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ABSTRACT

This study's primary objective was to investigate the teaching of English as a Home Language and First Additional Language in desegregated urban high schools in Johannesburg, South Africa. The research is qualitative, comparative and emancipatory in nature and employs a case study strategy. The study is informed and framed by two theoretical and conceptual dimensions; the critical theory and poststructuralism. Qualitative data collection methods such as classroom observation, semi-structured interviews, questionnaires and document analyses were employed to collect the study's data. Qualitative data analysis methods such as global analysis, content analysis and critical discourse analysis were used to analyse data. Though the two English curricula were designed for two different groups of English learners, the study’s findings reveal striking similarities in the structure and content of the documents as well as the manner in which the two English courses are taught. However, critical analysis of the Grade 12 external examination question papers for English reveals astonishing disparities in standards used in the two English courses to measure proficiency and competence in the language. Furthermore, the study has found that the division between English Home Language and English First Additional Language, particularly in the Further Education and Training phase, is to a larger extent motivated by the principles of democracy, social equity and social justice. However, the irony is that classification of English learners based on competency or proficiency levels in English language has had negative implications; it has become another form of social segregation which perpetuates discriminatory practices in schools. This study therefore recommends that the Department of Basic Education should consider adopting a single English language curriculum that would accommodate all English language learners. In addition, further studies should be conducted to interrogate the current English language curriculum and assessment policy, the quality of English instruction and English language instructors in South Africa.
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CHAPTER 1: TEACHING ENGLISH IN URBAN HIGH SCHOOLS

1.1 INTRODUCTION

After 1994, the South African government adopted a humanistic and liberal approach to education (Breen, 1999) with an aim to ‘redress past injustices in educational provision’ and ‘to provide an education of progressively high quality for all learners’ (Republic of South Africa, 1996:5). A new school curriculum (Curriculum, 2005) was adopted with the anticipation that its implementation would reverse inequality and discriminatory practices of the old schooling system (Vally & Dalamba, 1999:17). Further, Hoadley (2011:151) states that the government considered curriculum reform as one of the ‘crucial levers for fostering the ideals of the new nation’ and to bring about a new political vision (Chisholm, 2005a). However, despite numerous curriculum reform projects undertaken by the Department of Basic Education (henceforth DBE and previously Department of Education) since 1994, scholars such as Ayliff (2012) and Coetzee and Hohl (2009) cite shortcomings in the curricula projects preceding the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement namely; Curriculum 2005 and the National Curriculum Statement, with Hoadley (2011:151) referring to them as mere ‘political projects’ used by the government as a ‘scapegoat’ for the poor products of the country’s ailing education system.

Furthermore, Coetzee and Johl (2009:19) describe South Africa’s current education system as ‘new politics of protecting the pass rate’ where educational standards are compromised through the manipulation and adjustment of marks. It is for these reasons that most people perceive the ‘old pupil’ as a better product than the ‘matriculant’ of South Africa’s new education system (Hove & Maruma, 2014:587). Hoadley (2011:151) argues that the shortcomings in curriculum reform in South Africa can be traced to the fact that the process focuses only on changes in ‘knowledge to grant access to previously marginalised groups, rather than facilitating greater access to specialised knowledge’. For instance, the introduction of new school subjects such as English Second Language or English First Additional Language (henceforth EFAL) (Umalusi, 2008), which is this study’s focus.

In South Africa, language education, particularly English, is extremely contentious. English language education continues to be used as the basis for ‘classifying and dividing’ people (Vally & Dalamba 1999:15) as well as ‘the cornerstone of
segregationist education policies’ (Mda, 2004:177). Despite all the new educational policies and changes in South Africa, Bosman (2000) and Heugh (2009) maintain that English language education remains a challenge for most learners, even those in urban contexts where there is greater access to the language. It is worth mentioning that the most disadvantaged group in this regard are black learners in rural areas, most of whom lack exposure and access to English language speakers, texts and technology often experienced by their urban counterparts (Mda, 2004; Tshotsho, 2013).

The larger section of the South African population is composed of multi-lingual communities, with many young people showing proficiency in more than one language at different levels of ability (Posel & Zeller, 2010; Statistics South Africa, 2012). Post - 1994, the new democratic South Africa saw an increase in the numbers of African language speaking learners moving into the former Model C schools (Chisholm, 2005a), hoping that the kind of English instruction offered by these schools would increase their chances for a better future (De Klerk, 1996). This movement of learners came as a result of the desegregation of schools (Soudien, 2004), a process intended to create a new, integrated and inclusive society which would defy and break the racial boundaries created by the apartheid system (Lafon, 2010). The process of desegregation resulted in many urban schools having to deal with linguistically diverse learner populations, with most learners speaking different home languages and showing different levels of competence in English (Meier & Hartell (2009). Further, Meier and Hartell (2009) point out that many desegregated urban schools currently face numerous challenges particularly in dealing with black African learners who come from linguistically diverse backgrounds. It is for this reason that some critics view the process of school desegregation as simply a political move whose aim was to assimilate and accommodate black learners into the existing white schooling systems (McKinney, 2011; Soudien & Sayed, 2004).

As stated above, urban schools have an enormous challenge in determining which English language curriculum is appropriate for black African learners who show home-language proficiency in English, from the multiple English language curricula offered by the DBE (Heugh, 2009; Tshotsho, 2013). This study’s focus is therefore to investigate the teaching of English as a Home Language (EHL) and English as a First Additional Language (EFAL), in Johannesburg’s desegregated suburban high
schools. Further, the study intends to interrogate the relevance of the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statements (CAPS) for EFAL, particularly for multilingual black African learners in the Further Education and Training phase.

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT AND RATIONALE

Research shows that South Africa is the only country in Africa that has an English curriculum which distinguishes between different levels of proficiency, offering the language as a Home Language (HL), a First Additional Language (FAL), and a Second Additional Language (SAL) or even a Third Additional Language (TAL) (Umalusi, 2008). Despite having multiple syllabi for English, English language competence remains a barrier to education and employment in South Africa, particularly to black learners (Alexander, 2005; Bosman, 2000). Scholars such as Lafon (2010) maintain that the multiple English language curricula serve no academic purpose in the country’s education system but simply maintain and perpetuate the apartheid-era partition of society, excluding and discriminating certain groups of people. As pointed out by Kachru (1986), the concept of English Home Language (henceforth EHL) and EFAL reinforces the concept of ‘us’ and ‘them’ in both teachers and learners in institutions of education.

While some continue to blame the Bantu Education for learners’ low levels of proficiency in English (De Klerk & Gough, 2004), scholars such as Chetty and Mwepu (2008) argue that the problem lies with the nature and quality of English language instruction that learners are exposed to; blaming the current South African education system. While modern social and economic systems require certain kinds of English language competence, the South African education system is, on one hand, still creating conditions which ensure that vast numbers of young people are unable to acquire the desired English language competence (Alexander, 2005). Though many South Africans view English language as a resource, others still see English as an impediment to the academic success of many young people who are not so proficient in the language (Makoni & Pennycook, 2005; Wright, 2002). Another interesting observation by Gray (2008) is that in many schools English is sometimes

1 Bantu Education enforced racially separated educational facilities as well as racially discriminatory curricula for each population group in South Africa (Whites, Black Africans, Indians, and Coloureds). Black people were denied access to the same educational opportunities and resources enjoyed by white South Africans.
still perceived and treated as a foreign language and not as one of the eleven official South African languages. McNamara (2012a:570) describes the ‘ambiguous quality’ of English language in developing countries such as South Africa as ‘a two-edged sword’, where the language always carries with it ‘the potential for inclusion and exclusion’ and that ‘its potential for justice is simultaneously a potential for injustice’. According to Janks (2004:33) ‘if you provide more people with access to the dominant variety of the dominant language, you contribute to perpetuating and increasing its dominance. If, on the other hand, you deny them access, you perpetuate their marginalisation in a society that continues to recognise this language as a mark of distinction’. The contention here, therefore, is whether there is any justice in teaching English separately as a Home Language and as a First Additional Language.

De Klerk (1996) and Prinsloo (2012) maintain that the prevailing situation in South Africa is that the DBE expects as many people to develop some competence in English, while on the other hand it prevents them from acquiring sufficient competence in the language by severely limiting access to only the so-called ‘mother-tongue’ English speakers. Ayliff (2012) and Bosman (2000) argue that the curriculum for English as a Second Language (EFAL), in particular, is the major cause for a dismal state of proficiency in English and other problems related to English language instruction in high schools. Umalusi (2014:18) reports that there was a reduction in the ‘depth and breadth’ of EFAL content in the CAPS for the FET phase when the DBE decided to abandon the National Curriculum Statements. Further, Umalusi (2014) argues that the current EFAL curriculum, unlike the EHL curriculum, lacks strong discipline-based approach to subject knowledge as it only emphasises the development of literary competence.

In the English language, the DBE (2011a & b) purports to be committed to empowering young people, particularly African learners, with appropriate English language skills and competence yet ironically, very low standards are set to achieve this. First it was the unpopular levels of Higher and Standard grades that emphasised different levels of difficulty in English language teaching and learning,

---

2 Umalusi is the Council for Quality Assurance in General and Further Education and Training established in terms of the General and Further Education and Training Quality Assurance Act in South Africa.
which raised a lot of questions on the DBE’s double standards as it seemingly perpetuated discrimination in terms of language access, and ‘pejorification’ in terms of competence in South African schools (Granville, Janks, Joseph, Mphahlele, Ramani, Reed & Watson, 1997:25). The four levels that existed in the teaching of English (the English First Language and Second Language both in Higher and Standard grades) also widened the gap between those who had limited proficiency in English and those who were highly proficient in the language (Ayliff, 2012).

After abandoning the controversial levels, the Higher and Standard grades in English language instruction, the DBE (2011a & b) adopted the Home language and Additional language system (Ayliff, 2012; Umalusi, 2008), which however, still distinguishes and categorises learners on the basis of competency or proficiency levels. Though the aims and other elements of these two curricular are almost identical, recent research has revealed that EHL examination questions are often pitched at an advanced level compared to EFAL examination questions (Ayliff, 2012). This therefore means that EFAL learners are systematically denied complete access to the English language. One then wonders if denying a particular group of people complete access to a language as influential as English is social justice (Alexander, 2005). In a study conducted in higher education in South Africa, only a few first-year undergraduate university students (who are products of the EFAL curriculum) could adequately read, write or comprehend English, the dominant language of teaching and learning in many tertiary institutions (Ayliff, 2012). All these challenges can only be attributed to the ways in which English is taught in high schools.

According to the CAPS for English, the labels ‘EHL’ and ‘EFAL’ refer to the proficiency levels at which the language is offered and not the native language and acquired language (DBE, 2011a & b). This means that these terms only refer to levels and not whether the language itself is acquired as a home language or learnt as a second language by learners. Since it is not politically correct to use race or geographical location as a determinant for levels of proficiency in English, such as what the Bantu Education system used to do, it is difficult to understand how schools are expected to determine learners’ level of proficiency in multilingual urban communities where English is no longer an exclusive property of a particular English speaking group (Ridge, 2001). According to Bieswanger (2008) the majority of
English speakers worldwide are non-native speakers of the language, and even the so-called native speakers do not speak the widely valued varieties; the British English and American English. The terms ‘Home language’, ‘Additional language’ and ‘level of proficiency’ might be preferred by the DBE to avoid ‘pejorification’ (Granville et al, 1997:25) yet it is undoubtedly clear that classifying learners and categorising the teaching of English language in South Africa is largely influenced, among other factors, by the native or non-native English speaker theories and fallacies or by what Kachru (1986) refers to as the ‘Centre speakers of English’ and ‘Periphery speakers of English’ assumptions.

Granville et al (1997) argue that if everyone would have total access to English, English would no longer be an elitist language. Canagarajah (2006) stresses that in English language instruction, categories based on birth or blood (native or no-native) are discriminatory and labelling learners as EHL or EFAL is no different from distinguishing speakers as native and non-native speakers of English. Canagarajah (1999a) contends that many would consider themselves native speakers of indigenised varieties of English that have emerged in many postcolonial communities. For instance, De Klerk’s (1996) Black South African English in South Africa. This is due to the fact that many people in these communities acquire English as a first language simultaneously with one or more other indigenous languages to develop multilingual competence. According to Moussu and Llurda (2008) such people are equally native speakers of English as much as they are native speakers of one or more local languages. It would, thus, be appropriate to describe them as balanced bilinguals or multi-linguals than calling them learners of EFAL.

According to Mahboob (2005), the arrangement of English language curricula into levels and the classification of learners, particularly in urban high schools, has seemingly created more harm than good. Categorising English language into rigid levels implies a hierarchised view of language education, in which EHL occupies a prestigious position and EFAL an inferior one (Moyo, Beukes & Van Rensburg, 2010). Such a conception of language education perpetuates education-based discrimination by ascertaining different learning conditions for groups of learners based on language privileges (Mahboob, 2005) and such practices contradict the CAPS principles of social transformation and integration (DBE, 2001a & b:4). Thus, in current teaching practices in South African public schools, some non-native
speakers of English are not keen to learn under the EFAL curriculum because of the societal and institutional discourses and practices that portray the curriculum as inferior (Levine, 1990:5). It is in this light that scholars such as Mpepo (1998:87) advocate for the ‘de-nativisation’ of English language teaching practices, in recognition of the world-language status of English.

Heugh (2009) advocates for the debate about English teaching further when she states that the practice requires a detachment from the systems, practices and misconceptions of the past and present and to simply focus on the language and the learner, particularly in multilingual contexts such as South Africa. De Klerk and Gough (2004) and Mesthr (2006) further maintain that there is a new kind of English which has arisen out of the non-racial and multicultural experiences of many black middle-class children especially in urban schools. This is the Black South African English, which has become a standard variety in some government departments and economy. For this reason, Ridge (2001) argues that there is no need to categorise the teaching of English. Instead, focus should be on careful negotiation of the local varieties if the English, which is desired by the larger part of the South African society, is to be the English that the country’s education wishes to offer.

This study further interrogates the prevailing notions and sentiments in the academic and public discourses that all learning challenges in South Africa should simply be reduced to English and the fact that English is always portrayed as a problem to black children. Seemingly, black learners in South Africa are portrayed as if they have some kind of language disability that automatically prevents them from fully acquiring English language and they therefore always require special services in the form of EFAL (Chetty & Mwepu, 2008). It is, however, not the intention of this study to dispute the argument that English language also contributes to poor learner performance, particularly in township and rural schools. My position is that poor learner performance in English does not solely lie with the language or the language learner, but rather, an investigation needs to be conducted into English language policy and curricula, the quality of English language instruction and the quality of language teachers in South Africa.
1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research questions used to guide this study are as follows:

- What are the implications of teaching English as two separate subjects in a society where English language proficiency determines academic and social success of learners?
- What are the perspectives and experiences of EHL teachers and EFAL teachers regarding teaching EHL and EFAL in desegregated urban high schools?
- What are the similarities and differences in teaching practices in EHL and EFAL?

1.4 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

This study's aim was to investigate the teaching of EHL and EFAL, particularly in desegregated urban high schools in the West Rand region of Johannesburg, South Africa.

In order to achieve the aims of this study, the following objectives were set:

- To investigate the implications of teaching English language as two separate subjects through a comparative analysis of the curricula and assessment standards of EHL and EFAL,
- To examine the views as well as lived experiences of EHL teachers and EFAL teachers working in desegregated urban high schools,
- To observe and examine the actual practices in English language classrooms in desegregated urban high schools in order to find out if there are differences in the way the two English curricula are taught.

1.5 CHAPTER OVERVIEW

This research report comprises of five chapters. Chapter 1 introduces the study and discusses the research problem statement and the rationale, and clearly states the research questions, aims and objectives that guide the study. Chapter 2 discusses the literature and the study's theoretical and conceptual framework. Chapter 3 focuses on the research design and methodology of this research project. In addition, the chapter discusses the context of the study, the participants involved, the
data collection and analysis methods and techniques and the ethical considerations that formed the basis of this research. In *Chapter 4*, the data obtained through the use of various data collection tools is presented and interpreted. Lastly, in *Chapter 5*, I present and discuss the conclusions of this study’s findings, the limitations of the study, and also present recommendations for further research.

1.6 CONCLUSION

This chapter has stated and briefly discussed the focus of the research project, namely: the research questions, the problem statement and the aims and objectives of the study. Though there is very little literature or any recent research publications on this study’s topic, the next chapter presents the review of literature on various aspects of the topic in order to consolidate the study’s theoretical and conceptual framework.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses and explores the study’s theoretical and conceptual framework and the theories and assumptions underpinning English language pedagogy in South African high schools. Concepts such as desegregation of schools in South Africa, bilingual or multilingual English language learners in urban South Africa and curriculum design are also discussed and explored. For the purposes of this research, the terms ‘First Language’ and ‘Native Language’ are used interchangeably with the term ‘Home Language’. Further, the term ‘Second Language’ is used interchangeably with the term ‘First Additional Language’. The semantic difference in these terms is not that clear, even though other scholars might argue that one sounds more discriminatory or more politically correct than the other.

2.2 THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This research is informed and framed by two theoretical and conceptual dimensions: critical theory and poststructuralism. These two theories offer new ways of studying and theorising language, language practices, meaning and discourses. Additionally, they enunciate closely related perspectives on the problems caused by discriminatory capitalist ideologies, particularly in education (Agger, 1991; McNamara, 2012b; Morgan, 2007). Those who hold liberal, democratic or humanist views in education might see these two theories as radical and political. However, Agger (1991:106) argues that in a capitalist or positivist society, there are a lot of ‘taken-for-granted assumptions’ and therefore, these theories can be viewed as desirable and fitting ‘critiques of positivism’, ‘interrogating’ social relationships and practices in society.

Research shows that populations around the world have become more mobile and concentrated in big cities than before, and these spaces are now ‘noted for their ethnic, racial, and linguistic pluralism’ (Morgan, 2007:956). However, the way English language is taught in many of these cities does not reflect the pluralised linguistic lives of most of these urban populations (Kirkland, 2010). English teaching institutions in many of these big cities is still guided by ‘static attitudes, theories,
methods and techniques’ which are generalised and utilised across a wide variety of English learners, failing to meet the linguistic needs of many learners (Mansoor & Reza, 2009:37). According to Chetty and Mwepu (2008), the development of all language curricula in South Africa in particular, is politically motivated and English language pedagogy is presently inappropriately used as an instrument to achieve certain socio-economic and political agendas by those in power.

2.2.1 Critical theory

Luke (1997:143) defines critical theory as ‘a commitment to reshape literacy education in the interests of marginalised groups of learners, who, on the basis of gender, cultural and socio-economic background have been excluded from access to the discourses and texts of dominant economies and cultures’. In critical theory, the middle-class positivist ideology is interrogated ‘in an effort to end class society, patriarchy, racism, and domination’ providing a framework for possible transformation (Agger, 1991:109). A critical perspective in education explains how and why pedagogies are continuously ‘shaped by ideologies arising from power, politics, history, and culture’ and interrogates power relations in learning institutions and society in general (Benites, 2012:76). Further, Benites (2012:77) explains how critical theory provides society with critical knowledge on ‘why some realities are legitimated while others are silenced or made invisible; whose knowledge is officially validated, which version of truth is actually left out’ and ‘how the world sanctions and fosters inequalities and injustice’ through education and other social processes and practices.

Critical theorists argue that capitalist and positivist ideologies, particularly in education, ‘promote passivity and fatalism and that the common values inculcating obedience and discipline contradict people’s objective interest in liberation’ (Agger, 1991:109). This is clearly a reaction against liberal, democratic, or humanist views, agendas and definitions of education (Breen, 1999) which are seemingly the driving forces in the South African Education system. This study employs critical theory to investigate how dominant ideologies and discourses in texts and institutionalised linguistic practices in society can influence the construction of certain knowledge, meanings and identities as well as the extent to which these processes can privilege certain groups of people, while marginalising others.
Makoni and Pennycook (2005:141) contend that languages are social inventions in the sense that ‘many structures, systems and constructs such as tradition, history, or ethnicity, which are often thought of as natural parts of society, are inventions of a very specific ideological apparatus’ and ‘to claim authenticity for such constructs, therefore, is to become subject to very particular discourses of identity’. Makoni and Pennycook (2005) further state that ‘the ideology of invention serves as a critique of language imposition or linguistic imperialism, not in the sense that dominant languages are imposed on minority groups, but rather in the sense that the imposition lies in the ways in which speech forms are constituted and constructed into languages, and particular definitions of what constitutes language expertise are construed and imposed.’ In many countries of the periphery (Kachru, 1986) such as South Africa, current language instruction practices such as classifying, counting, naming and distinguishing languages as if they are discrete, abstract objects and the counting of speakers of languages are viewed as discrete forms of discriminatory linguistic practices founded on monolingual norms and ideology (Makoni & Pennycook, 2005:142). They further argue that in reality, there is no such thing as an exclusive English language or any other language since all languages have been reinvented and changed considerably over time (ibid).

Further, Blackburn (1994) argues that there are no fixed meanings in language or any social or institutional discourses or any fixed relationship between language and the world. Hawkins and Norton (2009:1) maintain that language teaching and learning theories and methods, socio-linguistic practices, behaviours and ideas are ‘not neutral and objective’, instead they are ‘shaped by and within social relationships that systematically advantage some people over others, reproducing inequitable relationships of power in society’. Makoni and Pennycook (2005:137) therefore argue for a form of critical language awareness which ‘rejects the positivist objectification of language, in favour of a more complex, sophisticated and nuanced view of language’. Further, I concur with Makoni and Pennycook (2005:141) that language pedagogy should be apolitical and be detached from any political influence. Language curriculum development should take into consideration a variety of socio-cultural contexts, linguistic knowledge and learners’ experiences. I believe any form of political influence in language teaching and learning leads to hierarchized language pedagogy where institutions such as schools legitimate the
transmission of the linguistic knowledge, culture, values and interests of those in power or dominant groups and the marginalisation of other groups.

Since critical theory maintains that language teaching and learning are political processes (Hove & Maruma, 2014; Morgan, 2007; Norton & Toohey, 2004), it is imperative for teachers of English to interrogate the dominance of some discourses perpetuated by language curricula and policies (Norton & Toohey, 2004). Further, Mansoor and Reza (2009:46) caution English teachers to ‘be aware of the political dimension in English language instruction and mistrust underlying ideologies that construct the global nature of English as neutral’. Canagarajah (2002), Kumaravadivelu (2001) and Pennycook (1994) suggest locally-situated ways of teaching English language, which will take into account the learners’ diverse historical and socio-cultural factors. It is clear that South Africa’s current English pedagogy is driven by monolingual ideology as it has covertly erected boundaries within the language itself, limiting the degree to which it may be learnt through classifying and categorising its speakers according to levels of proficiency (Makoni & Pennycook, 2005). However, these boundaries may not be clearly visible to the larger society because of the careful selection of the terminology used to distinguish and describe the categories by the DBE (2011a & b); for example, referring to learners as ‘EHL speakers’ or ‘EFAL speakers’. In interrogating such discourses and language practices one is not limited to critical theory. The following subsection therefore explores poststructuralism, an extension of the critical theory which focuses on ‘knowledge and language’ and on ‘literary criticism, literary theory and cultural analysis’ (Agger, 1991:112).

2.2.2 Poststructuralism

Poststructuralism ‘is the name given to a series of related intellectual developments which are a response to the prevailing influence of structuralism and does not reject structuralism per se, but rather logically radicalises it’ (McNamara, 2012b:477). According to Foucault (cited in McNamara 2012b:476), Agger (1991) and Mansoor and Reza (2009) in poststructuralism, systems of knowledge are not absolute and stable, they are simply discourses that are culture dependent, changing over time, varying from community to community. It is a theory which considers ‘subjectivity and consciousness as socially produced in language, a site of struggle and potential
change’ (Weedon, 1987:183). It is in this sense that scholars such as Canagarajah (1999a:22) prefer to define the theory as a ‘resistance theory’ which seeks to reveal and explain contradictions within institutions ‘to help subjects gain agency, conduct critical thinking and initiate change’.

The study draws on poststructuralism in order to critique existing power relations in society and to understand how social justice can be achieved, particularly in education (Agger, 1991; Canagarajah, 1999a; Weedon, 1987, 1999). The study further uses the theoretical lens of poststructuralism to interrogate the extent to which language instruction and other language practices such as testing can create boundary markings, inclusion and exclusion (Shohamy, 2001). Like critical theorists, poststructuralists maintain that ‘language is not transparent as in humanist discourse’ and that ‘it is not an abstract system, but is always socially and historically located in discourses’ (Weedon, 1987:183). Further, MacNamara (2012b) and Weedon (1999) maintain that language is a cultural and political construct and a constant site of struggle for signification. Poststructuralists warn that ‘power relations are always implicated when we formalise particular language or identity correlations. Such representations are always shaped by discourses, and are hence dangerous, in that they potentially reify the marginal positions and practices that they name’ (Morgan, 2007:958).

