

**TEACHERS' AND LEARNERS' BELIEFS ABOUT THE USE OF
CODE-SWITCHING IN ENGLISH SECOND LANGUAGE
CLASSROOMS: A CASE OF TWO SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN
MASVINGO DISTRICT, ZIMBABWE**

By

RUGARE MAREVA

**Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in English**

in the

**Department of English
School of Human and Social Sciences
University of Venda**

Promoter: Dr. P.K Kaburise

Co-Promoter: Prof. E.K Klu

April 2016

DECLARATION

I, Rugare Mareva, hereby declare that the thesis for a Doctor of Philosophy in English, hereby submitted by me at the University of Venda, has not previously been submitted for a degree at this or any other university, and that it is my own work in design and execution and that all reference material contained therein has been duly acknowledged.

Signature _____

Date _____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my unreserved gratitude to the Almighty God, whose blessings make all things possible. Secondly, I humbly and sincerely extend my heartfelt gratitude to my promoter, Dr P.K. Kaburise, and co-promoter, Dr E.K. Klu, without whose professional and scholarly guidance this work would not have been completed. I would also like to extend my heartfelt gratitude to Dr B. Dube for the sterling job that she did, of editing the dissertation. From Great Zimbabwe University, I would like to thank Professor S. Nyota for her motherly encouragement and support, as well as my great friends Felix P. 'Chirandu' Mapako and Jabulani 'Dembe' Sibanda for some useful insights and advice. I would also like to thank my colleague, Benjamin Maposa, for all the moral and material support that he rendered to me. Furthermore, special thanks also go to the following for the permission that they granted me to carry out the research at the schools that were within their jurisdiction: the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education, Zimbabwe; the Provincial Education Director for Masvingo Province, the District Education Officer for Masvingo District, as well as the heads of the two secondary schools at which the study was carried out. I would also like to wholeheartedly express my gratitude to the four ESL teachers and their learners, for sacrificing their precious teaching and learning time to participate in the inquiry.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my late beloved father, Mr Demison 'VaKudya' Mareva, my Mother Rosewitter 'VaGiredhi Hwani' Mareva, for siring and rearing me with unflinching dedication, against all odds. The work is also dedicated to my beloved wife, Florence, and my children, Joe, Peshi, Tsitsi, Pau, Tavo and Fortu, for their moral support, patience and endurance during my absence from home as I worked on the study. Last but not least, I dedicate this research project to my elder brother, John 'Guruve' Mareva, for heading the family ever since our father passed on.

ABSTRACT

The study sought to investigate the role played by learners' mother tongue, in the teaching and learning of English in secondary schools in Zimbabwe. Two secondary schools in Masvingo District were used as a case study. The study was informed by bilingualism, models of bilingualism and related theories such as Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and Communication Strategies. The selected communication strategy that was focused on is code-switching. This communication strategy reveals the important role that the learners' L1 can play in learning English. The study, therefore, sought to gain insights into the beliefs of secondary school teachers and learners of English about the use of code-switching in the teaching and learning of English. The study also sought to investigate the ESL teachers' perceptions on the relationship between code-switching and emerging varieties of English called New Englishes, as well as the teachers' perceptions on the teaching of such local varieties of English. The inquiry adopted a qualitative research paradigm and focused on two purposively sampled secondary schools comprising one rural day, and one urban boarding school that also enrolls day learners. It was the researcher's belief that these schools would offer useful insights about the role of the learners' L1 in the teaching and learning of English. The study employed three data collection tools, namely observation, interviews and focus group discussions. Ten Form One and ten Form Three English lessons were observed per school, to give a total of twenty lessons. The four ESL teachers whose lessons were observed at the two schools were interviewed. The researcher also held focus group discussions with a sample of a group of ten Form One and ten Form Three English learners per school. Thus, four focus group discussions were held. Data were analysed and presented qualitatively through identification of emerging themes, and through descriptions, narratives, direct quotes, and tables. Results show that the ESL teachers and learners who participated in the study code-switched from English to the learners' L1 as a communication strategy and teaching and learning tool, mainly to foster understanding among learners and between the learners and their teachers, and for other communicative and social functions. Results also indicate that there was more code-switching at School B (rural day secondary school) than at School A (urban boarding secondary school), although the teachers' and learners' code-switching functions at the two secondary schools were by and large similar. It also emerged that the frequencies of the teachers code-

switching differed from teacher to teacher, with Teacher A (urban boarding secondary school) code-switching moderately and Teacher B (urban boarding secondary school) code-switching minimally, while Teacher C and Teacher D (rural day secondary school) code-switched frequently. With regard to the learners, the study revealed that Class A learners (urban boarding secondary school) code-switched moderately during formal classroom exchanges with their teacher, but code-switched a lot among themselves. Class B learners (urban boarding secondary school), Class C and Class D learners (rural day secondary school), code-switched minimally during formal classroom exchanges with their teachers. However, as was the case with Class A learners, they code-switched a lot among themselves. The teachers were largely tolerant of their learners' code-switching although they showed awareness of the possible negative effects of learners' code-switching in the learning of ESL. As for the learners, the majority expressed an appreciation of their teachers' code-switching but there were also negative sentiments against the teachers' code-switching. The inquiry also revealed that there was unanimous agreement among the four teachers that there is a relationship between code-switching and New Englishes. In addition, two of the teachers expressed the view that there is nothing wrong with teaching the local variety of English in the schools, while the other two said they preferred the teaching of 'standard' English. In light of the findings, the study recommends that language policy planners revisit the English-only policy in the school and consider adopting the endo-normative rather than the exo-normative model of English for the education system. The study also recommends that the Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education should hold workshops to sensitise teachers on how code-switching may best be employed as a teaching and learning tool. Furthermore, the study recommends that ESL teachers be guided by the Postmethod pedagogy, a sense of plausibility as well as the notion of relativism in their decisions on code-switching. In addition, the inquiry recommends that the Zimbabwe Schools Examinations Council be sensitive to aspects of the local variety of English rather than set exo-normative models. Finally, the study recommends that further research be done on code-switching in school types which were not included in the sample for the present study.

Key Words: Bilingualism, Code-switching, Communication Strategies, Mother Tongue, New Englishes.

Table of Contents

DECLARATION	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF FIGURES.....	vii
ABBREVIATIONS	viii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
1.INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 BACKGROUND	1
1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	4
1.3 ASSUMPTIONS.....	6
1.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	6
1.5 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY	7
1.6 RESEARCH QUESTION AND SUB-QUESTIONS	8
1.7 DELIMITATIONS	8
1.8 LOCATION OF THE STUDY	9
1.9 DEFINITION OF KEY CONCEPTS	10
1.10 OUTLINE OF THE STUDY	11
1.11 SUMMARY	13
CHAPTER TWO: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW	14
2. INTRODUCTION	14
2.1 BILINGUALISM.....	14
2.1.1 Models of Bilingualism.....	15
2.1.1.1 The Transitional Model.....	15
2.1.1.2 Subtractive Bilingualism.....	16
2.1.1.3 Additive Bilingualism.....	16
2.1.1.4 The Separate Underlying Proficiency (SUP) Model	17
2.1.1.5 The Common Underlying Proficiency (CUP) Model	17
2.1.1.6 The Thresholds Theory	18
2.1.1.7 The Developmental Interdependence Hypothesis.....	18
2.2 BENEFITS OF BILINGUALISM.....	19

2.3 THE IMPORTANCE OF LEARNING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE	20
2.4 THE GOAL OF SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHING AND LEARNING	23
2.5 ROLE OF THE LEARNERS' L1 IN THE L2 CLASSROOM	24
2.6 SOME THEORIES OF SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION (SLA)	30
2.6.1 The Acculturation Model	31
2.6.2 Krashen's Input/Comprehension Hypothesis.....	31
2.6.3 The Sociocultural Theory	32
2.6.4 Interlanguage	33
2.7 SOME MONOLINGUAL AND BILINGUAL APPROACHES AND METHODS.....	34
2.7.1 The Direct Method (DM)	36
2.7.2 The Audio-Lingual Method (ALM).....	36
2.7.3 The Natural Approach	37
2.7.4 The Grammar Translation Method (GTM).....	37
2.7.5 Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)	38
2.7.6 Dodson's Bilingual Method	39
2.7.7 The New Concurrent Method	39
2.7.8 Community Language Teaching.....	39
2.7.9 Other Views on Language Teaching Methods	39
2.8 COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES.....	42
2.9 CODE-SWITCHING	45
2.9.1 Code-switching in Multiple Settings in Zimbabwe	49
2.9.2 Code-switching in Educational Settings.....	52
2.9.3 Negative Impact of Code-switching in the Classroom.....	64
2.9.4 Code-switching and New Englishes	66
2.10 THE INFLUENCE OF TEACHERS' AND LEARNERS' BELIEFS ON	73
2.11 SUMMARY	75
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	77
3. INTRODUCTION	77
3.1 QUALITATIVE RESEARCH.....	77
3.2 CASE STUDY RESEARCH	82
3.3 POPULATION AND SAMPLE	83
3.4 DATA COLLECTION TOOLS.....	85
3.4.1 Observations.....	85
3.4.1.1 Advantages of Observation	86

3.4.1.2 Disadvantages of Observation.....	87
3.4.1.3 How the Observations Were Carried Out.....	87
3.4.2 Interviews.....	88
3.4.2.1 Advantages of Interviews.....	90
3.4.2.2 Disadvantages of Interviews	91
3.4.2.3 How the Interviews Were Carried Out.....	92
3.4.2.4 The Teachers' Biographical Information.....	92
3.4.3 Focus Groups	93
3.4.3.1 Advantages of Focus Groups.....	94
3.4.3.2 Disadvantages of Focus Groups	95
3.4.3.3 How the Focus Group Discussions Were Carried Out.....	95
3.5 DATA ANALYSIS.....	96
3.7 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	100
3.8 ETHICAL ISSUES	100
3.9 SUMMARY	101
CHAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS	105
4. INTRODUCTION	102
4.1 EXTENT TO WHICH TEACHERS AND LEARNERS CODE-SWITCHED; THE CODE-SWITCHING FUNCTIONS	104
4.1.1 Teacher A and Class A: Extent and Functions of Code-switching.....	104
4.1.2 Teacher B and Class B: Extent and Functions of Code-switching.....	117
4.1.3 Teacher C and Class C: Extent and Functions of Code-switching.....	124
4.1.4 Teacher D and Class D: Extent and Functions of Code-switching.....	138
4.2 TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS ON LEARNERS' CODE-SWITCHING	149
4.2.1 Findings from Interview with Teacher A.....	149
4.2.2 Findings from Discussion with Class A Learners	150
4.2.3 Findings from Lesson Observations (Class A)	150
4.2.4 Findings from Interview with Teacher B.....	152
4.2.5 Findings from Discussion with Class B Learners	152
4.2.6 Findings from Lesson Observations (Class B)	153
4.2.8 Findings from Discussion with Class C Learners.....	155
4.2.9 Findings from Lesson Observations (Class C)	155
4.2.10 Findings from Interview with Teacher D	156
4.2.11 Findings from Discussion with Class D Learners.....	156

4.2.12 Findings from Lesson Observations (Class D).....	157
4.3 LEARNERS' PERCEPTIONS ON TEACHERS' CODE-SWITCHING	158
4.3.1 Findings from Discussion with Class A Learners	158
4.3.2 Findings from Discussion with Class B Learners	159
4.3.3 Findings from Discussion with Class C Learners	160
4.3.4 Findings from Discussion with Class D Learners.....	161
4.4 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CODE-SWITCHING AND NEW ENGLISHES	163
4.4.1 Findings from Interview with Teacher A.....	163
4.4.2 Findings from Interview with Teacher B.....	163
4.4.3 Findings from Interview with Teacher C	164
4.4.4 Findings from Interview with Teacher D	164
4.5 SUMMARY	165
CHAPTER FIVE DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS	166
5. INTRODUCTION	169
5.1 CODE-SWITCHING BY TEACHERS AND LEARNERS: EXTENT AND FUNCTIONS .	166
5.1.1 Code-switching by Teachers	166
5.1.2 Code-switching by Learners	174
5.2 TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS ON LEARNERS' CODE-SWITCHING	177
5.3 LEARNERS' PERCEPTIONS ON TEACHERS' CODE-SWITCHING	183
5.4 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CODE-SWITCHING AND NEW ENGLISHES; TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS ON THE TEACHING OF THE LOCAL ENGLISH VARIETY	191
5.5 SUMMARY	196
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	197
6. INTRODUCTION	197
6.1 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	197
6.2 RECOMMENDATIONS	200
REFERENCES	203
APPENDICES.....	221
APPENDIX 1: Classroom Observation Schedule	221
APPENDIX 2: Interview Guide Questions	223
APPENDIX 3: Focus Group Discussions Guide.....	224
APPENDIX 4: Sample of Lesson Transcripts	225
APPENDIX 5: Ethical Clearance	252

APPENDIX 6: Application to Permanent Secretary to Carry out Research in Schools in Masvingo District253

APPENDIX 7: Letter of Permission from Permanent Secretary254

APPENDIX 8: Letter of Permission from Provincial Education Director for Masvingo255

APPENDIX 9: Participant Consent Form for Teachers256

APPENDIX 10: Participant Consent Form for Learners257

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1: Teacher-Participants' Biographical Data.....	95
Table 4.1: Teacher A – Code-switching Functions and Frequencies.....	107
Table 4.2: Class A Learners – Code-switching Functions and Frequencies	114
Table 4.3: Teacher B – Code-switching Functions and Frequencies.....	120
Table 4.4: Class B learners – Code-switching Functions and Frequencies.	124
Table 4.5: Teacher C – Code-switching Functions and Frequencies.....	124
Table 4.6: Class C Learners – Code-switching Functions and Frequencies.....	137
Table 4.7: Teacher D – Code-switching Functions and Frequencies.....	141
Table 4.8: Class D Learners – Code-switching Functions and Frequencies.....	149

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1: Map of Masvingo, Zimbabwe.....	10
---	----

ABBREVIATIONS

CLT – Communicative Language Teaching

CUP – Common Underlying Proficiency

EFL – English as a Foreign Language

EL – Embedded Language

ENL – English as a Native Language

ESL –English as a Second Language

GTM – Grammar-Translation Method

L1 – First Language

L2 – Second Language

ML – Matrix Language

NS – Native Speaker

SLA – Second Language Acquisition

SUP – Separate Underlying Proficiency

TL – Target Language

UNESCO – United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation

WEes – World Englishes

ZIMSEC – Zimbabwe School Examinations Council

ZJC – Zimbabwe Junior Certificate

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1. INTRODUCTION

This introductory chapter begins by giving the background to the study and outlines the linguistic situation in Zimbabwe, the place of English in Zimbabwe, and the country's national language policy on education. The problem that necessitated the investigation is also stated in this chapter. Assumptions that guide the study are also stated, as well as the aim, objectives, research question and sub-questions that the study seeks to answer, as well as the significance of the study. The chapter also offers delimitations in terms of scope and geographical area under study. An outline of the study is also given, in terms of what each chapter focuses on. The chapter also defines key terms that feature in the study. A summary of the chapter is then made.

1.1 BACKGROUND

Located in Southern Africa, Zimbabwe, a former British colony, has a population of about thirteen (13) million people, according to the latest (2013) national census results. The linguistic situation in the country is that Zimbabwe is a multilingual country with sixteen (16) spoken languages (Hachipola, 1998). Of these, until the Constitution of Zimbabwe Amendment (No. 20) Act of 2013, English was the official language, while Shona and Ndebele were national languages spoken by 70% and 15% of the population, respectively (Peresuh and Masuku, 2002). The others were regarded as minority languages and these include Shangani, Venda, Kalanga, Nambya, Tonga, Chichewa, Sotho, Chikunda, Sena, Barwe, Hwesa, and Tshwawo (Chimhundu, 1997). However, the Constitution of Zimbabwe Amendment (No. 20) (2013:17) stipulates the following:

- (1) The following languages, namely Chewa, Chibarwe, English, Kalanga, Koisian, Nambya, Ndau, Ndebele, Shangani, Shona, sign language, Sotho, Tonga, Tswana, Venda and Xhosa, are the officially recognised languages of Zimbabwe.
- (2) An Act of Parliament may prescribe other languages as officially recognised languages and may prescribe languages of record.
- (3) The state and all institutions and agencies of government at every level must
 - (a) Ensure that all officially recognised languages are treated equitably; and

- (b) Take into account the language preferences of people affected by governmental measures or communications.
- (4) The state must promote and advance the use of all languages used in Zimbabwe, including sign language, and must create conditions for development of those languages.

Nevertheless, the place of English in Zimbabwe is that, like in many other former British colonies, the language continues to enjoy a higher social status than any of the indigenous languages since, for many years, it has been the only official language (Kadenge and Mabugu, 2009). However, English is the home language of less than 1% of the population (Peresuh and Masuku, 2002). English is the main language of international and intranational business, government, legislation, religion, advertisements, political manifestos, and other important documents (Mabugu, 2009). According to Mavhunga (2006:447-448), English *'has remained the language of instruction in the private and public schools. It remains the language of the office. Furthermore, the 'O' level school-leaving certificate cannot be complete unless one passes... English of course.'* English is, thus, perceived to be an economic gatekeeper (Nyawaranda, 2000).

Zimbabwe's national language policy on education is contained in the Education Act of 1987 (as amended in 1990) and is quoted in Nziramasanga (1999:156-157) as follows:

- (a) Subject to provisions of this section, the main languages of Zimbabwe, namely Shona, Ndebele and English, shall be taught in all primary schools from the first grade as follows:-
 - (i) Shona and English in all areas where the mother tongue of the majority of the residence is Shona; or
 - (ii) Ndebele and English in all areas where the mother tongue of the majority of the residents is Ndebele.
- (b) Prior to the fourth grade, either of the languages referred to in paragraphs (a) and (b) of subsection (1) may be used as a medium of instruction, depending upon which language is most commonly spoken and better understood by the pupils.

(c) From the fourth grade, English shall be the medium of instruction provided that Shona or Ndebele shall be taught as subjects on an equal-time-allocation basis as the English Language.

(d) In areas where minority languages exist, the Minister may authorise the teaching of such languages in primary schools in addition to those specified in subsections (1), (2) and (3).

However, the Amended Education Act of 2006 stipulates that indigenous languages may be used as media of instruction throughout the primary school, while English becomes the sole medium of instruction from Form One. Gora (2013), however, observes that primary school teachers continue to resort to English as the medium of instruction.

Two issues that stem from the above policy are relevant to the present study. Firstly, English is stipulated as the sole medium of instruction from Grade 4 of the primary school, or from Form One according to the Amended Act of 2006, yet literature abounds on the benefits of using the learners' L1 as the medium of instruction. (See Dube and Cleghorn, 1999; Peresuh and Masuku, 2000; Mufanechiya and Mufanechiya, 2010). Studies also point to the usefulness of the L1 even in the teaching of the L2. (See Spratt in Matthews, Spratt and Dangerfield (eds), 1985; Nyawaranda, 2000; Chimbganda and Mokgwathi, 2012). Secondly, English is also taught as a subject and because it is taught while learners already have their mother tongues, English is taught as a second language in most schools in Zimbabwe. For this reason, the concept of interlanguage is of relevance in the teaching and learning of English and other subjects.

According to McLaughlin (1987:60), the term 'interlanguage' was coined by Selinker to refer to *'the interim grammars constructed by second language learners on their way to the target language.'* Brown (1987:169) also defines interlanguage as *'the separateness of a second language learner's system, a system that has a structurally intermediate status between the native and target languages.'* Richards in Richards (1997:83) offers a sociolinguistic dimension of interlanguage as *'the process by which local varieties of English have emerged in many parts of the world.'* This is in apparent reference to 'New Englishes', a concept which is of relevance in this study and whose

other concern is to find out if code-switching in the classroom could be adopted in the context of the Zimbabwean variety of English.

Because the current study investigated teachers' and learners' beliefs about the role of the learners' L1 in the teaching and learning of English at two secondary schools in Masvingo District, it was interested in one aspect of interlanguage, namely Communication Strategies. I purposively selected code-switching since it can provide insights into the role played by the learners' L1 in the teaching and learning of English. The study focused on the oral productions of English Language teachers and learners.

This study complements the efforts of other researchers who have researched into the contentious issue of the role of the L1 in the teaching and learning of the L2 and other subjects. Particular interest was on those who had researched on Bilingualism, interlanguage, Communication Strategies, and code-switching. The study, thus, intended to gain insights into what is obtaining in secondary schools in Zimbabwe on the role of learners' L1 in the teaching and learning of English. The study took place against the background of English being a compulsory subject in Zimbabwe and that is also the sole prescribed language of instruction from Form One up to university level.

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem that motivated this study is three-fold: it (the problem) lies in Zimbabwe's language policy on instruction, the low national Ordinary Level English Language pass rate of about 20% (Rafomoyo, 2014) and the controversy surrounding the role of the learners' L1 in L2 instruction. Zimbabwe's language policy on instruction stipulates that from Form One English must be the sole language of instruction in the teaching of all subjects, including, of course, English itself. The exception is the teaching of local languages as subjects (Nziramasanga, 1999). However, there is apparently a never-ending debate on the role of the L1 in L2 instruction and in teaching and learning in general. As Storch and Wigglesworth (2003:760) aptly put it, *'The use of learners' L1 is a controversial issue in L2 education.'* El-Dali (2012) also acknowledges the existence of controversy on the use or avoidance of the L1 in the L2 classroom. Sachiko (cited in Nyawaranda, 2000) also observes that there are differences in

opinions among teachers on the role of the mother tongue in instruction, and these opinions reflect the differences in the teachers' wider beliefs about the best way to learn a language. Furthermore, in South Africa, use of the L1 in the classroom through code-switching, translation and code-mixing has been criticised for the negative, though unintended, effects on learners (Muthivhi, 2008).

According to Nyawaranda (2000:26) Cummin's Common Underlying Hypothesis states that *'there is a common or interdependent relationship between some aspects of L1 and L2 proficiency in a bilingual across languages.'* Research also points to the many advantages of using the L1 in the L2 classroom and in teaching and learning in general. For example, Spratt (in Matthews, Spratt and Dangerfield, 1985) states that the learners' L1 can be useful for instructions, classroom management, explanations, justifications, communicating meaning, and checking comprehension.

Another advocate of the L1 in the classroom is Macaro (2000), who contends that the L1 is the language of thought for all but the most advanced learners, and may, therefore, enrich associations and reduce memory constraints. Similarly, Peresuh and Masuku (2002:27) state: *'Research has amply demonstrated the superiority of the mother tongue (L1) to second language (L2) as the medium of instruction for the subjects of the school curriculum.'* Peresuh and Masuku (2002) go on to quote the UNESCO document which underscores the psychological, sociological and educational importance of the L1 to the child. Atkinson (cited in Nyawaranda, 2000) also avers that a teacher who ignores the students, L1 in the classroom is most likely to teach with less than maximum efficiency.

The problem that motivated this study, therefore, is that, while Zimbabwe's language policy on instruction categorically states that English must be the sole language of instruction from Form One, controversy surrounds the role of the L1 in L2 teaching and learning and in teaching and learning in general. With reference to the former, Ntombela and Dube (cited in El-dali, 2012) argue that the controversy stems from two conflicting ideologies, namely the monolingual and bilingual approaches to L2 teaching and learning.

The monolingual approach is represented by language purists, prescriptive grammarians and advocates of the immersion theory. While the bilingual approach accepts the usefulness of the L1, the monolingual approach insists that the L1 interferes with L2 acquisition and, thus, argues for an 'English only approach'. With reference to the role of the L1 in teaching and learning in general, the L1 is viewed by many scholars and researchers as playing a pivotal role in learning concepts, among other important functions. It is, therefore, because of this controversy that the present study focused on the role being played by Shona (L1) in the teaching and learning of English. Shona is the language spoken by the majority (70%) in Zimbabwe (Peresuh and Masuku, 2002). The study was also carried out in Masvingo District, an area where Shona is the predominant indigenous language. The inquiry focused on one Communication Strategy in the bilingual learners' interlanguage, namely code-switching, a strategy which may also be used as a pedagogical tool by teachers. The study takes place against the background of English being not only a compulsory subject in Zimbabwean schools, but also the sole prescribed language of instruction from Form One upwards, except in the teaching of indigenous languages as subjects.

1.3 ASSUMPTIONS

I assumed that secondary school teachers and learners of English who would participate in this study are bilinguals whose L1 is Shona and L2 English. Therefore the issue of code-switching, which is a common phenomenon among bilinguals and is central to this study, applies to them.

