, I discuss the background to this study.

1.1 Background: Multilingualism in the Western Cape: policy versus practice

In post-apartheid South Africa, transformation in bilingual education towards multilingual education, as a means to realise the symbolic and material benefits of multilingualism in learners, has been one of the many preferred research topics for socially responsible linguists over the last eleven years (compare for instance, Alexander, 2002; Heugh, 1995a; De Klerk, 1995; Webb, 2002). However, very few studies have tackled the issue of how to implement multilingualism in practice in education and in society. According to Mesthrie (2006: 151), near the early days of democratic South Africa:

The 1990s ushered in a host of spectacular and far-reaching changes...the most tangible of these have been a negotiated settlement between previously antagonistic forces, the inception of democracy, a new constitution that counts amongst the more progressive in the world, and the empowerment of a new black middle class. Less tangible have been practices that attempt to realise the new constitutional ideals and the policies they engendered, [in realising multilingualism]. (My emphasis added)

In the aftermath of publishing the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa 1996, interpretative dilemmas were clearly taking place among language researchers regarding the implied multilingualism of the constitution (Webb, 1999). At the time,
It was clear that the 11 languages - English, sePedi, seTswana, isiXhosa, isiZulu, isiNdebele, siSwati, xiTsonga, Afrikaans, tshiVenda and seSotho (see Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996) - was a reflection of multilingualism in the country, but great ‘uncertainty surrounded the practicality of the proposals’ (Mesthrie, 2006: 152). As a result, a number of language bodies and committees investigated multilingualism in formulating language policies and frameworks for advancing multilingualism in every sector of South African society: for the promotion of African languages and the development of bilingual and multilingual education (Plüddemann, 1999). These national language bodies and committees were NEPI, LANGTAG and later PANSALB.

In the early days of democracy, the National Education Policy Investigation (NEPI) was the first body designed to provide ‘input to any future government and crucial issues relating to education’ (Mesthrie, 2006: 152). Subsequently, LANGTAG, who comprised a select few language practitioners, provided much needed empirical insights into the need to change a seemingly monolingual society into a multilingual society, in a bid to prevent language shift (see LANTAG, 1996, report). But in order to realise and monitor the implementation of multilingualism in South Africa, the creation of a statutory body was a necessity: the Pan South African Language Board (PANSALB) is that committee (see PANSALB reports, 1999, 2000, 2001, on the promotion of languages in South Africa).

Consequently a number of national and provincial language policies have been engendered: The National Language Policy Framework (NLPF), The Language-in-Education Policy 1997 (henceforth, LiEP 1997), The Language Policy for Higher Education (LPHE), and most relevant to this study, the Western Cape Language Act 1998 (henceforth, WCLA 1998). Of particular concern in this study are the national document LiEP (1997) and the provincial document WCLA (1998).

LiEP (1997) is the national policy document which sets out the guiding principles on paper for not only the design but the advancement of multilingualism through
language education. Although it does not explicate in detail how multilingual education should be practised alongside current models of bilingual education, which is the policy’s greatest shortcoming, it nevertheless emphasises the need to promote multilingualism. Language policy researchers have often resorted to disconcerting remarks about the practical realisation of multilingualism in education: what Webb (1999) has come to term ‘an overestimation of language policy in mismatching dream and reality’. Thus provisioning multilingualism in policy presents practical dilemmas as captured in the tenets and aims of LiEP 1997.

The tenets of LiEP (1997) are set against the following background: ‘… to promote multilingualism, the development of the official languages, and respect for all languages used in the country, including South African Sign Language and the languages referred to in the South Africa Constitution’. The policy also foregrounds explicitly that to advance a multilingual society and multilingualism in individuals, ‘… the learning of more than one language should be general practice and principle in our society. That is to say, being multilingual should be a defining characteristic of being South African’. Moreover, directly following these imperatives, the main aims of the policy seek:

1. To promote full participation in society and the economy through the equitable and meaningful access to education;
2. To…establish additive multilingualism as an approach to language in education;
3. To promote and develop all the official languages;
4. To support teaching and learning of all other languages required by learners or used by communities in South Africa, including languages used for religious purposes, languages which are important for international trade and communication, and South African Sign Language, as well as Alternative and Augmentative Communication;
5. To counter disadvantages resulting from different kinds of mismatches between home languages and languages of learning and teaching;
6. To develop programmes for the redress of previously disadvantaged languages.

What is immediately discernable from the policy in its provision of multilingualism is the practicality of implementing the aims. While many South Africans speak more
than one language, many attend schools with other multilingual South Africans; many schools are unable to provide the learning of more than one language as media of instruction (Banda, 2000; see especially Mbatha and Plüddemann, 2004a; compared to Mbude-Shale, Wababa, and Plüddemann, 2004a). To advance the argument that almost all the aims of LiEP 1997 are difficult to implement, we need to look no further than the paradox that English and Afrikaans have caused, versus the African languages: while the prior two languages are vehicles to academic and economic success, they also cause inequality (Alexander, 2005a).

In a recent panel discussion, organised by the Sunday Times on language policy (see Mother tongue for all, 4th July 2007), issues of the aforementioned nature were problematised again with respect to African languages. The panellists were Prof Neville Alexander (Director of PRAESA – Project for the Study of Alternative Education in South Africa), Prof Theo du Plessis (Head of the Unit for Language Management at the University of the Free State), Prof Peter Mtuze (Former head of the African Languages Department and former Deputy Registrar at Rhodes University), Dr Kathleen Heugh (Chief Research Specialist with Human Sciences Research Council - HSRC), Prof Sizwe Satyo (Head of the African Languages and Literatures at UCT), Ms Montao Rose Smouse (UCT lecturer in SeSotho as a First Language) and Ms Nomboniso Gasa (Political and Gender Policy Analyst). Prof Alexander, from the outset of the discussion, highlighted the importance of language policy concerns in very practical terms: “… unless African languages are given market value, unless the status of African languages is enhanced, and unless African languages are learned in a multilingual context by all South African citizens, we are not going to make the progress that we are potentially capable of making in the country. And I mean progress in all dimensions of our society: economic, political, cultural and educational.”

If multilingualism is to be realised in practice, following the second aim of LiEP (1997), one then has to be adamant to make obvious the implementation strategies for the achievement of an ‘additive multilingualism approach to language education’
through bilingual and multilingual education models. According to Webb (1999: 355), LiEP 1997, the ‘… policy of multilingualism and pluralism seems to be moving in the wrong direction’, towards monolingualism. This is a worrisome movement. What is worse, the policy’s multilingualism, as Makoni (2003a; 2003b) (see also Makoni and Pennycook, 2006; Makoni and Meinhof, 2004) argues, is a ludicrous promotion of different monolingualisms: for instance, “… there has been a decline in the choice of an African language as first language of learning and teaching, and an accompanying increase in choice of English: whereas an average of about 25% of the pupils in DET schools were taught in English in the late nineteen-eighties, more than 60% of the schools in the four provinces outside the Western Cape selected English as a first language of learning and teaching in 1997” (Webb, 1999: 355).

This decline, unfortunately, has to do with the choice factor of the policy. While one impossible aim of the policy seeks to support teaching and learning of all other languages required by learners or used by communities, in South Africa, learners are also offered a choice to choose the language of learning and teaching (see Desai, 2001). Is this practically reasonable? How should we address the language choice factor in the policy for becoming and staying multilingual by individuals in practice? What are the practical reasons for LiEP 1997’s inability to realise multilingualism? Are the current bilingual education models in the country actually designed in such a way to practically implement the aims and choice factor of the policy?

Webb (see 1999: 358-9) suggests that we need to redesign the national language-in-education policy necessary to allow individual South Africans access to symbolic and material gains of multilingualism. It would be possible to create different policy options for the following sociolinguistic category types or areas: the larger urban areas, smaller urban areas, and the deep rural areas. However, such cordonning off of various language contact areas would adversely lead to a situation of ‘hermetically sealed off’ (Makoni, 2000) languages, which in the end could and probably would adversely affect the advancement of bilingual and multilingual education. Nonetheless, as Webb (1999: 360) argues, that in spite of LiEP 1997’s shortcomings
as mentioned above, it does make a position on bilingual education implicitly clear for the advancement of multilingualism in practice:

It obligates schools to promote multilingualism by requiring of them that they stipulate how they will do it, and it suggests that they (i) use more than one language of learning and teaching and/or (ii) offer additional languages as fully fledged subjects and/or (iii) apply special immersion or language maintenance programmes (particularly in cases where learners’ home languages are not used as language of learning and teaching).

LiEP 1997 has many shortcomings concerning the provision of multilingualism. It burdens the design of multilingual education, thinking towards additive multilingualism (Plüddemann, 1997), as an almost impossible reality. The policy document opens up more questions than practical realisations. While it does implicitly require schools to design their own multilingual models to advance multilingualism within learners, what happens to the models that are already in place, especially models such as dual-medium and parallel-medium? Do current models of bilingual education promote multilingualism for multiliteracy in South African learners? Are the current models of bilingual education able to adequately advance multilingual and multiliteracy in South African learners? Following from what has been discussed does the LiEP 1997 require more pragmatic elements of what needs to be done to become multilingual through language education? What about multilingualism in provinces like the Western Cape?

In the Western Cape three languages are used as media of instruction in schools (WCED report, 2002) and official government domains: Xhosa, English and Afrikaans. The Western Cape Provincial Languages Act of 1998 states that all three languages need to enjoy parity of esteem by their use in provincial parliament, advertisements, official notices, and communication by parliament to the public and other organisations in official identification signs, especially government signage.

The same with PANSALB the national statutory, the Western Cape Provincial Languages Act of 1998 also ensures the promotion of Xhosa, English and Afrikaans
through the sister statutory body, The Western Cape Language Committee. To such an end, the act aims to promote multilingualism in the Western Cape through the promotion of Xhosa, English and Afrikaans which ‘binds all [provincial] government structures to a multilingual mode of operation’ (Mesthrie, 2006: 153).

The Western Cape Languages Act of 1998 does not state which languages ‘bilingual’ and ‘multilingual’ schools should use as media of instruction. Schools have to consult LiEP 1997 as guideline and are practically left to their own devices as a recent report from the Western Cape Education Department (henceforth, WCED) indicates (compare Plüddemann, Braam, Broeder, Extra and October, 2004b; for a discussion). Amongst other findings, the report suggests that upon investigating the more widespread models of bilingual education, dual-medium and parallel-medium schooling in the province

- Teachers had virtually very little knowledge about the national language policy, with a few exceptions.
- It has become the norm to support the tendencies towards rapid shifts of ‘subtractive transition to English-medium schooling’.
- Xhosa-speaking teachers who teach at the intermediate and senior phase are unable to teach through the medium of the mother tongue as they find it ‘difficult and even impossible’.
- Many of the schools in the Western Cape are under-resourced and therefore bring the implementation of dual-medium and parallel-medium into question.

As a result, the WCED now seeks to do away with models that lead to ‘subtractive multilingualism’ and now explicitly prefers ‘additive multilingual’ language education typologies for advancing multilingualism in the province, in the form of Mother tongue-based bilingual education (MTE). To quote the report at length,

“Mother tongue-based bilingual education (MTE) is...a more persuasive and more easily comprehensible rendering of the meaning of “additive multilingualism”. It includes the following definitional features:
(a) using the mother-tongue (=home languages(s) or L1) of the child/learner as a formative Lolt from Day 1 in Grade R or Grade 1 up to and including the last day of the school year in Grade 6;
(b) introducing the first additional language (FAL) as a subject as soon as possible in the foundation phase, including Grade R;
(c) assuming that a dual-medium approach is preferred by the parents or guardians, gradually using the FAL as a supportive Lolt as and when the children have adequate competence; and
(d) ideally, using L1+FAL as complementary Lolts at a 50% - 50% level by the end of Grade 6.

Normally, however, other permutations of this dual-medium model can be expected to prevail because the teachers’ limited language proficiency and the subject knowledge as well as other constraints of a material or managerial nature.” (page 2)

On close inspection of the above quote, the proposed model of MTE seems far from using three languages as media of instruction. This is a dilemma because the report brings forth empirical evidence of a number of challenges. Yet, in spite of this the report recommends the option of one language as a language of learning and teaching. Moreover, the model is also transitional, as it is premised on Xhosa L1 speakers shifting to English medium of instruction. Every definitional feature uses only one language as a language of learning and teaching, or medium of instruction. How does MTE ensure learners become multilingual when only one language is used as a medium of instruction? Or is this an attempt to phase out or redesign the currently wide-spread models of bilingual education, dual-medium and parallel-medium schooling? (Compare this with the WCED Language Transformation Plan, 2007)

If we compare the report with the Western Cape Language Act of 1998, it is fair to comment that language policies of the primary schools in the Western Cape should use the three recognised languages as media of instruction, to not only realise the aims of LiEP 1997, but produce multilingual and multiliterate school leavers. Is it fair to dismiss dual-medium and parallel-medium models of bilingual education when we know so little of their unofficial and official promotion of multilingualism in the province?
A number of studies completed by the Project for Alternative Education in South Africa (henceforth, PRAESA) support the findings and suggestion of the WCED report. One study by Plüddemann et al. (2004a) suggests that dual-medium and parallel-medium schooling are practised by *default* and not by *design*. In other words, because of the lack of knowledge of the national language policy, according to Plüddemann et al., teachers do not understand the implementation of dual-medium and parallel-medium instruction and schooling. Likewise, Mati (2003) points out that the reason dual-medium and parallel-medium are ineffective in curbing subtractive to transitional English-medium schooling have to do with political will, parents and learners’ aspirations in the commodification of English as an additional language.

What about the *how* of dual-medium and parallel-medium instructional practice? In both studies suggestions and arguments for the equating of African languages towards realising multilingualism in the Western Cape have been advanced, but none of the suggestions have seen execution, only more probing into the instructional dynamics of the models, which is rather questionable because none of the studies made use of extensive classroom observations to problematise dual-medium and parallel-medium instruction.

Where previously only dual-medium and parallel-medium language classrooms were observed for effective implementation of the national language policy, Plüddemann and Mbude’s (2002) pilot study also brings to bare the dynamics of dual-medium instruction in a science classroom. In the application of the model, these researchers show the difficulties of translating materials into Xhosa because of the deficit of scientific material available in the language, and the competence of the participating teachers in teaching through two mediums. Likewise, in early studies of Gerda De Klerk (1995a) have shown that the introduction of even a third language to a previously parallel-medium and dual-medium schooling structure requires the restructuring of such schools in terms of monitory and human resources to maintain the effectiveness of the models and the promotion of multilingualism.
To summarise, there seems to be a disjuncture between policy and practice and as a result multilingualism in the Western Cape is realised on paper but difficult to establish in practice. Although the provisions of the Western Cape Languages Act of 1998 and the findings of the Language Policy in the primary schools in the Western Cape report (2002), very little research shows whether the models do what they are designed to do at the level of instruction and school level. In fact, research on dual-medium and parallel-medium schooling remain insufficient. As a consequence, many challenges are mentioned of dual-medium and parallel-medium schooling instead of what brings about the challenges at the level of instruction.

1.2 Statement of purpose

In this study, the aim were to examine the application of dual-medium and parallel-medium models of bilingual education, and the factors influencing the success of practice at selected schools in the Western Cape.

1.2.1 Objectives

- To ascertain the practice of bilingual education in selected schools.
- To explore classroom interaction to establish the current teaching and learning models in place.
- To ascertain the efficacy of the dual-medium and parallel-medium instruction models as used at the selected schools to promote multilingual proficiency in learners.
- To propose a model of multilingual education and recommendations for future implementations of such a model.
1.2.2 Statement of Research Problem

The general question this study sought to answer is whether the dual-medium instruction and the parallel-medium instruction models, in practice at the two schools, effectively promotes the principle of LiEP 1997 for the attainment of multiliteracy by learners. The principles and aims of LiEP 1997 succinctly stress all learners in South Africa should receive schooling through at least two or three languages to become multilingual for multiliteracy.

1.2.3 Research Questions

- What language teaching models are in place at the selected schools?
- Do the language teaching models promote multiliteracy?

1.3 Rationale

The motivation for this study is a consequence of another bigger project of which I was contracted in 2005 as a postgraduate research assistant that involved gathering data to explore innovative literacy practices in classrooms at 12 schools in the Western Cape. The schools were purposely chosen because of the nature and design of their ‘bilingual education model’. They were also classified as some of the top schools in the Western Cape, by the Western Cape Education Department (henceforth, WCED). Of the 12, six of the schools are primary schools situated in coloured working class areas (3), and in townships (3). The remaining schools were high schools.

During the first year of this thesis project two primary schools were chosen to participate. Permission was sought to study the design and implementation of the schools’ bilingual education models. Firstly, preliminary discoveries of the bigger project indicated a non-unified, seemingly haphazard application of dual-medium and
parallel-medium schooling and instruction. This transformed into questions subsequently formulated as already given above.

Secondly, my previous assumption was that most classrooms at the coloured schools remain perfectly homogenous. However, this was not the case because there were black learners from the townships and informal settlements in the classrooms who spoke Xhosa and Zulu. This prompted the concern of whether dual-medium and parallel-medium instruction models were able to promote multilingualism to produce multiliteracy learners.

1.4 Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested by this study.

1. Parallel-medium instruction in practice uses only one language of learning and teaching (LoLT), and thus leads to monolingual classroom practice.

2. Dual-medium instruction offers the best route to bilingualism, but in practice it is applied haphazardly so that its benefits are lost in the process.

1.6 Focus of study

This study was conducted at two historically disadvantaged primary schools in Cape Town. The focus was on classroom practice(s), supported by principals and Grade 7 teachers in their understanding of dual-medium and parallel-medium schooling and instruction.

1.7 Research methodology

Qualitative research techniques were used to collect the data for this study. In other words, interviews and observations were carried out and document analysis to meet
the objectives of this study. Furthermore, the observations and document analysis were triangulated with interview data to support my assumptions.

1.8 Organisation of dissertation

Chapter 1 gives the background to the study and the problem. The problem identified was whether dual-medium and parallel-medium models of bilingual schooling, as implemented by two historically disadvantaged schools, are able to promote multilingualism for multiliteracy as envisioned by the language-in-education policy of 1997. This chapter also discusses the motivation for carrying out this study.

Chapter 2 is a literature review of bilingual education (analytical underpinnings) and bilingual schooling typologies. Different types of bilingual education are reviewed followed by a critique of the debate on bilingualism in South Africa, especially the application of dual-medium and parallel-medium schooling.

Chapter 3 discusses the research methodology informed by qualitative strategies of data collecting: the ‘triangulation’ method (TerreBlanche and Durrheim, 2001).

Chapter 4 presents the findings and discussion of classroom practice at selected schools, triangulated with data from interviews with principals and teachers. In this chapter, I use the analytical implications of ‘strong’ bilingual education typologies to conclude the discussion on the application of dual-medium and parallel-medium schooling. Bilingual education typologies are “… all forms of provision for bilingual learning in and through two languages” (Martin-Jones, 2007: 164).

Chapter 5 is a summary of the thesis that concludes on the hypotheses and the questions, followed by recommendations.
In the following chapter, we will discuss the concept of bilingual education and bilingual schooling issues in South Africa.
2.0 Introduction

In this chapter a review of literature is discussed. The first section is an overview of the concept bilingual education in terms of ‘strong and weak’ models. Section two will then discuss typologies of bilingual education, followed by a critique of the concept (and models) of bilingualism as depicted in local South African literature, i.e. the bilingualism debate in South Africa, in section three.

2.1 Bilingual education: ‘strong’ and ‘weak’

Bilingualism is a language phenomenon that develops within societies (‘groups’ or ‘communities’) and individuals (cf. Edwards, 1994; 2003; 2007; Baker, 2006; 2007a; 2007b; Hoffman, 1991; Hamers and Blanc, 2000), and where such societies and individuals are able to use two languages in many intimate and public domains. Thus a bilingual is a person who speaks two languages, and a multilingual person is able to speak more than two languages. To become bilingual or multilingual is an extraordinary experience, because the language (s) we learn open different types of social, educational, political and economic worlds. Even so, if bilingualism is a phenomenon where two languages are acquired by an individual and a phenomenon possessed by societies alike, then bilingual education has to ensure bilingual development or ‘language proficiency’ (Cummins, 2000). But what exactly is bilingual education?

Bilingual education is a term that refers to structurally different schools where teaching is done ‘bilingually’ or schools where teachers educate ‘bilingual students’ (Baker, 2006). It refers to schools where children from minority language backgrounds are immersed from ‘minority language dominance’ to ‘majority
language dominance’, schools that assist in furthering or developing bilingualism and biliteracy in children, and schools where content subjects are taught through the medium of two languages (Baker, 2007: 131) (see also, Hamers and Blanc, 2000; Genesee, 2006, for comparable definitions).

Bilingual education is not a situation where a school makes use of a child’s L1 as a medium of instruction for a brief phase, or transitional period, or if a child’s L1 is only used as a subject. As I will show later, schools that define themselves as bilingual schools do not practise bilingual education. Baker (2007: 131) states that there is a general misunderstanding in applying the term bilingual education. This is due to the distinction between minority and majority languages, which has a widespread distinction in Western literature and a growing reference in the South African literature. Makoni (2006; 2004), a detractor of Western linguistics, has frequently argued of inventions of language models made by Western language theorists, which are frequently unchallenged and adopted by African language researchers. This is a discriminatory practice and one which in the South African multilingual situation, where learners acquire more than three languages before they start their school career, could have adverse, irreversible language effects.

Baker (2001; 2006) provides a comprehensive list of ‘strong’ versus ‘weak’ forms of bilingual education, where the goal is to develop full bilingualism within the child (see Baker, 2006). Firstly, the weak forms of bilingual education models affect bilingualism in children negatively, because students in minority numbers are swept into a classroom where the majority learner enjoys full explicit instruction in his/her language. Secondly, learners either remain monolingual or achieve ‘limited bilingualism’. The educational and social orientation goals of weak forms of bilingual education are to alienate the minority group completely (Baker, 2000).
2.2 Additive bilingual education: ‘Strong’ types of bilingual education

Strong forms of bilingual education aim to foster additive bilingualism. Languages are maintained within such programmes and everything is done to promote previously marginalised groups of speakers, by emphasising educational and social orientation goals geared towards ‘pluralism and enrichment’ (Leary-Lindholm, 2001).

The strong models of bilingual education successfully immerse learners from majority language groups (immersion bilingual education), home languages are maintained (heritage language/maintenance bilingual education), two-way/dual language (teaching two languages at the same time) and mainstream bilingual education. Weak forms of bilingual education result in learners either becoming relative bilinguals or achieve limited bilingualism. At worst, the learners could stay monolingual. The weak bilingual education models are submersion education (with withdrawal classes), segregationist education, transitional education, mainstream with foreign language teaching education and separatist bilingual education.

2.2.1 Immersion bilingual education

Immersion bilingual education originates from Canada and consists of various types (cf. Genesee, 1987; Genesee, 1998; Baker, 2006). It was created out of a petition by a few English speaking parents who persuaded school district administrators to set up a kindergarten grade to immerse their children into French. The first type of immersion bilingual education is early (infant) immersion (the St Lambert experiment) (for a detailed description see Genesee, 1987; see also Baker, 2006: 246), then middle immersion (delayed – 9 to 10 years) and late immersion (at secondary school level). Other types are total immersion (100% into the L2), partial immersion (50% into the L2), early total immersion, heritage language immersion, double immersion and the rarest of such types, activity-oriented immersion.
The Canadian immersion situation is an additive bilingual situation, aimed at acquiring two prestigious languages – French and English. In these types of immersion education, the child is granted the option to use his/her home language from one to one-and-a-half years, for classroom communication. Genesee (1987: 14) postulated that, “...the most distinctive feature of [Canadian] immersion programs is their use of the second language to teach regular academic subjects, such as mathematics and science, in addition to language arts”. Here the child’s language is maintained alongside the majority language, while studying his/her minority language in a majority language society (cf. Genesee, 1998). French is not learned at the expense of the English L1 speaker. Teachers are fully bilingual and therefore represent standard models of ‘successful bilingualism’.

2.2.2 Dual language schools

Dual language schools have become over the last ten years a popular strong form of bilingual education in the United States of America (USA) (cf. Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Baker, 2006; 2007). Lindholm-Leary (2001) argued that minority learners reap real benefits from this bilingual model cognitively, and not only is a home language maintained but additive bilingualism is an assured policy of the model. Baker (2007: 132) states that dual language schools teach ‘...the subject curriculum through one language on one day and through a different language the next day, in strict alternation’. The likely two majority languages in such schools are an almost equal composite of English L1 speakers and American-Spanish L1 speakers.

The aim of the dual language model is to develop biliteracy and full bilingualism and may be executed in the following ways: a) a non-English language, for instance, can be used for 50% of instruction; b) languages are used alternatively; c) learners are almost the same proportion and integrated in lessons; and d) language may be used on alternate days in teaching different subjects. Sometimes dual language schools are called ‘two-way bilingual education’.
Often language alternation occurs in such classrooms, which might be a form of code switching (Lindholm-Leary, 2001). However, Baker (2000, 2006) argues that code switching between languages is not the preferred practice: a situation may arise where learners become uninterested because delivery of content has been switched to the language they are not so proficient in.

### 2.2.3 Heritage language bilingual education

Another popular strong form of bilingual education in the USA is heritage language education. This model teaches indigenous language minority children, for example, through their home language (L1) for at most 20% of the designated curriculum time: the Navajo and Spanish speaking children in the USA. This model focuses on minority groups who relocated and were re-established in a majority language community, in other words, immigrant families. This type of bilingual education is sometimes called maintenance bilingual education or developmental maintenance bilingual education (Baker, 2006). It may have various interpretations or overtones as it is called ‘native language’, ‘ethnic language’, ‘minority language’, ‘ancestral language’, ‘aboriginal language’, *et cetera* (Baker, 2007).

### 2.3 Subtractive bilingual education: ‘Weak’ types of bilingual education

A home language (or minority language) used for a limited time resulting in ‘relative monolingualism and enculturation’ in a majority language classroom setting is a form of weak bilingual education (Baker, 2007: 133). According to Hamers and Blanc (2000: 323) weak typologies of bilingual education “…lead to socio-political disruption, the programmes are often defended on ideological grounds, in the name of linguistic and cultural pluralism”. This has been especially true in the USA (Krashen, 1996; 1999).
Children from minority language backgrounds are typically restricted in using their home language in classrooms only after a certain ‘adaptation period’ in schools that apply weak forms of bilingual education. Baker (2007) argues that the use of language assistants in bilingual education classrooms who to take learners from their home language use and mainstreaming them into a majority language use for instance is a typical indication of a weak form of bilingual education. In this case, such classes culminate into transitional bilingual education. Weak forms of bilingual education result in subtractive bilingualism, academic underachievement, lack of confidence in language use, increasing drop-out rates, and possibly semilingualism. According to Baker (2007: 133), these results of weak forms of bilingual education are because children’s

…home language tends to be denied when they are made to operate through the majority language in the classroom. The child is expected to learn through a language that may be insufficiently developed to understand an increasingly complex and abstract curriculum. The child not only has to learn a new language, but learn through that new language, and may therefore find that understanding the curriculum not easy.

Strong forms of bilingual education have the potential to develop and build bilingualism in children, compared to weak bilingual education forms. But, both strong and weak forms have limitations. The general consensus though is that weak forms of bilingual education are unpopular and only strong forms of bilingual education lead to additive bilingualism and maintain bilingualism or multilingualism in children (cf. Beardsmore, 1993; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Baker, 2007; 2006).

A lot of countries, such as Norway and Denmark combine a number of strong forms of bilingual education to combat either mass minority groups immigrating into such countries (Jørgensen and Quist, 2007), or respond to the growing needs of global bilingualism or multilingualism that greatly affects political concerns. Extra (2007), for instance, is very critical of minority programmes such as the the Languages Other Than English – LOTE programme in Victoria State, USA, and the Muttersprachlicher Unterricht programme in North Rhine-Westphalia, Germany. In
these countries both programmes are critiqued for its lack of serious linguistic consideration for minority groups, heading down paths of assimilation. Minority groups are either accommodated for or not, because state structures believe that an assimilationist approach holds the key to citizenship. Furthermore, “…the number of bi- and multilingual speakers a country produces may be seen as an indicator of its educational standards, economic competitiveness and cultural vibrancy” (Dewaele et al, 2003: 2).

In South Africa, we may have minority groups that have migrated from one province to the next, or emigrated from neighbouring countries such as Namibia and Zimbabwe, but language researchers would agree that we do not have minority or majority languages. Adopting the concepts minority or majority languages to the South African bilingual and multilingual situation would be futile, as our ‘bilingual education’ programmes accommodate the 11 languages of the constitution and not minority and majority languages. Makoni (2000) suggests that we cannot adopt such concepts, because they are Western monolinguisms manufactured for different monolingual immigrant and permanent citizens, belonging to monolingual language communities. In South Africa it would be an overwhelming task to research which of the 11 official languages are majority languages, as all of them would practically be majority languages, statistically and empirically (Granville et al, 1998).