In applied linguistics, poststructuralism is ‘a form of social and political engagement expressed in a sustained critique of current social, political, and cultural forms’, critically theorizing discourses of class, identity, ethnicity, gender and sexuality (McNamara, 2012b:477). Poststructuralist theories of language focus on the ‘apolitical deconstructive and reconstructive criticism of discourses and texts; a radical rewriting of meaning and the analysis of discourse and power’ (Weedon, 1987:172). Derrida, (cited in Dominik Finkelde, 2013:1246) one of the leading poststructuralist writers, defines ‘deconstruction’ as ‘the art of reading by which one finds the cracks and fractures in one’s thinking and self-understanding’ and a process that ‘challenges traditional assumptions about how we read and write’. For Derrida (cited in Agger, 1991:113), reading ‘is a strong activity, and not merely a passive reflection of an objective text with singular meaning’. Derrida further argues that every text is ‘undecidable in the sense that it concerns conflicts within it between different authorial voices’ (ibid). According to Kramsch (2012:483) poststructuralism
seeks to understand ‘the social and historical conditions of discourses’ and ‘attempts to deal with the pervasive contradictions of the search for authenticity and legitimacy in a world of discourses and self-declared authorities’. Discourses represent political interests and as a result, they are constantly vying for status and power and lamentably, the site of this battle for power becomes an individual’s subjectivity (Weedon, 1987).

Weedon (1987:179) argues that language on its own cannot have any social and political effect ‘except in and through the actions of the individuals who become its bearers by taking up various forms of subjectivity, meanings and values which it proposes and acting upon them’. Like critical theorists, poststructuralists believe that language and identity change with time, which therefore means that texts and discourses are subjective (Agger, 1991:114). Weedon (1987:176) contends that languages position speakers in various discursive positions, through which their identities and subjectivity are ‘constructed and constituted’. It is for this reason that poststructuralist approaches in applied linguistics have moved from studying ‘stable permanent identities’ to studying ‘moving and changing subject positions’ (McNamara, 2012a). In my view, in an ever-changing society such as South Africa, English teaching also plays a part in the continuous reconstitution of identities of English speakers and therefore an objective approach to English pedagogy would perpetuate Western monolingual ideologies that portray English as globally neutral. For instance, it is the fact that there are people who continue being identified as ‘native speakers of English’ or ‘non-native speakers of English’ in institutions of learning.

Poststructuralists also argue that texts and discourses conceal cultural, political and identity conflicts within them, making them contested sites of meaning (Agger, 1991; Morgan, 2007). According to Breen (1999), social institutions such as schools sustain and perpetuate the hegemony, views and discourses of those in power through institutional and educational discourses. Canagarajah (1999a) argues that resistance is the only way to emancipate subjects from such dominant discourses as those found in texts and learning institutions. Poststructuralism is therefore pivotal in reconceptualising and addressing language teaching practices in culturally and linguistically diverse classroom contexts (Norton, 2010). In other words, poststructuralism provides moments of resistance for those who might feel
oppressed by particular discourses and practices. Teachers for instance, are simply not pawns to be used by other powerful actors. They have critical agency to resist discourses such as those transmitted in the curricula (Canagarajah, 1999a).

Morgan (2007) states that recent language learning theories such as those for English Second Language are seen as institutionalised and individualised discourses which subject learners to unfair linguistic practices; conceptually isolating them from natural language-learning contexts. Further, these institutional and educational discourses, with their implicit meanings, are characterised by linguistic practices and assessment procedures that contribute immensely to inequitable and unjust practices, which socially define learners by ‘affirming and naturalising’ their positions of ‘failure’ or ‘success’ (Breen, 1999:48). Canagarajah (1999a:22) strongly condemns the way learners are ‘conditioned mentally and behaviourally’ in these institutions to reproduce Western ideology, practices and culture of English language learning, calling it a ‘vicious cycle’ where ‘the dominant social arrangement passes on its values to the school’ and the learners ‘subsequently uphold the status quo’ passively. The so-called English Second Language or EFAL learners, in particular, have become sites ‘for a range of possible forms of subjectivity, subjected to the regime of meanings of particular discourses and enabled to act accordingly’ (Weedon, 1987:179).

Kramsch (2012:484) argues that most English language learners are no longer ‘deficient communicators’ but ‘incipient’ bilinguals or multi-linguals who have moved into ‘subject positions’ that are much more complicated than the traditional position of ‘non-native speaker’. English language teaching and learning will therefore become more effective, relevant and meaningful when the curriculum recognises a variety of learners’ linguistic identities, identifying pedagogical practices that enhance learners’ investment in the language (Norton, 2010). Morgan (2007) states that the stigmas attached to certain labels based on learners’ language proficiency levels that are prescribed and legitimised by institutional discourses; for example, classifying learners as ‘low English language proficiency learners’ or ‘English Second Language learners’ might lead to a situation where learners start to view themselves as inferior. The worst scenario is when they start to feel that their participation and contributions in the English language classroom are worthless, leading to negative feelings such as withdrawal or isolation (Kramsch, 2012).
Scholars such as Bax (2003), Canagarajah (2002), Kumaravadilevu (2001) and Kumaravadilevu (2006) strongly critique language teaching methods and approaches with a western provenance such as the Communicative Language Teaching approach. They suggest new language teaching principles that recognise local linguistic, socio-cultural, and historical factors to avoid the reduction of language learning and language acquisition into any single method. Chick (1996:22) states that choosing a communicative language teaching approach ‘was possibly a sort of naive ethnocentrism prompted by the thought that what is good for Europe or the USA had to be good for KwaZulu’. Further, Savignon (1991) argues that mere exposure to language and practice with functional communication will not ensure the desired proficiency in language learning. Furthermore, Bax (2003), Reed (2003) and Wildsmith-Cromarty (2000) maintain that taking a communicative route to language teaching and learning encourages learners to accept the ways in which the target language is currently being used in society, rather than encouraging them to be critical about why language is used in particular ways or contexts. Cook (2001) adds, for instance, that the communicative approach has no techniques of its own for teaching skills such as pronunciation or vocabulary. In poststructuralism, assumptions about particular theories, approaches and methods which are usually universally regarded as ‘progressive’, or ‘humanistic’, or ‘learner-centred’, particularly in language instruction, are interrogated and challenged. Language professionals are therefore encouraged to be vigilant and critical all the time (Breen, 1999:48).

2.2.3 Critique of Critical theory and Poststructuralism

It is, however, also imperative not to ignore scholars who critique the relevance of critical theory and poststructuralism, particularly in English language teaching and learning. McKinney and Norton (2008) state that critical pedagogy that interrogates and reveals social inequalities to learners do not necessarily bring about change to the individual or to the society as a whole. Further, McKinney and Norton (2008) argue that such assumptions ignore the multiple investments that learners bring to the classroom. Sower (1999:742) adds that the application of poststructuralism to English language teaching and learning ‘is just an exercise in word games’ and that ‘introducing an explicitly political agenda into the classroom is dangerous’. According to Morgan (2007:961) critical theory and poststructuralism invite, in some students, ‘a sense that there is nothing real outside of language and texts’. Morgan (2007:961)
states that if texts are perceived as ‘political’, then ‘conceptual rigor is sacrificed’. Further, Fairclough (1992) and Poynton (1993:2) argue that poststructuralism in particular, ‘lacks the necessary linguistic tools’ where language students can engage in the analysis of texts and discourses.

However, in spite of the weaknesses of critical theory and poststructuralism outlined in the critique above, I consider the two theories the most fitting and relevant for this study. This study required a critical approach and hence blending the two theories provided an informed critical lens. Critical theory and poststructuralism enunciate closely related perspectives on how to critically study and theorise discourses and institutionalised discursive practices in English language education. The two theories interrogate the ways in which subjects are produced by dominant discourses and ideologies and associated power relations in society (Morgan, 2007; Weedon, 1987). Further, the theories emphasise the emancipation and autonomy of subjects and resistance to different forms of subjectivity (Barret, 2005).

2.3 DESEGREGATION OF URBAN SCHOOLS IN SOUTH AFRICA

After 1994, the government of South Africa initiated radical changes in the country’s schooling system; as a way to restore social justice, to address the inequalities that existed between township schools and the formerly white only suburban schools, and to promote integration, multilingualism and equal opportunities for all (Vandeyar, 2010a). The government adopted policies and legislation such as the South African Schools Act No. 84 of 1996 which were intended for desegregation and the elimination of all forms of discrimination in public schools (Meier & Hartell, 2009; Vandeyar & Killen, 2006:384). This meant that children from diverse cultural backgrounds could attend any public school of their choice. However, South African communities responded differently to the process of desegregation. According to Nkomo, Chisholm and McKinney (2004), it is only formerly White, Indian and Coloured schools that have desegregated because there has been no movement the other way round (Soudien, 2004). Black African middle class children flocked from dysfunctional township schools to formally White and Indian schools in search of quality education and better English (Kamwangamalu, 2003). Because of their resourcing during apartheid, formerly White schools are believed to offer quality education and they are ‘perceived as strategic sites for the acquisition and
maintenance of a prestigious variety of South African English’ (McKinney, 2013:22). To most Black learners and their parents, moving to formerly White suburban schools is an upward social mobility (Mesthrie, 2010:13). White, Indian and some Coloured learners on the other hand migrated to expensive white private schools (Vandeyar, 2010a). Meier and Hartell (2009) call this ‘white flight’, some form of ‘white’ resistance to the process of integration. Many Afrikaans-medium schools had to adopt a dual medium policy of English and Afrikaans in an attempt to survive. However, there are also some public schools that did not change their language policies and learners are still forced to learn the new language used as a medium of instruction, for example, the current Afrikaans-medium schools (Soudien, 2004; Vandeyar, 2010a).

Interestingly, the South African government encouraged integration in schools but could not provide proper guidelines on how to deal with issues of culture and language; for instance, in the implementation of a somewhat ambiguous new Language in Education Policy in multicultural contexts (Vandeyar, 2006). Schools were expected to adopt any of the three approaches in accelerating the integration process in schools: assimilation, multiculturalism or the anti-racist approach (Hoadley, 2011). Assimilation is rather a limited form of integration (Soudien, 2004) since it means that the cultural groups being ‘assimilated’ should acquire ‘the behaviour, values, perspectives, ethos and characteristics of another ethnic group and sheds its own cultural characteristics’ (Vandeyar, 2010a:345), ‘with the result that the status quo is kept intact’ (Meier & Hartell, 2009:181) and this applies to both teachers and learners. Further, assimilated learners are expected to adapt to the ‘existing curricula that have been implemented for a different learner population’ (Meier & Hartell, 2009:181). In other words, assimilation is an approach that objectively serves to hide institutionalised racism or discriminatory practices and attitudes in desegregated schools. It is, however, interesting to note that most studies reveal that the integration process in formerly White schools followed the assimilationist route (Hoadley, 2011; Soudien, 2004).

The anti-racist approach is a perspective that seeks to ‘redress inequities through a politicisation of curriculum and instruction’ (Mansfield & Kehoe, 1994:420). It is an approach that addresses the history and experiences of people who have been left out of the curriculum (Vandeyar, 2006). Anti-racist education teaches the structural,
economic, and social roots of inequality with focus on unequal social and power relations in society (Mansfield & Kehoe, 1994:420). Anti-racist education ‘attempts to equip teachers and learners with the analytical tools to examine critically the origins of racist ideas and practices and to understand the implications of racial identity and actions in the promotion of the struggle against racism’ (Vally & Dalamba 1999:36). Further, Vally and Dalamba (1999:35) state that anti-racist education can only be achieved through ‘dismantling of institutionalised practices of racism, changing the curriculum, and bringing about changes in attitudes and behaviour. However, research shows that not a single school has pursued the anti-racist education in South Africa (Vandeyar, 2006). In my view, this is probably due to the fact that anti-racist education is to some extent a radical approach that calls for radical action. Those in authority have to acknowledge the existence of racism and all forms of discrimination so as to act accordingly. Possible fear is that radical action against institutionalised practices that are deemed racist might violate some people’s rights; for instance, trying to compel Afrikaans-medium schools to stop teaching in Afrikaans can amount to violation of linguistic rights of the Afrikaans-speaking children.

Multiculturalism or the ‘contributionist’ approach entails that learners from cultural groups other than the formerly dominant group of the specific school population are accommodated by including some aspects of their culture (Banks, 2006:59). These schools often have hidden forms of discrimination against learners who do not share the schools’ linguistic, class and cultural norms (Chisholm, 2005a:217). A good example of such schools are those that have chosen to teach one of the African languages as a mother language to all Black learners, which is obviously not in the interest of all learners. According to Carrim (1998:31) the minimal type of multiculturalism introduced in schools was ‘at best stereotypical’ and ‘at worst caricatured’ as differences among learners were projected in negative ways without combating racist practices. In other words, the approach is simply a denial of differences between people, rather than an authentic integration approach that seeks to promote diversity, multiculturalism and multilingualism.
2.4 MULTILINGUAL ENGLISH LEARNERS IN URBAN SCHOOLS

Hakuta and Butler (2006) define multi-linguals or bilinguals as individuals or a group of people who simultaneously acquire linguistic knowledge and proficiency of two or more languages from birth and have the ability to use all the acquired languages at the same level of proficiency. Clark (2002) maintains that most children, particularly in modern multilingual urban set-ups become balanced bilinguals or even trilingual at an early age. Further, Krashen (1981) states that the language development of people who become balanced bilinguals at an early age follows the same pattern as that of monolingual children. According to Hakuta and Butler (2006) and Canagarajah (1999a), multilingualism and bilingualism are complex psycho-linguistic behaviours which depend largely on a variety of factors which include language prestige, socio-cultural pressures, motivation and opportunity of language use. Multilingual or bilingual people usually acquire and use their languages in a variety of contexts for different purposes, in different domains of life, with different people (Madiba, 2012). Research also shows that there are relationships between various academic-related skills in the languages of bilingual or multilingual learners and that these learners have the ability to transfer academic skills from one language to another (Cummins, 1992; 1999).

To be natively competent in two or more languages means to acquire speaking, reading and writing skills in these languages and to have multiple linguistic identities or different linguistic identities meaning looking at the world from different social and cultural perspectives (Valdes, 2005). A study by Kramsch (2012) shows that there are many multilingual or bilingual young people particularly in urban South Africa who speak a number of languages without making any conscious effort, switching back and forth between English and other African languages. From the definition of bilingual or multilingual learners in the discussion above, one can then argue that the current English language curricula and policies grossly neglect the kind of English language learners in many South African urban English classrooms, who are often viewed and mistaken for EFAL learners and hence treated as learners in need of special services. The following section therefore discusses and interrogates curriculum design in order to determine the curriculum models adopted by the DBE in designing the current English language curricula.
2.5 CURRICULUM DESIGN

Since the focus of this study is to investigate both theory and practice in English language teaching, it is therefore necessary to have a section that discusses curriculum design in general. Ellis (2004:5) defines a curriculum as ‘the plans made for guiding learning in the schools, usually represented in retrievable documents of several levels of generality, and the actualisation of those plans in the classroom, as experienced by the learners and as recorded by an observer; those experiences take place in a learning environment that also influences what is learned’. In other words, a curriculum involves planning and the implementation and realisation of particular learning processes, as well as the context in which planned learning processes should take place. In curriculum design, different curriculum models are crafted. However, since curriculum design is not the primary focus of this study, this section will only explore the two widely used models; the product-oriented model and the process-oriented model (Neary, 2003:39).

According to Kelly (2004), a product-oriented curriculum is a planned technical process meant to measure behavioural change using set objectives and outcomes. In this model, the curriculum is usually a set of documents that teachers have to implement in an attempt to modify the behaviour of learners in order to meet the expectations of the set behavioural objectives and outcomes (Rudduck, 2013; Stenhouse, 1980a). However, Stenhouse (1976:2) critiques this model arguing that learning is a process that involves the acquisition of knowledge and therefore it is inappropriate to reduce ‘knowledge’ to behavioural change. According to Stenhouse (1976:5) the objectives and outcomes curriculum model ‘side-tracks and blurs the ethical and political problems associated with the control of education, its aspirations and its individualisation’. Rudduck (1988:33) adds that the model is a symbol of the ‘academic researcher's distrust’ of the teacher and that specifying learning objectives and outcomes for a learning experience limits ‘genuine inquiry’. Further, the model is viewed as ‘indoctrination rather than education’ as ‘it is fundamentally at odds with the notion of education for emancipation or empowerment’ (Freire, 1993; Kelly, 2004:60).

In many of the documented curriculum packages of the product-oriented model, there is deliberate manipulation of language in order to ‘mislead’ readers and to
'deflect criticism' (Kelly, 2004:41). For instance, there is a tendency by curriculum designers to make unsubstantiated assertions about 'standards', 'breadth', 'balance', 'continuity', 'progression' in learning as though teachers must not question the meanings of such terms (Kelly, 2004:40). It is for these reasons that critics of the product-oriented curriculum such as Stenhouse (1976) and Rudduck (1988) advocate for a more democratic curriculum; the process-oriented model in precise terms.

The proponents of the process-oriented model contend that education is too complex a phenomenon to be measured and evaluated by reference to its objectives and outcomes (Rudduck, 2013). Rudduck (1988:31) further maintains that a curriculum is not something to be 'worked out by others and offered to teachers, who are merely to apply it; it is a diagnostic and experimental tool designed to help teachers examine some of the fundamental problems of schooling'. In the process-oriented model the term 'curriculum' simply refers to the interaction of teachers, learners and knowledge in the classroom (Stenhouse, 1976). In other words, a curriculum should simply be specifications on how a learning process should be evaluated in the classroom and not packages of content which teachers and learners should internalise. According to Stenhouse (1988:45) 'teachers are necessarily autonomous in professional judgment and do not need to be told what to do' and hence a process-oriented approach frees teachers and learners from 'the tyranny of imposed meaning' (Giroux 1981:81). However, some writers point out the weaknesses of the process-oriented model that it rests upon the quality of teachers and relies on the cultivation of wisdom and meaning-making in the classroom (Kelly, 2004). In other words, the implementation of such a curriculum would be a challenge for poor and incompetent teachers.

2.6 CAPS FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE

The Curriculum Assessment Policy Statements (CAPS) is a relatively new curriculum adopted in 2012 after the DBE’s decision to abandon the National Curriculum Statements (NCS) (Umalusi, 2014). In developing CAPS and its predecessors, Curriculum 2005 and NCS, the DBE clearly preferred the product-oriented approach (Jansen, 2001). The curriculum is aligned on the principles of the outcome-based education (OBE) (Hoadley, 2011; Morrow, 2007), and emphasises the realisation of set aims and behavioural objectives. The curriculum is a package of documents
stating aims, objectives and assessment standards set by the DBE, instructing the teacher to facilitate learning through selecting content and knowledge that will enable learners to reach certain behavioural outcomes (Hoadley, 2011). All these features point to a product-oriented curriculum model.

Jansen (2001) and Hoadley (2011) argue that the numerous curriculum projects undertaken after 1994 were simply a radical reaction to the curriculum and teaching practices of apartheid and a political means to consolidate the ideologies of the ANC government through the control of pedagogy and pedagogical practices. The new curriculum policy focused on changing the kind of knowledge transmitted in schools, apparently to avoid ‘explicit prioritising of knowledge distribution to any particular group’ and in pursuit of ‘social justice’ (Hoadley, 2011:154). The policy focused on granting access to previously marginalised groups rather than emphasising access to specialised knowledge (Chisholm, 2005b). However, critics of the African National Congress’ (ANC), South Africa’s ruling party, approach to curriculum development such as Alexander (2001) argue that pedagogy cannot be an outcome of the curriculum and that teachers should not be instructed through curriculum prescription to use particular pedagogic forms in the classrooms. According to Alexander (2001:142), pedagogy is ‘an independent social form’ which consists of sediments of practices and therefore pedagogic practices cannot be changed through curriculum stipulation. Hamilton (1999:145) adds that pedagogy should be built on ‘the lived experience of practitioners, an awareness of the historicity of practice, and an anticipation of the life-worlds of future practitioners’. However, in the South African context, the arbitrary condemnation of the apartheid curriculum and teaching practices and the sudden transition to the new curriculum alienated old teachers in particular, from their experiences and practices (Alexander, 2001).

I find the term ‘product’ problematic, especially with reference to learners as it suggests ‘objects’ which can be produced, modified and manipulated to the producer’s satisfaction. The irony is that a government that claims to promote the spirit of social justice, emancipation and empowerment of the previously marginalised adopts a curriculum whose focus is to modify people’s behaviour through indoctrination (Freire, 1993; Giroux, 1981). The fact that the curriculum has been revised several times and still continues to be revised, points to the failure of the approach to produce the desired products. Further, the new curriculum
undermines and disempowers the teacher, as it shifts the position of the teacher from being the authority of knowledge to a passive observer whose role is to facilitate the subjection of learners to pedagogical practices crafted to modify behaviour.

In the following sub-sections, the CAPS for EHL and EFAL are briefly discussed. This is simply an overview of the curriculum and not an analysis of the finer details of the two English language curricula; such will be conducted in Chapter 4 of this study.

### 2.6.1 English Home Language

According to Granville *et al* (1997), the term ‘Home Language’ is used to describe the language that children acquire from birth and in which they are most proficient. The CAPS for English language states that the term ‘Home Language’ refers to the proficiency level at which the English language is offered and should therefore not be mistaken for ‘native language’ or ‘acquired language’ (DBE, 2011a).

It is interesting to note that when the DBE (2011a & b) shifted from the term ‘English First Language’ to ‘EHL’, the curriculum itself did not change significantly (Hove & Maruma, 2014), and one visible feature of both the English First Language and EHL curricula is that they are more advanced and challenging than the English Second Language or EFAL curricula (Ayliff, 2012). The term ‘Home Language’, like its predecessors; the ‘Native Language’ and the ‘First Language’, is becoming problematic in modern multilingual societies, especially those found in urban areas (Moussu & Llurda, 2008). Many children in these spaces acquire more than one language from their earliest childhood and as a result, they do not have one first language or home language (Granville *et al*, 1997). Granville *et al* *(ibid)* further point out that languages that are acquired by some learners in their earlier ages do not continue to be the languages in which they become most competent as adults. Further, another argument is that sometimes the child’s main language might not necessarily be the language of either parents or the language spoken at home, but simply the dominant language of the community in which the child lives in. Faced with such complicated linguistic populations, schools have difficulties in deciding which learners should learn EHL or EFAL. It is also not fair to shift this decision-making burden to learners or their parents as they also cannot determine which language is their ‘home language’ or their ‘first additional language’.
In a critique by Moussu and Llurda (2008), terms such as ‘Native Language’, ‘First Language’ or ‘Home Language’ in English language teaching are viewed as descriptive and discriminatory and continue to perpetuate the elitist notion of English and assumed superiority of those who speak a particular desired variety of the language. Hakuta and Butler (2006) argue that it is not all native speakers of English or EHL speakers who are proficient in all the skills of the language as expected. For example, some have a bigger vocabulary than others, and some can read faster and write better than others yet some struggle, particularly in academic English language proficiency. According to Van Rooyen and Jordaan (2009), the problem in many linguistic societies is that adequate conversational skills are often assumed to reflect proficiency in academic language, which is the basis of language competence in schools. Van Rooyen and Jordaan (2009) further state that it usually takes eight to nine years or more of formal education for native speakers of a language to acquire the appropriate academic language proficiency.

Seemingly, it is only in the English language where non-native speakers of the language are subjected to issues of authenticity and legitimacy (Jenkins, 2006). Moussu and Llurda (2008) contend that every user of a language is, to a certain degree, a native speaker of that language and therefore speakers of English should not be classified according to their relationship with the language and that the ownership of English is open to anyone who wishes to use it (Ndebele, 1987). According to Kachru (1986), classifying speakers of a global language such as English puts some people in an exclusive group of English speakers (the Centre Speakers), and others who are not that so proficient in the language, in a group of outsiders (the Periphery Speakers). Research on world Englis hes and indigenised varieties of English show that English has become an indigenised language in many of the countries (Kirkland, 2010; Mesthrie & Bhatt, 2008) that Kachru (1986) classifies as the ‘Periphery Speakers’. Therefore, speakers of English in such countries cannot be dismissed as non-native speakers of English simply because they do not speak a centre variety; the British or American variety (Higgins, 2003).

English by definition is diverse, plural, and always changing and therefore, it would be inappropriate to treat the language as a stable, fixed object (Kirkland, 2010). According to Kirkland (2010), Englis hes, as opposed to English, are relevant to the twenty-first-century discourses of English language education. However, promoting
linguistic pluralism does not mean that the ‘old’ English language education is irrelevant. It simply means fully appreciating the hybrid nature in which English is practiced and performed, especially by urban youth and making it part of the new English language education (Kachru, 1986; Mesthrie & Bhatt, 2008). On the same note, it means *Englishes* as home languages vary from community to community. In other words, no community, social class or group should claim ownership of the language or suggest that their *English* is the only desired standard variety. Since no community can lay claim to academic language as its mother tongue, it follows that any English language variety in which high proficiency exists can be used to facilitate the development of academic language (Madiba, 2012). The prevalent assumption that all learners of English need or desire the so-called native-speaker competence will not contribute anything towards a better understanding of various ways in which English is used within multilingual contexts (McKay, 2003). Canagarajah (1999a) and Okazaki (2005) argue that the current mainstream English language classrooms are detached from larger historical and social conditions of many English language learners and that English language learning theory and pedagogy need to give attention to the pluralist linguistic identities of learners from diverse cultural backgrounds.

