A CASE STUDY OF ENGLISH/XHOSA CODE SWITCHING AS A COMMUNICATIVE AND LEARNING RESOURCE IN AN ENGLISH MEDIUM CLASSROOM

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Education (English Second Language)

Rhodes University

by

Sithembele Marawu

January 1997

ABSTRACT

Research on code switching (CS), the use of more than one language in a single piece of discourse, has focused on various aspects of the phenomenon. For example, research has concentrated on switching that occurs between turns of interlocutors in a piece of discourse, sometimes between sentences within a single turn and sometimes within a sentence. Researchers have approached this discourse behaviour from various perspectives. For instance, some investigate the social functions of the switches, others explore the linguistic constraints on the switches. Furthermore, most of this research has examined CS in non-educational contexts.

Research on classroom CS, the focus of this study, took hold in the mid 1970s. Researchers began to investigate the communicative functions of CS and the frequency with which teachers and learners used certain languages to perform different functions. Recent studies on classroom CS focus on the sequential flow of classroom discourse and "the way in which code-switching contributes to the interactional work that teachers and learners do in bilingual classrooms" (Martin-Jones 1995:91). The approach used in these studies is the conversational analytic approach grounded in ethnographic observation.

In South Africa little research has been done on classroom CS, though it makes an important contribution to the interactional work of teachers and learners in classrooms. This study explores the use of English and Xhosa in the classroom as a learning and communicative resource. Its focus is on the communicative functions of the switching behaviour of a teacher as she interacts with her pupils. In other words, this study looks at how the research subject uses English and Xhosa to get things done in the classroom. As the classroom situation observed is dominated by the teacher, this study concentrates mainly on her communicative repertoire. It does not attempt a full linguistic description of the switches made by the research subject, for example, it

does not deal with linguistic constraints on CS.

One of the major findings noted in this study is that the research subject does not use CS so as to avoid using English. She uses CS as a learning resource. It has also been noted that CS is used by the research subject as a contextualisation cue, for example, we noted the way it co-occurs with other contextualisation cues like nonverbal communincation cues. This is in line with Martin-Jones' (1995) viewpoint that CS is not used by bilingual teachers simply to express solidarity with the learners but to negotiate and renegotiate meaning.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to the following people, without whose support and guidance this research would have not been possible:

1. My supervisors, Ms Sarah Murray and Mr Andrew van der Spuy for their patience, encouragement, constructive criticism and willingness to share their expertise.
2. Professor David Gough for his valuable contribution and guidance when he was my supervisor.
3. My parents, Victor Fuma and Nobantu Vuyelwa for being a source of inspiration throughout all the years of my quest for formal education.
4. My wife, Lindiwe and my children, Lihle and Litha, for their patience with a husband/father whose nose was always glued on books.
5. Professor Marylin Martin-Jones of Lancaster University, UK., Professor Angel Lin of City University, Hong Kong, Professor Elaine Tarone of Minnesotta University, USA for suggesting and providing relevant reading material to this study.
6. Dr G. Cornwell, for his superb proof-reading skills.
7. Ms Zukiswa Mahlathi and Nomakhaya Dlangamandla-Mashiyi for their support and encouragement.
8. The principal of the school where this research was conducted, and the Std 6 history teacher and her pupils, for their willingness to participate in this research.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

1.1 INTRODUCTION

One of the most persistent and perplexing problems for education planners in South Africa today is posed by the need for a language - in - education policy that will develop and promote the equal use and status of the nine previously marginalised languages of South Africa. Planners have at the same time to ensure that developing and promoting the use and enjoyment of these languages does not deny learners access to languages of prestige and international communication like English.

Perhaps it is in the light of this that CS is no longer discouraged in the classroom as a symptom of inadequate command of the target language and an impediment to its acquisition. In fact the use of code switching as a classroom strategy is a widespread phenomenon in South African schools, and had been going on long before its recommendation by the present government. The most obvious reason for this is that, while many learners in South Africa aspire to acquire English because of its socio-economic value and prestige, they struggle to learn through the medium of English.

Furthermore, teachers use CS in the classroom as a communicative resource to help impart information to learners. It occurs most frequently as a natural part of teachers' classroom discourse. For example, when I asked my research subject why she used the expression *siyevana* [are you with me?], she said that she was surprised, after viewing the video, to see its prevalence in her interaction with the pupils. Though it comes unconsciously, it is an expression that is part of the language she uses to explain information to the pupils.

This study concentrates on English/Xhosa code switching in the classroom. It seeks to observe when and how a teacher interacts with her pupils through code switching. Furthermore, it explores the contexts in which instances of code switching typically occur. It also describes the functions of code switching, and in particular the role of translation, in the South African classroom context.

Chapter Two of this study offers a review of the relevant literature, while Chapter Three describes the research methodology employed. In Chapter Four the research data are analysed, and in the fifth and final chapter the findings are discussed and some conclusions proposed concerning relevant issues.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of research that has been done on classroom code switching (CS). The chapter begins with research that covers CS generally or CS outside the classroom. Having given this overview of general CS, it moves on to research on classroom CS, the particular focus of this study.

A general overview of CS is provided because it is felt that in order to get a balanced and fully conceptual perspective on classroom CS, one has to appraise the recent trends in research on CS generally. For the purposes of such a broad overview, I look at the work of Myers-Scotton (1993). Subsequently, Martin-Jones'(1995) work is reviewed in detail as it offers a more focused perspective on research on CS in bilingual classrooms.

2.2 Research into code switching in non-educational contexts

Myers-Scotton (1993) gives a broad historical and critical overview of research on CS. She begins by stating that today there is not only interest in CS but it is an established field of study researched from various perspectives:

> In the last ten years, almost all major conferences within linguistics have included at least one paper on CS, and articles on CS appear regularly in many journals within the field (1993:45).

Myers-Scotton attributes the tremendous present-day interest in CS to the pioneering work of John Gumperz and Jan Blom (B&G) (1972). Though Blom and Gumperz dealt with CS between dialects of Norwegian, their study prompted other researchers to investigate CS between languages.

Myers-Scotton points out that prior to the work of Blom and Gumperz, CS was not regarded as an important aspect of bilingual discourse: "It was not that others had never discussed CS, although treatments were admittedly few and did not always appear in very accessible places" (1993:46). One of the reasons why CS was not regarded as an important research topic was the negative attitude that it was a "performance error" resulting from lack of ability in one of the languages. But Myers-Scotton dismisses the characterisation of CS as "unprincipled alternation", noting that "speakers were obviously fluent in both codes they used" (1993:50). Myers-Scotton (1993:50) goes on to give an historical background to the study of CS. She states that in the 1970s many studies on the social functions of CS appeared. These focused on Spanish/English CS, for example, Jacobson (1978a; 1978b); Donald Lance (1970; 1975) and Guadalupe Valdes-Fallis (1976). This was followed by focus on multilingual Africa as a rich research site. Studies on CS between English/Swahili were conducted by, for example, Beardsley and Eastman (1971). Other researchers who have looked at CS in Africa include Mkilifi (1972); Parkin (1974); Myers-Scotton and Ury (1977); Agheyisi (1977); and Scotton (1979).

Most of this research focused on the social motivations of CS, one of the concerns of Blom and Gumperz. Myers-Scotton (1993) maintains that in the late 1970s and 1980s the mode of interest in the social motivations of CS was little changed from thearlier approach of Blom and Gumperz. But she points out that, from the mid-1970s, scholars began showing an interest in the linguistic constraints of CS. They examined, for instance, the question of where in a sentence a

switch could occur.

Myers-Scotton goes on to say that, for a long time (about fifteen years) after the study by Blom and Gumperz, researchers used Gumperz's notion of situational and metaphorical CS. She points to a lack of clarity in Blom and Gumperz's definition of situational and metaphorical CS:

> Situational CS is never really very well defined, but it seems clear that B & G are referring to CS motivated by changes in factors external to the participant's own motivations (e.g. makeup of participants, setting, topic) when situational CS is meant.
>
> And while they continue to talk about "topic" when mentioning metaphorical CS, it is not really topic which B & G wish to relate to metaphorical CS so much as a presentation of self *in relation to* the topic, or changes in relationship to other participants. (1993:52)

Myers-Scotton says that other researchers, like Pride (1979) and Auer (1984), also find problems with Blom and Gumperz's definition of situational and metaphorical CS. Pride (1979:39-40) states that Blom and Gumperz's definition of the two types of CS is unclear and that they "are not so separate as Blom and Gumperz seem to assume". Auer (1984:91) also argues that "the distinction between situational and metaphorical code-switching must be criticised from both ends . . .".

These critical views of Blom and Gumperz's notions of situational and metaphorical CS show that researchers, after initially following their line of thought, were beginning to develop their own critical perspectives on the study of CS. Further, these differences in opinion show that CS was becoming established as a field of study. Yet without Blom and Gumperz, we would perhaps not have these divergent views which are a major contribution to the study of CS; as Myers-Scotton (1993:55) puts it, "it is perhaps no exaggeration to say that much of the work on CS would not have been done at all without the stimulation of B & G".

Blom and Gumperz's contribution to the study of CS not only took the form of stimulating

interest in other researchers; they also made a theoretical contribution. For example, their work enabled new models for the study of CS to be developed. Myers-Scotton (1993:56) mentions the "interactional/interpretative" model which emerged as an alternative to the "allocation paradigm". She describes this model as follows:

> This model, however, is never really explicated. Rather it exists in a number of crucial premises: (1) small-group interactions are the proper research site and naturally occurring data are the object of study; (2) the social meanings of language use are a function of situated contexts; and (3) the use of linguistic choices as a strategy adds intentional meaning to an utterance.

Myers-Scotton's overview of research on CS highlights the following: the remarkable contribution of Blom and Gumperz, particularly their study of 1972; the emergence of a bank of information expressing ideas on CS from various perspectives; the shift of focus from the social motivations of CS, an orientation of Gumperz, to the study of the linguistic constraints of CS. Also noted by Myers-Scotton's work is the shift of focus by Gumperz himself from the notion of metaphorical CS to "conversational CS", though she argues that "'conversational CS' as a creative performance seems to mean that the term is another name for metaphorical switching" (1993:53).

If research on CS took hold after the study by Blom and Gumperz in 1972, then classroom CS is to be seen as an offspring of research on CS generally. Developments in the study of general CS have had impact on the understanding of classroom CS. If, for example, we consider the shift from the way CS was perceived before the Blom and Gumperz days - that is, as an aspect of the performance of the imperfect bilingual - to its consideration as a feature of the discourse of bilinguals, we see the influence of this change in perception in stimulating interest in classroom CS. Martin-Jones (1995:91-92) states that the serious study of CS in the classroom began in the mid 1970s with a debate on the influence of CS on children's language development: "there was considerable controversy in educational circles in the United States about the impact of bilingual

classroom communication on children's language development". Martin-Jones goes on to say that researchers shifted away from this debate after realising the flaws of earlier studies of bilingual classrooms.

I have thus far given a broad overview of research on CS. The next section turns to research focusing on situations outside the classroom which have been found relevant to this study. The section does not therefore pretend to offer an exhaustive review of CS research outside the classroom.

2.3 Myers-Scotton's markedness model

In this section I look at Myers-Scotton's work in detail, particularly the markedness model. One of the reasons for dealing with Myers-Scotton's work in detail is that she attempts to provide a "larger framework from which [CS's] social functions can be derived" (Myers-Scotton,1993:74). She explains her markedness model as follows:

> The theory behind the markedness model proposes that speakers have a sense of markedness regarding available linguistic codes for any interaction, but choose their codes on the persona and/or relation with others which they wish to have in place. (1993:75)

Myers-Scotton gives four social functions of CS: code switching in a sequence as an unmarked choice; code switching itself as the unmarked choice; code switching to make a marked choice, and code switching to make an exploratory choice. Code switching in a sequence as an unmarked choice occurs when the speaker changes from one unmarked code to another unmarked code. In CS itself as an unmarked choice we consider the overall pattern of CS, and not the individual switches, and also look at the social meaning it carries. Myers-Scotton defines a marked choice

as a "deviation from the expected or unmarked choice". This can be compared to what Appel and Muysken (1987) call the "directive function" of CS, because it occurs when CS is used to exclude a person from a portion of the conversation. Code switching to make an exploratory choice occurs in a new and uncertain situation when strangers explore codes.

Myers-Scotton's research is important for this study, particularly the markedness model. For example, the model is used to examine whether the switches to Xhosa by the research subject are marked or unmarked switches. In other words, does the research subject switch codes so as to exclude or include her pupils? Does she use Xhosa as an exploratory choice? It is questions like these that are explored in Chapter Five, using Myers-Scotton's markedness model.

2.4 Research into code switching in educational contexts

Having looked at research that covers CS generally, I now move on to research dealing with CS in the classroom. This research has a self-evident importance for my study, which also focuses on classroom CS. While little research has been done on classroom CS in South Africa, one researcher who has addressed the phenomenon is Adendorff (1992), who looks at CS as a communicative and learning resource in the classroom. Peires (1994) examines CS as an aid to L2 learning, but her data is not based on classroom interaction; this applies also to the work of Kieswetter (1995), who looks at CS by students from selected South African schools.

Nevertheless, the research of Peires (1994) and Kieswetter (1995) is important and relevant to this study since it deals with CS in South African institutions of learning. In this study, their work is used as a "prelude" to examining spontaneous instances of CS by my research

subject (Adendorff 1992:24). Peires, for example, argues that CS must not be viewed as a "handicap" but as a useful classroom resource. Peires' argument is relevant to my study because I look at how Phila uses CS as a learning aid. Kieswetter (1995) has grounded her study in the work of Myers-Scotton (1992), particularly the markedness model. The fact that Kieswetter has used Myers-Scotton's model makes her study relevant to mine because Myers-Scotton's integrated approach to the study of CS and the markedness model have been found very useful in determining the functions of code switches used by my research subject.

This section also includes notice of research that has been done on classroom CS in other parts of the world; for example, research by Ndayipfukamiye (1994) in Burundi, Camilleri (1996) in Malta, Lin (1996) in Hong Kong and Arthur (1996) in Botswana. All these studies are related to my research.

I begin with the recent work of Martin-Jones (1995), which offers a review of trends in research on CS in the classroom. According to Martin-Jones, research on CS in the classroom has been going on for almost two decades, starting in the mid-1970s. She discerns two strands of work on bilingual classroom interaction: earlier studies which concentrate on classroom discourse analysis in bilingual contexts, emphasising the communicative functions of CS in teacher-led talk; and more recent studies, which focus on the sequential flow of classroom discourse and the role of CS as an interactional resource in the classroom.