On the other hand, if we reduce the official languages to minority languages, a language like seTswana, for instance, we run the risk of promoting the South African multilingual situation as different monolinguisms (Makoni and Pennycook, 2007). Xhosa, English and Afrikaans in the Western Cape are by far NOT minority languages. Even if we deem Xhosa a majority language in the Western Cape, it sets a double standard against English and Afrikaans speakers who would argue that their languages are being marginalised: this would be unconstitutional and outright unlawful. Moreover, it would mean we have to promote monolingual language education programmes. This is unacceptable.
2.4 The Bilingualism debate in South Africa

Bilingual education has been a central issue to the development of South Africa’s education system since the country’s inception as a republic and transition into a new democracy (cf. Heugh, 2000; Webb, 2002; Giliomee, 2003). For more than 60 years, a struggle has been brewing between various parties for which type of bilingual education is needed (November, 1991). With the advent of democracy in 1994, the new South African government was tasked with changing the face of bilingual education (Alexander, 2002). The first meaningful change came with the publication of the new Constitution of South Africa, in which the government, by reconceptualising the status of languages in this country, promulgated 11 official languages.

The language provisions are clearly spelt in Section 6 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa No. 108 (1996: 1245). What is clear (from the constitution) is equality for ‘official languages’ and ‘indigenous languages’, signifying the commitment of the South African legislature. It is also clear that the language provisions attempt to alleviate the ‘historically diminished use and status of the indigenous languages’, but at the same time call for the recognition of all 11 official languages to ‘enjoy parity of esteem’ (see Strydom, 2003; for a legislative view).

To ensure this is achieved, the provisions created a statutory body (‘A Pan South African Language Board’ - PANSALB) to monitor the conditions of promotion and development of not only the 11 official languages but ‘all languages commonly used by communities in South Africa…’ (See annual reports published by PANSALB, 1999; 2000; 2001). However, after more than 12 years into a new democracy PANSALB has had little effect in the area of bilingual education.

On the other hand, language researchers in South Africa have located a debate regarding the saliency of such terms as subtractive and additive bilingualism to such
an end that additional terms have surfaced, ‘additive multilingualism’. Additive bilingualism in South Africa could mean to gain ‘…advanced bilingual proficiency, cognitive development, and general social empowerment preferably through the use of two LOLTs, one of which has to be the primary or home language of the majority learners’ (Plüddemann, 1997: 19). However, to date it is unclear what additive multilingualism stands for. On the other hand, with respect to bilingual education programmes, Plüddemann argues that

The most important of the older concepts that should be reintroduced is bilingual education, meaning the use of two LOLTs in the educational process. Dual-medium education should be the preferred (‘strong’) form of bilingual education, with parallel-medium education (2 x single-medium education in the same school, with plenty of opportunities for contact across language lines) an interim solution until teachers have been enabled to teach through the medium of LOLTs. It may be possible to rehabilitate the concept of mother-tongue education; if not, its equivalents of primary languages or main languages or home language/s education should be punt. (Plüddemann, 1997: 24).

The fact that Plüddemann here applies the concept bilingual education as an umbrella concept for parallel-medium education, mother-tongue education or main languages or home languages education, is a contradiction in terms, and academically misplaced. How will all the above programmes promote multilingualism? Should we not then consider the distribution of the official languages in enriching our understanding of additive, subtractive and additive multilingualism? Moreover, is it scientifically wise to outright reject terms such as additive bilingualism, subtractive bilingualism and additive multilingualism? I agree with Banda (2000) that South African academics, or those who inquire within a bilingual education framework, have failed to capture the linguistic distribution of all 11 official languages.
2.5 A historical detour: bilingual education models between 1910 and 1994

2.5.1 Dutch (Afrikaans)-English bilingual education

The first signs of bilingual education in South Africa came at the advent of British colonial rule, during the second half of the 19th century. Controlling the Cape Colony and Natal, the British colonialists pushed Dutch-speaking settlers further into South Africa who created two republics, known today as Transvaal and Orange Free State. Education in the two republics was through the medium of Dutch, or Dutch and English (the then official language), constituting an official form of bilingual education.

At the end of the first Anglo-Boer War, bilingual education changed when the British coerced Dutch/Afrikaans speakers into Anglicisation (see Giliomee, 2003; and Malherbe, 1977; 3-17). In 1910 a settlement was reached that placed Dutch and English on an equal footing, but two years later, in 1912, Afrikaans gained prestige and replaced Dutch as the second official language. According to November (1991: 41),

After 1912...different linguistic groups were educated at separate schools sites, and dual-medium or parallel-medium schools, where English and Dutch Afrikaans speakers mixed in the same classes, or, respectively, in separate classes in the same school.

Those learners enrolled at primary and secondary schools where both English and Afrikaans were used as media of instruction; dual-medium schools, were increasing in numbers and outperformed their monolingual peers in bilingual proficiency (Malherbe, 1977). They were also most eligible to find a job because of their bilingual ability.

In the early years of the Republic of South Africa, bilingual education was designed to combat supposed social inequality, mainly among white Afrikaans speaking and
white English speaking South Africans. The canon piece of literature that has been widely cited is that of Malherbe (1947; 1977), who describes in much detail the development of bilingual education (models) amidst growing political tensions in South Africa, during the late and early ’40s.

At the height of the 1943 provincial elections in South Africa, two parties, the National Party (NP) and Union Party’s main arguments were over language and the survival of Afrikaans amidst the growing hegemony of English (Giliomee, 2003). Compared to its opponents (the Union Party), the National Party contested a model where all children attending public schools study Afrikaans separately, while Union argued for a model that considered the needs of prospective bilingual learners, by instructing them through their Mother Tongue from foundation phase and gradually introducing a second language as a supplementary medium (Malherbe, 1946; 1977).

Union’s language policy was a model of dual-medium and parallel-medium instruction (see in this regard Truter, 2005; for a comprehensive report on the implementation of Union’s language policy). Within parallel-medium classes, learners study their mother tongue under separate roofs, but would commune with the second language learners of their mother tongue at times outside the class (Malherbe, 1946). According to Heugh (1995: 84), parallel-medium schooling “…catered for two linguistic communities within the same school by streaming children into separate language classes…Afrikaans-speaking children would be in an Afrikaans stream, whilst English-speaking children would be in an English stream”. Dual-medium instruction entailed the teaching of two languages to mother tongue speakers of those languages under one roof. According to Malherbe (1977), at the time it took on the following forms:

1. It involved teaching English/Afrikaans alternating, involving repetition, and bearing on the proficiency of the teacher in both languages.
2. Using languages on alternate days summarising lessons.
3. Teaching some subjects through English and others through Afrikaans.
4. Using the L2 as medium for several subjects for not more than an hour per day in all classes beyond Grade 4.

In other words,

1. “Two languages are used in the classroom interchangeably each day for the content subjects or parts of the curriculum, e.g. History, Geography, Science, Mathematics, etc. For example, the lesson might be introduced in one language; elaboration and activities might take place in the other language; and the lesson might be rounded off in the first language used. Any number of variations can be introduced to enhance teaching and learning opportunities.

2. The two languages might be used on alternate days. An experiment conducted by Professor Reyburn of the University of Cape Town in the mid-1940s concluded that this method was particularly successful in developing a bilingual proficiency” (Malherbe, 1977: 99; as cited by Heugh, 1995: 84).

The dual-medium system was regarded as the more successful of the two bilingual education models. This was corroborated through a number of early studies. Professor Reyburn in the 1940s proved that learners academic performance in such classes were significantly better compared to those learners in single medium classrooms (Malherbe, 1977: 93).

The National Bureau of Education and Social Research in 1943 published a large scale study with the voluntary participation of 18 000 learners in 1938. This study revealed that in dual-medium classrooms, a degree of Afrikaans-English bilingualism was fostered and a general respect existed between the two language communities. Moreover, Afrikaans and English speaking learners already came from bilingual homes; monolingual instruction would not benefit such learners (the National Bureau of Education and Social Research study cited in Malherbe, 1977: 56-66).

Malherbe (1977: 82-92) highlights that certain political gatherings - the *Broederbond* (The Brotherhood), and the Federasie van Afrikaanse Kultuurvereniginge (FAK) (The Federation of Afrikaans Culture organisations), in support of the National Party (NP) - disparaged the dual-medium bilingual schools, or bilingual education. These organisations cited that children attending these schools developed cognitive defects
and other unconfirmed conjectures. After the NP came to power in 1948, dual-medium schooling was overtaken methodically by monolingual schools.

2.5.2 Bantu bilingual education: The Mother Tongue plus Afrikaans/English

During the 19th century the education of black children was mostly as result of missionary undertakings. The missionaries from England could only manage through the medium of English, but the German and Swiss missionaries managed to gain enough proficiency to teach through African languages. Those black students who could afford British colonial, state-funded English education became part of the ‘English-speaking and educated elite’ (cf. Heugh, 2002: 13; see also Hartshorne, 1992).

‘Bilingual education’ for African speakers comprised of using the mother tongue as primary medium of instruction for four to six years, followed by a rapid switch to English. In the missionary schools, the idea that English was best for an ‘intellectual and civilized’ African was imbued in the minds of many African speakers who attended such schools. This meant that in the ‘public schools’ African children attending such schools needed to do a lot of catching-up to be also counted as intellectual and civilised. Compared to the education for “White-Afrikaners” and “White-English”, schooling the ‘Natives’ or ‘Bantu’ (November, 1991) was provisioned by commissions such as the Welsh Committee and Eiselen Commission, from 1910 to 1948. The Welsh Committee summed up the situation in black schools as one where English was the medium of instruction (in the Cape and Natal areas), but Zulu was taught as a vernacular from 1885 onwards to all black pupils – in the Natal area. According to Hartshorne (1997: 193),

In all the provinces a vernacular language was a compulsory subject of study throughout the primary school and in teacher training colleges. At secondary level almost all pupils took a vernacular language but it was not a compulsory subject or a pre-requisite for success in Junior Certificate (St 8) or Senior Certificate (St 10). As far as medium of instruction was concerned the position was that the pupil’s mother
tongue was to be used for the first six years (up to and including St 4) in Natal, for the first four years (St 2) in the Cape and Free State, and for the first two years (the sub-standards) in the Transvaal.

In subsequent years the Eiselen Commission was established to study black education in South Africa. The Eiselen Commission, so named after its leader Werner Willy Max Eiselen, was created to provide education for the Natives or Bantu in South Africa (cf. Malherbe, 1977). With a strict mandate, the commission (as cited here by November, 1991: 61) recommended (amongst others) that

The formulation of the principles and aims of education for Natives as an independent race, in which their past and present, their inherent racial qualities, their distinctive characteristics and aptitude, and their needs under the ever-changing social conditions are taken into consideration. [And] The extent to which the existing primary, secondary and vocational educational system for Natives and the training of Native teachers should be modified with respect to the contents and form syllabi, in order to conform to the proposed principles and aims, and to prepare Natives more effectively for their future occupations. (Union of South Africa, 1951: 7)

The Commission results noted that eight years of mother-tongue education for black learners would suffice, followed by a form of dual-medium bilingual education (Afrikaans and English) in secondary school. In other words, this meant that half the subjects would be taught in English and some in Afrikaans. The results of the Eiselen Commission’s report disregarded the opinions of blacks concerning mother tongue instruction and favoured the use of Afrikaans instead. What followed was the publication and implementation of legislative proceedings to clearly define and demarcate education for the Native. At the time, schools were divided administratively according to House of Assembly (HoA), for white children, House of Delegates (HoD), for Indian children, House of Representatives (HoR), for coloured children, and Department of Education and Training (DET), for African children. However, with the publication of the Bantu Education Act, No. 47 of 1953, this mattered little retrospectively as the then Minister of Native Affairs, Dr H.F Verwoerd, had the following to say about schooling the “Bantu”, in his presentation of the Act in Parliament:
By 1953 the Central State Department vigorously implemented single medium education, which was most prevalent in primary schools (Malherbe, 1977). November (1991) points out that by 1953 the unilingual language policy had spread throughout Bantu bilingual education and English (the medium of instruction) used most readily since the 1930s, was phased out by Afrikaans. On the 16th June 1976, the SOWETO (South West Township) revolt signified the beginning to the end of apartheid’s Afrikaans dominated schooling. The years of democracy could be seen over the horizon. Yet, after more than 50 years of education hegemony, the medium of instruction issue remains unresolved. Notwithstanding, attempts have been made to redesign and reorganize bilingual education in South Africa.

2.6 Years of Democracy: Bilingual education models between 1995 and 2006

Between 1995 and 2000, South African politicians were reshaping the political, economic and education landscape(s) (Alexander, 2000), while the world was watching. Tremendous changes were echoed in ‘policies of democracy’ and the Constitution became the general foundation for designing bilingual education and policies in South Africa. In other words, the general thinking post-1994 on bilingual education in South Africa had developed along the lines of the language provisions expressed in section 6 of the constitution.

2.6.1 National Additive Bilingualism: towards a language plan for South African education

From 1990 to the 1994 elections, a common question at the time was which bilingual education model would be most beneficial to South African learners, without excluding any of the 11 official languages. The first of a few bilingual education models to be suggested was the National Additive Bilingualism model designed by
Luckett (1995), who cited the low status of African languages afforded in the previous apartheid context as the impetus for her model.

Luckett’s design is a ‘historical-holistic model’ that responded to the shortcomings of the national language policy in an attempt to promote African languages and national access to these languages in higher status stylistic domains. It is also an attempt to change perceptions and views that create myths about the status of African languages. Moreover, this form of bilingual education is described in two ways: it is ‘National’, and the goals of the programme are ‘Additive Bilingualism’.

Firstly, the model according to Luckett covers the national education system ‘…because it is designed to apply to all South African pupils in a unitary South Africa’ (1995: 75). In other words, covering the national sphere includes all South African learners dependent on education bodies in “…implementing and resourcing regional policies which are adapted to the needs and languages of region in question but within the national framework” (Luckett, 1995: 75). Secondly, it is called Additive bilingualism because it aims at “…gaining of competence in a second language while the first language is maintained”, because, “additive bilingualism usually has a positive effect on a child’s social and cognitive development” (Luckett, 1995: 75), as opposed to subtractive bilingualism.

Drawing on the bilingualism (cognitive) theories of Cummins (2000), the CALP (cognitive/academic language proficiency) and BICS (basic interpersonal communication skills) levels of language learning, Luckett argues that it is important for individual bilingual learners to acquire not only BICS, but more importantly CALP, in their mother tongue and less importantly in the target language, expounding this through a summarised discussion of the findings of the Threshold Project (McDonald, 1990):
How then will the National Additive Bilingualism bilingual education model ensure that learners achieve CALP in both their first language and a target language? Can it prevent subtractive bilingualism situations? Luckett suggest that the programme will aim “…to avoid the pitfalls of subtractive bilingualism by ensuring that all pupils have the opportunity to learn to operate at cognitively-demanding levels in their first languages” (1995: 75). To be cautious, learners should not be forced to receive instruction through a second language before they have reached CALP in their first language (Luckett, 1995).

Luckett made no suggestion as to when in the curriculum learners should develop CALP in a second language, only that it has to happen in the first language first. When then must we introduce cognitively-demanding stimuli to develop a second language? This answer is given by Luckett through this narrow definition of bilingual education: “…bilingual education requires that both the dominant and the subordinated languages are used at some stages in the curriculum as media of instruction” (Luckett, 1995: 75). Here is a sheer lack of clarity as to when to introduce African languages as media of instruction within the curriculum: ‘at some stages’? Why dominant and the subordinate languages and not official or indigenous languages? Moreover, no suggestion is also made as to what impact this model may have on current existing models of bilingual education in South Africa.

Attempting to clearly spell out the National Additive Bilingualism model, Luckett proposed how it may be applied to a Zulu-speaking child (Thembi) living in Kwazulu-Natal. Thembi’s first language is Zulu, and in her pre-school years her Zulu speaking teachers ensures the full development of her first language. If her first language was not Zulu she could gradually be introduced to receptive skills
(listening, for example) in Zulu. In primary school Thembi starts to learn to read and write in Zulu. She is introduced to the world of mathematics in Zulu.

Luckett points out that if English was Thembi’s parents’ choice for a second language, then receptive skills should be developed. This is followed by a continued cognitive development in Zulu used as a medium of instruction for the full primary school stay. English is only introduced as a medium of instruction alongside Zulu depending on Thembi’s development in the language, but as an alternative according to Luckett. But for the majority of the time Thembi will learn English as a subject.

In secondary school Thembi now continues to develop in Zulu through cognitively-demanding tasks. Thus Zulu is both a subject and used as a medium of instruction simultaneously. Subsequently, Thembi starts developing cognitive academic skills in her second language, English. Luckett suggests that Thembi’s medium of instruction process in developing or fostering bilingualism may only be achieved if

All primary schools should offer at least three languages, one of which should be English (or another language of wider communication). Another should be the dominant regional language (where there is one) and the third language should be one that the parents of the school have chosen. The learning of a third language should be optional. And, secondary schools in South Africa…should offer at least four South African languages of which the learning of a third language as a subject should be strongly encouraged (1995: 76).

A number of reservations must be stated regarding this model. It is clear from the above quote that Luckett makes a number of inconsistent statements regarding the role of African languages compared to English. If English is one of the languages offered by primary schools and, as deemed by Luckett, a language of wider communication, then it may compete with the official medium of instruction, if it’s not English already. This may lead to the insistent devaluation in the status of African languages. In fact it does not help the cause of African languages at all.
Secondly, in no geographical region of South Africa is one to find one dominant regional language (compare here the argument of Banda, 2000, on the distribution of official languages). In the Western Cape alone Xhosa, Afrikaans and English could be considered equally dominant regional languages. Why do we insist that a third language should be optional? Why is the model named ‘National Additive Bilingualism’ when there is a strong emphasis on regional varieties? Moreover, why an insistence for additive bilingualism and not additive multilingualism? Additive multilingualism presupposes that more than two languages could be used as media of instruction (Auer and Wei, 2007).

The goals of the National Additive Bilingualism programme are to manage English hegemony. But in doing so, Luckett has underemphasised the lack of prestige African languages were being afforded during this transition period. Throughout primary and secondary schools, the goals of any bilingual education programmes should be clearly and intensely focused on. What happens after secondary (post-compulsory schooling and tertiary education) is entirely up to the individual. In this case Thembi, who would most likely end up choosing English as her preferred medium of instruction. According to Luckett’s prediction English will most likely be favoured over African languages as medium of instruction for years to come.

Every language has the capacity to be used as media of instruction in bilingual classrooms, to develop communication and academic skills in a particular language, for its target speakers. Luckett suggest that African languages are underdeveloped to achieve academic skills within learners of such languages. In effect, Luckett (1995: 77) questions the importance of African languages as languages of learning and teaching and the accessibility of content material: “As media of instruction, the African languages will need to be developed to carry cognitively-demanding content and concepts”; this applies only to second language classrooms.
The National Additive Bilingualism model proposed by Luckett (1995) has been designed in response to the changing political situation in South Africa. Luckett does not address the problem of the old dual-medium and parallel-medium forms of bilingual schooling, emphasising policy and language myth defects instead (amongst others). The path to designing this model should have been situated against the backdrop of the old models, because “the models of language learning in use at present and the languages of learning in the content subjects only serve to perpetuate the inequalities of the past” (Alexander, 1995: 79). What path then was taken to design a bilingual education model that attempts to exonerate the inequalities of the past?

2.6.2 The Multi-medium school model

Alexander states that PRAESA was busy with ‘an appropriate multilingual approach to education in South Africa’ (1995: 79), drawing on examples of bilingual education work achieved in India, Australia, California, Belgium and countries in Africa, to address the changing political situation in South Africa. The project’s goals were twofold:

…to provide a model or demonstration multilingual programme that will help students to develop and maintain their first language; content skills; and the skills needed for life in a multilingual democratic society…to establish a model or demonstration school (potentially in each province) in conjunction with a university-based centre for the training of educators (teachers, administrators, curriculum developers and ancillary school personnel) to provide quality comprehensive services in multilingual educational programmes. (Alexander, 1995a: 79)

I should state here that PRAESA has been a great force in researching bilingual education in the Western Cape. I should also state that although the countries in Africa are not named, South Africa’s sociolinguistic situation is diversely different to India, California, Australia, and Belgium. The researchers affiliated with this institution have inspired both support from the Western Cape Education Department (WCED) and academic opposition. Even so, Alexander (1995a) suggests three
bilingual education options that immediately become apparent for learners in South Africa: the multi-medium school model; learning through L1 only – a medium term model; and the immersion model.

The first bilingual education model or rather, ‘models of multilingual schooling’ proposals given by Alexander are ‘The multi-medium school model’. Originally presented at a symposium for teachers of Afrikaans hosted by the University of the Western Cape in 1990, shown in the table below, Alexander (1995a: 80) states that this model “…presupposes that, for many years (possibly for as long as two generations), there will be very strong economic and social pressure on non-English speakers in South Africa to target English as a language of learning for their children”. Therefore this model would be best for the elevation of African languages and enrichment as media of instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESCHOOL-RECEPTION YEAR</th>
<th>Spontaneous use of all language varieties present in the child’s environment. L1 should be emphasised but not forced.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>L1 across the curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L2 oral (mainly listening skills)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>L1 across the curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L2 oral (more emphasis on speaking skills, especially songs and rhymes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 3-4</td>
<td>L1 across the curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consolidation of L2 reading skills. Writing introduced gradually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>L1 across the curriculum except maths and science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maths and Science in L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L3 introduced with emphasis on oral skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 6-8</td>
<td>L1 and L2 as languages of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oral skills in L3 consolidated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>L1 and L2 as languages of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L3 formally introduced as a subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10 – 12</td>
<td>L1 and L2 as languages of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L3 as a subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 13</td>
<td>Preparation for tertiary education research and study skills in L1 and L2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi-medium school table adopted from Alexander (1995: 80)

Other presuppositions addressed by the Multi-medium school model, so to not ‘necessarily’ disadvantage learners in South Africa, refers to the hegemony of English that may force parents and students for straight-for-English model (s) or a form of subtractive/transitional bilingualism. By Alexander’s (1995a: 81) predictions, “…the existing lack of material and trained human resources in virtually all the African languages in South Africa will inevitably restrict the extent to which tuition
can be offered in those languages.” Moreover, “it might, for example, be more appropriate for a student to learn certain subjects through the medium of one language rather than another because the learning materials for that language are more competent (Alexander, 1995a: 81)”.

It is not clear what Alexander meant by ‘more competent’ learning materials. Nor does he expound on this notion. Nonetheless, the multi-medium model “…implies movement towards a situation where most, preferably all, teachers are at least comfortably bilingual, preferably” (Alexander, 1995a: 81). However, is being comfortable in the two languages that will be used as media of instruction by teachers enough? Teachers need to be proficient in both languages; otherwise they fail at their instructional practise (cf. Benson, 2004; Baker, 2007).

Considering the above table adopted from Alexander (1995: 80), we should consolidate the linguistic implications of the model and the goals of the multi-medium model. Compared to Luckett’s emphasis for introducing a second language for Thembi in the pre-school year, focussing on receptive skills, Alexander decided on the ‘usage of all language varieties present in the child’s environment’, to develop receptive skills. What if the child has more than four language varieties present in his or her environment? Clearly the linguistic implications of this model are misplaced.

2.6.3 L1 only: a medium term bilingual schooling model

This option that Alexander provides deals exclusively with L1 instruction. It rests on the idea that: “…complete proficiency in a second/target language is possible if that language is taught as a subject and never used as a language of learning (in other subjects); there need not be pressure on non-English-speaking children to have English as a language of learning in order to gain competence in the language” (Alexander, 1995: 81). Yet is it not precisely because a second/target language is
used as a medium of instruction that learners engage in highly cognitive-demanding tasks?

It is clear that Alexander muddled his definition of bilingualism in suggesting this model, adding to the difficulties of defining bilingualism in the South African context. We must consider pressure to be societal, in other words, pressure is decoded as attitudes strongly shaped by a school’s surrounding community, to the extent where the community is either for or against a target language (Baker, 2007). This is one of the crucial considerations for designing any bilingual education programme.

Compared to Luckett’s model and Alexander’s previous model discussed here, Alexander (1995: 81) also challenges the myth that ‘…English can only be achieved if it is used as a language of learning’, which is a colonial perception. The L1 model’s “…arrangement is congruent with additive bilingualism and since there are a number of different first languages which would be catered for, this will eventually constitute another multilingual option” (Alexander, 1995: 81). How does this option qualify as a multilingual option when only one language is earmarked as medium of instruction? How can this model be compatible with additive bilingualism when the emphasis for one language clearly would lead to monolingualism? This model is indefinable. The goals of the programme are not detailed enough. Predicting whether such a model would last in multilingual South Africa should and must be deemed futile, even if one’s predictions rest on the political developments of the country (Alexander, 1995).

The L1 model of Alexander in design (and if implemented) would surely classify as a weak bilingual model, because no mention is made of a second language that will be used as a medium of instruction. Moreover, it is clear that the model does not consider the components of strong bilingual models. Does designing a model where the subtle goal (s) is one language of instruction plus an additional subject in the curriculum, that actually culminates into successful bilingual education (or
schooling), in a country where 11 languages was made official? Is adding a language subject to a monolingual curriculum really bilingual education? Does this not lead to monolingualism?

2.6.4 The Immersion schooling model

As I have discussed in the above section on the international models, immersion became a popular choice in Canada (a Francophone country) and United States of America (USA) (an Anglophone country), particularly because of small pockets of minority speakers (non-dominant groups) that vied for Canadian and American citizenship (cf. Baker, 2007; Genesee, 1987; 1998; 2005). Today it is still an option (Genesee, 2005). Minority speakers acquire English or French.

Alexander’s Immersion schooling model is described to us in less than three paragraphs. It is a model of bilingual education aimed at immersing English and Afrikaans L1 speakers in African languages: “…L2 immersion in non-dominant languages is a real possibility for English- and Afrikaans-speaking children” (Alexander, 1995: 81). Furthermore, Alexander (1995: 82) asserted that it would be “…undesirable for children to be immersed in the pre- and junior primary schools, it is to be expected that those (probably middle class) parents of English- and Afrikaans-speaking children who choose this option will be prepared to let them be immersed from senior primary or junior secondary phase when they will have consolidated their L1.”

The Immersion model is dependent on a number of presuppositions rather than clearly defined goals. The researcher assumed at the time, because of a lack of well trained teachers to cover all subject areas, ‘adequate learning materials in Xhosa’ (Alexander, 1995: 82), ‘learners will have to use English or Afrikaans texts, in some cases parallel texts (Xhosa-English or Xhosa-Afrikaans)” (Alexander, 1995: 82). Yet, I find that the absence or omission of a clearly defined period of immersion to be a
serious scholastic error on the part of the researcher. The design is less than scientifically desirable and may lead to subtractive bilingualism, especially in the case where it is assumed that learners will use for the time being English or Afrikaans texts or parallel texts. This move away from what a bilingual education programme aims to do: to foster or develop bilingualism.

Using parallel texts as Alexander had so succinctly referred to, could be practising a form of immersion that does not fit into the strong forms of bilingual education category mentioned by Baker (see section 2.1). Allowing L1 English or Afrikaans learners to access texts in English or Afrikaans, because of the absence of well trained teachers and learning materials in Xhosa, could possibly move away from additive bilingualism. Why should we consider ‘The Immersion model’ when so little is said about it? If the model was designed for additive bilingualism then surely the researcher should have strategically captured possible forms to cover the sociolinguistic spectrum of South Africa. It is exactly because of too much crucial design, definable aims of the programme and considering of bilingualism dynamic omission(s) that this model will stay on the paper it was printed.

2.6.5 Dual-medium revisited: the multilingual school

The dual-medium revisited bilingual/multilingual education model offered here by Heugh, aims to suit schools who want to offer schooling through any two of the 11 official languages: either ‘Zulu-English’, ‘Sotho-Afrikaans’ or Venda-North Sotho’. In other words, according to Heugh, this approach constitutes that one official language and one ‘minority community/religious language’ be taken. What makes this version of dual-medium schooling unique from the ones practised between 1910 and 1994 is its multilingual approach adopted in line with the provisions of the constitution. Heugh (1995: 85) contends that this bilingual/multilingual model ‘… is not limited to two particular languages only’ and therefore, it should be possible to use a third language for instruction, even a fourth as an optional subject.
Heugh argues that the dual-medium model revisited challenges the hegemony, or rather, prevailing attitudes towards English (cf. Luckett, 1995; and Alexander, 1995; in this section). Because of this, she cautions teachers to be careful and flexible in deciding when and how to alternate between the languages used for instruction, to prevent code-switching. Indeed, code-switching is a recurring theme in strong forms of bilingual education, especially in dual language schools research. The prevention of it depends largely on the bilingual proficiency of the teachers.