### 2.6.2 English First Additional Language

Granville *et al* (1997) describe a First Additional Language as a language which an individual adds to a first or primary language and it is different from ‘English as a foreign language’ in the sense that it describes a language which is widely used in the society. A foreign language on the other hand refers to any language which learners are unlikely to hear or read outside the classroom because it is not in use in the wider community (Mahboob, 2005). Therefore, English can only be called a foreign language for learners who come from countries where English is not widely used. According to the CAPS for EFAL, the term ‘Additional Language’ does not mean a ‘second language’ that a learner acquires from birth but simply refers to the proficiency level at which the English language is offered (DBE, 2011a & b).

However, the term ‘EFAL’, as its predecessor ‘English Second Language’, seems to be a problem in multilingual societies where children begin to acquire two or more languages from their earliest childhood (Granville *et al*, 1997). The DBE (2011b)
assumes that the EFAL learners do not possess any knowledge of English when they arrive at school. I therefore question the appropriateness of such an assumption to a multilingual urban population such as in Johannesburg, where English is used as one of the languages for daily communication. According to Chetty and Mwepu (2008), it is inappropriate to assume that there is a linguistic or cultural deficit among EFAL learners in urban contexts because they do not live in a vacuum; they are exposed to English language every day in their lives through media and popular culture. Surprisingly, the DBE (2011a & b) does not provide schools with any guidelines or suggestions on how to separate English language learners according to their proficiency levels or how to identify EFAL speakers in a multilingual society that has a broad continuum of English language proficiency, with tremendous and complex changes in language ability among English language speakers (McKay, 2003).

Ortmeier-Hooper (2008:392) states that the label ‘English Second Language’ or ‘EFAL’ is a descriptive ‘deficit model’ and an institutional discourse marker, which points to the need for ‘additional services’ and to the status of those who are still viewed as novices in English language. One wonders how long it takes for such learners to be called ‘English Additional Language learners’ and for how long they should be provided with special services, for instance learners who are at an exit level such as the FET phase (Hakuta, Butler & Witt, 2000). Hakuta and Butler (2006) state that bilingualism or multilingualism is a dynamic process and that one’s bilingual or multilingual profile changes over time. As mentioned earlier, there is an argument that it takes five to seven years of effective schooling in English for children to develop native-speaker competence in English and to acquire Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency in the language (Cummins, 1992; Paradis, 2007; Roseberry-Mckibbin & Brice, 2000). This therefore means that after seven years of effective schooling in English, EFAL learners could be integrated with EHL learners (Viljoen & Molefe, 2001). One wonders then whether EFAL learners in the FET phase in South African urban high schools would have been ‘taught effectively’ in the early stages to reach the desired level of English language proficiency so as to escape the ‘EFAL’ label (Hakuta & Butler, 2006). Further, the label might even be a problem to English language learners themselves, particularly those who might
genuinely be in need of extra language support, because of the stigma attached to the label (Ortmeier-Hooper, 2008).

Moyo et al (2010:26) argue that the division between EHL and EFAL in the FET phase is ‘based on superficial grounds motivated by social segregation and ineffective EFAL teaching in earlier schooling’ and that ‘the arrangement of language curricula into rigid levels is responsible for language-based segregation in multilingual societies’. One therefore questions the appropriateness and the validity of the assumptions by the DBE (2011a & b) about EFAL learners in desegregated urban schools in South Africa, who are subjected to a somewhat inferior English language curriculum.

Further, Mahboob (2005) argues that the English Second language or EFAL curriculum creates a lot of problems as labelling a language as second, third or fourth, automatically creates attitudinal problems. This is because it is generally believed that anyone would take second as less worthy, in the sense that coming in second in the eyes of society is not as good as coming in first. The middle-class and upper class black parents who send their children to formerly white-only English schools in search of quality education also want their children to learn ‘proper’ English (De Klerk & Gough; 2004; Kamwangamalu, 2003; Soudien, 2004). When the DBE (2011a & b) realised that the term ‘Second Language’ caused a lot of problems, they then shifted to the term ‘First Additional Language’ to avoid the stigma attached to the terms, ‘first’ and ‘second’ (Ayliff, 2012). Regardless, in the eyes of many, EFAL is still not very different from English Second Language, as it still sounds second best (Mahboob, 2005).

De Klerk & Gough (2004) state that the EFAL curriculum was specially designed to assimilate and accommodate the previously disadvantaged black communities. The paradox in the current situation is that the black learners, who are currently in Grade 10-12 English language classes, cannot be put under the category of a previously disadvantaged group as they started school after 1994 (Ayliff, 2012). These are a unique and complex crop of multilingual learners who show high proficiency in more than two languages and usually prefer not to speak their own languages in favour of English (Mda, 2004). It is therefore inappropriate and misleading for one to assume that such learners do not possess the required knowledge and competency of
English language when the majority of them are exposed to the language with some of them practically using it every day in a variety of social contexts. Some of these learners speak English only and have been labelled pejoratively as ‘coconuts’ by other black children in black communities (McKinney, 2007:17). McKinney (2007) and Rudwick (2008) attribute such labels to the emergence of a new form of sub-cultural and linguistic capital. Scholars such as Chetty and Mwepu (2008) therefore suggest the need for language teaching approaches that will ensure that English language is presented as a potentially emancipatory force in learners’ lives, especially in multilingual societies such as South Africa.

The current classification and categorisation of English language learners in South Africa denies EFAL learners the opportunity to mix with EHL learners in the classroom environment (Ulate, 2011). The challenge now is that this kind of language discrimination, as argued by Lippi-Green (1997), is rarely considered a true discriminatory practice, as many would want to believe that the Department of Basic Education is doing justice to the black child. The current South African education system also fails to meet the linguistic needs of many immigrant and refugee learners who should be learning English as a foreign language (Adebanji & Gumbo, 2014; Kajee, 2011). In the current South African English curricula, teaching English as a foreign language is not discussed. Immigrant learners can only attend private institutions which offer English as a foreign language or they get subjected to EFAL teaching and learning practices in public schools (Vandeyar, 2010b; Wang & Phillion, 2007).

2.6.3 English language teaching and learning

English language teaching in developing countries has, for much of its history, been subjected to theories, ideologies, methods, approaches and materials of the so-called Centre-speakers of the West (Canagarajah, 1999b), often with questionable relevance to the socio-cultural and linguistic contexts of these nations (Sadeghi, 2008). One of the major aims of the English language curricula in South Africa is to value and promote linguistic diversity, social integration, multilingualism and inclusivity; hence the adoption of humanistic and liberal English teaching approaches of the West (Makoelle, 2012). Kumaravadilevu (2003), Prabhu (1990) and Sadeghi
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interrogate the relevance of these Western English teaching approaches, particularly in multilingual English language classrooms, since most of them merely focus on methodology and view language as an object. Kumaravadivelu (2003:28) argues that methods are ‘too inadequate and too limited to satisfactorily explain the complexity of language teaching operations around the world’ and they are ‘based on idealised concepts geared towards idealised contexts, largely guided by a one-size-fits-all’ approach. Prabhu (1990:172) discredits the concept of adopting particular methods in language teaching and argues that teachers simply need to learn ‘to operate with some personal conceptualisation of how their teaching leads to desired learning’.

The adoption of the widely used communicative approaches to teaching English language has been critiqued by many contemporary critical theorists for their bias towards producing fluent speakers of English language while neglecting other important skills such as writing and the mastery of language knowledge (Ayliff, 2012). When the DBE (2011a & b) adopted the communicative teaching approaches to English language teaching, there was an assumption that learners would probably achieve the desired communicative competence through exposure to the language and through maximally using the language for social communication in the classroom. On the contrary, these approaches do not improve the learners’ standards of English despite exposure to the language or through communicative activities (Balfour, 2002). Further, Canagarajah (2006) argues that learners do not develop communicative competence and negotiation strategies for real world needs of bilingualism or multilingualism inside the classroom, but rather outside the classroom. According to McKay (2003), the promotion of communicative approaches to English language teaching in South Africa was largely influenced by the tendency to extend the so-called native-speaker assumptions and unfounded theories of English language teaching and learning. Critical theorists argue that it does not make sense to talk about authentic speakers of English in a world where mobility and global practices are gradually erasing cultural and linguistic boundaries (Kramsch, 2012).

While the communicative language teaching proponents consider that the authenticity of the so-called native speakers of a language is the cornerstone of teaching that language, it is interesting to note that the current South African
education system paradoxically isolates and denies EFAL learners the opportunity to mix with those who are perceived as highly proficient in English, the EHL learners, in English classrooms, for them to get the required exposure and coaching in the language (Ayliff, 2012). Isolating these learners only seems discriminatory and symbolic of Kachru’s (1986) ‘Periphery Speakers’ of English. One then wonders how these EFAL learners are expected to learn the language if they are denied the opportunity to communicate with EHL ‘experts’ in the classroom by the same system which pushes for communicative language teaching environments in language classrooms.

Some scholars also critique the text-based approach which assumes and encourages incidental teaching and learning of grammatical structures of English (Ayliff, 2012). It is believed that some of the problems surrounding the inability of many English language learners and students in school and in tertiary education to write well-constructed English texts might rest with these assumptions (Umalusi, 2014; Widodo, 2006). It is vital that English language learners have some grammatical knowledge about the structures of English and some meta-language with which to describe them, so that they are aware of language errors found in the texts they produce (Neeta & Klu, 2013).

Confusingly, the DBE (2011a & b) creates multiple curricula for English language and then proposes the same teaching methods and strategies for all the curricula. The curricula also show striking similarities in the aims, weekly time allocation and assessment stipulations (Lafon, 2010). According to Umalusi (2008), the DBE (2011a & b) fails to differentiate between pedagogies for second language acquisition and those appropriate for language enrichment. It seems very odd to design two separate English language curricula without having a clear distinction between them (Ayliff, 2012). Because of the discrepancies and confusions around the existence of multiple English language curricula, some scholars suggest that South Africa perhaps needs to consider having one English language curriculum for all learners (Ortmeier-Hooper, 2008). Having multiple curricula for English language can be compared to what Weedon (1987:174) refers to as the ‘different languages and different discourses within the same language’ that ‘divide up the world and give it meaning in different ways which cannot be reduced to one another through translation’. According to Sadeghi (2008), a curriculum should be a social contract
and therefore curricula of plural languages such as English should not be imposed but negotiated and challenged. Further, language curriculum development should not be used as a tool to pursue political agendas, instead; it should be a process that recognises and transmits the most important aspects of cultures, knowledge, values and practices of society (Hopkins (2001).

The DBE (2011a & b) does not provide English language teachers with clear guidelines on how to deal with linguistically diverse English language classes (Umalusi 2008, 2014). It is not clear how English language teachers are expected to measure the learners’ levels of English language proficiency for them to determine whether a learner should learn EHL or EFAL (McKay, 2003). Evidently, learners are not expected to decide for themselves which level of English to study. As a result, populations of many English language classrooms in South African high schools do not often correspond, as expected, with the different proficiency levels at which English language is offered in the English curricula (Umalusi, 2008). It might not be surprising to find learners with very low English language proficiency levels in EHL classrooms or vice versa.

Another big question which needs clarity is whether English should be taught as a language or as a subject (Granville et al, 1997). The CAPS for both EHL and EFAL state that English should be taught as a subject (DBE, 2011a & b). Since English is currently being taught as a subject and not a language, one then wonders why this particular subject (English) is being taught in categories while other subjects are not taught in categories, unless if it means EHL and EFAL are two completely different subjects. If that is the case, then it means the other subject (EHL) uses higher standards.

2.6.4 English language testing and assessment

Foucault (cited in McNamara, 2012a:565), defines testing as ‘a normalizing gaze, a surveillance that makes it possible to qualify, to classify and to punish. It establishes over individuals a visibility through which one differentiates and judges them’. Critical theory raises vital questions on the ethics and values of English language testing, the responsibility of English language testers and the socio-political role of English language tests in current testing practices (McNamara 2012b:556). Studies show that there are discrepancies in current English language testing and
assessment practices in South Africa. According to Tshotsho (2013), there seems to be no uniformity and standards in measuring academic proficiency since the language is assessed and tested as First, Second or sometimes as Third language at different levels. For instance, in an investigation conducted by Umalusi (2004, 2014), it was found that there were declining levels of conceptual challenge in English Second Language or EFAL senior certificate examination papers and that there were too few questions pitched at higher levels of cognitive demand. Hove and Maruma (2014:592) believe that EFAL examinations are ‘overtly politicised examinations that passes candidates because they can respond correctly to the simple questions’ on questions papers, creating an impression that these learners have achieved the desired competency and proficiency levels in the language. Umalusi (2014) found that some EFAL learners receive marks for simply writing their names on their answer scripts.

In poststructuralism, test scores are viewed as texts which are subject to multiple interpretations like any other texts, and there is therefore a need for ‘critical language testing that reveals hidden values in tests, policy agendas and ideologies’ (McNamara, 2012b:555). Makoni and Pennycook (2005) argue that language tests and assessments are simply tools of regulating and imposing language teaching and learning. In an English language classroom with learners from multilingual backgrounds, there is always a struggle for meaning within language itself among learners taking a language test, which means language tests and assessments are also sites of struggle for social meaning and signification (McNamara, 2012b; Shohamy, 2001).

One therefore wonders if there is any equivalence in the English language courses of different English curricula offered in South Africa. If EHL is being assessed at a more advanced level, then it literally means the EHL qualification is of better quality compared to the EFAL or English Second Additional Language qualification. If the DBE (2011a & b) claims that EHL and EFAL qualifications are at the same level, then logical reasons should be provided for teaching and assessing these language courses separately.

2.7 ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNING, BICS AND CALP
In language teaching and learning, Cummins (1979) distinguishes between two different kinds of language proficiencies, the Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS) and the Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). The Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills include accent, oral fluency and sociolinguistic competence (conversational fluency), and for this reason, it is therefore considered as equivalent to the concept of communicative competence (Granville et al., 1997). According to Cummins (1979), the Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency refers to the ability to understand and produce the more complex written and oral language of academic discourse. This is the kind of language that Madiba (2012:16) defines as ‘the language used in academic settings to help learners acquire and use knowledge’ and ‘the set of words, grammar and organisational strategies used to describe complex ideas, higher-order thinking processes and abstract concepts order’. In other words, this simply refers to the learners’ ability to express themselves, in both oral and written modes which are required for academic success in school and tertiary education. Though home language proficiency plays a role in the acquisition of the Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency, it is mostly in the schooling contexts where CALP is developed, and rarely in other contexts where learners use the language (Posel & Zeller, 2010).

Though both EHL and EFAL learners may be able to use English competently among themselves in social settings, they lack the cognitive academic proficiency expected in the classroom (Cummins, 2001). The discrepancy between the way English language words are written and the way they are pronounced is a challenge for both EHL and EFAL speakers (Dalvit, Murray & Terzoli, 2009). The school’s playground environment and the home environment do not normally offer learners the opportunity to use academic proficiency nor do they require the language associated with the higher order thinking skills expected in the classroom (Khatib, 2012). Though the CAPS for English (DBE, 2011a & b) encourage the use of the Communicative Language Teaching approach which emphasises the development of interpersonal communicative skills, it should be noted that cognitive academic language is found primarily in academic texts and that extensive engaged reading is very crucial in the acquisition of these skills (Cummins, 1999 and Cummins, 2001). Further, in reading literary texts, EFAL speakers have the opportunity to access language intended for EHL speakers, and as a result, they become familiar with
many different linguistic forms, communicative functions and meanings (Khatib, 2012). This therefore means that the acquisition of Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency in English language, which normally determines the learner’s success in school, does not matter whether one is a native speaker or non-native speaker of English. Thus being a native speaker of English does not put one in a better position in the acquisition of such proficiencies and skills.

2.8 THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHER

In discussions and debates on English language teaching and learning it is not unusual for one to stumble upon questions on whether native speakers of English language are necessarily good teachers of English or whether native speakers of English language are necessarily good learners of English (Ulate, 2011). Canagarajah (1999b) argues that having English as one’s mother language does not automatically qualify one to teach the language, neither does it make one a good English student. English language teaching is an art and a skill that requires appropriate language knowledge and complex pedagogical preparation and practice (Ulate, 2011).

Though English is preferred as a language of instruction in many schools in South Africa (Casale & Posel, 2010; Desai, Qorro & Brock-Utne, 2010; Ndlangamandla, 2010), it is surprising to note that the DBE (2011a & b) expects teachers of other subjects to integrate English language teaching into their subjects through the notion of English across the curriculum (Neeta & Klu, 2013). I believe such is a misleading assumption that undermines the English language teacher, as English language teaching requires experts with both linguistic and content knowledge of the language. There is a lot involved in teaching English language; it is not all about simply speaking the language (Ulate, 2011). That is why scholars such as Canagarajah (1999b) assert that many teachers of English, particularly those who do not understand what it means to be an English language teacher, spend a lot of time trying to repair their pronunciation or performing other cosmetic changes so that they sound native, instead of developing their language knowledge.

Studies show that a lot of high school English language teachers in South Africa do not possess adequate proficiency in English language for effective teaching and learning to take place in English language classrooms and, as a result, most of them
often resort to African languages in teaching the language (Morrow, 2007; Neeta & Klu, 2013). Lamentably, their lack of subject knowledge in English language is often redefined as general literacy needs, or needs related to socio-economic status, ignoring the need for professional language knowledge development (Ulate, 2011). Teaching and learning in most South African high schools and universities is characterised by poor English language proficiency, problems which are perpetuated by both teachers and learners (Ayliff, 2012; Hove & Maruma, 2014:592; Neeta & Klu, 2013). It has been found that learners with poor English language proficiency gain entrance to tertiary institutions, and then later return to schools to become English teachers with limited language knowledge base, recycling English language education problems (De Klerk & Gough, 2004). It is disturbing to learn that when English language teachers repeatedly switch from English to their mother tongues (code-switching) due to lack of proficiency, people are made to believe that it is bilingual education or that it is because the learners do not understand English. This simply undermines English language education (Neeta & Klu, 2013).

It has become a global norm that so-called native-speakers of English language, for example, the British, Americans and Australians are always assured of English language teaching jobs in communities with non-native speakers of English. On the other hand, Periphery teachers, who are sometimes products of poor English language education, find it difficult to teach in the Centre nations (Canagarajah, 1999b). South Africa is not an exception in these discriminatory practices; for example, I have observed over the years that many elite schools, particularly those that are privately owned often specify that a native English language speaker would be preferred to teach English in their schools. One often wonders what these institutions consider as a characteristics of a competent English language teacher; whether one's relationship with the language or linguistic knowledge and competence. The implication here is that non-native English language teachers are not good teachers.

Since the South African English language curriculum classifies learners according to proficiency levels, channelling them into two different systems (EHL and EFAL), one cannot ignore the fact that these learners ultimately become products of two different systems. One then wonders how the DBE expects institutions of higher learning to deal with the two groups of learners since English language courses for teacher
education offered in most of these institutions do not distinguish between EHL and EFAL. Further, English language courses in most institutions of higher learning concentrate on literature and not the study of English language structures (I have used the term ‘most’ because a few universities offer a mix of literature and language). According to Hove and Maruma (2014:592) the majority of EFAL learners who enrol at university show startling inadequacies in English proficiency, that is why all these institutions have specialised courses for students to improve proficiency in the language and to promote academic literacy (Council on Higher Education, 2001:5). EHL learners are always at an advantage, not only because it is their home language, but because they study the language at a more advanced level. However, I believe that any English learner who aspires to be an English language teacher can do so, if given proper English language instruction both in school and in tertiary education, regardless of their relationship with the language.

2.9 CONCLUSION

This chapter discussed the two theoretical and conceptual dimensions that informed this study: critical theory and poststructuralism. The two theoretical dimensions enunciate closely related perspectives on the problems caused by discriminatory ideologies and practices in language education and provide a critical lens which this study employs in theorising and interrogating language use and practices, discourses as well as the construction in modern society. Additionally, the chapter presented literature relating to the teaching of EHL and EFAL in the FET phase in South African urban high schools. Important terms and concepts related to the topic have also been defined and discussed. The discussion of literature has also brought about important issues related to the topic, which then called for a carefully planned research design to ensure a balanced exploration and examination of these issues.
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses and explores the research design, the methods of data collection, research participants, research context and methods of data analyses. In discussing the study’s research design, which is a comparative and emancipatory qualitative research, which employs a case study strategy, qualitative data collection methods (classroom observation, interviews, document analysis and questionnaires) and qualitative data analyses methods (global analysis, content analysis and critical discourse analysis), reasons for the selection of such a design and methods are provided. The chapter also provides a detailed description of the research contexts and research participants who were two desegregated former Model C high schools, English teachers and learners. A justification for the selection of such contexts and participants is provided. Lastly, the chapter gives a detailed discussion of the ethical considerations that form the basis of this study’s research conduct.

3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

According to Creswell (2008:3) ‘research designs are plans and the procedures for research that span the decisions from broad assumptions to detailed methods of data collection and analysis’. This research is qualitative and employs a case study strategy. Furthermore, the study is comparative (Creswell, 2008), exploratory (Neuman 1997) and emancipatory in nature (Marshall & Rossman, 2006; Parker, 1992). This research design was selected based on the nature of the phenomenon under study (English language teaching), the context of the study and my personal experiences as an English language teacher in South African urban schools.

In qualitative research, a particular social phenomenon is explored and the researcher does not rely only on tested hypotheses to make decisions (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). The researcher investigates in detail one case at a time and works primarily with unstructured data collected through various qualitative data collection methods (Heath & Street, 2008). In qualitative research, the behaviour of participants cannot be manipulated and data is collected through studying people’s behaviour in their natural settings as well as people’s accounts or reports of their lived experiences (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Qualitative data collection methods
such as semi-structured individual interviews, observations and document analyses were used in this study. Denzin and Lincoln (1998) contend that such sources of information provide a wide range of data required to provide an in-depth understanding of the situation as they potentially enable the researcher to identify factors such as social norms and values whose role in the study may not be readily apparent. Furthermore, the use of qualitative data collection methods allows greater spontaneity and adaptation of the interaction between the researcher and the study participants (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Miles and Huberman (1994:25) define a case study as ‘a phenomenon of some sort occurring in a bounded context.’ Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007) and Henning, van Rensburg and Smit (2009) understand a case study as simply an enquiry of a particular phenomenon within its natural context. According to Yin (2003:2), a ‘case study’ is a preferred strategy when the focus of the research is on a ‘contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context’ and to answer the ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions about the phenomenon. A particular case is selected for study because of its unique characteristics (Yin, 2003). Further, a case study is an enquiry which focuses largely on defining the unique case features and differences that the case exhibits from the larger population (Miles & Huberman, 1994). According to Yin (2003) a case study strategy ensures that the topic under study is well explored and that the true nature of the phenomenon is exposed (Yin, 2003).

The research takes a comparative route (Creswell, 2008) as it explores the differences and similarities in the curricula for EHL and EFAL and the teaching practices of the two English language courses. Comparative data was generated through the use of qualitative data collection methods such as classroom observations, interviews and document analysis. Qualitative data analysis methods such as discourse analysis were then used to critically examine, interrogate and expose similarities and differences in the curricula and teaching practices of the two English language courses. The study is exploratory in nature (Neuman 1997) as it examines and interrogates the relationship between the intentions of the English language curriculum and the actual teaching practices (the relationship between curriculum theory and classroom practices).
The study is emancipatory in nature since it draws from resistance and emancipatory theories such as poststructuralism and critical theory (Canagarajah 1999a; Morgan, 2007). The study draws attention to dominant discriminatory and unjust ideologies and practices in English teaching that are perpetuated and reinforced by certain institutionalised discourses (Marshall & Rossman, 2006; Parker, 1992:7). Furthermore, it reveals how teachers and learners are positioned as subjects of particular practices and discourses in the teaching of English (Janks, 1997). The study then advocates for transformation and enlightens subjects (teachers and learners) to critically interrogate their circumstances for them to gain autonomy and agency in school environments (Creswell, 2008:10).

To ensure credibility or trustworthiness of the research design and the research findings, issues of validity and reliability were also considered in this study (Patton, 2001). Validity involves the collection and analysis of data to assess the accuracy of a research instrument while reliability refers to the consistency of results produced by a particular instrument (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Validity and reliability are closely linked with issues of credibility, neutrality, consistency and generalizability of findings of a qualitative study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). If validity or trustworthiness can be tested then more ‘credible and defensible results may lead to generalizability’ (Stenbacka, 2001:551). However, generalizability in qualitative research depends on the case being studied (Patton, 2001). Hence this study’s findings, in particular, can only be generalised to situations or cases of similar contexts which are desegregated ex-Model C urban high schools. One of the effective ways to evaluate validity and reliability in qualitative research design is to employ the triangulation method (Campbell, 1996). According to Patton (2001:247) triangulation is a process of employing ‘multiple methods or data’ in order to ‘strengthen’ the study and to ‘evaluate’ its findings.

In this study, the use of qualitative data collection methods (observations, interviews and document analyses) led to a more valid and reliable construction of what actually happens in English language classrooms in urban high schools. To ensure consistency of results, the same research instruments were used with the same participants who were the four selected English language teachers. Additionally, to ensure the credibility and trustworthiness of the findings, the study did not rely only on a single data collection method. A comparative analysis of data from the three
data collection methods which were document analyses, interviews and classroom observations enabled me to evaluate the accuracy of the study findings and to make reliable, comprehensive and unbiased conclusions about the study.