Martin-Jones goes on to say that the approach used in the strand of research which focuses on the sequential flow of classroom discourse is the conversational analytic approach, grounded in ethnographic observation. She focuses on what she calls "cross-disciplinary currents of influence" and the different approaches used in the two strands of research on bilingual classroom interaction. In her discussion of the first strand of research, she makes reference to two studies conducted in bilingual classrooms in the United States. In her review of the second strand

of research, she refers to two studies conducted in different learning settings. One of these studies was conducted by Zentella (1981) in two bilingual classes in New York. In these two classes Zentella conducted ethnographic observations. The other study was conducted by Lin (1988, 1990), who investigated patterns of CS in English lessons in Anglo-Chinese secondary schools in Hong Kong. Martin-Jones draws attention to the way in which Lin used the conversational analytic approach. The questions asked by such researchers in their investigation of classroom discourse are just the sort of questions posed in this study:

> The analysis of code-switching data gathered in classrooms such as these was guided by such questions as: what types of communicative acts can be identified? In what language are acts of different types performed? How often and how consistently? What values are conveyed to learners by the teachers' patterns of bilingual communication? (Martin-Jones 1995:93)

By "these" Martin-Jones refers to studies by researchers such as Milk (1981), Guthrie (1984) and Dore (1977). These researchers used the conversational analytic approach in their analysis of data.

Martin-Jones then looks at developments in research in bilingual classrooms, highlighting changes in approach to the study and analysis of CS in the classroom. She mentions, for example, the use of audio-recordings of classroom interactions as one of the significant breakthroughs in classroom CS. She also sees a shift from the focus of earlier studies on the communicative functions of CS in teacher-led talk to the development of an account of the "sequential flow of classroom discourse and of the way in which code-switching contributes to the sequential work that teachers and learners do in bilingual classrooms" (1995:91). She also focuses on the development of micro-ethnographic work in bilingual classroom discourse. She concludes by indicating how she feels research in bilingual classrooms should be developed:

> We need to develop more critical approaches to ethnographic work in the classroom and to our analysis of bilingual classroom discourse. We need to be able to show how code-switching in bilingual discourse is shaped by the social conditions operating in different types of classrooms and how differing views

> about the value and purpose of bilingual education are manifested in bilingual discourse practices. (1995:108)

I now turn to the work of Valdes-Fallis (1978). Valdes-Fallis focuses on the teacher and the use of CS in the classroom. She attributes negative attitudes towards bilingualism by some educators to the fact that they have a poor understanding of the notion of bilingualism. She goes on to say that educators involved in planning bilingual programmes have to note "the language strengths of the two languages in the community, and their own use of two languages within the bilingual classroom" (1978:3). She then gives a detailed description of the facets and varying characteristics of code switching. This is followed by a brief discussion of the importance of the teacher's attitude toward codeswitching in the classroom. Valdes-Fallis' (1978) work is perhaps typical of its era (Myers-Scotton [1995] observes that interest in CS as a research subject burgeoned in the mid- and late-1970s, while Martin-Jones [1995] dates the beginning of research in classroom CS to the mid-1970s). The appeal by Valdes-Fallis to teachers to adopt a positive attitude towards CS in the classroom is part of the debate of the time against those who believed that CS in the classroom would have a negative impact on the development of the learners' L2.

Until recently, CS has been proscribed in South African schools and little research has been done on it as a classroom strategy. An exception is Adendorff (1992), who conducted a study in which he observed how three teachers - an English teacher, a biology teacher and a geography teacher - interacted with their learners using CS in the classroom.

Adendorff first looks at how CS outside the classroom could be used as a basis for understanding classroom CS. He examines what he calls "grosser" instances of CS and goes on to say that he sees these as a "useful prelude to examining" spontaneous instances of CS. What he calls "grosser" instances of code switches are switches similar to those made by Nelson Mandela, Margaret Thatcher and Japan's ambassador to South Africa, when they switched from

English to Afrikaans and then continued their speeches in English (1992:23-24).

Adendorff's focus is on code switching in the classroom but, as already pointed out, he starts by looking at general instances of CS. In the section where he looks at the implications of CS for teacher education in South Africa, Adendorff proposes the development of sociolinguistic sensitivity in aspirant teachers, and suggests that programmes dealing with this can "focus squarely on fundamental insights which sociolinguists have gained into the nature of language in general as well as into the use of language in society" (1992:35). In other words, Adendorff emphasises the importance of research that has been done on CS outside the classroom to the study of CS in the classroom.

According to Martin-Jones' review of research on CS in the classroom, Adendorff's work is an example of the second strand of recent research, which focuses on the sequential flow of classroom discourse and the role of CS as an interactional resource. What Adendorff highlights in his analysis of instances of CS is the notion of CS as a communicative and learning resource. In doing this, he examines the functions performed by switches from English to Zulu, arguing that they are used for solidarity purposes, for exercising authority and managing the class, and to reinforce explanations that were made in English.

On the issue of the solidarity function of CS, Martin-Jones (1995:98) makes this point: Whilst the languages used in a bilingual classroom are bound to be associated with different cultural values, it is too simplistic to claim that whenever a bilingual teacher who has the same language background as the learners switches into a shared code, s/he is invariably expressing solidarity with the learners. What Martin-Jones is suggesting is that we need to go beyond the "we code" and "they code" in our analysis of classroom data. She goes on to say that teachers and learners use CS to "negotiate and renegotiate joint frames of reference and to exchange meanings on the spur of the moment" (1995:98).

Adendorff believes that CS can be used in the classroom as a learning and communicative resource. He argues that people who decry CS do so "because their own social identity is wrapped up in language preferences which do not employ switches" (1992:36). In this he seems to share the opinion of Valdes-Fallis (1978), who believes that educators who have a negative attitude towards CS have a poor understanding of the notion of bilingualism. As already mentioned, Adendorff believes that the development of a positive attitude towards CS in the classroom has to be encouraged in teachers, and suggests that this could be done during teacher training. Again, Valdes-Fallis also believes that teachers have to adopt a positive attitude towards CS in the classroom; by so doing, they will be able to use CS as a learning resource.

The issue of "consciousness-raising" in teachers can be compared to what Valdes-Fallis (1978) refers to as the development of a positive attitude towards CS by teachers. The development of a positive attitude towards classroom CS became an important issue after interest in classroom CS as a research topic grew in the mid-1970s. One of the reasons for its importance is that there were those who argued that CS in the classroom was a hindrance to the development of the learners' second language (L2).

In raising the same issue in South Africa in the 1990s, Adendorff shows that there is a need to do "consciousness-raising" among teachers, since there are many who believe that CS retards acquisition of the learners' L2. This may be the case because so little research has been done on classroom CS in South Africa: there seems to be a need for general awareness, based on research, of the merits and demerits of classroom CS.

Ndayipfukamiye's (1994) research on CS in Burundi primary classrooms looks at how French and Kirundi are used by teachers in constructing knowledge across the curriculum. She states that in the classroom situation teachers are faced with two demands: they have to teach through the medium of French, a language of prestige in Burundi, but simultaneously they have

to guide their learners through the curriculum. CS is, therefore, a linguistic resource used by teachers to meet the demands of the classroom situation. She goes on to mention that it is a resource for concept development, "a key to the world of the participants and a means of alleviating the artificiality of the classroom from the learners' experience" (1994:83-84).

What we deduce from the foregoing review is that the learners' mother-tongue (MT) has a role in the classroom situation. It seems that how and when teachers use CS will depend on the situation in which they find themselves. Furthermore, that teachers have to meet the demands of the curriculum - that is, ensure that the learners understand the content of the subject - and also learn the prestigious L2, is a problem not peculiar to Burundi. In South Africa, for example, English is a language of prestige, a language most people want to acquire so as to join the higher echelons of society. Teachers have the responsibility of teaching English so as to meet this demand, while at the same time being required to teach the content of the subjects. In most cases learners are not prepared for English-medium education, and hence teachers use CS to alleviate the situation. My research subject is a good illustration of this.

In another research study, Ndayipfukamiye (1996) focuses on teacher/learner interactions during French classes. She mentions that during these French lessons both the teachers and the learners code-switched between French and Kirundi. She states that code switching practices such as these, at the local level of lessons, should be "understood with reference to the relationship and ideological forces operating at broader societal level" (1996:35). The same idea is expressed by Valdes-Fallis (1978), who feels that language planning should consider "the real use of the two languages in the community" (1978:3). What we deduce from the ideas expressed by these two authors is that CS patterns in the classroom should be viewed against general language practices in society.

Ndayipfukamiye emphasises the fact that teachers in Burundi always find themselves

acting against policy because, although they are expected to teach in the medium of French, they frequently resort to Kirundi. This is similar to the South African situation before the recommendation of CS in schools. Teachers used CS in the classroom as a strategy to cope with the constraints they faced as a result of having to teach in English.

In her research on CS in Hong Kong schools, Lin (1996) states that English enjoys a high status because of its prestigious position as a language of power, education and socio-economic advancement. She goes on to say that many students aspire to acquire English because of its socio-economic value, but struggle to learn through it as a medium of instruction. She further states that the imposition of English as medium of instruction in Hong Kong schools benefits a few children, those who come from a lifeworld of bilingual and elite parents, but not the majority of Chinese children in Hong Kong who come from a "lifeworld where it is impossible and unnatural to use English" (1996:62). Lin, like Ndayipfukamiye, perceives CS in the classroom to be a valuable solution to the problems teachers encounter as a result of having to teach in the learners' L2.

The educational situation Lin describes is similar to the South African one, especially when CS was proscribed in schools. Many students in South Africa come from backgrounds where English is not their everyday language. Code switching is therefore perceived as a way of alleviating this problem.

Arthur (1996) investigated classroom interaction in Botswana primary schools. She states that in Botswana during the first four years, Setswana is the medium of instruction; beyond Standard 2, English is the medium of instruction. Her research focuses on participant-related CS, though it acknowledges the occurrence of discourse-related CS. One of her observations is that pupils are not allowed to code-switch when responding to the teacher's questions. I also observed in my study that when the learners respond to the teacher's questions they respond in English,

even though the teacher may have explained the topic in both English and Xhosa.

On the issue of using CS to encourage participation, one of the factors Arthur mentions is that the tag switches used by the teachers she observed elicited minimal response from the class. She argues that these are not intended to make a genuine check on pupils' understanding but "constitute a ritualistic pseudochecking with the concomitant convention that the only possible response is affirmative" (1996:22). Similarly, I observed that the tag switches used by my research subjects were not used to check understanding, but for attention focusing, solidarity purposes and as structuring devices. On the use of translation as a classroom strategy, Arthur observed that translation is not used to add something new but to facilitate understanding of what has been explained before. She calls these incidences of translation "interlingual reformulations" and says that examples are literal translations, equivalence explicitly marked, and paraphrase where no first language (L1) equivalent exists (1996:24).

Camilleri (1996) deals with language practices in secondary classrooms in Malta. She examines how teachers and learners use Maltese/English CS as a communicative resource in the classroom. This issue is also discussed by Adendorff (1992). In examining language practices in the classroom, Camilleri considers the historical and the social background of the Maltese islands, paying attention to the symbolic values associated with English and Maltese, and showing how CS in the classroom reflects the general language practices of Maltese society.

In stating that CS in the classroom is a reflection of the language practices of the society, Camilleri seems to share the point of view of Valdes-Fallis (1978) and Ndayipfukamiye (1996). She goes on to say that Maltese in the classroom is used to reduce the distance between the teacher and the learners and to express friendliness and warmth. Ndayipfukamiye (1994), in her discussion of classroom CS in Burundi, also mentions the role of CS in alleviating the artificiality of the classroom in relation to the home experiences of the learner. Camilleri goes on to state that

in the Maltese islands exclusive use of Maltese is associated with linguistic purism, while on the other hand, exclusive use of English is associated with "snobbism".

Camilleri argues that one of the reasons for teachers' using CS is to avoid being dubbed snobs or purists. Furthermore, she states that teachers use English/Maltese CS in the classroom to express their dual identity: they use English to show that they are "educated" and Maltese for espousing their Maltese identity. This is not different from the South African situation where English, as pointed out before, is associated with a high social status. It is a language of the elite. Most speakers, therefore, use it to show their level of education; the more fluent you are in English, the more you command respect. Yet interlocutors sometimes switch to their L1 to express their national identity.

In the classroom situation on which this study is based, one can say that my research subject switches to Xhosa so as to show her pupils that she is also *um*Xhosa, that she is one of them, and yet they have nevertheless to learn history and also the prestigious English language.

Among the issues emanating from the literature I have reviewed on classroom CS are the following:

- Second languages are languages of prestige in countries where, for example, they are the medium of instruction. This is enhanced by their position as languages of power and socio-economic advancement.
- Though learners are aware of the prestigious position of their second languages, they struggle to learn through the medium of these second languages.
- Among the problems teachers are faced with in the classroom is the need to teach through the medium of the learners' L2 and at the same time ensure that they understand the content of the subject.
- CS in the classroom is used by teachers as a linguistic resource to meet the

demands of the classroom.

- CS in the classroom should be viewed against the general language practices of society.

- Teachers use CS as a communicative and learning resource in the classroom.

This chapter has focused on research dealing with CS outside the classroom, as well as research exploring CS in the classroom. Aspects of research on CS outside the classroom have proved relevant to this study; for example, the functions of the switches made by the teacher have been examined using Myers-Scotton's (1992) markedness model. The research on classroom CS reviewed in this chapter was conducted in a variety of countries such as Hong Kong, Burundi and Botswana. The relevance of these studies consists in the fact that they all deal with classroom situations similar to the one which is the focus of my own observations.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter offers a description of the research process. It deals, for instance, with the reason for the choice of the teacher observed, and the equipment used for data collection. It also discusses the research theory relevant to this study, concentrating on four criteria for judging the quality of research designs: reliability, validity, generalisability, and ethics.

3.2 The rationale for case study research

Stenhouse (1988:49) describes the case study method as involving the "collection and recording of data about a case or cases, and the preparation of a report or a presentation of the case". In this instance, the data collected and recorded concerns one case: the study therefore employs the strategy of the single case study rather than that of the multiple-case design. The case concerned is that of English/Xhosa code switching by a teacher in an English second language setting.

Yin (1984) gives three main rationales for conducting a single case study: where the researcher is making a critical test of existing theory, where the case represents a unique event, and where the case serves a revelatory purpose. The first two rationales are not relevant to my research, in that it neither seeks to test any existing theory, nor does it deal with a unique or rare

event. The third rationale, however, is indeed applicable. Yin (1984:43) says that a revelatory case occurs when a researcher "has an opportunity to observe and analyse a phenomenon previously inaccessible to scientific research". Code switching, specifically English/Xhosa CS, has not hitherto been literally inaccessible to investigation; but access has been severely restricted by the fact that CS has been proscribed by departments of education in South Africa, and therefore difficult to research since participants could not admit to practising it. Now that the official policy has changed in South Africa and CS in the classroom is no longer banned, research on classroom CS is essential.

That CS in the classroom has been a phenomenon largely ignored by researchers in South Africa implies that any research on it should attempt to reveal in depth all the various processes at work. This consideration provides another rationale for conducting a single case study, as these crucial processes are unlikely to be fully revealed in a large-scale research project.

3.3 Research methods used in this study

This research took place in a natural or normal classroom situation. I describe the classroom setting as normal or natural because the researcher was a non-participant observer. One of the purposes of being a non-participant observer is to try to observe what actually and normally happens when the teacher teaches. Also, the researcher tries to disown any preconceived ideas he might have about the use of CS in the classroom, for example, ideas that CS in the classroom is good or bad. In reality, of course, it is not easy to do this. I think what is important is that the researcher must be aware of potential bias and try not to allow preconceived ideas to influence the research. This is in line with the aims of interpretive research, within whose parameters this

study falls.