One important factor for Heugh (1995: 87) is the recognition that “…students are inclined to ‘tune out’ when a lesson is laboriously translated from one language into another in a dual-medium classroom…especially so if the students’ writing skills in both languages are not required to be assessed”. However, the onus rest on the teacher to ascertain from students whether they understand the lesson content. Of course, being assessed on your writing skills requires a different competence compared to oral skills (Lindholm-Leary, 2001; see also Auer and Wei, 2007 on becoming bilingual).

Citing some findings of the Ramirez report on the traditional teacher-talk method and the duration of such talk in the USA, Heugh (1995: 87) argues that learners ‘tuning out’ should not be a factor in any appropriately-facilitated lesson’. But, is it not inextricably linked to appropriately-facilitated lessons? Students readily conform to the ‘interactional order’ (Martin-Jones, 2007) of the class and always have a vested interest to know, learn, and understand (Auer and Wei, 2007). Appropriately-facilitated lessons must predict that students tune out for effective classroom practise.

There seems to be, as with the models presented by Luckett (1995) and Alexander (1995), a contradiction in terms because it is unclear what Heugh really means with this dual-medium model. One cannot call a bilingual education model such as this one, dual-medium and then in the same title line, multilingual schooling. The
dynamics and implementation dimension of the dual-medium schooling, in the past, and those past models that are still in practise, had been designed to cater for two linguistic communities. The goals were achieved strategically not only in teaching strategy, but also all other dynamics involving individual differences in children, language distribution, and aims of the model. Compare this to the table given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESCHOOL-RECEPTION YEAR</th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
<th>Grades 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5-7</th>
<th>Grades 8</th>
<th>Grade 9-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L1 literacy established</td>
<td>L1 literacy established</td>
<td>L1 literacy reinforced; cognitive enrichment via L1</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L2 oral skills consolidated</td>
<td>L2 oral skills consolidated</td>
<td>L2 reading and writing introduced</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L3 oral skills introduced</td>
<td>L3 oral skills consolidated</td>
<td>L3 oral skills consolidated</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>L3 introduced formally, if not already</td>
<td>L3 reading and writing introduced, if not already done</td>
<td>L3 examinable subject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Although the table gives us a comprehensive understanding of the model, it does not clearly define itself within the framework of bilingual education (Baker, 2006; 2007). What is clear though, only two languages will be used for instruction, interchangeably, while a L3 will seemingly be added as a subject? If two languages are used according to earlier definitions of dual-medium schooling, then this model does not make provision for multilingual schooling. This is because the L3 is not used for instruction, nor does the model develop L2 skills or simulate cognitively-demanding contexts because the L2 literacy skills are delayed behind the L1 literacy skills.

This would mean there would be an unequal distribution in time and focus on language instruction, and students will not come to grips with L1 cognitively-
demanding classroom contexts, depending on whose L1 is taught. That could result in an unusual form of subtractive bilingualism!

Since the suggestions of these models coincided with the publication of the new language-education-policy of 1997, thinking about bilingual education in South Africa has changed marginally. Banda (2000: 52) has argued that ‘…any bilingual education programme in South Africa will have to take into consideration the distribution of languages’, as patterns of in-migration are reshaping linguistic landscapes, especially in the Western Cape, particularly in Cape Town.

The language-in-education policy of 1997 exemplifies the Constitution’s language provisions through its own expressions, provisions, and principles. Amongst others, one important principle of the language-in-education policy of 1997 is to “maintain home language(s) while providing access to and the effective acquisition of additional languages”. It discourages previously assimilative approaches to bilingual education but promotes an additive approach to bilingual or multilingual education. In effect, this approach advocates strong models of bilingual education that furthermore affords the individual the right to choose his/her language of learning and teaching (medium of instruction).

Despite these provisions, South African linguists emphasised the need for mother tongue education through what is now known in the local literature as Mother Tongue-Based Bilingual education (henceforth MTBE). Is this the attempt to rehabilitate the ‘mother tongue’ that Plüddemann (1997) was referring to?

2.6.6 Mother tongue-based bilingual education (MTBE) for South Africa

Bilingual education programmes designed to be placed within an MTBE bilingual framework, ‘…use the learner’s first, known as the L1, to teach beginning reading and writing skills along with academic content’ (Benson, 2004b: 2), where the L1 is
regarded as a reference to ‘any language in which school-aged children are competent’. According to Benson, in MTBE programmes a second language (L2) should be taught in a systematic way to allow learners to transfer skills between a L1 and L2.

Despite this, there are certain advantages tied to MTBE programmes: early literacy development in the mother tongue; content teaching in the L1 facilitates transfer to a L2; orals skills are developed of a L2; linguistic and cognitive transfer; assessment of language skills will be more effective; psycho-social characteristics will increase for the better; and bilingual and biliterate learners are produced through MTBE programmes.

MTBE programmes are thoughtfully designed to combat a number of challenges: historical precedents; compensation schemes to address the status of previously marginalised language groups; challenge old ideologies of language to generate new ideologies ‘for revalorization of indigenous knowledge now known as the African Renaissance’ (Benson, 2004b), or otherwise generate ideologies imbued with official languages status development; and to develop educational objectives.

Implementing MTBE is a huge logistical challenge (Benson, 2004b). Some of these challenges are typical of any bilingual education programme, as was detailed in the discussion of the previous models, and as I have pointed out, Baker prefers to call them crucial components that need careful consideration. It is the goal of MTBE to: combat poverty and develop human resources (teachers); develop higher degree programmes, communications and L1 vocabulary for pedagogic purposes as in-service training for teachers, and postgraduate training; develop materials (bilingual materials that is), language policy development; and the allocation of the material resources for better quality education (Heugh, 2005).
According to Benson (2004b:13), MTBE programmes increase students’ self-worth and moves them to greater classroom participation. Students discover a newfound self-respect in their L1, supported by their peers. Parents increasingly participate in these programmes and there is renewed gender based independence by girls.

Alexander (2002a: 7; cf. Alexander, 2003) has argued that since the publication of language-in-education policy of 1997, the dilemma of bilingual education may only be solved through the rehabilitation of the mother tongue by means of Mother tongue-based bilingual education programmes. He maintains that:

The actual variant decided upon would have to be determined by the concrete situation seen in terms of teachers’ competence, availability of books and other educational resources as well as by language attitudes and the overall linguistic environment. Whichever variant is adopted after careful consideration of all the relevant factors, the essential point, as is emphasised by the central Department of Education of South Africa, is to maintain the mother tongue throughout the educational career of the child or the learner. This should mean that it should be used as the LOLT as far as possible and, where it is not possible to do so, it be offered as a subject at the L1-level.

From being at the cross-roads of discussing bilingual education models, to the ‘no alternative approach’ adopted here by Alexander, he has taken the bilingual education debate to an inroad leading back to the cross-roads. The phobia of have to maintain the mother tongue has not only been expressed by Alexander in previous models as discussed above, but again asserted in the above quote. Nonetheless, it begs the question, if it is a MTBE imperative, how do we then proceed to implement MTBE in the South African education context?

Heugh’s multifarious monolingual orientated typologies attempt to answer, following the idea that teacher supply and shortages are a strong indicator of bilingual education worsening in South Africa: “The SAIRR [South African Institute of Race Relations] identifies an immediate shortage of between 4 000 and 12 000 teachers of mathematics and science, while 25% of maths and science teachers are under-qualified…[and]…only 1% of students in townships passed maths and science in
their school leaving certificate examination in 2000 is undoubtedly partly accounted for by an undersupply of teachers in these subject areas (SAIRR, 2001: 275; cited by Heugh, 2005: 138).

Time allocation for INSET (teacher in-service training) in accommodation of all 11 official languages in Heugh’s view, has suffered severe negligence much because the national Department of Education (DoE) has invested the majority of their energy into a ‘cascade model’, which subsumes the idea that advisors will help teachers in the classrooms to implement or effect major changes. However, the DoE reserves the right to insist that from a monitory viewpoint “…the language policy supportive of multilingualism, mother tongue education (MTE) and bilingual/dual-medium forms of education, is too expensive for the country to bear.” (Heugh, 2005: 139) In response to this the following mother tongue-based bilingual education models are proposed in Heugh (2005) (see table below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario 1a</th>
<th>Scenario 1b</th>
<th>Scenario 2a</th>
<th>Scenario 2b</th>
<th>Scenario 3</th>
<th>Scenario 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English mainstream plus ESL pull-out</td>
<td>English mainstream plus ESL content</td>
<td>L1 for 2-3 years then switch to ESL</td>
<td>L1 for 2-3 years then ESL</td>
<td>L1 for 6 years then ESL</td>
<td>Dual-medium (L1 plus L2 throughout)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision</td>
<td>3000+ teachers 1, 8m hrs</td>
<td>3000+ teachers 1,8m hrs</td>
<td>INSET 266 000 teachers 46,6m hrs</td>
<td>INSET 266 000 teachers; additional 30 000 teachers 44,6m hrs</td>
<td>INSET 266 000 teachers; 36,6m hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESET Provision</td>
<td>ESL pullout specialization</td>
<td>ESL content specialisation</td>
<td>ESL proficiency (minimum 100 hours per trainee)</td>
<td>ESL content teachers training; ESL proficiency training (minimum 100 hours per trainee)</td>
<td>ESL proficiency. For 50-100% of trainees who will use ESL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reorganisation of curriculum for teachers will reduce costs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ESL proficiency for 50% teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional costs for:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Return on Investment</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table adapted from Heugh (2005: 153)

The first mother tongue-based bilingual education model proposed here by Heugh, scenario 1a, can be used, and according her (2005: 42), “is used, for speakers of African languages (AL) who attend former ex-HoA, ex-HoR or ex-HoD English
medium schools for first language speakers of English”. These English medium schools, where AL speakers attend, amount only to 6-7 percent. The Afrikaans medium schools for L1 speakers of Afrikaans, where AL speakers attend, amount to 18 percent. However, speakers of AL tend towards the English medium schools. This changes the linguistic demographic of the school and so to address the situation:

The English medium schools, and also formerly Afrikaans-medium schools which have introduced English medium streams because of the changing linguistic profile of students, currently apply the ESL–pullout system to address the ‘language problem’ (Plüddemann et al., 2000)…more obviously apparent in the Western Cape Province and Gauteng than any other province… and tend to be in the urban-metropolitan centres and comprise no more than 25% of the schools of the country (Heugh, 2005: 143).

To improve learners’ academic achievement and English language proficiency, Heugh suggests that provision needs to be made for teachers who do their INSET in ESL pullout classes: in other words, training and resourcing in schools with ESL pullout classes. As part of their INSET training teachers need to be enriched with the dimension of bilingualism theory, especially bilingual acquisition theory and pedagogical issues pertaining to acquiring two languages across the curriculum (Heugh, 2005: 145). This model, according Heugh’s predictions, will have low investment returns because of the nature of ESL pullout classes, compared to Scenario 1b where the focus would be on ESL content.

Scenario 1b’s aims insist on ESL content teaching for African language speakers enrolled at English medium schools for English L1 speakers. Heugh acknowledges that this approach has been adopted by schools in the USA and Britain, but in few South African schools, because it is “…partly a function of teacher training programmes which have been slow to accommodate explicit language learning needs of linguistically diverse students in formerly mainly English and Afrikaans medium schools” (Heugh, 2005: 145). Furthermore,

…should mother tongue medium education (MTE) be restricted to the Foundation Phase (Grade 1-3) for most students, then our levels of achievement are more likely to match the mainstream school results of the majority of African countries where
the switch to English, French or Portuguese medium takes place by the fourth year of school (2005: 146).

In this case Scenario 2a should be used. However, if the DoE insists on proceeding with this bilingual education form, Heugh suggests that one extra school year be added to improve L2 speakers of English against L1 speakers of English, in not only the language subject area but content subjects as well, a mass movement towards INSET for 262 500 teachers of the country of which 66 000 would be required ‘to improve the teaching of L1 literacy in the Foundation phase’.

According to Scenario 2b, learners will not need to do an additional year of schooling, because this model requires 66 000 additional teachers for INSET for L1 literacy improvement in the Foundation Phase; additional time is of crucial concern for the effectiveness of this model; ESL training across all learning areas; and 200 hours of ESL training for those teachers in content learning areas. Scenario 3 aims to develop learners’ L1 as a medium of instruction up until Grade 6, and possibly to Grade 7, for at least 50 percent of the school day between Grades 4-7 (Heugh, 2005: 150). By Heugh’s estimation learners should have attained a 50 percent plus English proficiency by the time they start the Grade 10 year.

To improve academic achievement and English language proficiency, the number of repeaters and drop-outs would considerably decrease, as well as the number of learners who require an additional year of schooling. However, to achieve the ends of this mother tongue-based bilingual programme, 66 000 teachers in the Foundation Phase, would require INSET to improve L1 literacy. Furthermore, to manage the teaching of subjects and/or content through Grade 4 to 7, Heugh states that 50 000 teachers will need to be required to go through 100 hours of L1 INSET.

40 hours should be invested in INSET ‘...to articulate language learning with curriculum and concerns of content teachers’ (Heugh, 2005: 151). Before teachers begin their career, Heugh states that they do 200 hours of ESL training if they are to
teach English, as a requirement. The end result, teachers must then be able to manage
to increase student performance: “students should achieve 50% for English at the end
of Grade 12 and a higher percentage of students would be able to achieve success in
mathematics and science” (Heugh, 2005: 150).

Scenario 4 commences with L1 teaching in the foundation phase. Subsequently,
dual-medium teaching starts from Grades 4-7 with the L2 used in the following
forms: by Heugh’s time estimation, the L2 must be used 20 percent in Grade 4; 30
percent in Grade 5; 40 percent in Grade 6; and 50 percent in Grades 7-12. Subjects
should be shared across the curriculum in a L1 and L2 (Heugh, 2005: 151).

To improve the academic achievement of learners and English language proficiency,
Heugh (2005: 151) suggests that the implementation of this model requires that
66 000 teachers must go through INSET to improve L1 literacy in the Foundation
phase. An additional 100 000 teachers must go through INSET to teach subject or/and
content areas for about 100 hours as well as their English language proficiency,
which would require an additional 200 hours. Furthermore, 40 hours should be
invested in INSET for language teachers in ‘how to articulate language learning with
curriculum and concerns of content teachers’ (Heugh, 2005: 151).

As with all the previous models, it stands out that the presenters of the above model
have failed to capture the importance of second language instruction in furthering
bilingualism. There seems to be a monolingual bias at best and, at worst, a
contradiction in terms where it concerns Mother tongue-based bilingual education.
Recall that our previous distinction of bilingual education was the use of two
languages as language of instruction: TWO! Insisting on mother tongue-based
bilingual education in addition of another language subject to the curriculum, is NOT
bilingual education. Are we reverting to unilingual forms of bilingual schooling, i.e.
weak forms? Heugh might have come close with Scenario 4, but it is not clear
whether the L2 will be added as a language subject or used as a medium of
instruct. If MTBE leads to implementation, the linguistic effects might be irreversible.


A lot has been said about the concept bilingualism, bilingual education in the international literature, and the bilingualism debate in South Africa. All that has been said about dual-medium and parallel-medium in the past and the redesign proposed here by Heugh (1995), has lead some researchers to conclude that presently dual-medium and parallel-medium instruction schools are diverting from the official form of practice (Plüddemann et al, 2004a) in Cape Town, Western Cape.

2.7 Dual-medium and parallel-medium research in Cape Town, Western Cape

The few research studies that have had some success in examining the application of dual-medium and parallel-medium models of bilingual education were achieved largely by PRAESA researchers. In fact, those responsible have come to define or rather conceptualise dual-medium and parallel-medium schooling in Cape Town, Western Cape. In Plüddemann and Mbude (2002), current difficulties with implementing dual-medium, for instance, is highlighted: shortage of human resources, changing linguistic classroom compositions, and a host of material
resource matters, supported by a pilot study of Mbude-Shale, Wababa and Plüddemann (2004b).

In Plüddemann et al (2004a), it is argued that ‘language shift’ in the greater Western Cape has had a significant impact on Cape Town schools, who now offer English-medium schooling where previously they had not, because of parental demand agitating the implementation of dual-medium and parallel-medium by default and not design. The dual-medium and parallel-medium project of Plüddemann et al (2004a) points towards the lack of ‘co-ordination and direction’ from education stakeholders, as the project findings seem to suggest. Resulting in a misinterpretation of not only the language-in-education policy of 1997, what dual-medium and parallel-medium schooling and instruction should actually be, but also bilingualism and pedagogical implications.

The researchers’ (re-)conception of dual-medium and parallel-medium, firstly, fits their particular inquiry suggested by quantitative methods, which, secondly, is firmly anchored in those ones referred to in Heugh (1995) and Malherbe (1977; 1947). In other words,

Dual-medium education is understood to mean the systematic use of two languages for teaching, learning and assessment, both orally and in writing; learners thus experience the curriculum through the medium of two languages.” And, “…parallel-medium education is meant the use of two LoLTs in parallel (usually single-language or unilingual) streams in the same schools; that is to say, learners experience non-language areas of the curriculum through the medium of one language only. (Plüddemann et al, 2004a)

However, the definitions of dual-medium schooling in particular differ with respect to the projects’ inquiry: no real conceptual care is taken in defining the concept in Mbude-Shale, Wababa, and Plüddemann (2004), compared to Plüddemann et al (2004a). If lack of coordination is anything to go by, it would seem that there is misconstrued arguments for dual-medium and parallel-medium practice that interject into Mother tongue-based bilingual education (MTBE), which, as I have previously
argued, is a contradiction in terms (see Mati, 2003; for similar misconstructions). In other words, so long as learners study their mother tongue, they may experience the curriculum through any amount of languages.

Although LiEP 1997 promotes additive bilingual education, unawareness of policy compared to practice deducted from the schools visited in Plüddemann’s (2004a) project, is of serious concern. Even the distance between the implementation of the new curriculum and LiEP 1997 was apparent (Plüddemann et al., 2004a). The researcher postulates that in the short and long term ‘strong leadership on the part of the Department at provincial, district, and circuit levels’ (2004a: 40), will be needed. Moreover, leadership needs to also trickle down to grassroots level (learners and their parents), where support for LiEP’s additive bilingualism promotion must be realised to remedy instructional problems. However, Banda (2000: 58-9) postulates that ‘…the problem does not appear so much with the medium of instruction, as with classroom practice’.

2.8 Theoretical and Analytical Implications

Both the international literature and the local South African literature task bilingual education schools with developing bilingual ‘language proficiency’, in that a student’s L2 must be developed at no cost to the L1 – i.e., additive bilingualism. Schools must prevent subtractive bilingual situations which typically occur in bilingual classrooms (Cummins, 2000). The models reviewed in the international literature provide us with a necessary guideline to strong bilingual education forms where two languages are used as media of instruction. Most of the models presented in the South African literature are not a true presentation of strong bilingual typologies. For this reason, this study advocates definitions of strong bilingual education models: the use of two languages as media of instruction (Beardsmore, 1993; Baker, 2007; Martin-Jones, 2007). It will also be used to evaluate and analyse the current models of language teaching to promote dual-medium and parallel-
medium instruction at selected schools and the extent to which these models promote multiliteracy.

2.9 Conclusion

This literature review chapter has been divided into four main parts that gave an overview of the concept bilingualism, discussing bilingual education typologies as suggested by the seminal works of Beardsmore (1982; 1993) and Baker (1993; 1995; 2000; 2006; 2007), the bilingualism debate in South Africa, and the theoretical implications. As has been suggested by the literature, in the next chapter the methodological framework will be built on data collection tools for qualitative research in understanding of dual-medium and parallel-medium models’ classroom practice, supported by the understanding of principals and teachers at selected schools.
Chapter 3

Research Methodology

3.0 Introduction

The following chapter outlines the research methodology used in this study. The chapter offers a discussion on the research methods used to collect the data, the research site and sampling procedures, and the research techniques used to interpret the data.

3.1 Research method

According to Leedy (1993), qualitative research data occurs mostly in the spoken mode, through documenting physical interactions of humans in various spaces of communicative events. The collection of such data is justified on the grounds that researchers are particularly interested in empirical events (Nunan, 1992) which are descriptive, analytic and interpretive. As far as my study is concerned, it is descriptive because it describes (pre-)existing events, conditions and processes as they happen.

This study is qualitative in nature because it is concerned with respondents’ understanding of dual-medium and parallel-medium in practice. In qualitative research, the collection of the following types of data is permissible: classroom observation transcripts and document analysis (in the case of this study, consisting of classroom lesson materials, photographs of literacy artefacts), and interview transcripts. Furthermore, the triangulation technique was used to authenticate the findings.

As a consequence of the above, classroom observations, document analyses and interviews were used to investigate the application of dual-medium and parallel-medium models of bilingual education at the two participating schools as practised in
Grade 7 classrooms. These techniques will help establish what teaching models are in place at the selected schools. I used the techniques to establish which factors affect successful practice of the dual-medium and parallel-medium models and whether, if at all, dual-medium and parallel-medium classroom practice at selected schools promote multiliteracy.

3.2 Research Techniques

3.2.1 Classroom observation

Theoretically, classroom observation has a two-pronged focus: the teaching of content by the teacher and the learning of such content by learners in a class, while interaction occurs between the teacher and the learner. The type of classroom observation used in this study was the Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT) scheme as described by Nunan (1992: 96). A scheme most commonly used in the early 1970s for documenting classroom interaction, Nunan explains COLT assist trained researchers to gather reliable observation data by using more than one ‘rater or observer’.

The COLT scheme consists of two parts: part A and B. The part A is concerned with documenting activity types, participation organisation, content, student modality and materials used as part of classroom activities. Part B is much concerned with documenting the use of classroom language, or rather communication dimensions of the classroom: use of target language, information gap and sustained speech, incorporation of preceding utterance, discourse initiation, and relative restriction of linguistic form (see Nunan, 1992: 99).

Part A of the COLT scheme was used because it related closely to this study in the following ways: Practically, after interviewing principals, permission was requested to do observations of lessons in Grade 7 classrooms. After receiving consent, a small
notebook was used to write down observations. Only later, pending the teachers’ interviews and approval was it necessary to bring in a video camera and a secondary rater to record classroom activities. While recording, observation notes were made in the notebook. Furthermore, classroom observations occurred between and after the teacher interviews.

### 3.2.1.1 Classroom observation questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>Participation Organization</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Student modality</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the activity type – e.g. drill, role play, dictation?</td>
<td>Is the teacher working with the whole class or not?</td>
<td>Is the focus on classroom management, language (form, function, discourse, sociolinguistic), or other?</td>
<td>Are students involved in listening, speaking, reading, writing, or combinations of these?</td>
<td>What types of materials are used? How long is the text?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are students working in groups or individually?</td>
<td>Is the range of topics broad or narrow?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What is the source/purpose of the materials?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If group, how is it organised?</td>
<td>Who selects the topic: teacher, students or both?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How controlled is their use?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table adopted from Nunan (1992: 99)

### 3.2.2 Document Analyses

Another research tool, which I thought to be necessary, was examination of various materials and documents. A careful study was made of all classroom lesson materials and other documents (photos of literacy artefacts, i.e., pictures of previous lessons on the walls of the classrooms, newspapers and prescribed textbook readings; and classroom lesson transcripts), to triangulate the data from documents with literature review, interviews, and classroom observation findings. The aim was also to identify whether these documents support literacy development within the scheme of dual-medium and parallel-medium schooling or instruction, and to determine whether the
documents make any notable contributions to the development of language proficiency of learners in the Grade 7 classrooms.

3.2.3 Interviews as a research technique

Gathering interviewing data happens through verbal interaction between the interviewer and interviewee. The exchange between the interviewer and interviewee is face to face and the interviewee is regarded as the data source for the interviewer (TerreBlanche and Durrheim, 2002). It is a form that allows us to understand a fellow practitioner, peer or person. Furthermore, the interview has limitations but provides interesting, important and precise information (details) of an interviewee, something that a questionnaire cannot achieve (Leedy, 1993). According to TerreBlanche and Durrheim (2002: 128), ‘conducting an interview is a more natural form of interacting with people than to make them fill in a questionnaire’.

Interviews consist of a variety of forms, from formal to informal. In TerreBlanche and Durrheim (2002) it is said that interviews can be unstructured, semi-structured and structured. Structured interviews are carried out when the interviewer comes with questions that have been pre-formulated. Unstructured interviews, in contrast, allow an interviewee to respond in his/her own time and with more variety. The style of a semi-structured interview is informal.

3.2.3.1 Procedure and Sampling of Interviewees

The first process followed was to formulate possible interview questions. Later these questions were refined, revised and readiness for interviewing checked. All the questions that were formulated fall within the semi-structured interview type. This interview type was chosen because my respondents needed to feel the freedom to respond in their own time. The rationale behind this was to allow them to express their perceptions, gather thoughts and provide or reflect on ideas timeously. To allow
them to practise the necessary power of control over the interview in case the researcher impeded on the interviewing process.

To collect this data, my study was carried out in full-time Grade 7 classes at School A primary and School B primary in Cape Town, Western Cape. These schools were chosen for the following reasons. The similarity between School A primary and School B primary is that both schools are located in working class communities; are classified by the National Education department as historically disadvantaged schools, and both rigorously implement the new Curriculum 2005 or OBE (Outcomes-based Education). The difference between the two schools is that both are surrounded by linguistically homogenous communities. At the time of data collection, the learners in the Grade 7 classroom at the respective schools were all between 12 and 13 years old.

Both principals were interviewed. I also gave them written permission/approval from the Western Cape Education Department (WCED) to negotiate the research of this study. I chose the principals because they were experienced and shared a willingness to be interviewed. In other words, the ‘purposive’ sampling was followed:

In purposive sampling the researcher handpicks the cases to be included in his sample on the basis of his judgement of their typicality. In this way he builds up a sample that is satisfactory to his specific needs.” (Cohen and Manion, 1989: 103)

The principals were interviewed one at a time. In other words, face to face, person-to-person. They (the principals) were allowed to state their beliefs and ideas, as well as their concerns regarding instructional and schooling practises directly and indirectly related to dual-medium and parallel-medium schooling, and instructional practises at the Grade 7 level.

Before the start of the interviews, the purpose of the study was explained to the interviewees. This was done to dispel any fears of critique as normally invoked by
appraisers and inspectors involved in the educational processes and to win them over for participation in this study, and willingness to support any requests by me during the data collection process.

With permission from my interviewees, a tape recorder was used to record their answers, which was transcribed immediately thereafter. The interviews with the principals helped me to find out how much principals were informed about the design and implementation of dual-medium and parallel-medium schooling. By transcribing the interviews, further investigation into the principals’ views on the models was made possible. Regarding the questions for the principals, fourteen set interview questions were formulated, followed by additional follow-up questions that depended on the type of responses.

In comparison, four Grade 7 teachers were interviewed from the two primary schools respectively. The teachers individually have over 20 years of teaching experience. These Grade 7 teachers were chosen to be interviewed because they were not only experienced, but willing as well. Moreover, I want to point out, they are responsible for instructional practises and establishing pedagogical relationships between their learners.

The process followed to interview the teachers were conducted much the same with the principals, one person at a time. However, because of daily time constraints, the interviews took place in the teachers’ classrooms. In comparison to the principals’ interviews, the teachers were given greater freedom to state their beliefs and ideas, as well as their concerns regarding instructional and schooling practises directly and indirectly related to dual-medium and parallel-medium schooling, and instructional practises at the Grade 7 level. Teachers were also allowed greater power and control during the interview.
The purpose of the study was not explained by the researcher to the teachers, because the principals took the liberty to do so on his behalf. As a consequence, great difficulty was encountered to dispel fears of possible critique and this lead most of the teachers to assume that this study formed part of the educational processes that so readily investigate their teaching practices. Therefore, to win them over for participation in this study, and willingness to support any requests by me during the data collection process, the study was reemphasised countless, and the purpose and possible benefits of this study explained before requesting an interview with a Grade 7 teacher.

Nonetheless, four teachers in the end granted permission and their answers were recorded with a tape recorder, which was followed by immediate transcribing. Interviewing the teachers assisted me in discovering not only how much they were informed on matters of bilingual education models, but also on the curriculum process regarding the development of the learners in their classrooms. By transcribing the interviews, further study into the teachers’ perceptions on the instructional practices, and medium of instruction and other related issues, was made possible. The interview questions for the teachers consisted of fourteen questions.

3.3 Research Limitations

This study has limitations. The data collected at the two schools are not representative of all the schools in Cape Town, Western Cape. Questionnaires were not used in my study and therefore the techniques chosen for data collection may not have been enough.

3.4 Ethics

Permission was requested from the Western Cape Education Department (WCED) as authorisation to do research at the schools, and consequently provided to the
principals. The participation of the various parties involved was optional and accepted by means of free consent, sought in written form, and translated into the respondents’ respective first languages: English, Afrikaans and Xhosa.