3.3 METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION

Qualitative data collection methods were used in this study to obtain a more detailed understanding of the phenomenon. Data were collected from the last quarter of the year 2015 to the beginning of 2016. Ezzy (2002) states that qualitative data collection methods enhance a person’s understanding of the situation as something to be discovered than to make assumptions on its existence. As the researcher, I was therefore at liberty to interrogate the ways in which English (EHL and EFAL) is taught in desegregated urban high schools, simply by being closer to the context. In qualitative research, the primary ways of collecting qualitative data are interviews, observations and a review of material culture (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). In this study, three qualitative data collection methods were employed, namely: observations, semi-structured interviews, questionnaires and document analyses.

3.3.1 Observations

Observation is one of the most natural qualitative data collection methods because it connects the researcher to the most basic of human experiences (Guest, Namey & Mitchell, 2013). One can easily miss the research participants’ unconscious behaviour if one simply relies on data collection methods such as interviews, focus groups and surveys (Rossman & Rallis, 2003). According to Henning et al (2009) observation entails the systematic noting and recording of events and behaviours in contexts chosen for study; the observer simply documents and describes the participants’ complex actions and interactions. Guest et al (2013) describe observation as an ongoing dynamic activity where the researcher tries to discover and understand participant behaviour that happens subconsciously in the normal course of their lives. In other words, observations are useful in contexts where participants have complex interactions with each other or with their environment. Furthermore, observations reduce bias and obtain a more valid understanding of participant behaviours (Guest et al, 2013). In other words, if researchers do not have direct contact or access to the research context, they might collect data that reflect their own point of view rather than the participants’ social reality.
In this study, eight unstructured observations were conducted in four Grade 11 English classrooms (in both EHL and two EFAL classrooms); two in each classroom in Schools A and School B. In School A, lessons lasted for thirty-five minutes, while in School B, lessons lasted for forty minutes. The purposes of the observations were to examine and compare classroom practices in EHL classrooms with those in the EFAL classrooms. These included English teaching and learning content, methods and approaches used in both EHL and EFAL classrooms. Further, it was important for me to observe the English language proficiency levels and other linguistic behaviours of EHL and EFAL learners and teachers.

According to Guest et al (2013) research observers should not be viewed as complete insiders during observations. Successful observers have to inspire enough trust and acceptance to enable participants to act as naturally as they would if the researcher were not present (Guest et al, 2013). As an observer, I acted as a non-participant in the classroom in order to minimise reactivity from teachers and learners (Cohen et al, 2007). During observations, I recorded all the teaching and learning practices and behaviours I could identify in the English language classrooms in the form field notes in order to avoid missing important data. Field notes are described by Henning et al (2009) as detailed, non-judgemental observational records that describe what has been observed. After conducting the observations, I compiled all the field notes and then analysed them to form the study’s important data.

3.3.2 Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were conducted in this study. Open-ended questions were prepared for the chosen participants, who were, in this case, four English language teachers from the two selected high schools. The interviews were conducted before classroom observations. The teachers were interviewed individually in their classrooms. Oppenhein (2002) maintains that an interview allows the researcher to reach a depth of data as it allows the respondents to express their views with greater richness and spontaneity. In other words, open-ended questions do not limit the responses of the respondents in any way; respondents have the freedom to answer as much as they wish. During the interviews, I also employed some interviewing strategies suggested by Rossman and Rallis (2003) such as
probing participants, following clues and seeking reasons for some of the responses provided by participants. The data I collected were the participants’ perspectives on the situation and not my views as the researcher. All the interviews were tape-recorded and then transcribed verbatim. The transcripts then formed important data for this investigation. Through these interviews, one could easily understand how English language teachers interpret and understand the contents and stipulations of the two English language curricula. The interviews also allowed me to obtain valuable information about the experiences and perspectives of English language teachers regarding the teaching of the two English language curricula in the FET phase.

3.3.3 Document analyses

The third data collection method employed in the study is document analyses. According to Denzin and Lincoln (1998), raw material for analyses may be any form of communication which is usually written materials. Rossman and Rallis (2003) maintain that document analyses is one of the most effective methods of data collection as it is unobtrusive and nonreactive, that is, it can be conducted without disturbing the setting or context in any way. The primary written materials for analyses in this study were the CAPS for EHL and EFAL in the FET phase, internal examinations set by English language teachers, external end of year and supplementary examination papers for 2014 for both EHL and EFAL and learning programmes designed by teachers. These documents were analysed to critically examine discourses in these texts; whether there are differences and/or similarities in discourses about curriculum content, the quality of assessments and assessment standards in the two English courses. Further, the documents were analysed to evaluate correlation between curriculum theory and classroom teaching practices.

3.3.4 Questionnaires

A self-administered structured questionnaire was utilised to collect biographical and demographical data for all learners who participated in the study. The questionnaire was convenient as learners could easily complete it within a short period of time in a convenient place. A few simple questions were asked so that learners could provide accurate information about themselves and their backgrounds. Analysis of this
information provided important information on the identities of learners in the English language classrooms of the two schools.

3.4 RESEARCH CONTEXT
The study was conducted in two desegregated urban high schools situated in the Roodepoort area in Johannesburg, South Africa. I do not teach in any of the two schools. The two high schools are ex-Model C schools located in formerly-white suburbs. These two schools were chosen as suitable contexts for the study because they serve linguistically and culturally diverse learner populations, probably because of the schools’ desegregation process. Learners in the two schools speak different home languages and show different levels of proficiency in English language. The learner population of the first school (henceforth School A) comprises mostly of Black African learners from Roodepoort and different parts of Soweto as well as a few White, Indian and Coloured learners also from Roodepoort. The second school (henceforth School B), situated not far from School A serves mostly the Afrikaner community in Roodepoort and other areas around Roodepoort. The learner population of this school comprises mostly of White Afrikaner learners, few Black African learners from Soweto and Roodepoort and a handful of Indian and Coloured learners, also from Roodepoort. The teaching staff of School A comprises mostly of Black African and White teachers and a few Indian teachers while the teaching staff in School B consists of only White Afrikaner teachers.

School A only uses English as a language of teaching and learning. School B uses both English and Afrikaans as a medium of instruction in lower grades (Grade 8 and 9) and only Afrikaans is used as a medium of instruction in the senior grades (Grades 10–12). The principal of School B stated that the dual medium policy was only implemented in 2012. However, the two schools offer both EHL and EFAL in the FET phase.

3.5 RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS
Four English language teachers from the two selected high schools were chosen for interviews and their classrooms were utilised as contexts for observations. One of the purposive sampling strategies, the criterion sampling method, was employed in selecting the primary participants of this study (Given, 2008). Criterion sampling
involves the selection of cases or participants who meet a certain criterion (Given, 2008). Since this study’s focus is English teaching and learning, two EHL teachers and two EFAL teachers were selected, particularly those who teach grade 11 in the FET phase. I ensured that experienced and newly qualified English language teachers were selected for the study. Learners from classes identified for the research automatically became secondary participants for the study, indirectly participating through observations and directly participating through providing their biographical information, which was important in establishing linguistic compositions of English language classes in the two schools. Further, English language teachers and learners were selected to participate in the research because the study views them as subjects of dominant ideologies and discourses of the curriculum and other discriminatory discursive practices found in schools (Janks, 1997).

### 3.5.1 Teachers

In School A, the two English language teachers who participated in the study are both White females. In the interview, the EHL teacher (Teacher 1) mentioned that she is quite experienced as an English language teacher, as she has taught EHL for forty years. However, the teacher mentioned that she has never taught EFAL. The teacher also stated that English is her mother language and that she cannot speak any other language besides English. The EFAL teacher (Teacher 2) in School A seemed much younger than the EHL teacher. In the interview, the teacher stated that she is still new in the teaching profession and that she teaches both EHL and EFAL. She mentioned that she speaks both English and Afrikaans perfectly, though her home language is Afrikaans.

In School B, the two teachers who participated are also White females. In the interview, the EHL teacher (Teacher 3) stated that she has been teaching English for a ‘few’ years. She is currently teaching both EHL and EFAL. The teacher mentioned that she speaks English perfectly though her home language is Afrikaans. The EFAL teacher (Teacher 4) in School B looked much older than the EHL teacher. She stated that she has been teaching English language for twenty years but she has never taught EHL. Further, the teacher mentioned that she only speaks English and Afrikaans, and that Afrikaans is her home language.
3.5.2 Learners in School A

In School A, two Grade 11 English classes participated in the study (one for EHL and another for EFAL). Data from questionnaires completed by learners show that the two Grade 11 classes comprise mostly of Black African learners and a few White, Indian and Coloured learners. Their ages ranged from 16 to 18 years. Most of the learners (in both classes) reported that they live with their parents in areas around Roodepoort and Soweto. A few reported that they live with grandparents or relatives. The majority of them stated that they grew up in Johannesburg. Only a few reported that they grew up in other provinces or cities. Further, analysis of the data reveals that most of the learners grew up in urban settings and they speak more than one language.

In the EHL class, twenty-seven learners participated; twenty-two Black Africans, three Coloured, one White and one Indian. Despite the fact that this was an EHL class, seventeen learners indicated that they only speak African languages at home and mentioned English as one of the languages they speak with friends at school. Ten learners indicated that they speak English and other languages at home. All the learners in this class stated that they speak and write English perfectly. Most learners stated that they speak English and African languages with their friends at school.

In the EFAL class, twenty-eight learners participated. Twenty-four are Black Africans and four are Coloured. Though these learners study EFAL, twelve of them reported that they speak English and other African languages with their parents at home and four of them indicated that they only speak English at home. However, all learners in this class stated that they speak and write English perfectly. Further, most of them stated that they speak English and African languages with their friends at school.

According to the language policy of the school, learners have a choice of learning English, Tswana or Zulu as a Home Language and Afrikaans or English as a First Additional Language. The policy acknowledges the fact that it is not practical to offer all languages as subjects and therefore the school uses assimilation as an integration approach. Though the language of instruction in the school is English, code-switching is encouraged in the classroom in situations where learners do not understand concepts. According to the policy, all administration, communication with
parents and academic activities are conducted in English. The policy further states that the school does not use language competence as an admission criterion.

3.5.3 Learners in School B

In School B, two Grade 11 classes participated in the study (one for EHL and another for EFAL). Data from questionnaires completed by learners show that the two Grade 11 classes in the school comprise mostly of White Afrikaner learners, a few Black African and Coloured learners. The learners’ ages ranged from 16 to 18 years. Most learners in the two classes reported that they live with their parents in Roodepoort. A few reported that they live with their relatives or friends. The majority of them stated that they grew up in Johannesburg. Only a few reported that they did not grow up in Johannesburg or Gauteng. Data also show that most of them grew up in urban settings and that they speak more than one language.

In the EHL class, thirty-one learners participated; nineteen White, eight Black Africans and four Coloured. Most White and Coloured learners in this class indicated that they speak both English and Afrikaans at home. Only a few of them mentioned English as the only language spoken at home. Black African learners stated that they speak English and one or two African languages at home. All learners in this class stated that they could speak and write English perfectly. Further, most learners in this class stated that they speak English and Afrikaans with their friends at school, except a few who indicated that they also speak slang and African languages.

In the EFAL class, twenty-eight learners participated; twenty-five White, two Coloured and one Black African. Most learners stated that they only speak Afrikaans at home and at school, except a few who indicated that speak both English and Afrikaans. A few indicated that they speak English and other languages at home. Most learners stated that they could speak and write English perfectly. Though the class learned Afrikaans as a home language, some learners stated that they could not speak and write Afrikaans.

School B has been using Afrikaans as the only medium of instruction until recently. When requested to provide the schools’ language policy, the English head of department stated that the school is still in the process of drafting one, but no explanation was given concerning the language policy currently in use.
3.6 METHODS OF DATA ANALYSES

The data analysed included field notes from observations, interview transcripts and documents. Three methods of data analyses were used to analyse data, namely, global analysis, content analysis and critical discourse analysis. The global analysis method was used to analyse field notes from classroom observations. According to Cohen et al (2007), a global analysis of texts is a holistic reading of texts which requires an integrated view of data and the way in which a range of themes are generated from texts. It is a method which explores ‘the connections between the explicit statements and the implicit meanings in people’s discourse’ through the technique of ‘breaking up text, and finding within it explicit rationalisations’ and their implicit meanings (Attride-Stirling, 2000:387). In my analysis of the field notes, I searched for meaningful patterns and main themes in the texts, instead of using codes and categories, or chunking the data into segments (Henning et al, 2009). I reduced field notes into more manageable global themes, with each theme representing a main idea. I then assembled the themes into similar, coherent groupings that formed thematic networks. Through the theoretical lens of poststructuralism and critical theory, the thematic networks and patterns that amounted to particular meanings were critically explored and examined.

The content analysis method was employed to analyse interview transcripts. According to Mayring (2014), content analysis is broad and diverse and it is highly impossible that one can use all the techniques of the method to analyse data. This study therefore employs a limited form of content analysis whose focus is to establish and interrogate the semantic-syntactic manifestations of discourse and the situations in which subjects produce discourses (Franzosi, 2004). Krippendorff (1980) maintains that content analysis is an appropriate method in the interpretation and analysis of data in a case study research. Content analysis ‘attempts to define more casual descriptions of the content’ (Franzosi, 2004:547), by ‘systematically and objectively identifying specified characteristics within text’ (Krippendorff, 1980:21). These characteristics can represent explicit meanings or inferred meanings in texts (Bryman, 2004). Though the procedures of content analysis are dependent on context and the kinds of texts for analysis, the method is strictly controlled and follows a ‘systematic approach’ to data analysis (Mayring, 2014:40). In content analysis, one has to make meaning out of each sentence in the text in order to make
sense of the data (Cohen et al, 2007). In my analysis of the interview transcripts, I employed an inductive approach to generate categories (themes); I derived patterns or themes which were directly expressed in the interview transcripts. All units of analysis in the data (utterances that amount to important data) were then coded, that is, allocated to the categories. This was then followed by the interpretation of the themes or categories where I used a theoretical lens of critical theory to infer meaning.

The critical discourse analysis method was used to analyse documents (written texts). Critical discourse analysis is not merely ‘a descriptive and explanatory practice that aims at truth claims’ but ‘a critical enterprise’ (Parker, 1992:6) and a ‘reflexive process’ (Lucke, 1996:13). It is a method which ‘challenges current dominant ways of understanding or viewing the objects of study’ and ‘opens up space for alternative reflections that could lead to change’ (Zeeman, Poggenpoel, Myburgh, and Van der Linde, 2002:96). Further, Lucke (1996:13) argues that texts represent ‘the social and discursive relations between human subjects.’ Critical discourse analysis is therefore used to ‘deconstruct’ texts (Weedon, 1987:172) in order to reveal ‘the function of particular discourses, the way they position their subjects in relations of domination and subordination or of opposition and resistance’ (Zeeman et al, 2002:99), and to identify institutional practices that are reinforced or undermined when particular discourses are used (Parker, 1992:7).

According to Janks (1997:329), critical discourse analysis has ‘three dimensions’ which require different kinds of analyses. The method does not only involve the analyses of texts or discourses (verbal or written) but also includes the analyses of the processes involved in the production of texts or discourses, the way texts and discourses are received by subjects, and the ‘socio-historical conditions which govern these processes’ (Janks, 1997:329). This study used limited critical discourse analysis, since the focus was only on the analysis of written texts such as the curriculum, the processes by which such texts are produced and the manner in which they are received by subjects such as teachers and learners. Through critical reading of the written materials and an objective interrogation of the language and perspectives of the author (Cohen et al, 2007), patterns in language or discourse that amounted to particular meanings or themes emerged (Henning et al, 2009). As I
read the data, I identified central themes as well as categories and sub-categories that supported the central themes (Henning et al, 2009).

After analysing all the data, the results of the study were then synthesised to form a detailed report presented in Chapter 4 of the research project. However, for this research project to be a success, ethical procedures discussed in the next section had to be followed.

3.7 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Before conducting this research, an application was made to the University of Johannesburg’s ethics committee (Higher Degrees Committee) to ensure that the research met ethical standards. As the researcher, I ensured that my research was executed with professionalism and integrity, from the preliminary stages until the time of publication. Norwood (2009:69) states that ‘in research, ethical decisions are a product of careful deliberation, choice and accountability on the part of the researcher during the entire research processes’. It was therefore of paramount importance for me as the researcher to respect the rights, privacy, dignity, and sensitivities of the research participants as well as the integrity of the institutions within which my research was conducted. Informed consent, anonymity, confidentiality, data generation, treatment of publication and relationship between the researcher and participants were also identified among others as central to this study (Streubert Speziale & Carpenter, 2007).

Before the study was conducted, it was very important for me to inform the selected participants that they were not going to be coerced to participate and that they had the right to terminate their participation anytime if they no longer wished to be part of the study (Norwood, 2009). This meant that participants were going to provide information without any use of force, fraud, deception, duress, bribery or any other form of constraint. Further, participants were informed that their participation was confidential and that personal data were going to be made public only behind the shield of anonymity (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998). Before conducting the research, I requested permission from the principals of the two high schools to conduct my research in their institutions. I also obtained informed consent from the selected English language teachers. Informed consent was also obtained from the parents or guardians of selected English language learners, since most of them were still
minors; to ensure that they were protected from any harm and to safeguard their privacy. To obtain consent, I ensured that all the participants had a complete understanding of the nature and purpose of the research, the methods that I intended to use in conducting the research, my intentions to involve them, my expectations and the importance of the study.

Sometimes it becomes a complex task for a researcher to conduct research while trying to guard against the invasion of the participants’ privacy, particularly if the objective of the study is to obtain information about the participants’ attitudes, beliefs, opinions and behaviour (Best & Kahn, 2006). However, as a professional researcher I was very much cautious and confidential about private information. I assured all the participants that the data or information they were going to provide was going to be held and kept in strict confidence and that it was only the researcher and the participants who would have access to the information. I also ensured that the participants and the school remained anonymous by using pseudonyms.

3.8 CONCLUSION

This chapter discussed the research approach and procedures, as well as the important details regarding the research site and participants. The research data collection tools and strategies discussed in the chapter made it easier for me to collect sufficient and relevant data for the project. All the data collected was analysed and interpreted in the chapter that follows.
CHAPTER 4: PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF DATA

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter focuses on the analyses of data obtained from classroom observations, interviews and document analyses. The chapter analyses data under six major themes. The first theme focuses on the propositions of the CAPS with regard to the teaching of EHL and EFAL in the Further Education and Training (FET) phase. The second theme examines the teaching and learning programmes for English and other documents obtained from English language teachers. The third theme discusses the contents and the structure of assessment and testing instruments for English, precisely, the internal and external examination question papers for English language in the FET phase. The fourth theme explores and examines the experiences and perspectives of teachers for EHL and EFAL. The fifth theme discusses the actual teaching and learning practices in English language classrooms of the two selected schools. The sixth theme explores the implications of teaching English as a Home Language and a First Additional Language.

4.2 CAPS FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE IN THE FET PHASE

Close analysis of the two English language curricula reveals that there are a few differences in the content of the two documents. Though the two curricula were designed for two separate English language courses, the aims and teaching approaches in the two documents are identical and are set out to achieve the same objectives. However, there are some observable differences between the two curriculum documents due to some minor changes and adjustments to the words used in phrasing assessment standards in the EFAL curriculum. Further, the DBE (2011a & b) provides more detailed information, particularly on the content to be covered in Grade 10 to Grade 12 in the EFAL curriculum.

4.2.1 The term 'proficiency levels'

In my analysis of the two curricula, it was difficult to understand the logic behind the adoption of the term ‘proficiency levels’ by the DBE (2011a & b), in distinguishing between the two English language courses (EHL and EFAL). The statement below appears in both CAPS for English:
‘...many South African schools do not offer the home languages of some or all of the enrolled learners but rather have one or two languages offered at Home Language level. As a result, the names Home Language and First Additional Language refer to the proficiency levels at which the language is offered, and not the native (Home) or acquired (as in the Additional) languages’ (DBE, 2011a & b:8).

It is clear from the above statement that the DBE is aware of the fact that most learners are not offered the opportunity to learn their home languages, particularly at high school level. Instead, learners are compelled by the system to learn other languages as home languages, and for this reason, curriculum designers prefer to use the term ‘level of proficiency’ to distinguish between English language courses. Umalusi (2014) argues that the DBE might have realised that terms such as ‘Home Language’ or ‘First Additional Language’ are inappropriate in contexts where learners are not given the opportunity to learn their ‘proper’ home languages. Hence it is assumed that terms such as ‘proficiency levels’ are appropriate in defining learners who are compelled by the system to learn a language such as English as a ‘home language’.

One wonders whether schools and English language teachers understand the DBE’s intention of using the term ‘proficiency levels’. Currently, there is no system in place or guidelines in the English language curricula to measure the assumed proficiency levels in the language. The use of the term ‘level’ means there should be some standard or mechanism used to determine one’s proficiency in a language. The use of the term might potentially create confusion in schools. Misinterpretation of the term might lead to a situation where learners are arbitrarily placed in wrong English language classrooms, compelling them to learn a wrong English language curriculum. Further, this might lead to a scenario where learners adopt false linguistic identities, for instance, that of ‘EHL learners’ yet English is actually not their home language, and English language teachers would also perceive them likewise.

4.2.2 Time allocation

The two curriculum documents show considerable differences in the time allocated for teaching and learning of EHL and EFAL. EHL is allocated more tuition time than
EFAL right from the foundation phase to the FET phase. The following statement appears in both curriculum documents:

‘Ten hours are allocated for languages in Grades R-2 and 11 hours in Grade 3. A maximum of 8 hours and a minimum of 7 hours are allocated for Home Language and a minimum of 2 hours and a maximum of 3 hours for Additional Language in Grades 1-2. In Grade 3 a maximum of 8 hours and a minimum of 7 hours are allocated for Home Language and a minimum of 3 hours and a maximum of 4 hours for First Additional Language’ (DBE, 2011a & b:6).

From the statement above, the DBE expects primary school learners to have more exposure to their home languages than their additional languages. In many schools, it is always assumed that African languages are home languages for Black African learners and English or Afrikaans is for White, Indian and Coloured learners. Though this assumption might be true in some instances, it ironically means less exposure to the first additional language for Black African learners, which is usually English. Mda (2004) and Taylor and Coetzee (2013), state that the academic and social success of the majority of South African learners depends on their proficiency in English. It is therefore only logical to state that less exposure to English in the earlier stages of the learners’ schooling life might have a negative impact on their proficiency in the language and hence negatively influence their academic success later in school. The DBE disregards the fact that English later becomes a preferred language of teaching and learning for both EHL and EFAL learners (in school and tertiary institutions of learning). Allocating EHL speakers more English tuition time simply places them at an advantageous position since they are already many hours ahead of English additional language learners. It is a contradictory and self-defeating exercise for learners to spend eight hours per week learning isiZulu as a mother tongue and four hours learning English, when later on only their English proficiency, and not isiZulu, would be used to determine their academic success. Clearly these are some of the implicit internal inconsistencies of the discourses in the CAPS for English that ultimately subject learners to unfair teaching and learning practices.

The decision to allocate more tuition time for home languages than additional languages, particularly in the foundation phase, is clearly influenced by the Language in Education Policy (Government of the Republic of South Africa, 1997)
which encourages mother tongue-based bilingual education and the additive bilingualism approach as the learner progresses into senior learning phases. The mother-tongue based bilingual approach stems from theorists such as Cummins (1992) who maintain that there is a great interdependence between literacy skills across languages. However, proponents of the immersion teaching and learning approach argue that home language instruction later interferes with and delays the acquisition of English as an additional language and that the transition to English language that must occur in bilingual models may be extremely disruptive and educationally damaging if learners are not properly supported (Taylor & Coetzee, 2013). In the immersion of the teaching and learning approach, the target language, for instance English, is best acquired if learners are exposed to the language as much as possible (Cohen, 1998; Krashen, 1985:72).

The issue of allocating more tuition time to home languages than additional languages continues into the intermediate phase and senior phase. However, in a surprising twist, the DBE allocates the same tuition time for EHL and EFAL in the FET phase, regardless of the great disparities in tuition time in the preceding phases. One might be misled to assume that EHL learners and EFAL learners would be operating at the same level of proficiency in the language by the time they progress into the FET phase. According to research, children take between five to seven years of effective English teaching to develop native-speaker competence in English and to acquire Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency in the language (Paradis, 2007; Roseberry-McKibbin & Brice, 2000). However, considering the limited tuition times allocated to EFAL, particularly at primary level and the poor quality of English language teachers in South African schools (Morrow, 2007; Neeta & Klu, 2013; Ulate, 2011), it would be inaccurate to claim that EFAL learners receive adequate English teaching within their first five to seven years of schooling.

It is also worth noting that in the proposed times allocated for the development of four English language skills; reading, writing, speaking and listening, EFAL is allocated less time for writing skills compared to English Home Language. One wonders whether the skill of writing is not that important for EFAL learners, particularly in the FET phase. Further, the decision to allocate limited time for writing skills for EFAL learners is inconsistent with the principles of the Communicative Language Teaching approach outlined in the same CAPS documents, that:
‘Learners learn to read by doing a great deal of reading and learn to write by doing much writing’ (DBE, 2011b:16).