Interpretive research employs self-report, questionnaire and observation as ways of collecting data. In this study, self-report and observation were used in collecting data. Data collection was facilitated by the use of a video recorder, supplemented by field notes. In these notes I recorded my observations of classroom activities of particular relevance to the research.

3.3.1 Choice of Subject

There are various reasons why I chose Phila (I have given her and the school where she teaches a pseudonym) for this study. Firstly, I chose her because she is bilingual in English and Xhosa - a basic requirement in view of the fact that the subject under investigation is code switching from English to Xhosa. Secondly, the students in her class are also bilingual in English and Xhosa, though they are not as fluent as their teacher in English. Thirdly, I chose her because she openly acknowledged that she code-switches in class. Finally, I chose her because she was interested and willing to participate in this research.

3.3.2 Process of setting up the research

This research was conducted in a junior secondary school in Umtata. For ethical reasons I have given this school a fictitious name, Philani Junior Secondary School. On the first day at Philani J. S. School I met the principal and explained to him the purpose of my visit. At my request, he referred me to a history teacher. I asked for a history teacher because I wanted to observe which language she used to impart the content of the subject to the pupils. I relayed to the teacher the

purpose of my visit, explaining to her that I wanted to observe her conducting five 35 minute-lessons. She showed interest and a willingness to participate in this study.

3.3.3 Equipment

To collect data in class a video-recorder was used. The video-recorder was operated by a research assistant, which gave me the opportunity to sit and observe my research subject. The purpose of using the video-recorder was to ensure that I obtained both a visual and an auditory record of the classroom activities. Viewing the videos, especially for the purposes of transcribing the lessons, was an important element of the research.

3.3.4 Trial Run

I first paid Phila a visit and observed her teaching a lesson which was not video recorded. On this first visit, I explained to the students who we were and the purpose of our visit. I told them that they should behave the way they normally behave and try to ignore our presence. I acknowledge that it was difficult for them to do this. However, I observed that as we continued visiting their class, they got used to our presence.

I shall now turn to a consideration of the standard criteria for assessing the quality of research designs: the notions of reliability, validity, generalisability and ethics. I shall attempt to apply these to our single case study.

3.4 Reliability

Research is reliable if a different investigator, using the same research procedures used by an earlier investigator, conducts the same study and produces the same findings and conclusions. When it comes to interpretive research, however, this notion of reliability becomes problematic. It is problematic because a different researcher may produce a different interpretation of the same study. To help minimise this subjective variability, Yin (1984) says that the researcher must make every step "as operational as possible". The researcher must always bear in mind that accuracy in every step of his/her research is crucial. Yin goes on to say that the researcher must conduct his/her research as if he /she were an "accountant" whose accounting procedures are to be audited. To ensure this I established a clear research procedure and each step was followed and documented. This started from the day I introduced myself to my research subject. In doing this I had in mind the ethical side of research. In collecting data, I used a video recorder to secure an audio-visual record of the classroom activities; this had the advantages of being both a permanent document and an accessible source for data analysis.

3.5 Validity

Validity refers to the "quality of the conclusions and the processes through which these were reached" (Taft 1988:16). Taft goes on to say that the exact meaning of validity depends on the "criteria of truth that are adopted". One of these criteria is credibility. A credible report is a report that gives a description of precautions taken so that observations are accurate. Credibility is

enhanced if the researcher describes the evidence on which interpretations of the data are based. The researcher must also try to ensure the accuracy of the data and all the steps and procedures used.

To augment the validity of his interpretation, the researcher can compare his views with those of certain members of the group participating in the research, or with those of anyone who knows the group. This is what Yin (1984:37) calls "multiple sources of evidence": these sources furnish the researcher with various perceptions of the same situation. To enhance the validity of my own interpretation, I held an interview with my research subject in which she had an opportunity to comment on my interpretation of the data.

Another tactic to ensure validity is to observe the same situation over and over again so as to ascertain whether a phenomenon recurs or features only once. If the latter is the case, then the validity of whatever is observed is questionable. Use of the video recorder in collecting data helped me in reviewing all the lessons I observed. In addition to this, the fact that I observed five different lessons helped me to establish whether or not a phenomenon was repeated. I observed in the first lesson, for example, that my research subject used the expressions, *siyevana?* or *uyaqonda?* [are you with me? understand?] when she was explaining something to the pupils. I later found that these expressions recurred in all the lessons I observed. Using Taft's line of thought, I then had to check whether, for example, the expressions *siyevana?* and *uyaqonda?* were used for the same purpose in all the lessons.

The researcher can also give the person involved in the research an opportunity to see and respond to a draft account of the research, to enable them to give their views as to its validity. To accomplish this, I gave the research subject a draft copy of my thesis so that she could look at my interpretation.

3.6 Generalisability

Another question concerning single case study designs is whether their findings are generalisable. Critics of single case studies say that single cases offer a poor basis for generalising (Yin 1984:39). However, in case studies the researcher does not undertake the research with preconceived ideas based on a certain theory, as he or she is not in the first instance concerned with proving or disproving general hypotheses.

With case studies the researcher nevertheless attempts to generalise the findings to the level of theory. Taft (1988:62) agrees with Yin when he says that the researcher must not come with "preconceived ideas" aiming to test hypotheses, but that the theory must be "grounded in the research process itself". By this he means that theory will emerge as the process of study and research goes on; moreover, "theory that emerges from exposure to the data is more likely to fit requirements than theory on an abstract basis".

3.7 Ethics

The first thing that I had to consider was presenting myself accurately to the principal, the head of division, the teacher and the students. This is important because if the researcher does not present his or her identity accurately it may affect the willingness of the person to be researched to participate. Insofar as it affects the issue of mutual trust, such accuracy is also a moral issue, and one that seemed particularly important because I was going to work with a teacher I had not known before. I had also to ensure that her participation in this research was voluntary. It is

obviously desirable, even essential, that anyone involved in research should be a willing participant.

Dane (1990) says that the ethical balance of voluntary participation involves two separate issues: coercion and awareness. He defines coercion as "using threats or force, as well as offering more incentive than what would reasonably be considered fair compensation". In the case of my research no coercion was used. The teacher was not made any offers she could not refuse, nor was she in any way obliged to take part in the project. Her participation, then, was simply voluntary. Moreover, she was aware from the start that she was part of a research project; in other words, she was not observed without her knowledge. A possible problem which arises is that if the person being observed is aware that they are participating in a research project, their behaviour may not be unaffected by the presence of the researcher. On the other hand, the researcher has to try to witness what normally happens, say, in a classroom situation, without any unethical treatment of the participants.

3.8 Conclusion

This chapter has looked at aspects of case study research, especially those relevant to the single case study. It has described the research methods used in this study, the manner in which the research subject was chosen, and the criteria for judging the quality of research designs.

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter features analysis of data based on the interaction of a Std 6 history teacher with her pupils. The focus is on the language she uses to impart information to the pupils, and in particular code switching. I will first give my general impressions of the school and class where the research was undertaken. This will be followed by analysis of the types of code switching that occur in the data. Special reference will be made to the functions these fulfil in the classroom situation.

4.2 The school and the class observed

The school is situated in one of the townships of the city of Umtata, the former capital of Transkei. While the school buildings are well-constructed, there are no science, geography or language laboratories. The pupils are mainly Xhosa-speaking, learning English as a second language. I observed that outside the classroom pupils communicate in their mother tongue, Xhosa, though English is the official medium of instruction. Teachers, as well, are mother-tongue speakers of Xhosa. They also communicate with one another in Xhosa, though their discourse is characterised by English/Xhosa code switching.

The class I observed is a Std 6 class of 55 pupils. The setting of the classroom is the

traditional one where the pupils are seated in rows facing the teacher. The classroom is equipped with a chalkboard and a duster as learning aids. The teacher seems to be the sole source of information and she dominates the class throughout the lesson, although towards its end she tries to engage the pupils through questions. The following extract from the corpus of data collected shows how she uses English/Xhosa CS in interacting with her pupils:

(Extract 1)

T: . . . the spinning and weaving are the two basic processes by which a cloth is manufactured. Spinning and weaving are two processes in the manufacturing of a cloth (writes on the board). /England was the first country to manufacture *ilaphu, siyevana?* [England was the first country to manufacture cloth, do you understand?] The spinners, the people who were spinning were known as the spinners. *Into eyayisenzeka yile,* the spinners will take a bundle of wool and pull out a thread [What happened was this . . .]. *Niyasiqonda isikhinci esi sewulu?* [Do you know a bundle of wool?].

P: Yes !!!

T: *Yinto enjalo ke le sithetha ngayo* [It's something like that we are talking about]. The weavers will arrange these threads parallel from top to bottom *kuphume ntoni? Ilaphu* [to produce what? A cloth]. (Points to her diagram) *Yimisonto leya. Kwenziwa ilaphu ngoku* [Those are threads. A cloth is being made now]. The weavers will arrange these threads parallel from top to bottom. *Siyevana?* [Are you with me?]

P: Yes!!

T: . . . and then they will put them across to make what? *laphu.* They will put them parallel from top to bottom *kuphume ntoni? Ilaphu* [To produce what? A cloth]. (points to her diagram) *Yimisonto leya* [Those are threads.] . . . Before the industrial revolution, cloth was made by using a simple machine - the spinning wheel. The spinning wheel made one thread at a time.

As can be observed in extract 1, above, Phila in her interaction with the pupils makes use of all the types of code switching: tag-switches, inter-sentential switches, and intra-sentential switches. Phila's recourse to these various types of code switching will now be scrutinised.

4.3 Analysis of types of CS occurring in my data

4.3.1 Tag-switches

Tag-switches are exclamations, tags or parentheses in another language. Some authors refer to these as lexical or phrasal insertions, for example Kieswetter (1995). Examples of these switches are discourse markers, e.g. *anyway*; adverbial time and place phrases, e.g. *yesterday*; question forms, e.g. *why?*; set expressions, e.g. *it's true;* exclamations, e.g. *oh!*; terms of address, e.g. *my dear;* and single words without affixes, e.g. *cheap* (Kieswetter,1995:23).

Close observation of extract 1 above shows English as the matrix language (ML) and Xhosa as the embedded language (EL). This distinction is made by Myers-Scotton: the matrix language is the language that receives linguistic items from another language, whereas the embedded language is the language that "donates" linguistic items to another language. The phrasal insertion that is dominant in extract 1 is in Xhosa. It is the word *siyevana?* as shown in the following example:

(Extract 2)

The weavers will arrange these threads parallel from top to bottom, *siyevana?*

Siyevana?, literally, means "Do we we hear/understand each other?" The most appropriate translation of siyevana in the context of this lesson is "are you with me?", although "are you with me?" translated into Xhosa would be *ninam?* Furthermore, this tag switch expresses the we-type of solidarity.

It is the prefix *si*[we] which makes this word plural and helps Phila to identify with her pupils. If Phila, for example, asked, *niyeva?* [do you understand] she would not have been able to identify with her pupils. The word *niyeva?* refers to the pupils only and there is emphasis on the word "you" which specifically refers to the pupils. By using the word *siyevana?* Phila includes herself as one of the pupils, whereas *niyeva?* distances Phila from the pupils and is authoritative in tone.

The tag switches *siyevana?* and *uyaqonda?* are in the interrogative form. However, one has to look at whether Phila poses questions to get a response from the pupils or merely uses the words as structuring devices. If they are used to elicit a response, what kind of response do they elicit? The type of response the tag switches elicit from the pupils is a chorus response:

(Extract 3)

T: . . . so the new machine was formed or discovered by the investors. *Siyevana?*
P: Ye-es!!

The above is an example of the general pattern of what occurs when the tag switches, *siyevana? or uyaqonda?* are used by Phila. When asked why she used these expressions, Phila said that she usually used them to make sure that the pupils understood what she was saying. The chorus response by the pupils, however, is not a genuine indication that they have understood the lesson.

Another interesting aspect of these tag switches is that they occur in the learners' MT. Since the pupils could understand the English equivalents of the tag switches used by their teacher, their occurrence in the learners' MT does not perform a special educational function. What emerges, therefore, is that the social function of tag-switching here seems more important than the educational function.

4.3.2 Inter-sentential switches

Inter-sentential switches occur when a sentence or a clause from a donor language is inserted between sentences of the recipient language:

(Extract 4)

> They will put them parallel from top to bottom, *kuphume ntoni? Ilaphu. Yimisonto leya.* (points to her diagram) [They will . . . what is produced? Cloth . . . understand? Those are threads]

Close scrutiny of data reveals that most of the inter-sentential switches appearing in my data are in the interrogative form. The following extract from the lesson on "The Inventions of the Industrial Revolution" illustrates this:

(Extract 5)

T: These lines will come together (points to her diagram on the board) *Siyaqonda?*
. . . to make what? to make *ilaphu. Niyaqonda?* They will put these lines parallel from top to bottom. *Andithi?* [Is that not so?] They will put these lines parallel from top to bottom and then put them across, *kuphume ntoni? Ilaphu. Uyaqonda? Yimisonto leya. Siyevana?* [They will put . . . To make what? Cloth. Understand? Those are threads. Are you with me?]

P: Yes!!!

T: *Aba bakhupha ntoni? Bakhupha imisonto kula bundle. Uyaqonda? Bayinike bani? Bayinike i*weavers. *I*weavers *zithini?* They arrange these from top to bottom . . . *bayibeke kanje* (demonstrates on the board) and put others across to make what? To make *ilaphu. Uyaqonda?* [These take what? take threads from that bundle. Understand? And give it to whom ? And give it to the weavers. The weavers do what? . . . put it like this . . . to make cloth. Understand?]

P: Ye-ees!!

T: *Uyayiqonda ilinen le ikhoyo, andithi?*

P: Ye-es!!

T: *Ukhe uyibone ilinen ukuba injani. Kukho la migca andithi?*

P: Ye-ees!!

T: *La migca icacile kuyo. Injalo ke*. That's how cloth was made in England.

Uyaqonda?

P: Ye-ees!!

[You know the linen that is being used (she refers to the new fashion). Right? You know what this linen is like. It has those lines. Right? Those lines are visible in it. It's like that . . . Understand?

The above extract shows the question form as a feature of interaction in this classroom. Phila not only switches to the pupils' MT but also relies heavily on the question form as a discourse strategy. It is used as a discourse strategy because she does not pose questions so that the pupils can provide her with answers or cues to indicate whether she should proceed or repeat herself. Let us consider this example:

(Extract 6)

*Bayinike bani? . . . bayinike i*weavers [They give it to whom? . . . the weavers].

Phila after posing the question does not wait for the pupils to respond but provides the answer herself. In other words, she uses the interrogative form to structure the discourse of the classroom. Another feature of discourse in this classroom is the way in which Phila uses the question form and intonation simultaneously as devices. This serves as example:

(Extract 7)

T: . . . so these machines were to be made of what? To be made of steel and iron. *Siyevana?*

P: Yes!!

T: These machines they were using were to be made of what? Of (pause) steel and iron. *Ngenxa yantoni? Iplanga eli lalingakwazi ukuthini? Ukuthi* carry *i*strain *santoni? Samalahle* and iron [Because of what? The wooden one couldn't carry the strain? of what? . . . of coal and iron].