3.5 Conclusion

Chapter 3 has outlined the research methods used for this study. These methods discussed were interviews, classroom observations and document analyses respectively. The sampling and selection procedures have also been discussed. The following chapter presents the findings and a discussion of the data.
Chapter 4

Findings and Discussion

4.0 Introduction

In this chapter the findings and discussion are presented. The first section is a brief discussion of the sociolinguistic situation of the selected schools. In section two, the findings of the observation data are discussed and triangulated with the findings of the document analyses and interviews. Section three is a discussion of principals and teachers understanding of dual-medium and parallel-medium instruction schooling. Baker’s (2007) and Martin-Jones’s (2007) definitions of bilingual education models, that is, the use of two languages as media of instruction, was used to explore the application of dual-medium and parallel-medium instruction in classroom discourse in the selected schools.

4.1 Setting the scene: the sociolinguistic context of School A versus School B

As a point of departure, a short comparative overview of the sociolinguistic contexts of School A and B will be given. This information is gleaned from observations I made on the school grounds and outside the surrounding communities.

School A is a public school and is situated between four (‘coloured’) working class communities (Elsies River, Matroosfontein, Clarke Estate and Lavistown) and an informal settlement, Malawi kamp (camp). A historically disadvantaged primary school, more than three languages are spoken as a first language by School A’s registered learners: viz, Afrikaans, English, Xhosa and Zulu. The learners come from homes with diverse cultural backgrounds, different religious affiliations and dissimilar economic circumstances.

The school boasts a rich multilingual environment where learners of different cultural backgrounds are registered. Outside the classroom, learners communicate with each
other at different times in different languages. In other words, they sometimes speak in English, Afrikaans and other times in Xhosa or Zulu, or a mixture of all these languages, during lunch time, playing together in groups that are not restricted to race or cultural background. While the Afrikaans L1 speaking learners often keep to their own groups, this however does not last as they make friends with Xhosa, Zulu and English learners.

In comparison, the sociolinguistic context of School B is remarkably different. Situated in Langa Township, the school is a public, historically disadvantaged primary school that has registered learners from the surrounding community of Bonteheuwel, and township communities of Nyanga, Gugulethu, and Khayelitsha. Learners from Bonteheuwel community speak Afrikaans as a L1 and English as a L2, while learners from Langa, Nyanga, Gugulethu and Khayelitsha speak Xhosa or/and Zulu as a L1 and English as a L2.

Langa community is largely trilingual in the sense that the use of Xhosa, Zulu and English features prominently in many domains. English and Xhosa are used at shops, taxi ranks and with public officials of the municipality. Therefore it is assumed that a learner who attends School B, or is enrolled by their parents at the school, is bilingual and possibly multilingual.

4.2 Classroom practise 1: parallel-medium instruction

If bilingual education means the use of two languages as media of instruction (Baker, 2007; Martin-Jones, 2007), learners are exposed not only to the cognitive benefits of such instruction, but culturally and socially engaged with learners who speak a different language, a target language (also used as a medium of instruction). In such classrooms, learners use an ‘other’ language which forms part of their bilingual repertoire, but is also a language of resource. It benefits them in a number of ways: (1) they are able to utilise embedded specialised vocabulary in their first language,
and (2) expand their bilingual abilities in the development of a target language. Thus, being in a bilingual instruction system benefits the bilingual learner.

Learning through a bilingual system provides opportunities for developing bilingualism and reduce or do away with monolingualism (Hovens, 2003). However, the onus rests on language and content teachers to ensure learners reap the full benefits of implemented bilingual education models to participate in their respective linguistic communities or societies. At school level, managers or principals of schools that implement a bilingual model are responsible to utilise every human and material resource to accomplish the successful application of such models. Unfortunately, in countries where movement towards monolingualism is the norm and bilingualism loosely the exception, monolingual teaching systems will dominate as de facto ill-conceived, ill-understood bilingual education systems (Beardsmore, 2003).

Bilingual learners who are swept into such monolingual classrooms are neither provided with opportunities to utilise their bilingual abilities, nor are they allowed to expand on previous specialised vocabulary for instance (see Hadi-Tabassum, 2006). Such learners are truly disadvantaged and disempowered (Cummins, 2000) and suffer serious withdrawal symptoms caused by monolingual teaching models.

Monolingual teaching systems do not promise bilingualism (Hall and Eggington, 2000). Teachers and principals in monolingual teaching systems are not encumbered with human and material resource(s) difficulties, nor are they overwhelmed with bilingual learners in such classrooms, as the prevalent belief is monolingualism and monoliteracy is the goal.

In intensive observation of the application of parallel-medium instruction at School A, and in the attempt to establish whether parallel-medium as currently practised, represent bilingual education, it was discovered the model in design, and how it was implemented, left far much to be desired. During the initial stages of parallel-medium
classroom observation, evidence of bilingual practice was, on the surface, viewed as common communication practice between teachers and learners. However, with time the application of the model revealed bilingual learners are swept into monolingual language teaching models and simultaneously disempowered. As a result, this practice restricted learners to regressive monoliterate teaching practices that restrict to utilise only one language.

As mentioned above, in this section I will discuss some of the findings with respect to classroom observations and document analyses of parallel-medium classrooms. Two objectives will be achieved: (1) we will explore how parallel-medium teaching and learning models are currently practised in Grade 7 classrooms at School A and conclude whether it is a monolingual or bilingual education model; and (2) explore whether parallel-medium instruction promotes multiliteracy.

Initially the principals and teachers all mentioned the success of the parallel-medium model in practice at School A. The reason they cited, was the ‘varied’ use of two languages as media of instruction. They argued that learners are given numerous opportunities to advance in the medium of instruction used towards ‘bilingualism’. They praised the model because the school has a library that paves an easy way towards bilingualism. However, as will be discussed below, because two languages are used in a school does not necessarily ensure learners actually learn through two languages, neither does it mean to be bilingual education (Baker, 2007).

In a parallel-medium instruction system, learners are taught through the medium of one language in separate classrooms, but they also enjoy a language subject. In other words, at School A, learners’ were taught through different monolinguual streams: there was an Afrikaans language of learning and teaching stream and an English language of learning stream. At no point were learners combined in classrooms to be taught content through two languages and at no point were they allowed to converse through two languages with the teacher about classroom content, or with each other,
except outside the classroom during lunch breaks. If they did, it was because of either teacher absenteeism or to observe other learners doing curriculum work.

In my observation of many parallel-medium classroom instruction events, Afrikaans learners in the Afrikaans medium stream were normally taught, for instance, History or Geography by the same teacher separately, but by the same teacher who teaches the English learners in the English medium stream. Though content was taught through the medium of one language only, at no point during the observation of the application of the model did learners experience both History or Geography lessons in Afrikaans and English simultaneously.

In the extract given below, a Geography lesson, for instance, the above arguments are apparent. The Geography classroom illustrated clearly how separate English and Afrikaans lessons were taught along two distinct streams. This lesson was in English.

1. T: ...huge amounts of food and cereal, there is also poultry and cattle. Rich countries also use huge amounts of energy, one American uses as much energy for industry, heating and transport as 53 people in India, 48 in Mali or 1072 people in Nepal, Nepal is a very poor country here on the foot of the Himalayas Mountains...but they are very poor so if you compare the poor south they are in the poor south with those in the rich north, u can rarely see there is a comparison when it comes to food and energy resources. Ok here’s a map that shows you the distribution of the world’s population, remember the dots, one dot represents ten million people so you don’t have many dots in many of the continents, just look at that distribution, where do you find most of your dots? In which continent?
2. : In Asia.
3. T: Ok there is two dots in Asia which are countries are they.
4. L: China and India.
5. T: China and India good, so how many did you get that Damian?
6. L: (answer inaudible)
7. T: yes but how did you identify the countries.
8. L: (inaudible) borderline.
9. T: Can’t hear?
10. L: Borderline.
11. T: The borderline ok. Bradley?
12. L: The people crowding up.
13. T: Right but I want to know how you identified the two countries.
15. T: The dots yes, how about the shape = =
16. L: = and the size.
17. T: Ok good. Now you see the Islands there above the Pacific Ocean.

The above teacher, who one may complement for her use of the English language, rigorously teaches learners to appreciate the curriculum through both understanding and using the language in the classroom. She does not code-switch nor does she commit to learners using any other language but English. In so doing, she restricts bilingual learners to the use of English when questions are posed and when they are required to form opinions about a particular geographic theme.

In this classroom English/Afrikaans, Afrikaans/English and Xhosa/English bilingual learners were present. This linguistic classroom setup however did not persuade the teacher to allow learners to utilise Afrikaans and Xhosa to answer questions or formulate opinions.

Banda (2006) suggests that one way bilingual learners practise their bilinguality is to prepare their answers and even do group discussion in, say Xhosa or Afrikaans, and then translate their responses into English for the benefit of the teacher and school’s policy on LOLT (language of learning and teaching). As will be evident below, the design of the parallel medium model restricts and even discourages such bilingual practice.

When learners discussed anything in a language other than in English, they did it without the teacher’s consent. They understood perfectly that they had to ask questions and answers in English. It is not surprising that many of the learners, when it came to discussing the lesson or lesson task in their various groups, did not speak in English. They either spoke in Afrikaans or Xhosa, because many of them could
converse in those languages more easily, but at the same used English for communication to a much lesser degree.

Under normal circumstances, English is meant to be the medium of instruction for English first language learners. However, studies have shown that South African parents prefer English medium of instruction for their children whatever their first language (cf. Banda 2000, De Klerk 2002). The problem, however, is that even where there is evidence that learners are in fact bilingual, as was the case in the class under discussion, the teacher mostly ignored the bilinguality of learners in the classroom.

Learners learned through one language and no other language was utilised to discuss lesson content. The teacher made sure that no other language would intrude on how lesson content was learned because she contained a focussed use of English throughout the lesson, even when she disseminated the lesson task:

28. LS: 10 million.
29. T: 10 million of them. B) Which continent is most populated? C) Name two countries in this continent that have a lot of people. D) Name the continent that has the smallest population? E) Which part of the world uses the most resources, the Rich north or the poor south? These are very easy questions but are you going to use this map to identify the countries, you can take your geography book, today’s date is the 11th, write that and next to it you write population (inaudible) please do this…
30. LS: (inaudible – chatting)
31. T: The average death rate was 9 to 1000 people so…was 13 the worlds average population changed to 13 per 1000 people, this change was…positive, the population change as a result of the difference in birth and death, geographers to as a natural increase and decrease. Here we have a table about the natural increase or decrease of the population, the table below shows the birth rate statistics for 2001 of 6 countries, will these statistics still be the same today.
32. LS: No Miss.
33. T: Why not?
34. L: People die, get babies.
35. T: … and its how much years down the line?
36. L: Four years.
37. T: Four years, so what has happened to the population?
38. L: (inaudible answer).
39. T: It has changed. The demography has changed; here is a table for the natural rate of change for different countries. We have Thailand. Where is Thailand?
40. L: Asia.
41. T: What do you connect to Thailand?
42. LS: The Tsunami!
43. T: The Tsunami yes…because Thailand is a very popular holiday resort. France?

The bilingual learners in this classroom had not gained anything from monolingual classroom practice, as they were constrained to use only one of the languages which form part of their linguistic repertoire.

This monolingual teaching approach, observed in the above Grade 7 English parallel-medium classroom, not only showed learner disempowerment, but also manifested drawbacks experienced by those learners who are bilingual. I observed that they often found it difficult to work in groups with learners who speak English fluently.

The school’s monolingual outlook can be seen that some learners are blamed for coming from homes where English was not spoken as the first language. For instance, one teacher pointed out those struggling with English are “…from Langa and Gugulethu, [where] there are language problems, language problems …” (T2XB). Clearly, the teacher has failed to deal with bilingual learners and blames them for his own inability to deal with such learners.

Group work is an essential part of Curriculum 2005. Learners have to consolidate all their efforts to create synergy in groups and as a result have to muster every leadership and social ability they have acquired over the years. This includes languages. In other words, it is through group work that learners can converse freely and use their full range of linguistic repertoire for enhanced multiliteracy and multilingual knowledge (cf. Banda 2003). In the next lesson documented learners were supposed to work in groups, but because of language restrictions, group work was not very successful. The goal of the lesson was for learners to answer nine
Afrikaans sentences from which nine prepositions were left out, as shown on the working page below:

Parallel-medium instruction as classroom practice restricts learners from accessing their knowledge of prepositions which they have in English. In the picture, the top bold sentences give a definition of the Afrikaans preposition and what it does within a sentence. The Afrikaans prepositions serve the same purpose as prepositions in the English language. In a sense, learners could compare this functional category they have learned to the ones they already possess in English. However, the aim of parallel-medium instruction required the teacher to teach through Afrikaans, because
it was an Afrikaans lesson and learners had to learn by asking questions in Afrikaans and formulating answers in Afrikaans.

The teacher also used English and Afrikaans haphazardly and confused the learners in the process. When learners did not respond in Afrikaans, the teacher would express indignation for learners that they have to answer in Afrikaans because they are learning through Afrikaans. This was particularly evident at the start of the lesson.

1. T: Why are you so quiet?
2. [Mumbled responses from learners]
3. T: Now sit down. Um, die voorsetsel, kinders luister mooi. Het julle almal hierdie voorsetsel voltooi? [Um, the preposition, children listen carefully. Did you all complete this preposition exercise?]
4. LS: NO.
5. T: Nee Meneer!!!! [No Sir!!!]
6. LS: Ja Meneer. Nommers een, [inaudible] [Yes Sir. Number one]
7. [Teacher puts pupil out of class]

Compared to the previous teacher, this teacher explicitly makes it known to learners that they have to respond in Afrikaans otherwise they are reprimanded. If we study this extract closely, on the surface, it seems unfair for the teacher to preface to learners that it is fine to use English, which forms part of their Afrikaans/English or Afrikaans/English/Xhosa repertoire, while at the same time restricting them to using Afrikaans only for all knowledge because it is the language of learning and teaching. Clearly, this contradiction could explain the learners not responding as expected.

Unfortunately, the teacher in this classroom set a model of language use that only Afrikaans is supposed to be used as a source of knowledge throughout the lesson. The teacher ensured learners used Afrikaans only, but in doing so he himself did not realise the propensity of learners to use both English and Afrikaans to help them to answer the questions that he had posed. Although he did not give permission for such a manner of participation, it surely would not have estranged learners in using Afrikaans.
The monolingual orientation engrained in the parallel medium model means that the teacher is often unable to deal effectively when two linguistic systems available to the learners are at odds, as the following extract suggests. Instead of dealing with the problem, the teacher keeps on repeating “he is under the wrong impression” (see line 3 below). Secondly, he fails to help the learner who confuses the English ‘goods’ with the Afrikaans “goedere”. Therefore, chances are that the learner will make the same mistake again as the teacher has failed to use the two languages to explain the problem.

1. T: Nommer agt, Learner 0 [Pointing to one of the learners]. Learner 0!!! Learner 0. Learner 10, gee vir my die antwoord. Hy het nie eens sy bladsy voor hom nie. [Number eight, Learner 0 (Pointing to one of the learners). Learner 0!!! Learner 0. Learner 10, give me the answer. He doesn’t even have his page with him.]

2. L: Dit is hiereso. [I do have it.] 


4. T: Die deure, lees daai woord...wat is die woord? Die goedere. Nie die goe-deure nie. Nie goedere!!! [The doors, read the word...what is the word? The goods. It’s not the do-or. No door!!!]

5. LS: Goedere. [Goods]

6. T: Goedere. [Goods]

7. LS: Goedere. [Goods]

This study is not concerned with the cognitive and phonological and phonetic interfaces of bilingual learners, but in passing, most likely lines 4 to 7 speak volumes of how these bilingual learners seem to grapple with monolingual content. We could assume that these bilingual learners are searching for the correct phonetic expressions via either English or the varieties of Afrikaans they are able to command. We could also assume that, because their ability in standard Afrikaans is not that well
developed, they are struggling with ‘white’ Afrikaans. As a result, they confuse the word *Good* plus –*s* with *Goed* (-ere).

Compared with the previous Geography lesson where English was strictly used for discussing content, asking questions, and giving answers by the teacher, the Afrikaans lesson is also of a monolingual orientation. Surely, what has been discussed above cannot lead to additive bilingualism in learners; it certainly seems to be moving in the direction of subtractive bilingualism.

Thus far, the argument is that the design of parallel-medium instruction leads towards monolingual rather than bilingual development of learners. In a sense, to use the metaphor, when parallel lines are drawn they cannot meet. In other words, in parallel-medium streams English and Afrikaans are taught separately, which means learners in the two streams do not meet in a classroom to be taught through two languages.

It is evident that, because one language is used as a language of learning and teaching parallel-medium instruction as implemented in the above classrooms reflects a largely monolingual language education model. However, there are times when teachers are forced to abandon their monolingual parallel-medium teaching to offer a semblance of a bilingual model. To validate these arguments, we look at one such case where, what should have been a parallel medium mathematics classroom, the teacher distributed a test to learners with instructions in both Afrikaans and English:
What we can make of this piece of text is that the teacher took it upon himself to cater for learners’ bilingual abilities to do mathematics in both English and Afrikaans. In a sense, he realised the importance of tapping into the untapped language reserve of the learners in developing mathematics (bi-) literacy. At least that was the assumption of his teaching model. However, in his explanations he opted for English and neglected to also address the class in Afrikaans (which was not necessary but it would have been good bilingual education practice given the bilingual text):
1. T: Okay, it is nought comma four, right? Nought comma four. **Maak hom reg, nig**ie. *(Make it right, girlie)* [Inaudible] Nought comma four, Okay? Right. It’s like a crossword puzzle. It’s like a crossword puzzle. No calculators!! No calculators…You don’t even touch a calculator! Right. Once you’re finished with that over there, the next one [inaudible] also no calculators…decimal, your multiply decimal. Half decimal places, hey? Right, okay.

2. [Hands out papers to learners]

3. T: Everyone ready? Okay, start quarter past nine. About quarter to nine I’ll make a turn here. All right, start. On your own.

4. [Learners start with test]

5. [Teacher enters after leaving class unattended]

6. T: Deduce on a page but no calculators. [Inaudible because of background noise] Good, excellent. So tomorrow [Inaudible]. Okay, right. Those pages just pass those pages to the front. The name is written on the pages.

7. LS: Yes sir.

In the end, the teacher practises what the design of parallel-medium requires him to do: to teach in one language. The introduction of dual language texts seems to suggest his attempt to accommodate the bilingual learners in his class, while the model entails the use of one language only. It defeats the purpose then of having dual language texts when in the end you revert to a monolingual form of teaching.

To provide further evidence of the effects of the parallel-medium design, we will consider another parallel-medium classroom.

Like their English bilingual peers, Afrikaans bilingual learners also experience stringent monolingual language instruction practices at the school. There is usually a misconception that teaching a language as a subject makes the programme bilingual. In this regard, the misconception is that since English is taught as a subject in Afrikaans parallel medium programmes; this makes the design bilingual. Research and literature does not support this. Teaching a language as a subject and the other as a medium of instruction does not constitute bilingual teaching (Banda, 2000; Battens-Beardsmore 1993; Martin-Jones 2007). Where a language is taught as a subject,
learners are not expected to engage with the language at a high cognitive level, and in most cases learners learn enough for basic communication. This is clearly the case in the extract below in the Grade 7 English additional language class, in the Afrikaans parallel-medium instruction stream, where the lesson moves from basic interpersonal communication (lines 9-22) to basic vocabulary development (lines 23-25).

Lesson extract:

9. (incoherent)
10. T: Did you hear what she said?
11. LS: No Miss!
12. L: (incoherent)
13. T: Ok, yes?
14. L: (incoherent).
15. T: Anybody else, what do you think?
16. L: (incoherent).
17. T: Learner 03, what do you think?
18. L: The children are talking?
19. T: The children are talking. Do you think he wants (inaudible)? Do you think he’s shy?
20. L: He’s shy.
21. T: How do you think he really feels, how is the boy standing alone with them? Wait – Wait, don’t shout it out, you know what you want to say.
22. L: He doesn’t know them.
23. T: He doesn’t know them, ok.
24. L: He feels rejected.
25. T: He feels rejected, nice word, rejected, can you give me another word for rejected, and how would you feel if something rejects you, another word?

As one would expect, and in spite of managers’ sentiments, parallel-medium instruction cannot promote multiliteracy as it is premised on a monolingual approach. Therefore, as one would expect, the classroom at School A had English newspaper clippings for the English stream, and Afrikaans clippings for the Afrikaans stream; at no point were they used concurrently.

Many classrooms at School A were filled with readings ranging from newspapers (*The Argus*, *Cape Times*, and *Die Burger*), extra readings with pictures, didactic prescribed textbooks with colourful illustrations, and so forth. The snapshot taken (see below) resembles a bunch of unused newspapers piled up by the teacher every day.
Parallel-medium programmes in design and practice, as illustrated above, are in no way near developing bilingualism or promote multiliteracy. In spite of what seems evidence of unused multilingual reading materials (in the snapshot) the evidence is clearly defines that the elementary teaching of language as a subject as illustrated above suggests learners in parallel-medium streams would be able unable to engage with such material at high cognitive academic levels. This would only be possible in a well constituted bilingual education practice.

To summarise, I want to argue that parallel-medium models consist of two single medium “schools” built on one schools grounds and learners do not receive their LOLT in two languages. Learners attend different streams and do not really meet, except outside the classrooms where they enjoy each others’ company during lunch breaks, before and after school, and to converse in the language(s) they are able to.

In any case, the model, as it is practised by School A does what it was designed for: to teach learners in parallel-medium streams separately in one language. However,
teaching a language as a subject does not constitute a bilingual programme. Therefore, parallel-medium models are unlikely to develop multilingual skills or multiliteracy practices in learners.

4.3 Classroom practise 2: dual-medium instruction

Dual-medium bilingual education models are one of few typologies that ensure learners are exposed to the cognitive benefits of bilingualism (Baker, 2007; Cummins 2000). In such classrooms, learners benefit from cultural and social interaction with other bilingual learners. At the same time readily access the linguistic resources of a target language, because of the way it is used for instruction. These are but some of the principles and aims of dual-medium instruction.

Dual-medium instruction offers the best route to bilingualism for learners (Hadi-Tabassum, 2007; Leary-Lindholm, 2001). The reasons for this are well-documented in the literature: (1) learners who find themselves in such classrooms are able to access specialised vocabulary in their first language; and (2) they can expand on their bilingual abilities in the acquisition of a target language (Garcia and Baker, 2007).

In the Western Cape, dual-medium instruction is the preferred model of bilingual education for schools (Heugh, 1995c; 2003; 2005; Alexander, 1995b, Plüddemann, 1997), because two languages of learning and teaching (LoLTs) are used. It is a bilingual education model implemented in systematic ways (Plüddemann and Mbude, 2002). Thus two languages may either be used subsequently for the explicating of lesson content in one lesson on different days, or used interchangeably during different weeks (Cenoz and Genesee, 1998).

The basic bilingual development creed of dual-medium instruction rests not only on teachers’ ability to implement the model successfully, but to also capture the attention
of learners through bilingual communication. But, this must be achieved by adhering to the design of the model.

Dual-medium teaching is impervious to monolingual teaching (Byram, 1993). Many researchers commend this model for its success with regards to challenging and managing monolingualism. Yet, it is language and content teachers who are responsible for maintaining this success. Moreover, dual-medium by design requires teachers to ensure their learners reap the full benefits of bilingual teaching in practice. But, teachers must also empower learners to fully participate in their respective societies.

Regrettably, in schools and classrooms where dual-medium instruction is confused with code-switching learners lose out on bilingualism benefits (Baker, 2000). According to Beardsmore (1993a), a large majority of teachers who taught within this typology, had thought many times that they were doing dual-medium instruction, but in actual fact they were just code-switching to get through curriculum content.

Throughout the literature on dual-medium instruction, language researchers argue that teachers who find themselves teaching bilingual learners through such a bilingual education system must, refrain from code-switching practices between the two languages used for instruction. If they do, then it is a reflection of their competence not only in those languages, but also whether they understand what the model is meant to be doing (Leary-Lindholm, 2001).

In my observations of Grade 7 dual-medium classrooms at School B, I discovered that dual-medium instruction was confused by teachers to mean code-switching. At the beginning of observing the classrooms, I assumed teachers were aware of the forms of dual-medium instruction in the local and international literature. However, as will be discussed below, later intensive observations revealed that that was not the case, because teachers themselves were confused by what it means to teach two
languages systematically. In other words, what it meant to implement dual-medium instruction.

In this section of the chapter, I will discuss the findings of observations and document analyses of dual-medium classrooms. We will explore how dual-medium teaching and learning models are currently practiced in Grade 7 dual-medium classrooms at School B through a discussion of three such classrooms. Thereafter we will conclude whether the application of the model is bilingual education and if the model promotes multiliteracy.

Implementing dual-medium instruction means a number of things for bilingual learners learning through such a bilingual education system. They are taught through the medium of two languages and they enjoy in addition a language subject. At School B, learners in dual-medium classrooms were made up of different dual LoLT combinations. In other words, there are Xhosa/English dual-medium classrooms and English/Afrikaans dual-medium classrooms.

These combinations were done to accommodate Afrikaans L1, English L1 and Xhosa L1 learners in and surrounding communities outside Langa Township. However, with this combination came much confusion and discrepancies regarding the daily implementation of the model.

First, Xhosa L1 learners, for instance were taught through Xhosa and English (LoLTs) in their language classrooms, and likewise in content learning areas. English learners were not swept into this dual language combination.

Second, the Afrikaans L1 learners, the few learners registered at School B, were taught through English and Afrikaans. But, I will argue below, because these learners were swept into the English/Afrikaans dual LoLT combination (because of their
small number), immersing learners into dual-medium classrooms cause instructional disadvantages (Genesee, 2006; Cummins, 2001).

Third, English L1 learners were taught through English and Afrikaans, compared to the immersion of Afrikaans L1 learners; the Xhosa L1 learners suffered the same result in their commodification of English as an additional language (Heller and Martin-Jones, 2001; Heller, 2007). Thus, all these learners met in many of the Grade 7 classrooms, causing frequent language contact, notwithstanding the frequent language contact times during lunch breaks at their school.

These varied combinations, the principal motivated, were in response to coloured learners registering at the school. This did not manifest properly with respect to teachers implementing the model, because the observation findings suggested they themselves were confused with this type of dual LoLT setup. On the one hand, some of the teachers seemed to have coped with the Afrikaans and Xhosa bilingual learners being immersed into their classrooms, but only because they believed those learners had to be integrated irrespective whatever bilingual education model was implemented.

Krashen (1999; 1996) argues that not understanding what a bilingual education model aims to achieve, and for which language group it caters, opens up to overwhelming confusion by the very proponents responsible for implementing the model. I discovered teachers at School B suffered from this very misunderstanding, because in the classrooms the design of dual-medium instruction was not applied at all: instead of doing dual-medium instruction, teachers just code-switched between two languages.

On the other hand, Martin-Jones (2007: 165) distinguishes that in the past dual-medium programmes were in past literature separated by the language separation approach versus the concurrent language approach: “In the former approach, the
languages used...were confined to different days or to different areas of the curriculum. In the latter, both languages were used by teachers and learners in all activities of the programme and code-switching was, thus, a salient feature of classroom interaction.”

Dual-medium in design does not cater for code-switching practice. Yet in spite of this, I found in practice dual-medium classrooms exhibited concurrent approaches of dual-medium instruction, as pointed out by Martin-Jones, was prevalent at School B. Code-switching was the most salient feature of teaching content.

In a dual-medium classroom, which was a Xhosa/English dual LoLT setup, the teacher not once attempted to do dual-medium instruction. Instead, as the extract below shows, to explain content and interact with learners, the teacher code-switched between Xhosa and English.

1. T: Tigers, okay guys. Now are you ready to report. Are you ready to report? (1) Iphi into enibhale kuyo. (2) He bethuna, kutheni nizakunika umntu ocareless? (3) Usiscriber? (Where is the paper you wrote on? Why do you give it to the careless person? Are you the scriber?) Are you ready to report, mh? Are you ready, are you ready, are you ready, okay right. Any group can come first. So when you report you must tell us the group name and the leader’s, the members of the group okay and if your group does not listen it means the leader again loses a point, ileader (the leader) okay you may wait, wait, wait. It means (4) kwimarks zenu unemark yereporter, unemark yescrisber. (5) Unemark yantoni? (6) Yeleader so ileader number one, scriber number one, reporter number one ndizakutshekishasha bona ngoku iimarks zabo. (7) Kwimarks endizakuninika into enibhale apha kuyo izakudibana neyereporter yenu so lento izareportwa nini izakudibana kwimarks zenu okay. (8) So, if ileader iyafelisha zona iimarks zento eyiyo zezakho. (9) So, qiniseka (ngento yakho). (On your marks you will have a reporter mark, scriber mark. Which mark do you have? Leader mark so the leader, I will check their marks now. On the marks I will give you will include your reporters mark. The thing you will report will be included on your marks. The leader fails the marks will still be yours. Be sure (with your thing).