1.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The current study took place against the backdrop of Zimbabwe's language policy on instruction which stipulates that English be the sole medium of instruction from the secondary school level upwards (Zimbabwe Amended Education Act, 2006) The study was also carried out in the context of the controversy surrounding the role of learners L1 in L2 instruction (Al-Nofaie, 2010; Kafes, 2011). The study is, thus, significant in that it sought to unearth the beliefs of secondary school teachers and learners about code-switching in the teaching and learning of English in Zimbabwe. Teachers' beliefs influence what the teachers do in the classroom (Gardner and Miller, 1999; Altan, 2006; Brown, 2009). Similarly, learners' beliefs also influence how the learners attempt to learn a language (Dornyei, 2005). Thus, the present study is of importance as it

sought to establish the situation on the ground, in terms of practice, the role of learners' L1 in the teaching and learning of English as a Second Language so as to sensitise teachers of English, as well as policy makers to what is happening, with a view to suggesting a way forward in terms of policy and practice. This study is also significant in that it sought to establish the beliefs of not only teachers of English but also those of the second language learners themselves. It is also my belief that what is happening at the two selected secondary schools, in terms of code-switching in the teaching and learning of English, can be generalisable to what is happening in other secondary schools in Zimbabwe.

This study is also significant in that it sought to contribute to the body of existing knowledge on the usefulness, appropriateness and necessity for teaching local varieties of English (of which code-switching may be an important feature) which are also known as New Englishes or World Englishes that have evolved as a result of the spread of English, over time, across the globe.

1.5 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

In broad terms, the study aimed to investigate teachers' and learners' beliefs about the Communication Strategy of code-switching in the teaching and learning of English at two selected secondary schools in Masvingo District, Zimbabwe. Emanating from this aim are the following objectives:

- (a) To find out the extent, and the possible functions of, code-switching in the teaching and learning of English at two secondary schools in Masvingo District;
- (b) To establish the selected teachers' and learners' perceptions on the use of code-switching in the teaching and learning of English;
- (c) To establish the teachers views on the relationship between code-switching and New Englishes, and the selected teachers' perceptions on the teaching of the Zimbabwean variety of English in secondary schools in Zimbabwe; and
- (d) To make recommendations to educational policy makers, the Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education, secondary school teachers of English,

and the Zimbabwe Schools Examinations Council (ZIMSEC), in light of the findings of the inquiry.

Below, therefore, are the main research question and sub - questions that guided the study:

1.6 RESEARCH QUESTION AND SUB-QUESTIONS

The research question that guided the study is: What beliefs do the selected teachers and learners of English at two selected secondary schools in Masvingo District hold about the use of the communication strategy of code-switching in the teaching and learning of English?

From the research question, the following sub-questions were derived:

- (i) To what extent, and for what possible functions, is code-switching being employed in the teaching and learning of English at two secondary schools in Masvingo District?
- (ii) What are the perceptions of the selected secondary school teachers of English on the code-switching done by their learners during English lessons?
- (iii) What are the perceptions of the selected secondary school learners of English on the code-switching done by their teachers during English lessons?
- (iv) What are the views of the teachers on the relationship between code-switching and New Englishes, and what perceptions do the teachers hold about the teaching of the code-switched variety of English in secondary schools in Zimbabwe?

1.7 DELIMITATIONS

The study was informed by the theory of bilingualism and, in turn, interlanguage. However, the researcher recognised that interlanguage is a very broad concept that involves many psycholinguistic processes (Selinker in Richards, 1997). The study was, therefore, interested in one aspect of interlanguage, namely Communication Strategies and of these, the study focused on code-switching, a strategy that is classified under 'borrowing' in Tarone's taxonomy of Communication Strategies (Brown, 1987). This strategy was of significance in this study because it offered

insights into the role played by the learners' L1 in the teaching and learning of English at two secondary schools in Masvingo District.

The study was also informed by bilingualism, theories of second language acquisition, second language teaching approaches and methodologies, and New Englishes. However, focus was only on those aspects of theories and methods that were relevant to this study. Furthermore, because of time and resource constraints, I could not visit every secondary school in Masvingo District and has, therefore, sampled one rural day and one urban boarding secondary school which also enrolls day learners.

1.8 LOCATION OF THE STUDY

The study was carried out at two secondary schools located in the Masvingo District of Masvingo Province, Zimbabwe. The provincial capital city of Masvingo Province is Masvingo, which is located roughly at the centre of Zimbabwe, approximately 300km from Beitbridge in the south, Bulawayo in the west, Harare in the north, and Mutare in the east.

The first school, School A, is an urban boarding secondary that also admits day school learners and is located in the city of Masvingo city. School B is a day secondary school located about 50 km from the city of Masvingo. The map below shows the position of Masvingo city, where School A is located.



Figure 1.1: Map of Masvingo, Zimbabwe

1.9 DEFINITION OF KEY CONCEPTS

In this section, I define some of the concepts that are central to the research.

Bilingual Approach: This is an approach to L2 teaching and learning that believes the learners' L1 can play a facilitating role in L2 teaching and learning and so permits use of the L1 in the L2 classroom.

Bilingual Education: Education that uses and promotes two languages.

Bilingualism: Ability to speak two or more languages.

Code: A set of organising principles behind the language that is employed by members of a social group.

Code-switching (CS): The use of two or more codes within a conversation or within text. It may also be referred to as code-mixing, codeshifting, language alternation, language mixture, or language switching.

Communication Strategy (CS): An individual's attempt to find a way of filling the gap between his/her communication effort and immediate available linguistic resources.

English as a Second Language (ESL): English taught to learners whose primary language is not English, that is, English taught to learners who have already acquired their L1. It is English spoken in countries that Kachru (1985) refers to as 'Outer Circle' countries such as Zimbabwe.

First Language (L1): A language that one learns from birth. It is also known as the native language or the mother tongue.

Interlanguage (IL): A separate linguistic system resulting from a learner's attempted production of the target language. The system is half-way between the native language and the target language.

Language Policy: What a government does either officially or through legislation, court decisions or policy, to determine how languages are used, cultivate language skills needed to meet national priorities or establish the rights of individuals or groups to use and maintain languages.

Medium of Instruction: Language used in teaching and learning. Language of education.

Monolingual Approach: An approach to L2 learning that argues that L2 learning should be modelled on the learning of an L1, that is, through maximum exposure to the L2.

Multilingualism: Ability to use two or more, or several languages.

New Englishes: Emerging varieties of English as a result of the spread of the English Language throughout the world.

Official Language: A language that is given a special legal status in a particular country, state, or other jurisdiction.

Qualitative Research: Research that seeks to understand an individual's perceptions of the world from his or her own frame of reference. It uses the natural setting as the direct source of data, is descriptive, and uses tools such as interviews, observations and documents to collect data.

Second Language (L2): Any language that one speaks other than one's first language.

Target Language (TL): The language that the learner is aspiring for, that is, the language being learnt.

1.10 OUTLINE OF THE STUDY

The study investigated the role played by learners' L1 in the teaching and learning of English Language at two secondary schools in Masvingo District. The inquiry focused

on Communication Strategies, an important aspect of interlanguage. The Communication Strategy that was selected for investigation is code-switching.

Chapter One offers the background to, rationale behind, and significance of the study. The chapter briefly explores the language situation in Zimbabwe and the country's language policy on instruction. The chapter also focuses on the research study's assumptions, aim, objectives, research questions, and significance of the study. The chapter ends with the researcher defining key terms related to the study.

In Chapter Two the researcher focuses on the theoretical framework and literature review. The theory to that was discussed is bilingualism and related models. The literature explored included the importance of learning English as a second language, theories of second language acquisition, Communication Strategies, code-switching, monolingual and bilingual approaches to L2 teaching and learning and related methods, New Englishes, role of the learners' L1 in L2 teaching and learning and in particular in teaching and learning in general, among other literature. Related studies are also highlighted.

Chapter Three focuses on the methodology that was employed in the inquiry and this includes the research paradigm, research setting and design, population and sampling, data collection tools, as well as data analysis and presentation. The chapter also highlights the aspects of quality assurance, ethical issues to be considered, as well as limitations of the study.

In Chapter Four, I present the findings of the study, while in Chapter Five a discussion of the findings is made by interpreting the findings, relating them to the theoretical framework and literature review. The findings are triangulated using the three data collection tools where necessary.

In Chapter Six, I summarise, conclude the inquiry, and give some recommendations for language policy planners, the Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education in Zimbabwe, ESL teachers, as well as for the Zimbabwe School Examinations Council (ZIMSEC) in particular, and examination boards in 'Outer Circle' countries in general.

1.11 SUMMARY

The chapter discussed the background to the study. The linguistic situation in Zimbabwe was described as multilingual. Sixteen languages are spoken of which until the Constitution of Zimbabwe Amendment (No. 20) Act of 2013, English was the official language enjoying a high social status, while Shona and Ndebele were national languages. The rest were considered minority languages. The Constitution of Zimbabwe Amendment (No.20) Act of 2013 then raised the statuses of all the other languages to official languages.

Zimbabwe's national language policy on education permits the use of local languages at primary school level, while from the first year of secondary education English is prescribed as the sole medium of instruction. The problem that motivated this study was discussed. The national language policy on education stipulates that English must be the sole language of education at secondary school level. However, literature reveals many benefits that would accrue from using the learners' L1 in education in general, and from using the learners' L1 in the teaching of a second language. Proponents of bilingual teaching approaches and methods espouse such benefits. The aim, objectives, research question and sub-questions were stated. Delimitations of the study were made, after which an outline of the research was made. A definition of key terms that were used in the study was done, such as bilingualism, communication strategies, interlanguage, language policy, medium of instruction, New Englishes, Qualitative research, among others.

The next chapter focuses on the theoretical framework that informed the research and also reviews literature related to the study.

CHAPTER TWO: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

2. INTRODUCTION

This chapter focuses on the theory that informs the study and reviews related literature and studies. Bilingualism is the theory that underpins this study, so models of bilingualism are highlighted. The chapter also explores the importance of learning English as a Second Language. The goals of L2 teaching are also explored, as well as the role of language learners' L1 in L2 learning. Furthermore, the chapter reviews some theories of second language acquisition. Some monolingual and bilingual approaches and methods to L2 teaching are also explored. Communication strategies, of which code-switching is an aspect, are also explored in the chapter. Literature on code-switching, its models, code-switching in multiple settings in Zimbabwe, as well as code-switching in educational settings, is then reviewed. The relationship between code-switching and the concept of New Englishes is also examined. The chapter ends with a focus on the influences of teachers' and learners' beliefs on their classroom practices.

2.1 BILINGUALISM

This study on the impact of code-switching in the teaching and learning of English at two secondary schools in Masvingo District of Zimbabwe was informed by theories and models of Bilingualism. Code-switching is a manifestation of bilingualism.

There seems to be no common definition of bilingualism among researchers. For example, while Bloomfield (cited in Butler and Hakuta, 2006:114) defines bilinguals as individuals who have '*native-like control of two languages.*' Haugen (cited in Butler and Hakuta, 2006:114) gives a broader definition of bilinguals as individuals who are fluent in one language but who can produce '*complete meaningful utterances in the other language.*' Butler and Hakuta (in Bhatia and Ritchie, 2006) subscribe to this broader notion of bilingualism as they define bilinguals as individuals or groups of people who obtain communicative skills with varying levels of proficiency, in oral and/or written forms, so as to interact with speakers of one or more languages in a given society. The two authors also define bilingualism as psychological and sociological states of individuals or groups of people resulting from interactions, via language, in which two or more linguistic codes (including dialects), are used for communication.

Grosjean (1982:51) argues that *'Bilingualism is the regular use of two (or more) languages, and bilinguals are those people who need and use two (or more) languages in their everyday lives.'* Similarly, Hamers and Blanc (1990) regard a person as bilingual if they have access to two linguistic codes.

Hamers and Blanc (1990) identify and define individual bilingualism, which they call bilinguality and as a psychological state of an individual who has access to two or more languages. The authors also identify societal bilingualism, which they conceptualise as the state of a community in which languages are in contact and are available for use, and in which there are bilingual speakers. This study was interested in individual bilingualism or bilinguality.

2.1.1 Models of Bilingualism

This section takes a look at models of bilingualism, namely the Transitional Model, Subtractive Bilingualism, Additive Bilingualism, the Separate Underlying Proficiency (SUP) Model, the Common Underlying Proficiency (CUP) Model, the Thresholds Theory, and the Developmental Interdependence Hypothesis. The models show the relationship between a language learner's L1 and the language being learnt (L2). Thus, the models are relevant in this study which investigated the role of Shona in the teaching and learning of English at selected secondary schools in Zimbabwe.

2.1.1.1 The Transitional Model

In this model, learners are temporarily allowed to keep their L1 before being shifted to the dominant (official) language. They will only be moved to the second language when they are thought to be adequately proficient in it (Cummins, cited in Baker, 2006). The aim is to increase the use of the dominant language (L2), while proportionately reducing the use of the L1 (Villarreal, cited in Baker, 2006). The present study, therefore, sought to find out if English is being taught predominantly in English at the selected secondary schools in keeping with the Transitional Model, or whether Shona is being used, and with what impact.

2.1.1.2 Subtractive Bilingualism

This model demotes the L1, resulting in the loss of cultural identity and reduced self-concept (Baker, 2006). Also, in subtractive bilingualism, *'the bilingual feels that the second language is the cause of some loss with respect to the first'* (Malmkjaer, 1991:58). In the model, learners are moved away from the mother tongue as soon as possible. This may occur when the second language and culture are acquired so as to replace or demote the first language and culture (Ndamba, 2013). Subtractive bilingualism, therefore, aims at diminishing the role of the L1 while promoting the use of the L2. In this study, thus, I investigated whether the learners' L1 has been demoted or diminished in the teaching and learning of the second language (English) at the secondary school level in Zimbabwe.

2.1.1.3 Additive Bilingualism

The model promotes the development of both the L1 and the L2 and encourages the users' flexibility in them (Baker, 2006). In additive bilingualism, the bilingual *'feels enriched socially and cognitively by an additional language'* (Malmkjaer, 1991:58). The addition of a second language or culture is unlikely to replace or displace the L1 and its culture. Also, the L1 is not dispensed with as the language of instruction (Baker, 2006). This model, therefore, recognises the complementary roles played by the learners' L1 and the L2.

Although there clearly is bilingual education or *'education that uses and promotes two languages'* (Baker, 2006:213), Zimbabwe's Education Act of 1987, as amended in 1990, (cited in Nziramasanga, 1999) seems to promote subtractive bilingualism as it prescribes the use of English as a medium of instruction from Grade three of the primary school up to university. However, the country's Education Amendment Act of 2006 seems to raise the status of Ndebele and Shona by stating that English or Shona or Ndebele may be used as the medium of instruction prior to Form One. However, subtractive bilingualism continues because of teacher unwillingness to teach in the indigenous languages (Gora, 2013). *'Primary school teachers are of the view that it is not worthwhile to instruct in the mother tongue for a short period then switch to another medium of instruction for a greater part of one's educational life'* (Gora, 2013:124). This point is also raised by Shizha (2012: 786) who observes that *'Even prior to fourth*

grade, most teachers prefer the subtractive or submersion model that primarily makes English the medium of instruction from the outset, from the first grade.'

In the current study, therefore, I inquired into whether (as in the Additive Model of Bilingualism) the learners' L1 plays a complementary role, through code-switching, in the teaching and learning of English at secondary schools in Zimbabwe.

2.1.1.4 The Separate Underlying Proficiency (SUP) Model

The model posits that two languages cannot exist together in a person's mind at the same level, and that the two languages operate separately without transfer. Furthermore, a second language takes second place to the first one, thereby diminishing its level of proficiency (Cummins cited in Baker, 2006). In other words, according to Talebi (2014:215) the model postulates that:

proficiency in L1 would be separate from proficiency in L2 and that language representations would be stored separately in an individual's operating system... L1 would impede learning in L2 or delay its development and that content learned in L1 would not transfer to L2.

Thus, the SUP model shows a negative relationship between the first and the second language. The present study, thus, sought to find out secondary school teachers' and learners' beliefs about this relationship between the learners' L1 (Shona) and the L2 (English).

2.1.1.5 The Common Underlying Proficiency (CUP) Model

This model fundamentally differs from the SUP model in that it holds that there exists a state of equilibrium between the first and the second language. Thus, there appears to be adequate cerebral living quarters for them both (Cummins, cited in Baker, 2006). Therefore, *'cognitive/academic proficiency (e.g., skills such as phonological awareness, reading strategies, and vocabulary) developed in the first language would transfer to the second language and support acquisition of literary skills in the second language'* (Talebi, 2014: 215). When the child learns one language, he or she acquires skills and metalinguistic knowledge that can be depended on when working in another language. Thus, CUP provides the basis for the development of both the L1 and the L2.

Baker (2006) came up with six important ramifications from the Common Underlying Proficiency Model. Firstly, despite the language being used, thought comes from a single brain and, even with two or more languages thought comes from a single source. Secondly, bilingualism is possible because the brain can store two or more languages. Thirdly, information processing skills can be cognitively developed in two languages and also in one language. Fourthly, the language used in the classroom needs to be adequately developed so as to be able to tackle the cognitive challenges of the classroom. Then, speaking, listening, reading and writing in the L1 or the L2 helps the cognitive system to develop but learners should learn in a sufficiently developed L2. Finally, failure of either the L1 or the L2 to function well may impact negatively on cognitive functioning and academic performance.

The CUP Model, in a nutshell, views the first and the second language as existing side by side and playing complementary roles. In this research study, I sought to establish what the teachers and learners of English at the selected secondary schools believe about the relationship between Shona and English in the teaching and learning of English.

2.1.1.6 The Thresholds Theory

The theory consists of the first and the second thresholds, where the first threshold is a level that the child must reach so as to avoid negative consequences of bilingualism. The second threshold is the level that allows the child to experience positive benefits of bilingualism (Skutnabb-Kangas cited in Baker, 2006). Hence this study focused on whether or not the teachers and learners of English see any benefits accruing from using the learners' L1 (Shona) in the teaching and learning of English.

2.1.1.7 The Developmental Interdependence Hypothesis

This model is closely related to the Common Underlying Proficiency Model in that it posits that a child's second language competence is in part dependent on the level of competence already achieved in the first language. The more developed the first language, the easier it will be to develop the second language (Cummins cited in Baker, 2006). Thus, it was the focus of this study to find out whether or not the learners'

L1 (Shona) is viewed as being instrumental in the teaching and learning of the L2 (English), through code-switching.

2.2 BENEFITS OF BILINGUALISM

According to Crystal (1997), two thirds of the world's children grow up in bilingual environments. Wei (2000) states that one third of the world's population routinely speaks two or more languages. In fact, everyone is bilingual, according to Edwards (2006), since there is no one in the world who does not know at least a few words in languages other than the mother tongue. Edwards (2003:28) also views bilingualism as such a common phenomenon that he argues that monolingualism has become '*an aberration, an affliction of the powerful, and a disease to be cured.*'

Literature abounds on the benefits of bilingualism in the classroom. For example, Kessler and Quinn (1980) contend that bilingualism helps in developing strong thinking skills. Bialystok (2001) states that bilingualism assists the bilingual to focus, remember and making decisions. Jessner (2008) observes that bilingualism helps in the learning of other languages. Castro et al. (2011) give the metalinguistic advantage of being bilingual, that is, it helps in thinking about language. Diaz (1985) argues that the ability to read and think in two different languages promotes higher levels of abstract thought. In addition, Zelasko and Antunez (2000) aver that bilingual people understand Maths concepts and solve word problems more easily. May, Hill and Tiakiwai (2004) also give some of the advantages of bilingualism as cognitive flexibility, metalinguistic awareness, and communicative sensitivity (awareness of which language to speak in which situation). It is in light of these advantages that the present study focused on investigating the role played by Shona (learners' L1) in the teaching and learning of English Language at two selected secondary schools in Masvingo District. Focus was specifically on code-switching.

Related to bilingualism is the concept of multilingualism. Haugen (cited in Wachira, 2006) defines a bilingual as someone who knows two languages, the one who knows more than two languages, also known as a plurilingual, a multilingual or a polyglot. Here bilinguals and multilinguals are viewed as the same.

In the current study I assumed that the participants' (teachers' and learners') L1 is Shona, while English is their second language, thus the term bilingualism is preferred.

The following concepts that are related to this study all emanate from Bilingualism and are, thus, explored: interlanguage, Communication Strategies, code-switching, and New Englishes. Related studies are also reviewed.

2.3 THE IMPORTANCE OF LEARNING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

Language can be defined as *'a collection of symbols, letters, or words with arbitrary meanings that are governed by rules and used to communicate'* (Pearson et al., 2003:74). It is also defined by Crystal (1997) as the systematic and conventional use of sounds, signs or written symbols in human society, for purposes of communication and self-expression.

The notion that language influences thought is the underlying proposition of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis or linguistic relativity. The theory holds that certain properties of a given language have consequences for patterns of thought about reality (Lucy, 1997). The issue of language in the teaching and learning process, where *'the primary function of language is to impart factual information and to convey essential commands'* (Aitchison, 1987:27) is, thus, of far-reaching significance. Among the many functions of language, Yule (1985:6) gives the transactional function, *'whereby humans use their linguistic ability to communicate knowledge, skills and information.'* Wells (cited in Wells and Nicholls, 1985:39) also observes the importance of language in learning thus: *'For it is through the power of language to symbolise 'possible worlds' that have not yet been experienced, that... teachers can enable children to encounter new knowledge and skills and make them their own.'*

Literature points to many benefits that accrue from learning a second language such as English in Zimbabwe. Firstly, language learning is viewed as having cognitive benefits (Kirkpatrick, 2000). In line with this view, Byram (1993:93) states that language learning provides *'access to different bodies of knowledge which are unavailable to the monolingual speaker.'* In relation to this, Gibbons (1994:3) argues that language learning helps learners to *'understand that there are alternative ways of conceiving and labelling the universe.'* Baldauf (1993:125) also observes that language learning provides *'an analytic and communicative skill that enhances learning in other fields.'*

Language learning is also viewed as contributing to language awareness by providing feedback on the L2 and the culture it expresses, by encouraging the learner to pay attention to words and their meanings, and by encouraging the learner to use language to learn about the world (Hawkins, 1999). In addition, language learning aids learning the culture of the target language (Fitzgerald, 1999). Furthermore, according to Hawkins (1999), language learning is an exhilarating experience in itself that is intrinsically rewarding.

Equally important is the economic advantage of learning a language. According to Kirkpatrick (2000), speakers of only one language are disadvantaged on the international job market and in business. In Zimbabwe, the economic advantage of learning English dates back to the colonial era as stated by Chiwome (1996:7):

The English Language was prestigious... It was the medium of most instruction. For that reason it came to be viewed as the gateway to success. Its literature was viewed as world literature... Candidates aspired towards passing English, the language without which the Cambridge School Certificate would not be valid.

After independence in 1980, English continued to be viewed as the high status variety. According to Nyawaranda (1998:48):

English is a very important subject on the school curriculum. Because of its high status as an official language, because of its perceived international status, and because it is a compulsory subject at 'O' Level, English receives a disproportionate amount of attention in the secondary school curriculum; in fact, it takes the lion's share of the time allocated to subjects on the school's timetable. Even outside the school life, English is still highly regarded in the wider community.

Cook (2008:1) summarises the importance of language learning thus:

Language is at the centre of human life... Knowing another language may mean: getting a job; a chance to get educated; the ability to take part in the fuller life of one's own country or the opportunity to emigrate to another; an expansion of one's literary and cultural horizons; the expression of one's political opinions or religious beliefs. It affects people's careers and possible futures, their lives and very identities. In a world where probably speak two languages than one, language learning and language teaching are vital to everyday lives of millions.

English, which is the focus of this study, has become a global language because of the great significance that it has assumed internationally. *'A language achieves a genuinely global status when it develops a special role that is recognised in every country'* (Crystal, 1997:2). In Zimbabwe, English plays such a special role in that not only is it the medium of instruction at secondary school level, but it is also taught and learnt as a subject that must be passed for one to have a full O-Level certificate. It was also the sole official language until the adoption of the new constitution in 2013.

Nunan (2003:590) states that:

In academic contexts... more than 50% of the millions of academic papers published each year are written in English... English is currently the undisputed language of science and technology... in specific disciplines, English appears to be the universal language of communication.