As Phila poses these questions her tone assumes variations; for example, when she utters the

sentence which begins "These machines . . .", her tone can be classified as low-rise, because she begins in a low tone which rises as she poses the question, and when she utters the words "steel and iron" we can classify her tone as low-fall.

The effect of these intonational variations is that they serve as attention-focusing mechanisms. In the above example Phila manages to keep the pupils attentive as she moves from a low-rise tone to a high-rise tone. In addition she uses these to foreground information. The following excerpt from extract 7 is a good example of this: . . . these machines were made of what? In place of "steel and iron" Phila inserts "what?", and by so doing not only keeps the pupils attentive but also sustains the core of her explanation: thus "What?" foregrounds "steel and iron". Further, that the pupils utter at the same time as Phila the words "steel and iron", using the same intonation and stress, is described by Gumperz and Herasimchuk (1975:95) as meaning, "I am following your direction". As has been suggested before, this type of response is not a good indication of whether or not the pupils have understood the teacher, but is rather concerned with social solidarity.

We assume in relation to the foregoing analysis that whether the utterance is in English or Xhosa, it would produce the same educational effect. The Xhosa expression beginning with *ngenxa yantoni?* [because of what?] is not different from the English expression "These machines . . . be made of what?" in structure and in the way in which their speaker uses intonation and the question form in articulating them. That most of the expressions in which the question form and intonation are used as strategies are in Xhosa, therefore, does not mean that they would not have achieved the same effect if they had been uttered in English.

4.3.3 Intra-sentential switches

The term intra-sentential switching refers to switches which occur in the middle of a sentence, as in:

(Extract 8)

> *Into eyayisenzeka yile*, the spinners will take a bundle of wool and pull out a thread. *Niyasiqonda isikhinci esi sewulu?* [What happened was . . You know a bundle of wool?]

The switch in the above example occurs in a sentence which is in English. In other words, according to Myers-Scotton's (1992) concept of the matrix model, English in extract 8 is the matrix language and Xhosa is the embedded language. The switch in extract 8 serves a predominantly social function because Phila does not use it to explain to the pupils a concept they do not know. It also shows the fluency of Phila in both English and Xhosa.

That the switch in extract 8 performs a social function is more apparent when it is compared with the following statement:

(Extract 9)

> An island is a piece of land surrounded by sea - a country surrounded by sea, *isiqithi ngesiXhosa* [an island in Xhosa].

Unlike in extract 8, the Xhosa expression in extract 9 is mainly used for educational purposes. Phila, after defining an island in English, decides to use a Xhosa expression which sums up her definition. The word *isiqithi* is the equivalent of the English word island. Phila, therefore, uses translation as a technique. The purpose is to enable the learners to associate Phila's definition of an island with what they already know in their mother tongue, *isiqithi*. One can thus say that in this way Phila links together the literacy of the home with the literacy of the school. That Phila

has used translation in the above example prompts us to look in detail at incidences where it occurs as classroom strategy.

4.4 Translation

Translation is another aspect of code switching which appears in the research data, under two categories: direct translation and conceptual translation. Lindholm and Padilla (1978:37) define direct translation as "using the equivalent word(s) in the appropriate language" and conceptual translation as "defining the word(s) or concept with other than the equivalent word".

4.4.1 Direct translation

As already observed, the research subject in her interaction with the pupils also relies on translation to reinforce acquisition of the subject matter. The following are examples of direct translations extracted from her lessons:

(Extract 10)

T: Just as petrol is necessary in driving a motor engine, steam power is necessary in driving factories, I mean factory machines . . . *Njengokuba uyazi ukuba imoto ayihambi ngaphandle kwepetrol,* so *ne-ne -ne*steam power was necessary to do what? To drive factory machines. [...just as you know that a car cannot move without petrol, also]

(Extract 11)

T: These steam engines had to be made of iron and steel because wooden machines were not strong enough to withstand the strain of coal . . . so

these machines were to be made of what? Were to be made of steel and iron. *Siyevana*? . . . These machines that they were using were to be made of what? Of steel and iron . . . *Ngenxa yantoni? iplanga eli lalingakwazi ukuthini? ukuthi* carry *i*strain *santoni? samalahle and iron* [Because of what? Wood could not do what? Could not carry the strain of what? Of coal and iron].

(Extract 12)

T: What is a natural product? Mhh!! Who can give an example of a natural product?
P: Tree
T: A natural product is something *edaliweyo, engakhange yenziwe ngumntu ukuze ibekhona* - that's a natural product [. . . that is created, that is not man-made].

In the first example given above (extract 10), Phila begins by explaining in English her illustration of the necessity of steam power in factory machines and repeats it in the learners' MT. Although Phila does not make a word-for-word translation of what she has already said in English, close scrutiny of the Xhosa version shows that it is a direct translation in the context of her explanation.

A complete replacement of each English word with its Xhosa equivalent would have affected the gist or meaning of Phila's explanation to the pupils. Phila's purpose in using a direct translation is to facilitate what she has already expressed in English. It seems, therefore, that her emphasis is on acquisition of the subject matter, because the English version of her explanation does not contain words or concepts which necessitate translation.

In the second example (extract 11), Phila first explains in English but does not immediately translate this into Xhosa. The sentence which is directly translated is the following: *These steam engines had to be made of iron and steel because wooden machines were not strong enough to withstand the strain of coal.* After saying this she uses a lot of repetition to emphasise the main point of her explanation. Though the switches in Xhosa are in the form of questions, they are a direct translation of the highlighted sentence. As already observed, Phila uses translation to reinforce the English explanations.

Extract 12 is a good example of a direct translation being used to relate a concept that may be difficult for the pupils to understand because of its remoteness from their experience. In the absence of an equivalent term in Xhosa for the word "natural", Phila offers an explanation which is a direct translation of this word. It is felt that a similar explanation in the pupils' target language would have enriched their vocabulary. The fact that the pupil gave an example of a "natural product" correctly indicates that she knew the term "natural" but couldn't answer the initial question because of target language limitations.

4.4.2 Conceptual Translation

Phila uses not only direct translations to explain the subject matter to the pupils but also conceptual translations. The following are some of the conceptual translations appearing in the research data:

(Extract 13)

T: In England there was economic stability that made it a better country to invest in so other countries invested in England *ngenxa yantoni? Kukho uxolo, kuzolile e*England [...because of what? There is peace, stability in England].

(Extract 14)

T: Capital is money that is used to produce more money. *Mhlawumbi umntu athenge i*taxi *ukwenza enye imali - la mali athenge ngayo i*taxi *yintoni? Capital. Uzakwenza ntoni? uzakwenza enye imali ngala mali athenge ngayo i*taxi [Perhaps a person buys a taxi to make more money - that money they used to buy a taxi is what? Capital. Is going to do what? Is going to make more money with the money they used to buy the taxi].

In extract 13, above, Phila explains that what made England a better country to invest in was economic stability, and the Xhosa words *kukho uxolo, kuzolile e*England [there is peace, there is

stability in England] make specific reference to this, the theme of her explanation. After explaining in English Phila decides to reinforce her explanation in the learners' MT. The Xhosa expression is a summary of her explanation in English.

In extract 14 Phila uses translation to explain the term "capital". The English explanation is brief and concise while the Xhosa one is lengthy because of the example she gives to explain this term. Unlike in extract 13, above, the learners' MT in extract 14 is not used to sum up what has already been explained but to give a detailed explanation of what has been superficially given in English. These examples clearly show that Phila relies on both languages when imparting information to the pupils. Furthermore, the extract cited shows that she is concerned primarily with the content of the subject matter. This brings us back to what Ndayipfukamiye (1994) explained as the constraints teachers are faced with in the classroom: the need to teach the subject matter while at the same time endeavouring to ensure that the pupils acquire their target language.

Having looked at translations and the purpose of their occurrence in this classroom, I now turn to borrowed words appearing in my data.

4.5 Borrowing

Linguistic borrowing simply refers to the incorporation of single words or short idiomatic phrases from one language into another. These language items are assimilated into the grammatical system of the recipient language through morphological and syntactic integration. Romaine (1989) supported by Myers-Scotton (1992) attests that not all borrowed items can be phonologically integrated with ease into the recipient language. Furthermore, scholars who developed methods for the identification of borrowed items make a distinction between established borrowing and

recent borrowing.

Various criteria are employed to determine the status of borrowed linguistic items in a recipient language. Romaine (1989), for example, mentions the degree of integration of borrowed words in the base language as one of the criteria. Romaine goes on to give another criterion as determining the status of a word. This entails finding out whether the word has an equivalent in the base language. If it does, then the following questions about the word must be posed: is the word still in use in the community? Do members of the community regard it as belonging to their language or another?

My corpus of data does not feature many examples of borrowings which are phonologically integrated into the recipient language. There is only one example of a phonologically integrated word appearing in my data. This word is *iwulu* [wool].

(Extract 15)

Niyasiqonda isikhinci sewulu [You know a bundle of knitting wool].

In other contexts the word "wool" when literally translated into Xhosa would be *uboya.* In extract 15 the borrowing *iwulu*, though originally coming from "wool", does not mean *uboya.* Phila in the above example refers to a bundle of knitting wool. Phila, however, has another reason for using the Xhosa word iwulu. Before looking at the function of the borrowing *iwulu*, it is important to look at the context in which extract 15 appears. This is necessitated by the fact that the entire sentence is a Xhosa sentence.

(Extract 16)

T: *Into eyayisenzeka yile*, the spinners will take a bundle of wool and pull out a thread. *Niyasiqonda isikhinci esi sewulu* [What happened was, the spinners . . . you know a bundle of wool].

The borrowing *iwulu* appears in a sentence that is completely Xhosa. If we look at the context in which it appears, it is a code switch which we earlier classified as an inter-sentential switch. Since the whole sentence is in Xhosa it is difficult to single out the word *iwulu*, which now is part of Xhosa vocabulary through phonological integration. In other words, it would be like taking out any Xhosa word in extract 16 and analysing its function, thus engaging in a futile exercise. This may well be the case with all *established* borrowings.

In the light of the foregoing argument it is, therefore, essential to look at the function of the whole sentence in order to analyse any particular instance of code switching. The Xhosa phrase in extract 16 performs both a social and an educational function. When Phila switches from English to Xhosa, she does not switch because she wants to avoid using English or is unable to render the expression in English. She switches to Xhosa because she wants to show solidarity with her pupils or, as she put it, "to make the pupils relax and to be comfortable". Most of her switches to Xhosa express what Wardhaugh (1989) calls the we-type of solidarity.

However, Martin-Jones (1995) argues that when teachers switch to the learners' language, they do not do so simply to express solidarity with the learners but "to negotiate and renegotiate joint frames of reference and to exchange meaning on the spur of the moment" (1995:98). When I asked my research subject why she switches to Xhosa, she said that CS sometimes occurs spontaneously. In other words, as she delivers her lessons she unconsciously switches to Xhosa. Code switching, therefore, is part of her classroom discourse, part of her interaction with the pupils as she "negotiates and renegotiates" meaning with the pupils "on the spur of the moment". Martin-Jones goes on to say that CS is not different from other contextualisation cues which occur at gestural, kinesic and prosodic levels.

It is interesting to note the way in which code switching occurs alongside other cues, such as nonverbal cues. One of the nonverbal communication cues which co-occurs with CS in my

research subject's discourse is intonation. For example, when she articulates the Xhosa expression in extract 16 she lowers her tone. It is this change in intonation which directly involves the pupils in the discussion, because it has an appeal for them. As a result of Phila's voice modulation which she uses as an educational strategy, the pupils show great interest and remain attentive. Her explanation of why she uses intonation confirms my interpretation:

> Intonation is very important so that if there was anyone who was feeling sleepy may wake up. I also use it to stress important information.

Furthermore, by code-switching when explaining the process of spinning and weaving Phila helps the pupils to conceptualise this process. This stems from the fact that the pupils might not even know what a bundle is. The Xhosa expression helps her to make the pupils associate a bundle with what they already know, *isikhinci* and this enhances their understanding of the lesson.

4.5.1 Nonce borrowing

Nonce borrowings are switches which do not undergo phonological adaptation, and whose use in the recipient language is ephemeral. These are switches which Khati (1992) prefers to call intra-lexical switches. He describes intra-lexical switches as the use of morphemes from two languages within the same lexical item (1992:183). Poplack and Wheeler (1987) use the term nonce borrowing when referring to such switches since their occurrence is temporary and meant for specific occasions and purposes. The same language items are also referred to as code mixes. They contain morphemes from both languages within single words which have not been phonologically and morphologically integrated into the host language (Kieswetter 1995:23).

The following extract from the research data contains examples of intra-lexical switches or code-mixes:

(Extract 17)

T: **Itrade** yayilula **kwiEngland** kuba into zayo zazinga ta**xwa** siye kwi government (she writes in English on the board) [Trade was easy in England because its goods were not taxed]. ***Ipolitical*** *stability ibalulekile elizweni,* for example, *apha* ***eSouth Africa*** *mhlawumbi kwaZulu-*Natal *apho kubulawa abantu, singathi* there is political instability *kuba kuyaliwa abantu bayabulalana, so* ***e*****England** there was political stability, that made it a better country to trade with and to invest in, so other countries invested in England. *Ngenxa yantoni? Kukho uxolo kuzolile* ***e*****England** [Political stability is important in a country, for example here in South Africa, say in Zulu-Natal where people are killed, we can say there is political instability because there is fighting, people are being killed. So England . . . because of what? There was peace and stability in England].

P: Yes!!!

T: The government was stable *kungekho zingxushu-ngxushu* in England everybody was given an opportunity to start his or her own business, nabani na. *Uyaqonda*? [....without instability.....anyone . . . understand?].

P: Yes!!!

T: [continuing] *nokuba ungumntu onjani, waphantsi waphezulu if unakho wawusithi* start your own business [No matter what type of person you are, if you had the means you could start your own business, understand?]

P: Yes!!!

T: Anyone who wanted to start business was given capital - *nabanina ofunayo* was given capital by the banks [Anyone who wanted . . .]

The above segment of discourse contains intra-lexical switches such as "*i*trade", "*i*political" and "*i*England". These intra-lexical switches cannot be singled out for analysis. One has to look at the context in which they appear. To clarify this let us consider the following:

(Extract 18)

*I*political stability *ibalulekile elizweni* . . . .[Political stability is important in a country . . . .]

The word "*i*political" is formed by an English stem, "political", and a Xhosa prefix, *i*. To understand the function played by this lexical item one has to look at the whole sentence. The word "*i*political" goes together with the word "stability", in other words, it is a noun and its adjective. The two words are both English words except that a Xhosa prefix *i* has been added to

the word political.

If Phila had started the sentence with "political stability . . .", she would have had to continue and complete it in English, because a switch to Xhosa would be impossible after the word "stability". In extract 18 it is the prefix *i* in "political" which makes a switch to Xhosa possible after the word stability. The intra-lexical switch "*i*political" goes hand in hand with the Xhosa word *ibalulekile* [it is important].

Although I have made the assertion that to understand the function of intra-lexical switches one has to look at the whole code-switching form, extract 17 appears to exemplify a different code-switching strategy. It is different because I see it as what Adendorff (1992) calls a contextualisation cue or a meta-message, one in which it is not easy to determine the recipient language or the donor language. The whole discourse is a combination or mixture of English and Xhosa. To explain this further, a Xhosa speaker who is not fluent in English or a native speaker of English with no knowledge of Xhosa would not register Phila's message in extract 17.