It is interesting to note that EFAL has a lot of time allocated specifically for teaching language structures while little emphasis is put on the explicit teaching of language structures in EHL classrooms. According to the DBE (2011a & b), EFAL learners need to spend more time working towards language proficiency and full communicative competence, and EHL learners need more time to study literature than language because their communicative skills are already at an advanced level. The implication here, I suppose, is that EHL learners do not have to explicitly study language structures because they already possess knowledge of grammar. I argue that this is an inappropriate and a misleading assumption about both groups of learners, as it will be revealed later in the discussion. Also of importance is the fact that not every English language learner taking EHL is operating at a high level (Hakuta & Butler, 2006).

Furthermore, the DBE suggests a lot of time for classroom oral communication in EHL classrooms, compared to EFAL; it is almost double the time suggested for EFAL. This arrangement is inconsistent with some of the statements found in the CAPS for English. For instance, the EFAL curriculum states that learners should have a ‘great deal of exposure’ to the target language and that they should get ‘as many opportunities to practise or produce the language’ in a variety of contexts (DBE, 2011a & b: 16). Limitations in suggested tuition times for some of the components of the EFAL curriculum lead to a contradiction between what the DBE aims to achieve theoretically and how EFAL teachers are expected to realise the aims in practice. These are some of the internal inconsistencies of the CAPS for English that have to be uncovered to expose what is glossed over by the curriculum (Barry, 2002). EFAL learners, particularly in the FET phase, need a lot of tuition time, more exposure to the target language and a lot of practice in the classroom for them to improve their communicative skills (Cohen, 1998).

4.2.3 The English First Additional Language learner

After careful analysis of the English language CAPS, I felt it was necessary to understand how the curriculum positions the EFAL learner. Further, it is necessary to understand how EFAL learners are positioned in the continuum of English language
learners by the curriculum. I was particularly interested in the statement below, which appears in both EHL and EFAL CAPS:

‘The First Additional Language level assumes that learners do not necessarily have any knowledge of the language when they arrive at school.’ (DBE, 2011a & b: 8).

The above statement might be, to a certain extent, accurate only with reference to learners in the countryside and not learners in urban South Africa. South Africa is part of the global community and one of the notable characteristics of the global community is the spread and indigenisation of English language in different parts of the world (Kirkland, 2010; Mesthrie & Bhatt, 2008; Moussu & Llurda, 2008). South Africa has its own varieties of English which are widely used in many households, particularly in big cities and other urban areas; for instance, the Black South African English (De Klerk, 1996; De Klerk & Gough, 2004). It is therefore justifiable to say that the statement above is contextually relative. In urban settings such as Johannesburg, it is generalisation to say that EFAL learners ‘do not necessarily have any knowledge of the language when they arrive at school’ (DBE, 2011a & b: 8). To support this view, Granville et al (1997); Moussu and Llurda (2008), view the term ‘EFAL’, as problematic in modern multilingual societies, particularly in urban spaces where children may acquire more than one language, including English, from their earliest childhood and hence do not particularly have one home language which they are more proficient in.

In my analysis of the two English language CAPS documents, I found the statements below concerning EFAL learners quite problematic:

‘By the time learners enter Grade 10, they should be reasonably proficient in their First Additional Language with regard to both interpersonal and cognitive academic skills. However, the reality is that many learners still cannot communicate well in their Additional Language at this stage. The challenge in Grades 10-12, therefore, is to provide support for these learners at the same time as providing a curriculum that enables learners to meet the standards required in Grade 12.’ (DBE, 2011a & b: 8).
It is difficult to understand how the DBE expects EFAL learners to ‘be reasonably proficient’ particularly in cognitive academic skills at this stage when they are actually being given little instruction time and limited exposure to the language at primary level when compared to EHL learners. My understanding is that cognitive academic skills are only acquired in institutions of learning, and therefore, a considerable amount of tuition time is required for the acquisition of these skills (Cummins, 1999; Khatib, 2012). I also find it difficult to conceptualise the term ‘reasonable proficiency’. The DBE needs to elaborate more on the ‘level of proficiency’ expected at this stage and what mechanism teachers should use to determine this level of ‘reasonable proficiency’. It is also not clear how long it takes for EFAL learners to show a reasonable level of proficiency, precisely in the cognitive academic skills and whether the time frame is the same for all learners to adequately acquire these skills. Even though the DBE (2011a & b) is aware of the challenges encountered by EFAL learners in trying to achieve the desired levels of proficiency in the language, there are no clear guidelines on what kind of support English language teachers should give to such learners.

One of the aims of the DBE is to ensure that EFAL learners:

‘...meet the standards required in Grade 12. These standards must be such that learners can use their additional language at a high level of proficiency to prepare them for further or higher education or the world of work’ (DBE, 2011a & b: 8).

However, it is not clear which standards are used as a yardstick to measure the performance of EFAL learners. Further, it is not clear whether the standards for measuring English language proficiency in EFAL are similar to those used in EHL. Close analysis of the two CAPS documents reveals a lot of disparities between the teaching and learning content and assessment standards of the two English language courses. Learning content for EFAL is not cognitively challenging, compared to EHL. For instance, texts studied or produced by EFAL learners are shorter and simple compared to those for EHL learners. It is therefore not clear which standards are ‘the required standards’ since it is evidently clear that the two English language curricula use different standards to measure English language proficiency.
Further, a comparative analysis of the various aspects of the two English language curricula, for example, the time allocated for tuition, content depth, and lengths of texts, only reveals that the standards for EHL are much higher compared to EFAL. This simply means that EFAL learners would not have reached the proficiency levels of EHL learners by the time they complete high school studies (Umalusi, 2008). Though it is mandatory for institutions of higher learning such as universities not to make a distinction between EHL and EFAL in their selection of students (Hove & Maruma, 2014). It detrimentally becomes an unfortunate situation for EFAL learners because these institutions do not operate on two different standards; they only operate on the highest possible standards which are clearly those of EHL. That is the reason most universities in South Africa are now ‘trapped into offering bridging courses and mandatory academic English language programmes in order to adequately prepare first year students for the rigorous demands of a tertiary curriculum’ (Hove & Maruma, 2014:592). This is a clear indication that the DBE’s assertions of ‘high standards’ in EFAL are superficial and contradictory to what is happening in reality; the curriculum is clearly failing to prepare learners for standards in further or higher education (Hove & Maruma, 2014). In support of this view, Coetzee and Johl (2009) argue that the discourses about standards in the curriculum are political and subjective on the basis that the Minister of Basic Education has powers to determine standards or to change or manipulate standards. It is unfortunate that teachers are not invited to be part of the team that decides important issues of the curriculum such as standards and teaching approaches (Kelly, 2004). Regardless, Giroux (1997:103) argues that teachers are not simply ‘public servants, whose role is primarily to implement’ the curriculum; they are ‘critical bearers of knowledge’ and ‘transformative intellectuals’ who ‘conceptualise pedagogical practice’ and challenge the discourses of the curriculum.

4.2.4 Approaches to teaching English language

The two English language curricula suggest the same teaching approaches, namely: the text-based approach, the communicative language teaching approach, the integrated approach and the process-oriented approach (DBE, 2012a & b). It is difficult to understand why similar teaching approaches are suggested for teaching language curricula meant for two different groups of English learners. Lack of differentiation in teaching approaches in the two English courses clearly points to
lack of understanding of the teaching methods appropriate for learners who are mother-tongue speakers of a language and those suitable for learners who are assumed to be in the process of acquiring a language (Umalusi, 2008, 2014). As argued by Kumaravadivelu (2003:28), the DBE should abolish the ‘one-size-fits all’ approach in the teaching of English and distinguish between EFAL acquisition teaching approaches and teaching approaches which are meant to extend the language proficiency of EHL learners in curriculum development.

In both EHL and EFAL CAPS, the DBE (2011a & b) focuses on the development of four skills namely: listening, speaking, reading and writing without specifying the content to be used. The assumption is that any content or activity that can integrate any of the four skills is regarded as suitable for English learners. The two curricula emphasise that English language learners should exercise and develop these four skills concurrently in various communicative contexts. Both curricula recommend a thematic approach in the selection of content texts so that a variety of genres focusing on the same theme can be used holistically in developing all the important skills. Further, English language teachers are encouraged to select reading texts that become ‘progressively more challenging’ from grade to grade (DBE, 2011a & b: 11) whereas there are no clear guidelines on how to achieve this. It, therefore, remains the burden of English language teachers to look for and select content texts that are appropriate for the level of their learners. This means the success of English language learners is subjected to the teacher’s discretion, skills and ability to search for appropriate texts and other learning material.

4.2.5 Sequencing of English language skills and content in the FET phase

It is not clearly stated in the proposed teaching plans that appear in the two English language curricula how English language teachers should sequence skills and content to allow for progression across the three grades in the FET phase (from Grade 10-12). The aims for the three grade levels (Grades 10, 11 and 12) and English language levels (EHL and EFAL) are the same. There is little indication on how far the English language teacher should have progressed by the end of each grade level. Further, it is not clear what the differences are in the literary genres and texts to be studied in Grades 10 and 11 and the depth at which they should be studied, except only in Grade 12 where these genres and texts are prescribed by the
DBE. The fact that these two English language curricula are theoretically designed for three different grade levels (Grade 10, 11 and 12), with six different levels of proficiency and competence, aiming at different levels of language mastery, one would expect the DBE to provide precise information on how teachers should distinguish between the various areas of the curriculum and not only in the assessments and examinations (Moyo, et al, 2010; Umalusi, 2008, 2014).

As stated above, it is largely in examinations where differentiation of the levels of cognitive demand of the two English language curricula is made. It is difficult to understand cognitive depth in both curricula, unless one consults the external examination question papers. It appears English language teachers either need to use their intuitive sense in deciding what constitutes cognitive progression, or they need to use external examination question papers as a guide to understand the different levels of cognitive depth at which to engage their learners (Ayliff, 2012; Neeta & Klu, 2013; Umalusi, 2008). In other words, it is the examinations which specifically set ‘the standard’, or the different levels of cognitive demand. The irony is that a curriculum imbued with the discourse of social justice (Chisholm, 2005b) actually contributes in perpetuating such societal inequalities.

Not all English language teachers have the ability to develop a reasonable level of common understanding of what quality of work constitutes what level of English language proficiency (Hove & Maruma, 2014). Though there are ‘suggested’ weekly teaching plans in the two English language CAPS meant to guide the teacher, the documents provide very little detail about the depth of content in each grade level (Umalusi, 2014). Though the curriculum states that these plans are merely examples, it is known that the majority of teachers use them as they are, without making any changes (Umalusi, 2014). Critical examination of these plans reveals a lot of disparities between the topics outlined in the teaching content and those indicated in the teaching plans. The teaching plans are ‘repetitive, narrow and oversimplified’ and there are too many gaps that require reworking to prevent ‘partial and incoherent’ implementation of the curriculum (Umalusi, 2014:47). It therefore requires highly skilled and competent teachers to identify and rectify such gaps.
English language teachers might find some of the statements in the English language CAPS confusing, for instance, the statement below regarding the selection of reading texts in the EFAL CAPS:

‘...it is very important that oral, written and visual texts are at the right level for learners. If the texts are too difficult, learners will become discouraged and they will not learn anything; if they are too easy, there will be no challenge and little learning will take place. An important role of the language teacher is to match the level of text to the level of the learner.’ (DBE, 2011b:11).

It is not clear from the above statement how English language teachers should ‘match’ the level of a text to the level of the learners. This is clearly a challenging task that requires knowledge of subject content, skill and proper guidelines. Except for the lengths of the texts suggested by the two curricula, the English language teacher is not provided with any tools to use in selecting texts that are appropriate for the level of English language learners. Besides variation in length, there are a lot of factors to consider which might affect the level of accessibility of texts or factors that would make a text more or less suitable for teaching learners at different levels of language proficiency. For example, the teacher should consider density of register in texts, vocabulary used in texts, suitability of content and complexity of structure in texts (Granville, 2001).

The two curricula also do not clearly specify the number and types of texts to be covered in each year in the FET phase. The documents do not provide the kind of detailed information needed to ensure that English language teachers know exactly what amount of reading is required in each grade level, particularly in Grade 10 and 11. Unclear guidelines about content coverage across the three grades in the two English courses may lead to a situation where English language teachers decide to concentrate only on texts that will be examined. Further, the narrow range of types of texts evaluated in the examinations could be the cause of limited variety in choice of texts studied in English language classrooms. The EFAL curriculum also states that learners in the FET phase should be involved in extensive reading, while on one hand the same curriculum limits them to two literary genres in each year of study. Exposing EFAL learners to a limited number of genres is disempowering and
contributes to the marginalisation of a particular group of people in a society which continues to recognise English ‘as a mark of distinction’ (Janks, 2004:33).

Since Grade 10 and 11 are not externally examined, some statements in the document (which are open to interpretation) might lead to deliberate misinterpretation by some English language teachers in schools. For instance, the statement below in the EFAL CAPS:

‘In Grades 10-12 learners should study a range of literary texts. For example, a teacher could choose a range of poems over the two years (Grades 10 and 11), short stories from different countries, novels and plays from different periods or films by different directors.’ (DBE, 2011b:14).

The statement above is merely a suggestion of what English language teachers could do in selecting texts. Since nothing compels teachers on which texts to study in each year, some of them might simply avoid teaching the kinds of texts or literary genres that they are not comfortable with due to the fact that Grade 10 and 11 are not externally examined and nothing compels them to teach any particular genre or texts. Though comprehensive lists of literary and non-literary texts are there to guide teachers, no clear specification is provided on the number of texts and genres or types of texts (literary and non-literary) to be covered in each year of study for grade 10 and 11. It is only in Grade 12 where teachers are informed of literary texts to study because of the annual lists of prescribed texts provided by the DBE. However, this seems to happen only because Grade 12 is externally examined.

The two English language curricula state that English language teachers should ensure that learners are exposed to as many literary genres as possible in each year of study (DBE, 2011a & b). Considering the limited tuition time allocations suggested by the curriculum, as well as the limited tuition time allocated to English language lessons in schools, it is highly impossible that there is enough time for teachers to cover all literary genres in each grade level. For instance, in the grade 12 curriculum for EHL, all literary genres are compressed in one year of study, making it difficult for teachers to adequately and sufficiently deal with other aspects of the curriculum. It would have been more logical for the DBE to spread the literary genres over three years of the FET phase and indicate clearly which literary genres should be studied in each year.
In the EFAL curriculum, Grade 10-12 teachers are required to choose only two from the list of genres: poetry, novel, short stories and drama for their learners (in each grade level). In other words, the EFAL learners should only be exposed to two literary genres in each year of study, which is usually of the teacher’s choice or the school’s choice. Their exposure to a variety of literary genres therefore depends on what teachers decide to cover across the three years of study. This means it is possible for some teachers to deliberately avoid particular literary genres throughout the phase, thereby disadvantaging learners. Makoni and Pennycook (2005) and Weedon (1987) interrogate such discourses as the discourse of ‘choice’ and ‘flexibility’ in the curriculum, which give English language teachers leeway and authority in choosing texts, while on one hand compromising quality and promoting inequality and subjectivity on the part of the learner. The DBE might be aware that teachers would possibly choose the simplest of the literary genres, for instance, short stories, to ensure that learners pass examinations, without considering the negative impact that such choices would have on the EFAL learner.

Interestingly, EHL Grade 10-12 learners on the other hand have to study three literary genres: a novel, play and poetry in each year of study. While EHL learners are examined on the same types of literary genres in each grade level (drama, novel and poetry), examinations for the EFAL learners on one hand largely depend on genres the individual school or teacher has chosen for learners to study. This kind of scenario raises a lot of questions about the knowledge levels and competency levels of EFAL grade 12 learners, particularly in literary texts and literary studies. According to Bawarshi (2000:351) it is critical for high school learners to be exposed to a variety of literary genres as each literary genre constitutes its own ‘social semiotic’. It is, therefore, imperative that the DBE makes it mandatory for EFAL learners to be exposed to all literary genres.

The two English language curricula do not provide lists of literary texts for all grades in the FET phase, which means every year, English language teachers have to wait for the DBE to provide a list or to announce if the list has changed or not. I feel it would be more appropriate to include such lists as part of the curriculum to avoid misinterpretation and confusion in schools. In addition, for English language teachers to fully understand and effectively implement the curriculum, they also have to consult other policy documents which appear to be giving meaning to the curriculum
itself; for example, the policy pertaining promotion requirements (DBE, 2012). The English language curricula may appear to be explaining all issues clearly, yet it is surprising to note that there are some issues which require the English language teacher to consult other policy documents.

It is also interesting to note how the two English curricula deal with the issue of grammar and other language structures, precisely how these components should be taught in English language classrooms. The statement below appears in the EFAL curriculum statement:

‘Learners also need to know the basics of language: grammar, vocabulary, spelling and punctuation. Generally, teachers will deal with these aspects of language in context...there is also a place for direct/explicit teaching of the basics...It is important to remember that the role of grammar teaching is to support correct language use, and that it has little value if taught as decontextualized rules.’ (DBE, 2011b:11).

The DBE emphasises teaching the basics of language structures in context and clearly discourages EFAL teachers from teaching explicit grammar rules particularly in decontextualized situations, due to the fact that CAPS adopts the Communicative Language Teaching as the central approach. The curriculum states that English language structures are best taught in context, simultaneously with other skills of the language (DBE, 2011a & b). However, scholars such as Ayliff (2010) argue that contextualised teaching of grammar in EFAL classrooms in South Africa has resulted in very low levels of grammatical accuracy and fluent written competence. According to Ayliff (ibid), the problem with contextualised teaching of grammar is that some learners might not have the capacity to process other skills together with various grammatical structures simultaneously. Critical theorists view meaning-focused language teaching as inadequate for developing academic English language skills because it merely targets communicative competence and leads to fossilisation of weak grammatical competence (Uysal & Bardakci, 2014). Widodo (2006) maintains that an explicit way of grammar teaching is one of the effective ways of raising learners’ awareness of grammatical features of language because it is largely a conscious process that involves formal exposure to rules of syntax and semantics as well as specific applications of the rules.
The EHL curriculum on the other hand emphasises the importance of learning grammar but no tuition time is allocated in any grade level in the FET phase and very little is said about how these language structures should be taught. The assumption probably is that EHL learners already have the implicit knowledge of grammar which they might have internalised at an early age or through the natural language learning process. However, theorists such as Krashen (1987) argue that it is not always accurate to assume that all native speakers of a language consciously know the explicit knowledge and rules of their language. According to Krashen (1987), children implicitly learn aspects of language, but do not have access to the explicit explanations of the grammar rules; hence explicit knowledge can never be implicit knowledge, though explicit knowledge can have some impact on implicit knowledge. In light of this argument, it is very important for EHL learners to also study some aspects of grammar explicitly for them to master and understand language rules and knowledge which might be difficult to conceptualise.

Furthermore, the EFAL curriculum states that the most effective way for learners to improve their grammar and increase their vocabulary is by doing a lot of reading inside and outside the classroom (DBE, 2011b:15). As it will be revealed later on in the discussion, schools do not provide sufficient time and resources for extensive reading, particularly in the classroom. A study conducted by Umalusi (2008) reports that English language teachers only seem to concentrate on prescribed literary texts, almost to the neglect of other important aspects of the curriculum, and that a lot of tuition time is spent reading these texts in the classroom.

4.2.6 Curriculum interpretation and implementation

The two English language curricula place a lot of demands on the English language teacher with regards to curriculum interpretation and implementation (Hove & Maruma, 2014). In addition to a lot of administrative work that teachers are expected to execute, the DBE expects English language teachers to design learning programmes for all grade levels, using curriculum, assessment and policy guidelines. Teachers are tasked with setting up a composite subject framework for all grade levels, which should be translated into grade-specific work schedules and three-year assessment plans. Each teacher is expected to design lesson plans which should show information on learning and teaching activities, indicating the relevant learning
outcomes and assessment standards to be achieved in each lesson. Further, teachers are burdened with the task of looking for teaching content and materials appropriate for learners in different grade levels. This simply means competent teachers are those who would have the capacity to properly design all the documents as expected and display their resourcefulness and creativity in looking for teaching and learning content and material that would match learners’ proficiency levels (Umalusi, 2014). When the Department of Education shifted from Curriculum 2005 to CAPS, one of the intentions was to minimise the teacher’s administrative responsibilities. However, evidence from this study shows that there are still countless responsibilities that teachers are expected to perform before being engaged in the actual teaching process.

The process of designing these documents requires a lot of time; time which could otherwise be utilised for teaching and learning. The process can be quite challenging and strenuous, particularly to new English language teachers. It may also be very difficult for teachers in poor, under-resourced schools to effectively implement the curriculum, especially if the schools do not have the resources to acquire appropriate teaching and learning material required in the English language classroom. However, because the English language curricula are flexible and open to interpretation, as they do not prescribe teaching and learning content, some competent and experienced teachers might find it much easier to interpret and implement them. Since the two English language curricula are open to interpretation it means the learners’ success does not only hinge upon the teachers’ competence, knowledge and skills, but also subjected to the individual teacher’s intuitive capacity to interpret the curriculum as well as other contextual factors (Agger, 1991; Hawkins & Norton, 2009). The DBE had envisaged a utopian world that consists of only competent teachers, which, according to Morrow’s (2007) study is not the case in South Africa. To corroborate Morrow’s (2007) findings, Bloch (2009) and Hyslop (1999) add that Bantu education in South Africa denied black populations quality education and hence many black teachers in most public schools, particularly those situated in townships, are products of the Bantu teacher training system and possess weak subject matter and inadequate pedagogical knowledge.
4.3 LEARNING PROGRAMMES DESIGNED BY TEACHERS

Two EHL learning programmes and two EFAL learning programmes from the two selected schools were analysed in the study. The four learning programmes were for the 2015 Grade 11 English language learners. The documents were obtained from the four English language teachers who participated in the study. During individual interviews with the four teachers, one was made to believe that all English language teachers in the two schools, including the English heads of department, were involved in the process of designing these documents.

4.3.1 English language learning programmes from School A

In my analysis of the learning programmes from School A, I was confronted with similarity in structure and layout of the two documents; the documents only differ in a few areas, for example, the types of texts or topics to be studied. The two learning programmes show what should be covered in each lesson of the week as well as in each week of the school term. However, the two programmes simply show a list of the topics to be covered without providing detailed information on the topics. Further, the programmes do not provide information on what the teacher should aim to achieve in each topic. The EHL programme indicates that three literary genres (novel, drama, and poetry) are covered during the course of the year, while the EFAL programme shows only two literary genres for the year (drama and poetry). A lot of tuition time is allocated to these literary genres; for instance, the EHL programme allocates double lessons for fifteen weeks to a novel, which is almost fifty percent of the subject's tuition time. In my opinion, fifteen weeks is too long for one text, unless if the actual reading of the text is carried out in the classroom.

It appears English language teachers in School A rely heavily on one textbook for each grade level, since the two learning programmes show one textbook as the only source of most of the teaching content, particularly reading comprehension texts. In both programmes, only one textbook title appears in each programme for most of the activities; unless if teachers do not strictly follow these learning programmes. Further, the two learning programmes also provide dates for portfolio tasks in each school term.
4.3.2 English language learning programmes from School B

The learning programmes from School B are completely different from those of School A despite the fact that these documents are drawn from exemplars in the same curriculum documents. The two programmes look almost similar in structure. The documents clearly show what is taught in each week as well as in each school term. The topics to be covered are outlined in a more detailed manner. Though the programmes do not provide aims for each topic, they are easy to follow since they specify what the teacher and learners do in each lesson. However, though the two programmes are a bit detailed compared to those of School A, it might still be a huge challenge for new English language teachers to follow them. The EHL learning programme states that three literary genres (a novel, drama, and poetry) are studied in the course of the year, while the EFAL learning programme shows only two literary genres for the year (a novel and poetry).

As in School A, the programme designers from School B also allocate a lot of time to the study of literary texts and poetry. The learning programmes also show that there is over reliance on specific textbooks for teaching content such as reading comprehension texts. However, there are instances where the two programmes state that teachers should consult other sources for teaching content such as newspapers and the internet, particularly for reading texts. The two programmes also clearly indicate portfolio tasks for each school term as well as the dates on which these tasks are conducted.

4.3.3 Discrepancies in the four learning programmes

The four learning programmes from the two schools clearly show that English language teachers lack proper guidance on how to design these important documents. Critical analysis of the four programmes shows that it is only when learners do portfolio tasks that they get the opportunity to practise skills such as extended writing and oral communication. The learning programmes appear to be assessment driven. To support my view, in a study conducted by Morrow (2007:95) on curriculum implementation in South Africa, it was found that learners ‘are constantly under the burden of knowing that everything they do will be assessed’ and that teachers are ‘driven to such a frenzy about assessment portfolios that they have little time to teach’. According to Kelly (2004:127) assessments are meant to support
the curriculum and not to be a ‘directive’ of curriculum provision. Further, besides reading the teacher-prescribed literary texts and non-literary texts in the classroom, the programmes do not show any other activities related to extensive reading outside the classroom. Other aspects of the language such as grammar do not appear in the programmes, particularly in the EFAL learning programmes, where the curriculum has allocated time specifically for teaching language structures. Instead, the programmes only indicate that ‘language’ will be done in context on the day when reading comprehension is done.