Furthermore, in a study on the place of English in the educational systems of selected countries in the Asia and the Pacific regions, Nunan (2003) discovered that the ages at which English is introduced as a compulsory subject in China, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Taiwan and Vietnam range from 6 to 12 years of age. Nunan (2003:605) further observes that *'the age at which English is introduced as a compulsory subject in most of the countries has shifted down in recent years, a shift that is predicated on the importance of English as a global language.'*

From the importance of learning a second language discussed above, the implication is that a second language, in this context English, should be taught and learnt in the best possible manner for it to be understood. How to acquire a second language more

effectively is a significant task for the twenty-first century (Macaro, 2009). One way of teaching and learning a second language is through the use of learners' L1 (code-switching) and this was the focus of this study which sought to find out secondary school teachers' and learners' beliefs about English-Shona code-switching in the teaching and learning of English.

2.4 THE GOAL OF SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHING AND LEARNING

According to Krashen and Terrell (1983), the primary goal of language learning should be the development of communication skills. Ohmaye (1998) also sees the primary function of language as communication and interaction. This view is also held by Hoff (2013) who states that one of the objectives of language learning world-wide is the acquisition of communicative competence.

Hymes (cited in Simensen, 2007:72) coined the term 'communicative competence' to refer to *'when to speak, when not, and as to what to talk about with whom, when, where, in what manner.'* Later Canale and Swain (1980) conceptualised communicative competence as consisting of four aspects, namely grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence. Grammatical competence includes the ability to comprehend and manipulate vocabulary, rules of word formation and combination, pronunciation and spelling. Sociolinguistic competence refers to the ability to produce and comprehend appropriate utterances, based on the situation and the people involved in the communication. It is *'an understanding of social context in which communication takes place'* (Richards and Rodgers, 2007:160). Discourse competence involves the skill of combining grammatical forms into a unified spoken or written text that is appropriate to the situation and the purpose. It is *'concerned with the connection of utterances to form a meaningful whole'* (Savignon, 1983:38). Finally, strategic competence has to do with the ability to use communication strategies to achieve goals, and compensate for breakdowns in communication. Strategic competence refers to *'the coping strategies that communicators employ to initiate, terminate, maintain, repair, and redirect communication'* (Richards and Rodgers, 2007:160). Yule (2012) also argues that communicative competence is the ability to use a language accurately, appropriately, and flexibly, that is, grammatical, sociolinguistic/pragmatic, and strategic competence, respectively.

Studies on communication strategies (Maleki, 2010; Mei and Nathalang, 2010; Xhaferi, 2012; Ugla, 2013) show that code-switching is one of the communication strategies that a language learner may make use of, and, therefore, any language teacher who embraces communicative competence as the primary goal of language teaching and learning could accept code-switching as a functional language teaching and learning tool. Thus, this study aims at finding out the beliefs of the selected secondary school English teachers about the use of code-switching as a communication strategy when teaching.

The Zimbabwe School Examinations Council (ZIMSEC) Ordinary Level English Language Syllabus (1122) (1996:2) acknowledges that the major goal of second language teaching and learning is the acquisition of communicative competence, as the syllabus recommends a teaching approach that is:

... intended to provide pupils with the communication skills necessary for the different roles and situations in which they are likely to find themselves after leaving school... to make the learning of the English language more functional and purposeful...

The syllabus is apparently referring to Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). This study sought, therefore, to find out whether the selected secondary school teachers of English use CLT, with its judicious use of the learners' L1, to make the teaching and learning of English more functional and purposeful.

2.5 ROLE OF THE LEARNERS' L1 IN THE L2 CLASSROOM

One of the issues that have taken centre stage in the field of bilingualism and language teaching is whether or not the learners' L1 should be used in the classroom. Macaro (2014) refers to the 'virtual' position, in which the teacher's belief is that the whole teaching and learning process should be in the target language, and the 'maximal' position in which the teacher concedes, though begrudgingly, that in reality some L1 will be used because of the learners' low target language proficiency. Then there is the 'optimal' position, in which the teacher sees the L1 as playing a beneficial role in the teaching and learning of the L2, but is aware of both the pros and cons of using

the L1 in the classroom. This study, thus, seeks to establish the beliefs of the selected secondary school teachers on the role of the learners' L1 in L2 teaching and learning.

Al-Nofaie (2010) acknowledges that the use of the L1 when teaching the L2 has dominated L2 acquisition for decades and has been a controversial issue. This observation is shared by Kafes (2011:128) who states that *'The role and use of L1 in instructed second/foreign language classroom... has without any doubt been at the crux of a fair extent of controversy, debate and discussion.'* Both Al-Nofaie (2010) and Kafes (2011) identify two schools of thought that have either advocated for, or rejected the use of the L1 in L2 teaching and learning. These are the Bilingual Approach and the Monolingual Approach, respectively.

While the Bilingual Approach accepts or encourages use of learners' L1 in L2 teaching and learning, in monolingual teaching *'the teaching itself, as well as the organisation of the work in the classroom, should take place in the target language,* (Simensen, 2007:236). This exclusive use of the L2 was advocated for by the Reform Movement in the advent of the Direct Method, in which *'teaching in the target language itself would establish direct associations or links between L2 items and the things, actions, and the states talked about'* (Simensen, 2002:26).

Cook (2001) observes that, over the last century, use of the L1 in L2 learning has largely been regarded as taboo and was, therefore, banned or minimised. Cook also states that proponents of the Monolingual Approach argue that, firstly, the learning of an L2 should be modelled on the learning of an L1, that is, through maximum exposure to the L2. Secondly, the advocates claim that successful learning involves the separation and distinction between the L1 and the L2. Thirdly, it is argued that students should be shown the importance of the L2 by its continual use. Furthermore, the rationale behind the Monolingual Approach is that the more students are exposed to the target language (TL), the quicker they will learn it and, as they learn and use it, they internalise and begin to think in it. In addition, the only way that learners will learn the TL is if they are forced to use it (Auerbach, cited in Sharma, 2006). In the words of Cook (2008:95), *'the purpose of language teaching in one sense is to provide optimal samples of language for the learner to profit from – the best 'input' to the process of language learning.'*

On the part of teachers, Moodley (2014:61) observes that (in situations where English is the target language):

When the matrix language is English, the co-occurrence of English with another language is frequently viewed as a 'sub-standard' language behaviour and teachers seldom feel at ease with this phenomenon in the classroom, on the other hand, when the matrix language is an indigenous language, and the guest language is English, speakers tend to feel 'superior' or 'knowledgeable' in their display of English.

Hence, the present study sought to find out the selected teachers' beliefs in the situation where English is the target and hence matrix language and Shona the guest language.

Moreover, according to Macaro (2001:551), proponents of L2 exclusivity argue that *'teaching entirely through the TL makes the language real, allows learners to experience unpredictability, and develops the learners' own in-built language system.'*

On the contrary, Miles (2004) argues for the use of the Bilingual Approach, and condemns the Monolingual Approach on the grounds that, firstly, it is impractical, secondly, native teachers are not necessarily the best teachers, and thirdly, exposure (to TL) alone is not sufficient for learning. In support of the Bilingual Approach, Brown (2000:68) also argues that the first language *'can be a facilitating factor not just an interfering factor.'* Brown is here alluding to the issue of language transfer, which is defined by Odlin (1993:27) as *'the influence resulting from similarities and differences between the target language and any other language that has been previously (and perhaps imperfectly) acquired.'*

The facilitating factor (Brown, 2000) is what is referred to as positive transfer, or a situation where similarities between the L1 and the L2 can facilitate learning. Positive transfer is also defined by Nunan (2000) as the use of the rules that coincide in both the L1 and the L2 and the learners using the L1 rules to benefit from learning the L2. The interfering factor (Brown, 2000) refers to negative transfer, or the use of L1 rules in the learning of an L2 although such rules do not exist in the L2 (Nunan, 2000). Dulay

and Burt (cited in Maniam, 2010), refer to negative transfer as interference, which they define as automatic transfer, due to habit, of the surface structure of the L1 on the surface structure of the L2.

In apparent reference to the notion of negative transfer, Sridhar (1994:802) states that second language learners' first languages are *'not viewed as resources; they are at best shadowy presences, which have only a nuisance value as sources of interference and as the incompetent learner's last resource for performing with competence.'* The term interference, however, is now viewed as representing an out-dated and incorrect view of the influence of L1 influence on L2 learning, so transfer is regarded as a more preferable term. Jarvis and Pavlenko (2001:1) define transfer as *'the influence of a person's knowledge of one language on that person's knowledge or use of another language.'*

Cook (2002) identifies the concept of multi-competence, which is defined as the compound state of the mind with two grammars. Cook views L2 users as being different from L1 users and encourages language teachers to celebrate this difference, adding that L2 users can never become native speakers, so comparing them to native speakers would set a standard that is unattainable and undesirable. Cook (2012) also says multi-competence takes the goal of language teaching as the production of a successful L2 user, not an imitation native speaker, and adds that multi-competence does not see any virtue in making learners use the L2 only in the classroom since this denies the existence of the L1 in their minds. Thus, Cook (2001) argues for the maximisation of the L1, since multi-competence means that the L1 is always present in the users' minds. Thus avoiding it would be artificial and sometimes inefficient.

In support of the use of the learners' L1 in the L2 classroom, Corder (1992:24) avers that:

Second language learners not only possess a language system which is potentially available as a factor in the acquisition of a second language, but equally importantly they already know something of what a language is for, what its communicative functions and potentials are.

In addition, the L1 is seen as playing a chiefly heuristic and facilitatory role, helping in discovery and creation (Corder, 1992).

For Harbord (1992), using the L1 in the L2 classroom is a humanistic approach which allows learners to express themselves, and also to be themselves. For this reason, rigidly

eliminating or limiting the native language does not appear to guarantee better acquisition, nor does it foster the humanistic approach that recognises learners identities as native speakers of a valuable language that is as much a part of them as their names (Harbord, 1992, p. 351).

In support of the learners' use of their L1 in the L2 classroom is Nguyen (2010) who also observes that being tolerant of the learners' L1 encourages their participation.

Macaro (2001) also avers that excluding the L1 in L2 learning is impractical and may deprive learners of an important tool for language learning. Macaro (2005:68) also argues that the L1 is *'the language of thought for all but the most advanced L2 learners.'* Deller and Rinvoluceri (2002) see the L1 as being not only necessary but also effective. Choong (2006:2) gives some of the reasons for using the L1 in the classroom as *'to convey and check comprehension of grammatical forms and meanings, to give instructions, and to manage the class'*, and adds that *'These things may be difficult or impossible to do without resorting to the L1, and it saves time that might be squandered trying to conform to a strict rule of L1 prohibition.'* Also, Atkinson (1988), Collingham (1988), Piasecka (1988), and Harbord (1992) (all cited in Al-Nofaie, 2010) give many and generally similar L1 use occasions in the L2 classroom which are viewed as strategies to facilitate communication and learning. Such L1 use occasions include eliciting language, checking comprehension, giving instructions, presenting and reinforcing language, checking for sense, testing, building and maintaining co-operation among learners, facilitating teacher-student relationships, among others. It is in view of such L1 use occasions that the current study investigated what obtains in selected secondary schools in Masvingo District, focusing on code-switching.

The learners L1 is also seen as useful in teaching content subjects, although arguments have also been given in favour of a second language such as English. For example, Cook (cited in Mufanechiya and Mufanechiya, 2010:117) acknowledges the importance of English, observing that knowing English is associated with:

getting a job, the ability to take fuller part in the life of one's own country or the opportunity to emigrate to another, an expansion of one's literary and cultural horizons, the expression of one's political opinions or religious beliefs.

Nyawaranda (2000:26-27) also states that English is seen as an advantageous language of instruction in Zimbabwe because it is perceived as '*an economic gate-keeper*' and, thus, '*there are still some schools that insist on use of English at all times on school premises.*' According to Peresuh and Masuku (2002:29), English is being used as the medium of instruction partly for political considerations, the argument being that '*promoting a common language, namely English, is necessary in order to promote national unity, as this facilitates inter-group communication and mutual understanding.*'

However, Peresuh and Masuku (2002:27) also state that '*Research has amply demonstrated the superiority of the mother tongue (L1) to the second language (L2) as the medium of instruction for the subjects of the school curriculum.*' The UNESCO document (cited in Peresuh and Masuku, 2002:28) is also in support of use of learners L1 as it states that:

Psychologically, (the mother tongue) is a system of meaningful signs that, in (a child's) mind, works automatically for expression and understanding. Sociologically, it is a means of identification among members of a community to which he belongs. Educationally, he learns more quickly through it than through an unfamiliar linguistic medium.

Halbach (2012:33) alludes to the fact that the learning of new and complex material requires the L1 medium by observing that:

As students move up into higher grades, and the contents that have to be taught become increasingly more complex, teachers find it more and more difficult to deal with the challenge... the combination of new concepts to be learnt with a foreign language medium to do so. Not knowing how to face this challenge, many teachers finally resort to students' L1 for these more complex explanations.

Many studies have been carried out on the role of the learners' L1 in the L2 classroom. These include studies by Nyawaranda (2000), Cook (2001), Storch and Wigglesworth (2003), Sharma (2006), Al-Nofaie (2010), Grim (2010), Kafes (2011), and Halasa and Al-Manaseer (2012). However, within the Zimbabwean context, this researcher has only come across Nyawaranda's study that investigated the role of the learners L1 in L2 (English Language) learning. However, Nyawaranda's study also does not investigate the beliefs of the learners themselves about the use of their L1 in the teaching and learning of the L2 (English) nor on the spoken productions of the learners, which the present study did.

2.6 SOME THEORIES OF SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION (SLA)

Second Language Acquisition (SLA), according to Kramsch (2000:322), *'might be called a theory of practice of [second] language acquisition and use. The theory of [second] language study makes explicit or implicit claims as to how languages can or should be taught in the classroom.* SLA focuses on the acquisitional aspects of language learning and teaching, within or outside classroom contexts (Kramsch, 2000). However, the present study was interested in what goes on inside the L2 classroom. While some of the SLA theories seem to allow for, or advocate for the use of the learners' L1 in L2 teaching and learning, others appear to discourage or forbid the use of the learners' L1. The theories are, thus, relevant to this study on the impact of code-switching in the teaching and learning of English at the two selected secondary schools. The theories that I found relevant in the context of this study are the Acculturation Model, Krashen's Input Hypothesis, the Sociocultural Theory, and Interlanguage.

2.6.1 The Acculturation Model

Propounded by Schumann (1978), the model posits that Second Language Acquisition (SLA) is influenced by acculturation, defined as *'the social and psychological integration of the learner with the target language (TL) group'* (Schumann, 1978:29). In a study of six language learners, Schumann (1978:34) established that *'the subject who acquired the least amount of English was the one who was the most socially and psychologically distant from the TL group.'* Hence, the fewer the social and psychological distances from the TL group the greater the success in SLA because *'the degree to which a learner acculturates to the target language group will control the degree to which he acquires the second language'* (Schumann, 1978:34). Furthermore, Schumann (1986:385) argues that while acculturation is not a direct cause of Second Language Acquisition, it :

as a remote cause brings the learner into contact with TL-speakers and verbal interaction with those speakers brings about the negotiation of appropriate input which then operates as the immediate cause of language acquisition.

By advocating a second language learner's immersion in the target language, the Acculturation Model, therefore, seems to trivialise the role of the L1 in L2 learning. Thus, language teachers who believe in the Acculturation Model of second language acquisition are likely to shun code-switching between the target language and the learners' L1. Therefore, the present study sought to find out whether or not the selected secondary school teachers of English in Masvingo District code-switch, and, if so, what their reasons are.

2.6.2 Krashen's Input/Comprehension Hypothesis

The Input Hypothesis falls under the Creative Construction or the Natural Approach (Altenaichinger, 2003). According to Krashen (1985), the theory has five hypotheses. The first hypothesis is the Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis, which states that language acquisition is a sub-conscious process, which is identical to the process that children use in acquiring their first language, while learning is a conscious process and results in knowing about language.

Second is what Krashen (1985) calls the Natural Order Hypothesis, which states that we acquire the rules of a language in a predictable order, with some rules coming early and others late. Third is the Monitor Hypothesis, which posits that our ability to produce utterances in another language comes from our subconscious knowledge. Learning, which is our conscious knowledge, serves only as an editor or Monitor. Fourth, and directly linked to the present study, is the Input Hypothesis, whose proposition, according to Krashen (2005:2), is that:

humans acquire language in only one way- by understanding messages, or by receiving 'comprehensible input' We progress along the natural order (hypothesis 2) by understanding input that contains structures at our next 'stage' – structures that are a bit beyond our current level of competence... input is the essential environmental ingredient.

The fifth hypothesis, according to Krashen (1985), is the Affective Filter Hypothesis which states that while comprehensible input is necessary for language acquisition, it is not enough because the learner needs to be open to input. The affective filter is a block that prevents the learner from fully using the comprehensible input, that is, when the filter is up. However, when the filter is down, language acquisition is enhanced. Krashen (1985:6) then summarises the five hypotheses, showing that he sees no role played by the L1 in L2 learning by claiming that:

people acquire second languages only if they obtain comprehensible input and if their affective filters are low enough to allow the input 'in'. When the filter is 'down' and appropriate comprehensible input is presented (and comprehended), acquisition is inevitable.

The Input Hypothesis, therefore, apparently advocates exclusive use of the target language and is relevant to the current study on selected teachers' and learners' beliefs about code-switching in the teaching and learning of English.

2.6.3 The Sociocultural Theory

According to Lantolf and Thorne (2007:217-218), the Sociocultural Theory is *'grounded in a perspective that does not separate the individual from the social and in*

fact argues that the individual emerges from social interaction and as such is always fundamentally a social being.' In the theory, learning is thought to occur when the individual *'interacts with the interlocutor within his/her Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)'* (Lightbown and Spada, 2006:47). Thus, in the social world, language learners observe others using language and imitate them and, with the collaboration of other social actors, the language learners move from one stage to another (Menezes, 2013). Thus, according to Levine (2011) there is need for scaffolding from the teacher or from other students.

By situating the language learner in a social context, the Sociocultural Theory seems to imply that the language learner's L1 plays a pivotal role in L2 learning because, for instance, if the language learner finds himself or herself in a bilingual and hence code-switching social milieu, the L2 learner may find code-switching inevitable. Thus, the Sociocultural Theory has a direct bearing on the present study on the impact of code-switching in the teaching and learning of English at selected secondary schools in Masvingo District.

2.6.4 Interlanguage

An important aspect of bilingualism that has gained prominence in the teaching and learning of English as a Second Language, which this study draws from, is the concept of interlanguage. The notion of interlanguage is central in the explanation of bilingual learner language or Second Language Acquisition (Hamers and Blanc, 1990). According to McLaughlin (1988:60-61), the term interlanguage was first coined by Selinker to refer to a *'separate linguistic system resulting from a learner's attempted production of the target language norm.'* Brown (1987:169) defines interlanguage as *'the separateness of a second language learner's system, a system that has a structurally intermediate status between the native and the target languages.'* According to Brown (1987), Nemser (1971) and Corder (1971) referred to the same phenomenon as 'approximate system' and 'idiosyncratic dialect', respectively.

Interlanguage may also be viewed as a strategy in which the speaker tries to reach the interlocutor's L1 but has little proficiency in it (Duran, 1994). Klein (1986) defines interlanguage as learner-language varieties and says they should be viewed as systematic, variable and creative, with rules unique from themselves, not just

borrowed from other languages. For Ellis (1985), interlanguage refers to a series of developmental stages which L1 learners pass on their way to the target language proficiency.

According to Selinker (cited in McLaughlin, 1988), interlanguage is a product of five central processes involved in L2 learning. These are language transfer, transfer of training, strategies of second language learning, strategies of second language communication, and overgeneralisation. The present study was concerned with strategies of second language communication or communication strategies and in particular, selected code-switching. The study investigated the role played by learners' L1 (Shona) in the teaching and learning of English Language at two secondary schools in Masvingo District.

Duran (1994) sees a possible strong relationship between interlanguage and code-switching and argues that they may appear more or less concurrently in the language life of the developing bilingual. However, Duran adds that interlanguage may be associated with the earlier stages of the developing bilinguals, and code-switching with the middle and later phases of bilingual acquisition. Duran goes on to observe that, both interlanguage and code-switching are often seen as nonnormative forms of language which, however, seem to have a function of facilitating thinking and may someday be viewed as normative and significant in the life of bilinguals. The present study, therefore, sought to find out what the situation is like with regard to code-switching in the teaching of English at two secondary schools in Masvingo District.

2.7 SOME MONOLINGUAL AND BILINGUAL APPROACHES

Some monolingual and bilingual approaches and methods to L2 teaching

While some authors use the terms 'approach' and 'method' interchangeably, Richards and Rodgers (2007) make a distinction between the two. They state that a language teaching approach refers to a theory about the nature of language and language learning that serves as a source of practices and principles in language teaching. An approach is concerned with a model of language competence and with the basic features of linguistic organisation and language use, as well as the central processes of learning and the conditions that are believed to promote successful learning. A

method, however, is the level at which theory is put into practice, choices made about the skills and content to be taught, and in what order (Richards and Rodgers, 2007). A method, thus, is at a broader level than an approach. Richards and Rodgers (2007:15) further posit that *'Particular approaches and methods, if followed precisely, will lead to more effective learning than alternative ways of teaching'*, and that *'The quality of language teaching will improve if teachers use the best available approaches and methods.'*

In terms of teaching methods that recommend and those that reject the use of learners' L1 in the L2 classroom, El-Dali (2012) posits that there are two extremes represented by the Grammar-Translation Method and the Direct Method, with the former advocating liberal use of the L1 and the latter inhibiting its use. Between these two extremes is the New Concurrent Method, which requires teachers to balance the use of the L1 and the L2 through systematic and purposeful code-switching when introducing concepts, reviewing previous lessons, capturing learner attention, and praising learners (Faltis cited in Al-Nofaie, 2010). Another method which advocates for judicious use of the L1 is Communicative Language Teaching (Richards and Rodgers, 2007), while the Natural Approach advocated for by Terrell and Krashen (1983) rejects use of the L1 as it focuses *'less on accurate production and more on the natural development and exposure to the target language... a learner should concentrate on the input before trying to produce the language'* (Aslam, 2009:66).

In apparent reference to Bilingual and Monolingual approaches and methods, Madrid and Sanchez (2001) identify crosslingual and intralingual techniques. On the one hand, in crosslingual techniques, the learner receives input in the L2 while the L1 is used to clarify meaning, thereby helping lost, confused or disoriented students and satisfying the needs of the learner. Such techniques are based on the assumption that the learner will not develop the L2 independently, but in relation to the L1. This is called compound bilingualism.

On the other hand, intralingual techniques are within the TL most of the time, with the TL used as the exclusive framework of reference. This is called coordinate bilingualism (Madrid and Sanchez, 2001). The focus of this study, therefore, was to investigate whether the selected secondary school teachers of English use monolingual or

bilingual approaches and methods, that is, whether they use intralingual or crosslingual techniques, and their reasons for doing so.

2.7.1 The Direct Method (DM)

This was the first monolingual teaching method. It was developed at the end of the 19th Century against the earlier Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) (Thornbury, 2000). The Direct Method was modelled along observations of child language learning (Richards and Rodgers, 2007). The learner was supposed to learn grammar inductively, through exposure to the TL, the same way children learn their L1 (Thornbury, 2000). Thus, classroom instruction was given in the TL only, with the students' L1 totally excluded (Richards and Rodgers, 2007). In other words, meaning was *'to be conveyed directly in the target language through the use of demonstration and visual aids, with no recourse to the students' native language'* (Diller cited in Larsen-Freeman, 2000:23). Brown (1987:57) also points out that the basic premise of the Direct Method *'was that second language learning should be more like first language learning: lots of active oral interactions, spontaneous use of the language, no translation between the first and the second language...'*

However, the method was criticised for its exclusive use of the TL, which was viewed as being sometimes counter-productive because of the teacher's long explanations engendered by prohibition of translation. Total banishment of the learners' L1 was rejected by teachers who felt that there was less harm in translating some words and phrases than in leaving pupils to *'flounder around...'* (Howatt and Widdowson, 2004:225). Stern (1983:40) also states that the Direct Method was beset with the problem of *'how to convey meaning without translating, and how to safeguard against misunderstanding without reference to the first language...'*

In the present study, thus, I sought to find out whether the selected secondary school teachers of English teach English in English only as advocated by the Direct Method, or whether they code-switch between English and the learners' L1.