The entire discourse in extract 17 is an example of discourse in which code switching serves as a communicative or interactional resource which Phila uses to clarify, explain or elaborate information for the pupils. Let us consider this sentence from extract 17 in support of my assertion:

> The government was stable *kungekho zingxushu-ngxushu* [. . . without chaos or disorder or instability]

When the words *kungekho zingxushu-ngxushu* are translated into English, one of the translations is "instability". This means that if this translation is invoked in the above example, the following sentence can result:

The government was stable without instability.

The use of the English word "instability" renders the above sentence senseless because of redundancy. Phila repeats in Xhosa the explanation that the government was stable. It helps her in emphasising and clarifying the point that trade and industry in England were boosted by political stability.

4.6 My research subject's perception of classroom code switching

In the methodology chapter, I mentioned the importance of validity in the interpretation of data. To enhance the validity of my interpretation of the data, I held an interview with my research subject to give her an opportunity to comment on my interpretations. In this section I therefore look at how she perceives CS as a teaching and learning strategy.

Before undertaking this study, the first thing I asked my research subject was whether she code switched in class, and she responded affirmatively to the question. I asked her this question because I wanted to make sure that I was going to observe the language she customarily used in her day-to-day interaction with her pupils.

During the interview with my research subject, I had another opportunity to ascertain her opinion on the use of CS in the classroom. This was her response:

> The use of code switching is very effective in our teaching. The pupils are comfortable in the classroom. The atmosphere is not tense. They are able to understand the subject matter.

It is clear from the above explanation that Phila uses CS to create an atmosphere conducive to learning. She feels that when she explains solely in English the class becomes tense.

Code switching breaks this tension. She does this because she wants the pupils to understand the subject matter. In this respect, CS is used as a learning resource. This tallies with my observation that she does not only use CS to impart the subject matter but to create a congenial educational atmosphere.

My research subject feels that CS plays an important role in keeping the pupils attentive. I observed that when she code switches, she uses two strategies: the question form and intonation. I found that she uses intonation as an attention-focusing mechanism. She added that she also uses it to stress important information.

On the use of rhetorical questions, she said that they do not only help her in keeping the pupils attentive, but also help them to recall the correct answers when they are asked similar questions. Though she says that she uses the question form to help the learners recall the correct answers she provides when posing these questions, scrutiny of her communicative repertoire reveals that she uses the rhetorical form to structure the classroom discourse.

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the most striking feature of the use of this type of classroom discourse, that is, discourse marked by rhetorical questions and intonation, is the way CS co-occurs with other communication cues. For example, intonation is a non-verbal communication cue, but in Phila's discourse, it co-occurs with code switching. This seems to confirm Martin-Jones' argument that CS "is one of a number of possible contextualisation cues or communicative resources available for constructing and interpreting meanings in context" (1995:98).

As observed earlier in this chapter, one of the dominant expressions in my research subject's communicative repertoire is *siyevana* [Do we hear/understand each other?]. My interpretation of this expression is that it mainly performs a social function. It is also an example of the way Phila uses CS to create an atmosphere conducive to learning. She explained her use

of this expression as follows:

> – I usually use the expression *siyevana* to make sure that the pupils understand what I am saying, and also to give a chance to anyone with a question.

Though she says that she asks this question to give a chance to anyone with a question, I found that in all the lessons I observed there was not a single pupil who asked her a question. However, one does not necessarily say that they did not ask questions simply because the question *siyevana?* does not prompt them to do so. I acknowledge that there are various factors which discourage them from actively participating in the lessons. (These factors will not be discussed here owing to limitations of space.) The problem with the use of the expression *siyevana* is that it prompts chorus response. To assess whether the pupils have understood the lesson or an aspect of it, questions eliciting individual response are always preferred.

In sum, my research subject believes that CS has an important role to play in the classroom as a communicative and learning resource. Some of the issues raised in this section are revisited in the discussion chapter.

4.7 Conclusion

This chapter has analysed instances of code switchingu sed by my research subject in interaction with her pupils. It has looked at the functions of switches to the learners' mother tongue, noting that switches are used for various purposes such as negotiation and renegotiation of meaning, and the construction and interpretation of meaning in context. We have also looked at switches that are direct and conceptual translations of explanations that were made in the learners' second language. These were used by Phila to reformulate and stress explanations that were first given in the learners' second language. The last section of this chapter has looked at how my research subject perceives classroom CS. It was observed that she considers CS to be an important learning resource.

CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter will discuss the main findings arising from the research data analysis in terms of the following categories: tag switches, intra-sentential switches, inter-sentential switches and translations. There will be discussion of the general functions of CS in terms of Myers-Scotton's (1992) markedness model, as well as some consideration of the use of CS as an avoidance strategy.

5.2 Code switching

The data collected have shown extensive use of CS by Phila. Our attention now turns to the nature and function of the various kinds of code switching employed. We begin with tag switches.

5.2.1 Tag switches

Two phrasal insertions dominated Phila's interaction with her pupils. These are *siyevana?* [Are you with me?] and *uyaqonda?* [Do you understand?]. It has been noted that these phrasal insertions perform a mainly social function, an observation based on the assumption that the pupils would have understood them even if they were not expressed in Xhosa.

It has also been observed that these phrasal insertions are in the interrogative form. The kind of response they elicit from the pupils, however, does not have much educational value, because they tend to prompt not individual response but class chorusing. The disadvantage of class chorusing is that it does not guarantee that learning has taken place; teachers in training are always advised not to ask questions like "Do you understand?" but rather specific questions that require individual attention.

The following illustrates this assertion. In a lesson on the "Inventions of the industrial revolution", Phila explained that James Hargreaves invented a fast machine, the Spinning Jenny:

(Extract 19)

T: Some of the workers feared that they might lose their jobs because the Spinning Jenny was faster than them. *Baqonda ukuba oh bazakuluza imisebenzi yabo, kuba le* machine *inganidi bantu baninzi - bayidistroya, siyevana*? [They realised that, oh, they were going to lose their jobs because this machine did not need many people . . . they destroyed it].

P: Ye-e-s.

As already indicated, the switch *siyevana?* prompts the chorus response, "Yes", which might give the false impression that the pupils understood Phila's explanation. On the other hand, it gives the impression that Phila by asking, *siyevana*, is saying to her pupils, "Now that I've translated this information, do you understand?"

Whether the pupils understood her explanation or not became clearer when she asked these questions after presenting her lesson:

(Extract 20)

T: What was the reaction of the people when the Spinning Jenny was invented by James Hargreaves?

P.A: The people they lose their jobs.

T: What was their fear?
P.A: They destroyed the machine.
(Teacher points to another pupil)
P.B: They thought they would lose their jobs.

Though I have made the assertion that the use of the expression *siyevana* prompts chorus response from the pupils which may give the false impression that they have understood the lesson, at the end of it, they showed by their answers that they had generally understood. This is indicated by the above example; what it also reveals is that Phila is concerned that the pupils use "correct English". In illustration, she ignores the answer of pupil A (which is more or less correct in terms of content, although it mistakes the appropriate discourse structure) because her English is not "correct".

What we may deduce from this is that although Phila uses both the learners' MT and target language to impart the content of her subject, she seems aware that they have to learn English as well. She herself confirmed this when I asked her why the pupils answered in English, even if the question contained language items in their vernacular, by saying that they had to learn to express themselves in English. This implies that when she teaches she has to attempt two things: on the one hand, she has to ensure that the pupils understand the content of the subject (and to this end she makes use of code switching). And on the other hand, given the task of teaching through the medium of English, she has to ensure that the pupils become adept in that language. A situation similar to this is described by Ndayipfukamiye (1994:82) in her study of CS in Burundi primary classrooms:

> The teachers in the classes I observed were faced with two kinds of constraints in their day to day classroom practice. On the one hand, they had to cope with the task of teaching through the medium of French. On the other hand, they were expected to guide their learners through the curriculum following highly conventionalised pedagogic routines.

5.2.2 Inter-sentential and intra-sentential switches

One of the striking features of Phila's discourse is the use of inter-sentential and intra-sentential switches which are in the form of rhetorical questions:

(Extract 22)

> T: *Aba bakhupha ntoni? Bakhupha imisonto kula* bundle *uyaqonda? Bayinike bani? i*weavers [These take out what? They take out threads from that bundle, understand? They give them to whom? To the weavers].

These rhetorical questions are used by Phila as a strategy - a way of explaining and introducing information to the pupils. Let us consider this example: "*Aba bakhupha ntoni? bakhupha imisonto kula* bundle". After posing the question, "*Aba bakhupha ntoni?*", Phila gives an answer, "*Bakhupha imisonto kula*" bundle [They take out threads from that bundle], which is not only an answer to her own question but a way of informing the pupils that the spinners pulled out a thread from the bundle of wool and gave it to the weavers. Furthermore the questions she uses occur as formulaic expressions, acting as a kind of structuring device. This is an example of how she uses the interrogative form as a strategy not only for passing information to the learners but also for structuring her lesson:

(Extract 23)

> T: . . . . so during the 19th century *i*investors *zaexperimenta ukwenza ntoni?, ukwenza into enokuthi ikhwelise i*passengers *eziyi*14 - that is *abantu abayi 14 uyaqonda? Basebenzisa ntoni? Basebenzisa esi*steam power. *Esi*steam power *babesisebenzisa entweni kuqala? Ezi*factory. So it was experimented *into ye*transport *eyayikwelisa ntoni? Abantu abayi* 14 *uyaqonda?* [. . . investors experimented doing what? Doing something that could carry 14 passengers, that is, people who are 14, understand? They used what? They used this steam power. They used this steam power in

what first? In factories . . . so it was experimented this thing of a transport, carrying what? People who are 14, understand?].

Another interesting result emanating from scrutiny of Phila's communicative repertoire is her use of intonational devices and the manner in which she interweaves these with the use of the question form. As she poses the rhetorical questions, her intonation assumes the following variations: low-rise tone; high-rise tone; low-fall tone, and monotone. She begins the question with a low-rise tone which turns to a high rise-tone when she articulates the last word in her question. This is followed by a low-fall declarative tone when she makes the statements which serve as answers to her questions. In addition to this, when making the answers, she draws together words in monotone. The following example attempts to illustrate this:

(Extract 24)

,Babeseb'enzisa 'ntoni? = low-rise tone.
e'nzisa 'ntoni? = high-rise tone.
Babesebenzisa esisteam power = low-fall tone; monotone.
[They used'what? = low-rise tone
'what? = high-rise tone
They used this steam power = low-fall tone; monotone]

The foregoing arguments indicate that Phila uses rhetorical and intonational devices as attention-focusing mechanisms. As she poses the questions, using variations in tone, she manages to captivate the learners' interest. Further, although these devices appear in the learners' mother tongue, they would have achieved the same effect if Phila had expressed them in the learners' target language, English.

5.3 Translation

Some of the switches Phila uses to interact with her pupils are translations. In this section I examine the role of switches that are translations as classroom strategies.

5.3.1 Direct translations

The following is an example of direct translation used by Phila:

(Extract 25)

T: An island is a country surrounded by the sea. *Isiqithi ngesiXhosa* [An island in Xhosa].

Phila, after explaining in English what an island is, uses the word *isiqithi* which is the Xhosa equivalent of the English word, island. As indicated in the previous chapter, this direct translation is meant to help learners associate what they already know in their mother tongue with what is explained in their target language. Further, the direct translation, *isiqithi*, is used to reinforce the meaning of the English word "island."

5.3.2 Conceptual translations

My data show a prevalent occurrence of conceptual translations. It has been observed that Phila uses them to explain and reinforce the meaning of what she has already expressed in the learners' target language. This is an example of conceptual translation:

(Extract 26)

> Tariff is money that is paid to the state. *I*tariff *ifana ne*tax *le ibhatalwayo ngezinto zingenayo kwelolizwe* [Tariff is just like tax that is paid for goods coming into another country].

Phila uses conceptual translation to unpack and reformulate the word tariff. Phila's purpose in using conceptual translation in the above example applies to all the patterns of conceptual translation appearing in my data.

Furthermore, the fact that there is a salient occurrence of conceptual translation implies that Phila is concerned with the explanation of meaning to the pupils. It also means that translation comes spontaneously from Phila and is a feature of her linguistic sophistication. Phila's use of conceptual translation seems to be the result of what Malakoff and Hakuta (1994:145) call the syntactic and lexical restructuring that must be done in formulating the original source in language meaning in the target language sentence structure.

5.4 General functions of classroom code switching

It is clear from the foregoing arguments that my research subject does not only use CS for social purposes but for educational purposes too. The fact that she uses CS to communicate the subject matter to the pupils shows the way CS contributes to the interactional work of teachers as a learning resource. In addition to the individual functions of aspects of switches mentioned above, such as the use of intonational devices, translation and the interrogative form, CS is also used as a strategy to emphasise, intensify and elaborate a point. This may serve as an example:

(Extract 26)

> In order to improve transport, the investors started looking to see if the steam power which was used in factories could be used to solve the transport problem . . . they wanted to know if *bangayisebenzisa ekusolveni le* transport problem [. . . it could be used to solve the transport problem].

The switch that occurs in extract 26 is what we have already classified as a direct translation. It is therefore used not only to reinforce the meaning of the English explanation but also to emphasise and intensify Phila's point.

On the other hand, it has been observed that most of the expressions that are in the learners' MT seem to perform social functions. Some of these switches perform what Appel and Muysken (1987) call the directive function, because Phila switches so as to include her pupils by using their MT. Other instances perform what they refer to as the expressive function of code switching, because Phila switches so as to show her mixed identity. The assertion that there are more social functions than educational functions attached to code switching becomes more persuasive when we use the markedness model to consider the functions of classroom code switching.

5.4.1 Marked and unmarked switches

The notion of marked and unmarked switches stems from Myers-Scotton's markedness model. This model construes code switching as negotiation regarding the rights and obligations balance (RO balance) between interlocutors (Myers-Scotton 1992). It makes the proposition that interlocutors make marked and unmarked choices in any given speech event.

Myers-Scotton (1992) gives four social functions of code switching: code switching in a sequence as an unmarked choice; CS to make a marked choice; CS itself as the unmarked choice,

and CS to make an exploratory choice.

Code switching in sequence as an unmarked choice

The speaker changes from one unmarked code to another unmarked code. In the classroom situation under research, Phila changes from English, an unmarked code, to Xhosa, another unmarked code. Both English and Xhosa are unmarked codes in this context because Phila as well as the pupils expect them. Phila uses English, the unmarked code for the unmarked RO balance set in this classroom situation. Phila's mother-tongue is Xhosa (which is also the pupils' mother-tongue) so when Phila switches to Xhosa a different unmarked RO balance is set and Xhosa serves as its index. Therefore, some of the switches to Xhosa are an indication by Phila of the socio-cultural identity and background she shares with the pupils.

Code switching itself as the unmarked choice

It is important to scrutinise the overall pattern of code switching. Adendorff (1992) posits that CS itself is a code - a meta-message. This implies that CS can be viewed as the unmarked choice indexing the unmarked RO balance (Myers-Scotton 1992).