2. T: Okay, carry on.

3. (Noise)
4. T: (10) Sisi asoze kaloku niyambona mos nhe ziimarks zenu ke eziya akazokuxelelwa ndim ba makakhwaze worse ureportela iclass and if uthethela phantsi abazokukwazi ukumamela. *(Sister, you’ll never you see him neh that is your marks. I am not the one to tell she must speak loud words. She is reporting for the class and if she is speaking softly they can’t listen.)*

5. L: Group one, name Meet Zephyr, scribe one (inaudible) Sisipho, scribe two Yard, leader one Market Alley, leader two (inaudible), reporter one (inaudible), reporter two (inaudible).

6. T: What is the topic of?

7. L: (inaudible)

8. T: The topic is = =

9. L: = = The topic is matter and measurement. When we measure, the list of things that we = =

The teacher above first attributes two sentences to English and then switches to Xhosa for a continuous number of lines. This switch does not happen gradually, or systematically, but rapidly and haphazardly. Moreover, the switch to English after a few lines happens without any signpost given by the teacher, which eventually confuses learners. This is particularly evident with regards to Xhosa. Only 10 lines are attributed to use of Xhosa, mostly to admonish learners, while clearly English is used for talking about content.

In this dual-medium classroom the teacher did not start with dual-medium Xhosa/English instruction. The teacher code-switched between the two languages to reach an explanation for learners and at the same time assumed the bilingual learners in the classroom would understand. However, code-switching, like the teacher has started at the beginning of her lesson, is not dual-medium instruction. I point this out because English, which is the target language for Xhosa L1 learners, does not help learners to decide the important aspects of the target language.

If we want to ensure that bilingual learners reap the full benefits of a dual-medium bilingual education system, both languages need to be used and promoted as media of instruction in all learning areas (Baker, 2000). Unfortunately, the teacher in the above dual-medium classroom does not understand the design of dual-medium instruction,
because she code-switches between Xhosa and English, which reflects her confusion on how to do dual-medium instruction. Evidently she is either not fully competent or fully confident in one of the LoLTs.

Beardsmore (1993) argued that in relation to the design and application of the trilingual model in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, teachers are first language speakers of two languages used for instruction and competent in a third one (also used as a medium of instruction). Furthermore, teachers who display high levels of competency during instruction, become role models to their learners, because they (the teachers) emulate perfect language models (Banda, 2000). The argument here is that, irrespective of what bilingual education model is designed, eventually when it is ready for implementation teachers not only have to be first language speakers of the languages used as media of instruction, but competent in the teaching of those languages.

When this is achieved, those teachers will understand their role as implementer of a bilingual education model and not change direction away from the design of the model when implementation is required. But of course, we discover here the teacher above did exactly the opposite.

Whether the teacher mentioned above is competent in English or not may be another argument taken up later, but, as the below extract shows, she does not understand the application of dual-medium instruction which evidently means strictly code-switching. Of course by code-switching between English and Xhosa as it is done here, the lesson for the learners are half fulfilled: a greater understanding of what needs to be done is lost.

10. T: Okay, okay, what you must do neh. The list of things that we compare, and then your name them. Siyavana? (Do you agree?)
11. L: Yes miss.
12. T: Don’t (name) all of them at the same time. The list of things we compare, store. You must know that the list of things that we compare (1) zezi nezi nezi (are these, and that) that we store (2) uzipize, that we build uzipize so that sizo understanda ukuba nithini. (3) Okay, niyandiva nhe? (You call them, you call them, we will understand what are said. Do you hear me?)


14. L: The list of things that we compare store, closed space, (inaudible) house mount (inaudible) hot, cold (inaudible) how we would = =

15. T: = = How we would measure?

16. L: How we would measure these things from the tape measure, cm centimetre?

17. T: How we would measure these things? U (4) (a) wethu needs ilento lunits of lento istandard (Our (a) this is the units and the standard) units of measurement. What are the standards units of measurement mh?

18. L: Centimetres.

19. T: Centimetres, kilometres, millimetres (5) okokuqala ndifuna ukuyazi ukuba nizakusebenzisa eziphi istandard units of measurement nhe and then u (b), number (b) which instruments, so xa uyuze icentimetres which instruments would you use when you measure icentimetres, iyavakal? Okay, thank you, give her a round of applause saph ‘iphepha. (Firstly, I want to know which standards units you are going to use and when you used centimetres, centimetres, do you understand? Give me the paper.)

20. [Pupil clapping hands]

The teacher realises that learners are not getting the full instructions which she gave in English and Xhosa. By this understanding, we cannot blame the bilingual learners, who are themselves making sense of the teacher’s haphazard language teaching model. The above abstract offers us further evidence of the teacher abruptly abandoning code-switching between English and Xhosa. But again, this action of the teacher reflects her confusion in how to apply dual-medium instruction. I also want to argue that the teacher has herself only to blame for learners being confused (see for instance line 11 and 18).

D’Oliveira (2003) recently argued that many aspects for realising multilingualism in South African schools directly relates to teachers and their understanding of language policy issues, to help them understand what it means to teach more than one LoLT. I want to add that such an understanding enriches the application of bilingual education models, because having extensive knowledge of these issues separate teachers in
those schools who struggle with implementation, from those in schools who succeed with minimum difficulty.

The observation findings thus far seem to suggest that teachers are struggling with the application of dual-medium instruction, because they confuse it to mean code-switching. This I attribute to the language teaching model the teachers chose to use, which is not dual-medium instruction. If the teacher was aware of how she confused code-switched between English and Xhosa, I see no reason why she could not have changed her way of teaching. However, one cannot decide to change in the middle of a lesson to conform to dual-medium instruction, after having already code-switched between the two languages.

The teacher had no intention of doing dual-medium instruction. It was clear to me the teacher assumed, for instance, because learners were Xhosa L1 speakers, they would benefit from prolonged instruction in Xhosa. As the extract below illustrates, by that time learners were so confused as to what to do they were not paying any attention to what the teacher was saying.

89. L: Xolo Miss uSugar la Miss, (1) uyadlala kamamelanga. (Sorry Miss, Sugar is kidding he is not listening.)
90. T: (2) O uSugar seyasibonisa into kuba yena nguye ozakudubaduba iSouth Africa njengokuba sifuna iSouth Africa eright wean Siyabulela uzagakuba yilampuku emaniluma abantu emilwenzeni, ndiyakucela ke siyevana, masingakathazi. Usually they use (3) inantsi kakhona iimpuku ekuthwa ziiguineua piga, ndenz ‘umzekelo ndathi mhlawumbi masithi bazakufaka icancer apha kwezimpuku bathathe impuke emnymama bathathe in\mpuku emhlophe. Ziimpuku zaselab, laboratory nhe so into abazakuyenza bazakuzifaka icancer zoyitwo and then bathathe imeasurement yeeyeza idrug ethile endingazoyazi ba andiyoscientist bayifake kulentansika kufuneka bamejari she basifa yona elikangale kule nhe safaka masithi i-injection safaka kanga idose kwezimpuku zoyitwo and then bazakuzinika a specific time bathi okay after a month sizakujonga ba kwezimpuku le siyifake icancer cells ingaba iyeza kuyo lizakusebenza kangakanani mhlawumbi yilimnyama yona, le imhlophe uyauninonder so benza ntoni ngoku , benza ntoni? (4) Bayathini? (Oh, Sugar is showing us that he is the one who will mess up South Africa while we
want a right South Africa. He will be like that rat who bites people on legs. Please, do we agree? We must bother. Usually they use this there is rats called guinea pigs. I’m making an example; maybe let’s say they are spreading cancer in these rats taking a black rat, taking white rats also. Let’s say these are lab rats, laboratory rats what are they going to do, and they will infect cancer on both and then take measurement of medicine, a special drug. I don’t know I’m not a scientist inserting it on that they to measure, injecting medicine with such amount let say injection, overdosing on these rats they and then they will give a specific time saying a month. We will see on these rats on the one injected with cancer cells how the medicine will work, how much maybe is the black, and white do you understand? So, what are they doing now, what are they doing?)

91. L: (5) Bayacomperisha. (They are comparing)

92. T: (6) Bayacomperisha siyavana ke xa becomperisha abazovela bathathe ikomityi yeyeza bayigalele apha kulempuku bathathe iteaspoon balifake apha. (7) Ingaba kukuvomperisha lo nto? (They are comparing do we agree that when comparing they don’t take medicine cups pouring rats taking teaspoon inserting it on. Is that comparing?)

In this dual-medium classroom, Xhosa and English should have been used equally and systematically to properly reflect the application of dual-medium instruction. In not doing so, the Xhosa/English bilingual learners have not benefited from the code-switching language teaching model of the teacher.

Because the teacher confused dual-medium instruction to mean just code-switching between English and Xhosa, the Xhosa L1 learners are being deprived of a number of bilingualism benefits: (1) while English is a target language for the learners in the classroom, the language teaching model of the teacher in no way allows them proper access to the linguistic resource of the language (presenting topics in English by constructing a discourse of speech or reporting back in the language); and (2) the productive skills of bilingualism (Baker, 2006) are subdued for the target language, which, at the Grade 7 classroom level, help learners little with producing good to excellent academic work required by the teacher.

Dual-medium instruction in design does not work when teachers just code-switch between two languages haphazardly (Lindholm, 1990). I am not implying that the
Lindholm (1992) postulates that the pedagogical implications of doing code-switching is so adverse that if teachers were to gauge whether learners understood lesson content, more instruction and learning confusion would arise. Recently Leary-Lindholm (2001) has not swayed from this argument, but argues that it seems teachers understanding of the design of dual-medium instruction in relation to the application of the model, seems to be worsening. Although the researcher mainly works in the USA, I want to argue here that in relation to what we have been discussing so far, clearly one cannot expect these bilingual learners to have acquired any substantial knowledge in English or made any significant development in Xhosa if teachers in our schools confuse the model to mean just code-switching.

Martin-Jones (2007: 165) states that “…a language separation approach in a bilingual education programme provides a better guarantee that equal time will be assigned to both the languages”. Such an approach is dual-medium instruction and what the teacher above should have used to guide her language teaching model. The language separation approach ensures the success of dual-medium instruction, not code-switching. Language separation does not imply separate language streams or different language(s) for different learners, as in the parallel-medium model already discussed above, but ensuring the languages concerned are used equitably as LsoLT (Languages of Learning and Teaching) for the same learners.

In honour of Beardsmore and the seminal writings he produced towards bilingualism and bilingual education, Dawaele, Housen, and Wei (2003) imply that the greatest harm a misapplied bilingual education model could cause is serious regression of bilingualism: i.e., subtractive bilingualism. At the Grade 7 level this may actually be the case, because learners are unable to access the linguistic resources of the target
languages. We can only blame the teacher for not doing what the design of dual-medium instruction requires.

Although this study has not focussed on the application of dual-medium instruction in the lower grades at the school, if similar code-switching practices were prevalent across all grades, then subtractive bilingualism could well be a reality. This was especially prevalent, as I will discuss in observation of the other two dual-medium classrooms. In these classrooms Afrikaans and Xhosa L1 learners were immersed; teachers were even more confused about how to do dual-medium instruction. This confusion was agitated by the presence of those learners.

In observation of the other two dual-medium classrooms, the teachers were confronted with a number of linguistic challenges. They had to deal with two and three groups of bilingual learners respectively. In the first dual-medium classroom discussed below (Afrikaans L1) I will illustrate how learners were taught through English and Afrikaans, alongside English L1. English was the target language for the former group.

Thereafter, I shall discuss a dual-medium classroom where Xhosa L1 learners were taught through English and Afrikaans with L1 speakers of those languages. Despite the teachers’ postulations, evidently, English was the target language. However, I argue that both Afrikaans and English could have been the target, because the learners are in Grade 7 classrooms, not only speak both languages, but could access the linguistic resources of Afrikaans and English. This stated, irrespective of the teachers language teaching model. In reality, the only problem should have been how to incorporate Xhosa into a multilingual programme, where Coloured learners and teachers do not speak the language.

Nunan and Lam (1998) postulate that teachers working in multilingual contexts, in multilingual classrooms, are challenged to accommodate every learner in their
classrooms with respect to cultural and linguistic resources the learners bring to the classroom. Likewise, Benson (2004a) argues that as a result, teachers often have to take on many roles. They not only have to be the teacher, but sometimes they have to mediate communication between those learners who speak a different language against official mediums of instruction, sometimes act as social workers, et cetera. On the other hand, Banda (2006; 2000) adds with respect to the implementation of bilingual education models, this taking on extra roles and accommodating learners’ means little if teachers cannot speak a learner’s language.

The observations revealed that teacher competence in the languages of learning and teaching to be crucial for the successful implementation of dual-medium instruction. Many of the Grade 7 teachers at School B were unable to maintain good to excellent communication with learners, because of their lack of competence in one or the other language. This is because of the language teaching models they chose to utilise for disseminating lesson content. In the below given extract, the teacher tried to do dual-medium instruction by teaching learners English/Afrikaans Economics, but before doing so, he told me he preferred teaching the lessons in English rather than in Afrikaans.

1. T: We’re waiting for you to settle down! We are still waiting for you to settle down… Just for your benefit, De Wet seven A is sitting on this side of the room, De Wet seven B, the Afrikaans class they’re sitting on this side of the room (right side). Okay! Remember we spoke about 4 factors of production sometime last week and I gave the work to you. Will you stop that chatting!!! Just stop. Right, there are 4 factors of production, (1) vier faktore van produksie [four factors of production]. Now remember we said the word “production” means to produce something. But to do – in order to do that, there are certain things that plays a role in order to produce a certain item. Okay, object or whatever the case may be. (A learner says there are 7, not 4 factors) (2) Nou daar is sekere faktore wat ‘n rol speel. [Right, there are seven factors that play a role.] What are the first there are four? What is the first one? Labour, right? The factor of labour, wat behels arbeid? (3) Wat is die arbeid waarvan ons praat? [What is the labour we are talking about?]
2. T: Soil, oil, coal. These are all things that (inaudible) so that is...we call ‘Natural Resources’. That’s natural resources, (4) natuurlike hulpbronne [natural resources]. (5) Dit kry ons van die natuur [This we get from nature]. (6) Wat is die derde faktor? [What is the third factor?] What is the third factor?

3. English Ls: Capital.

4. T: (7) Kapitaal. [Capital] (8) Vir die kant van die klas...se vir my...waar moet kapitaal of wat is kapitaal? [For this side of the class...tell me...what to do with capital or what is capital?] (English learners shout the answer). Shh, don’t shout. Wat is kapitaal? [What is capital?]

5. [No response from Afrikaans section]

6. T: (9) Die kant van die klas. (10) Wat is kapitaal? (11) Jy moet nie rond kyk nie, kyk vir my!! (12) Wat is kapitaal? [This side of the class. What is capital? You must not look around, look at me!!] [No response from Afrikaans section]

This teacher physically separated the Afrikaans L1 learners from the English L1 learners in the classroom. In so doing, he thought he was managing and teaching the learners about the concept of capital by using Afrikaans and English equally. Clearly this was not the case because dual-medium instruction was not achieved.

Initially I expected this teacher would actually adhere to using both languages in a systematic way because of the nature of the subject. In other words, in content classrooms bilingual learners not only enjoy the benefit of receiving and producing lessons in another language, but they get to expand on whatever knowledge they previously acquired about the subject. However, this was made impossible because the teacher never expanded on such knowledge, because he code-switched haphazardly between English and Afrikaans. As the above extract showed, the function of the teacher’s code-switching disadvantaged the Afrikaans L1 learners.

In this classroom the teacher tried to manage the Afrikaans learners by casual communication to prompt their understanding of the subject. He does this not through the application of dual-medium instruction but rather through haphazard code-switching from English to Afrikaans. For this reason I argue it is impossible for these learners to have had accessed the specialised vocabulary on the specific subject in
Afrikaans. On the other hand, the teacher’s code-switching practice also does not benefit the English learners, because they also had to receive dual-medium instruction in Afrikaans to access specialised vocabulary on the subject matter.

This concurrent language teaching model by the teacher deprives both Afrikaans and English L1 learners in the classroom. This stems from the teacher not preferring to teach Economics in Afrikaans but also his confusion of doing dual-medium instruction as code-switching. In other words, while the teacher code-switched between English and Afrikaans he did not realise he is preventing his bilingual learners from properly accessing the lesson content.

The code-switching practice of the teacher had deregulated access to language resources for his learners (Martin-Jones, 2007). The teacher who was supposed to do dual-medium instruction has made a number of assumptions about the learners in his classroom. The first has to do with generalising code-switching practices of learners basic communication skills outside the classroom (McCormick, 2002). The second has to do with importing this into classrooms interrupting the ‘interactional order’ of the bilingual education models (Martin-Jones, 2007: 171). This is particularly evident above in his attempt to do dual-medium instruction.

Because learners code-switch between different languages in their linguistic repertoire outside contexts separate from the classroom, does not mean teachers must do the same within the classroom context. This is especially the case for dual-medium classrooms where teachers must do dual-medium instruction. In fact, what the teacher has done in the above classroom is not dual-medium instruction because his teaching goals are misplaced and he doubts his competence not in knowing the Afrikaans language, but teaching Economics through Afrikaans alongside English.

First, by code-switching the way the teacher has done, English is valued above Afrikaans because the teacher believed Economics could best be understood through
English than Afrikaans. In so doing, the teacher had caused instructional problems for himself that the design of dual-medium instruction discourages: he separated Afrikaans and English learners, concurrently disempowering them to interact with the lesson content. He should have applied language separation, not physical separation (Joseph and Romaine, 2004).

In Joseph and Romaine (2004; 2006), two of the best researched studies on bilingual education in South Africa, the researches have proven through their study of English and Sesotho sa Leboa dual-medium instruction, that if you maintain to the design of the model in implementation, learners will excel at academic work, because language equity is stressed. They will feel empowered even if you are not aware of it, because no one is disadvantaged at the end of classroom lessons. Cognitively learners’ bilingualism expands because additive bilingualism is the goal.

Second, the teacher does not understand that the bilingual learners in his classroom not only commodify English, but Afrikaans as well. They do this not only for developing their bilingualism receptive and productive skills. But to develop competence to perform in different contexts of their respective communities where both Afrikaans and English are legitimated (Heller, 2007), because the languages inhibit social- and linguistic-symbolic (market) value (Bourdieu, 1991). Unfortunately, the teacher’s preferred language teaching model restricts this bilingualism development and commodification.

Again, I am not implying the teacher above did dual-medium instruction. If anything, he has failed in this respect. The teacher confuses the application of the model by code-switching so haphazardly between English to Afrikaans.

If our teachers have difficulty with one of the languages of learning and teaching in the application of dual-medium instruction - Afrikaans in this case - then it not only speak volumes about their competence in languages used as media of instruction, it
means they do not understand what is meant by dual-medium instruction in general. In the local literature, especially dating back to the transition period of 1994 in South Africa, researchers had argued that, for the immediate implementation of bilingual education models in the country teachers need only be ‘comfortable’ (Alexander, 1995a; 1995b) in teaching one language.

This is a serious misconception, because 12 years later, the findings here clearly indicate teachers are struggling with dual-medium instruction which they do not attribute to themselves but to the changing linguistic classroom setup they have to deal with. Teachers in dual-medium classrooms do not realise that it is not only good enough to teach dual-medium classrooms, you actually need to do dual-medium instruction. Not doing so defeats the principle and aims of bilingual education.

Banda (2000) argues that the scholarly error(s) in the local literature is closely tied to understanding of the processes of learning through bilingual education models. Any bilingual education model requires competent, preferably first language speakers of a language used as a medium of instruction (Beardsmore, 1993). If this requirement is met, then educational processes will be met easily, through the aid of successful bilingual classroom practice. At the same time, I want to add that it seems dual-medium classrooms, as we discovered above, are agitated by teachers not accommodating bilingual learners which makes for unsuccessful bilingual instructional classroom practice.

Dual-medium instruction is not being implemented according its design. The findings clearly indicate teachers confuse dual-medium instruction to mean code-switching. It also shows the motivation for this lies behind the assumption teachers make about the competence of their bilingual learners. It is also a reflection of teacher competence in the language of learning and teaching, and the ability to academically accommodate learners in general.
I found in some of the Grade 7 dual-medium classrooms where three language groups were present, teachers were strongly motivated to pursue this confusing implementation of dual-medium instruction. Not only did those teachers haphazardly code-switch between languages, but lowered their standard of language use to academically accommodate a third language group: Xhosa L1 learners. The teachers, however, did not speak Xhosa and this furthermore agitated dual-medium classroom practice, as I will discuss below.

If you as a dual-medium teacher encounter three language groups in your classroom, although you know you have to systematically teach through two languages only (as part of the design of dual-medium model), then competence in all three languages is of crucial importance for successful dual-medium classroom practice. If you do not have competence in all three languages, and only have competence in the dual LoLT, then you will constantly encounter language instruction problems (Artigal, 1993), even if the third language group of learners in your classroom is there to acquire one LoLT (De Klerk, 1995a).

In De Klerk’s (1995a) study, teachers exhibited great difficulty with Xhosa learners mainly because they could not speak the language and therefore did not know how to manage them. However, Banda (2000) argues we need not make haste to manage Xhosa learners who represent the third linguistic community in classrooms, because those learners already understand the two LoLTs used for instruction. It is just a matter of allowing them to access the linguistic resources of those languages. But speaking their language would help to empower them and possibly open possibilities to trilingual instruction (Cummins, 2001). How you do the former is a different thing altogether.

I found in dual-medium classrooms at School B Xhosa learners were never acknowledged, not because they were present to acquire English as a target language, but mainly because the teacher could not speak those learners L1. As a result, the
Xhosa L1 learners ignored the teacher when lesson tasks had to be completed. Instruction in these classrooms was worse than in those of dual-medium classrooms above (as I will illustrate below).

Reading in a dual-medium model means to read in two languages separately. Doing so successfully allows learners to take cognisance of whatever knowledge was acquired. At no point during dual-medium instruction must the languages overlap, otherwise the full benefit of developing reading (biliteracy) is lost (Bloch, 2002). Unfortunately, in the last classroom I found the total opposite.

At the start of the lesson the teacher allowed learners to read a story in English and Afrikaans. All bilingual learners read in English and thereafter in Afrikaans. But just before the learners finished reading in English, the teacher said, “I am. Okay. Okay, this is enough of the frog. We gonna do a little Afrikaans now” (line 1 of part two below). Moreover, later during the lesson, the teacher suddenly changed the lesson content which meant she had to promote a different teaching model. As a result a number of instructional difficulties arose.

Firstly, when the teacher mentioned to learners they will read in Afrikaans, allowing them to anticipate the switch from reading in English to Afrikaans, she undervalued Afrikaans as one of the languages of instruction. The teacher evidently established instructional standards. In other words, we will always start with English, do a little bit of Afrikaans, but never use Xhosa as a language of instruction.

The design of dual-medium instruction requires the use of two languages for the successful practice of bilingual education. But, as Part 1 below illustrates, although the teacher allowed learners to read in one and another language sequentially which cannot be impeded upon, it was never the intention of the teacher to practise dual-medium instruction. Again, this I attribute to teachers confusing the model to mean code-switching.
Part 1


2. L: There was once a giant frog. His skin was green and his chest was bright yellow. His eyes were very big and stuck out at the top of his head. He wasn’t an ordinary frog. He was as tall as a man and he could think and speak. He liked to wear a bow tie around his neck. The frog did not want to live under the water like other frogs, so he decided to build a house on the bank of the river. The house was big and beautiful but the frog wasn’t happy. He was very lonely. Eventually the frog decided to look for a wife to share his home. There was a village nearby. Many women lived in this village, but they weren’t interested in him. They laughed at him when he asked them to marry him. The frog had to go back to his house alone. He was very sad and he felt lonelier than ever. One day he visit his frog (Teacher: visited) friends under the water, “you are a frog. Stop trying to be like a man,” they told him, “come and live with us”. The frog thought about this for a while. He decided to move back to his house under the water. He took all his bow ties. Suddenly he felt he was not lonely anymore and before long he fell (felt) in love with a very lovely frog and they were married by a frog, “and I’m proud of it,” he told his wife.

I discovered when learners read this part of the story in English everybody read in unison and the words and sentences resonated across the classroom. It was clear to me that the Xhosa L1 learners participated enthusiastically because they knew, as I conjectured, in order to commodify English reading in the language is one way of accessing linguistic resources in the language. Notwithstanding, the English L1 and Afrikaans L1 learners did likewise.

When the learners read the story in Afrikaans there was a clear difference: the Xhosa L1 learners seemed to be struggling with reading in the language (see Part 2 below). The teacher did not notice this (possibly ignored it).

During the observation of this class, I made sure that I was close to the group of Xhosa learners and discovered they read at best the words they understood in
Afrikaans. The teacher did not encourage them to read because she was reading with all the learners. She was very indifferent to the Xhosa learners.

**Part 2**

1. T: I am. Okay. Okay, this is enough of the frog. We gonna do a little Afrikaans now. Are you satisfied with this?
2. LS: Yes.
3. T: Okay. Come we do a little Afrikaans. I’m just gonna do two stories, hey? Okay, come let’s do this: “Dassie se stert”.
4. LS: Dassie se stert.
5. T: Dassie se stert, okay?
6. LS: Dassie se stert.
7. T: Kom, almal van julle gaan nou saam lees, okay? Ek willie he die een moet langer, uh, uh, of stadige praat as die ander nie, en lees saam, ne? Want dit gaan – ons wil ’n bietjie tyd bespaar, okay? Koning Leeu, kom.
8. L: Koning Leeu wil vir al die duure ’n stert gee, om die diere meerde werk te gee. (?????????) Hulle het ’n heele dag gehad om hulle sterte te gaan haal. Klein Dassie was baie lei en het in die son le en bak. Hy vra toe vir Jakkals om vir hom een te bring. Jakkals het ’n stert vir homself gekry en nog een vir Dassie, maar toe word Jakkals honger, en hy eet Dassie se stert op. Toe hy by Dassie kom, jok hy en se vir Dassie hy moet self ’n ander stert gaan haal. Dassie hardloop so gou as dat hy kan na Koning Leeu. Maar hy was te laat. Al die sterte was al weg gegee. Dis hoekom klein Dassie vandag nie ’n stert het nie.
9. T: Okay. Se vir my, hier praat hulle van twee duurtjies, van watter twee diertjies praat hulle in hierdie storie?
10. LS: Jakkals en Dassie.

In the application of dual-medium instruction the above should not happen, because if learners were assessed on whatever content they acquired, teachers may discover learners learned nothing at all (Hadi-Tabassum, 2006). This is actually what happened when the teacher questioned learners about the story. Furthermore, I must point out some discrepancies of the reading done in this dual-medium classroom.

If we study the full transcript of this class closely, we discover the teacher made a serious error with respect to when to question learners about the story. She starts posing questions to learners in English directly after they have read in the language.
Likewise, this happened when they read in Afrikaans. But then afterwards the teacher decided to change the lesson content to sentence construction in English and Afrikaans. This type of instructional practice in one lesson is not dual-medium instruction.

The teacher combines language separation teaching alongside concurrent language teaching, which made this dual-medium classroom particularly interesting. I had initially expected through observations that this classroom came closest to implementing dual-medium instruction. Unfortunately, when the teacher switched lesson content, she also reverted to code-switching between English and Afrikaans (as the below extract illustrates).

1. T: Okay, Soqelo, (1) by gaan probeer. [Okay, Seqelo will try.]
2. L: My nose bleed.
3. T: Ja, but that is in English. I want Afrikaans. (2) Ek wil ‘n Afrikaans sinnetjie he. (3) Ek wil ‘n Afrikaans sinnetjie he. Um, um, um Sha – kira. (4) My neus is…. [Yes, but that is in English. I want Afrikaans. I want an Afrikaans sentence. I want an Afrikaans sentence. I want an Afrikaans sentence. Um, um, um Sha – kira. My nose is …]
4. LS and T: (5) Seer. [Sore]
5. T: Okay, (6) dit was pragtig. (7) Jevrouens, is dit genoeg of… [Okay, that was perfect. Ladies is that enough or … - reference to researchers]

There is serious misunderstanding by the teacher in how to teach within the dual-medium instruction. Although she was somewhat successful in getting learners to read in English and Afrikaans, clearly the above does not conform to dual-medium bilingual classroom practice.

Again, dual-medium instruction is confused to mean code-switching. But this time around, it was done so haphazardly it was difficult to establish what the teacher was attempting to achieve with her language teaching model. Qualitatively, the teacher code-switched too many times, in terms of the design of dual-medium instruction, is too many times too much.
I must argue that dual-medium classroom practice is overwhelmed with code-switching practices which mainly manifests through the language teaching models of teachers. Academically, this has debilitating effects.