2.7.2 The Audio-Lingual Method (ALM)

The Audio-Lingual Method was another monolingual method also known as the Army Method. The Audio-Lingual Method focused on intensive oral drilling (Richards and Rodgers, 2007). Language was viewed as a form of behaviour which was to be

acquired through the formation of correct speech habits (Thornbury, 2000). The teacher would model the TL and there was no use of the learners' L1 (Richards and Rodgers, 2007), since the L1 was thought to interfere with students' attempt at mastering the target language, focus being on accuracy and error-free utterances (Larsen-Freeman, 2000).

The current study, therefore, sought to find out whether the selected teachers avoid the learners L1 in keeping with the Audio-Lingual Method.

2.7.3 The Natural Approach

Developed by Terrell and Krashen, the Natural Approach focused on comprehensive input in the target language (Richards and Rodgers, 2007). Meaning is put across directly through demonstration and action, without translation or use of the learners' L1 (Nunan and Lamb, 1996) hence it is a monolingual approach. According to Krashen and Terrell (1995:59), *'The classroom is the source of input for the language students, a place where they can obtain the comprehensible input necessary for language acquisition... consistent with language acquisition theory...'*

The Natural Approach is, thus, a monolingual approach that banishes the use of code-switching between the target language and the learners' L1. Therefore the present study focused on finding out whether the selected secondary school teachers of English model their teaching on the Natural Approach that forbids use of the learners' L1.

2.7.4 The Grammar Translation Method (GTM)

Prevalent from the 1840s to the 1940s, but still being used in a modified form today, the Grammar Translation Method made extensive use of language learners' L1. It focused on the study of grammar rules, followed by their application in translation exercises into and out of the TL (Richards and Rodgers, 2007). The grammar rule was first stated explicitly and translation exercises followed (Thornbury, 2000). The Grammar-Translation Method was, thus, clearly a bilingual method in which, according to Nhan and Lai (2012:560):

The students' native language was employed as the standard medium of instruction which was used to explain new items and to draw comparisons

between the foreign language and the students' first language... the meaning of the target language is made clear by an equivalent translation in the students' native language.

Furthermore, instructions were given in the learners' L1 (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). The method was, however, criticised for, among other shortcomings, preventing learners from getting the necessary natural language input that would assist them to acquire the target language (Harmer, 2007), because the target language was subordinated to the L1. It was, thus, also the concern of the current study to find out whether the teachers under study code-switch through translation as they teach English.

2.7.5 Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) focuses on the functional and communicative purpose of language (Richards and Rodgers, 2007), since *'Language learning is learning to communicate'* (Finocchiaro and Brumfit, 1983, p.91). Focus, thus, is on communicative competence, which according to Thornbury (2000:18), *'involves knowing how to use the grammar and vocabulary of the language to achieve communicative goals, and knowing how to do this in a socially appropriate way.'* Although learners use the TL to communicate authentically and meaningfully (Richards and Rodgers, 2007), judicious use of the learners' L1 is permitted (Finocchiaro and Brumfit, 1983). This is also echoed by Larsen-Freeman (2000:132), who states that:

Judicious use of the student's native language is permitted in CLT. However, whenever possible, the target language should be used not only during communicative activities, but also for explaining the activities to students or in assigning homework. The students learn from these classroom management exchanges, too, and realise that the target language is a vehicle for communication...

Thus, the present study sought to find out whether the teachers of English use the learners' mother tongue as permitted by CLT.

2.7.6 Dodson's Bilingual Method

According to Dodson (1967), in the Bilingual Method, the teacher reads a second language sentence aloud several times and gives its meaning in the L1 of the learners. After this, the students imitate the teacher by repeating the sentence in chorus, then individually. The teacher then tests the learners' comprehension by saying the L1 sentence, while pointing to a picture and asks the language learners to answer in the TL. The method, thus, makes use of the learners' L1 and, as the name suggests, is a bilingual method that promotes code-switching between the TL and the learners' first language.

2.7.7 The New Concurrent Method

According to Jacobson (1990), in the New Concurrent Method, the teacher switches from one language to another at key points, following particular rules, with the aim of balancing dual language use. The method, thus, approves of code-switching - just like the code-switching that happens in real life – the aim being to accomplish the goal of '*strengthening of both languages*' (Chamot and Stewner-Manzaneres, 1985:31). The New Concurrent Method is thus, relevant for the present study on code-switching in the teaching and learning of English at selected secondary schools in Masvingo District.

2.7.8 Community Language Teaching

According to Curran (1976), in Community Language Teaching, language learners spontaneously talk to each other in the L2, through the mediation of the L1. A student says something in his or her L1 and the teacher translates it into the L2, while the other students listen to both the L1 and the L2 utterances. Thus, the L1 is viewed as the initiator of L2 meaning.

Therefore, Community Language Teaching encourages code-switching in L2 teaching, an issue which was at the centre of the current study.

2.7.9 Other Views on Language Teaching Methods

On methods of English Language teaching, Larsen-Freeman (2000) rejects absolutism – the belief that one single method can be the best – and calls for relativism and pluralism. While relativism recognises that methods have their strengths and weaknesses and are, therefore, not practical for all contexts, pluralism advocates for

synthesising of different methods, thus, recognising the value of each method. Larsen-Freeman (2000:182) argues that *'...rather than adopting or rejecting methods in their entirety as being suitable or unsuitable for a particular context, different methods, or parts of methods, should be practised in the same teaching context.'* By implication, therefore, Larsen-Freeman seems to be calling for the fusion of monolingual and bilingual L2 teaching methods. The present study was, thus, interested in finding out the language choices of the L2 (English) teachers in the English classroom.

Perhaps an L2 teacher's decision on whether to use or not to use the L1 in the L2 classroom could be guided by Kumaravadivelu's (2006) Postmethod pedagogy. Kumaravadivelu (2006:171) argues that post-method pedagogy is pedagogy that *'must be sensitive to a particular group of teachers teaching a particular group of learners pursuing a particular set of goals within a particular institutional context embedded in a particular socio-cultural milieu.'* Apart from this aspect of particularity (sensitivity to context), Kumaravadivelu also states that post-method pedagogy is also characterised by practicality (teacher-generated theory of practice), and possibility (a critical reflection of prevailing social and historical conditions). These three aspects of particularity, practicality and possibility *'interact with each other in a synergic relationship where the whole is greater than the sum of its parts'* (Kumaravadivelu, 2003:545). Therefore, whether or not the L2 teacher should or should not employ the language learners' L1 could be guided by Kumaravadivelu's notions of particularity, practicality and possibility.

However, post-method pedagogy clearly recognises the important role played by the L1 in L2 teaching and learning, as one of the principles of the pedagogy is that the teacher should ensure social relevance. Kumaravadivelu (2003) actually suggests that the L1 is a rich resource that enables the teacher to make a link between the home language and the TL, thereby ensuring social relevance. Kumaravadivelu, thus, seems to encourage code-switching between the target language and the learners' L1, which is the focus of this inquiry.

Related to Kumaravadivelu's Post-method pedagogy is what Prabhu (1990) terms a sense of plausibility. A sense of plausibility is defined as a sense of a teacher's subjective understanding or personal conceptualisation of teaching carried out in the

classroom and their envisaged effect. It is a kind of pedagogical intuition that emanates from a teacher's experience as a learner, as a teacher, exposure to teaching methods, what the teacher knows or thinks about other teachers' actions or opinions, and the teacher's experience as a parent or caretaker. Prabhu (1990:173) then articulates the importance of the teacher engaging the sense of plausibility thus:

It is when the teacher's sense of plausibility is engaged in the teaching operation that a teacher can be said to be involved, and the teaching not to be mechanical. Further, when a sense of plausibility is engaged, the activity of teaching is productive: There is then a basis for the teacher to be satisfied or dissatisfied about the activity, and each instance of such satisfaction or dissatisfaction is itself a further influence on the sense of plausibility, confirming or disconfirming or revising it in some small measure, and generally contributing to its growth and change.

By implication, therefore, Prabhu seems to advocate code-switching if the L2 teacher sees it as plausible.

Similar to Prabhu's sense of plausibility is Gebhard and Oprandy's (1999) argument that instead of being concerned with a search for the best method, the teacher should be concerned with the learners and trying to find out what works for them. Thus, by implication, the L2 teacher should code-switch or avoid code-switching if he or she sees this as what is best for the learner.

Similarly, Tribble (1997) calls for teacher independence, avoidance of fixed ideas, and promotion of fashionable formulas, exploration of principles and experimenting with techniques in the classroom. In support of flexibility on the part of teachers, is Tomlinson (2005:143), who also argues that *'flexible, weak versions of pedagogic approaches, which encourage teacher variation within a recommended framework, have a much better chance of helping teachers to help their learners to learn.'* The current study, thus, took place within the context of not only the reviewed Monolingual and Bilingual language teaching approaches and methods (crosslingual and intralingual techniques), but also within post-method pedagogy, and the concept of a sense of plausibility.

2.8 COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES

Ellis (2006:529) defines a second language learner strategy as a *'mental or behavioural activity related to some specific stage in the overall process of language acquisition or language use.'* Cohen (1998) defines language learning and language use strategies as processes that learners consciously select and which may result in action being taken so as to enhance the learning or use of a second or foreign language. The strategies, according to Cohen (1998:5), constitute *'the steps or actions consciously selected by the learners either to improve the learning of a second language, the use of it, or both.'*

According to Brown (2000), a communication strategy is a method of achieving communication or encoding or expressing meaning in a language. Faerch and Kasper (1983) explain that communication strategies constitute events occurring while the individual generates or plans and executes messages. When creating a plan, the individual may experience a gap in his/her linguistic knowledge and, due to this, the original plan cannot be executed and a different one is required and then executed as a communication strategy. Ellis (2009:60) shares this intra-individual view of communication strategies by stating that *'As anyone who has tried to communicate in L2 knows, learners frequently experience problems in stating what they want to say because of their inadequate knowledge. In order to overcome those problems, they resort to various kinds of communication strategies.'*

The same view is shared by Poulisse (1990) who defines communication strategies as compensatory strategies or processes that are adopted by language users in creating alternative means of expressing themselves when they face linguistic shortcomings that make it impossible to communicate their intended meanings in the preferred manner. Hedge (2000) also observes that learners can compensate for their lack of resources in the second language by either changing their original intention or by resorting to other ways of expressing themselves. Other authors who share the same view of communication strategies are Mitchell and Myles (1998:94) who state that communication strategies are *'tactics used by the non-fluent learner during L2 interaction, in order to overcome specific communicative problems.'* Similarly, Ugla et al. (2013:131) define communication strategies as *'The strategies that are used by*

English as a second language (ESL) learners to overcome the breakdowns during oral communication....' The purpose of such strategies is to achieve mutual understanding between interlocutors (Dornyei and Scott, 1997).

However, from an inter-individual perspective, communication strategies, according to Tarone (1983:64), are:

a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared... attempts to bridge the gap between the linguistic knowledge of the target language learner, and the linguistic knowledge of the target language interlocutor in real communicative situations.

Implicit in this definition is that communication strategies involve both parties engaged in communication. Hence, the current study focused on code-switching by both teachers and learners of English.

Bialystok (1990) identifies problemat�city, consciousness and intentionality as common features in the various definitions of communication strategies offered by various scholars. Problemat�city implies that the strategies are adopted when problems that may interrupt communication are perceived in language learning or production. This is encapsulated in most of the definitions of communication strategies (Faerch and Kasper, 1983; Poulisse, 1990; Mitchell and Myles, 1998; Hedge, 2000; Ellis, 2009; Ugla et al., 2013). Consciousness refers to the learners awareness that a strategy is being employed for a particular purpose, or awareness of how the strategy may lead to an intended effect. Intentionality refers to language learners' control over communication strategies so that a choice may be made from a range of options and then applied to achieve certain effects (Mei and Nathalang, 2010).

However, Cook (1993) points out that, communication strategies may be employed even in the absence of a communicative problem, by implication, in the process of problem-free conversation. Hence, the current study was interested in investigating to what other uses English Language teachers and learners put the communication strategy of code-switching, which McDonough (1995) views as an achievement

strategy that learners resort to, so as to compensate for their lack of language competence.

Faerch and Kasper (1983) identify reduction versus achievement communication strategies. In the former, when TL learners face a problem, they can reduce (change) their communicative goal, through avoidance, and in the latter, the learner sticks to the original goal but expands his/ her means to execute their original plan through achievement behaviour. The current study was interested in achievement strategies also known as compensatory strategies, in which communication strategies are classified according to the linguistic source the learner draws from (Faerch and Kasper, 1983). The linguistic source can either be the L1 or the L2. The present study focused on L1 based strategies, that is, strategies based on the learners' L1. The study singled out code-switching for investigation.

Various scholars have come up with their own taxonomies of communication strategies. In Tarone's taxonomy (cited in Brown, 1987), communication strategies involve paraphrasing (approximation, word coinage and circumlocution), borrowing (literal translation and language switch), appealing for assistance, miming, and avoidance. Faerch and Kasper's (1983) taxonomy identifies reduction strategies (topic avoidance, message abandonment and omission), achievement strategies (L1 based strategies of code-switching, literal translation, and foreignisation), and L2 based strategies (generalisation/approximation, word coinage, paraphrase and restructuring).

Dornyei's (1995) taxonomy divides communication strategies into avoidance strategies (message abandonment and topic avoidance) and compensatory strategies (circumlocution, approximation use of all-purpose words, word coinage, use of non-linguistic signals, literal translation, foreignisation, code-switching, appeal for help, and stalling/time-gaining). A look at the above three taxonomies reveals that code-switching, which was central to the current study, is common.

Most studies on communication strategies have tended to focus on all communication strategies and on their use by second language learners. For example, Xhaferi (2012) investigated the use of communication strategies in the essays of Albanian English

Language students at a South Eastern European University. Ugla et al. (2013) investigated the use of communication strategies by Malaysian ESL students at tertiary level and established that code-switching was the third most used 'direct' communication strategy. Mei and Nathalang (2010) carried out a study on use of communication strategies by Chinese EFL learners and found out that language switch (code-switching) was employed by some low proficiency learners.

The current study differs from the above studies in that it investigated the use of only one strategy (L1 based strategy) by both English Language learners and their teachers as a pedagogical tool. The study took place in the Zimbabwean context where Shona is the L1 of the majority of both learners and the teachers, while English is their L2.

2.9 CODE-SWITCHING

This section begins by defining a code, after which it explores several definitions of code-switching vis-a-vis code-mixing. The section also highlights some models of code-switching that propose several functions of code-switching. Furthermore, the section explores code-switching in multiple settings in Zimbabwe before looking at code-switching in educational settings. Finally, the section examines the relationship between code-switching and the concept of New Englishes.

A code, according to Ayeomoni (2006), is a verbal component that can be as small as a morpheme or as comprehensive and complex as a whole language system. According to Wardhaugh (2010:84), a code is *'the particular dialect or language that a person chooses to use on any occasion, a system used for communication between two or more parties.'* However, because the current study investigated the impact of English-Shona code-switching in the teaching and learning of English, a code was taken to mean a distinct language, not a dialect.

Code-switching, a common phenomenon among bilinguals (Malmkjaer, 1991), is defined by Eldridge (1996:303) as *'the alternation between two (or more) languages.'* Nunan and Carter (2001:275) *define code-switching as 'a phenomenon of switching from one language to another in the same discourse.'* Fromkin and Rodman (1998) view code-switching as a universal language contact phenomenon reflecting the grammars of two languages working simultaneously, and it occurs where there are

groups of bilinguals who speak the same two languages. To Cook (2008:174) code-switching is conceptualised as *'going from one language to the other in mid-speech when both speakers know the same two languages.'*

To Simensen (2007), however, code-switching entails merely borrowing one or more words from the native language. Myers (2008:43) gives a language-learner-specific definition of code-switching by defining the phenomenon as *'a linguistic term usually used when learners of a second language (L2) include elements of their mother tongue in their speech.'* Kachru (2009:31) views code-switching and code-mixing as having *'a legitimate place in the multilingual's repertoire just as switching between registers and styles has its functions in a monolingual's behaviour.'*

While Romaine (1994) divides code-switching into intra-word, intra-sentential and inter-sentential switching, some scholars seem to use these divisions to attempt to distinguish between code-switching and code-mixing. For example, Myers-Scotton (cited in Alenezi, 2010, p. 3) offers a general definition of code-switching as *'the use of two language varieties in the same conversation'* but goes on to differentiate between code-switching and code-mixing by stating that code-switching occurs when bilinguals alternate between two languages during interaction with another bilingual, while code-mixing is the use of words, affixes, phrases and clauses from more than one language within the same sentences. Gardner-Chloros (2009) also attempts a distinction between the two by stating that in code-mixing, the language alternating phenomenon occurs within the same sentence and affects single lexical items, while in code-switching, the phenomenon occurs across sentence boundaries and involves longer stretches.

Kamwangamalu (2010:116) also defines code-switching as *'the intersentential alternating use of two or more languages or varieties of a language in the same speech situation'*, and code-mixing as *'the intrasentential alternating use of two languages or varieties of a language...'* Similarly, Muysken (cited in Kim, 2006:44-45) states that code-mixing refers to *'all cases where lexical items and grammatical features from two languages appear in one sentence.'* In addition, Bhatia and Ritchie (also cited in Kim, 2006:45) define code-mixing as *'mixing of various linguistic units (morphemes, words, modifiers, phrases, clauses...) primarily from two participating grammatical systems'*

within a sentence.' For Crystal (2008), in code-mixing linguistic elements are transferred from one language to another as the speaker begins a sentence in one language, then makes use of words or grammatical features from another language. These three definitions seem to agree that code-mixing is intra-sentential.

Poplack (cited in Kim, 2006) however, argues that code-switching is the alternate use of two languages in a single discourse, sentence or constituent. Clyne (also cited in Kim, 2006) views code-switching as occurring within a sentence or between sentences. Benson (2001) also defines code-switching as the use of two languages within one conversation or text and says the phenomenon is also referred to as codemixing, codeshifting, language alternation, language mixture, and language switching. A related term is 'borrowing', which is defined by Grosjean (2010:58) as *'the intergration of one language into another.'* Thus, the distinction between code-switching and code-mixing is not always clear. Therefore, in the present study code-switching and code-mixing were taken to mean the same thing.

Kamwangamalu (2010) observes that current literature generally uses the term code-switching to refer to both code-switching and code-mixing. The current study also used code-switching as the general term to refer to the two phenomena, in view of Eastman's observation (cited in Gardner-Chloros, 2009), that attempts to differentiate between code-switching, code-mixing and borrowing are doomed.

Also noteworthy is that the present study investigated code-switching from a sociological perspective which, according to Chimbganda and Mokgwathi (2012:22), *'tries to identify reasons for, and the effects of, code-switching.'* This is opposed to a structural approach which tends *'to focus on the surface aspects, the 'what' of language alternation and the regularities of the switches'* (Chimbganda and Mokgwathi, 2012:22).

A prominent model of code-switching is the interactional model by Gumperz, which later came to be known as the semantic model of conversational code-switching (Then and Ting, 2011). In the model, Gumperz (cited in Then and Ting, 2011) conceptualises code-switching as situational and metaphorical. While situational code-switching

accommodates a change in setting, topic or participants and serves to redefine the situation, metaphoric code-switching occurs without any change in social situation.

Gumperz identifies six metaphoric code-switching functions as quotation, addressee specification, interjections, message qualification, and personalisation versus objectification (Then and Ting, 2011). Kamwangamalu (2010) asserts that while situational code-switching is external or sociologically conditioned, metaphoric code-switching is internal and psychologically conditioned. Kamwangamalu (2010) goes on to observe that Gumperz's model helps to show that code-switching is not meaningless or a deficit that should be stigmatised. Instead, it can, and does serve, a wide range of functions in bilingual interactions, such as to express modernisation, confidentiality, solidarity or ingroupness identity, sympathy and intimacy.

Another useful model is the Markedness Approach proposed by Myers-Scotton (cited in Kamwangamalu, 2010). The approach proposes that all linguistic choices, including code-switching, are indices of social negotiations of rights and obligations that exist between participants in a conversation. The rights and obligations derive from situational features that are salient to the exchange, for example, statuses of the participants, the topic and the setting. Myers-Scotton's approach defines code-switching as an unmarked (expected) choice between peers in conventional settings in which code-switching is expected for the exchange in question and signals solidarity and in-groupness identity among participants.

Myers-Scotton also argues that code-switching may be a marked (unexpected) choice and therefore signals social distance among participants. Furthermore, in non-conventionalised settings or uncertain situations, code-switching may be an exploratory choice where speakers negotiate the right code for the particular conversational exchange (Kamwangamalu, 2010). The Markedness Model, thus, rests on the Negotiation Principle and its three maxims, the unmarked choice maxim, the marked choice maxim, and the exploratory choice maxim (Jagero and Odongo, 2011). Ferguson (2003) came up with a three-fold broad categorisation of code-switching as follows: code-switching for curriculum, code-switching for management of classroom discourse, and code-switching for interpersonal relations. Within each of these three broad categories are many narrower functions.

According to Jenkins (2006), speakers who have more than one language available to them may code-switch or code-mix as a matter of choice, and also for other pragmatic or expressive reasons. This concurs with Das's study (2012) which shows that code-switching can be used as a strategy to fulfil certain objectives which include to minimise and emphasise differences between interlocutors, to signal language preference, to obviate difficulties caused by failure to find the correct referential terms in one language, to frame discourse, to contrast personalisation and objectification, to convey cultural-expressive messages, to dramatise words in order to attract attention, to lower language barriers between speakers and audience, and to reiterate messages. However, Raschka et al. (2009) observe the multifunctionality of language alternation, in which code-switches may simultaneously fulfil multiple functions.

Baker (cited in Alenezi, 2010) identifies the following functions of code-switching: to emphasise a point, to substitute a word in place of an unknown word in the target language, to express a concept that has no equivalent in the culture of the other language, to reinforce a request, to clarify a point, to express identity and to communicate friendship, to ease tension and to create humour, and to introduce certain topics. Thus, the present study investigated code-switching in light of the various functions proposed by various models and scholars.

2.9.1 Code-switching in Multiple Settings in Zimbabwe

Studies show that code-switching pervades many facets of the linguistic landscape in Zimbabwe. Mugari (2014:228) investigated code-switching in urban grooves music and observed that:

code-switching by the artistes is a symbol of their unity and identity with their clients, it is an acknowledgement of a bigger picture, the existence of a mid-variety of communication, a language style, not exclusively defined by the traditional language choices, but a mixture of these.

Mugari further observes that code-switching is not just a convenient and haphazard phenomenon, but an acceptable form of communication, and that code-switching by urban groovers symbolises the phenomenon of code-switching in Zimbabwe,

reflecting the larger social scenario. Mugari (2014:228) concludes that urban 'groovers':

sing in a code-switched variety as a style to identify with contemporary sociolinguistic pattern where code-switching is the norm... instances of code-switching point to the existence of a separate language style that should be accepted because sociolinguistically speaking, it is language in use and a formidable communicative tool.

Myers-Scotton (1993:122), who carried out studies on code-switching in Zimbabwe and Kenya, established that:

The young men in [Zimbabwe] and [Kenya] are not satisfied with the identity associated with speaking English alone or that associated with speaking Shona or Swahili alone when they converse with each other. Rather, they see the rewards in indexing both identities for themselves. They solve the problem of making a choice evolving a pattern of switching between the two languages.

A study by Mareva and Mapako (2012) investigated code-switching in the comments by readers of *The Herald Online* between 13 September and 20 September 2011 and established that 39% of the comments on selected news articles contained code-switching. Mareva and Mapako conclude that code-switching has become a prevalent feature of the multi-lingual Zimbabwean society.

Veit-Wild (2009) observes that code-switching between Shona and English or between Ndebele and English is very common among most urban and many rural bilinguals, a situation in which one of the languages serves as the Matrix Language (ML) into which the other language is embedded as the Embedded Language (EL). Veit-Wild observes that code-switching is usually linked to age/generation, education, social class, the urban/rural divide, and gender.

Veit-Wild's (2009) study revealed that, in Zimbabwean literature, Chenjerai Hove and Dambudzo Marechera transplant Shona linguistic concepts into their English

narratives. Veit-Wild also found out that Shimmer Chinodya in his two novels *Chairman of Fools* and *Strife*, also inserts Shona expressions and phrases into his works, mainly when the characters are engaged in dialogues. Furthermore the researcher also established that Chiundura-Moyo's *Pane Nyaya* and Ignatious Tirivangani Mabasa's *Mapenzi* rich in code-switching, thereby reflecting the contemporary Zimbabwean Society.