My research subject is bilingual and CS is construed as a bilingual mode of communication. Myers-Scotton adds that bilingual speakers need two codes "to index what they see as their unmarked RO balance" (1992:70). Approached from this angle that Phila code switches can be perceived as not only a display of her level of proficiency in English and Xhosa but also a display of her bilingual ability. In other words when CS occurs as the unmarked choice indexing the unmarked RO balance, it occurs as a phenomenon that is frequently and extensively

used by interlocutors proficient in two (or more) languages. In sum, CS is a common feature of bilinguals that is also the embodiment of their simultaneous identity.

Code switching to make a marked choice

A marked choice is defined as a deviation from the expected or unmarked choice. There is no indication in my data that Phila code switches so as to change some aspects of the RO balance and thus pass a meta-message. What has been observed, instead, is that she code switches so as to include her pupils.

Code switching to make an exploratory choice.

This occurs in a new and uncertain situation where strangers explore code choice (Myers-Scotton 1992:176). In the context of this research Phila is not engaged in an exchange of codes with a view to choosing a code which the pupils will be comfortable with. Instead, an unmarked RO balance indexed by unmarked codes is set for the speech situation under research.

Code switching as an avoidance strategy

In addition to the social and educational functions performed by code switching in the classroom already mentioned, there is the possibility that teachers may switch to the pupil's MT so as to avoid using English in the classroom. Adendorff (1992), although recommending CS where necessary, warns that teachers should not use it as an "avoidance strategy". This is similar to what Appel and Muysken (1972:118) call the referential function of CS, because it often involves a lack

of knowledge of one language, or a lack of facility in that language on a certain subject. In my data, however, there is no indication that Phila switches from English to Xhosa because she wants to avoid using the former. To substantiate this view, it will suffice to point out that all Phila's expressions in the learners' MT are expressions which she would have been able to put in English. We can consider, for example, discourse markers like *siyevana?* or *uyaqonda?* [Are you with me? Understand?], as well as other dominant CS features of her discourse like translations, especially conceptual translations.

5.5 Conclusion

This chapter looked at the main findings arising from the research data analysis. For example, it has been noted that the phrasal insertions, *siyevana* and *uyaqonda* [are you with me? and understand?] perform a mainly social function. However, it has been noted that we cannot simply describe a switch by a teacher who shares the same MT with the pupils as expressing solidarity with the pupils. Teachers use CS as a communicative resource; therefore its occurrence in the classroom should be viewed in relation to other contextualisation cues like non-verbal communication cues.

Another noted feature of the research subject's discourse is the way she uses the question form to structure her classroom discourse. The demands teachers are faced with in classroom situations have been also highlighted. One of these demands is that teachers have the task of teaching the subject matter and at the same time have to teach through the medium of English. This is a classroom demand because the learners are not yet well versed in English but at the same time have to receive instruction in it. In addition to this, English is a language of prestige

in South Africa so everybody aspires to learn it. Therefore, CS is a kind of language teachers use to alleviate some of the effects of differences between the learners' home background and the school situation. That CS should be viewed as a contextualisation cue became apparent when we considered Phila's use of intonation. In considering Phila's use of intonation we were able to see the way CS co-occurs with other communication cues. Also noted in this chapter is that some of the switches are translations, direct and conceptual, and that Phila uses them to reformulate and reinforce what she has already explained in the learners' target language. The chapter closes with Myers-Scotton's markedness model.

CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

6.1 Introduction

The general focus of this thesis has been on the nature and function of the code switches used by Phila in the classroom. This chapter looks at the issues arising from the previous chapters and attempts to draw them together.

6.2 Discussion

Code switching is one of the resources in Phila's communicative repertoire. In her interaction with the pupils she used three types of CS: tag-switches, inter- and intra-sentential switches. Analysis of incidences of these switches revealed that they perform an educational function and/or a social function (though the latter appeared to be dominant).

As was observed in the analysis chapter, most of the switches to Xhosa perform a social function and an educational function. My research subject uses some of the expressions in Xhosa to show solidarity with the pupils. For example, she feels that when she uses English only the atmosphere in the classroom becomes tense. She uses CS to break the tension, as she put it, "to make the pupils relax and to be comfortable". If we consider the whole pattern of CS as a code on its own, then Phila uses it as a communicative and learning resource. My research subject explained the importance of CS as a learning resource as follows: "They [the pupils] are able to

understand the subject matter."

On the use of CS by teachers for solidarity purposes Martin-Jones (1995) argues that we cannot always say that a teacher expresses solidarity with learners when he/she switches to the language he/she shares with them. In other words, Martin-Jones wants to see a shift away from simply looking at CS in terms of the 'we code' and 'they code' distinction. The same view is expressed by Myers-Scotton (1993:54) when she examines Gumperz's use of these terms:

> even though it would seem that Gumperz's use of 'we codes' versus 'they codes' creates the obvious problem of implying a stable interpretation for *all* interactions, his followers ignore the problem and go on using the 'we'/'they' distinction...

Martin-Jones goes on to state that teachers use CS to negotiate and renegotiate meaning. If we look at the instances where my research subject switches to Xhosa, we see evidence of the "negotiation and renegotiation of meaning".

In her explanations as to why she uses CS, she said: "I want the pupils to be clear about the lesson". The prevalent occurrence of the tag switches, *siyevana?* and *uyaqonda?*, the switches from English to Xhosa or Xhosa to English in the middle of a sentence, or at any point in a sentence, and the reformulation of her explanations through direct and conceptual translation, all show that she wants to leave no stone unturned in trying to make the pupils "clear about the lesson".

Martin-Jones, like Gumperz (1982), states that CS is a contextualisation cue or communicative resource used for conveying meaning. Code switching operates like other contextualisation cues in the construction and interpretation of meanings. Martin-Jones compares CS to other contextualisation cues like kinesics and gestures. She goes on to say that these do not carry meaning on their own but when they co-occur with other communication cues.

Code switching, therefore, must be seen as part of Phila's classroom discourse, a communicative resource she draws upon to convey meaning to the learners.

That CS is a contextualisation cue co-occurring with other cues became clear in my study when I considered the way my research subject conveys meaning through intonation. Let us look at this example:

(Extract 27)

> . . . so other countries invested in England *ngenxa yantoni? Kukho uxolo,kuzolile e*England [because of what? There is peace in England, it is quiet in England].

In the above example, my research subject switches from English to Xhosa. As she code switches her tone also changes. She moves from a low-tone to a high-rise tone, and then to a low-fall tone.

Intonation is a non-verbal communication cue, but in extract 27 it co-occurs with code switching. I was also able to observe other communication cues that co-occur with the switches to Xhosa. For example, I was able to see the gestures she made as she changed from English to Xhosa. Using Martin-Jones's argument, CS in the above extract does not carry meaning alone but in concert with the other communication cues. Martin-Jones explains this further by saying: "Code-switching can therefore be seen as a resource similar to some punctuation features in a written discourse" (1995:98).

Some of the switches to Xhosa Phila uses are translations of expressions she has already uttered in English, as in this example:

(Extract 28)

> These steam cars frightened horses and damaged roads. *Esi*steam power *caba sasingxola kakhulu amahashe ebaleka xa sidlula avele othuke* and *simosha*

nantoni? Simosha nendlela [This steam power apparently made a big noise that made horses run when it was passing and also damaged what? Damaged roads].

In the above extract Phila first explains in English the disadvantages of using steam cars and then gives the same information in Xhosa. This is the type of translation we categorised as a conceptual translation in the analysis and findings chapters. Phila uses it as a communicative strategy. She uses it to construct and interpret the meaning of her explanation for the pupils. In the Xhosa version of her explanation Phila adds words she did not use in the English explanation. For example, she adds words such as *caba* [apparently], *ngxola* [noisy], and *kakhulu* [much]. These words correspond with the word "frightened" in the English version of her explanation, and all help to explain the effect of the noise made by steam cars. Therefore, she uses the switches to Xhosa to reinforce and reformulate what she has explained in English. Arthur (1996:24) refers to incidences of translations like that in extract 28 as "interlingual reformulations". Phila's intention in using them is not to add something new but to facilitate pupils' understanding of what has been explained before.

As we noticed when we looked at the way in which CS co-occurs with intonation or other communication cues, the switches in the extract - which are translations of English explanations - co-occur with other cues like intonation and gesture. They also co-occur with classroom strategies such as the posing of rhetorical questions.

6.3 Conclusion

The main focus of this thesis has been the use of code switching in the classroom. It has examined the nature and functions of the switches used by a junior secondary school history teacher in

conveying information to her pupils.

The general conclusion to be drawn from the observation and argument of the previous chapters is that CS has an important role to play in the school classroom. But so far, very little research has been done on the implications of CS in the classroom, especially in the South African context. Now that the practice of CS is officially sanctioned in this country, there is a need for this phenomenon to be thoroughly investigated.

Atkinson (1987:241) notes that "at present it would seem to be true, in general, that in teacher training very little attention is given to the use of the native language", and argues that use of the learner's MT as a classroom strategy should be introduced to teachers during training. If CS were to become an aspect of teacher training, further research into its potential and implications would be required, possibly leading to the development of material or textbooks on how to use it in the classroom. Adendorff (1992) agrees that CS has a positive role to play in the classroom. He also feels that there should be "consciousness raising" among teachers in training on the importance of classroom code switching. In sum, there is a challenge to education and language planners and all those involved in teacher development to view CS as a valuable learning resource, and to begin to devise ways and means of using it effectively in the classroom. It is a simple fact that CS is a widespread phenomenon in schools, that teachers are using it without any proper guidance, and that they will continue to use it in mediating the constraints of the classroom and the curriculum.

We must also be mindful of the other, negative side of classroom code switching. Adendorff (1992) maintains that teachers should be made aware of the importance of CS in the classroom, but warns that it should not be used as an "avoidance strategy". This simply means that teachers should not use the fact that they have been given permission to code switch in the classroom as an excuse to avoid using English. This is particularly important for teachers who are

not L1 speakers of English and are not entirely comfortable with the language: English remains the official medium of instruction, and it is the responsibility of teachers to ensure that their pupils acquire an adequate command of it. Thus Atkinson (1987:246), though in favour of MT use in the classroom, warns against its excessive use as follows:

> - The teacher and/or the students fail to observe distinctions between equivalence of form, semantic equivalence, and pragmatic features, and thus oversimplify to the point of using crude and inaccurate translation;
> - Students speak to the teacher in the mother tongue as a matter of course, even when they are quite capable of expressing what they mean in English;
> - Students fail to realize that during many activities in the classroom it is crucial that they use only English.

As already pointed out, the recommendation of CS as a classroom strategy by the present government must not be used as an "avoidance strategy". English is not only an international language but also a language of prestige in South Africa. This implies that while teachers may use CS as a communicative and learning resource in the classroom, they have to ensure that learners are not thereby denied access to English, which is a language of wider communication, power and social, cultural and economic empowerment.

REFERENCES

Adendorff, R. (1992). Code-switching amongst Zulu speaking teachers and their pupil: Its Functions and Implications for Teacher Education. In J. Boughey (ed.), *Applied language Studies: Visions and Realities*. Proceedings of 1992 SAALA conference (pp.23-42). Cape Town: UCT.

Appel, R. & Muysken, P. (1987). *Language Contact and Bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.

Arthur, J. (1996). Code Switching and Collusion: Classroom Interaction in Botswana Primary Schools. *Linguistics and Education* **8**, 17-33.

Atkinson, D. (1987). The Mother Tongue in the Classroom. *ELT Journal* 42/4, 241-247.

Auer, J.C.P. (1984). On the Meaning Of Conversational Code-Switching. In J.C.Auer and A.D. Luzio (eds.), *Interpretative Sociolinguistics: Migrants - Children - Migrant Children* (pp. 87-108). Tubingen: Niemeyer.

Baetens, H. (1982). *Bilingualism: Basic Principles*. Beardsmore: Multilingual Matters.

Barnes, L.A. (1994). Bilingual Code-switching: Function and Form. *South African Journal of Linguistics* **20**, 269-284.

Cameron, D. and others (1994). The Relations Between Researcher and Researched: Ethics, Advocacy and Empowerment. In D. Graddol, J. Maybin, and B. Stierer (eds.), *Researching language and Literacy in Social Practice* (pp. 19-25). Frankfort Lodge: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Camilleri, A. (1996). Language Values and Identities: Code Switching in Secondary Classrooms in Malta. *Linguistics and Education* **8**, 85-103.

Cohen, L. & Manion, L. (1994). *Research Methods in Education*. London: Rout Lodge.

Dane, F.C. (1990). *Research Methods*. California: Brooks/Cole.

Dore, J. (1977). 'Oh Them Sheriff' : A Pragmatic Analysis of Children's Responses to Questions. In Ervin-Susan and Mitchell-Kernan-Claudia. *Child Discourse.* New York: Academic.

Gumperz, J.J. (ed.) (1982). *Language and Social Identity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J.J. & Herasimchuk, E. (1975). The Conversational Analysis of Social Meaning: A Study of Classroom Interaction. In M. Sanches & B.G. Blount (eds.), *Socio-cultural Dimensions of language Use* (pp.81-111). New York: Academic Press.

Huerta, A. (1977). The Acquisition of Bilingualism: A Code-switching Approach. *Working Papers in Sociolinguistics* **39**, p.32.

Kharma, N.N. and Hajjaj, H. (1989). Use of the Mother Tongue in the ESL Classroom. *Iral* xxvi/3, 223-235.

Khati, T. (1992). Intra-Lexical Switching or Nonce Borrowing?: Evidence from Sesotho - English Performance. In Herbet (ed.), *Language and Society in Africa: The Theory and LPractice of Sociolinguistics.* Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

Kieswetter, A. (1995). Code-Switching amongst African High School Pupils. Occasional Papers in African Linguistics, No.1.

Lindholm, K.J.M. and Padilla, A.M. (1978). Child Bilingualism: Report on Language Mixing, Switching and Translations. *Linguistics* 211, 23-44.

Lin, A.M.Y. (1996). Bilingualism or Linguistic Segregation? Symbolic Domination, Resistance, and Codeswitching. *Linguistics and Education* **8**, 49-84.

Martin-Jones, M. (1995). Code-Switching In The Classroom: Two Decades of Research. In L. Milroy and P. Muysken (eds.), *One Speaker Two Languages: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Code-switching* (pp.91-111). Britain: Cambridge University Press.

Merritt, M. and others (1992). Socialising Multilingualism: Determinants of Codeswitching in Kenyan Primary Classrooms. *Journal of Multilingual and*

Multicultural Development 13,1&2, 103-120.

Mesthrie, R. (1993). Nineteenth-Century Attestations of English-Afrikaans Code-mixing. *Language Matters* **24**

Milk, R.D. (1981). Variations in Language use in two Bilingual Second-Grade Classrooms. *Convention of the American Educational Research Association.* Los Angeles.