I say this because while the teacher above confuses the model to mean code-switching, learners, like the Xhosa L1 speakers in the classroom, certainly are at a disadvantage because the teacher does not give them enough time to perform through English (see line 1 to 3 above).

The interesting aspect of the teacher’s exchange with Soqelo above brings forth a number of issues I already argued above. When the learner gave the sentence in English, the teacher did not realise he was struggling to produce an Afrikaans one. Because the teacher did not speak Xhosa, there was no way to surmise and establish this. Even worse, she persisted with conversing in English even though she required from learners an Afrikaans sentence.

If teachers do not understand, or are unsure what it means to do dual-medium instruction, they will abandon their language teaching models to eventually not practice it. In the local literature, knowing about the practice of dual-medium instruction is commonly misunderstood (Plüddemann et al., 2004a). Researchers like Plüddemann argue, that the reason teachers confuse dual-medium to mean code-switching, is because they revert back to old ways of teaching and refrain from following dual-medium instruction in design.

I want to argue here that this hyperbole regarding dual-medium instruction is ill-understood, because clearly the findings here prove that teachers, by way of their language teaching models, show their misunderstanding of the model. They believe they are doing dual-medium instruction when in actual fact they are just code-switching. This is not because the model is practiced by ‘default’ but because they do not follow the ‘design’. We need to understand that if a bilingual education model is
not practised according to how it is designed then it is misapplied (Beardsmore, 1993).

The haphazard code-switching by the teacher mentioned above and other teachers in the Grade 7 dual-medium classrooms indicate the ineffectiveness of bilingual education at School B. Unfortunately, every day that these confused instructional practices take place, learners are losing the benefits of the design of the model. It seems more the Xhosa learners as has been illustrated.

Teacher’s inability to speak Xhosa further enforces the ineffectiveness of the model as implemented at School B. In fact, Xhosa learners are disempowered because the teachers themselves do not believe in the instructional value of the language. They always pointed out Xhosa learners’ inability to comprehend the languages of learning and teaching, as the teacher in this classroom indicates in the below extract.

6. Observers: It’s fine... baie dankie [thankyou]
7. T: (8) Maar ons het al... (9) Ons het Maandag die storie gedoen... (10) Maandag... (11) Maar ek doen dit maar weer... omdat dit vat tyd vir hulle. (12) Kyk Xhosa’s mos hulle eerste taal. (13) So Engels, hier... leer hulle nou Engels en Afrikaans, verstaan uu, so umm, jy kan nie net vir hulle, soma net vandag... nee jy kan nie. Defnitief nie. (14)Ja. Kyk hier. (15) Uu kan nou hoor hoe praat hulle Afrikaans. (16) Nou as ek nie so moet doen nie, dan sal die kinders nooit Afrikaans sal kan leur nie. [But we did the story Monday already. But I will do it again because it takes for them to get it. You see Xhosa is their first language. So, English at this school, they study English and Afrikaans, do you understand, so umm, you cannot teach them just today, you have to drag it over time, definitely not. Yes. You see, you heard how they speak Afrikaans. Therefore, if I don’t teach the way I have demonstrated then they will never learn Afrikaans].

I believe that this attitude of the teacher was strongly imbued in the language teaching model she chose to follow. I also want to argue that this might be another motivation for the frequent code-switching between Afrikaans and English and not Xhosa. Of course, competence in the language (Xhosa) takes precedence.
Although Xhosa in this dual-medium classroom was not used as one of the languages of learning and teaching, the teacher could have made an effort to use the language of the learners as a resource. In other words, Xhosa could have been used for basic communication without detracting from dual-medium instruction. But of course, the findings prove the teacher cannot speak Xhosa at best and at worst, is far from doing dual-medium instruction.

The instructional difficulties encountered by the teacher above would never have manifested if dual-medium instruction was applied according to its design. The Xhosa learners in this classroom are not benefiting from the teacher’s language teaching model because code-switching is prevalent and, these learners are given too little room for participation in the lesson (as the below extract illustrate).

8. T: (17) Moenie uit skree nie, ne. (18) Moenie uit skree nie, want dan gee jy vir die res van die klas die antwoord, en dan kan hulle nie self dink nie. (19) Ok, - ur, umm - gee jy vir my die Engels woortjie. Give the English word for the word ‘seun’ [boy] in Afrikaans. The Afrikaans word is ‘seun’, now give me the English word… hey… boy.. okay, okay, baie goed. Nou gee vir my ‘n sinnetjie. (20) Wie gaan vir my ‘n sinnetjie gee? ‘n Sinetjie gee met die woord seun. Silinia. [Do not scream, ok. Do not scream, because you will give the rest of the class the answer, and you will not allow them to think for themselves. Ok, - ur, umm – give me the English word. Give the English word for the word ‘seun’ in Afrikaans. The Afrikaans word for ‘seun’, now give me the English word…hey…boy…okay, okay, very good. Now construct a sentence for me. Who is going to make up the sentence? A sentence, give me a sentence with the word boy. Silinia.]

In this Grade 7 dual-medium classroom the learners who are multilingual, the Xhosa learners, are afforded too little time for participation during lessons, because the teacher’s language teaching model is designed in such a way to prompt them only when it is realised they are not participating. Again the findings indicate that teachers seek to separate learners by means of concurrent language teaching, instead of language separation for effective implementation of bilingual instruction.
Dorris Sommer (2004: xi) in the introduction to her monograph – *Bilingual Aesthetics: a new sentimental education* – invites readers with an alluring question: “What if I said that an extra language, beyond a coordinating lingua franca, promotes personal development, fair procedure, and effective education …?” My answer must surely be - dual-medium instruction by design is able to ensure an extra language, additive bilingualism - and can definitely promote personal development and fair instructional procedure systematically for effective educational practice. Unfortunately the findings of the application of the model by far do not confirm to this.

Although dual-medium instruction seems to bring learners closer to bilingualism, a lot of benefits, the likes of which were mentioned by Sommer here, are lost due to the language teaching models chosen by the teachers, especially in the above classroom. If dual-medium instruction was applied in the way it should have been applied, then additive bilingualism would be a realistic benefit for Xhosa, English and Afrikaans L1 learners. Currently this is difficult to establish.

Furthermore, I initially expected that the two languages used as languages of learning and teaching would have been used together on posters pasted on the walls of the dual-medium classrooms. This expectation was premised on the design of the model. But, unexpectedly, in many of the dual-medium classrooms at School B, one language, English, dominated in a range of classroom produced materials, prescribed materials and newspaper clippings. The snapshot below resembles a newspaper page in English accompanied by a poster with English words.
The dual-medium model in design and as applied here by teachers at School B have the potential to strongly promote additive bilingualism, if only they understood what the model really aim to do. Despite this, the language teaching models used by the teachers that are deeply imbued with code-switching prevent learners to access embedded knowledge in a target language. As a result, multilingualism is difficult to establish because the haphazard code-switching by the teachers above resembles them currently struggling to teach through two languages, and that teaching through three languages would be equally overwhelming. Thus the confusing implementation of dual-medium instruction as code-switching prevents not only the development of bilingualism, but is in no way near promoting multiliteracy.

To summarise, dual-medium instruction in design and how it has been practised by teachers in some of the classrooms above, is not bilingual education. Teachers confuse the model to mean code-switching. They prevent the bilingual learners from fully utilising their own linguistic repertoire or acquired knowledge in the official language of learning and teaching and the other LoLT. Although the model in design does seem to bring learners closer to bilingualism, code-switching haphazardly
between the media of instruction makes this difficult. As result, learners lose out daily on the benefits of dual-medium instruction.

All the teachers above misapplied the model. They have not understood what it means to do dual-medium instruction. For that reason, the model, as applied at School B currently, is unable to develop multilingual skills or promote multiliteracy practices in learners. I want to strongly emphasise that the misapplication of the model misunderstood as code-switching, stems from the lack of possession of specialised knowledge about the model.

The manner in which the teachers above practised the models must be related to how they come to understand the models. The observations alone and the arguments made above I felt warranted interview data to establish the source of the confusion of dual-medium instruction.

4.3 Interview findings of principals and teachers

The observation findings on the application of dual-medium instruction as code-switching above suggest teachers and principals do not understand what it means to implement bilingual education in general. However, it also suggests that teachers and principals’ understanding of bilingualism is misplaced.

Both principals and teachers seemed uninformed about the tenets of dual-medium and parallel-medium instruction and how it should be applied (Baker, 2006). Vermeulen (2001) had argued teachers’ understanding of bilingual education has significant effects on the development of bilingualism in target groups of the models and the overall philosophy of the models. I discovered during the interviews that when teachers were interviewed none of them had the same understanding of dual-medium and parallel-medium instruction.
Recently, Housen (2002: 2) postulated that the importance of “…understanding of the organisation and functioning of a bilingual program requires clarity about its target population, the context in which it is implemented, and it’s proclaimed philosophy and objectives”. Before the collection of the interviews, the assumption was that principals and teachers would clarify these things for me.

Not understanding the organisation and functioning of your own school’s bilingual programme reflects a serious error in knowledge. Principals at both schools shed no clarity on their bilingual programmes or a proclaimed philosophy and objectives. The principal of School A (henceforth, PXA) said that his understanding of dual-medium schooling is ‘the use of two languages, favourably English and Afrikaans’.

This is not a useful definition of bilingual education. Nonetheless, when asked about parallel-medium schooling (‘… mediums English/Afrikaans as language of instruction’ – PXA), his comment related strongly to his definition of dual-medium schooling: the use of two languages, which in principal confuses dual-medium with parallel-medium instruction to mean the same thing.

Taken against the observation findings, one is left with the impression that, because of such confusion, the language teaching models in Grade 7 classrooms at School A does nothing for individual (learner) bilingualism. In comparison, the principal of School B (henceforth, PXB) understood dual-medium instruction to be a feature of code-switching: “… we code-switch here, use both of them, it has been like that and it's still like that”. This type of understanding validates the observation findings of the dual-medium classrooms above: code-switching is confused with dual-medium instruction. But again code-switching does not constitute dual-medium instruction, nor comes near to bilingual education.

This kind of practice is troublesome because every day that this confusion is put into practice, bilingual learners lose out on the benefits of dual-medium instruction.
Clearly such understandings of the models are not bilingual education. Moreover, it also validates the discrepancies in the application of dual-medium and parallel-medium instruction.

As this is the understanding of the principals, they as managers of the schools are the ones responsible for ensuring dual-medium and parallel-medium instruction practices. But how could they if they themselves do not understand what the models aim to do. This surely brings into question how these managers view bilingual learners: a problem to be solved or a precious linguistic commodity, because these learners register at their schools to commodify an extra language.

Nonetheless, definitions from the principals against the classroom observations make a lot of things seem unclear in respect to the application of the models at their schools. Neither of the principals made reference to the detailed requirements given by Housen above.

This lack of knowledge of bilingual education models, according to Baker (2007), has damning effects on how such models are applied on a daily basis for learner target populations. Leary-Lindholm (2005), in a draft report of dual language schools, argues that training or not training professional staff on the application dimensions of understanding bilingual education models is an indication of staff quality in schools. Although this may not be a universal truism for managers at all Western Cape schools implementing bilingual education models, this certainly seems evident for the principals at the selected schools.

There were common themes on what constitutes dual-medium and parallel-medium instruction during the teachers’ interviews. Every teacher interviewed had surprisingly different ideas regarding the models and the application of them. Teachers, as respondents, were treated as equal professionals to the principals in their capacity of understanding the concerned models, both conceptually and operationally.
Teachers had a general and genuine concern for every learner in their classroom. Regarding the understanding of dual-medium and parallel-medium instruction, though, a number of related understandings of the models came to the fore. There was a general misunderstanding and differentiation between the models of instruction. Dual-medium instruction, for example, is understood as the teaching of the ‘mother languages’ (Teacher of School A, 1).

On the other hand, parallel-medium is understood as teaching through two languages in the same school rather than the same class. The model is an instruction system that ‘shows the equality of two languages’ (Teacher of School A, 2) and ‘creating opportunities for all learners – despite their language barriers’ (Teacher of School B, 1). Furthermore, it is a system that allows ‘moving parallel in the class with each learner’s language’. The last definition does not qualify as parallel-medium instruction or any of the definitions given by the teachers should be deemed as bilingual education, when in practice the models like dual-medium instruction are not applied in a systematic way.

Compared to the principals’ understanding of the models, the discrepancy in how teachers understand dual-medium and parallel-medium instruction indicates the disjuncture between these two groups of professionals. This authenticates the classroom observations of the application of the models: the confusion, the misapplication and the disempowerment of bilingual learners through language restriction.

These interview findings on how principals and teachers come to understand the design and application of dual-medium and parallel-medium instruction is fraught with misunderstandings. There seems to be a general lack of understanding the conceptual and operational components of dual-medium and parallel-medium schooling and instruction. So much so that both conceptual and operational
dimensions are confused to mean almost the same thing, which remains linguistically inconsistent. The lack of scientific understanding of the models reflects a lack of inconsistent training, either not offered by the provincial education department or further training courses.

4.5 General Summary

The findings discussed in the above sections with regards to the observation data, the triangulation of such data with document analyses and interviews reveal the following:

- The evidence collected supports overwhelmingly the conjecture that, because parallel-medium uses only one medium of instruction (or language of learning and teaching), general classroom practice is de facto monolingual or it leads to monolingual classroom practice.
- As expected, parallel-medium means instruction in one language for each learner. Thus, by design and its very nature, it does not lead to full bilingualism.
- The promotion of multiliteracy in parallel-medium schooling cannot become a reality. This model precludes the development of individual bilingualism. This is corroborated by teachers and the principals understanding of the model, divulging discrepancies which serve as impetus for the misapplication of parallel-medium instruction as bilingual education.
- Dual-medium instruction (in observation) is confused to be code-switching. None of the forms described in the local and international literature were followed by the teachers.
- Dual-medium instruction seemingly does offer some route to bilingualism, but that route is made difficult by teachers confusing language teaching models. As a result, and as discussed, bilingualism benefits are lost.
• In conclusion, the non-universality and diversity that exist among principals and teachers regarding the defining aspects of dual-medium schooling or instruction, is a poor reflection of teacher training programmes: the acquisition of knowledge on bilingual education models in and outside South Africa.

4.6 Conclusion

This chapter was divided into four sections. The first section gave a brief description of the sociolinguistic contexts of School A and B in which the application of dual-medium and parallel-medium practice took place. In the second section, the findings of the observation of parallel-medium instruction were discussed, followed by a discussion of dual-medium instruction. The final sections of this chapter looked at how the principals and teachers supported the application of dual-medium and parallel-medium schooling in practice, by explicating their understanding of the models.

The next chapter concludes the thesis followed by recommendations.
Chapter 5

Conclusions and Recommendations

5.0 Introduction

In this thesis I have explored the application of dual-medium and parallel-medium models of bilingual education at two historically disadvantaged primary schools in the Western Cape. Through qualitative research methods (observations; document analyses and interviews), three of the four objectives of this study were accomplished. Those objectives were: (1) to ascertain the practice of bilingual education at the selected schools; (2) to explore classroom interaction in Grade 7 classrooms to establish current teaching and learning models in place; and (3) to ascertain the efficacy of the models as used at the selected schools to promote multilingual proficiency in learners. The last objective was to propose a multilingual education model following the findings of this study (objective 4).

This chapter is divided into three sections. In section one I will discuss the answers to the questions asked in this study and the implications it has for scholarly work on bilingual education in the Western Cape. Section two briefly explicates objectives 1 to 3 and ends with the last objective: a tentative multilingual instruction model which seeks to better integrate Xhosa for classroom practice. The last section, section three, concludes this chapter with practical recommendations for the Ministry of Education and scholarly recommendations with respect to rethinking the design and application of bilingual education.

5.1 The research questions

The general question answered in this study, is whether the dual-medium instruction and the parallel-medium instruction models, in practice at the two schools, effectively
promote the principle of LiEP 1997 for the attainment of multiliteracy by learners. This was posed against the background assumptions that parallel-medium in practice uses only one language of learning and teaching (LoLT), which leads to monolingual classroom practice. Dual-medium offers the best route to bilingualism, but in practice it is applied haphazardly and therefore its benefits are lost in the process. This was followed by a number of successive research questions.

5.1.1 What language teaching models are in place at selected schools?

Teaching a language, as the findings and discussion chapter revealed is a challenging undertaking within a monolingual teaching system. It is even more challenging when two languages have to be used for teaching of content in a bilingual teaching system. If the classroom linguistic composition changed, language teaching can become an engulfing practice.

At School A teachers found themselves not encumbered with instructional difficulties, because in parallel-medium classrooms teachers teach through one language only. In other words, all language teaching in the parallel-medium classrooms at School A suggested that instruction in one language is best. The teachers all maintained monolingual instruction in the classroom and disciplined learners who did not conform to such type of language teaching.

The teachers who taught in dual-medium classrooms code-switched so much between the languages used for instruction, that they caused more disadvantages than advantages for the bilingual learners in their classrooms. The findings clearly showed that whatever language teaching model the teachers sought to follow, and what they perceived as dual-medium instruction, is misleading as the generic practice is entrenched as code-switching. This is collaborated by the findings of the second classroom observed, where learners were physically separated, and corroborated by teachers and principals’ incredulous misunderstanding (inversely supporting) of what
they believe to be dual-medium instruction (schooling). Despite this, it does seem that the model, at the level of instruction, currently offers the best route to bilingualism, but is applied too haphazardly, resulting in the loss of such benefits.

Dual-medium teaching, as I illustrated, does not use Xhosa for instruction. The language and the speakers (learners) are undervalued as a linguistic resource. But, as I further argued, the blame here is not inherently the learners’ fault, because the teacher alone should take responsibility at an instructional level, while the principal of the school should follow suit as facilitator at a macro level.

5.1.2 Do they promote multiliteracy?

Both schools lack the capacity to facilitate multilingual learning and the development of multiliteracy, at the macro level, because they lack essential literacy needs: a library, access to print (and not unused print material as was pointed out in the previous chapter) and online resources. We have seen this to be intrinsically true in the parallel-medium classrooms. But even dual-medium classrooms do not aim to develop multilingualism in learners for multiliteracy.

5.2 Objectives

5.2.1 The practice of bilingual education in School A and B

The definition of bilingual education adopted in this study was used to establish whether dual-medium and parallel-medium models actually do what it is designed to do, but at the same time establish the efficacy of these models. It was found that parallel-medium schooling at School A did not conform to the definition of bilingual education, because as I argued, teaching a subject alongside one language of learning and teaching (LoLT) does not constitute bilingual education.
Because the model has a monolingual outlook, I irrevocably assert that the model does not represent bilingual education. The implementation of the model at School A develops monolingualism, English on the one hand and Afrikaans on the other, irrespective of Xhosa learners’ presence. Thus, parallel-medium instruction as currently practised is not bilingual education.

The dual-medium model, as it was implemented at School B, is fraught with misunderstanding(s) by teachers who tried to do dual-medium instruction. The model was confused by teachers to mean code-switching and as a result did not adhere to the design of the model. In essence, the teachers implemented (dual-medium) concurrent language teaching instead of language separation (Martin-Jones, 2007).

5.2.2 Classroom interaction and the current teaching and learning models in place at School A and B

Extensive classroom observations were made of Grade 7 classrooms to achieve this objective. I learned that interaction between the teacher and Xhosa learners was very indifferent as opposed to learners who spoke English and Afrikaans as a home language. But, as I argued, this is due to teachers’ competence in all the languages of learning and teaching, notwithstanding Xhosa not used as a medium of instruction in those classrooms. At School A, teachers never really encountered classroom interaction difficulties, because the model was monolingual and therefore monolingual language teaching. On the other hand, at School B, I have illustrated that teachers found it very difficult to pacify classroom instruction where classrooms comprised of three linguistic communities, suggesting hierarchies of languages: in other words, English, then Afrikaans but not Xhosa for communication and discussing content (but as discussed in the previous chapter the latter was never because use of of lack of teacher competence in the language).
5.2.3 The efficacy of the dual-medium and parallel-medium instruction models as used at the selected schools to promote multilingual proficiency in learners.

In Baker (2006; 2007), continual documentation of the efficacy of models like, dual language schooling, heritage language schooling and other popular bilingual education models in the United States of America, have been regarded a norm for developing other models against those ones with monolingual orientations (cf. Krashen 1996). The effectiveness of bilingual education models is dependent on a number of factors which complement each other.

In the first instance, the principle, aims, and design of the model is adhered to in application. Second, managers and teachers of schools fully understand the disadvantages and advantages of the model and improve on them continuously. Third, the need and implementation of comprehensive language integration within the curriculum as instruction, is the norm and not the exception or underemphasised. In achieving this particular objective for this study, I found conclusive evidence that promoting multilingual proficiency in learners was a concern, or dealt with as an exception at both schools.

With regards to School A’s parallel-medium implementation at Grade 7 level, I found monolingualism to be the norm and therefore promoting multilingualism an implausible attempt. In other words, it would imply the rethinking of the application of the model. Certainly teachers, by way of their language teaching model, found this too onerous. At the same time in the Grade 7 classrooms where Xhosa learners are present, teachers came under tremendous pressure to abandon their monolingual approach because learners themselves communicated multilingually, irrespective of the teacher who could not reciprocate due to competence in one of the other languages not used for instruction.

In dual-medium classrooms at School B, the efficacy of promoting multilingualism in learners is an escalating and ignorant driven practice, entrenched in the beliefs of the
teachers that dual-medium instruction is code-switching. As a result, they develop bilingualism in a misguided manner and make no provision for developing multilingual proficiency, albeit the learners themselves are able to speak several languages. Thus rendering the model applied by School B’s teachers as ill-understood to facilitate this promotion.

5.2.4 Multilingual education for the Western Cape

If we consider the current application of the models at the two schools, we face an equally disheartening and complicated task to conceive a universal, integrative multilingual education model to be adopted by schools in the Western Cape. This study has been proof of how little we know about bilingual education models in the country. But in spite of this, we still tend to recommend models with monolingual biases and dismiss the findings of inexpensive multilingual models that actually achieve their principles and goals (see especially Beardsmore and Lebrun, 1993, on the review of Trilingual Education in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg).

To break the monolingual barrier of parallel-medium instruction, and to rethink properly dual-medium instruction for trilingual instruction, we crucially need to integrate Xhosa as a third language of instruction, but also need also competent Xhosa teachers. Here the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg model provides us with the necessary guidelines:

- A language frequently used in higher and intimate and official (school) domains need to be given acknowledgement to empower the speakers and learners of those languages;
- Print literacies do not necessarily devalue the instructional capacity of that language because this can be managed with time; and
- Using three languages as media of instruction leads to greater respect among those learners and more competent citizens. It is for these reasons the study
was driven towards a holistic, integrative, multilingual education model, which make much greater work of Xhosa as a language of instruction from Grade 1 to Grade 7.

| L1, L2 and L3 Multilingual Instruction for Western Cape schools (from Grade 1 to 3) |
|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| **Literacy Skills**                   | L1, L2 and Xhosa                |                   |
| **Numeracy Skills**                   | L1, L2 and Xhosa                |                   |
| **Life Skills (EMS, Life Orientation, Arts and Culture)** | L1 and L2 instruction |                   |

| L1, L2 and L3 Multilingual Instruction for Western Cape schools (from Grade 4 to 7) |
|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| **Language, Communication, Literacy** | L1 Instruction (should not only be used for learning areas exclusively) | L2 (first additional language subject), used for instruction as well. |
| **Mathematics (Numeracy)**            | Most likely English or Afrikaans depending on the L1 of the learner | Xhosa (second additional language subject), used for instruction as well. |
| **Science**                           | L1 Instruction                 |                   |
| **Life Orientation**                  | Xhosa Instruction              |                   |
| **EMS (Economics and Management Science)** | L1 instruction              |                   |
| **Social Sciences**                   | English or Afrikaans Instruction depending on the L1 of the learner |                   |
| **Natural Sciences**                  | L1 Instruction                 |                   |
| **Arts and Culture**                  | Xhosa Instruction              |                   |
| **Technology**                        | L1 Instruction                 |                   |

5.3 Recommendations

Following the above objectives in this study, the below given recommendations are made:

5.3.1 Practical Recommendations

1. That the Ministry of Education should consider the establishment, development and maintenance of bilingual/multilingual education further training programmes made part of diploma courses at teaching training colleges, universities and other institutes of higher learning;
2. That parallel-medium schooling is phased out, because it neither serves the full purpose of the LiEP 1997, nor the development of bilingualism or multilingualism or even multiliteracy;
3. That the Ministry needs to pay attention to the design, implementation and monitoring of the model;
4. That to achieve 1 to 3 above a unified consultancy group or committee of current thinkers on bilingual and multilingual education models in the Western Cape be approached to design multilingual education models that are neither a reformulation of old ones, confusion of current implemented ones or confused with the understanding of bilingual education in general;
5. That in the Western Cape, Xhosa be made compulsory as part of multilingual classroom practice in former Coloured and White schools.

5.3.2 Scholarly Recommendations

All the multilingual models proposed by researchers of bilingual and multilingual education in the local literature err in understanding what such models must aim to do. I argued that all of those models are designed with a monolingual bias: to promote the mother tongue alongside two subjects as part of multilingual schooling. As a result I make the following scholarly recommendations:

1. That current thinking should part ways with weak conceptualisation(s) of bilingualism and rethink the design and application of the models studied in this study in terms of their promotion of multilingualism for multiliteracy.
2. That researchers working at multilingual schools must realise that having multilingual classrooms does not mean you are doing multilingual education.
3. That we must generate our own conceptualisation of what constitutes multilingual education premised strongly on theories of strong models of multilingual education.
4. That the design of whatever strong multilingual education model conceived or sought after being tested for effectiveness before official implementation.