Still in Zimbabwean literature, Nyota and Mapara (2011) also reveal that code-switching is now a common linguistic phenomenon as reflected in the novels of Mabasa and Mavesera. In the former's novel, *Mapenzi*, characters who include professionals, politicians, students and landlords are engaged in code-switching, while in the latter's novel, *Makaitei*, code-switching is used 'to give a realistic picture of the language situation as used in life' (Nyota and Mapara, 2011:168).

Mukenge and Chimbarange (2012:583) attest to the prevalence of code-switching in the Zimbabwean linguistic landscape when they assert that:

code-switching is a well-known trait in the speech pattern of the average bilingual in any human society the world over including Zimbabwe. Most Zimbabweans either speak Shona and English or Ndebele and English. Thus, there is bound to be code-switching determined by the context of language use.

In their study on the film *Yellow Card*, Mukenge and Chimbarange (2012) found out that code-switching has also pervaded the Zimbabwean film industry and conclude that code-switching occurs so as to effectively refer to and explain concepts that are deemed to be difficult to talk about when using the formal code, to create humour, to accommodate or exclude individuals or groups, and to compensate for language deficiency in speech.

Code-switching has also become commonplace in Zimbabwean politics as the following excerpt in the speech of an emerging political figure, in an article by Share and Machivenyika (2014) shows:

It is that same person who goes around demanding 10% shareholding in companies. If you go to any company now, the name of that person is mentioned. You lead factions, you extort companies and you are involved in illicit diamond deals, so you cannot say you are not corrupt... *Ndakati kuna baba baby-dumping munoiziva here? Vakatiehe. Ndakati munhu iyeye ari kutungamirira factionalism tiri kuda kuti timuite baby-dumping. Mukasamudumper isusu tichamudumper. Tichaitaisu baby-dumping nekuti zvinodivider musangano... Tonodumper mwana mustreet ogodyiwa nemagora nekuti kana takuita expose kana nhunzi chaidzo ukange wafa apo hadzidi kutombosvika padhuze newe nokuti dzinenge dzakutotya corruption iri pauri...*

In the above extract, the politician begins her speech in English, which appears to be the Matrix Language, then embeds Shona sentences, phrases and words.

Against the backdrop of code-switching being a common phenomenon in many aspects of the Zimbabwean linguistic landscape, the present study, therefore, focused on inquiring into the beliefs of selected secondary school teachers' and learners' beliefs about code-switching in the teaching and learning of English. Teachers' and learners' beliefs, as reviewed later in this chapter, inform what actually transpires in the classroom.

2.9.2 Code-switching in Educational Settings

Many other studies have been carried out on the subject of code-switching in educational settings, and the phenomenon was found to be prevalent, though sometimes as an unconscious activity. Code-switching in educational settings is viewed by Macaro (2009) as similar to the code-switching activities that occur in various real-life situations, such as the ones explored in the preceding sub-section. Macaro (2005:72) also observes that code-switching is a common phenomenon in the L2 classroom where the learners share the same mother tongue, and that code-switching by L2 teachers *'has no negative impact on the quantity of students' L2 production'*, but may actually increase and improve L2 production if expertly done. Macaro (2005) also points out that, teachers who are deprived of code-switching from their tool kit are unable to offer their learners translation as a learning task, yet translation is a valuable language skill that learners are very likely to need in the

outside world. Apart from that, such teachers find it hard to offer learners pre-learning activities, which trigger appropriate combinations of listening strategies since learners are likely to react more positively to the task at hand if they are assured in their mother tongue. Furthermore, avoiding code-switching will inhibit the use of certain classroom activities, which are useful. According to Macaro (2005:80), *'There is nothing unnatural or 'psycholinguistically disturbing' about codeswitching in the classroom. It just mirrors a natural process happening in naturalistic discourse.'*

Ferguson (cited in Baker, 2006:295) observes that code-switching:

is not only very prevalent across a wide range of educational settings but also seems to arise naturally, perhaps inevitably, as a pragmatic response to the difficulties of teaching content in a language medium over which pupils have no control. Moreover, because teaching is an adrenalin-fuelled activity, making numerous competing demands on one's attentional resources, much switching takes place below the level of consciousness. Teachers are often simply not aware of when they switch languages, or indeed if they switch at all.

Sert (2005) also observes that the use of code-switching by teachers is not always done consciously, so the teacher is not always conscious of the functions and outcomes of code-switching.

While Simon (2001) avers that code-switching in the classroom may be influenced by the teacher's desire to make use of all the possible available means to facilitate learning, Baker (2006:296) observes that *'The use of two languages in the classroom is all about which language is relatively valued, **privileged**, how use of two languages are synchronized and sequenced, negotiated and switched, how meanings and understandings are constructed.'*

On what language teachers think about code-switching, Macaro (2005:68) observes that although studies seem to show that bilingual teachers believe that *'the L2 should be the **predominant** language of interaction in the classroom ... in none of the studies I have come across is there a majority of teachers in favour of excluding the L1 altogether.'* Macaro (2005:68) also states that research findings *'suggest that the*

teachers in the secondary sector use more L1 with 'less able' learners because these learners find it more difficult to infer meaning and therefore get more easily frustrated.' To Macaro, thus, L2 teachers' recourse to the learners' L1 is almost entirely for the purpose of achieving learner comprehension.

On what L2 learners' think about teachers' code-switching, Macaro (2005) observes that some (slow) learners get frustrated when they cannot understand the teacher's L2 input and are, thus, comfortable with the teacher's code-switching so as to get meanings of words and phrases. However, according to Macaro (2005:70):

There is no evidence pointing in the direction of higher achieving learners (or fast learners) feeling more at ease with L2 exclusivity. It seems to be more to do with individual preferences. Some like their teacher to make immediate and explicit L1/L2 connections (but) others do not feel this is necessary.

Brice and Roseberry-McKibbin (2001) suggest that teachers could adopt strategies of code-switching that centre around dealing with vocabulary issues, for classroom organisation and management, for building relationships with learners, and for clarification of points of understanding.

Sert (2005) identifies teacher code-switching functions as topic switch, code-switching for affective functions, and for repetition. In code-switching for topic switch, the teacher constructs a bridge between the known (L1) and the unknown (target language content), making meaning clear. In code-switching for affective functions, code-switching is used by the teacher to build solidarity and intimate relations with learners, thereby creating a supportive language environment in the classroom. Through repetition, code-switching is done by the teacher for clarity of meaning, but Sert points out that this may have the unintended impact of learners losing interest in the teacher's L2 utterance, as the learners know that the teacher will repeat them in the L1, thus limiting the learners' L2 exposure.

Yataganbaba and Yildirim (2015) investigated Turkish EFL Young Language Learner teachers' code-switching from English (L1) to Turkish (L2) in their classroom

interactions. The researchers established that all the teachers who participated in their study used code-switching for a number of pedagogical functions such as translation, asking L1 equivalence, giving instructions, explaining, clarifying, maintaining discipline (warning and admonishing), for unofficial interactions, confirming, changing topic, assigning homework, correcting mistakes, checking homework, checking comprehension, correcting pronunciation, and signalling humorous situations. The researchers concluded that code-switching *'is not something that the teachers should avoid at all costs'*, but something that the teachers should not over-use (Yataganbaba and Yildirim, 2015:96). The researchers, thus, call upon teachers to strike a balance between the use of the learners' L1 and the target language.

In a related study, Bozorgian and Fallahpour (2015) inquired into the amount and purpose of L1 use in EFL classrooms by teachers and learners at two English language institutes in Iran. The researchers found out that, though there was a limited amount of L1 use, the teachers and learners used code-switching to enhance the language teaching and learning process. The researchers established that the teachers resorted to the L1 for translation (from L2 to L1), contrasting (L1 and L2) utterances, evaluation of students' contributions, giving instructions, giving the objective of an activity, eliciting student contribution, commenting, checking comprehension, for administrative issues (such as announcements), repeating students' utterances, reacting to students' answers, for their own false starts, creating humour, for incorporating words from the L1 culture into L2 speech, and for encouraging learner participation.

As for the EFL learners, the two researchers discovered that they used the L1 to ask questions, answer questions, scaffolding (helping each other in group tasks and other situations), self-correction, and for seeking clarification and elaboration. Bozorgian and Fallahpour (2015:79) concluded that though the L1 was minimally used, the language teachers and learners were not reluctant to use it, and recommend that:

L1 can be used and actually should be used as an aid by the teachers to convey meaning, manage the classroom, make a friendly environment, reduce the students' anxiety, facilitate communication, elaborate on the course objectives and clarify the ambiguous points ... The students are also

allowed to use their L1 for scaffolding and peer learning, but they must not use it more frequently to overshadow their L1 exposure to L2/EFL, which makes them lazy, and interferes with their L2/EFL learning. L1 should be used in a way that students L1 is an effective tool for improving and facilitating L2/ EFL learning and teaching....

Sert (2005) observes that, like their teachers, learners are not always aware of the reasons for code-switching and its functions and outcomes. Sert goes on to explain the code-switching functions that were identified by Eldridge (1996), namely equivalence, floor holding, reiteration, and conflict control. The equivalence function involves the learner making use of the L1 equivalent of a lexical item in the target language, which may be done when the learner lacks the competence for using the target language explanation for the lexical item in question. In floor holding, learners fill the stopgaps with the L1, so as to avoid gaps in communication. This may be due to lack of fluency in the target language but may result in loss of target language fluency in the long term. Reiteration is a learner code-switching function in which messages are reinforced, emphasised or clarified and may be because the learner has failed to transfer meaning exactly in the target language, or may be done to show the teacher that the learner has comprehended. Finally, code-switching for conflict control involves the student code-switching to avoid misunderstandings (Sert, 2005).

In his study on code-switching in ESL teaching in Jaffna, Sri Lanka, Canagarajah (1995) categorised teacher code-switching into two broad categories, namely code-switching for classroom management and code-switching for content transmission. Code-switching for classroom management includes opening the class, negotiating directions, requesting help, managing discipline, teacher encouragement, teacher compliments, teacher commands, teacher admonitions, mitigation, pleading, and for unofficial interactions. Code-switching for content transmission is meant for review, explanation, negotiating culture relevance, parallel translation, and for unofficial student collaboration (Canagarajah, 1995).

In Sri Lanka, Makulloluwa (2013) also carried out a study on code-switching by teachers in ESL classrooms at the University of Colombo and established that the learners' L1 is used by teachers in varying degrees in the ESL classroom – depending

on the language proficiency of the learners and the teachers' individual beliefs – for a number of communicative goals that are interactional, pedagogical and administrative. Code-switching was used as a compensatory strategy owing to low L2 comprehensibility on the part of the learners, as well as, as a strategy to create a positive effective classroom environment.

Storch and Aldosari (2010) conducted a study on the use of the L1 (Arabic) in EFL teaching and learning and concluded that the use of the L1 by the learners seemed to serve important cognitive, social and pedagogical functions, but the researchers are against the idea of learners using L1 extensively. Storch and Aldosari, however, point out that to restrict or prohibit the use of L1 in L2 classes is to deny learners the opportunity of using an important tool.

Lasagabaster (2013) investigated the teachers use of learners' L2 in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) contexts in Colombia and found out that teachers used the learners' L1 to explain, clarify, save time, make comparisons between the L1 and the L2, to make students aware of the importance of their L1, to develop confidence in learners, to foster debate, to discipline learners, and to give instructions.

In a related study, Lee (2010) investigated the use of code-switching by ESL teachers in secondary schools in Malaysia, and found out that the majority of the teachers said code-switching should be used in the English classroom but that it should be limited to specific purposes, that is, the teachers advocated the maximisation of the target language. The teachers revealed that they saw the need for code-switching to help learners feel comfortable and confident, to allow weaker students to comprehend the text being used, and to aid learning. In addition, teachers agreed that code switching promotes bilingualism and that it facilitates second language learning. Code-switching was also seen as a strategy for the teaching and learning process. On top of that, teachers believed that code switching helped students relate their first language (L1) to their second language (L2). The use of code switching in instruction helped students to clear doubts and uncertainties over subject matter (Lee, 2010).

In Japan, McMillan and Rivers (2011) investigated the attitudes of native-English teachers towards teacher and student use of students' L1 in EFL classes at a Japanese university. In the study, the teachers proffered both positive and negative sentiments about teacher and student use of learners' L1. Some of the reasons that were advanced in support of teachers' use of learners' L1 include facilitation of communication between students and the teacher, for complex definitions and instructions, for building rapport with students, for creation of humour, for demonstrating an appreciation of learners linguistic and cultural identity, for aiding vocabulary learning, for translation and comparing the L1 and the L2, and for the promotion of multilingualism.

However, some of the teachers also felt that teachers' avoidance of learners' L1 would result in more negotiation of meaning in the L1, would cater for students' own L2-only use preference, would discourage student L1 use, and would be in keeping with policy. Arguments that were advanced in favour of student L1 use include facilitation of successful communication with the teacher and the rest of the class, facilitation of learner-learner interaction and peer assistance, catering for students' of low L2 proficiency levels, building rapport in the classroom through humour, as well as acting as a form of L2 needs analysis. However, some of the teachers felt that allowing student L1 use would be tantamount to justifying learner laziness or off-task behaviour. Some were also of the view that student L1 avoidance would promote thinking in English, and some felt that the L1 should be used in emergency situations only. McMillan and Rivers (2011:259) recommend that policy should not be stagnant but evolving:

Teachers, as reflective practitioners and professional decision-makers, should be encouraged by program managers to develop localised strategies for maximising TL comprehension and production – strategies which are supported by research in keeping with teachers' personal beliefs.

In Ghana, Yevudey (2013) explored the pedagogical functions of code-switching in Ewe (an L1) and English (an L2) lessons and found out that code-switching was used to explain questions and statements that learners did not understand, for introducing English lessons, to correct learners who had provided incorrect answers, for

acknowledgment of learners and calling on them to participate, and facilitating understanding and vocabulary acquisition through repetition of sentences by translation.

According to Clegg and Afitska (2011), though language practices such as code-switching are a controversial issue, often condemned by authorities and not accepted by teachers in sub-Saharan Africa, code-switching has important pedagogical functions. These include explaining and elaborating on concepts, increasing participation in the classroom, establishing good relationships in the classroom, enabling the smooth running of the lesson, as well as establishing connections with the learners' local culture.

In Botswana, Chimbganda and Mokgwathi (2012) investigated the use of code-switching by teachers in secondary schools and established that while code-switching is prevalent in Biology and Home Economics, it was less prevalent in History, and minimal in English Language lessons. Chimbganda and Mokgwathi (2012:30) conclude that:

code-switching cannot be wished away. As long as learners and teachers live in a community which is bi- or multilingual, there will always be need to use alternative language codes which can best express their ideas. In this study, it has been shown that code-switching is used in teaching almost all the subjects, especially content subjects.

The authors, however, bemoan the haphazard manner in which code-switching takes place in secondary schools in Botswana and cite Cook (2001) who suggests that teachers colleges should equip teachers with code-switching techniques. Chimbganda and Mokgwathi (2012: 30) also cite Adendorff (1996) who advocates the sensitisation of teachers *“to the fact that languages carry a social meaning and that the learners’ heritage language can be used as a window through which meaningful knowledge can be constructed in the classroom out of their primary experience and culture.”* The present study, therefore, sought to find out what the situation is like in secondary schools in Zimbabwe, including the reasons and the impact.

In Namibia, Simasiku (2014) investigated the perceptions of Grade 10 ESL teachers about the effects of code-switching in their classrooms and found out that the majority of the teachers viewed code-switching as having a positive effect on learner participation and that it acts as a scaffold to support learners who lack proficiency in the target language. The majority of the teachers also revealed that their learners showed enthusiasm and happiness when code-switching was allowed in the classroom, while one said the learners were sad and another said the learners appeared indifferent. The teachers suggested that learners were happy and enthusiastic when code-switching was allowed because learners were free to express themselves in their L1, were confident they would not make mistakes, and they quickly mastered what was taught. One teacher who said the learners' appeared sad gave the reason that learners expected the lesson to be conducted in English but were disappointed when teachers code-switched. Simasiku's study also revealed that, though teachers appreciated monolingual teaching to enhance the learners' linguistic competence in English, they saw code-switching as a tool of improving their learners' comprehension in English.

Simasiku, Kasanda and Smit (2015) carried out a study to find out why secondary school teachers, in Namibia, were not using code-switching in Grade 10 English medium classrooms even in the face of the learners failing to understand what the teachers were communicating. The findings were that teachers were hostile towards the use of code-switching, citing the language policy that insists on English only, school rules that demanded English exclusivity, lack of vocabulary in the mother tongue, misconceptions about job opportunities (the belief that is the mother tongue was used in the classroom, the learners might later fail to be employed), as well as the fear that code-switching might result in the mother tongue finding its way into the learners' writing. Hence the present study sought to find out teachers' beliefs about code-switching in ESL secondary school classrooms in Zimbabwe.

In another study, Simasiku, Kasanda and Smit (2015) investigated whether code-switching enhanced Grade 10 learners' academic achievement in the Caprivi Education Region of Namibia. The study revealed that, from the point of view of teachers, code-switching had the benefits of making learners understand concepts, instructions and topics, teacher explanations, keeping learners actively involved in

lessons and stimulating participation. However, the teachers also revealed that the majority of their learners preferred English as a medium of instruction. One of the reasons that were given was that it is the medium through which they should learn English and is also the medium of instruction for Namibia. Another reason was that English makes everyone understand since the learners have different mother tongues. English is also compulsory and seen as beneficial. Furthermore, it is school policy to use English.

However, other learners preferred to use local languages for easy communication because they lacked the English vocabulary and were incompetent in it, and because the teachers allowed the L1 to be used when learners were working in groups. The majority of the teachers also preferred their learners to use English because of the teachers' belief that learners cannot learn English through local languages. Another reason was that English is the only medium of instruction or international language used world-wide which is also the official language and medium of instruction for Namibia. Moreover, policy demands that English be used. The teachers also preferred English for learners to practise using the language and improve their communication skills. Apart from that, all subjects are taught in English except the local language, and learners are tested in English.

In Zimbabwe, Mashiri (2002) found out that University of Zimbabwe students switched between Shona and English, albeit in informal situations. Although Mashiri's article focuses on the grammatical perspective of code-switching while, the current study was inclined towards the sociolinguistic perspective, Mashiri (2002:257) concludes that:

University of Zimbabwe students who use Shona as their L1 and English as their L2 constitute a well-defined bilingual group that employs Shona-English as their 'normal' code in informal and off-the-record conversations in which Shona is the base language and English the embedded or guest language.

The present study, however, was interested in the impact of English-Shona code-switching in the formal set-up of the teaching and learning of English at secondary school level.

Dube and Cleghorn (1999) found out that code-switching is common in Mathematics lessons in primary schools in Zimbabwe. They found out that code-switching is mainly done for repetition to emphasise what has been said, for affective connections (to provide a linguistic bridge between the classroom and the home culture), to give instructions, and to promote understanding of important concepts.

Viriri and Viriri (2013) investigated code-switching in the teaching and learning of twelve subjects in selected secondary schools in Buhera District of Zimbabwe and established that code-switching by both teachers and learners was rampant in all the subjects, resulting in genuine dialogue between the teacher and the learners, which fostered understanding and, therefore, enhanced learning. Code-switching was found to be common when the teachers were explaining difficult concepts, when both the teachers and the learners were posing questions to each other, when the teachers were commenting on or commending learners' efforts, and when the learners worked in groups.

However, Viriri and Viriri's study found out that, despite the advantages apparent in code-switching in teaching and learning, the practice resulted in learners writing 'poor quality' essays that were written in 'Shonglish' (a mixture of Shona and English), which impacted negatively on learners' performance in the final public examinations. Viriri and Viriri (2013:233), however, conclude that *'code-switching is unavoidable as long as a foreign language is the only language of the classroom but cannot solve all the (communication) challenges faced by both teachers and pupils during classroom interactions.'*

In another inquiry in the Zimbabwean secondary school context, Marungudzi (2014) explored code-switching in the teaching and learning of content subjects (that is, excluding English on which the current study focused). Marungudzi observed that code-switching was used by teachers for classroom management, during content transmission as a contextualisation cue that alerts learners about what is coming, to ask questions (as a marker of solidarity between the teacher and the learners), and to clarify concepts. The researcher further observed that there was also some code-switching when the learners interacted with each other, to which the teachers showed no concern, indicating that *'the teachers did not view the language of instruction as*

cast in stone, but as a tool which could be bent at their discretion to meet their classroom needs' (Marungudzi, 2014:474).

In a study more closely related to the current study, Nyawaranda (2000) investigated the beliefs of two secondary school teachers on the role of Shona in English Language lessons and established that the two teachers had contrasting views. In the study, one of the teachers seemed to consider herself as a good model for her second language learners and resorted to the use of English only in the English lessons, suggesting that she feared that the learners might develop negative attitudes towards English if Shona is used, and that the students might be deprived of the opportunity to practice English for examination purposes. Nyawaranda (2000:32) then observes that this teacher's *'non-use of the mother tongue in theory and practice suggests an ESL model for instruction that is influenced by a 'purist' view.'*

However, the other teacher in Nyawaranda's study viewed Shona and English as playing a complementary role in the English lessons. The teacher used Shona to bridge the gap between the students L1 and English, to repeat for effect, to instil a sense of confidence in the learners, to explain lexical items that may be non-existent in the target language, to give contextual cues, and to accommodate learners' lack of proficiency in English, resulting in his lessons flowing more easily. Nyawaranda concluded that this teacher's use of Shona in English lessons is in contradiction with Zimbabwe's language policy on instruction, which states that all instruction from the third grade of the primary school (before the policy was amended in 2006 to make English the compulsory medium of instruction from the first year of secondary education) except in the teaching of local languages should be in English. According to Nyawaranda (2000:39), this:

continued use of Shona in ESL instruction, let alone its use in the teaching of other subjects, shows the complexity of choosing what language to use in the classroom. This complexity demonstrates that language use in the classroom cannot be effectively legislated by language policy.

The current study complements Nyawaranda's study but its point of departure is that it focused on the use of Shona in English Language lessons by both teachers and

learners, and the study was carried out from the perspective of the communication strategy of code-switching.

2.9.3 Negative Impact of Code-switching in the Classroom

Despite the positive gains of L2-L1 code-switching reviewed in the above section, some arguments have been put forward against code-switching in L2 teaching and learning. According to Macaro (2005:68), *'By far the majority of bilingual teachers regard codeswitching as an unfortunate and regrettable but necessary.'*

Moduopela (2013) feels that if code-switching by the teacher is used to compensate for the teacher's own deficiency in the target language, this sends the wrong message to the learners, implying that the teacher should be a good model for the 'Standard English' that the learners should emulate. Modupeola further argues that code-switching through repetition of an instruction or an idea in another language may slow down the rate of learning the target language. This view is shared by Sert (2005) who observes that over-reliance on code-switching may result in the learners listening only to the L1 repetition and ignoring the L2 utterance. This will limit the learners' exposure to L2.

Cook (2002) observes that, in instances where classroom members do not share the same L1, code-switching may create problems as some learners will feel left out in the teaching and learning process. Since it is impossible for the teacher to relate to all the mother tongues of the learners in the classroom, code-switching should be avoided and the target language should be used consistently instead.

Another argument is advanced by Eldridge (1996:310), who asserts that if learner code-switching continues in the classroom, it may result in fossilisation and *'the language acquired would then become a hybrid variety, and the learners would find themselves severely linguistically deprived with target language code monolinguals.'* In addition, code-switching may be associated with the notion of negative transfer, *'the inappropriate use of the first language (L1) or dialect (D1) when speaking or writing the second language (L2) or dialect (D2)'* (Siegel 2009:48). Furthermore, Sampson (2011) argues that if learners feel that code-switching is allowed for all communicative functions in the classroom, they may deliberately overuse the phenomenon even when

they have the proper linguistic resources to express themselves in the L2. Krashen and Terrell (1983) also call for L2 exclusivity in L2 learning, arguing that language learners acquire the L2 through the same natural way they learn their L1. In relation to this, Macaro (2005:65) observes that:

Code-switching by the bilingual teacher is contentious because it flies in the face of the notion of comprehensible input. If learners learn by adding to their store of knowledge, just a little bit more of the new language *via inference* ($i + 1$), then why should they need to know what the equivalent linguistic element is in their own language?