The four programmes are saturated with literary studies, particularly those for EHL, almost to the exclusion of other important aspects of the curriculum. However, it is not a mistake on the part of the teachers since these programmes are drawn from a curriculum which over-emphasises the study of literary texts (Umalusi, 2008, 2014). The programmes fail to strike a balance between literary studies and other important components of the curriculum such as reading for comprehension, the improvement of writing skills and language structures. There are absolutely no differences in the contents of the four programmes that explicitly separate EHL and EFAL, except the fact that there are only two literary genres in the EFAL programmes. In fact, one can effectively use the EFAL programme to teach EHL learners. This is clearly the inevitable result of imposing an ambiguous curriculum without clear implementation strategies.

There is clearly over-reliance on specific textbooks for learning content in the four programmes. This is probably due to the fact that teachers have limited powers in selecting textbooks of their own because the selection and supply of textbooks in South African public schools is controlled by schools and government officials who enter into business partnerships with textbook production companies (Spreen, Stark & Vally, 2014). Spreen et al (2014:7) argue that textbook provision in South African public schools is a highly commercialised issue, which results in untold levels of corruption, as textbook production companies continue to siphon public funds in their business partnerships with schools and the government. In other words, if schools and the government enter into business partnerships with particular publishing companies for the provision of textbooks, then teachers are stuck with the textbooks until such time when the partnership expires. Lamentably, teachers and learners are on the receiving end as they become subjects of the knowledge, culture and value
systems (Agger, 1991; Weedon, 1987) reproduced and transmitted in the textbooks as well as the neoliberal capitalist agenda of textbook entrepreneurs whose aim is to protect the interests of a few individuals at the expense of the public and to maximise profits through the exploitation of public institutions (Sreen et al (2014).

4.4 INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL EXAMINATIONS FOR ENGLISH

Internal examination question papers set by English language teachers in the two selected schools and external end of year and supplementary examination question papers for 2014 for both EHL and EFAL were analysed in this study. Analysis of these assessments was done in order to find out whether similar assessment standards are used in measuring academic proficiency in English language.

4.4.1 Internal examination question papers for English

Four Grade 11 English language internal examination question papers from the two schools were analysed; two EHL examination question papers and two EFAL examination question papers. All the tests were written at the end of first school term and they are supposedly a reflection of what was covered during the course of the term. Further, these internal tests are considered as important portfolio tasks for English language learners.

4.4.1.1 Internal examination question papers for English from School A

Each of the examination question papers analysed from School A had three sections. The time and marks allocated to the test papers were identical (2 hours) but the marks were not the same. The total marks for the tests are 80 for EHL and 70 for EFAL. The EHL test paper has a reading comprehension section, novel, and poetry sections, while the EFAL test paper has a reading comprehension section, drama and language sections. There is no section focusing specifically on language structures in the EHL test paper, except a few comprehension questions that test language in context. The two test papers also do not have the summary section. I was particularly impressed by the cover pages for the two test papers which display a detailed analysis grid showing the distribution of questions according to their level of difficulty, using Bloom’s Taxonomy of cognitive levels. However, a critical analysis of questions in the two test papers reveals that the examiners did not spread the
questions according to cognitive levels outlined in the Bloom’s Taxonomy of
cognitive levels.

Most comprehension and literature questions in these test papers are lower order
questions requiring only single word answers. The questions do not require the
application of higher cognitive and reasoning thinking skills. Comprehension
questions, particularly those in the EFAL test paper, appear to have the same
weighting despite their differences in cognitive demand. The reading comprehension
text for EHL is shorter than the lengths of reading texts suggested by the curriculum
for Grade 11 EHL learners. Further, I felt most of the poetry questions in the EHL
test paper were challenging for Grade 11 learners; the advanced language used in
phrasing the questions made most of the questions higher order questions in this
section of the test paper.

4.4.1.2 Internal examination question papers for English from School B

The two examination question papers from School B had three sections each, and
the questions were limited to a few components of the curriculum. There seems to
be some uniformity in the structure of the two test papers. The time and marks
allocated to both test papers were identical (1 hour 30 minutes and 70 marks). Both
test papers have a reading comprehension section, summary and language
sections. The lengths of the comprehension texts for the two test papers are way
above the lengths suggested by the English language curricula for Grade 11
learners. The only differences in the two test papers were that the comprehension
section in the EHL test paper carried more marks than that in the EFAL test paper,
and the language section in the EFAL test paper carried more marks than that in the
EHL test paper.

The language used in phrasing reading comprehension questions is at an
appropriate level and the questions were spread across all the cognitive levels
(according to the Bloom’s Taxonomy of cognitive levels), with marks allocated
appropriately to each question. However, there were no discernible differences in the
level of difficulty between reading comprehension questions of the two tests. In the
EHL test, learners have to write the summary in a paragraph form, while the EFAL
learners have to present the summary in point form. Different language structures
are tested in a variety of contexts in the language sections of both test papers.
4.4.2 Discrepancies in the internal examination question papers

It appears there are no common standards used to dictate the structure and content of internal examination question papers in schools. For instance, it seems schools do not assess the same curriculum components in each school term and each school has its own standards and style of setting test papers. This is probably because of the fact that the English language curricula do not provide clear guidelines on how teachers should design question papers and what precisely should be assessed in each school term. There is no section focusing particularly on writing (functional writing or extended writing) in all the analysed test papers. This simply means that learners are not assessed on extended writing in the first school term in the two schools, except in a few portfolio tasks where they are required to write essays. The examiners from School A compressed too many components of the curriculum in one paper; perhaps it would have been more reasonable if there were two separate question papers, one for testing reading comprehension, summary writing and language and another for literature.

Close analysis reveals that there is no correlation between what is being assessed in the test papers and what has been taught throughout the school term in School B, despite the fact that teachers who set the test papers are the same teachers who design learning programmes. Only three components of the curriculum are assessed (comprehension, summary and language) when a lot of topics are covered during the first term; for instance, literature. Further, it is quite confusing that there are no clear differences in the level of difficulty or cognitive depth between the EHL questions and EFAL questions in the internal tests from the two schools.

4.4.3 External examination question papers for English

Twelve Grade 12 English language external examination question papers for the period February/March 2014 and October/November 2014 were analysed in this study. These included four Paper 1 question papers, four Paper 2 question papers and four Paper 3 question papers, for both EHL and EFAL. A mere look at the external examination question papers for the two English courses might deceive one to think that these examinations are of the quality or that they use the same standards, simply because of the similarities in structure, the manner in which questions are sequenced as well as times and marks allocated for the examinations.
However, uniformity in appearance and quantity of questions in the examination papers and similarity in times and marks allocated to examinations do not necessarily mean the examinations are of the same quality or use the same standards. Quantity and appearance do not translate into quality. There are other important factors to consider that influence the quality and standard of a test paper, for example, the depth and quality of questions and the language used in phrasing the questions. Close analysis of the examination question papers reveals that there are differences in the terminology used in phrasing questions as well as the levels at which questions are pitched, which means a difference in cognitive demand. There are also disparities in the lengths of reading comprehension texts as well as the texts which learners are expected to produce during the examination. According to reading theorists such as Alderson (2000) and Chastain (1988) length contributes to the level of difficulty of a text as it influences the amount of interpretation required. It therefore means comprehension passages in the EFAL examination papers are deliberately made shorter in order to influence the examination’s level of difficulty.

4.4.3.1 English Language Paper 1

Paper 1 consists of three sections; the comprehension section, the summary section and language section. Despite the similarities in the structure of the Paper 1 question papers for EHL and EFAL as well as the time and marks allocated to these examinations, a closer look at the examination papers revealed that there are huge differences in the quality of responses that the two groups of learners are expected to produce because of the differences in the quality of questions asked. The EHL reading comprehension texts are much longer and more challenging than the EFAL reading comprehension texts. Further, an analysis of questions reveals that EHL questions are pitched at a higher level because of the way the questions are phrased. The language used for EFAL questions is much simpler, making the questions not as challenging.

EFAL learners are only required to present the summary in point form, while EHL learners are given an option to either present the summary as a fluent paragraph or in point form. This simply means EFAL learners are limited to one way of writing a summary, which also appears to be the easier option. In my understanding, there is a huge difference between a summary in a fluent paragraph and a summary in point
form. Clearly, presenting a summary in a fluent and meaningful paragraph is more cognitively demanding than simply listing points. Restricting EFAL learners to a particular type of summary question is merely another strategy by the examiners intended to make learners pass (Coetzee & Johl, 2009).

Further, the language sections in the Paper 1 question papers of EFAL carry more marks compared to the language sections in the EHL question papers. Confusingly, a closer look at the questions revealed striking similarities in the reading texts used in the language sections of all the Paper 1 question papers of the two English language courses, as well as in the manner in which questions were structured.

4.4.3.2 English Language Paper 2

In my analysis of the Paper 2 question papers for the two English language courses, quite a lot of interesting points for discussion emerged. The Paper 2 question papers for EFAL are ridiculously thick thirty-eight page documents with sixteen questions each, on four literary genres. Learners are expected to respond only to any two questions from such a wide choice of questions. Though there are two types of literary questions in the paper (essay and contextual) from four literary genres (novel, drama, short stories and poetry) learners can avoid essay type questions and other genres since the instructions simply state that learners should answer any two questions. In fact, there are no instructions to ensure that learners respond to both contextual and essay type questions. What this simply means is that an EFAL learner can actually complete high school and proceed to tertiary education after having studied only two literary genres and without having written any literary essay. In my view, some experienced EFAL teachers who are aware of this loophole are likely to prefer concentrating only on particular literary genres, thus consequently deciding in advance of the examination which literary genres learners will have to respond to, and which literary genres to avoid. Similarly, some teachers might decide to concentrate on coaching their learners to answering particular types of literary questions. For example, teaching only contextual type of questions and avoid teaching essay type questions since such questions are usually more cognitively demanding and quite a challenge to learners.

There is nothing wrong with having a wide choice of questions in a question paper, however it does not make logical sense for the EFAL examination paper to contain
so many literary genres and questions whereas learners have to respond to only two questions from two genres. The curriculum presents a wide range of literary genres for learners to study while on one hand it deprives them of the opportunity to be assessed on these genres in external examinations by limiting them only to two genres. Further, most essay and contextual questions in the EFAL question papers (whether on a novel, play or poetry) seem to be lower order questions because of the use of simple terms such as ‘Discuss’, ‘Explain’, ‘State’, ‘Identify’ or ‘Describe’ as markers of cognitive depth. In some instances, learners are required to match statements from column A with those in column B or to answer multiple choice questions.

In the EHL Paper 2 question papers analysed, learners are required to choose five questions from sixteen questions, which is also a very wide choice, nonetheless a reasonable one. However, the paper is designed in a way that learners respond to questions on all three literary genres (novel, drama and poetry). Unlike the EFAL Paper 2, instructions on the EHL paper clearly state that learners have to respond to at least one essay type question and one contextual type question, making it mandatory for them to answer literary essay questions. The paper is more cognitively challenging because most questions are pitched at a much higher level and require higher cognitive and reasoning skills. Higher order terms such as ‘Examine’, ‘Comment’, ‘Comment critically’, ‘Account for’ and ‘Critically discuss’ are used as markers of cognitive depth. Though most EHL learners are taught how to respond to such questions, an average learner might find it difficult to understand some of the terms and phrases used in question papers.

4.4.3.3 English Language Paper 3

In the Paper 3 question papers analysed, it emerged that the examination questions for the two English courses are pitched almost at the same level and the marks and times allocated to the examinations are the same. There are also similarities in the way the papers are structured. The only visible differences in these examination question papers are the lengths of responses that learners are expected to produce. It is quite confusing to note that EHL learners are required to write twice as much as what EFAL learners are required to write within the same examination time.
It is therefore clear that the standards of examination questions for the EFAL examination papers are highly flawed and that they do not reflect the highly overstated curriculum and assessment objectives stated in the English language CAPS. The discourses of high standards in the EFAL curriculum are clearly inconsistent with the standards of the EFAL examinations.

4.5 EXPERIENCES AND PERSPECTIVES OF TEACHERS

The four English language teachers expressed a lot of different views about teaching English language as well as learners in the FET phase. In my exploration of the experiences and perspectives of the four teachers, a lot of interesting points emerged, and these are discussed under various themes below:

4.5.1 Approaches to teaching English language

One of the aims of interviewing the four teachers was to find out the approaches they use to teach English language. In responding to various questions relating to approaches to teaching English language, Teacher 1 could not clearly explain if there are any differences or similarities in the way the two English language curricula should be taught in the FET phase. Instead, the teacher simply stated that EFAL teachers ‘cannot teach’ EHL learners. The teacher stated that she has never taught EFAL. However, to my surprise, she stressed with confidence that EHL standards are ‘advanced’, when she actually did not know the standards used in the subject.

Teacher 2 could not provide clear answers to questions about teaching approaches; instead, she went on to describe how EHL teachers were more creative than EFAL teachers simply because she believes they can manipulate the language. In her understanding, the approaches to teaching EHL are different from the approaches to teaching EFAL because of the fact that EHL teachers focus on literature and poetry and not grammar or ‘the language itself’ and EFAL teachers focus more on ‘the language itself’. Such a response is a clear indication that the teacher has a vague understanding of what teaching approaches entail.

Teacher 3 teaches both EHL and EFAL in the FET phase. In her responses to questions about teaching approaches, she stated that there are differences in the way the two subjects are taught. She explained that when she became an English language teacher, she only taught EFAL and that it took her time to teach EHL
because of the differences in teaching approaches. One wonders which approaches she was referring to since approaches to teaching both English language courses are the same in the two English language curricula. The teacher further stressed that EFAL focuses more on language, while EHL focuses more on literature.

Teacher 4 refused to answer questions on approaches to teaching the two English language curricula; instead, she told me that the EHL teacher was in a better position to answer such questions. I gathered from her response that perhaps she believes that the EHL teacher might know better about teaching approaches, simply because she teaches EHL and EFAL in the school. However, later on in the interview, the teacher contradicted herself by implicitly suggesting that there are differences in teaching the two English language curricula:

‘On my side I think it’s far more different to teach Home Language. Their syllabus is too long’ (Teacher 4).

Though the differences in curriculum content might be another issue for this teacher, the implication from her statement is that EHL is taught differently from EFAL.

The various views discussed above clearly show that the four English language teachers have very little understanding of the approaches to teaching EHL and EFAL outlined in the CAPS documents. Some of them seem to confuse teaching approaches and subject content, hence they spoke about what is taught in each subject. This is also a clear indication that teachers do not give themselves time to read the CAPS documents. To corroborate my argument, a study conducted by Morrow (2007) on the implementation of Curriculum 2005, found that the teachers’ rhetoric of teaching methods and approaches revealed their lack of understanding of the curriculum and contradicted their classroom practices. Possible reasons could be; either these teachers do not understand the CAPS or they do not see the importance of reading the documents. The challenge is that English language is not a content-based subject such as, for instance, Science or Geography (Umalusi, 2014). As long as teachers know which literary genres and literary texts to study, they can teach as they wish throughout the year without making any reference to the finer details of the curriculum.
Data reveal that there is clearly a wide gap between policy and practice or between curriculum intention and reality. According to Stenhouse (1980b:31), it is not unusual in educational practices that there are wide gaps between a curriculum and the realities of its implementation because the norm has been that a curriculum is simply a set of ‘hypothetical’ specifications drawn from mere research and not from real situations and practical teachers’ experiences. South Africa has experienced too many changes in curriculum development from 1994 (Hove & Maruma, 2014) and according to Stenhouse (1980b:31), such changes make teachers become ‘suspicious’ of the curriculum and its intentions. Thus if teachers have doubts about the ‘credibility’ of a curriculum, they choose to ‘avoid, subvert or reject it in various ways’. Further, Weber (2008:25) maintains that old and experienced teachers in particular, are likely to resist curriculum reform that is aimed at ‘altering teachers’ pedagogical assumptions, teaching methods, classroom organisation and assessment strategies’ as well as some traditional classroom practices.

4.5.2 Selection of teaching and learning material

The four teachers expressed different views on how they select their teaching and learning material, particularly reading and viewing texts (both literary and non-literary texts). Interestingly, none of the four teachers made reference to the guidelines in the English language CAPS documents in their selection of reading and viewing texts. It was clear from the responses of the four teachers that their choice of reading and viewing texts depends on their discretion and other contextual factors and not the guidelines outlined in the English language curriculum. However, one would not be quick to blame teachers for not mentioning the curriculum as a guideline since there are no other guidelines in the documents besides the suggested lengths of reading texts and Bloom's Taxonomy. The liberal choices of these teachers amount to another form of resistance to and avoidance of an ambiguous curriculum (Stenhouse, 1980b; Webber, 2008).

The views of the four teachers varied on what determines the appropriateness of a reading text, particularly non-literary texts for Grade 11 learners. Teacher 1 stated that her choice of reading material for her Grade 11 learners depended much on the availability of resources. She also mentioned that she chooses what she believes will ‘appeal’ to learners. Teacher 2 stated that she chooses texts from any sources that
‘relate to the learners’ lives’, but she did not mention the kinds of sources she gets the texts from. The teacher further stated that she does not consider length as a criterion for selecting a reading text; in her view, what is important is to set ‘challenging comprehension questions’. Teacher 3 stated that she uses current newspapers for reading texts and that she tries to select texts that are appropriate for the level of her learners. Teacher 4 reported that she selects reading and viewing texts from sources such as magazines and current newspapers and that she looks for the kinds of texts which learners enjoy reading. The teacher stressed that the best texts are those that are ‘not too difficult or too easy for learners’. However, the teacher stressed that it is quite a difficult task to find reading pieces that are appropriate for the level of learners. Surprisingly, none of the four teachers mentioned the use of textbooks as sources for non-literary texts, though all the internally designed learning programmes show over-reliance on specific text-books for content, particularly reading comprehension texts; unless if this means that these teachers do not strictly follow their own learning programmes.

The four teachers stated that their Grade 11 English language classes were studying literary texts as indicated in their learning programmes. However, it was clear from some of their responses that it was not their responsibility to select literary texts for their learners. It appears it is largely the responsibility of the school and English heads of department to select texts from the list provided by the DBE. For instance, one of the teachers stated that the Grade 11 learners in her school have been studying the same literary texts for many years and she did not know who actually selected the texts. Instead of being agents of change (Canagarajah, 1999a), these teachers have succumbed to such institutional practices that disempower them, making them subjects of ‘discourses of self-declared authorities’ (Kramsch, 2012:483). I believe teachers should have a voice in decisions, particularly on the selection of literary texts that they teach.

4.5.3 Setting of internal examinations for English

In answering questions regarding the process of setting internal examinations, all the teachers reported that they rely on Blooms’ Taxonomy or Barrett’s Taxonomy of cognitive levels as their only guide. It was surprising that none of the teachers mentioned the English language CAPS documents or the previous national
examination question papers as points of reference in setting examinations. For example, Teacher 2 stated:

‘According to the Bloom's Taxonomy, we ensure that we set higher order questions and lower order questions’ (Teacher 2).

This is clearly an indication that there are no other known standards used by teachers in setting internal examinations, other than the Bloom’s Taxonomy of cognitive levels. However, contrary to the teachers’ rhetoric of the Bloom’s Taxonomy of cognitive levels, most internal test papers analysed reveal lack of understanding of the taxonomy. Possibly, the only reason for teachers to mention Bloom’s Taxonomy, which they do not even understand, might be the fact that it is overemphasised in the curriculum as an alternative guide for setting tests. However, scholars such as Kelly (2004) critique the hierarchical order of questions that follows taxonomies such as that of Bloom, that they do not reflect the realities of the learning process. Kelly (2004) argues that real learning is a complex developmental process rather than a simple linear process.

Generally, the four teachers seem to believe that the standards for setting EHL tests should be high and that questions should be more challenging compared to EFAL. For example, Teacher 1 firmly stated from her experience, assessments and examinations for EFAL learners are ‘shorter and a bit easier’ (Interview with Teacher 1). Such a statement reveals that the teacher perceives EFAL as an inferior English course compared to EHL.

Teacher 4 stated that she ensures that her test papers ‘accommodate’ all learners. The teacher reported that she includes ‘advanced’ questions in test papers to accommodate ‘clever’ learners. In other words, ‘advanced’ questions in her test papers are only meant for ‘clever’ learners and therefore, those who are not ‘clever’ have their own share of simple questions in the same question paper (Interview with Teacher 4). It appears the teacher sets test papers already with fixed perceptions and labels of learners in mind, that is, those who are ‘clever’ and those who are ‘not clever’. According to Moyo et al (2010), this kind of thinking implies a hierarchised conception of testing; the kind of perceptions which perpetuate discrimination by assuming and ascertaining learners’ abilities.
It is clearly evident that the teachers view tests as tools that enable them to ‘differentiate and judge’ learners (MacNamara, 2012a:565) rather than instruments for assessing and evaluating learner competence and knowledge gaps. The notions that standards for EHL tests should be higher compared to EFAL and that EFAL tests should be shorter and easier undermines EFAL learners and reduces them to novices without potential to accomplish higher levels of competence in the language (Ortmeier-Hooper, 2008). However, such discourses are reinforced by the DBE, evidenced by the difference in quality of the external examinations for the two English language courses (refer to the analyses of external examination question papers). Further, the notion of having advanced questions in a test, only with the view of accommodating intelligent learners, amounts to a subjective practice since the tester deliberately erects boundaries to deny a particular group of people access to particular forms of knowledge (Shohamy, 2001). It is for this reason that scholars such as MacNamara (2012a) and Makoni and Pennycook (2005) describe tests as one of those discrete forms of discrimination that subject individuals to the whims of the tester.

4.5.4 English language proficiency levels of learners

It was interesting to note that the four English language teachers expressed similar views about the proficiency levels of English learners. The teachers stated that they do not see any differences in proficiency levels of EHL and EFAL learners. Teacher 1 stated that proficiency in English language largely depends on the individual learner, the quality of English language the learner is exposed to and ‘a whole range of other social contexts’ (Interview with Teacher 1). The teacher further stated that in her experience as an English language teacher, she has seen a lot of EFAL learners who display higher levels of proficiency in English compared to EHL learners. Teacher 2 echoed the same sentiments stating that there are some learners in her school who are highly proficient in English, yet they are not home language speakers of the language.

Teacher 3 stressed that one of the aims of her school is to place those who are more proficient in English in EHL classrooms, though this becomes a difficult process since some learners come from multilingual communities and have more than one home language, with English being one of them.
Below are some interesting responses from three teachers from the two schools:

‘...sometimes you find very bright learners in a First Additional Language class but then you find learners who perform very badly in a Home Language classes’ (Teacher 2).

‘There is no real difference. We have those who are Afrikaans speaking but taking English as a Home Language and they are good and we have those speaking African languages at home who are also very good in English Home Language’ (Teacher 4).

‘But I think with proper teaching everyone can make it ...’ (Teacher 3).

From the responses above, one may conclude that it is not only the so-called ‘native speakers’ of English who are more proficient in the language; there are also non-native English speakers who show higher proficiency in English. Further, as I have argued elsewhere in the discussion, being a native English speaker does not mean one spontaneously possesses cognitive academic skills which are usually used to gauge one’s proficiency levels in the language (Cummins, 2000; Hakuta & Butler, 2006; Posel & Zeller, 2010). In other words, being a native speaker of a language cannot be a deciding factor in achieving higher levels of proficiency in the language. Another point stressed by the three teachers is that any English learner can potentially achieve higher proficiency levels in the language, provided they are ‘willing’ to do so and they are given the necessary support. This means that there are some learners who achieve low levels of proficiency in English because they do not have the will to learn the language; they learn the language probably because they do not have any other choice.

**4.5.5 Perspectives of teachers on separate teaching of English language**

The four teachers expressed different views on teaching English separately as a Home Language and First Additional Language during interviews. Teacher 1 stated that she does not really understand the difference between the EHL curriculum and the EFAL curriculum despite her vast experience in teaching the language in the FET phase. The teacher stated that she has never taught EFAL hence she is not familiar with what happens in the EFAL classroom. Interestingly, the teacher later pointed out that she is aware of the huge differences between the two English
language courses and that the ‘requirements’ for EFAL are ‘inferior’ compared to those of EHL. Though the teacher acknowledges the disparities in the two English language courses, she believes that it is necessary to maintain the two courses as separate subjects.

Teacher 2 reported that it is not necessary to have two separate English language courses (EHL and EFAL). The teacher stated that she is aware of the differences between the two English language courses. She believes the EFAL curriculum is ‘too easy’ compared to the EHL curriculum (Interview with Teacher 2). In her opinion, all learners in high school should be taught EHL. She further pointed out that EFAL learners ‘struggle’ when they get to tertiary education because the curriculum does not adequately prepare them for academic standards expected in tertiary institutions.

Teacher 3 showed greater understanding of the two English language curricula as she made reference to some of the finer details of the documents. This is probably due to the fact that the teacher teaches both English language courses in the FET phase. Of particular interest was her reference to the different ‘suggested’ lengths of reading and writing texts of the two courses. The fact that EHL requires more reading and writing, and that there are differences in the weightings used in assessments of the two courses. The teacher is also aware of the fact that EFAL emphasises the mastery of language. According to the teacher, ‘genuine’ EHL learners will be bored if they were to learn in the same classroom with EFAL learners (Interview with Teacher 3). In her opinion, there are certain ‘things’ taught in EFAL classrooms which are ‘common knowledge’ to EHL learners (Interview with Teacher 3). However, the teacher acknowledged the fact that EHL classrooms do not always consist of EHL speakers in her school as expected, which ironically contradicts her perception of a ‘genuine’ EHL learner.