5.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, conclusions were made about the objectives and research questions of the study and practical and scholarly recommendations were made following the proposal of a multilingual model. While the recommendations are tentative and optimistic, it should nevertheless contribute to our thinking about multilingual education in the Western Cape and the greater South Africa.
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Appendices

Appendix A

Principal Interview Questions

1. Can you give a brief history of the school and its language policy?
2. How long have you been principal at this school?
3. What significant problems have you encountered as a teacher and manager of the school?
4. How many educational programs does your school have and what are the aims of those programs?
5. How many of these programs are literacy related or otherwise?
6. In your opinion, to what extend has these programs been effective.
7. Are there any noticeable improvements on learners’ literacy and learning in classes and the school (in general)?
8. In your understanding, what do the following terms mean: dual-medium and parallel-medium instruction?
9. In your opinion, how do dual-medium classes, compared to parallel-medium classes, differ in relation to the instruction of learners?
10. How has instruction changed since the inception of the new Curriculum 2005 (OBE)? And, in your opinion, what impact is it having on learners overall academic performance?
11. Do you feel that the literacy support programs presently in practice at the school are sufficient for learners’ proficiency development in two or more languages? If not, why?
12. What future initiatives can be taken to effectively ensure literacy support for learners in these classes, for instance?
13. Do you feel that parallel-medium instruction, compared to dual-medium instruction, leads to multiliteracy in learners? If not, why?
14. One important principle of the current language-in-education policy of 1997 is to “maintain home language (s) [of learners] while providing access to and the effective acquisition of additional languages”. Do you think that the implementation of the policy has been successful within the framework of dual- and parallel-medium teaching? If not, in your opinion, what has been the major factors contributing to the policy’s unsuccessful execution?
Appendix B

Teacher Interview Questions

1. Can you give a brief history of the school and its language policy?
2. How long have you been principal at this school?
3. What significant problems have you encountered as a teacher and manager of the school?
4. How many educational programs does your school have and what are the aims of those programs?
5. How many of these programs are literacy related or otherwise?
6. In your opinion, to what extent have these programs been effective?
7. Do you think that the community and parents are active agents in the development of the school?
8. What specific programs have the school put in place to accommodate and help learners whose home language is not the language of learning and teaching?
9. In your understanding, what do the following terms mean: dual-medium and parallel-medium instruction?
10. In your opinion, how do dual-medium classes, compared to parallel-medium classes, differ in relation to the instruction of learners?
11. How has instruction changed since the inception of the new Curriculum 2005 (OBE)? And, in your opinion, what impact is it having on learners overall academic performance?
12. Do you think the school has done enough?
13. What processes and strategies have you followed in your classroom to ensure the successful implementation of the literacy programs of the school?
14. What impact have these changes had on students literacy and learning in your classroom?
Appendix C

Transcription key: T (Teacher); L (Learner); LS (Learners); = = (overlap); [] (translation)

Parallel-medium teaching: English lesson

T: Have you all got a page, look at the picture.
LS: Yes.
T: Ok, now study this page, it says the pictures have a lot of information, we can often read messages from pictures and signs.
T: Learner 02 look at your picture!!
T: Ok, I think we can think answer and discuss the questions, what is happening to this picture? What can you see, what do you think? (inaudible).
L: (incoherent)
T: Did you hear what she said?
LS: No Miss!
L: (incoherent)
T: Ok, yes?
L: (incoherent).
T: Anybody else, what do you think?
L: (incoherent).
T: Learner 03, what do you think?
L: The children are talking?
T: The children are talking. Do you think he wants (inaudible)? Do you think he’s shy?
L: He’s shy.
T: How do you think he really feels, how is the boy standing alone with them? Wait – Wait, don’t shout it out, you know what you want to say.
L: he doesn’t know them.
T: He doesn’t know them, ok.
L: He feels rejected.
T: He feels rejected, nice word, rejected, can you give me another word for rejected, and how would you feel if something rejects you, another word?
L: Unhappy.
T: Good, is there another word for rejected, you can talk, you all experience these feelings?
L: Sad.
T: Yes, you got to the nuns...when you feel everyone hates you, look at that boy standing alone, how do you think he feels? But what do you think?
LS: Alone.
T: Alone, yes, lekker, look at the way he stands, he’s using body language – his body is speaking to us. What do you think about what his body is saying?
L: Sad
T: What tells you he’s sad?
L: His (inaudible), he’s standing away from them and he’s look at them.
T: He’s standing away from them and looking at them, yes, how, which, why do you think his body is (inaudible), what is his body telling us?
L: (inaudible answer).
T: Can’t hear?
L: Must I go.
T: Yes, his body is saying must I go or must I stay, I’m sure this has happened to you already so how do you feel, you know if you stand in a certain way, it tells you something.
L: Confused.
T: Confused, ok. Learner 05! Learner 06! What do you think?
LS: (inaudible answer).
T: What, yes.
LS: (inaudible answer). Another learner answers instead.
T: Ok, Learner 07 has a good point here, he says they have different clothes to his, he’s wearing short pants, and does anyone else wanna say something about it?
L: He’s left out.
T: He feels left out, right?
L: (inaudible answer).
T: You mustn’t talk when Learner 08 is talking, ok Learner 09, it’s rude.
L: He’s getting cold.
T: He’s getting cold, yes what do you wanna say, and you said it now, say it.
L: (inaudible answer).
T: What did you say?
L: (inaudible) Laughs by other learners.
T: Ha-ha-ha, don’t laugh at each other.
L: Maybe he’s wearing his uniform, they not.
T: Maybe he’s wearing his uniform and them not. Maybe that happens to you, you wearing your uniform and others are wearing casual clothes, will you feel out or not.
L: I would.
T: And they all stand here and look at you and the same people are talking, maybe they not talking about you, what will you think.
L: They talking about me.
T: Talking about you, maybe not, maybe they just happy but know that you dressed like that you’ll be thinking that you are talking about you, what does that tell you?
L: (inaudible)
T: What do you think why’s he buying cap?
L: His hair is thick.
T: His hair is thick, ok.
L: Its part of his uniform.
T: Maybe its part of his uniform, good, maybe his from a different school altogether, any other reason why he might be wearing that cap?
L: Because he is scared they gonna laugh at his hair.
T: Maybe they gonna laugh at his hair right (inaudible) maybe he’s wearing the cap for the sun right.
L: (inaudible)
T: He looks at them right, yes.
L: Maybe he (inaudible).
T: Alright don’t tell him what to say you talk and then its ok. What did you say?
L: (inaudible)
T: And someone said something here.
L: (inaudible).
T: What do you think?
L: They are boring.
T: They are boring, they like noise, he doesn’t like noise, there was something has an answer for me…What is your problem, you look at me with, you must fail for me.
L: He doesn’t like name brands.
T: He what?
L: He don’t like name brands.
T: Oh, don’t like name brands like his friends. What are name brands? Who wanted to answer? Yes?
L: Type of clothes.
T: Yes, a type of clothing, for example, Nike.
L: Quicksilver, All Star, Converse.
T: Ha-ah, don’t shout Learner 01!!
L: Billabong.
T: Ok, thanks, so some of us want to wear those expensive clothes but you must remember there is those persons, julle kan nie my tyd vat om dit te doen nie!!! Julle is amper tien minute laat (some learners walk in late)!!! You must remember you must be on time with the others.
L: Maybe he doesn’t have money.
T: That’s a good point yes, how does that make him feel?
L: Sad, not happy.
T: Maybe they call him names, yes.
L: Maybe he is disciplined and they are not.
T: Yes.
L: Maybe he is unhappy.
T: Maybe he is unhappy, ok.
L: Maybe he feels messed up.
T: Maybe he feels messed up; maybe he wants to be friends.
Parallel-medium teaching: Afrikaans lesson

T: Why are you so quiet? [Mumbled responses from learners]
T: Now sit down. Um, die voorsetsel, kinders luister mooi. Het julle almal hierdie voorsetsels voltooi? [Um, the preposition, students listen carefully. Did you all complete this preposition exercise?]
LS: NO.
T: Nee Meneer!!!! [No Sir!!]
LS: Ja Meneer. Nommer een, [Inaudible] [Yes Sir. Number one] [Teacher puts pupil out of class]
T: And stay out! Nommer een: Die kat le in die son. Nommer twee. Wie kan vir my nommer twee se antwoord gee? [Number one: The cat sleeps basking in the sun. Number two. Who can tell me the answer to number two?]
L: met. [with]
T: met. Hulle het ons…. Help my die sin voltooi. [with. They won the game…. Help me finish the sentence]
LS: Hulle het ons met ses punte gelos. [The won game by six points.]
T: Okay. Nommer drie. Nommer driee! Lees dit vir my. [Okay. Number three. Number three! Read it for me.]
LS: [Mumbled responses]
T: Lees jy dit vir my. [Pointing to learner]. Lees die sin. Shhh! Wie praat daar? I hope you are realising what’s happening here. So, baie van my tyd moet ek spandeer op discipline in hierdie klas. Want die kinders weet nie van hoe om hulle te gedra nie. Lees daai sin!! [You read it for me. (Pointing to learner). Read the sentence. Shhh! Who is chatting? I hope you are realising what’s happening here. Most of the time I spend on discipline problems in this class because these children don’t know how to behave. Read that sentence!!] [Learners read; inaudible]
T: Die deure, lees daai woord…wat is die woord? Die goedere. Nie die goe-deure nie. Nie goedere!!! [The door, read the word…what is the word? The goods. It’s not the door. Not door!!!]
LS: Goedere. [Goods]
T: Die…se almal die woord…die goedere. Is goedere, goedere! [The…everybody say the word…the goods]
LS: Goedere. [Goods]
T: Goedere word teen ‘n wins verkoop. Volgende een, nommer vier. Wie gaan vir my nommer vier se antwoord gee? [Goods are bought at a profit. Next one, number four. Who is going to give me the answer of number four?]
L: Hulle lewe in oorvloed. [They live in excess.]
T: Hulle lewe in oorvloed. Dis korrek. Nommer vyf. [They live in excess. This is correct. Number five.]
[Mumbled responses from pupils]
Parallel-medium teaching: Geography lesson

T: …huge amounts of food and cereal, there is also poultry and cattle. Rich countries also use huge amounts of energy, one American uses as much energy for industry, heating and transport as 53 people in India, 48 in Mali or 1072 people in Nepal, Nepal is a very poor country here on the on the foot of the Himalayas Mountains…but they are very-very poor so if you compare the poor south they are in the poor south with those in the rich worth, u can rarely see there is a comparison when it comes to food and energy resources. Ok heres a map that shows you the distribution of the world’s population, remember the dots, one dot represents ten million people so you don’t have many dots in many of the continents, just look at that distribution, where do find most of your dots? In which continent?
L: In Asia.
T: Ok there is two dots in Asia which are countries are they.
L: China and India.
T: China and India good, so how many did you get that Damian?
L: (answer inaudible)
T: yes but how did you identify the countries.
L: (inaudible) borderline.
T: Can’t hear?
L: Borderline.
T: The borderline ok. Bradley?
L: The people crowding up.
T: Right but I want to know how you identified the two countries.
L: The dots.
T: The dots yes, how about the shape = =
L: = =and the size.
T: Ok good. Now you see the Islands there above the pacific ocean.
LS: Yes Miss.
T: Which Islands are those, as also a country.
L: Japan.
T: Japan, oh good, ok, so you (inaudible), How many dots do you have there?
L: two.
T: Two, so what does it tell you immediately?
L: (inaudible) sparse.
T: Very sparsely populated, why is it so sparsely populated?
L: It’s mostly a desert.
T: it’s mostly desert, ok, especially in the wet season. So here’s task for you to
do that show the world population. Here is the map that divides the world into the
rich North and the poor South, here’s your task people and resources, use the map,
information on the page as well as information from other sources such as Atlases
and library books, here’s your Atlases, here’s library books, books so can use that as
a resource. No one says where do most of the world population live, in the Rich
North or in the poor South, which continent is more popular, you are gonna calculate
that by the Amount of dots you have ok. One dot represents how many people.
LS: 10 million.
T: 10 million of them. B) Which continent is most populated? C) Name two
countries in this continent that have a lot of people. D) Name the continent that has
the smallest population? E) Which part of the world uses the most resources, the Rich
north or the poor south? These are very easy questions but are you going to use this
map to identify the countries, you can take your geography book, today’s date is the
11th, write that and next to it you write population (inaudible) please do this…
LS: (inaudible – chatting)
The average death rate was 9 to 1000 people so…was 13 the world's average population changed to 13 per 1000 people, this change was…positive, the population change as a result of the difference in birth and death, geographers to as a natural increase and decrease. Here we have a table about the natural increase or decrease of the population, the table below shows the birth rate statistics for 2001 of 6 countries, will these statistics still be the same today.

LS: No Miss.
T: Why not?
L: People die, get babies.
T: …and it's how much years down the line?
L: Four years.
T: Four years, so what has happened to the population?
L: (inaudible answer).
T: It has changed. The demography has changed; here is a table for the natural rate of change for different countries. We have Thailand. Where is Thailand?
L: Asia.
T: What do you connect to Thailand?
LS: The Tsunami!
T: The Tsunami yes…because Thailand is a very popular holiday resort.
France?
LS: Europe!
T: Japan?
LS: Asia!
T: Taiwan?
LS: Asia!
T: Asia, that province South of China
T: India?
LS: Asia
T: The next one is for…
L: (noise)
T: Hello! Ryan, where’s Sweden!?
L: In Europe Miss.
T: Swaziland?
LS: In Africa, South Africa.
T: No SA, Africa, it’s a little independent province in North of South Africa. So here’s your table for each, calculate the birth rate versus the death rate. In Thailand sixteen were born and six died so the rate either increase to 10 or decrease to 10.
LS: 10
T: Ten, was that an increase or a decrease?
L: Decrease.
T: It was a decrease yes, in France 13 were born and 9 will die. 4. 9 versus 8.
Taiwan 14 versus 6?
L: 8.
T: India 25 versus 9.
L: 16.
T: Sweden 1
L: 1
T: What was that 1, increase or decrease.
L: Decrease.
T: There were ten birth rates and the death rate was only 11, was that an increase or a decrease.
L: Decrease.
T: Yes, 2) 41 versus 20 Swaziland.
L: 21
T: In which country is there a natural increase in the population? Sweden.
There’s another new world, “life expectancy”. Life expectancy is the average amount of years you are expected to live. Like, what is that in South Africa?
L: They die early.
T: What would you say is die early, yes Elsa?
L: (inaudible)
T: Now you must think, how long are people expected to live?
L: About 60 to 70.
T: Ok that’s normally the time people get sick and die. I saw something on TV that was so tragic, I don’t know if you saw it, it women was raped and assaulted. It was so tragic that society can do that (inaudible) ok so discuss in your group for 5 minutes. In your group discuss a question about your community, what the people are dying of, at which age they die, how long you expect people to live in your community. Do people die for different reasons, now then they done long ago? Just discuss this quickly.

Dual medium teaching: English and Xhosa

T: Tigers, okay guys. Now are you ready to report. Are you ready to report? Iphi into enibhale kuyo. He bethuna, kutheni nizakunika umntu ocareless? Usiscriber? (Where is the paper you wrote on? Why do you give it to the careless person? Are you the scriber?) Are you ready to report, mh? Are you ready, are you ready, are you ready, okay right. Any group can come first. So when you report you must tell us the group name and the leader’s, the members of the group okay and if your group does not listen it means the leader again loses a point, ileader (the leader) okay you may wait, wait, wait. It means kwimarks zenu unemark yereporter, unemark yescriber. Unemark yantoni? Yeleader so ileader number one, scriber number one, reporter number one ndizakutshekisha bona ngoku iimarks zabo. Kwimarks endizakuninika into enibhale apha kuyo izakudibana neyereporter yenu so lento izareportwa nini izakudibana kwimarks zenu okay. So, if ileader iyafelisha zona iimarks zento eyiyo zezakho. So, qiniseka (ngento yakho). (On your marks you will have a reporter mark, scriber mark. Which mark do you have? Leader mark so the leader, I will check their marks now. On the marks I will give you will include your reporters mark. The thing
you will report will be included on your marks. The leader fails the marks will still be yours. Be sure (with your thing).

T: Okay, carry on.

(Noise)

T: Sisi asoze kaloku niyambona mos nhe ziimarks zenu ke eziya akazokuxelelwa ndim ba makakhwaze worse ureportela iclass and if uthethela phantsi abazokukwazi ukumamela. (Sister, you’ll never you see him nhe that is your marks. I am not the one to tell she must speak loud words. She is reporting for the class and if she is speaking softly they can’t listen.)

L: Group one, name Meet Zephyr, scribe r one (inaudible) Sisipho, scribe two Yard, leader one Market Alley, leader two (inaudible), reporter one (inaudible), reporter two (inaudible).

T: What is the topic of?

L: (inaudible)

T: The topic is = =

L: = = The topic is matter and measurement. When we measure, the list of things that we = =

T: = = Mncedeni. (Help her/him)

L: The list of things that we compare, store, buildings (inaudible) pure space.

T: Okay, okay, what you must do nhe. The list of things that we compare, and then your name them. Siyavana? (Do you agree?)

L: Yes miss.

T: Don’t (name) all of them at the same time. The list of things we compare, store. You must know that the list of things that we compare zezí nezi nezi (are these, and that) that we store uzibize, that we build uzibize so that sizo understanda ukuba nithini. Okay, niyandiva nhe? (You call them, you call them, we will understand what are said. Do you hear me?)

L: Yes miss.

L: The list of things that we compare store, closed space, (inaudible) house mount (inaudible) hot, cold (inaudible) how we would = =

T: = = How we would measure?

L: How we would measure these things from the tape measure, cm centimetre?

T: How we would measure these things? U (a) wethu needs ilento iunits of lento istandard (Our (a) this is the units and the standard) units of measurement. What are the standards units of measurement mh?

L: Centimetres.

T: Centimetres, kilometres, millimetres okokuqala ndifuna ukuwayi ukuba nizakusebenzisa eziph iistandard units of measurement nhe and then u (b), number (b) which instruments, so xa uyuze icentimetres which instruments would you use when you measure icentimetres, iyavakal? Okay, thank you, give her a round of applause saph ‘iphepha. (Firstly, I want to know which standards units you are going to use and when you used centimetres, centimetres, do you understand? Give me the paper.)

[Pupil clapping hands]

T: The next group.
L: Group names Neppie Market scriber one.
T: You don’t have to tell us what they are doing just tell the names ‘Nwabisa’ read the names only.
L: Nwabisa Mpouyiya, Nasiphi M-
T: Mamela bhuti noba awubachazanga zintoni ndizaklubabona mna sityiwa lixesha. (Listen brother you don’t have to introduce them (the group) I will see them time is consuming)
L: Noddie Marque, Narkar M (inaudible), Aalder (inaudible)
T: Masiceleni ireporter zethu zizame u kukhwaza tu, thethani nazo, hayi andithi ngxolani. (We must ask our reporter to speak loud please, speak to the, no, I didn’t say you are allowed to make noise.)
L: The list of things that we compare
T: Awuvakali tu ndikuxelele. Awuvakali Tu. (We cannot hear, if I can tell you. We don’t hear.)
L: 10 kg flower, 5 kg sugar, store, food, fruit, meal (inaudible), shoes (inaudible), 10 kg, 5 kg, centimetre, millimetre, and tape measure.
T: Okay, thank you, give him a round of applause. The following group please. (Inaudible noise)
T: So I must give a zero to all the groups nhe?
L: Group five Amandals Sicktree, Sining Nestle, Matter Lead, Sycamore Maker, Marketable Oil, Morning Zeep. Why we Measure? The list of things that we compare, store, building = =
T: = = Bhuti I said we need only to mention what we compare then come to things that we store.
L: How long or high. Surface, floor space, using amount of space, houses, objects occupants occupies, say we are selling chips and juice and bananas. How we would measure these things (inaudible) centimetres, house, store, Kilometres, instruments = =
T: Okay, thank you, give him a round of applause, next.
L: Group names Apple (inaudible), Lemon (inaudible), Zest (inaudible)
T: Uyalila bethuna mncedeni uSphokazi. Mncedeni. Ebevumile ukuba yireporter? (Sycamore is crying please help her. Help. Did she agree that she will be the reporter?)
L: Yes Miss.
T: Okanye nimpushile (Or you pushed her)
L: Xolo Miss Ndiiyleader mna (inaudible) uyaphosisi ndiyileader. (Sorry, I am the leader, he is lying I am the leader.)
T: Mamela uwenzile umsebenzi wakho int ‘okuubawutsheke ba wonk ‘umntu uncomfortable when if comes to ukutshuza? (Listen, you did your work you have to check if everybody is comfortable, choose)
L: Yes Miss.
T: Kutheni ke ngoku ezakuxakeka efront kanti bevumile. Uphi uleader number two? (Why is she standing in front while she agreed? Where is the leader?)
L: Nanku. (She is)
T: So it means igroup yenu ineproblem nhe. So ndicela nizokubhala phantsi into eyenzekayo kulo group. I'll give you a second chance. Ndizakuphinda ndininike ichance. Mban 'okubhala phantsi ba kulo group kwenzeka ntoni. Hamba hila phantsi siyabuya, ndiyabuya nagani negroup yenu, it means ineproblem lo group. Next group. Ndithe kuny have to decide and agree kwinto eni(inaudible)leyo. Uphakamisele ntoni? (Your group has a problem hey. So please come and write down what is happening regarding the group. I will give you another chance. Who's writing down what is happening on that group. Sit down I am coming, I am coming to your group also because that group has a problem. I said to you. What you raising your hand for?)

L: Xol 'Miss uBubele bethe yi-yireporter. (Sorry Miss, Bubbles said he will be the reporter)

T: A, a ndiyabuya, ndiyabuya. Iza so ima apha okay thank you. (Ah, I am coming, coming, come and stand here.)

L: Group names Maak Kaas scriber number one, Tee Llep, Teesakkie Suiker scriber number two, Lugte Seep leader number one.

T: Iimarks zisaluzeka kulomntu usefront. (The marks will be allocated as the person in front presents)

L: Tafel Doek leader number two, Maas Kaas reporter number one, Donker Brood reporter number one, Tafel Sy. Topic matter and measurement. Why do we measure? The list of things that we measure.

T: Guys let us learn to listen xa kukho umntu efront. (if the person in front) Teesakkie niseneproblem kulogroup nhe. (Do you still have a problem in that group?)

L: The list of things that we store clothes = =

T: = = Okay, thank you. Give her a round of applause. Nimvile nhe ukhzwazile, uyaathetha ba masive. Sukuyihoya into yokuba ethetha wrongo esithini but okubalulekileyo yindlela le athetha ngayo siyavana coz iimarks zethu zikulonto asikho phez 'kokuba waright okanye wawrongo, siyavana? Anindimamelanga kengoku okay, next group. (Did you hear, she spoke loud so that we can hear. Don’t listen just to what she said wrong. What is important is the way she speaks. Do we agree because your marks are there not if she is right wrong, do we agree? You are not listening now.)

L: Group names Matebese Noludwe scriber, Ngqambi Yonela scriber, Thando, Jack leader, Hemilton Fatyi leader, Lazola Tshukula reporter, Yanga Varha Reporter. Topic matter and measurement. The list of things that we compare with
papers, omo, omo, windows. Build house, desk. How we would measure these things that we compare with (papers), store your shelves, ruler = =

T: = =Okay, ubuvumile ubayireporteryegroup yakho nhe? (You agreed with your group that you are the reporter?)

L: No.

T: Ngubani ileader yala group? (Who is the leader of that group?)

L: NguNearfall. (It’s Nearfall)

T: Bendingathanga kufuneka nivumelan e ukuba umntu makabe yintoni he? Bakunyanzelile? (Didn’t I say you must agree that the person must be what?)

L: Yes Miss.

T: Ukhona nawe sukuthi ba ithi si. (You there don’t say that)

L: Si.

T: Okay ndizakunika enye ichance ndicela niphinde nidecide kengoku. Guys Ipoint yam ngoke it’s not about being wrong or being right it’s about ukuba nina niyakwazi ukumanager na ukusebenza as a team, please khaniunderstandande nditshilo from the beginning. Kukho la group kaXina ayi-ayimamelanga tu ayikhathelelang abakazi nozakureportergeloxeha kodwa ngabona bangxolayo. Ndinicelile from the beginning ndathithi ndicela umntu uba akathandi sanukumnyanzela de a, omnye Ndithethe uzakubanentlioni ukureporter ne so mnikenicliche luzaziyo uzakukwazi ukuyenza into so that azokufunda kuye, nizakuqhela njani xa kufuneka mlawumbi nime phambi kwestikolo sonke ndithi izokuthethela iclass nizakwenza kanjani. Kufuneka umntu b’uyathetha kufuneka nimamele but animameli niyazibona. Kaloku ngendiske ndathi umntu makazenzele mos le nto, that is why ndisithi yenzani in groups ndifuna umntu from komnye ukuba umntu uziphatha kanjani xa ephakathhi kwabanye abantu but seemingly aniyivanga ipoint yam, siyavana bethuna? Sanukumnyanzela umntu mnikenicliche ibenguye uzakubona ke ngoku abone ba yho sizakufumana icliche sonke nizakubazireporters nonke nizakubaziscreebers nonke nibezileaders nonke. Xa kunxolwa eclassini it means asoze ulide naphina, and iboni nizakuphatha iSouth Africa nina kuba kaloku izabayichaos, kucacile ba kunxathwa hayi ngoku sivotela u-u-Lusithi uLus ngabani uJack xa kuzakuphatha uJack masithi apha kwaLanga qha it means wonk ‘umntu uzakwenza into ayithandayo akukho uzakumamela omnye. Niyaunderstanda bethuna? (I’ll give you another chance, please you must decide. My point now it’s not about being wrong or being right it’s about if you can manage to work as a team. You must understand I said from the beginning. There is this Hinas group that is not listening and they don’t care where as they still have to report, but they are the ones that make noise. I asked if the person doesn’t want to, don’t force her. The other one will be ashamed of reporting so give a chance to the person that will do the work. He will learn from it. How are you going to get used to it if you do not stand in front of the whole school representing the class? How are you going to do that? You have to listen if a person is speaking. You don’t listen can you see. I should have said each one must do his own work. I say you make groups I want each to learn from each other. How the person behave when with other people. You didn’t hear my point. Do you hear what I am saying guys? Don’t force people give them a chance; he must be the one who chooses and see. We all are going to have chances to be reporters,
scribers and all leaders. When it’s noisy you’ll never wait anywhere, I don’t see you governing South Africa because it will all be chaos. It seems as you’ll say no while voting for Lesing whose Lesing while Jack can govern lets say here at Langa only means everybody will do what favours him/her, no one will listen to others. Do you understand guys?)

L: Yes
T: Please khanindamameleni xa ndithethayo nto zakuthi, siyevana? (Please, you must listen when I am talking, do we agree?)

L: Yes Miss.
T: So ke ndicela sense ngolohlobo because sifuna ilanto zangomso iileaders Zangomso so ubonakala kwangoku usemncinci indlela ozakubayiyo xa umdala so please ke ndicela siprac tize lonto leyo, next group. Ziphelile iigroups ezizakureporter? (So, we must do like that because we want the leaders for tomorrow, what you doing while young reflects what you going to be when getting old. So please we must practice that. Are all the groups done reporting?)

L: No Miss.
T: Mamelani nina Bantu nifoste abantu, ndicela umntu oqondayo ba uzakwazi uyenza le nto anantsikenzi azivolontiye so that lo ungakwaziyo azokufunda from kuwe siyavana, siyavana Apple, Cima negroup yakho. Nicima yonk ‘into nina apho, andazi noba yilento kukho uCima apho. (List those forced people. A person who feels he can do this must volunteer so that the one that cannot can read from you, do we agree Apple, with your groups you deleting everything there, I do not know if its because there is something there)

L: = Group four, group names = =
T: = =Group.
L: = =Archers Baker scriber one, Name Surname scriber two, Wand Maker leader one, Look Now reporter, Xopist Letter reporter two. Topics matter and measurement. Why we measure, the list of things that we compare store, build, sand, low, high, build object, house, mountain, walls, cold. How we would = =

T: = =Measure = =
L: = =would measure these things = =
T: = =Okay thank you, give him a round of applaud. Mamelani ke nimvile indlela anantsika ngayo ne, bendingakwazi ba uyathetha kamnandi kangaka, ungaphinde ubenenloni apha eclassini siyavana. Uyamva uqinisekile lento ayifundayo nhe? Eyokuba amagama usawabiza wrongo aynangxaki siyavana, ubuzikhethele abakufosanga nhe? Mamelani ke khanibaqhwabeleni izandla. Okay nantsi into endifuna ukuyilungisa, nantsi into endifuna ukuyilungisa. We said we must write a list of things, izinto zizakuba namagama azo, the things that we compare siyavana? Usually who are the people who like to compare their findings? Besithe ngobani abakhomperisha ifindings zabo, mh? (Listen here, did you hear the way she presented. I didn’t know you speak so nicely, don’t you ever feel ashamed in class to hear me. Can you hear he is confident about what he is reading? It doesn’t matter if she calls name wrongly do we agree. You chose they didn’t force you? Give round of applause. Let me correct this, this is what I want to correct. We said we must write a list of things, things will have names, the things that we compare, do we
agree? Usually who are the people who like to compare their findings? Which people did we say they must compare their findings?)
L: (inaudible)
T: Usually (inaudible) I measurement (measurement) specifically helps oobani to compare their Findings, ikhona kwinotes zethu (list on your notes).
L: Iiscientists.
T: Iiscientists (Scientists). I measurement (Measurement) it helps scientists to compare their findings nhe. I even made e iexample ndathi like scientists masithi sithathe oogqirha iispecialist zoogqirha nhe, when they are trying to make iresearch masithi bazama ukuphanda, they are trying to find out, ubuzakuthini? (I even made an example saying like scientists we must take doctors, specialist doctors, right. When they are trying to make research, let say they are researching, what were you going to say?)
L: Xolo Miss uSugar la Miss, uyadlala kamamelanga. (Sorry Miss, Sugar is kidding he is not listening.)
T: O uSugar seyasibonisa into kuba yena nguye ozakudubaduba iSouth Africa njengokuba sifuna iSouth Africa eright wean Siyabulela uzakuba yilampuku emane iluma abantu emilenzeni, ndiyakucela ke siyevana, masingakhathazi. Usually they use inantsi kukhona iimpuku ekuthwa ziiguinea pigs, ndenz ‘umzekelo ndathi mhlawumbi masithi bazakufaka icancer apha kwezimpuku bathathe impuke emmyama bathathe in’impuku emhlophe. Ziimpuku zaselab, laboratory nhe so into abazakuyenza bazakuzifaka icancer zoyitwo and then bathathe imeasurement yeyeza idrug ethile endingazoyazi ba andiyoscientist bayifake kulenantsika kufuneka bamejarishe basifake iyeza elikanga kule nhe safaka masithi i-injection safaka kanga idose kwezimpuku zoyitwo and then bazakuzinika a specific time bathi okay after a month sizakujonga ba kwezimpuku le siyifake icancer cells ingaba iyeza kuyo lizakusebenza kangakanani mhlawumbi ylimnyama yona, le imhlophe uyaunderstand so benza ntoni, benza ntoni? Bayathini? (Oh, Sugar is showing us that he is the one who will mess up South Africa while we want a right South Africa. He will be like that rat who bites people on legs. Please, do we agree? We must bother. Usually they use this there is rats called guinea pigs. I’m making an example: maybe let’s say they are spreading cancer in these rates taking a black rat, taking white rats also. Let’s say these are lab rats, laboratory rats what are they going to do, and they will infect cancer on both and then take measurement of medicine, a special drug. I don’t know I’m not a scientist inserting it on that they to measure, injecting medicine with such amount let say injection, overdosing on these rats they and then they will give a specific time saying a month. We will se on these rats on the one injected with cancer cells how the medicine will work, how much maybe is the black, and white do you understand? So, what are they doing now, what are they doing?)
L: Bayacomperisha. (They are comparing)
T: Bayacomperisha siyavana ke xa becomperisha abazovela bathathe ikomityi yeyeza bayigalele apha kulemuku bathathe iteaspoon balifake apha. Ingaba kukuvomperisha lo nto? (They are comparing do we agree that when comparing they
don't take medicine cups pouring rats taking teaspoon inserting it on. Is that comparing?)
L: No.
T: They need to measure so that bazokwazi ucomparisha and then bazakujonga ke ngoku ba after a month le imnyama impuku besifake kanga kuyo so yona iye yathini, mhlawumbi iye yahhubha yafa le imhlophe. Okay so xa sisebenzise idose ethile kulunga le siyevana, behlula kanjani ne, bendinicacieisele ucomperishaenza kanjani ne. (They need to measure so that they can compare and then they will look on after a month the black rats we poured this must so what happened, maybe the white died. Okay when we used a certain dose this one goes like this, do we agree how on their difference? I explained how to compare.)
L: Ina. (Take this)
T: Bendithe ndicela babhale phantsi izinto abantu abaneproblems xa ndibhala phantsi iifindings zam apha kum ne because nam ngoku I'm trying to compare ukuba which group ekwaziyo ukunantsika which leader ekwaziyo ukuthini ukucontroller igroup yayo siyayibona lo nto leyo. I’m doing the same thing, so ziimeasurement zam, iimeasure endizisebenzisayo. I’ve done igroup work niyayiva lo nto leyo, so ukumejarisha akuko kuthatha into qha usebenzise itape measure qha okay so please ke ndiyanicela. Nina aniynzanga lo nto leyo, anilistanga izinto esithi sizicomperishe because kaloku bathe long bathi height and understandi bathetha ukuthini but sizakubuyela a pho right so into eyenzekayo kengoku zonke ezinto sizingenisile? (I said those who have problems when I’m writing down my findings must write down their problems because even me I’m trying to compare that which group can do which leader can say what controlling his group can we see that. I’m doing the same thing, so it's my measurement, measurement I use. I’ve done group work can you hear that, so measuring is not about taking something and measuring only so please I’m begging you. You didn’t do that, you didn’t list things that we compare because they said long saying. I do not understand what they mean, but we will come back on that. What is happening now, do we all submit?)
L: Yes Miss.
T: Sizingenisile? Ngeziphi iigroup ezingekareporti? Nani anikareporti? (Do we all submit? Which group still have to report? Do you all still have to report?)
L: Yes Miss.
T: Benireportile, ndicela ke zenidecide nhe. So niyazibona iigroups neemarks zenu ngokwenantsika zilapha nhe, so noke yibreak. Yibreak? (You already reported, please decide. You see the groups and your marks with, they are here, so it is break. Is it break time?)