On the same issue of comprehensible input, Macaro (2005:66) believes that '*Code-switching by the bilingual teacher is contentious because it is believed to cut down on the amount of exposure that the learner has to the L2.*'

Macaro (2005) also observes that code-switching becomes a contentious issue because it is associated with the grammar-translation method which now has become unfashionable. Apart from that, code-switching is also a contentious issue because some national agencies try to control what teachers do in the classroom, imposing certain methodologies despite lack of evidence in favour of their propagation. Furthermore, when used by L2 learners, code-switching is regarded by some teachers as off-task, deviant or disruptive behaviour and as evidence of not thinking as much as possible in the target language (Macaro, 2005).

In light of the arguments for and against code-switching in L2 teaching and learning, Macaro (2009:38) calls for optimal use of code-switching, whereby '*code-switching in broadly communicative classrooms can enhance second language acquisition and/or proficiency better than second language exclusivity.*' Macaro (2005) also calls this a theory of optimality, that is, how and when code-switching leads to language learning, learning how to learn, and to the development of communication skills. Macaro also argues that to advocate total freedom to code-switch at will is not acceptable and rejects phrases such as 'use the L2 as much as possible' or 'judicious use of L1' for being not informative enough.

In light of the negative aspects of code-switching in L2 learning put forward above, the present study sought to inquire into the beliefs of selected teachers and learners of English about code-switching in the teaching and learning of English.

2.9.4 Code-switching and New Englishes

One of the objectives of this study is to examine the relationship between code-switching by English Language teachers and learners, and New Englishes, that is, whether code-switching should be regarded as a deviant feature and, therefore, discouraged, or whether the phenomenon should be accepted as an aspect of interlanguage, or as a feature of New Englishes.

According to Norrish (1997), it is now commonplace to say that languages change over time and space and that this change is an essential characteristic of human language. According to Lee (2012, p. 191), *'The relentless expansion of the language (English) in diverse sociolinguistic and sociocultural contexts has also brought about the development of new recognised forms and norms of English in local contexts.'* Kirkpatrick (2007) distinguishes between what he calls 'native' and 'nativised' varieties of English. He sees the 'traditional' varieties of British, American and Australian English as native varieties spoken by native speakers, while nativised varieties are *'newer varieties that have developed in places where English was not normally spoken and which have been influenced by local languages and culture'* (Kirkpatrick, 2007:5).

Also known as World Englishes (WEes), or Global Englishes, New Englishes are also defined as all the local Englishes that are used by people of different nations to communicate (Lee, 2012). In support, Matsuda and Matsuda (2010:370) assert that *'The English Language is not a monolith but a catchall category for all its varieties – linguistic and functional – hence the term World Englishes (WE).'* Kadenge (2009) defines New Englishes as recently emerging varieties of English, especially in non-Western settings, such as India, Singapore, China and many parts of Africa. In these settings, English is the official language but not necessarily the first language of the inhabitants. Kadenge (2009) also identifies a sub-variety of New Englishes called 'African Englishes', or varieties of English that are evolving in Africa. Such varieties were once stigmatised as nonstandard but have now gained prestige and are becoming target forms for many new learners.

Kadenge (2009:158) notes that such non-native Englishes as Zimbabwean English are *'a distinct, systematic, endo-normative variety of English, which cannot be judged by the norms of the older varieties such as British English or American English.'*

The terms New Englishes, World Englishes and Global Englishes have been used *'almost interchangeably, with minimally varying connotations'* (Schneider, 2003:234) to refer to varieties of English. Schneider (2003) also distinguishes between ENL (English as a Native Language) countries, ESL (English as a Second Language) countries, and EFL (English as a Foreign Language) countries. In the first group, English is the native language of almost all or at least a significant majority of the population, such as in the UK and the USA. In the second group, English assumes prominent social functions as the language of politics, the media, jurisdiction and other official spheres, such as in Ghana, Nigeria and India. In the third group, English performs no official internal function, but is strongly rooted and widely used in some domains, such as in Egypt and Taiwan.

Schneider (2003) proposes what he calls the Dynamic Model of the Evolution of New Englishes. In the first stage, the Foundation stage, English is used on a regular basis in a previously non-English speaking country, owing to a significant number of English speakers who have settled in a new country. The second stage is the Exonormative Stabilisation stage when colonies or settler communities stabilise politically and English is now regularly spoken in a new environment where the resident community of expatriate native speakers account for most of the English usage. The next stage is Nativisation and it is characterised by a growing awareness of the deviance of some local linguistic usage from old norms. The stage is also characterised by use of loan-words and the language is nativised grammatically and structurally through use of constructions that are peculiar to the given country. The fourth stage is called Endonormative Stabilisation, marked by a gradual adoption and acceptance of an indigenous linguistic norm. The final stage is called the stage of Differentiation, where a new linguistic variety has emerged, with the achievement of political, cultural and hence linguistic independence.

Schneider's (2003) ENL, ESL and EFLs correspond with Kachru's (cited in Groves, 2010) World Englishes (both New Englishes and Old Englishes). Kachru conceptualises World Englishes in terms of three concentric circles: the Inner Circle, the Outer Circle, and the Expanding Circle. The Inner Circle refers to native-English-speaking countries such as the UK and New Zealand which use English as their primary language and are norm-providing or endocentric. The Outer Circle includes those countries where English was spread as a second language through colonisation. The Outer Circle varieties, mostly in Africa and Asia, have undergone some acculturation and nativisation, and their users are norm-developing. Zimbabwe, being a former colony of Britain, obviously belongs to the Outer Circle. The Expanding Circle refers to countries where English is regarded as a foreign language, such as China and Thailand. Such countries are norm-dependent, looking to 'standard English' for their norms.

In light of the advent of New Englishes, this study sought to answer the question whether or not code-switching in the English Language classroom in secondary schools in Zimbabwe should be regarded as an error. Kachru (cited in Groves, 2010:120) argues that while an error is due to random processes, a true innovation that becomes a feature of a new English variety *'is a result of a production process that marks the typical variety specific features; and it is systematic, and not idiosyncratic. There is thus an explanation for each deviation within the context of situation.'* Groves (2010:120) argues that:

for a deviation to be considered a feature of a new variety, it must firstly have the prestige of its users... secondly, it must be used by the bulk of its speakers, and thirdly, it must be systematic, due to the influence of the speech community's first language(s) and culture.

Groves (2010) goes on to call for a flexible attitude to new varieties in the classroom. Lowenberg (cited in Groves, 2010) contends that differences between 'standard' English and local varieties should be taken into account when tests are given. Kirkpatrick (2007) observes that it would be advantageous to employ multilingual teachers of ESL (rather than monolinguals) who understand English from the perspective of both 'standard English' and New Englishes. Kirkpatrick also sees

advantages in outer circle countries choosing an endonormative or nativised model of English. He feels that local teachers would be advantaged in choosing the local model because they speak that model. Thus, their model of English is legitimised and, therefore, the teachers' self-confidence and self-esteem are increased.

Furthermore, choosing the local model would result in the multilingual competence of the teacher being recognised and exploited in the classroom. In addition, according to Kirkpatrick (2007:190):

The two tenets concerning the monolingual teacher and monolingual classroom are discarded in favour of the multilingual teacher and the use of languages other than English in the classroom... as teachers know the language of their students and have had the experience of learning English as a second language, they can use their shared linguistic resources in the classroom while, at the same time, understanding the language learning problems that their students might face.

Kirkpatrick (2007) also identifies disadvantages inherent in choosing the exonormative or native speaker model of English. One of the disadvantages is that the value and legitimacy of the non-native local teacher's own model of English is automatically undermined. In addition, the non-native speakers would be required to teach a model which they do not speak, thereby reducing their self-confidence. Furthermore, the local multilingual teacher's *'knowledge of the language of their students, far from being seen as a strength, is seen as a weakness'* (Kirkpatrick, 2007:186), since English is seen as the only language of the classroom and the monolingual teacher is viewed as the ideal teacher.

Adedimeji (2007:2) acknowledges that English is now seen as a global language that is *'susceptible to the subtleties and idiosyncracies of regional linguistic behaviours.'* Adedimeji (2007) identifies transfer as a feature of Nigerian English.

Kamwangamalu and Moyo (2003) observe that Lesotho, Malawi, Swaziland (LMS) Englishes are made up of borrowed cultural vocabulary from local languages. In Botswana, studies have shown that Botswana English (BE) has *'distinctive characteristics some of which are products of its coexistence with Setswana, the*

national language' (Alimi, 2011: 124). According to Alimi (2011), many scholars have argued that New Englishes should be recognised as appropriate models for instruction in schools, a view which challenges the 'centrifugal' perspective of adopting the native-speaker standard as the only appropriate model of English Language instruction. Alimi (2011) observes that Botswana English is characterised by Setswana words and/or translated into English, and proposes the inclusion of Botswana English and other New Englishes in vocabulary teaching in schools in Botswana and other 'Outer Circle' countries.

In agreement, Jindapitak and Teo (2013) aver that it is a myth to expect pure English, similar to the one spoken by native speakers in England and America, when English is spoken by non-native speakers in non-native contexts. Jindapitak and Teo (2013:197) go on to observe that the various names given to English (in the advent of World Englishes):

suggest that English has been acculturated and transmitted to release multiple characteristics deviant from its mother in the Inner Circle... obsolete ELT paradigm, that is based on the ideology that native speakers are the authority of the language, needs to be replaced by a newer paradigm that relates language classroom to the world and takes into account local adaptation and appropriation.

Jenkins (2006:95) alludes to the relationship between code-switching and New Englishes or World Englishes by observing that since *'almost all Asian-English speakers are bi- or multilingual and make extensive use of CS (code switching) and code mixing, it seems logical to include this phenomenon in grammars and dictionaries of Asian English.'*

Young and Walsh (2010) investigated the beliefs of 'non-native English speaking' teachers from Europe, Africa, West Asia, South-East Asia and East Asia about the usefulness and appropriateness of teaching English varieties such as English as an International Language (EIL) and Lingua Franca (ELF), compared to native speaker varieties. The results revealed that the majority of the teachers were for teaching the 'standard' variety of English. The major reason given was that teachers felt that they

needed to teach the standard variety so as to address learners' needs and expectations, for example, the needs of learners who would have a lot of future contact with the English Native variety when they proceed to higher education and employment in countries such as the USA, Canada, UK, New Zealand and Australia. Most of the teachers believed in the 'standard' English variety even though they *'acknowledged that it does not really correspond to the reality of Englishes which are in use worldwide'* (Young and Walsh, 2010:135).

In a related study, Tweedie (2013) investigated the attitudes of 'native speakers' and 'non-native speaking' English Language teachers in Singapore towards the role of Colloquial Singapore English (CSE) or 'Singlish'. The results showed, ironically, that the 'non-native' English speaking teachers had a negative view of 'Singlish', while their 'native speaking' counterparts believed that 'Singlish', is a legitimate English variety in Singapore. This is in spite of the fact that Singlish is a common phenomenon in Singapore, as stated by Tweedie (2013:34) in the following quotation:

Despite official pronouncements against this variety of English, despite government campaigns promoting a more 'standard' alternative, despite EL syllabus with 'standard' ideals, and despite multitudinal efforts by individual school leaders to discourage the use of CSE, Singlish persists in the school canteens, morning assemblies, staff rooms and Singapore classrooms.

From the study, however, the researcher (Tweedie, 2013) got insights from language teachers into the possibilities of accepting Singlish, not as an obstacle to 'standard' English proficiency, but as a potentially helpful tool for making learners achieve 'standard' English proficiency.

Tweedie's study seems to confirm Kachru's (1992) observation that local English varieties are often barely accepted in their own environment, where it seems the interaction between language and that environment is not viewed as reason enough to deviate from the metropolitan ('standard' English) norm or the so called Prestige variety. In addition, in relation to the rejection of local English varieties in preference of 'standard' English, Norrish (1997) observes that the devaluation of home-grown language forms is strengthened by the effects of examination boards, which set

models of English that not many teachers would adhere to. Matsuda and Matsuda (2010) argue for the teaching of both the dominant 'standard' varieties, as well as local varieties because students need them both. On the teaching of the dominant varieties, Matsuda and Matsuda (2010:372) observe that:

as long as the dominant varieties prevail in public perception and teaching material ... language teachers have the obligation to make those discursive resources available to students so students can appropriate them for their own purposes ... It is also important to help students understand the privileged status that certain dominant varieties of English (and their users) enjoy, as well as some of the possible consequences of not using those varieties – and to do so without valorising the privileged varieties. To not make the dominant codes available to students who seek them would be doing disservice to students, leading to their economic and social marginalisation.

In apparent support of the teaching of local English varieties, Matsuda and Matsuda (2010: 370) aver that:

Because English in expanding circle contexts includes a wide array of international and intranational uses, the traditional model of setting a single target variety has become problematic, and the suggestion to consider intelligibility (i.e., word or utterance recognition) and comprehensibility (i.e., word or utterance understanding) as appropriate goals for English instruction no longer seems farfetched ...

In relation to this, Kachru (1992) argues that the native speaker of English is not always a valid yardstick with which to measure the global uses of English.

In another related study, Prashanti and Bhavani (2016) carried out an inquiry into secondary school teachers' perspectives on the teaching of pronunciations, accents and varieties of English in India. The researchers established that teachers were of the view that both native speaker (NS) norms and the Indian variety of English are important models. Unlike in Tweedie's (2013) study, in which the non-native English speaking teachers had a negative view of the local variety of English, the Indian

teachers seemed to prioritise non-native speaker norms. However, the majority of teachers argued that they preferred to retain their L1 identity rather than speak like native speakers of English.

The current study investigated the link (from the perspective of ESL teachers) between the use of code-switching in L2 teaching and learning to the concept of New Englishes. The study also investigated how teachers perceive the use of such emerging English varieties (which may be characterised by code-switching) in the Zimbabwean classroom context.

2.10 THE INFLUENCE OF TEACHERS' AND LEARNERS' BELIEFS ON CLASSROOM PRACTICES

According to Altan (2006:45) *'Beliefs are a central construct in every discipline which deals with human behaviour and learning.'* However, according to Pajares (1992), beliefs are difficult to define since they are associated with various terms such as attitudes, values, judgements, axioms, opinions, ideology, perceptions, conceptions, dispositions, personal theories, perspectives, and rules of practice. These terms are *'new jargon, old meaning'* (Pajares, 1992:314), implying that they could be referring to the same phenomenon. Borg (2001:186) defines a belief as *'a proposition which may be consciously or unconsciously held, is evaluative in that it is accepted as true by the individual, and is therefore imbued with emotive commitment; further, it serves as a guide to thought and behaviour.'*

Thus, both teachers' and learners' beliefs are significant since they have a bearing on what goes on in the classroom. This is supported by Kayaoglu (2013:36), who states that *'Beliefs have much in common with concepts such as dispositions, attitudes, values, opinions, judgments, perspectives and even personal theories'*, and adds *'that beliefs can be vitally important to teaching and learning because they are intertwined with knowledge.'* In the present study, therefore, some of the terms used by the authors above to refer to beliefs may be used interchangeably to refer to the same phenomenon. These include 'perceptions', 'attitudes', and 'views'.

Agudo (2014) alludes to the importance of teachers and learners holding similar beliefs when the researcher stated that, if there is a mismatch between the teachers' and the

students' beliefs, little learning is likely to take place. According to Gardner and Miller (1999:40) beliefs emanate from how teachers were taught, *'their training and experiences as teachers'* and these beliefs that teachers hold about language and language teaching have an effect on decisions made by teachers in lesson planning, and also influence what they do in the classroom. This is supported by Brown (2009), who observes that understanding teachers' beliefs means understanding the teacher's classroom practices as well. This is also clearly espoused by Altan (2006:45), who explains that:

Teachers' beliefs influence their consciousness, teaching attitude, teaching methods and teaching policies. Teachers' beliefs also strongly influence teaching behaviour and, finally, learners' development. The formation of teachers' educational beliefs in language teaching/learning process will exert an indiscernible effect on forming effective teaching methods and will bring about the improvement of learners language learning abilities.

Learners' beliefs, too, have a bearing on how the learners attempt to learn a language (Dornyei, 2005). Learners *'bring to their learning their own beliefs, goals, attitudes and decisions which in turn influence how they approach their learning'* (Victori and Lockhart, 1995:52). The learners' language learning beliefs refer to the knowledge by language learners about various factors in language learning, and these encompass how to learn a language, language skills, and communicative competence (Wenden, 1991). Learner beliefs are *'general assumptions that students hold about themselves as learners, about factors influencing language learning, and about the nature of language learning'* (Victori and Lockhart, 1995:224). Richards and Schmidt (2002:297) define learner beliefs as:

ideas learners have concerning different aspects of language, language learning and language teaching, that may influence their attitudes and motivations in learning and an effect on their learning strategies and learning outcomes. Learners' belief system are relatively stable set of ideas and attitudes as how to learn language, effective teaching strategies, appropriate classroom behaviour, their own abilities, and their goals in language learning.

Learners' beliefs originate from their classroom experiences and cultural backgrounds (Nhapulo, 2013). Grijalva and Barajas (2013:83) concur, as they observe that *'beliefs are usually shaped by students' and teachers' backgrounds since they are formed through interactions with others, own experiences and the impact of the environment around them.'* This is also echoed by Agudo (2014:287) thus:

Learners hold common and, in some cases, erroneous beliefs about how an L2 should best be learnt and taught in the classroom context, some of which are influenced by their classroom experiences, and others are shaped by their personality and their own cultural backgrounds which shape their attitudes towards language learning.

Because teachers' and learners' beliefs influence their classroom practices, beliefs were, therefore, a central aspect of the present study on the impact of code-switching in the teaching and learning of English at the selected secondary schools.

2.11 SUMMARY

The foregoing chapter focused on Bilingualism as the principal theory that informed the current study which examined the impact of code-switching on the teaching and learning of English in secondary schools in Zimbabwe. The models of bilingualism that were explored are the Transition Model, Subtractive Bilingualism, Additive Bilingualism, the Separate Underlying Proficiency Model, the Common Underlying Proficiency Model, the Thresholds Hypothesis, and the Developmental Interdependency Hypothesis. The chapter has also highlighted the benefits of bilingualism. Focus was also on the importance of learning English as a Second Language, the goals of L2 teaching, and the role of the learners' L1 in L2 learning.

Apart from these pertinent issues, the chapter also explored the following theories of second language acquisition: the Acculturation Model, Krashen's Input Hypothesis, the Socio-cultural Theory, and the Interlanguage Hypothesis. In addition, the chapter examined some monolingual and bilingual approaches and methods to L2 teaching. The Direct Method, the Audio-Lingual Method and the Natural Approach were identified as having a monolingual orientation, while the Grammar-Translation Method, Communicative Language Teaching, Dodson's Bilingual Method, the New Concurrent

Method and Community Language Teaching were found to be either tolerant of, or encouraging the use of learners' L1 in L2 teaching and learning.

The chapter, moreover, focused on communication strategies, in particular code-switching. Models of code-switching, that is, were explored. The chapter then reviewed literature on code-switching in multiple settings in Zimbabwe, that is, in the music industry, in the media, in Zimbabwean literature, in politics and in educational settings. After examining the relationship between code-switching and New Englishes, the chapter explored the influence of teachers' and learners' beliefs on classroom practices.

The next chapter focuses on the research design and the methodology that were adopted for the study.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3. INTRODUCTION

The focus of this chapter is on the research design and methodology adopted in the study. Qualitative research is defined and its principal tenets are highlighted in this chapter. Since the study is a case study, case study research is also explored. The target population of the study and the sampling procedure are discussed. Data collection tools employed in the study are stated, described and explained. These are observations, one-on-one interviews, as well as focus groups. The data analysis procedure that was adopted is explained. In addition, the chapter identifies limitations of the inquiry and addresses a number of ethical issues since the study made use of human subjects as participants.

Punch (2005:145) defines a research design as *'the strategy, the conceptual framework, the question of who or what to be studied, the tools to be used for collecting and analysing empirical material.'* The current study adopted the qualitative or interpretive research paradigm.

3.1 QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

According to Yates (2004), qualitative research attempts to achieve an in-depth understanding and detailed description of a particular aspect of an individual, a case history or a group's experiences. In the current study, the aspect being explored is the role of the first language learners' home language in the teaching and learning of English. Qualitative research, according to Yates (2004), might also aim to explore the way people give meaning to and express their understanding of themselves, their experiences and/or their worlds. Yates goes on to state that this research paradigm might also seek to find out and describe in detail social events and to explore reasons for their occurrence, rather than how often they happen. Similarly, Miles, Huberman and Saldana (2013) observe that, in qualitative research, through intense contact with the field or real-life setting, the researcher seeks to gain a holistic or integrated overview of the study, which includes the perceptions of participants, focus being on the ways in which they act, and why they act that way. Focus is, thus, on understanding behaviour, beliefs, opinions, emotions, views, processes, social interactions and meanings (Hennink, Hutter and Bailey, 2011).

In the words of Matthews and Ross (2010:141-142):

Qualitative research methods are primarily concerned with stories and accounts including subjective understandings, feelings, opinions and beliefs. Qualitative data are typically gathered when an interpretivist epistemological approach is taken and when data collected is the words or expressions of the research participants themselves.

In the present study, therefore, focus was on second language teachers' and learners' beliefs about the use of code-switching in the classroom, as manifested in their classroom behaviours. In addition, data were collected in the form of words and expressions of the teachers and learners of English.

Qualitative Research focuses on how people make sense out of their lives. For instance, what the participants in a study are thinking and why they are thinking that way, their assumptions, values, goals, motives and reasons are of interest to the study, hence the need to study the participants in their natural settings (Fraenkel and Wallen, 1990). Gray (2014:161) states that qualitative research *'is highly contextual, (data) being collected in a natural 'reallife' setting... and can show how and why things happen – also incorporating people's own motivation, emotions, prejudices...'* This is also echoed by Denzin and Lincoln (2008:4) who point out that qualitative research *'involves an interpretive, naturalistic approach to the world. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them.'* They are concerned with how things are done, for instance, how people's attitudes are translated into actions (Fraenkel and Wallen, 1990). In the present study, I was interested in how and why teachers and learners of English employ, or avoid, the learners' L1, that is, code-switching, in teaching and learning.

Qualitative research focuses on understanding an individual's perception of the world from his or her own frame of reference since truth or reality is that which people imagine it to be (Nyawaranda, 2003). Qualitative researchers are interested in the complexity of social interactions expressed in the lives of individuals and by the meanings the participants attribute to these interactions. Thus, qualitative researchers

go into the natural settings of individuals, not laboratories (Marshall and Rossman, 2006). Therefore, *'qualitative research is pragmatic, interpretive, and grounded in the lived experiences of people'* (Marshall and Rossman, 2006:2).

In the present study, the natural setting is the ESL classroom situation and focus was on why teachers and learners of ESL at the two selected secondary schools code-switch or avoid code-switching. Qualitative research may also attempt to explore the complexity, ambiguity and specific detailed processes happening in a social context (Yates, 2004). In the present study ESL teachers' and learners' beliefs about code-switching in the ESL classroom were, thus, explored.

Corbin and Strauss (2008:12) observe that *'qualitative research allows researchers to get at the inner experience of participants, to determine how meanings are formed through and in culture, and to discover rather than test variables.'* Corbin and Strauss add that qualitative research seeks to get into the world of participants so as to see the world from their perspective. Thus, the present study aimed to enter into the world of the selected ESL teachers and learners and examine their use or avoidance of code-switching in ESL lessons. The inquiry mainly looked for insights not quantitative data, hence my choice of the qualitative design. The study investigated teachers' and learners' beliefs using a contextual approach, which makes use of an interpretive paradigm, a naturalistic-ecological perspective which, according to Nunan (1992), holds that the context in which behaviour takes place significantly influences the behaviour.

Unlike quantitative research, which seeks statistical analysis, qualitative research seeks insight (Fraenkel and Wallen, 1990; Nyawaranda, 2003). Qualitative data are collected in forms of words or pictures. In the words of Fraenkel and Wallen (1990:443), *'In their search for understanding, qualitative researchers do not usually attempt to reduce their data to numerical symbols.'* Qualitative research is, thus, descriptive as it uses descriptive data in its research reports. According to Nyawaranda (2003), results in qualitative research are presented in the form of exemplars from field notes, interviews and documents. From these exemplars, inferential and explanatory descriptive analyses are made. Data are presented in a descriptive mode according to themes, using the researcher's own words. Narrative

vignettes and direct quotes from interviews, analytic charts, summary tables and descriptive statistics are used. In the words of Creswell (2009:39):

Qualitative research is a type of educational research in which the researcher relies on the views of participants, asks broad, general questions, collects data consisting largely of words (or text) from participants, describes and analyses these words for themes, and conducts the enquiry in a subjective, biased manner.