Teacher 4 stated that she was quite aware of the fact that EHL is ‘more advanced and difficult’, and that EFAL is an ‘easier option’ for learners (Interview with Teacher 4). The teacher stressed the importance of having the two English language courses in schools. According to the teacher, the EHL curriculum was designed for ‘brighter’ learners who are highly proficient in English, and therefore, those who are not that proficient in the language should learn EFAL. Though the DBE (2011a & b) states that the difference between the two curricula is simply the ‘levels of proficiency’ in
English, the teacher might be implying that the EFAL curriculum was intentionally crafted to accommodate learners who are generally struggling in school, and not necessarily in the language. The teacher also seemed to associate proficiency and competence in English with intelligence, a myth perpetuated by native speakers of English (Canagarjah, 1999b; Ulate, 2011).

It is, however, not surprising to hear such views from the teachers. The government’s intention of introducing EFAL, which is clearly a simple version of EHL, was to ensure en masse accessibility of English by the previously marginalised groups as English was viewed as a barrier to economic and employment opportunities and further education for the previously marginalised (Kamwangamalu, 2003; Soudien, 2004). However, despite the government’s discourses glorifying the so-called improved English performance in schools (Coetzee & Johl, 2009), the separate teaching of English as a Home Language and First Additional Language has had other unintended consequences. Separate teaching of English seemingly sustains discourses of superiority and inferiority which perpetuate segregation and subjectivity in schools (Breen, 1999). Further, as attested by the teachers, it is not an opinionated claim that EFAL is an inferior English course; EFAL ironically grants learners access to mediocrity and denies learners full access to advanced English language knowledge (Janks, 2004; Mahboob, 2005).

4.5.6 Is there an ideal English language teacher? The teachers’ perspectives

One of the purposes of conducting interviews with the four English language teachers was to establish how teachers perceive themselves as either ‘EHL teachers’ or ‘EFAL teachers’ as well as what they perceive to be an ideal English language teacher. Teacher 2, (the youngest amongst the four teachers) believes that there is nothing like an ‘ideal’ English language teacher. The teacher stated that she is not a native English language speaker but she teaches English and considers herself a competent English language teacher. She pointed out that anyone can teach English language as long as they are ‘passionate’ about the language (Interview with Teacher 2). According to the teacher, one does not need to be a native speaker of English to teach English. The teacher stressed that there are many competent non-native teachers of English and that there is nothing wrong with such teachers teaching EHL learners. She further argued that there are no differences
between EHL teachers and EFAL teachers; in her opinion, it is only up to the individual teacher to decide which English language curriculum to teach.

Teacher 1 emphatically and firmly stated that one needs to be a mother tongue speaker of English for them to teach English. The teacher believes that mother-tongue speakers of English are ‘good models of accent and pronunciation’ for learners (Interview with Teacher 1). Though the teacher boasts of many years of teaching experience, it was surprising to learn that she still believes EFAL teachers ‘cannot’ and ‘should not’ teach EHL learners and that EHL teachers ‘should not’ teach EFAL learners (Interview with Teacher 1). Below is her response when asked whether she could teach EFAL:

‘Aaa…I would die if I were to teach English First Additional Language’ (Teacher 1).

During the interview, Teacher 1 hardly showed any understanding of the two English language curricula, precisely that approaches to teaching the two English language courses are the same. It appears the teacher still subscribes to English native speaker perceptions and myths which portray native speakers of English as an exclusive group of authentic speakers of English, and those who are non-native speakers of English as simply periphery speakers (Canagarajah, 1999b; Jenkins, 2006; Kachru, 1986; Moussu & Llurda, 2008). Such perceptions and discourses perpetuate misconceptions that non-native teachers of English will never be at par with native teachers of English, regardless of their experience and level of education. Medgyes (1992:346) argues that it is not only one’s relationship with the language that makes one a competent teacher of the language but variables such as ‘experience, aptitude, charisma, motivation and training’ also play a decisive role in the teacher’s competence in teaching a language such as English.

It was not so easy for Teacher 4 to describe qualities of her ‘ideal’ English language teacher. However, after a few probing questions, the teacher stated that it should be someone who ‘loves’ literature (Interview with Teacher 4). In her opinion, it is not everyone who can become a teacher of English. The teacher believes that one does not necessarily have to be a native speaker of English to teach English. She emphasised the fact that English has now become a ‘universal’ language; therefore, what is important is for one to develop ‘passion’ for the language in order to teach it
(Interview with Teacher 4). Further, the teacher pointed out that there are no differences between EHL teachers and EFAL teachers; in her opinion, what is important is for the teacher to be competent and to possess ‘appropriate skills and knowledge’ (Interview with Teacher 4). Surprisingly, the teacher later contradicted herself when she stated that non-native teachers of English are not capable of teaching EHL learners. In her opinion, non-native teachers of English lack the necessary knowledge and skills required in teaching EHL learners. She believes that EHL learners might know more than the teacher. Though the teacher has a different opinion of what constitutes a competent teacher of English, it appears her perceptions of ‘an ideal’ English language teacher are to some extent influenced by English native-teacher myths (Canagarajah, 1999b).

According to Teacher 3, a ‘perfect’ example of a teacher of English should be someone who is ‘passionate’ about the language (Interview with Teacher 3). The teacher believes that a teacher of English should be somebody who ‘loves to see learners speaking English properly’ in any given situation. When asked whether it was necessary for one to be a native speaker of English for them to teach English, the teacher responded:

‘Ok, I think it’s very important but not absolutely essential’ (Teacher 3).

The above response is laden with a lot of hidden meaning. What one can deduce from the statement is that though it might be an advantage for those who wish to be English language teachers to be native speakers of English; this cannot be used as a criterion to evaluate the teacher’s competence in teaching the language. In other words, the teacher means that anyone can become an English language teacher regardless of their relationship with the language. Further, the teacher stressed the importance of ‘passion’ and ‘willingness’ to teach the language for those who wish to be English teachers (Interview with Teacher 3). She believes that an English language teacher should not be forced to teach any English language curriculum, particularly the EHL curriculum, especially if the teacher is not confident and not highly proficient in English. In other words, the teacher simply means that EHL is challenging and hence some teachers might not be confident and comfortable in teaching the curriculum. Further, her response below implies that there are differences between EHL teachers and EFAL teachers:
‘I started as a FAL teacher, now I teach Home Language. It takes some time for someone to learn the different approaches’ (Teacher 3).

It is a bit confusing what the teacher actually meant by ‘different approaches’ and why it takes time for one to learn these ‘different approaches’ because the approaches to teaching the two English language courses are the same in the two English language curricula (Interview with Teacher 3). This is clearly an indication that the teacher does not understand what ‘teaching approaches’ entail. This clearly indicates that the teacher confuses teaching approaches with subject content.

It appears it is only the younger English language teachers who seem to understand the English language CAPS and what English language teaching actually involves both in EHL and EFAL classrooms. The older and more experienced English language teachers who participated in the study seem to have created some kind of barrier and territory around them and they seem less interested in knowing what is happening in other English language classrooms. Some of them have become too comfortable and complacent in their zones and appear to have developed some kind of resistance to any changes in the system. This is probably caused by English language teaching-related myths and lack of understanding of the current changes in the English language curricula.

It is surprising to learn that experienced English language teachers are unaware of the glaring similarities in the two CAPS documents, and in particular, the approaches to teaching the two English language courses. To them, the two English language curricula are unrelated and they require specialist teachers. Further, these teachers, particularly those who teach EHL, appear to be influenced by Canagarajah’s (1999b) English native-speaker fallacies as well as perceptions that English language societies constitute Kachru’s (1986) Centre and Periphery speakers of English. That is, native speakers of English are very different from non-native speakers of English. To be precise, these teachers perceive native teachers of English as more superior and as masters of the language (in terms of subject knowledge) than non-native teachers of English, regardless of their level of education. It is also interesting to note that the teachers emphasise ‘passion’ and ‘willingness’ as important qualities for teachers who wish to teach English and little emphasis is made on the importance of teacher training and education.
4.5.7 Which English language curriculum for which English language learner?

The four teachers expressed interesting views on how their schools deal with the issue of placing learners in English language classes. Before conducting interviews with the four teachers, I had a lot of speculations on how schools might be dealing with the complex task of placing learners in appropriate English classes. I thought schools either allow learners to choose the appropriate English language curriculum or schools simply group learners and decide which English language curriculum was appropriate for them or perhaps schools simply decide which learners are suitable for which English language curriculum. I had these speculations because I have never heard of any high school that uses a particular system to assess and evaluate the learners’ levels of proficiency in English before placing them. However, the four teachers shared a lot of different systems adopted by their schools in placing learners, and these are explored below. The four teachers also gave a lot of interesting ideas and reasons on who should learn and under which English language curriculum.

Teacher 2 pointed out that it was difficult to tell which learner should learn under which particular English language curriculum, mainly in her school. The teacher stated that most learners in her school are not home language speakers of English yet they learn EHL. The teacher reported that other learners believe that EHL is appropriate for them simply because they can ‘speak’ the language (Interview with Teacher 2). However, later in the interview, the teacher pointed out that most learners learning EHL in her school show higher levels of proficiency, regardless of the fact that they are not native speakers of English. Teacher 1 stated that the issue of choosing an English language curriculum puts learners in quite a ‘difficult position’ (Interview with Teacher 1). According to the teacher, a better solution to this problem is to simply make it mandatory for all learners to learn EHL and do away with EFAL.

Teacher 3 believes that the EHL curriculum is only appropriate for learners who speak English at home, and that the EFAL curriculum was designed for ‘everybody else’ who is not a home language speaker of English (Interview with Teacher 3). The teacher stated that she is aware that things do not always happen as expected at her school, that is, EHL classes in her school do not always consist of EHL speakers. The teacher further stressed that the learner’s choice of an English language
curriculum has no effect on the learner’s performance; she believes what is important is proper instruction in the classroom. Teacher 4 believes that EHL is more ‘advanced’ and ‘difficult’ than EFAL (Interview with Teacher 4). According to the teacher, learners who ‘love’ English, and not necessarily those who are native speakers of the language, should be admitted into EHL classes. However, it is not clear what the teacher precisely meant by ‘love’ of English. Further, she pointed out that anyone can learn under the EHL curriculum, even though it is a ‘challenging’ course (Interview with Teacher 4).

In my bid to find out how the two schools place learners in different English language classes, it was interesting to note that teachers from School A gave conflicting statements on who decides which English language course a learner should study. According to Teacher 2, parents and their children who come to the school prefer EHL. In other words, learners and their parents are actively involved in making decisions. Seemingly, most learners and their parents in this school prefer EHL, not because they are native speakers of the language, but simply because of the status associated with the curriculum. The teacher further stressed that the school does not force any learner into any English language course. On the contrary, Teacher 1 firmly stated that learners do not have much choice because the school places them into classes and decides which English language course a particular class should study. This contradiction is a clear indication that there is no system in place in the school used as a guideline in placing learners into appropriate English language classes. In my opinion, it is either the two teachers are not aware of what is happening in the school or perhaps they were simply giving their own speculations on how the school might be dealing with the issue of placing learners. Unfortunately, I could not get the school management’s perspective on the issue though the school’s current language policy states that the school does not ‘use language competence as an admission criterion’. It is not clear whether it is ‘admission’ to the school in general or ‘admission’ into language classes.

English language teachers from School B stated that it was up to learners and their parents to decide which English language course to study. They reported that the school’s responsibility was simply to give advice to learners and parents, particularly if the learner’s English results from the previous grades are not that good. However, some parents insist that their child must learn EHL, regardless of the child’s
performance in English. The two teachers mentioned that many white Afrikaner learners, who are the majority in the school, prefer to learn Afrikaans Home Language and EFAL. Most Black African learners in the school learn EHL because they do not have any other choice; English is the only language offered at the school which is closer to a mother language to them. In my opinion, it makes logical sense for white Afrikaner learners to prefer Afrikaans Home Language than EHL due to the fact that Afrikaans still occupies a powerful place in academia, business and the economy in South Africa (Meier & Hartell, 2009). It is also a point worth mentioning that the white Afrikaner learners’ decision of learning EFAL does not disadvantage them in any way. Be socially or academically, Afrikaans is still used as a language of instruction in some tertiary institutions in the country.

In my preliminary discussions with the head of department of English in School B, I learned that the school had only recently adopted English as a language of instruction. I requested for a copy of the school’s language policy but was informed that the school was still working on a new policy. I realised that the school is one of those that did not heed the call to embrace desegregation but preferred the resistance route possibly as a reaction to the imminent threat of English as a dominant language of instruction (Soudien, 2004). Further, the school might have as well used the Language in Education Policy (Government of the Republic of South Africa, 1997) to justify its position; that the school and community as a collective were comfortable in maintaining Afrikaans as the only language of instruction. Possibly, the unpronounced agenda of this school was to attract only Afrikaans speaking learners thereby preventing non-Afrikaans speaking learners from enrolling at the school, though this has not stopped non-Afrikaans speaking parents from taking their children to the school. It is clear that the desegregation process created a lot of challenges related to language teaching and learning, challenges which the Language in Education Policy does not adequately address (Banks, 2006; Meier & Hartell, 2009), and hence some schools such as School B, take advantage of the confusion.

4.6 ACTUAL PRACTICES IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE CLASSROOMS

Numerous classroom observations were conducted to examine the ways in which English language is taught in the FET phase in the two selected schools. I was
particularly interested in finding out the actual teaching and learning practices in EHL and EFAL classrooms. These include teaching methods and approaches employed by teachers, teaching and learning content used and the English language proficiency levels and other linguistic behaviours of English language learners. Eight observations were done in four Grade 11 English language classrooms in the two schools; two in each selected classroom. In School A, the two lessons observed in the EHL classroom were on reading comprehension and parts of speech, while the two lessons observed in the EFAL classroom were on poetry and parts of speech. In School B, the two lessons observed in the EHL classroom were on poetry and reading comprehension, while the two lessons observed in the EFAL classroom were on parts of speech and poetry. In School A, lessons lasted for thirty-five minutes, while in School B, lessons lasted for forty minutes. A lot of interesting things were noted during the observations and they are discussed under different themes below.

4.6.1 Teaching methods and approaches used by teachers

The two English language CAPS state that the approaches to teaching English language should be text-based, communicative, integrated and process oriented (DBE, 2011a & b). However, it was interesting to note that the four teachers, whether for EHL or EFAL, relied heavily only on one teaching approach, the much emphasised communicative approach and disregarded the other teaching approaches suggested in the two curricula. In all the lessons observed, the teachers over-used discussion in the form of ‘questions and answers’ as a teaching technique. It was also confusing to note that some teachers rely on discussion as the only technique or method for teaching abstract texts such as a poem.

In one EHL lesson, the teacher used a game as an approach to teach direct and indirect speech. The game was an interesting communicative activity and learners enjoyed it in the beginning. However, the game later became monotonous as it was the only activity in the lesson. The teacher did not write any examples of direct and indirect speech on the board and learners never wrote anything in their note books; it was simply a language game without clear purpose. As an English language teacher myself, I realised that a lot of opportunities were being missed during this language lesson; the teacher could have explained a lot of rules and concepts during the
game. Further, the fact that nothing was written on the board to demonstrate the rules of writing direct and reported speech means that learners still did not acquire the skill of presenting the parts of speech in written form. At the end of the lesson, I wondered whether the teacher had properly planned for the lesson.

The data revealed that most of the lessons observed were teacher-centred. Though some of the lessons were generally communicative in nature, teachers could not give learners the opportunity to discuss concepts amongst themselves or to share ideas as a group. The lessons were characterised by excessive teacher-talk and less learner-activity. For instance, in one of the EFAL poetry lessons, the teacher read the poem aloud and learners were never given an opportunity to read the poem silently. After reading, the teacher then asked the learners a few questions to test whether they understood the poem. A few of them responded, but with incorrect answers. When the teacher realised that learners probably had not understood the poem, she decided to interpret the poem the way she understood it. Some bright learners could not agree with the teacher’s explanations and started asking clarity-seeking questions. To my surprise, the teacher quickly rejected their questions and opinions. It appears the teacher did not expect learners to question her interpretation of the poem. According to Hoadley (2011), the existence of teacher-centred lessons in post-apartheid classrooms in South Africa is a clear indication of continued existence of authoritarian pedagogical philosophy of the apartheid regime, where emphasis was placed on drill and little elaboration of concepts and skills, particularly in township schools. Learners were regarded as ‘ignorant and undisciplined and strong control was exerted over knowing, knowledge and knowers’ (Hoadley, 2011:144). In many South African public schools, it is common practice that teachers ‘walk into a classroom with a textbook and no lesson plan and hope to anchor the lesson on spontaneity’ and if that fails, the teachers then revert to a less stressful, but authoritative style, the teacher-talk style (Moyo et al, 2010:35).

The teaching methods and approaches used by the teachers in all lessons observed were biased towards the development of only one skill, precisely oral communication, neglecting other important skills such as writing and the mastery of language knowledge. Most of the lessons became monotonous because of the overuse of discussion and lacked learners’ motivation. All the teachers did not give learners anything to write. In fact, there was hardly any note book in front of learners
in any of the classes observed. Teachers themselves did not write or demonstrate anything on the board. Such teaching practices are inconsistent with English language CAPS principles, which emphasise the integration of all language learning skills (DBE, 2011a & b).

In the reading comprehension lessons observed, learners were given very little time to read. Instead, teachers rushed into discussion of comprehension questions, and in some instances, teachers themselves were providing answers to the questions. In all the comprehension lessons, learners were never given the opportunity to discuss the texts. The lessons generally lacked focus and substance and it is unlikely that learners gained any comprehension skills out of them. I felt that there was a need for teachers to stimulate creative thinking in learners as well as allowing them to take some form control of the learning process. It appears the four teachers, like many other incompetent English language teachers in South Africa (Granville, 2001), do not view comprehension as part of the reading process and clearly do not understand the purpose of teaching reading comprehension (Klapwijk, 2015). Granville (2001) adds that reading is an active and purposeful process where readers have to construct meaning by participating in a series of interactions with the text and not simply an exercise for answering questions. According to Granville (2001:14) ‘the comprehension question imprisons learners in thoughtless reading practices and actually stops them from understanding and responding to texts’.

Contrary to the claims of some of the four teachers (that the two English courses are different and that there are different approaches to teaching the two curricula), it was interesting to note that all of them (whether for EHL or EFAL) generally used the same teaching approaches, particularly those who taught similar topics. Their discourses about the teaching of English are inconsistent with what they actually practise in the classroom. These inconsistencies point to the lack understanding of the English curriculum and what English pedagogy entails. Because of the institutional discourses deliberately perpetuated to create discriminatory divisions between native and non-native speakers of English (Canagarajah, 1999a) in schools, teachers have been swayed to believe that EHL and EFAL are unrelated courses that require specific approaches and methods (Kumaravadilevu, 2003), yet in practice they cannot distinguish between their ‘imagined’ methods or approaches.
4.6.2 English language proficiency levels displayed by learners

I was fascinated by the high levels of English oral proficiency displayed by learners during classroom discussions. In fact, it was very difficult for me to carry out an accurate comparative evaluation of proficiency levels of spoken English of EHL learners and EFAL learners. Since the two English language curricula state that the difference between the two courses is the ‘levels of proficiency’ in the language, one would therefore expect EFAL learners to display low levels of proficiency in spoken English. On the contrary, the EFAL learners confidently used the language and showed very good command of the language in all the lessons observed. In actual fact, there were no discernible differences in levels of proficiency in English between the two groups of learners.

However, some might argue that proficiency in spoken language cannot be used as the only determinant for overall proficiency in a language. I acknowledge the fact that it is very important that one must also consider other proficiencies, for instance proficiency in written language, which normally reflects the level of cognitive academic language proficiency. Therefore, it could have been more accurate to compare the levels of proficiency in English of EHL learners and EFAL learners if their written assessments were included as data for analysis. The only reason why written assessments were not included in the evaluation of their proficiency levels in English is the fact that the two groups of learners are not exposed to the same assessments and hence only English oral proficiency was used to determine their levels of proficiency in the language.

4.7 IMPLICATIONS FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

In my interpretation of data collected through classroom observations, interviews and document analyses, I arrived at the conclusion that teaching English language separately as Home Language and First Additional Language has implications, particularly for learners in the FET phase and teachers teaching in this level. These implications are outlined and explored below.

4.7.1 English language proficiency, social status, social and academic success

The academic and social success of the majority of South African high school learners and tertiary students depends much on their proficiency in English language
Desai, 2010; Taylor & Coetzee, 2013). Silva (1997:6), Mda (1997) and Mda (2004) state that English is perceived as ‘the language of upward mobility and empowerment by Black South Africans’ as proficiency in the language is associated with status and economic benefits. English language proficiency particularly in South Africa acts as a ‘signal to employers of the quality of education that the worker has received’ (Casale & Posel, 2010:18). It is therefore not surprising to learn that most high school learners and their parents prefer EHL as it is perceived to be an advanced curriculum which provides the highest levels of academic skills and proficiency in English. Further, during interviews with the four English language teachers, I got the impression that EHL is seen as a curriculum for the elite and the ‘intelligent’, and anyone who studies it has some kind of social status and better chances in life; not forgetting the teachers who teach the curriculum as well. These perceptions are also perpetuated through institutional discourses and practices in schools and in English language classrooms (Morgan, 2007) that portray the EHL course, EHL teachers and learners as superior.

The four teachers also expressed different views on the learners’ social and academic benefits of studying the two English language courses. Teacher 1 stated that the ‘language’ of EFAL teachers and learners in her school is ‘not up to scratch’ and that ‘their grammar is poor’ (Interview with Teacher 1). The implication here is that the levels of proficiency in English of EFAL teachers and learners is not up to the desired standards probably because of the EFAL curriculum. Teacher 2 perceives EFAL as an ‘easy option’ because learners learn ‘less complicated things’ (Interview with Teacher 2). According to the teacher, EHL is more challenging but most parents and learners still prefer the course probably because of the perceived status and benefits attached to it.

Teacher 3 stated that some learners might feel that they are not ‘elite’ because of the fact that they are learning EFAL in her school (Interview with Teacher 3). Teacher 4 expressed similar views stating that EHL was designed for learners who are ‘intelligent’ (Interview with Teacher 4). The implication here is that learners who study the EFAL curriculum might be viewed as less intelligent. The teacher further stated that learning EHL ‘goes with status’ for learners.
Teacher 1 and Teacher 2 pointed out the status and superiority of EHL in society and in academia (whether real or imagined). According to the two teachers, learners who learn EHL have better chances of academic success when they get to university. Below is a response from Teacher 2:

‘...the disadvantages of English First Additional Language are that at university, they don’t care if you did First Additional Language or Home Language, so you disadvantage yourself if you do First Additional Language at high school. Home Language learners will always be at an advantage’ (Teacher 2).

It is clear that the teacher views EHL as the ‘standard’ in preparing learners for tertiary education compared to EFAL. It is, however, surprising for such a response to come from an EFAL teacher. Further, the two teachers also expressed their concerns about the depths at which literature is studied in EFAL classrooms, and pointed out that it is one of the drawbacks for EFAL learners who would want to continue studying English language at university.

On a different note, Teacher 3 and Teacher 4 pointed out that there are no social or academic benefits for learners learning any of the English language curricula. According to Teacher 3, learning EFAL does not make anyone ‘inferior’ (Interview with Teacher 3). Teacher 4 stressed that the most important goal that learners should strive for is simply the ability to speak English language properly. To me the responses above sound simplistic and naive. However, I was not surprised to get such responses from the two teachers, given the fact that School B has been using Afrikaans as the only medium of instruction until recently, and that the majority of learners in this school learn Afrikaans Home Language and still stand a chance at becoming successful in life. The impression I got from the two teachers is that English language proficiency does not matter for most learners in the school since they have an option to further their studies at universities which also use Afrikaans as a medium of instruction. It is highly likely that teachers and learners at the school, together with parents, place so much value in Afrikaans than in English (Soudien, 2004; Vandeyar, 2010a).
4.8 OTHER FINDINGS

During the processes of data collection, data presentation and interpretation, other important findings emerged. These findings might not have been discussed in detail in any of the major themes in this chapter but are of great importance to the research study. These important findings are therefore discussed in detail under the themes below.

4.8.1 Time allocated to English language lessons in schools

The issue of time allocated to English language lessons appears to be a big problem in the two selected schools. It is highly possible that the two schools might be implementing the English language CAPS guidelines as they are in allocating the suggested tuition times for English language lessons. The fact is that the suggested times for English lessons are practically not sufficient. Teachers, particularly from School A, stated that it was difficult for one to finish teaching anything within thirty-five minutes. Below is one of the comments from one of the teachers during an interview:

‘I would like to have more time, double lessons; you saw today we couldn’t finish our poetry lesson. We have very limited time to do everything’ (Teacher 2).