Moffat, S. and Milroy, L. (1992). Panjabi/English Language Alternation in the Early School Years. *Multilingua* 11/4, 354-384.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1992). Code Switching in Africa. In R. Herbet (ed.), *Language and Society in Africa.* Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Social Motivations For Codeswitching: Evidence from Africa.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1992). Comparing Codeswitching and Borrowing. In Eastman (ed.), *Codeswitching* (pp.19-39). Frankfurt: Multilingual Matters.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1988). Codeswitching as Indexical of Social Negotiations. In M. Heller (ed.), *Codeswitching : Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives* (pp.151-183). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ndayipfukamiye, L.(1994). Code-Switching in Burundi Primary Classrooms. In Rubagumya(ed.), *Teaching and Researching Language in African Classrooms*(pp.37-95). Oxford: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Ndayipfukamiye, L. (1996). The Contradictions of Teaching Bilingually in Post-Colonial Burundi: From **Nyakatsi** to Maisons en E`tage. *Linguistics and Education* **8**, 35-47.

Peires, M.L. (1994). Code Switching as an Aid to L2 Learning. *Southern African Journal of Applied Language Studies* 3(1), 14-22).

Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English Y.TERMINO EN ESPANO~L: toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* **18**, 581-618.

Pride, J.B.(ed.) (1979). Sociolinguistic Aspects of Language Learning and

Teaching. New York: Oxford University Press.

Romaine, S. (1989). *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Stenhouse, L. (1988). Case Study Methods. In J. Keeves (ed.), *Educational Research, Methodology, and Measurement: An International Handbook* (pp.49-63). Oxford: Pergamon.

Taft, R. (1988). *Ethnographic Research Methods.* In J.P. Keeves (ed.), Educational Research, Methodology, and Measurement: An International Handbook (pp.59-63). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Titford, C. (1983). Translation for Advanced Learners. *ELT Journal* 37/1, 52-7.

Tudor, I. (1987). Using Translation in ESP. *ELT Journal* 41/4, 268-273.

Valdes-Fallis, G. (1978). Code Switching and the Classroom Teacher. *Language in Education* **4**, 22-26.

Wardhaugh, R. (1986). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Yin, R.K. (1984). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Zentella, A. C. (1981). Ta bien, You could answer Me en cualquier idiom: Puerto Rican Codeswitching in Bilingual Classrooms. In Duran-Richard (ed.), *Latino Language and Communicative Behaviour*. Norwood, N.J. : Ablex.

Unpublished Material

South Africa (Republic). Education Department: African National Congress. (1994). Executive *Summary of Draft Policy Framework for Education and Training*. Centre for Educational Policy Development.

APPENDIX A

LESSON TRANSCRIPT (29/05/95)

T : What do you understand by the term Industrial Revolution? Who wants to try? What is a revolution?

P : change by means of violent or non-violent way.

T : Yes! a revolution is associated with change within a short period of time. This change may be violent or non-violent, *siyevana?* [Are you with me?]

P : Yes!!

T : Like this chage we are going to talk about, so this change was not violent. Siyevana?

P : Yes!!

T : (Writes on the board in English the definition of the word, revolution). People of Britain changed from farming to be an industrial society. *Ngelo xesha abantu base* Britain *yayingamafama, andithi? Babefuya bephila ngokulima,* so during this period that changed *baze bathini abantu? Baphila kwixesha le* industries *besebenzisa i*machines *xa besenza into zabo, siyevana?* [During that period people of Britain were farmers, is that no so? They reared animals and cultivated land.....and the people did what? They lived in a period of industries using machines to do their things, are you with me?]

P : Yes!!

T : These people in factories used machines, *siyevana?*

P : The people used machines into *ababengayazi i*machines, *baqhele ukusebenzisa izandla zabo* so these people used to do their things in their homes using their hands, *siyevana?* [...something they were not used to, the

machines. They were used to using their hands ...are you with me?]

T : Industrial revolution refers to the period from 1760 up to 1850 (She writes this on the board) ...during which time Britain was changed from a farming society to an industrial society, so goods were made on a large scale because of the use of powerful machines...so these goods were made by the powerful machines, *siyevana?*

P : Yes!!

T : Now we are coming to the characteristics of the industrial revolution (she write this on the board) The first one is, The steam power and the steam engine (she writes this on the board.) Just as petrol is necessary in driving a motor engine, steam power is necessary in driving factories I mean factory machines, *siyevana?*

*Njengokuba uyazi ukuba imoto ayihambi ngaphandle kwe*petrol *uyaqonda?* [Just as you know that a car does not move without petrol, understand?]

P : Yes!!

T : ...so *ne-ne-ne*steam power was necessary to do what? To drive factory machines, siyevana?

P : Yes!!

T : *Kufuneka ucinge ngemoto. Imoto ayikwazi kuhamba ngaphandle kwe*petrol, *siyevana?* [You must think of a car. A car cannot move without petrol, are you with me?]

P : Yes!!

T : And nasezifactory ifactory *azikwazi kusebenza ngaphandle kwantoni?* [...in factories, factories are unable to operate without what?]

P : Kwemachines [machines]

T : (Writes on the board "Steam power and factory machines") Just as petrol is necessary to drive a motor engine, steam power was necessary to drive

factory machines, *siyevana?* The making use of the steam engine was one of the factors which made the industrial revolution to be possible. *Apha sithetha ngantoni? Sithetha ngokutshintsha kwezinto, ngokutshintsha kwamaxesha, siyevana?* [Here we are talking about what? We are talking about how things changed, about changing times, are you with me?]

P : Yes!!

T : So *i*steam power and steam engine were one of the factors *ezabangela ukuba kubekho le* change *ikhoyo* cause *i*steam power ne steam engine were introduced so *kwakho ntoni? Kwakho ichange phi? E*Britain, *siyevana?* [...which caused this change because steam power and steam engine ...are you with me?]

P : Yes!!

T : *Zezizizathu ezabangela ukuba kubekho i*change, *i*steam power *ne*steam engine, *uyaqonda?*

[These were the factors which caused change, the steam power and the steam engine, understand?]

P : Yes!!

T : *Kuba kaloku kwakukho ntoni? Kwakukho i*factories so *i*factories *zifuna kusebenze ntoni?* [Because there was what? There were factories ...factories need what to operate?]

P : *I*machines.[Machines]

T : *Ngantoni?* [With what?]

T&P: *Nge*steam power.[With steam power.]

T : *Andithi?* [Is that not so?]

P : Yes!!

T : Ok!... because it was the first true source of power that was the driving force of the industrial revolution. *Njengokuba besenditshilo*, this was the driving

force of the industrial revolution.[As I have already said...] (writes on the board, Charcoal, iron and steal) Steam engines needed coal to burn. What is coal? *I*coal *yintoni?* [What is coal?]

P : *Ngamalahle*. [Coal]

T : *Niyaziqonda eza train zakudala? Zazihamba ngantoni?* [Do you know the trains that were used in the olden days]

P : *Ngamalahle*.[Coal]

T : *Zazihamba ngantoni?* [What put them in motion?]

P : *Ngamalahle*.[Coal]

T : So steam engine needed coal to burn. These steam engines had to be made of iron and steel cause wooden machines were not strong enough to bear the strain...so these machines were to be made of what? Were to be made of steel and iron, *siyevana?*

P : Yes!!

T : These machines they were using were to be made of what?

T&P: Of steel and iron.

T : *Ngenxa yantoni? Iplanga eli lalingakwazi ukuthini? Ukuthi carry istrain santoni? Samalahle* and iron, *siyevana?* [Because of what? Wood could not do what? Could not carry the strain of what? Of coal ...are you with me?]

P : Yes!!

T : ...so they had to use...?

P : Iron and steel to make the machines.

T : It became more and more difficult to melt the iron because there was shortage of chared wood to make the charcoal.

What do you understand by a natural product? h^er, What is a natural product? Mhh!! OK! Who can give an example of a natural product?

P : Tree

T : A natural product is something *edaliweyo engakhange yenziwe ngumntu ukuze ibekhona,* that's a natural product, *siyevana?* [...that is created that is not made by a human being to exist...are you with me?]

P : Yes!!

T : Attempts were made to use coal but were not successful, this led to the outbreak of a revolution. (Writes on the board another subheading, The expansion of productivity.)

....the use of steam power and engine freed man from his limitations. Many goods could now be manufactured in a short time. This is called productivity. What do you understand by the term productivity? Productivity? Productivity?

P : Productivity is to make goods within a short time.

T : Productivity is to make goods within a short time, so because of this change people in that society had to make goods within a short time. *Ngenxa yantoni? Ngenxa e*machines *eziya babe zisebenzisa.* Unlike *ngokuya babesenzisa izandla behlala emakhaya, uyaqonda?* [[Because of what? Because of the machines which they used. ....the time when they used hands in their homes, understand?]

P : Yes!!

T : (Writes on the board, Factories and cities.) What are factories?

P : Factories is where people make goods.

T : Factories are places where people make goods with the help of machines, so during this period many factories were built near the coal mines. As a result towns developed around factories...so people moved to these towns to look for work. This process is called urbanisation (Writes urbanisation on the board) The people who could not make it on farms moved to the cities to look for work. This process is called urbanisation. *Kudala abantu babemka*

*emakhaya bayokufuna umsebenzi ezidolophini ko*Durban, *bemke apha e*Transkei *baye eRawutini emigodini.* It's something like that *i*urbanisation, *siyevana? Umke kule ndawo uhlala kuyo uyofuna umsebenzi.* [In the past people used to leave their homes in the rural areas to look for work in cities like Durban. They left Transkei and went to the mines in Johannesburg.....are you with me? You leave the place where you stay to look for work.]

(Writes on the board Availability of capital) What is capital? What is capital?

P : Capital is money that is used to produce more money.

T : Capital is money that is used to produce more money, *siyevana?*

P : Yes!!

T : *Mhlawumbi umntu athenge i*taxi *ukwenza enye imali, la mali athenge ngayo i*taxi *yintoni?* Capital. *Uzakwenza ntoni? Uzakwenza enye imali ngala mali athenge ngayo i*taxi. [Maybe someone buys a taxi to make more money, the money h/she used to buy the taxi is called what? Capital.He/she is going to make what? Is going to make more money with the money he/she used to buy the taxi.]

Capital is money that is used to produce more money. people whom use their money to produce more money are called capitalists, siyevana? [are you with me?]

P : Yes!!

T : So the capitalists of Britain invested their money entweni? [in what?] In mining, trade and ship building (she writes this on the board) ...this way of investing became limited so the capitalists had to find other ways of investing their money...so they started to invest in industry i.e.they built factories. ...so the process whereby a rich man buys a factory, machines and workers to his services to produce goods is known as capitalism.

APPENDIX B

LESSON TRANSCRIPT 30/05/1995

T: (Writes on the board, " Reasons for the Industrial Revolution") Our lesson today is on why the industrial revolution started in Britain. The first reason ((Writes on the board, "Geographical and Natural resources in Britain") England is an island. What is an island? Hands up!

P: An island is a piece of land surrounded by sea.

T: An island is a piece of land surrounded by sea...a country surrounded by sea ...*isiqithi ngesiXhosa*.[...an island in Xhosa.] Because England is an island she was not involved in many wars...it was not easy for other countries to attack her...so this gave her an opportunity to develop her industries without outside interference. Number two England had good natural harbours (writes this point on the board). 3. She was the centre of trade. *Okwesine*,[fourthly] her climate was good for manufacturing fabrics such as cotton...*Okwesihlanu*,[fifthly] she had enough water...*la manzi ayephaya ayesetyenziswa kwi*factories.[...the water that was there was used in...] Overseas markets: Goods from Britain easily reached overseas markets. What do you understand by the term trading fleet? Trading fleet or the word fleet? Mhh!! (no response from the pupils) Who wants to try? *Yayisebenzisa inqanawe izisebenzisa kwi*transport so *inqanawe xa zininzi kuthiwa yintoni?* [It used ships for transport purposes...if ships are many they are called what?]

P: Fleet!!

T: *Yayisebenzisa ke ezinqanawa kwi*trade *yayo*. [It used these ships in its trade.] England as market (she writes this on the board). What is a tariff? Tariff is

money that is paid to the state...*itariff ifana ne* tax *le ibhatalwayo ngezinto ezingena kwelo lizwe, siyevana?* [Tariff is like tax that is paid for goods entering another country, are you with me?] ...so *i*England *yayine*advantage *kuba i*goods *zayo zazingataxwa, uyaqonda?* [England had an advantage because its goods were not taxed, understand? *I*trade *yayilula kuyo kuba into zayo zazingataxwa.*[Trade was easy for England because her goods were not taxed.]...*siye kwi*government (Writes this on the board). *I*political stability *ibalulekile elizweni*, for example, *apha e*SA *mhlawumbi kwa* Zulu-Natal *kubulawa abantu, leyo yi*political instability, *kuyaliwa abantu bayabulalana* so *e*England there was political stability that made it a better country to invest in so other countries invested in England *ngenxa yantoni? Kukho uxolo, kuzolile e*England...the government was stable *kungekho zingxushu-ngxushu*...so in England everybody was given an opportunity to start his or her own business, *nabani, uyaqonda? Nokuba ungumntu onjani, waphantsi waphezulu* if *unakho wawusithi* start your own business, *uyaqonda*? Anyone who wanted to start business was given capital by the banks, *nabani na ofunayo* was given money *zi*banks.[...lets move on to the government....political stability is important in a country...here in SA maybe in Zulu-Natal people are being killed, that is political instability...there is fighting, people are killing each other so in.....because of what? There is peace, there is stability in ....there was no instability.....anyone, understand? No matter what type of person you are , whether great or not if you had the potential you would ....understand? anyone who wanted was given money by the banks] What is capitalism or what is capital? Mhh!!

P: Capital means money.

T: Yes, capital is money that is used to get more money. What is capitalism? Mhh!! (no response) What is capitalism? Mhh!! (still no response) Capital is

money that is used to get more money, so what is capitalism? Yhes! (points a pupil who wanted to try, she was not audible but apparently her answer was not correct).

T: No that's not capitalism. Who can tell me the reasons why the Industrial Revolution started in Britain?

P: England was not involved in many wars.

T: Yes!! England was not involved in many wars. What else?

P: England had good natural harbours.

T: Yes! England had good natural harbours. What else? There are many reasons.

P: There was the centre of trade.

T: I don't understand.

P: England, England was the centre of trade route.

T: England was the centre of trade route.

P: England was the centre of trade route.(The teacher repeats this because the pupil did not show confidence, the pupil then repeated after the teacher)

T: OK! What else?

P: England had large quantities of iron ore.

T: Yes! England had large quantities of iron ore. What can you say about the stability of the government? What about the stability of the government?

P: Political stability made it very attractive to the investors.

T: Political stability made it attractive to the investors. They were not afraid to invest their money in Britain because the country was stable. What else can you say about political stability?

P: Government did not limit establishment of economic growth.

T: Government did not limit establishment of economic growth.

APPENDIX C

LESSON TRANSCRIPT (1/8/1995)

T : Our next topic is the inventions of the industrial revolution (she writes this on the board)

The inventions of the industrial revolution. What is to invest? Anyone with an English dictionary? (One pupil shows hers) look for the word. Inventions of the industrial revolution or the use of the steam power, steam engine, coal and iron, isn't?

P : Yes!!

T : This revolution took place because of the discovery of the steam power, steam engine, and coal. The need for goods to be manufactured within a short period became so strong that new and better machinery was in demand. The investors played a large role in developing new and better machinery, *siyevana?*

P : Yes!!