However, though the data consists largely of words, qualitative research does not reject the counting of aspects of the data (Punch, 2005). This is corroborated by Nyawaranda (2003: 6), who states that *'Descriptive statistics in the form of frequency counts may also be used.'* Similarly, Creswell (2013:185) observes that *'Some (but not all) qualitative researchers feel comfortable counting and reporting the number of times the codes appear in their databases.'* Best and Khan (2014:299) concur as they acknowledge that, in qualitative research, the description of observations is not ordinarily expressed in quantitative terms, but the authors go on to observe that *'It is not that numerical measures are never used but other means of description are emphasised.'* This is corroborated by Green and Thorogood (2014:5), who state that qualitative research tends to use *'language data'* rather than *'numerical data'*, but *'Many qualitative studies use simple frequency counts.'* Thus in the current study, although the focus was on the reasons why participants code-switch or avoid code-switching in the teaching and learning of English, simple frequency counts of instances of code-switching were used.

Another feature of qualitative research according to Bogdan and Taylor (cited in Nyawaranda, 2003) is that it uses multiple data collecting tools so as to achieve triangulation of the results, for purposes of reliability and validity. Nyawaranda (2003:10) explains that *'Triangulation may show disparities, but this is accepted in qualitative research. The idea is not to seek similarities in the results from various sources but to understand and explain when and why there are differences.'* Thus, qualitative research employs interviews, documents, field notes, observations and artifacts as some of its data collection tools (Nyawaranda, 2003). Corbin and Strauss (2008:27) also state that *'One of the virtues of qualitative research is that there are*

many alternative sources of data, so as to *'triangulate or obtain various types of data on the same problem, combining interview with observation.'* Gray (2014) concurs, stating that qualitative research combines several strategies such as interviews, focus groups and observations as the prime data collection methods. In light of this, the current study employed three data collection tools for purposes of triangulation.

Rossmann and Rallis (cited in Marshall and Rossmann, 2006) summarise the characteristics of qualitative research as naturalistic, drawing on multiple methods that respect the humanity of participants, focusing on context, being emergent and evolving, and being interpretive.

However, qualitative research is often seen as lacking reproducibility or lacking generalisability, and as being so personal that another researcher may use the same data to arrive at very different conclusions (Mays cited in Gray, 2014). Nyawaranda (2003:11) counters this criticism by arguing that:

... truth in a qualitative study does not emerge as one objective view, but rather as a composite picture of perspectives of different people involved in the study, an individual's own definition of the world... Duplicating exactly the study on a naturally occurring phenomenon, therefore, is as impossible as stepping into the same river twice... although results of a qualitative study cannot be generalised in the sense of the positivists, they can help in generating hypotheses and gaining insights.

Another perceived weakness of qualitative research is that the researcher's presence among participants might create bias or unreliability. However, Nyawaranda (2003) argues that most research instruments, be they quantitative or qualitative, affect the behaviour of participants in certain ways. Reliability in qualitative research is also enhanced through the use of triangulation or use of many sources of data, the idea being *'not to seek similarities in the results from various sources but to understand and explain when and why there are differences'* (Nyawaranda, 2003:10).

The current inquiry is a case study.

3.2 CASE STUDY RESEARCH

According to Merriam (2009:40) '*A case study is an in-depth study of a bounded system.*' This is further elaborated on by Creswell (2013:97) thus:

Case study research is a qualitative approach in which the investigator explores real-life, contemporary bounded system (a case) or multiple bounded systems (cases) over time, through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information (e.g. observations, interviews, audiovisual material, and documents and reports), and reports a case description and case themes.

Thus, in keeping with case study research, the current research focused on the situation on the ground by investigating code-switching in the teaching and learning of English at two secondary schools. Observations, interviews, and focus group discussions were used to collect data.

In the words of Best and Khan (2014:265):

The case study is a way of organising social data for the purpose of viewing social reality. It examines a social unit as a whole. The unit may be a person, a family, a social institution, or a community. The purpose is to understand the life cycle or an important part of the cycle or unit.

In the current study, the two schools are the selected units and the important part of the units is the issue of the use of the learners' L1 in the teaching and learning of English.

Theodorson and Theodorson (cited in Punch , 2005) also define a case study as a method of studying social phenomena by thoroughly analysing an individual case, which may be a person, a group, an episode, a process, a community, a society, or any unit of social life. Clark (2011:178-179) corroborates this, stating that in a case study '*the researcher purposively selects one or a few individuals, groups, organisations, communities, events... and the selected case(s) (are studied) within their social context(s)*' over a brief or long period.

Nisbert and Watt (cited in Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011) posit that case studies have the advantage of catching unique features that might otherwise be lost in larger scale data such as surveys. They provide insights into other, similar situations and, cases are strong on reality. They can be undertaken by a single researcher without a research team.

However, case study results may not be generalisable except where other researchers see their application, coupled with the problem of observer bias (Nisbert and Watt cited in Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011).

In the current inquiry, the two selected secondary schools in Masvingo District served as the case.

3.3 POPULATION AND SAMPLE

The population for the study comprises all teachers and learners of English Language in Masvingo District. Two selected secondary schools, an urban boarding school that also enrolls day learners and a rural day school, as well as the learners of the two schools, were purposively sampled. This is in keeping with qualitative research, which, according to Gray (2014:174):

usually works with purposive non-probability samples because it seeks to obtain insights into particular practices that exist within a particular location, context and time. Informants are therefore identified because they are known to enable the exploration of a particular behaviour or characteristic relevant to the research.

Creswell (2013) also asserts that, in purposive sampling, the researcher chooses individuals and sites for investigation for the reason that they can purposefully inform an understanding of the research problem and central phenomenon of the research. Purposive sampling is '*sampling in a deliberate way, with some purpose or focus in mind*' and '*advantage is taken of cases, events, situations or informants which are close at hand*' (Punch, 2005:187). Similarly, Clark (2011:123) describes purposive sampling as '*a nonprobability sampling procedure that involves elements based on the*

researcher's judgment about which elements will facilitate his or her investigation. Therefore, small samples of people, cases or phenomena that are situated in particular contexts are chosen (Gray, 2014). Creswell (2013:157) states that *'One general guideline for sample size in qualitative research is not only to study a few sites or individuals but also to collect extensive detail about each site or individual studied.'* Onuegbuzie and Leech (2007) concur when they point out that, the need to extract thick, rich data means that, in qualitative research the sample must not be too large. This is also supported by Yin (cited in Best and Khan, 2014:265), who posits that *'Even [a] single case [study] can enable [a researcher] to generalise to other cases that represent similar theoretical conditions.'*

The two secondary schools selected for this study, School A and School B, were purposively sampled on the basis of their different locations and distinct characteristics.

School A is an urban government boarding secondary school which also enrolls day learners. The learners' parents are largely working class and can, thus, afford to pay their children's fees. The school, therefore, has better learning facilities, textbooks and other infrastructure. The school gets its learners from generally well-equipped neighbouring government and city council-run primary schools where the pass rate at Grade Seven (end of primary school level) is generally high. The average annual pass rate at Ordinary Level at School A is 70%.

School B is a rural day secondary school that is run by the Masvingo Rural District Council. The school is located in a poor peasant farming community where parents struggle to pay fees for their children. The school is, thus, generally poor in terms of learning facilities, textbooks, teachers' accommodation and other infrastructure. The school draws its learners from equally poor neighbouring primary schools where the pass rate at Grade Seven is generally low. The average annual pass rate at Ordinary Level at School B is 15%. I, therefore, felt that these distinctly different secondary schools would provide useful, generalisable insights on the role of English-Shona code-switching in the teaching of English in secondary schools in Zimbabwe.

From these two secondary schools, two Form 3 English Language (one class per school) and two Form 1 classes (one class per school) were purposively sampled for investigation. Form 3 and Form 1 classes in Zimbabwe are considered non-terminal examination classes in Zimbabwe, thus I felt that the schools would give me greater access to the participants (teachers and learners of English) as they would not be too busy preparing for the public ZIMSEC examinations. The classes were also sampled on the basis of their being taught by trained and experienced English Language and teachers who are able to speak the learners' L1. This gave a sample of one hundred and sixty (160) English Language learners who were observed while learning English.

From this sample of one hundred and sixty learners, I requested the teachers of English of the four classes to purposively sample ten learners per class so that they would participate in four separate focus group discussions. The teachers purposively selected the learners using the criterion of high English proficient, moderate proficient, and low proficient learners per class.

The two Form 3 and two Form 1 English Language teachers were also purposively sampled on the basis of being trained teachers of English who have taught the subject for a minimum of ten years. I, therefore, felt that this sample of four teachers would provide some useful insights on the phenomenon under investigation, in the form of their beliefs on the role of English-Shona code-switching in the teaching and learning of English.

3.4 DATA COLLECTION TOOLS

Data were gathered using three data collection tools that are in keeping with the qualitative research paradigm. These are observations, interviews and focus group discussions, and they are discussed next.

3.4.1 Observations

Observation is defined by Sidhu (1984:158) as a technique which *'seeks to ascertain what people think and do by watching them in action as they express themselves in various situations and activities.'* It is *'the systematic viewing of people's actions and the recording, analysis and interpretation of their behaviour'* (Gray, 2014:413), which yields data that are primarily descriptive of settings, people, and the meanings that the

participants attach to them. According to Patton (cited in Best and Khan, 2014:253), *'The data from observations consist of detailed descriptions of people's activities, actions, and the full range of interpersonal interactions and organisational processes that are part of observable human experience.'* Thus, in the current study, teachers and learners of English were observed as they interacted in the activity of teaching and learning English, with a view to establishing their beliefs on code-switching in English (L2) learning.

Observation can be either participant or non-participant. In the former, the observer becomes part of the group and is no longer regarded as an outsider (Sidhu, 1984). This is what Fraenkel and Wallen (1990:446) call participant-as-observer, where the researcher *'participates fully in the group being studied, but also makes it clear that he is doing research.'* In non-participant observation, the researcher remains aloof from the group and does his or her observation as inconspicuously as possible (Sidhu, 1984). This is what Fraenkel and Wallen (1990:446) call observer – as - participant, where the observer *'identifies herself straight off as a researcher, but makes no pretence of actually being a member of the group she is observing.'* Observation may, thus, be overt (with the knowledge of those being observed), or covert (without their knowledge) (Gray, 2014). In the current study I chose to be a non-participant observer because of lack of time to work himself into the groups being studied, and because the participant observer may *'become more and more blinded to the peculiarities which he is supposed to observe'* (Sidhu, 1984:163).

3.4.1.1 Advantages of Observation

According to Sidhu (1984:158), observation is *'recognised as the most direct means of studying people when one is interested in their overt behaviour'*, is natural, and refined. In the words of Corbin and Strauss (2008:29), *'Observations put researchers right where the action is, in a place where they can see what is going on.'* Furthermore, observations, which may be accompanied by audiotaping and field notes, are important in that the researcher may want to find out whether what participants say is backed by their action. In this way, observations are useful for purposes of triangulation of findings (Nyawaranda, 2003). Corbin and Strauss (2008:29) concur with Nyawaranda's observation when they also state that *'it is not unusual for persons to say they are doing one thing when in reality they are doing something else.'*

Clark (2011) gives three other advantages of the observation tool of research, namely that it can provide a relatively unfiltered view of human behaviour, can provide an in-depth understanding of a social context, and that it is also relatively flexible owing to the fact that it is often complemented by other methods.

3.4.1.2 Disadvantages of Observation

One of the disadvantages of the observation tool, according to Corbin and Strauss (2008:30), is that *'A researcher may give meaning to action/interaction based on observation without checking out that meaning with participants'*, hence the need to combine observation with interview or to make allowance for verification with participants. Another shortcoming of observation that is stated by Clark (2011) is the problem of generalisability emanating from the possibility of the unreliability of observations and the use of nonprobability sampling. Clark also alludes to the issue of demand characteristics, where those being observed may distort or change their behaviour owing to their awareness that they are being observed. This is what Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011) call reactivity. This is where participants, because they know that they are being observed, may, for example, try harder in class, feel more anxious, behave much better or much worse than normal, behave in ways in which they think the researcher wishes, or in ways in which the researcher openly approves. Observation is also time-consuming (Corbin and Strauss, 2008; Clark, 2011), and can be intrusive (Corbin and Strauss, 2008).

The current study, however, employed the observation tool for its directness, naturalness, refinedness, and for purposes of triangulation of results, among other reasons.

3.4.1.3 How the Observations Were Carried Out

I observed ten Form 3 (five lessons per class per school) and ten Form 1 English lessons (five lessons per class per school) at each of the two schools in my search for insights into the role played by the learners' L1 in the teaching and learning, through the use of the communication strategy of code-switching. Each lesson was about thirty-five minutes long, giving an average of one hundred and seventy-five minutes per class. I felt that this would yield the insights that I was looking for. There is no

prescribed length of observation in qualitative research. This is supported by Best and Khan (2014:265) who argue that *'observations may take place over the course of an entire school year (or even longer) or could be as brief as an hour.'* At Form 3 level, I observed comprehension, summary, vocabulary, composition, register (oral communication), and grammar/ language structures lessons. These selected aspects are some of the aspects that are given prominence in the Zimbabwe School Examinations Council Ordinary Level English Language Syllabus. At Form One level, I observed comprehension, composition, grammar, vocabulary, and literature lessons, which are also some of the aspects that are given prominence in the Zimbabwe Junior Certificate (ZJC) English Syllabus. All the observed lessons were audiotaped for transcription and analysis later.

Apart from audiotaping the lessons, I also wrote field notes, which, according to Best and Khan (2014:271), *'should be complete and descriptive, and include everything the researcher/ observer feels may have import ... These notes should contain direct quotations whenever possible.'* I, therefore, directly quoted instances of both the teachers' code-switching and learners' code-switching and noted the teachers' and learners' reactions. I also noted down the possible functions for code-switching in by the teachers and learners. This is supported by Best and Khan (2014:271) who state that *'field notes often contain the observer's feelings and reactions toward the events observed.'* Gray (2014) also suggests that field notes should comprise, among other aspects, key quotations, observation of verbal behaviour, observation of non-verbal behaviour, and the researcher's views and feelings at the time of observation.

The purpose of the lesson observations was to find out whether secondary school teachers and learners of English code-switched from English to the learners' L1 and in what situations, so as to come up with the functions of the code-switching. An attempt was also made to establish the frequencies of the teacher and learner code-switching in the five lessons observed per class. Furthermore, I wanted to note how the teachers reacted to the learners' code-switching so as to partly address the question on the teachers' perceptions on learners' code-switching.

3.4.2 Interviews

An interview, according to Fraenkel and Wallen (1990:447), is the careful asking of relevant questions whose purpose is *'to check the accuracy of- to verify or refute- the*

impressions he or she has gained through observation... find out what is their (people) mind- what they think or how they feel about something.' Nyawaranda (2003) defines an interview as a face to face conversation that takes place between the researcher and the participant and also states that it is important to gain insight into people's behaviour, feelings or how they interpret the world around them. Similarly, Mishler (cited in Corbin and Strauss, 2008:28) observe that *'Questioning and answering are ways of speaking that are grounded in and depend on culturally shared and often tacit assumptions about how to express and understand beliefs, experiences, feelings and intentions.'* To Gray (2014:382), *'An interview is a verbal exchange in which one person, the interviewer, attempts to acquire information from and gain information from another person, the interviewee.'* For Kahn and Cannell, cited in Marshall and Rossman (2006:101), an interview is *'a conversation with a purpose'*, a view shared by Hennink, Hutter and Bailey (2011:109), who say *'An in-depth interview is a one-to-one method of data collection that involves an interviewer and an interviewee discussing specific topics in depth... a conversation with a purpose.'*

According to Punch (2005), an interview is a very good way of getting access to people's perceptions, meanings, their definitions of situations and their constructions of reality; it is also one of the most powerful means of understanding others. Merriam (2009:88) states that *'Interviewing is necessary when we cannot observe behaviour, feelings, or how people interpret the world around them.'* Best and Khan (2014) concur when they state that interviews are used in gathering information about people's experiences, knowledge, opinions, beliefs and feelings. Therefore the current study focused on the beliefs of English teachers and learners on the use of the learners' L1 in the teaching and learning of English at secondary school level.

Merriam (2009) identifies and explains three types of interview, the highly structured/standardised, the semi-structured, and the unstructured/informal interview. In the highly structured interview, wording and order of the questions are predetermined. In the semi-structured interview, the interview guide includes a mixture of more and less structured questions. All questions used are flexible and, usually specific data are required from all participants. There is also no predetermined wording and order of questions.

In the unstructured interview, open-ended questions are asked. The interview is flexible and resembles a conversation. The unstructured interview is used when the researcher does not know enough about an issue to ask relevant questions. This type of interview is primarily for ethnographic studies in which participant observation is the research tool (Merriam, 2009). Gray (2014:177) also states that *'Qualitative interviews utilize open-ended questions using either informal, conversational interviews, semi-structured interviews (where additional probing questions can be used) or standardised interviews, where they are not.'*

3.4.2.1 Advantages of Interviews

Sidhu (1984) gives several advantages of the interview as a tool of gathering data, one of which is flexibility. The researcher can follow leads that appear fruitful, can ask for elaboration, and clarify questions which are unclear to the participant. Marshall and Rossman (2006:102) state that *'Immediate follow-up and clarification are possible.'* Related to this is the possibility of cross-questioning, modifying and simplifying questions and adding supplementary questions. Unlike the case with a questionnaire, the interviewer can also create the right type of friendly atmosphere which is conducive for obtaining the required data. Furthermore, Best and Khan (2014) observe that people are often more willing to talk than to write, a point which is also raised by Sidhu (1984:146) who states that *'People are usually more willing and less hesitant to talk than to write especially on delicate, intimate and confidential topics.'* Sidhu also argues that data that are gathered through interviews have been found to be of reliable nature. Apart from that, an interview quickly yields large quantities of data (Marshall and Rossman, 2006).

In the current study I followed the semi-structured interview guide whose advantage, according to Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011:236), is that *'a schedule is prepared that is sufficiently open-ended to enable the contents to be reordered, digressions and expansions made, new avenues to be included, and further probing to be undertaken.'* Gray (2014:382) also notes the issue of probing as an advantage of the semi-structured interview by stating that *'The use of the semi-structured interview also allows the researcher to 'probe' for more detailed responses where the respondent is asked to clarify what they have said.'* Participants expand their ideas, explain their views, voice their priorities and opinions, and develop their ideas and speak widely on

issues that the researcher raises (Denscombe, 2010). A semi-structured interview guide, thus, indicates the general outline to be followed but, within each section, the questioning is free and full (Sidhu, 1984). However, interviews are not without their weaknesses.

3.4.2.2 Disadvantages of Interviews

One of the major drawbacks of the interview is the interviewer effect, that is, according to Clark, 2011:233), *'the changes in respondents' behaviours or answers that result from some aspect of the interview situation,'* such as *'interviewer's personal and social characteristics of the specific way each interviewer presents questions.'* Sidhu (1984) calls this interviewer bias and explains that the very presence of the interviewer has an effect on the responses that the interviewer will get. Best and Khan (2014:272) also allude to interviewer bias when they note that *'Too often interviewees provide information based on what they think the interviewer wants to hear'* and the authors advise that *'it is critical for the interviewer to make sure the person being interviewed understands that the researcher does not hold any pre-conceived notions about the outcome of the study.'*

Another disadvantage of the interview technique, according to Sidhu (1984), is that it is costly in terms of expenses, time and effort when compared to a questionnaire. On the part of the interviewee, Sidhu (1984) identifies limitations that have to do with the interviewee's experience as an interviewee, namely their judgement about themselves, their accessibility and readiness to divulge the information, and their ability to express themselves. In relation to this, Marshall and Rossman (2006:102) observe that *'Interviewees may be unwilling or may be uncomfortable sharing all the interviewer hopes to explore, or they may be unaware of recurring patterns in their lives.'*

Lack of skill on the part of the interviewer may also negatively affect the interview, for instance, the interviewer may fail to ask questions which evoke long narratives from participants, or not properly comprehend responses to questions or elements of the interview situation (Marshall and Rossman, 2006). Another challenge associated with interviews is that though large volumes of data can be yielded through interviews, the data are time-consuming to analyse (Marshall and Rossman, 2006). Furthermore if

interviewing is done tactlessly, it can result in an invasion of privacy, and this can make participants uncomfortable (Denscombe, 2010). Denscombe also observes that the use of an audio recorder in an interview may create an artificial situation. According to Sidhu (1984:157) this *'may make the interviewee cautious and scare him away from divulging secrets.'*

3.4.2.3 How the Interviews Were Carried Out

Four ESL teachers were interviewed on a one-to-one basis using a semi-structured interview guide so as to gain more insights into their employment, or avoidance, code-switching in the ESL classroom. Each interview session lasted between forty minutes and one hour. The interviews were useful in triangulating results from the other data collecting tools. The interviews sought to find out whether the teachers of English code-switched between English and the learners' L1, the reasons for the teachers' code-switching or avoidance of code-switching in English lessons, situations in which the teachers code-switched, code-switching by learners, the teachers' reactions to code-switching by learners, the teachers preferred method(s) of teaching English, the teachers' views on the relationship between code-switching and New Englishes, and the teachers' views on the use of New Englishes in the school system.

3.4.2.4 The Teachers' Biographical Information

Table 3.1 shows the biographical information of the four teachers.

Table 3.1: Teacher-Participants' Biographical Data

TEACHER	AGE	GENDER	QUALIFICATION	TEACHING EXPERIENCE (YEARS)	L1

A	48	MALE	M.Ed. English	23	SHONA
B	35	FEMALE	B.Ed. English	11	SHONA & NDEBELE
C	45	FEMALE	B.Ed. English	20	SHONA
D	47	FEMALE	BA English	22	SHONA

3.4.3 Focus Groups

Focus groups are a research tool that makes use of group interaction on a particular topic, the aim being to obtain data (Clark, 2011). According to Hennink, Hutter and Bailey (2011:136):

The aim is to gain a broad range of views on the research topic over a period of 60-90 minutes, and to create an environment where participants feel comfortable to express their views ... characteristics of a focus group discussion are a focus on specific issues, with a predetermined group of people, conducting an interactive discussion.

Yates (2004:171) argues that *'Getting the participants to talk, discuss and debate among themselves is part of the reasoning behind focus groups.'* Patton (cited in Merriam, 2009:94) also describes focus groups from a constructivist view thus:

Unlike a series of one-on-one interviews, in a focus group participants get to hear each other's responses and to make additional comments beyond their own original responses as they hear what other people have to say. However, participants need not agree with each other or reach any kind of consensus. Nor is it necessary for people to disagree. The object is to get high quality data in a social context where people can consider their own views in the context of others.

The role of the interviewer is that of a moderator or facilitator. Punch (2005:171) concurs by stating that the process is not one of alternative question and answer but. Instead, *'the researcher will be facilitating, moderating, monitoring, and recording group interaction.'* Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011:436) define focus groups as a

kind of group interview that is not in the mould of a backwards and forwards between the interviewer and the focus group, but rather a situation whereby *'participants interact with each other rather than with the interviewer, such that the views of the participants can emerge – the participants' rather than the researcher's agenda can predominate.'*

3.4.3.1 Advantages of Focus Groups

One of the advantages of focus groups is that the interviewer *'creates a supportive environment, asking focused questions to encourage discussion and the expression of differing opinions and points of view'* (Marshall and Rossman, 2006:114). Furthermore, focus groups encourage communication between, as well as participation by, participants (Kitzinger, 1994).

Other advantages are that they are a faster and easier way of collecting qualitative data than in-depth interviews, since a range of views can be collected in less time than it would take for individual interviews. They generate discussion that can bring to the fore a variety of issues, and may be less influenced by the interviewer than the one-to-one interview (Yates, 2004).