In all the lessons observed, the four teachers could not finish their lessons. From the response above, it appears English language teachers only manage to teach satisfactorily when they have double lessons. Teacher 1 complained that English language classrooms in her school were overcrowded and quite a challenge to teach. This also means a lot of marking and administrative work to deal with. The teacher further pointed out that studying literary texts and oral tasks takes a lot of tuition time from the limited time they have. She complained that there is no time for them to teach other important aspects of the language such as grammar and comprehension and as a result, learners display poor grammar and other language knowledge and skills.

Further, in my analysis of data from classroom observations, I realised that there were differences in tuition times allocated to English language lessons of the two selected schools. Nonetheless, it is not surprising to have such differences because
the two English language CAPS are not very clear on the issue of time allocation due to the fact that the DBE (2011a & b) uses terms such as ‘suggested’ tuition time. The use of such terms leads to ambiguity and causes confusion. One would therefore not blame schools and teachers if they interpret the statements differently.

**4.8.2 Other important views raised by teachers**

The four teachers expressed concerns about the current education system in South Africa and their dissatisfaction and disappointment about the current English language curricula. They stated that the two curricula, particularly EHL, place a lot of emphasis on literary studies, almost to the neglect of other important aspects of the language. The teachers therefore stressed the need for the current English language curricula to also focus broadly on the study of language structures and grammar. Teacher 2 alluded to the fact that the current English language textbooks in use partly contribute in perpetuating this problem; that most of them focus on content and fail to adequately deal with language and grammar. Teacher 4 complained about the Grade 12 EHL curriculum, that it is compressed with too many content topics which should be covered within a short period of time, hence teachers become more concerned about racing against time to finish the syllabus, neglecting the fact that learners have to understand what they are taught.

The teachers also complained that primary school teachers are not properly trained to teach English language and that they are partly to blame for the learners’ poor performance in English in high schools. The teachers believe that most of the language problems experienced in high school emanate from primary school. In their view, high school English language teachers always have to first deal with a huge knowledge gap before introducing a new curriculum to some Grade 8 learners. To corroborate the views of the teachers regarding the competence of primary school teachers, a study conducted by Spaull (2013:8) found that many primary school teachers in South Africa are incompetent and ‘lack an elementary understanding of the subjects they teach’. Because of the incompetence of these teachers, many children acquire ‘debilitating learning deficits early on in their schooling careers’ which are the ‘root cause of underperformance in later years’ (Lewin, 2007:23). According to Spaull (2013:8), the acquired learning deficits ‘grow over time to the extent that they become insurmountable and preclude pupils from following the
curriculum at higher grades’. Unless there is an improvement in teacher training of primary school teachers, primary school learners will always be subjected to poor teaching practices (Neeta & Klu, 2013)

4.9 CONCLUSION

The chapter presented, interpreted and analysed the data such as field notes from classroom observations, document analyses and interview transcripts under six major themes. Three data analyses methods were employed, namely: the global analysis, content analysis and critical discourse analysis. Further, the data were interpreted and analysed through the theoretical lens of poststructuralism and critical theory. The chapter also discussed other interesting findings of the study which might not have been discussed in any of the major themes, but are of great importance to the study. Interpretation and analysis of data enabled one to arrive at certain conclusions about the phenomenon under study. These conclusions are therefore discussed in the chapter that follows, together with the study’s limitations and recommendations.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In the preceding chapter, the data surrounding the teaching of English Home Language and English First Additional Language were analysed and interpreted. This chapter discusses conclusions of the findings of the study under the following themes: contents of the two CAPS for English, proficiency levels of English learners, interpretation and implementation of the curriculum by English teachers, perspectives of teachers about English teachers and implications for English language learners. Further, the chapter discusses the limitations of the study and the recommendations for the Department of Basic Education as well as recommendations for further studies.

5.2 CAPS FOR ENGLISH IN THE FET PHASE

In my analysis of the two English language curricula, a lot of inconsistencies surfaced. From the onset, the glaring similarities between the two curricula are a cause for confusion for anyone trying to make sense of the two documents. Though the two curricula were designed for two separate courses and for two different groups of learners, it is confusing that the aims and teaching approaches for the two courses are identical and are set out to achieve the same purposes.

A critical examination of the two curriculum documents and external examination question papers for the two courses reveals a lot of differences between the two English courses. The two English courses use different assessment standards and external examinations are not pitched at the same level. One is quite convinced by the findings, together with the literature consulted, that it was a deliberate move and perhaps ideological, on the part of the DBE to introduce the EFAL curriculum and then use certain discourses to convince the public that the curriculum is at the same level with the EHL curriculum. It is to a larger extent accurate that the EFAL curriculum is an ‘easier option’ designed for learners who find the EHL curriculum challenging.

The study reveals a lot of differences in the content studied in the two English courses. For instance, the two curricula suggest different lengths for literary texts, reading comprehension texts and texts to be produced by learners in the two English
language courses. EHL learners are always expected to read more and write more. The DBE does not provide any logical explanations for these glaring differences. One can only conclude that there are two English courses, of different standards, targeted at two different groups of learners which are superficially put at the same level possibly with an intention to achieve social justice.

Furthermore, the two English language curricula can simply be interpreted in two ways; that in implementing the curriculum, one must be cognizant of the fact that there are differences between the taught curriculum and the examined curriculum. The taught curriculum is the documented curriculum, accessible to everyone while the examined curriculum is hidden, probably only known to the examiners (McNamara 2012b; Shohamy, 2001). This simply means that the hidden or examined curriculum dictates the standards for the taught curriculum. In South Africa, the examined curricula for English appear to be greatly influenced by some political hand. For example, the fact that the Minister of Basic Education has powers to ‘determine assessment processes and standards for learner achievement’ in English (DBE, 2011a & b: 4). Findings of this study show that EFAL standards have deliberately been tampered with in various ways. It is only in the examined curriculum where the DBE distinguishes between the two English language courses, though it is not visibly clear to a lot of people. Besides studying the ‘taught’ curriculum, it means English language teachers have to be familiar with standards in the ‘examined’ curriculum by studying previous examination question papers.

5.3 PROFICIENCY LEVELS OF ENGLISH HL AND ENGLISH FAL LEARNERS

The findings of the study show that there are no clear differences between the levels of proficiency of spoken English of EHL learners and EFAL learners. Meagre differences in communicative competencies of the two groups of learners simply mean that EHL learners and EFAL learners in these two urban high schools or other similar schools might not be different after all. The only difference might simply be the fact that some learners study a more challenging English language curriculum while others study an easier option, EFAL.

Furthermore, the issue of placing learners in English classes based on ‘levels of proficiency’ is a more difficult and complex task than it seems. It is not easy for schools to use these assumed ‘levels of proficiency’ as a criterion to place learners
because there are no proper guidelines provided by the DBE. Allowing learners and their parents to choose an English language curriculum also presents a lot of challenges. It is not all learners and parents who understand the differences in the two English language curricula. It has also come to light that some learners and their parents choose, in particular, the EHL curriculum for reasons which have nothing to do with the learner’s level of proficiency in the language. This means that the learner compositions of EHL and EFAL classes in urban schools such as School A and School B are not a true reflection of what should constitute EHL and EFAL classes because the distribution and classification of learners is seemingly not based on the assumed levels of proficiency in English language.

5.4 INTERPRETATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF CAPS FOR ENGLISH

The process of interpreting, understanding and implementing the various components and aspects of the curriculum seems to be a daunting task for many English language teachers. Findings of the study show that even experienced teachers in well-resourced schools such as the two ex-Model C schools which participated in the study, do not clearly understand the two English language curricula. Further, the fact that teachers are burdened with the task of looking for most of the subject content and of designing learning programmes, schemes and plans makes it even more difficult for English language teachers. It appears the implementation of English language CAPS is subjected to a range of factors. For, instance if the school is poor and teachers do not have access to different information sources or if teachers are not properly skilled in looking for content sources, then the learner suffers. However, some might rightly argue that there is nothing to implement in the English language curriculum, except the interpretation and application of somewhat ambiguous guidelines.

It was clear from the numerous classroom observations conducted that English language teachers probably ignore the curriculum or do not interpret and implement it as expected. For example, the overuse of one teaching approach, the fact that most lessons were teacher-centred and that there was lack of learner-activity mean that teachers do not properly prepare for their lessons as expected. If teachers do not prepare for their lessons, then there is a possibility that the curriculum is not properly implemented. Further, the similarity in the manner in which the four teachers
from the two schools conducted their lessons is no coincidence. If this is how English language is being taught in schools, then it means teachers are clearly avoiding the two English curricula and that old classroom practices have not yet been eliminated as envisaged. However, one cannot blame teachers who avoid the current English language curricula because it appears possible for one to successfully teach without having read the curriculum; as long as one knows the kinds of texts studied in a particular grade level and the portfolio tasks and assessments required in that grade.

The four English language learning programmes analysed in this study clearly show that English language teachers lack proper support on how to design these important documents. Quite a lot of discrepancies in the documents emerged. The programmes are somehow difficult to follow because they lack detailed information. The programmes appear to be more aligned towards the completion of portfolio tasks than addressing various aspects of the curriculum. There are absolutely no differences in the contents of the programmes that explicitly separate EHL and EFAL. It evidently clear that teachers design these documents not because they are of use to them, but simply because it is a requirement for teachers to have them.

The test papers from the two schools show that there are no standards common to schools that dictate the structure and content of internally designed assessment and tests, except for the overly emphasised Bloom’s Taxonomy. It appears each school decides what to assess in each school term. There is clearly lack of standardisation of English end of term tests in schools. Lack of correlation between what is being assessed and what has been taught throughout the school term simply means that teachers do not understand the purpose of carrying out assessments at the end of each school term.

Analysis of test papers revealed a lot of differences in the quality of questions asked in Grade 12 examination question papers of the two English courses. There are a lot of differences in the quality of responses that the two groups of learners (EHL and EFAL learners) are expected to produce in the examinations. This clearly means that the two English language curricula use different assessment standards. This leads to the same conclusion that the two English language qualifications are not of the same level and quality, though the DBE would want people to believe otherwise. Further,
one is tempted to state that there is probably reasonable for parents and learners to prefer EHL.

5.5 PERSPECTIVES OF TEACHERS ABOUT ENGLISH TEACHERS

The study shows that the perspectives of native English language teachers are to a larger extent influenced by myths and perceptions that portray English Home Language teachers and learners as masters of English. It is also very clear from the responses of the four teachers that there are certain institutionalised discourses, practices and perceptions in schools that undermine the EFAL teachers and learners. EFAL teachers on the other hand seem to have developed a defensive attitude probably in an effort to redeem themselves from practices and discourses that portray them as inferior and incompetent or as second class citizens.

While it might be an advantage for those who want to be English language teachers to be native speakers of the language, findings of the study show that it is inappropriate to use this as a criterion to evaluate the teacher’s competence in teaching the language. Evidence from literature and findings of the study reveal that any English language speaker can become an English language teacher regardless of their relationship with the language. What is important is for the individual to possess the necessary knowledge, skills and the passion for teaching the language.

The younger teachers who participated in the study argued that there are no differences between EHL teachers and EFAL teachers. Their perspectives could be influenced by contemporary and progressive pedagogic theories and ideologies in English language teaching, which are now emphasised in modern language pedagogy. Older and experienced English language teachers seem to be stuck in the old teaching practices and perceptions in English language teaching and they seem reluctant to embrace any change. One can probably conclude that these teachers are either unaware of many positive changes that have taken place in the education system over the years or they choose to ignore them. In addition, the perspectives of older and experienced teachers create an impression that the old education system in South Africa was the best and that they (as products of the old system) possess the best teaching skills and knowledge. This therefore means that schools have become sites of struggle for recognition for teachers who are products...
of two different systems with different ideologies (the apartheid system and the post-apartheid system of teacher training).

5.6 IMPLICATIONS FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

Following the findings of this study, it can be concluded that the learners’ proficiency in English language indeed influences their academic and social success when they finish high school. Whether real or imagined, EHL occupies a more superior position, socially and academically. Learners from townships who attend suburban schools where EHL benefit not only social status, but also academically since it is clearly evident that the EFAL curriculum (probably the only English curriculum offered in township schools) does not adequately prepare them for tertiary education. One can only conclude that the DBE is working counter to its social transformatory aims. Teaching English separately as a Home Language and a First Additional Language clearly perpetuates social class reproduction and inequity.

5.7 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Owing to time constraints, I could not collect sufficient data through classroom observations as I had anticipated. If I had enough time I would have observed as many lessons as possible for me to get a clearer picture of what really happens in English language classrooms. During individual interviews, some English language teachers declined to respond to some of the questions, not because they did not understand the questions, but probably because they felt the questions would expose their lack of information on the matter in question. I also felt that data relating to the proficiency levels of learners in English language was not sufficient since my evaluation only relied on their oral communication. It was not possible for me to evaluate other language skills such as writing due to the fact that different kinds of assessments are used to assess the two groups of learners. Further, data collected for the study was limited to only two former Model C suburban schools and four White female English language teachers; probably the findings of the study would have been different if a lot of schools were involved in the study, including township high schools and Black African English language teachers.
5.8 RECOMMENDATIONS

The study proposes and discusses recommendations under three major themes, namely: recommendations for the DBE (curriculum designers and examiners), and recommendations for scholars who would like to conduct further studies on a similar topic.

5.8.1 Recommendations for the DBE

In my analyses of the two English language curricula, the learning programmes, internal tests and the Grade 12 English external examination question papers, quite a lot of discrepancies in these documents surfaced. The DBE could consider some of the recommendations proposed below in designing an English language curriculum that provides more detailed information to English language teachers.

5.8.1.1 Designing a completely new English language curriculum

Though the government’s desire to provide access to English is understandable, it remains a contentious issue if providing a curriculum such as the EFAL curriculum indeed produces the desired English competence and proficiency in learners. Contrary to what the DBE claims, findings of the study show that a curriculum such as EFAL has lost its credibility in the eyes of many in society. Many Black English language learners and their parents as well as some English language teachers hold EHL in high regard because of its status both in society and academia. I therefore recommend that the DBE should consider having a single English language curriculum for all learners, like in other countries, as Umalusi (2008) suggests. It is also worth mentioning that the current English language curricula do not address the needs of most learners, particularly multilingual Black learners from middle class and upper class families.

The current English language curricula emphasise the use four teaching approaches, namely the text-based approach, the communicative approach, the integrated approach and the process orientated approach. Though the four teaching approaches are meant to guide teachers, multilingual and multicultural contexts such as South Africa require an English curriculum which draws on how English language teachers conceptualise language, their teaching experiences, their knowledge and skills and their understanding of various language teaching and learning contexts
(Richards, 2013). According to Kamaravadilevu (1994:32), teaching methods should not be ‘an external set of principles’ which means English language teachers should be allowed to adapt their own teaching methods and approaches from a range of sources available to them. Some contexts require a careful selection and application of teaching and learning methods, therefore teachers must use their own discretion, experiences, knowledge and skills in selecting appropriate methods for learners.

This study’s findings show that the two English language curricula emphasise on meaning-focused activities, almost to the complete neglect of form. According to Prabhu (1990), a balanced language curriculum is one which draws attention to form and meaning of language, rather than only focusing on meaning. This study therefore suggests that the DBE should push for an English language curriculum that seeks to strike a balance between meaning and form particularly in the FET phase. Ayliff (2010) stresses that communicative and meaning-focused activities that build confidence and fluency in English language should only be emphasised in lower grades (perhaps in the foundation and intermediate phases), while in the higher grades (in the FET phase), the emphasis should be on form-focused activities that build accuracy and sound language knowledge. If the English language curriculum emphasises on form, learners will be able to master precisely all the important linguistic structures of English language.

Further, the DBE should also consider treating English language and Literature in English as two separate subjects to ensure a comprehensive and vigorous study of the courses. Findings of the study show that English language learners, particularly EHL learners, spend half of their tuition time studying literary texts because of the time required to study these texts, and as a result, a lot of other aspects of the curriculum are not adequately dealt with. It appears the DBE (2011a & b) had anticipated that the study of literary content would enhance the acquisition and mastery of other important linguistic skills and knowledge. In other words, the DBE does not value literature in its own right but simply view it as a means or a tool for teaching English language (Umalusi, 2008). According to Vera (1991:164), it is very important for high school learners to study literature from a ‘literary critical approach and a stylistic approach’ with the aim of interpreting ‘literary productions’, focusing on the text itself and not only on the language used by the writer.
5.8.1.2 Designing teaching and learning programmes and schedules

Findings of the study show that the process of designing English language learning programmes, schedules and plans is clearly a demanding and daunting responsibility for teachers. The DBE could perhaps alleviate the demand placed upon teachers by designing some of these important documents, for instance, a learning programme for each grade and include it in the package of other important curriculum and policy documents. Teachers should then be allowed to decide whether to use or to adapt the programme, depending on their willingness to design their own learning programmes. Further, providing teachers with programmes and schedules will also assist the DBE in monitoring the implementation of the curriculum in schools.

5.8.1.3 Setting quality and standardised exit tests for Grade 10 and 11

The DBE could perhaps take the responsibility of setting standardised summative English language tests for all schools for Grades 10 and 11 at the end of each year to ensure that learners are properly assessed before they progress to the next grade. Findings of the study reveal a lot of discrepancies in the internal tests set by English language teachers. The tests are not of the same quality and examiners use different standards. The current situation allows some schools to simply push learners through different grade levels using substandard tests since there are no clear mechanisms in place from the DBE to monitor the process of setting tests in schools, except for the moderation done by subject heads of department and other English language teachers.

5.8.2 Recommendations for further studies

In my engagement with literature relating to the study in Chapter 2, it emerged that there is currently very little research and information focusing on the topic or any study and information related to the topic. I therefore recommend that similar studies be conducted on the topic since findings of this study show that there are indeed implications of teaching English language as two separate courses in South African urban schools, particularly for learners in the FET phase. Literature relating to the topic and findings of the study reveal that interpretation and implementation of the two English language curricula present a lot of challenges to English language
teachers. I therefore encourage researchers to conduct further research particularly on the South African English language curricula, since any findings from such research will be invaluable input to the improvement of the country’s education system. Further, it would be worthwhile for scholars who would like to conduct further research on the topic to consider including township high schools and explore the experiences and perspectives of Black African English language teachers in their research studies.

5.9 CONCLUSION

The chapter discussed conclusions of the study’s findings. It is therefore important for any English language teacher or researcher reading this research report to understand that it would not be a misjudgement to disagree with some of the conclusions outlined above, which however, are based on the study’s findings. Additionally, the chapter discussed the limitations of the study as well as the recommendations for the DBE, scholars and researchers who would be interested in conducting similar research studies on the topic.
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Your school has been identified as a suitable site for the study because it is one of the desegregated high schools situated in an urban area, and also offers EHL and EFAL. The study will involve an investigation into the ways in which English language is taught as a Home language and a First Additional Language in urban high school.
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I would like to reassure you that your participation in this study will be voluntary and that whatever information you provide will be kept in strict confidence. The name of the school and the chosen participants will remain anonymous in any reporting on the research project. Please be assured that no one will be harmed during the course of the study. After the research project is completed I will be happy to share my findings with you.

Thank you for your cooperation in this regard.
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Annexure 5: Example of interview transcript (Teacher 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How did you become an English language teacher?</td>
<td>Aah…I went to Wits to study medicine but I didn't perform well, then I left and studied with UNISA. After obtaining my degree at UNISA, I then did my teaching Diploma at RAU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many languages do you speak?</td>
<td>Afrikaans and English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which language/s do you speak at home?</td>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which English curriculum are you currently teaching?</td>
<td>English grade 12 Home Language and FAL and grade 11 Home Language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you explain to me what you understand by EHL and EFAL?</td>
<td>Well… English Home Language I believe is for learners who speak English at home, but it doesn't always work like that. The Home Language syllabus focuses more on literature reading and the FAL syllabus focuses more on the language itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the difference between the two English curricula?</td>
<td>Well…the Home Language requires more reading, more writing of longer texts. The lengths of reading and writing texts differ. They have to master the language. And also the weighting is different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your opinion, which learners should learn EHL or EFAL?</td>
<td>Ok, well... English Home Language should be for people who speak English at home, and then FAL is for everybody else who doesn't speak English at home. But, you know, it doesn't always happen that way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do EFAL teachers and learners feel about the label ‘First Additional language’?</td>
<td>Aah... I don't think they feel much. When I was at school I was doing lower grade but I didn't have problems. There might be some who might feel they are not elite because of FAL but I haven't encountered it,...I don't know (<em>smiling</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your experience as an English language teacher what differences have you observed of the proficiency levels of EHL learners and EFAL learners?</td>
<td>Well, in our school, we have home language learners, so we target those who are more proficient. But I think with proper teaching everyone can make it. There are some people who are naturally good with languages, there are some who are good with Maths, there are some who can be good in two Home languages; it's just a gift.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your opinion, how necessary is it for learners to have two curricula for English particularly in the FET phase?</td>
<td>Aah... I think we need to have them both because real Home language speakers will be bored with FAL. There are things which are taught which home language learners know naturally. I think they should all be done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think are the advantages or disadvantages for learners to</td>
<td>I don't believe there are any, especially in their plans for the future. I think it depends on the individual, what exactly they want in life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learn EHL or EFAL?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your opinion, is there any ideal English language teacher?</td>
<td>Aah… <em>(Smiling)</em>…my idea of an English teacher is someone who is passionate about the language. Somebody who would love to see learners speaking English properly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your opinion, how necessary is it for an English language teacher to</td>
<td>Ok, I think it’s very important but not absolutely essential. It actually depends on an individual. But you cannot make somebody teach home language if they don’t know the language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be a native speaker of English?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are your views about no-native teachers of English teaching</td>
<td>I think it will be a disadvantage to the teacher, especially if the teacher is not proficient. But if the teacher is proficient then there is no problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learners who are native speakers of English?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your opinion, what is the difference between EHL teachers and EFAL</td>
<td>I think there is a difference. I started as a FAL teacher, now I teach Home Language. It takes some time for someone to learn the different approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your experience as an English teacher, what differences have you</td>
<td>Aah…I think in FAL the focus is on language, also the way we phrase questions is different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>observed in the way the two English language curricula are taught?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you select reading or comprehension texts for your English language learners?</td>
<td>I use current newspapers. I select material that suits the level of my learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How necessary is it for your learners to study all the literary genres?</td>
<td>I don’t think it’s necessary. That is why in FAL they have to choose only two. But I do think it’s important for them to study something which is a masterpiece.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When setting exams, what do you normally use as your guidelines to determine the cognitive level of your learners, or to ensure that you maintain the standards, if there are any standards?</td>
<td>I don’t think it’s necessary. That is why in FAL they have to choose only two. But I do think it’s important for them to study something which is a masterpiece.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the differences in examinations and other assessments of the two English language curricula?</td>
<td>Everything is shorter and a bit easier in FAL. Most of the Home language questions are quite challenging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your opinion about the time allocated (periods) for English teaching and learning in your school?</td>
<td>I think it is fine, but sometimes I think I need more time for Home Language, but it won’t be practical for me to have more time for Home Language and less time for FAL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is responsible for designing learning programmes for your grade?</td>
<td>We get some from the district office, but I decide to do mine for my classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is the school, teachers and parents involved in the learners’ choice of English language curriculum to study?</td>
<td>Well, most Afrikaans learners choose English FAL, if a learner doesn’t do well in Home language; I recommend that they rather go to FAL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does your school encourage and promote extensive reading?</td>
<td>Well, we have a media centre where the lady there is always there, but I don’t think our children are willing to go there (<em>laughing</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your school have any policy on the use of English by learners in the school premises?</td>
<td>No, my policy in my classroom is that they only speak English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes do you think should be made in the English curriculum to improve the teaching of English?</td>
<td>Well, providing textbooks that deal with grammar. The curriculum we have currently doesn’t encourage the study of language and grammar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annexure 6: Example of field notes from observation (Teacher 3)

Duration of the lesson: (40 minutes)
Class: Grade 11 EFAL
Number of Learners: 28

This observation will take the duration of the English lesson. I will not interfere with the learning environment or become a distraction to the learners. During this observation, I will examine the ways in which English language is taught. These include teaching and learning practices, methods, approaches and techniques and teaching and learning content used in English language classrooms. I will also observe the English language proficiency levels and other linguistic behaviours of English language learners.

Field Notes

Teacher tells learners that they will be doing a poem. Seemingly, learners already have a copy of the poem.
One male learner misbehaves while teacher is addressing the class. The teacher changes sitting arrangement and orders a problematic learner to sit in front.
One learner is asked to read the poem aloud while others listen.
After reading, the teacher starts asking learners questions to test their understanding of the poem. Example of questions: ‘What is the theme of the poem?’ ‘Can you identify one figure of speech in the first stanza?’
A number of learners speak at the same time, giving different responses. However, most of them show good command of the language.
Teacher continues to ask questions, without giving learners time to discuss their responses. The majority of them show enthusiasm to learn, but there is no order in the classroom.
Teacher uses the board for the first time in explaining the meaning of a few difficult words from the poem.
One male learner is playing with his cell phone at the back. Two female learners are playing with each other’s hair three desks away from the teacher.
Teacher seems to be in a rush to explain everything (a sign that she didn’t prepare for the lesson).
Teacher dominates the discussion and explains everything; learners are not given the opportunity to contribute anything.
No other learning or teaching aid used.
The lesson is concluded; learners have not written anything in their exercise books. No homework given.