T : New and better machinery was discovered or manufactured because there was agreat demand for manufacturing goods within a short period, *siyevana?*

P : Yes!!

T : There was a great demand for manufactured goods, so new machinery was discovered by the investors, *siyevana?*

P : Yes!!

T : The investors by discovering new machines launched England into industrialisation. I said to you last time we met that England became a leading country in the economy, *andithi?* [Is that not so?]

P : Yes!!

T : England became a leading country *kwintoni? Kw*ieconomy, *andithi?* [In what? In ...is that not so?]

P : Yes!!

T : So industrialisation in England began with the production of cloth after practical men invented better machines that launched England into industrialisation...so the new textile machines were responsible for the change that took place in England in the 18th Century. Textile machines were responsible for the industrialisation of England (she writes this on the board)...textile machines were responsible for the industrialisation of England. One of the investros who started the whole industrialisation process with regard to the textile industry was James Hargreaves (she writes this on the board). James Hargreaves was of the investors *phi*? In England, *siyevana?* [...where?...are you with me?]

P : Yes!!

T : This man James Hargreaves was one of the investors *phi? E*England, *siyevana*? [...where...are you with me?

P : Yes!!

T : Spinning and weaving are the two basic processes by which cloth is manufactured (she writes this on the board) England was the first country to manufacture what? Ilaphu, siyevana? [...cloth, are you with me?]

P : Yes!!

T : It was the first country to manufacture *i*cloth. [cloth] Spinning and weaving are the two basic processes by which cloth is made, *siyevana?* [are you with me?]

P : Yes!!

T : The spinners that is, the people who were doing the spinning were known as the spinners, *siyevana?* [are you with me?]

P : Yes!!

T : The people who were weaving were known as the weavers. *Into eyayisenzeka yayile*, during this process the spinners will take a bundle of wool or cotton and pull out a thread ne^h, *siyevana?* [What happened was...are you with me?]

P : Yes!!

T : *Kule* bundle, *Uyasiqonda isikhinci esi sewulu? So i*bundle *yinto enkulu ngaphezu kwesikhinci*...so these people take *i*bundle of wool or *i*bundle of cloth and take out a thread from out of that bundle, *niyaqonda?* [In this ...you know a bundle of knitting wool a....is something bigger than just a bundle of knitting wool...understand?]

P : Yes!!

T : ...and they will give that thread to the weavers, *siyevana*? [are you with me?]

P : Yes!!

T : ...*kaloku kwenziwa ilaphu ngoku, kwenziwa i*piece of cloth. they will give the thread to the weavers , the weavers will arrange these threads parallel from top to bottom, *siyevana?* (she draws on the board how these threads were arranged) [are you with me? Cloth is being made now. A piece of cloth is made, are you with me?]

P : Yes!!

T : They will arrange these threads, they will arrange these threads like this (illustrates again on the board) and then they will put them across, *siyevana*? [are you with me?]

P : Yes!!

T : These lines will come together (points her diagram on the board) *siyaqonda?* To make what? To make *ilaphu, niyaqonda*? [...understand?....cloth, understand?]

They will put these lines parallel from top to bottom, *andithi?* [not so?]

P : Yes!!

T : ...and then put them across *kuphume ntoni? Ilaphu, uyaqonda*? [...to produce what? Cloth, understand?]

P : Yes!!

T : ...*yimisonto leya, siyevana*? [those are threads, are you with me?]

P : Yes!!

T : *Aba bakhupha ntoni? Bakhupha imisonto kula* bundle, *uyaqonda?* [These take out what? they take out threads from that bundle, understand?]

P : Yes!!

T : *Bayinike bani? I*weavers, *I*weavers *zithini*? They arrange them from top to bottom, *bazibeke kanje* (goes to the board to illustrate using her diagram) and put others across to make what? To make *ilaphu, uyaqonda*? [They give it to whom? To the weavers. The weavers do what?.....put them like this....cloth, understand?]

P : Yes!!

T : *Uyayiqonda i*linen *le ikhoyo, andithi?* [You know the linen that is used now, not so?]

T : ....*Ukhe uyibone i*linen *ukuba injani? Kukho la migca, andithi*? [You have seen how this linen looks like? It has those lines, not so?]

P : Yes!!

T : ...*la migca icacile kuyo, injalo ke*, that's how cloth was made *phi*? In England, *uyaqonda?* [...those lines are visible/clear in it, it's like that...where....understand?]

P : Yes!!

T : Spinning and weaving are the two basic processes by which cloth is manufactured. The spinners took bundles of wool or cloth and made threads,

siyevana?

P : Yes!!

T : *La misonto.* [Those threads]

These threads were then given to the weavers. They arranged these threads parallel from top to bottom...*ezi* threads *zizakuphuma kanje, enye phezu kwenye, enye phezu kwenye, kanjalo* to make *ilaphu*...so before the industrial revolution women made cloth by using a very simple machine, the spinning wheel (she writes this on the board)

As this spinning wheel could only make one thread at a time it took a very long time to make a cloth, *siyevana*? [...these...would come out like this, one on top of another, one on top of another, like that....cloth.....are you with me?]

P : Yes!!

T : James Hargreaves decided to invent a faster machine that will weave many threads at a time. UJames Hargreaves invented a faster machine which could make from 8 to 30 threads *ngexesha.*[at a time] This was known as the Spinning Jenny (she writes this on the board) are you clear?

P : Yes!!

T : Some of the workers feared that they would lose their jobs because the Spinning Jenny was much faster than them. *Baqonda ukuba oh bazakuluza imisebenzi yabo kuba le* machine *ayinidi bantu baninzi bayidistroya.* Edmund Cartwright invented another machine. The weavers were no longer needed in the cotton industry, because they were no longer needed, they lost their jobs, *siyevana?*

P : Yes!!

T : Are you clear?

P : Yes!!

T : What machine was used by women before the industrial revolution?

P : The spinning wheel

T : What was the reaction of the people when the Spinning Jenny was invented by James Hargreaves?

P(a): The people they lose their jobs.

T : What was their fear?

P(a): They destroyed the machine.

P(b): They thought they would lose their jobs.

T : Yes! they thought they would lose their jobs as a result they destroyed the machine. Who was the person who invented another machine when the Spinning Jenny was destroyed?

P : It was Edmund Cartwright.

T : What happened to the rest of the people?

P : The weavers lost their jobs.

T : Do you this change *eyayisenzeka e*England? [... which took place in England]

P : Yes!!

APPENDIX D

LESSON TRANSCRIPT (2/8/1995)

T : Have you done my homework? All of you, he! ? *Kutheni ingathi anivumi nonke nje abanye?*

As you know that an increase in production of goods meant an increase in transport, there were only two ways at that time by which goods could be transported overland. It was by either use of horse-power or rivers and canals. As you know that transport was needed to take those goods to the markets, there were two means of transport used at that time, *amahashe nemilambo, siyevana?* [Why do you seem not to all agree, what about others?.....horses and rivers, are you with me?]

P : Yes!!

T : Inorder to improve transport, the investors started to see if the steam power which was used erh which was used in factories could be used to solve the transport problem...so the investors were interested in knowing if the steam power which erh you know...they wanted to know if *bangayisebenzisa ekusolveni le* transport problem cause *ezi zazi*slow *kakhulu, i*horse-power *ne*cannals *zasemlanjeni, uyaqonda?* [...they can use it in solving this....these were very slow,...and....of the rivers, understand?]

P : Yes!!

T : *...kwakufuneka into ezakuthi ikhawuleze ekutranspoteni i*goods to the markets...so experiments in the 19th Century succeeded in producing steam cars that were capable of carrying 14 passengers...so during the 19th Century *i*nvestors *za experimenta ukwenza ntoni? Ukwenza i-i-i-into enokuthi*

*ikwelise i-*ipassengers *eziyi* 14 that is, *abantu abayi* 14, *uyaqonda?* [What was needed was something that could speed up transportation of goods....the...experimented doing what? Doing something that could carry ...that were....people who are....understand?]

P : Yes!!

T : ...*besebenzisa ntoni? Besebenzisa esi*steam power. *Esi*steam power *babesisebenzisa entweni kuqala? Ezi*factory. Now *basisebenzisa* in the form of transport *bafuna kubekho i*transport *ekhawulezileyo*...so it was experimented *into ye* transport *eyayikhwelisa ntoni? Abantu abayi* 14. These steam cars frightened horses and damaged roads. *Esi*steam power *caba sasingxola kakhulu amahashe ebaleka xa sidlula, avele othuke* and *simosha nantoni? Simosha nendlela, uyaqonda*? [...they used what? they used this...This.....was used in what initially ? In the...they used it .....they wanted to have .....that was fast..the thing of...that carried what? People that were...This....apparently made big noise that caused frightning horses to run away and also damaged what? Damaged roads, understand?]

P : Yes!!

T : The steam cars frightened passing horses and damaged roads (she writes this on the board) George was one of the people who started to experiment this thing *entweni? Ezimotweni, siyevana?* [...in what? In motor cars, are you with me?]

P : Yes!!

T : *Ngumntu wokuqala ukusebenzisa i*steam engine *ezimotweni*. In 1848 he completed a locomotive. What is a locomotive? Yhes! [He was the first person to use the.....in motor cars.]

P : A locomotive is a movement.

T : *Niyaziqonda ezanto zihamba emgodini, ezanto kuthiwa ngomakalanyana.* [

Do you know those things used in mines, those things called locomotives.]

P : Yes!!

T : ...its something like that...so this man George discovered that. The mine owners now ordered locomotives from him to carry coal from the coal mines to the canals and rivers. *Bendithe kaloku i*forms *ze*transport *yayiyintoni*? It was the....[I said to you the...of transport were what?]

T&P: rivers and canals.

T : So *i*mine owners ordered locomotives from George in order to transport goods to the rivers and the cannals, *siyevana?* [..the.....are you with me?]

P : Yes!!

T : As a result of this the British government issued money for the construction of a railway line between Stokholm and Darlington. George was seen as an expert on locomotives and he was also given a task of building locomotives that would be used on that railway line, *siyevana?* [...are you with me?]

P : Yes!!

T : This man was recognised now by *intoni*? By the government, he was seen as an expert in making locomotives, *siyevana?* [...what?.....are you with me?]

P : Yes!!

T : This man *kwakhona u*George...I mean his train pulled 22 coaches with passengers and 12 trailers with coal...so *lomsebenzi awenzayo u*George Jefferson *ukwazi ukuba kuthini? Ukuba i*goods *zithuthwe, uyaqonda?* [...again....the work done by.....to make possible what? To make it possible for the goods to be transported, understand?]

P : Yes!!

T : *Njengokuba ibikhona i*transport before, after *enze le* locomotive *yakhe zikwazile ukuba i*goods *zilayishwe, uyaqonda?* [As there was....he did this....of his goods were transported with ease, understand?]

P : Yes!!

T : ...*zakwazi ukuba zithuthwe zisiwe* to those forms of transport (points to notes on the board - rivers and canals) *uyaqonda?* [...they were able to be taken...understand?]

P : Yes!!

T : ...*ngenxa yantoni? Ngenxa yale* locomotive *ayithe* invent. Four years later, his son Robert invented a better locomotive, the Rocket...a better locomotive which was built by his son uRobert was known as the Rocket (writes this on the board). His son, Robert built a better locomotive which could travel 50 km/h. *Niyabona ukuba i*forms *ze*transport *ziyaimprov(a) ngoku*....Because of this discovery *i*means of transport were no longer limited - they were no longer limited - *i*forms of transport *yayeka ukuba zi*cannals *qha nale* locomotive *yaba yi*form *ye*transport, *uyaqonda?* [...because of what? Because of this.....which he invented. Do you see that forms of transport were improved now.....the.....the....were no longer the...only, this...was also a form of transport, understand?]

P : Yes!!

T : *Ngenxa ye*discovery *ka* Robert *i*forms ze transport *zaimprova kuba kuqala kwakusetyenziswa i*horse-power, rivers and cannals. After their discovery *kwakusetyenziswa ntoni? I*locomotives, *siyevana?* [Because of the discovery of....the ...of.....were improved because before they used the.....what was used? The....understand?]

P : Yes!!

T : Because of improvements in transport people could reach the markets very easily, *uyaqonda?* [....understand?]

P : Yes!!

T : After *i*transport *eyenziwa ngu*Robert *abantu bakwazi ukuba bathini?*

*Bafikelele kwi*markets cause *i*goods *ezi ngaphambili zazingafiki kwi*markets *ngenxa ye*transport *engekhoyo. Ngenxa yale* improvement *kwi*transport *i*goods *zatsho zafika kwi*markets *kuba zona i*goods *kwangaphambili zazikhona but kunzima ukufika kwi*markets, *uyaqonda?* [...the...made by Robert people were able to do what? To reach the markets....the:...before did not reach the markets because of lack of transport. Because of this improvement in transport the goods were able to reach the markets and also the consumers were able to reach the markets, because before the goods were available but it was difficult to reach the markets, understand?]

APPENDIX E

SCHEDULE OF INTERVIEW WITH PHILA

R: During analysis of data, I observed that one of the expressions you use the most is *Siyevana*? or *Uyaqonda*? Can you tell me why almost after every explanation you give you ask the pupils, *siyevana*? or *uyaqonda?*

T: I usually use the expressions *siyevana* to make sure that the pupils understand what I'm saying to them, and also to give a chance to anyone with a question.

R: Again, I observed that these expressions *siyevana* or *uyaqonda* are in Xhosa. Can you explain why you have chosen to put them in Xhosa?

T: To make the pupils to relax and to be comfortable.

R: Do you think they wouldn't achieve the same effect if they were expressed in English?

T: They would achieve the same effect.

R: I have also observed that when you are explaining to the pupils the content of the subject, you use the question form, like we see in this expression; *Ngenxa yantoni? Iplanga eli lalingakwazi ukuthini? Ukuthi* carry the strain *santoni? Samalahle* and iron. It is clear to me that you don't expect answers from the pupils because you provide the answer yourself. Can you then explain why you use the question form when explaining and exposing

information to the pupils? [Because of what? Wood was unable to do what? To.....of what? Of coal....]

T: I want the pupils to be clear about the lesson and to be able for them to answer the questions correctly when they are asked.

R: Also these expressions are in Xhosa, again why? and why not English?

T: The aim of using Xhosa is to try to limit confusion in our pupils because it is not easy to express themselves as English is their second language.

R: Another interesting feature of your interaction with your pupils is that as you pose these questions your tone assumes variations, for instance, it rises and falls. Any special purpose for these intonational variations?

T: Intonation is very important so that if there was anyone who was feeling sleepy, may wake up. I also use that to stress important points.

R: Can you explain again, why after explaining in English what an island is, you decided to give a Xhosa version of the word "island". This is the expression I'm talking about:

> An island is a piece of land surrounded by sea, *isiqithi ngesiXhosa.*[...an island in Xhosa.]

T: I use the word *isiqithi* so that they can have a picture of what I am talking about.

R: Finally, what is your general opinion on the use of code switching in the

classroom.

T: The use of code switching is very effective in our teaching. The pupils are comfortable in the classroom. The atmosphere is not tense. They are able to understand the subject matter.

Once again, thanks very much for your co-operation and willingness to participate in this research.