Dual-medium teaching: Afrikaans and English economics

T: Those caps...O’raait. [Those caps okay] Basically what I’m gonna do is to the benefit of this session. I mean I’m going to discuss the little piece of work that I put on the board for you this morning. Ons gaan kyk na die werk wat ons vanoggend
We will discuss the work we did this morning for the benefit of this session. Just go back to the previous part of the work we did. Umm, then we start with the factors of production...die factors of production. Just have a look there, what can you tell me about the factors of production.

[Noise from learners]

T: We’re waiting for you to settle down! We are still waiting for you to settle down. The Grade seven girls on this side (left side), there are four adults here and so you are not behaving. Just for your benefit, De Wet seven A is sitting on this side of the room, De Wet seven B, the Afrikaans class they’re sitting on this side of the room (right side). Okay! Remember we spoke about 4 factors of production sometime last week and I gave the work to you. Will you stop that chatting!!! Just stop. Right, therefore 4 (four) factors of production, vier faktore van produksie. Now remember we said the word “production” means is to produce something. But to do – in order to do that: There are certain things that plays a role in order to produce a certain item. Okay, object or whatever the case may be. Nou daar is sekere faktore wat `n rol speel. [Right, there are seven factors that play a role.] What are the first there are four. What is the first one? [What is the first one?] Labour, right? The factor of labour, wat behels arbeid? Wat is die arbeid waarvan ons praat? [What is the labour we are talking about?]

[Unified answer from English learners]

T: Put up hands [chooses learner to answer]
L: People that work.

T: People that work. People that work. Yes, you need to have people that [inaudible] labour, that do the work in order to produce something. That is what it is all about, right? That is the first factor of production principles. You’re not supposed to look in your books. Second…the second factor. Die tweede faktor? [The second factor?]

L: Natural Resources.

T: Natural Resources. Give an example. Gee ‘n voorbeeld van natuurlike hulpbronne. Natuurlike hulpbron. Luister na die woord, ‘natuurlik’. ‘Hulpbron’? Wat kry ons in die natuur wat vir ‘n bron is wat ons kan gebruik om sekere dinge te vervaardig? [Give an example of natural resources. A natural resource. Listen to the word, natural and resource. What do we get from nature which serve as a resource that we are able to make certain things with?]

L: Gold.
T: Gold?
L: Water. [Water]
T: Water?
L: Soil.
T: Soil, oil, coal. These are all things that [inaudible] so that is...we call ‘Natural Resources’. That’s natural resources, natuurlike hulpbronne [natural resources]...
resources]. Dit kry ons van die natuur [This we get from nature]. Wat is die derde faktor? [What is the third factor?] What is the third factor?

L: Capital.
T: Capital. Kapitaal. [Capital] Vir die kant van die klas…se vir my…waar moet kapitaal of wat is kapitaal? [some learners shout the answer] [For this side of the class…tell me…what to do with capital or what is capital?] Shh, don’t shout. Wat is kapitaal? [What is capital?]

[Answer being mumbled]
T: Die kant van die klas. Wat is kapitaal? Jy moet nie rond kyk nie, kyk vir my!! Wat is kapitaal? [This side of the class. What is capital? You must not look around, look at me!!]

[Again, mumbling]
T: Good. She says it’s money need to produce. They also say it’s money needed to start your business because we know that capital…can we start a business to produce. Okay? So, daai is kapitaal. Die geld wat nodig is om sekere dinge te vervaardig en om ‘n besigheid mee te begin. What is the fourth and last factor? Wat is die laaste faktor? [So, that is capital. The money we need to produce certain amenities and consumable products and to start a business with. What is the fourth and last factor? What is the last factor?]

[Learners answer all at once]
T: Entrepreneurskap of entrepreneurship. What does it mean? [Entrepreneurship or Entrepreneurship]
L: To start your own business.
T: To start your own business. [Inaudible]. Somehow, somebody had to have an idea of what we are going to do with this business. Isn’t it so?
L: Yes.
T: As iemand nou die idée gehad het…wat gaan ons doen. Watter tipe besigheid gaan ek maak. En onthou ons het ook die voorbeeld gemaak van mense wat die stoele maak. [If some had the idea…what would we do? Which type of business would we start? And remember we also made the example of carpenters?] Those people manufacturing these chairs because we need something to sit on. So that they’re using raw material from natural resources, maybe the plastic manufacturer, the steel structures and they formulate it or they produce the chair. Isn’t that so? But remember what I said, what is the first thing that they had…Wat is die eerste ding wat ‘n entrepreneur doen voor hy sy besigheid begin? [What is the first an entrepreneur does before he starts a business?]

[Learners answer all at once]
L: Looks at the needs of the people, sir.
T: Good. She says that he looks at the needs of the people, ja. And then, what does he do afterwards? He try and provide in the needs of the people. Now, what are those needs? [Inaudible] We have to have shelter…
L: Water!
T: Yes, we have to have water.
L: Education!
T: Yes, education. These are the broader things. I’m not talking about those, I’m talking about the entrepreneurial entities where people…their aim is to make
money. Isn’t it so? Like the little house-shop or the guy on the corner selling his, fruit and vegetables or maybe the guy making little containers where you can plant your plant schemes. These are all entrepreneurial entities. Now the difference between an entrepreneur or anybody else. Now, that person, he’s got a foresight. He’s got an idea what he is going to do. He saw that long-term goal. In other words, he will sit down. He will say: ‘there is a need’, right? Remember the example I made about, the bags? Your school bags, right? Say for instance, all of us didn’t have a school bag. You were carrying your books in a little plastic bag. Now that person sees now people are walking with these bags to school…with their books to school but it’s raining. Books are getting wet, so what can we do about it. Obviously, that person sees that there is a need for a proper bag for that person or a child to carry his books to school. Isn’t it so? So wat maak hy nou? Hy gaan dan en hy probeer uitwerk; ‘Wat kan ek doen, wat kan ek maak om daardie problem aan te spreek en op die los’. [So, what does then do? He will go to the drawing board to work out: ‘What can I do, what can I do to solve the problem or to simulate solutions to the problem.’] To solve that problem, to solve that challenge we call it, o’raait? So what do we do? He goes, sit down. Makes a few sketches and the he decides to manufacture a bag which he will use and will sell for the people.

Dual-medium teaching: English/Afrikaans


L: There was once a giant frog. His skin was green and his chest was bright yellow. His eyes were very big and stuck out at the top of his head. He wasn’t an ordinary frog. He was as tall as a man and he could think and speak. He liked to wear a bow tie around his neck. The frog did not want to live under the water like other frogs, so he decided to build a house on the bank of the river. The house was big and beautiful but the frog wasn’t happy. He was very lonely. Eventually the frog decided to look for a wife to share his home. There was a village nearby. Many women lived in this village, but they weren’t interested in him. They laughed at him when he asked them to marry him. The frog had to go back to his house alone. He was very sad and he felt more lonely than ever. One day he visit his frog (Teacher: visited) friends under the water, “you are a frog. Stop trying to be like a man,” they told him, “come and live with us”. The frog thought about this for a while. He decided to move back to his house under the water. He took all his bow ties. Suddenly he felt he was not lonely anymore and before long he fell (felt) in love with a very lovely frog and they were married by a frog, “and I’m proud of it,” he told his wife.

T: Right, that was good. There was just one word you didn’t say properly. And that was one day he visited, okay? Can you see the word there? Just look.
Can you see the word visited there? The word – ja – visited. You said visit – some of you said ‘visited’. Okay, just read that sentence for me: one day…

L: One day he visited his frog friends under the water, he –
T: Now he said there was once a giant frog, a giant frog. Why a giant frog? What can you tell me of this frog? A ‘giant’ frog, the word ‘giant’.

L: A big frog.
T: A big – but was it just big?
L: Tall
L: Huge.
L: Massive.
T: A tall.
L: Huge.
T: A huge frog. And what was so differ - what was so different about this frog?
L: He have a big eyes.
L: He could think and speak
T: He could think and speak. What else, what else can you tell me about this frog?
L: He – he wore a bow tie, Miss.
T: He wore a bow tie. What else?
L: He was tall as a man.
T: He was tall as a man! Now describe this frog for me. Tell me about this frog.
L: His chest was bright yellow and his skin was green.
T: His skin is-is – what was bright yellow?
L: His chest.
T: His chest - right? And what was the colour of this frog?
L: Green.
T: Green, right? Now where did this frog live?
L: River.
L: House.
T: In a house.
L: At the bank of the river. At the bank of the river.
T: On the bank of the - ?
T and LS: river.
T: Now this frog was living in a – was it a normal house? What can you tell me of this house he had - he lived in?
L: It was big and beautiful.
T: It was a very big…
T and LS…and beautiful…
T: …house. Now listen here, what you know of frogs – do they live in houses?
LS: No.
T: No. Where do they then normally live?
LS: Under the water.
T: Under the water. But this frog was just…not an ordinary…?
T and LS: …frog.
T: Right, so, when he lived in the house – did he like to live there?
LS: No.
T: He la – ja, he la –
L: He loved his house.
T: liked to live in the house. But what was short…in this house?
L: A wife.
L: Without a wife.
T: A wife? What else?
L: He was lonely.
T: He was lonely! Right? And when he was lonely, when he was lonely…what did he think?
L: To go to the – to go to the village where - where there are – where there are beautiful women, Miss.
T: Right. He was – he was clever, hey? He went to this village to see all the beautiful…?
T: …women.
L: People.
T: Right. But why did he go to the women? Yes?
L: He was lonely.
T: Ja, uh, he was lonely…
L: He wanted to share his life…
T: He – he wanted to share his life with them…okay.
L: He wanted – did he ask them to marry him?
T: Okay, okay. He asked this – uh – he was looking for a beautiful…?
T and LS: Wife
(One learner/maybe the teacher says ‘women’)
T: Actually a partner, ‘cause he was lonely, right? Did he find somebody?
LS: No…yes…no.
T: That he liked. Did he find somebody?
LS: Yes.
T: Yes, right?
T: And so, what happened there?
LS: They got – they got married.
T: Did they get married?
LS: Yes, Miss
T: Is it?
LS: No…yes, Miss…no.
T: Yes? Come, tell me…
L: They laughed at him.
LS: They laughed at him!
L: Yoh.
T: When he went to the village…they laughed at him. And what did they tell him? What did they tell him?
L: (cannot make out what learner is saying)
T: Okay, they didn’t tell him anything, but he went back even…
T and LS: …more lonelier
T: So, when he got back, what did he decide?
L: He went to visit his friends under the water.
T: He went to his friends under the…?
T and LS: water.
T: Right? And so? When he got there, what did they tell him?
L: Stop trying to be like a man.
T: Okay! Stop trying to be like a…?
T and LS: man.
T: And what else did they tell him?
L: Come live with us.
T: Huh?
L: Come and live with us.
T: Come and live with…
T and LS: Us.
T: Why must he live with them under the water?
LS: Because he’s a frog.
T: Okay, okay, okay, listen, one at a time. Yes?
L: Because he’s a frog.
T: ‘Cause he’s a frog. What else?
L: Because he’s lonely.
T: ‘Cause he’s lonely. What else? Okay, no, what did the frog do when he…went under the water? What did he do?
L: He took off his bow tie.
T: Uh, he took off his bow tie! And what else? He took off his bow tie…?
L: Miss, he did finally find a wife, Miss.
T: Did he find – did he find a wife…under the water?
L: Yes, Miss
T: Right. And did he get married?
L: Yes.
T: Right, he got married. Were you also at the wedding?
LS: No.
(Teacher laughs)
T: Right, okay…um, um, um… Listen here, look to the passage quickly, look to the passage. I see there are words, there are words in this passage with…this…not gonna tell you what it is. I see a word like this… You see that thingie there? What do you call this thing?
LS: Apostrophe.
T: Right. Now this – who can, who can pronounce this word for me?
LS: Wasn’t
T: Aphiwe?
L: Was not.
T: Is it?
L: Wasn’t.
T: Is it? What do you say?
L: Wasn’t.
T: Hey?
L: Wasn’t.
T: Wasn’t. But was he, uh, uh, uh wrong?
L: No.
T: No, he wasn’t wrong. But this word here is ‘wasn’t’, right? But you can also say this is a shorter way of saying two words. Am I right? Now who can give me the two words?
L: Was not.
T: Was…
L: …not.
T: Not.
T: Okay, good. Now there are a few of these words in this passage. Who can give me another one?
L: Was lonely.
T: Who can give me another one?
L: Weren’t.
T: Weren’t. Who can give me the two words that – yes?
L: (inaudible)
T: No,no,no. I’m asking –
L: Were not.
T: Were not. Now who can give me a sentence with ‘were not’? Who can give me a sentence with ‘were not’? Nobody?
L: They were not married.
T: Very good, very good. Right, is there another word with the apostrophe?
L: You’re.
T: You’re? Okay, what is – give me the two words for ‘you’re’?
L: You are.
T: You…
T and LS: …are.
T: Good. Give me another word.
L: I’m
T: I’m, I’m, I’m. Now the – give me the two words for ‘I’m’.
LS: I am
T: I am. Okay. Okay, this is enough of the frog. We gonna do a little Afrikaans now. Are you satisfied with this?
LS: Yes.
T: Okay. Come we do a little Afrikaans. I’m just gonna do two stories, hey? Okay, come let’s do this: “Dassie se stert”.
LS: Dassie se stert.
T: Dassie se stert, okay?
LS: Dassie se stert.
T: Kom, almal van julle gaan nou saam lees, okay? Ek willie he die een moet langer, uh, uh, uh, of stadige praat as die ander nie, en lees saam, ne? Want dit gaan – ons wil ‘n bietjie tyd bespaar, okay? Koning Leeu, kom.
LS:  Koning Leeu wil vir al die duure ‘n stert gee, om die duure meerde werk te gee. (?????????) Hulle het ‘n heele dag gehad om hulle sterte te gaan haal. Klein Dassie was baie lei en het in die son le en bak. Hy vra toe vir Jakkals om vir hom een te bring. Jakkals het ‘n stert vir homself gekry en nog een vir Dassie, maar toe word Jakkals honger, en hy eet Dassie se stert op. Toe hy by Dassie kom, jok hy en se vir Dassie hy moet self ‘n ander stert gaan haal. Dassie hardloop so gou as dat hy kan na Koning Leeu. Maar hy was te laat. Al die sterte was al weg gegee. Dis hoek om klein Dassie vandag nie ‘n stert het nie.

T:  Okay. Se vir my, hier praat hulle van twee duurtjies, van watter twee duurtjies praat hulle in hierdie storie?

LS:  Jakkals en Dassie.

T:  Jakkals en…?

T and LS:  …Dassie.

T:  Nou wat kan jy vir my vertel van ‘n jakkals?

L:  Hy’s ‘n skelm.

T:  Hy’s ‘n skelm. En ‘n dassie?

L:  Hy’t nie ‘n stert.

T:  Moenie uit skree nie, ne?

L:  Hy’t nie ‘n stert.

T:  Hy’t nie ‘n stert nie. Wat kan jy nog v-vir my vertel?

L:  Hy was lei.

T:  Hy-hy in die storie is hy-was hy lei, okay. Nou, se vir my – nou daar was – Koning Leeu het vir die duure iets gegee…wat was dit?

L:  ‘n Stert.

T:  ‘n Stert, reg? En wat het Koning Leeu gese? Wat het Koning Leeu gese? Hoe het hulle geweet daar is sterte beskikbaar vir hulle?

T:  Hoe het hulle geweet daar is ‘n stert vir hulle?

T and LS:  (Inaudible)

T:  Aha

T:  Nee, hoe het hulle geweet daar is ‘n stert… Koning Leeu se…

L:  Koning Leeu het vir hulle gese.

T:  Het hy gese? Reg daar’s ‘n stert vir julle. En hoe gaan hulle die stert kry? Hoe sou hulle die stert kry?

L:  Hulle moet gaan haal.

T:  Hulle moet elk eene vir hulle ‘n sert gaan…

T:  Haal

T:  Het hulle toe almal – het hulle toe al twee gegaan?

L:  Nee

T:  Nee. Nou wat he gebeur? Wie kan vir my se?

L:  Dassie het vir Jakkals gevra om vir hom een te bring.

T:  Dassie het vir Jakkals gevra om vir hom een te…

LS:  bring

T:  Hoekom het hy nie self gegaan nie?
Hy was ly. Wat het hy dan gedoen? Wat het hy gedoen toe Jakkals sy stert gaan haal?

Hy’t in die son gele en bak. En toe het Jakkals toe gegaan?

Ja

Ja, hy het gegaan. En toe hy by Koning Leeu kom… toe wat gebeur toe?

Hy kry toe een vir hom en vir Dassie.

Dassie.

Maar daar’t toe iets lelik gebeur… sheninie…

Um…um Jakkals het vir Dasie se stert op geeet

Hoekom?

Hy was honger

Hy was – hy’t honger gewort. Toe dink hy wag hier gaan ek nou Dassie se stert…

Op eet

Okay. En toe hy nou by dassie kom toe wat se hy toe vir dassie? Wat het hy vir dassie gese? Shandre?

En kan nie hoor nie.

Hy moet vir homself een gaan haal.

Hy moet vir homself een gaan haal. Hoe - En toe wat se hy classie dassie toe vir hom?

Niks nie.

Het Dassie toe niks gese nie.

Ja ma toe hy vir Dassie vra hoekom het jy nie my stert nie, toe wat se hy vir Dassie. Wat het hy vir Dassie gese?

Hy moet sy eier stert…

Gaan haal.

Hy moet sy eier stert gaan haal. En het Dassie toe sy eier stert gaan haal?

Ja

Ja, hy’t sy eier stert gaan haal.

Waar het hy die stert gaan haal?

By Koning Leeu.

Ininitia, waar het hy die stert gaan haal?

By Koning Leeu.

En toe hy by Koning Leeu kom, toe wat se Koning Leeu?

Hy moet sy eier stert gaan haal.

Het Koning Leeu vir hom een gegee?

Nee.
T and LS: … stert nie.
T: Reg nou hier’s ‘n paar woortjies… wat urr…. Onthou julle ek he t vir julle – die die - hierdie woortjies. Ek het hierdie woorde met hiedie klankie uit gehaal… Wat is hierdie klankie nou..
L: ‘Eu’
L: Deur.
T: Deur. Se almal daai wootjie gou.
L: Deur.
T: Se ‘deur’.
LS: Deur.
T: Now give me the English word for the word…
LS: Door.
T: … deur… ok.. door.. ok.
T: Um wie kan vir my die woortjie ‘deur’ op die bord skryf. Kom ons kyk of sy kan spell…..
(Learner writes on the board)
T: Is it mo- … is it reg?
L: Ja.
L: Door.
T: Gutter. Wie kan vir my daardie word op die bord skryf? Tobeka… kom ons kyk of sy die woortjie op die bord kan skryf.
(Learner writes the word on the board)
Teacher: Is dit reg?
Learners: Ja
Teacher: Pragtig. Met watter klankie begin daardie woortjie?
Learner: ga, ga, gee, ga
Teacher: Reg, en waar eindig dit?
Learners: Ta ta, tee, tee, ta
Teacher: Okay. Met ‘n…
Learners: …Ta.
Teacher: Ta. Okay. Dan he tons nog ‘n woortjie gehard. Um um. Ek gaan vir jou .. ek gan vir jou self select die woortjie. Die reen is baie kwaai. Watter sinetjie in daardie woortjie het daadie klankie in?
Learners: ‘ee’, ‘ee’.
Teacher: Die reen. Okay. Wie kan vir my daardie woortjie kom skryf? Um , Innitia?
(Learner writes on board)
Teacher: Is dit reg?
Learner: Ja.
Teacher: Wie kan vir die Engels woortjie gee vir daardie woortjie? Wie kan vir my die Engelse woortjie gee? Um um…Zinziso, give me the English word for that word on the board - vir die woortjie reen… you can’t...
Learner: … a male dog.
Teacher: Ha?
Learner: A male dog.
Teacher: Good, right. Dan het ons noge woortjie gehard… umm… hierdie woortjie… ek gaan net - um - daar was n woortjie… ek gaan die woortjie self op die bord skryf. Steek jou hand op, wie ken die word. Steek jou hand op. Steek jou hand op. Zinzio, ken jy daai woortjie? Zizie?
Learner: Colour
Teacher: Okay… no, no. I didn’t ask for the English word. I didn’t ask for the English word. Jy moet die woortjie vir my uitspreek. Jy moet vir my se. You must say it to me. Say the word.
Learner: Dis ‘kleur’.
Teacher: Dis pragtig! Dis ‘kleur’. Daar’s die woortjie ‘kleur’. Wie kan nou vir my ‘n sinetjie gee met daardie woord. Wie kan vir my ‘n sinetjie gee met daardie woortjie. Ek wil nie elke keer die selfde mense vrae nie. Wie kan – Sapiwe - gee vir ons ‘n sinetjies met daardie woortjie.
Learner: …..
Teacher: Give me a sentence with that word. Can you? In Afrikaans. Okay, gee vir my ‘n sinetjie met daardie woortjie.
Learner: Die kleur is rooi.
Learner: Seun.
Teacher: Se weer.
Learner: Seun.
Teacher: Wie kan vir my die woortjie skryf. Okay, Amamda. Gee vir haar ‘n kaans.
Learners: Ja.
Teacher: Dis dood reg.. Baie mooi. Reg, nou wie kan nou - gee vir my gou die engels woortjie vir ‘seun’.
Learners: Boy.
T: Moenie uit skree nie, ne. Moenie uit skree nie, want dan gee jy vir die res van die klas die antwoord, en dan kan hulle nie self dink nie. Ok, - ur, umm - gee jy vir my die Engels woortjie. Give the English word for the word ‘seun [boy]’ in Afrikaans. The Afrikaans word is ‘seun’, now give me the English word… hey… boy.. okay, okay, baie goed. Nou gee vir my ‘n sinetjie. Wie gaan vir my ‘n sinetjie gee? ‘n Sinejtjie gee met die word seun. Silinia. [Do not scream, ok. Do not scream, because
you will give the rest of the class the answer, and you will not allow them to think for themselves. Ok, - ur, umm – give me the English word. Give the English word for the word ‘seun’ in Afrikaans. The Afrikaans word for ‘seun’, now give me the English word…hey…boy…okay, okay, very good. Now construct a sentence for me. Who is going to make up the sentence? A sentence, give me a sentence with the word boy. Silinia.
L: Die seun is stout. [The boy is unruly.]
T: Pragtig. Is dit ‘n mooi sinnetjie wat sy gee? Ons het nou twee, vier, five woorde. Kom ons lees nou net een woordjie. Nou net een woordjie. Wie kan dia aan nog ‘n woord met die woordjie ‘eeu’? Wie kan dia aan nog woordjie met die wat se jy…. [Very good. Was that a good sentence she came up with? We have now dealt with two, four, five words. Let us read one more word, just one word. Who can think of another word with the word construction ‘eeu’? Who can give another word with…what do you say…]
L: Neus. [Nose.]
T: Ha? [What?]
L: Neus. [Nose.]
T: Neus. Wys gou jou neus. Daar sy! Nou wie kan vir my - gee gou - give me the English word for the for the - vir die wordjie neus - give me the English word vir die woordjie neus. [Nose. Show me your nose. There it is, good. Now, who can give me, quickly, give me the English word for the for the – for the word nose – give me the English word for the word nose.]
L: Nose.
T: Nose. Is beautiful. Can you write the word nose on here? Sorry, neus [nose]. Kan jy die woordjie neus’ op die bord skryf? [Can you write the word nose on the blackboard?]
T: As jy se neus wat woord is eerste? As jy neus…water klankie hoor jy eerste? If you say the word nose, which word comes first? If you write the word nose…which sound do you hear first?
L: …..[…]
T: You say the word nose…
T: Nnn neus. Watter klankie hoor jy eerste? [Nose. Which sound do you hear first?]
L: (All mumbling out)…
T: You must actually write incursive hey. You didn’t write incursive but anyway. Se gou vir ons die woordjie daar meisie. Se vir ons. [Just say the word quickly. Sound it out loud].
L: Neus. [Nose]
Who have I not asked a question? Who? Kolese, construct a sentence with the word nose in it.

L: Nose.
T: Weet jy wat neus is? [Do you know what a nose is?]
L: Nose.
T: It’s your nose. Nou kan jy vir my ‘n sinnetjie gee met die word neus? Mm? Can you give me a sentence with the word – the Afrikaans word neus? [Now, are you able to construct a sentence with the word nose? Mm?]
T: Okay, Soqelo, hy gaan probeer. [Okay, Segelo will try.]
L: My nose bleed.
T: Ja, but that is in English. I want Afrikaans. Ek wil ‘n Afrikaans sinetjie he. Ek wil ‘n Afrikaans sinetjie he. Um, um, um Sha – kira. My neus is…. [Yes, but that is in English. I want Afrikaans. I want an Afrikaans sentence. I want an Afrikaans sentence. I want an Afrikaans sentence. I want an Afrikaans sentence. Um, um, um Sha – kira. My nose is …]
LS and T: Seer. [Hurts]
T: Okay, dit was pragtig. Jevrouens, is dit genoeg of… [Okay, that was perfect. Ladies is that enough or … - reference to researchers]
Observers: It’s fine… baie dankie [thankyou]
T: Maar ons het al… Ons het Maandag die storie gedoen… Maandag… Maar ek doen dit maar weer… omdat dit vat tyd vir hulle. Kyk Xhosa’s mos hulle eerste taal. So Engels, hier… leer hulle nou Engels en Afrikaans, verstaan uu, so umm, jy kan nie net vir hulle, soma net vandag… nee jy kan nie. Defnitief nie. Ja. Kyk hier. Uu kan nou hoor hoe praat hulle Afrikaans. Nou as ek nie so moet doen nie, dan sal die kinders nooit Afrikaans sal kan leer nie. [But we did the story Monday already. But I will do it again because it kills time. You see Xhosa is their first language. So, English at this school, they study English and Afrikaans, do you understand, so umm, you cannot teach them just today, you have to drag it over time, definitely not. Yes. You see, you heard how they speak Afrikaans. Therefore, if I don’t teach the way I have demonstrated then they will never learn Afrikaans].