In addition, focus groups produce data and insights that would not be accessible in the absence of the kind of interaction that obtains in groups (Morgan, 1988). In addition to this, according to Punch (2005:171), *'group situation can also stimulate people in making explicit their views, perceptions, motives and reasons'*, and focus groups *'are inexpensive, data-rich, flexible, stimulating, recall-aiding, cumulative and elaborative.'* Focus groups also offer opportunities for clarifications of responses, for probing and for observation of non-verbal responses (Stewart et al., 2007). Gray (2014:469) also points out that, focus groups *'allow for the synergistic building up of data as respondents add to the views expressed by others.'*

Other advantages of focus group discussions given by Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011) are generating data quickly and at a low cost, gathering data on attitudes, values and opinions, empowering participants to speak out and in their own words, and encouraging groups, rather than individuals, to express their thoughts, and provide a greater coverage of issues than would be the case in a survey.

3.4.3.2 Disadvantages of Focus Groups

However, focus groups are not without their shortcomings. According to Yates (2004), focus groups may not yield as in-depth and personal information as (one-to-one) interviews, and they also need to be well-managed since some members of the focus group may dominate the discussion. Fontana and Fray (1994) achieving balance in group interaction is a problem. Gray (2014) identifies five problems associated with focus groups. Firstly, the focus group discussion may go in a direction that is not intended by the researcher since the researcher, being a mere moderator, has less control or influence over the processes and outcomes, as compared to an interview situation. Secondly, there might be the challenge of not only locating but also persuading respondents to participate, since by its nature a focus group takes longer than an interview. Thirdly, focus groups are usually composed of convenience samples, thereby limiting generalisability of results. Fourthly, members' responses are dependent on each other, thus, further limiting generalisability of results. Fifth focus groups result in the problem of summarising and interpreting results because the data generated is of a discursive nature. Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011:437) summarise the disadvantages of focus groups thus:

The data may be difficult to analyse succinctly; the number of people involved tends to be small; they may yield less information than a survey; and the group dynamics may lead to non-participation by some members and dominance by others (e.g. status differentials may operate); the number of topics to be covered may be limited; intra-group disagreements and even conflicts may arise; inarticulate members may be denied a voice; the data may lack overall reliability.

3.4.3.3 How the Focus Group Discussions Were Carried Out

The inquiry carried out focus group discussions with four groups of ten ESL learners each. The discussion sessions were audio-taped and later transcribed for analysis. The discussions focused on the learners' views on code-switching (or avoidance of it) by the teachers of English. The discussions also sought to ascertain if the teachers code-switched and in what situations, if the learners themselves code-switched and in

what situations, the teachers' reactions to the learners' code-switching, and their general views on the use of their home language in the teaching of English.

3.5 DATA ANALYSIS

According to Strauss and Corbin (cited in Marshall and Rossman, 2006:154), *'Qualitative data analysis is a search for general statements about relationships and underlying themes.'* It is a process of ordering, structuring, and interpreting the data collected (Marshall and Rossman, 2006). Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011:537) also state that *'Qualitative research analysis involves organising, accounting for and explaining the data; in short, making sense of the data in terms of the participants' definitions of the situation, noting patterns, themes, categories and regularities.'* In the current study, I carried out what is referred to as inductive analysis, which entails *'discovering patterns, themes and categories in one's data'* (Patton cited in Marshall and Rossman, 2006:159).

The first step that was taken by the researcher in this study was to transcribe the data from lesson observations and interviews. Transcription involves transformation of sound/image from recordings to text (Duranti, 2007). It is a selective process where certain aspects of talk and interaction are transcribed since it is not possible to record all features of talk and interaction, and extraneous information makes a transcript difficult to read and, therefore, results in obscuring the research process (Davidson, 2009). After transcribing the voluminous qualitative data, I organised it, in line with Deem's (2002:846) observation that for the qualitative researcher to make sense out of the data, there is need *'to impose some form of order onto this data.'*

After organising the data, I subjected it to the process of reading and memoing, a process that involves immersing oneself in the details, writing notes or memos in margins of field notes and the transcripts (Creswell, 2013). Clark (2011) defines memos in qualitative research as extended notes that are written by the researcher so as to help the researcher to understand the meaning of coding categories. The transcribed qualitative data has to be read and re-read in order that the researcher becomes *'thoroughly familiar with the data'*, to be immersed in what was said, done, observed, and what is portrayed (Denscombe, 2010:283).

After reading and re-reading the data, I then classified them into codes and themes. As Creswell (2013:184) puts it, *'forming codes or categories represents the heart of qualitative analysis. Here researchers build detailed descriptions, develop themes or dimensions, and provide an interpretation in light of their own views or views of perspectives in the literature.'* I used what is referred to as open coding, that is, attaching labels to a piece of text to describe and categorise the piece of text (Strauss and Corbin cited in Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011). This type of coding can be done line by line, phrase by phrase, sentence by sentence, paragraph by paragraph, or unit of text by unit of text (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011).

To identify the themes, I looked for important information from the data in relation to the research question. Creswell (2013:186) states that *'Themes in qualitative research (also called categories) are broad units of information that consist of several codes aggregated to form common ideas.'* I, therefore, looked for common ideas in relation to secondary school English language teachers' and learners' beliefs about code-switching in the teaching and learning of English. I used the constant comparative method of data analysis, which entails comparing and contrasting data from different sources so as to develop categories and seek patterns among the categories (Silverman, 2010). This is compatible with triangulation (Nyawaranda, 2003; Corbin and Strauss, 2008; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011). In the current study, therefore, I compared and contrasted data from the one-on-one interviews that I held with the four teachers, with data from lesson observations and from focus group discussions with ESL learners.

The next step in my data analysis was to interpret the data. According to Marshall and Rossman (2006:161-162), data interpretation in qualitative research is a process that *'brings meaning and coherence to the themes, patterns, categories, developing linkages and story line that is engaging to read.'* Similarly, according to Creswell (2013), data interpretation in qualitative research involves abstracting out beyond the codes and themes, to the larger meaning of the gathered data.

The final process involved presenting or representing the data. According to Creswell, 2013:187), this is *'a packaging of what was found in text, tabular, or figure form.'* I, therefore, adopted a descriptive and interpretive mode of data presentation using my own words and own interpretations, through detailed descriptions, direct quotes,

summary tables and descriptive statistics where necessary (Nyawaranda, 2013). Although the study was qualitative, this did not imply that I totally dispensed with simple statistical counts. This is supported by Best and Kahn (2014:299) who state that *‘Qualitative studies are those in which the description of observations is not ordinarily expressed in quantitative terms. It is not that numerical measures are never used but that other means of description are emphasised.’*

The data analysis process outlined above is more or less consistent with the phases of qualitative research analysis suggested by Marshall and Rossman (2006), that is, organising the data, immersing oneself in the data by reading and re-reading it, generating categories and themes, coding the data, offering interpretations, searching for alternative understandings, and then presenting the findings.

3.6 QUALITY ASSURANCE

Guba (1981) proposes that quality or trustworthiness in qualitative research can be achieved by considering issues of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability.

One of the strategies of ensuring credibility is the adoption of methods that are well-established in qualitative inquiry (Shenton, 2004). Therefore, to enhance credibility in the current study I employed well-established data collection tools that are in keeping with qualitative research. These are observation (Patton, cited in Best and Khan, 2014; Gray, 2014), interviews (Marshall and Rossman, 2006; Merriam, 2009), as well as focus groups (Yates, 2004; Clark, 2011; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011).

Another strategy of enhancing credibility is triangulation, which *‘may involve the use of different methods, especially observation, focus groups and individual interviews, which form the major data collection strategies for much qualitative research’* (Shenton, 2004:65). These different methods compensate for their individual weaknesses and take advantage of their respective strengths (Guba, 1981). Thus, in the current study I employed observations, interviews and focus groups.

Tactics that ensure that participants are honest also enhance credibility, so each participant should be given the opportunity to refuse to participate if they do not wish

to participate, so that only those genuinely willing to participate can do so (Shenton, 2004). In the current study, therefore, I sought the consent of all the participants.

I also gave my thesis to a professor who is an expert at language teaching issues to read and offer her comments. I also made use of the feedback that I got from one international conference where I presented aspects of the current thesis. This is supported by Shenton (2004) who states that the qualitative project should be given to experts to read, and that one must make use of feedback from conferences.

Still on the aspect of credibility, I related my findings to previous related studies as recommended by Silverman (2000).

Transferability (or external validity), according to Merriam (1998) has to do with the extent to which the findings of one study can be applied to other situations. Thus, in this study, I attempted to address the issue of transferability by stating the number of organizations that took part in the study, the number and characteristics of the participants, the data collection tools, and the number of data collection sessions, as recommended by Shenton (2004). Also, according to Shenton (2004:70), '*similar projects employing same methods but conducted in different environments could well be of great value*' in assessing transferability. Thus, in the current study I reviewed literature on similar studies that were undertaken elsewhere.

To cater for the aspect of dependability, I used overlapping methods, namely focus groups and individual interviews. I also gave a detailed description of the research design and its implementation. Thus, I gave minute details how the observations, interviews and focus group discussions were held. Both the former and the latter strategies were proposed by Shenton (2004).

Finally, to address the issue of confirmability, I made an effort to ensure that the findings are the results of the experiences and ideas of the participants by objectively reporting their experiences, actions and views. Further, I also made use of triangulation as recommended by Shenton (2004).

3.7 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

In the study, I used non-participant observation in which the researcher remains aloof from the group activities being investigated (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011). It is my belief that, if I had used participant observation participants might have become more used to me and this might have increased their chances of behaving in a more natural way. The non-participant observation technique has more chances of reactivity effects, such as the presence of the researcher influencing participants' behaviour (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011). In the current study, thus, the possibility of the teachers and the learners engaging in, or avoiding code-switching because of the presence of the researcher, could not be ruled out. That is why I also employed interviews and focus group discussions to corroborate findings from lesson observations. Also, only twenty English lessons were observed due to time constraints. I feel that, although the lessons yielded important insights into the phenomenon of code-switching in the schools under study, participant observation of more lessons would have yielded more valuable insights. The other limitation of the study is that, although I feel that the two purposively sampled secondary schools yielded important insights in keeping with qualitative research, these two school types were too few to make the findings generalisable.

3.8 ETHICAL ISSUES

The study required me to visit schools to gather data. The schools are under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education, Art, Sport and Culture. Therefore, before going into the schools, I sought written permission from the relevant ministry, through the Masvingo District and the Masvingo Provincial Education Offices. Once permission had been granted, I also visited the heads of the schools that would take part in the study, informed them of the duration of the researcher's proposed visit to their schools and also sought their consent.

Furthermore, the study involved human subjects as participants and in this regard, Leedy (1985:100) states the following as some of the considerations to be made by the researcher:

fairness, honesty, openness of intent, disclosure of methods that will be employed, the ends for which the research will be executed, a respect for the

integrity of the individual, the obligation of the individual to guarantee unequivocally individual privacy, and an informed willingness on the part of the subject to participate voluntarily in the research activity.

In light of this, I also sought the consent of the selected teachers of English to observe their lessons, to interview them, as well as to grant me permission to hold focus group discussions with their learners.

The participants were assured that their anonymity was guaranteed and that the information they would give would be treated with utmost confidentiality and would be used for research purposes only. This is supported by Lofland (2006:51), who states that:

One of the central obligations that field researchers have with respect to those they study is the guarantee of anonymity via the ‘assurance of confidentiality’ – the promise that the real names of persons, places... will not be used in the research report or will be substituted by pseudonyms.

Thus, the two secondary schools that were selected for this study were named School A for the urban boarding school and School B for the rural day secondary school. The four teachers of English who participated in the study were also referred to as Teacher A, Teacher B, Teacher C, and Teacher D. The teachers were also assured that if they so wish, the participants will also be allowed access to the research findings. Another ethical consideration made in this study is that the research findings were presented in an honest manner, without any distortions. I also acknowledged the assistance of the people and organisations that co-operated with me to make the study successful.

3.9 SUMMARY

The chapter focused on defining and explaining the research perspective adopted in the study, namely, the qualitative or interpretive paradigm, in this case, in the form of case study research. The target population, sample and sampling technique were explained. The data collection tools employed in the research study, namely observations, interviews and focus groups, were explained. Advantages and disadvantages of these data collecting tools were identified. The data analysis procedure adopted was also highlighted and it entailed transcribing the data,

organising the data, reading and memoing the data, classifying the data into codes and themes, interpreting the data, then presenting or representing the data. After outlining the limitations of the study, the chapter addressed quality and ethical issues that are in keeping with the qualitative research paradigm.

CHAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

4. INTRODUCTION

The study sought to answer the following research sub-questions and these were addressed chronologically as follows:

- (i) To what extent, and for what possible functions, is code-switching being employed in the teaching and learning of English at two secondary schools in Masvingo District?
- (ii) What are the perceptions of the selected secondary school teachers of English on the code-switching done by their learners during English lessons?
- (iii) What are the perceptions of the selected secondary school learners of English on the code-switching done by their teachers during English lessons?
- (iv) Is there a relationship between code-switching by the selected teachers and learners of English and New Englishes, and what perceptions do the teachers hold about the teaching of the Zimbabwean variety of English in secondary schools in Zimbabwe?

In the first section of the chapter (4.1), I present findings showing the extent to which the selected teachers and learners of English code-switched during the teaching and learning of English. Tables showing the approximate frequencies as well as the possible functions of the code switches are presented. I use the word 'possible' taking into cognisance that a code-switched utterance may play more than one function. This is supported by Raschka et al. (2009) who observe code-switches may simultaneously fulfil multiple functions. Excerpts that illustrate the teachers' and learners' code switches are presented as part of the results from lesson observations. To augment the findings from lesson observations, the section also presents results from the interviews I held with the teachers on their own code-switching, as well as code-switching by their learners of English. In addition, the section also presents findings from the focus group discussions that I held with the learners, on their own code-switching, as well as the code-switching done by their teachers.

In the second section (4.2), the chapter presents findings showing the teachers' perceptions on their learners' code-switching. These findings were obtained from the interviews that I held with the four teachers and the four focus groups of learners, as well as from the lessons that I observed.

The third section of the chapter (4.3) presents findings on learners' perceptions on the code-switching done by their teachers and the findings were obtained from the focus group discussions that I held with the learners of English.

The fourth section (4.4) focuses on the findings on the teachers' views on the relationship between code-switching and New Englishes, as well as the teachers' perceptions on the possibility of officialising the teaching of the code-switched English variety in Zimbabwe's schools.

4.1 EXTENT TO WHICH TEACHERS AND LEARNERS CODE-SWITCHED; THE CODE-SWITCHING FUNCTIONS

To answer the first research sub-question, an analysis was made of excerpts from the twenty lessons that were observed of the four selected teachers of English at the two selected secondary schools. The teachers' and learners' code-switches from the excerpts were identified and indicated in italics in the lesson observation excerpts, and the frequency of occurrence of the code-switches were presented in tabular form. The possible functions of the code-switches were identified and indicated in capital letters and in square brackets within the excerpts from the observed lessons. Data obtained from interviews with the teachers, as well as from focus group discussions with learners, were also analysed to establish the extent, and functions of code-switching by the selected teachers and learners of English.

4.1.1 Teacher A and Class A: Extent and Functions of Code-switching

4.1.1.1 Teacher A: Code-switching Functions and Frequencies (Findings from Lesson Observations)

Teacher A code-switched moderately as shown in the excerpts from the lessons observed. The possible code-switching functions identified from Teacher A's code-switches comprised emphasising, explaining, checking understanding, inviting participation, joking, seeking confirmation, seeking emphasis, exemplifying, seeking acknowledgement, defining, seeking clarification, giving instruction, acknowledging/agreeing, eliciting, commenting, hesitation, drawing attention, and commanding.

Table 4.1 shows these code-switching functions identified from observing Teacher A, and the ‘approximate’ frequency of occurrence of each code-switching function. The word approximate has been used to allow for any errors of omission I might have made.

Table 4.1: Teacher A – Code-switching Functions and Frequencies

Code-switching Function	Frequency (Approximate)
Emphasising	50
Explaining	11
Checking Understanding	04
Inviting Participation	14
Joking	03
Seeking Confirmation	08
Seeking emphasis	03
Exemplifying	05
Seeking acknowledgement	01
Defining	01
Seeking Clarification	03
Giving Instructions	01
Acknowledging/Agreeing	02
Eliciting	02
Commenting	02
Hesitation	02
Drawing Attention	01
Commanding	01
TOTAL	114

The excerpts below show the situations in which Teacher A code-switched and the possible functions of the teacher’s code switches.

In the excerpt below Teacher A was teaching prepositions.

Teacher: Right so we were looking at eh – at eh prepositions, and I will give you characteristics of eh prepositions. Eh first one is eh prepositions eh work with eh with verbs. Eh *hazvirevi kuti eh zvinoinda zvose kubasa*. (It doesn’t mean they go to work together.) [JOKING]

Learners: (Laughter)

Teacher: *Zvinoreva kuti preposition inosevenza – paunongo constructa preposition inoshanda nei?* (It means a preposition works with what when you construct a sentence?) [CHECKING UNDERSTANDING]

Learners: *Neverb.* [SHOWING UNDERSTANDING] (With a verb.)

Teacher: *Neverb.* (With a verb.) [EMPHASISING] Can I have an example of a verb? We already have examples of prepositions. Can I have examples of verbs? Yes?

Learner: That.

Teacher: *He-e?* (Yes?) [INVITING PARTICIPATION]

Learner: That.

Teacher: That is not a verb. Yes? Thank you for trying ...

Teacher: So I have given you the three rules here, rule number 1, certain prepositions work with – sorry prepositions it's a must – prepositions work with verbs – *chero – chero zvaita sei.* (always, without fail.) [EMPHASISING] Preposition *inototi – chainosevenza nacho chii?* (What does a preposition work with?) [SEEKING EMPHASIS]

Learners: Verb.

Teacher: And - here are examples of verbs: jump – then the next one, certain verbs have many prepositions or work with many prepositions, verb one, *mapreposition pamwe 7*, (Let's say seven prepositions.) [EXEMPLIFYING] *asi zvichibudisa* (but bringing out) different meanings. [EXPLAINING] *Handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT]

Learners: Yes.

Teacher: Then the next one, certain verbs have no prepositions. Verb – verb *iroro harina basa nepreposition* – (That verb has no preposition-) [EMPHASISING] *asi taiti maprepositions anofamba namaverb* (but we said prepositions work with verbs) [EMPHASISING] *asi harina basa nazvo rinosevenza riri roga* (but it defies the rule and works without a verb) [EMPHASISING] and we have given you two examples.

In the above excerpt, Teacher A code-switched from English to Shona to joke, explain a point, check if learners had understood his explanation, emphasise a point, seek repetition for emphasis from learners, exemplify his explanation, seek acknowledgement of his explanation from learners, and invite a learner to participate

in the lesson through providing an answer. Because the teacher's joke drew laughter from the learners, the joke was meant to make the lesson enjoyable. The explaining, checking understanding, emphasising, and the exemplification functions of the teacher's code-switches seemed to be for pedagogical reasons to make the learners understand how prepositions work.

In the second excerpt below, the teacher was teaching oral communication or registers.

Teacher: Thank you. What does it show then if you don't feed your brother from 6am to 8pm? What does it show?

Learner: It shows *kuti hauna* (that you don't have) care. [EXPLAINING]

Teacher: It shows *kuti hauna* (that you don't have) care. [EMPHASISING]

Learners: (Laughter)

Teacher: *Kana usina* (If you don't have) care what does this mean yes Panashe? [CHECKING UNDERSTANDING]

Learner: *Une hutsinye*. (You are cruel.) [EXPLAINING]

Teacher: Speak up please.

Learner: *Une hutsinye*. (You are cruel.) [EMPHASISING]

Teacher: And eh in English if you have *hutsinye* (cruelty) [EMPHASISING] as Panashe has said – what does it mean? *Ha?* (Yes?) [INVITING PARTICIPATION] *Ha?* (Yes?) [EMPHASISING]

Learner: You are cruel.

Teacher: You are? I don't want chorus answers. It has to be alone. Yes Mike?

Learner: You are cruel.

Teacher: You are cruel - as Panashe said *une hutsinye*. (you are cruel.) [EMPHASISING] And eh even when your mother speaks to you she would say '*iwe*, you are very cruel. *Une hutsinye iwe!* (You, you are very cruel!) [EXEMPLIFYING] How can you deny my child food from 6am to 6pm?' So you are – you are cruel. Now I want you to get in pairs. Find pieces of paper in pairs. And eh create a situation or write a statement that eh rather describe an action or create a situation that shows eh that eh you are polite, that shows that you are rude, you are honest, you are humble, you are lazy. But before we do that ... who can give me the meaning of the word polite ... Yes?

Learner: Kind.

Teacher: *Ha?* (What?) [SEEKING CONFIRMATION]

Learner: Kind.

Teacher: You are kind. That is what she says. If you could write that ... The next one is honest. 'You are very honest.' ... Ah yes? *Ha?* (What?) [EMPHASISING]

Learner: Faithful.

Teacher: You are – if you are honest you are faithful. Any other? Yes?

Learner: Trustworthy.

Teacher: *Ha?* (What) [EMPHASISING] You are trustworthy. Any other? Any other? Any other? Any other? Yes?

Learner: *Kutendeka.* (Being trustworthy.) [DEFINING]

Teacher: Ah speak up please.

Learner: *Kutendeka.* (Being trustworthy.) [EMPHASISING]

Teacher: *Kutendeka.* (Being trustworthy.) [EMPHASISING] You are honest. *Kutendeka.* (Being trustworthy.) [EMPHASISING] '*Wakatendeka mwana uyu.* (This child is trustworthy.) [EXEMPLIFYING] I will reward you for being honest. Very honest.' Thank you young man. The next one is rude. Rude. Old people would say '*Une vurude iwe.*' (You are very rude.) [EXEMPLIFYING] Rude. Yes eh Audrey? Eh 'You are very – rude.'

Learner: Harsh.

In the excerpt, Teacher A code-switched to emphasise a learner's code-switched answer by repeating it, to check understanding, to invite the learner to participate, and to emphasise his invitation to a learner to participate, to seek confirmation of a learner's answer, and to exemplify a definition.

In the third excerpt below the teacher was teaching vocabulary.

Teacher: I hid the money in the – in the purse. Is it different from 'I put the money in the purse.'? Can you show the difference? Can you show the difference? Yes Z?

Learner: To hid the money *ku – ku* - to hid *kuviga.* (to conceal.) [DEFINING] Then to put *kungoisa.* (it's just placing.) [DEFINING]

Teacher: To hid *kuviga.* (to conceal.) [EMPHASISING] Here is my purse don't laugh at it because it's a bit old and there was some money. What happened to my money so I take the money and hide it somewhere maybe some people might want to take it away from me. So I hide it, conceal. He hid the money as Z correctly said. And then to put, can you repeat your answer?

Learner: *Kungoisa.* (To just place.) [EMPHASISING]

Teacher: *Kungoisa mupurse*. (To just place in the purse.) [EMPHASISING] And that's the difference. So I hid – I concealed the money – I liked Z's answer because the word is concealed, the word is concealed and then he answered it in the past ... Thank you Z. Number 2, 'He coerced me to play soccer against my will.' What is the eh meaning of the word coerced? Yes Teen Teen?

Learner: I think he bribed me.

Teacher: I think he bribed me to play soccer against my will. Thank you for trying Teen Teen but if you look at the hands they seem to say you didn't get the answer that they expected. Thank you for trying Tinashe. Yes Chikumbu?

Learner: He forced me to play.

Teacher: He forced me to eh – he forced me to – to play soccer against my will – eh I'm not angry with you Tinashe, but suppose one had said eh 'He pushed me to play soccer against my will.' What is the difference between forced and pushed me to – to – to play soccer against my will? How – what's the difference? It's correct to say he forced me to play soccer against my will. What's the difference between push, then force? Giles?

Learner: *Kuforcewa* – (To be forced -) [EXPLAINING]

Teacher: Speak up please.

Learner: *Kana uchiforcewa unenge uchimanikidzwa kutamba usingadi, asi kupushiwa kungo – kungotsimbidzirwa*. (When you are forced you are made to play against your will but to be pushed is to have your wishes thwarted.) [EXPLAINING]

Learners: (Laughter)

Teacher: *Kungotsi* – *kungotsimbidzirwa*, (to have your wishes thwarted) [EMPHASISING] *asi kuforcewa* eh – I think *kupushiwa* *zvava* eh *pava* *nephysical* – (but to be forced – I think to be pushed there is an element of physical violence -) [EXPLAINING] *physical* you – you – *ndoomaonero ake* (that's how he sees it) [COMMENTING] but then *kufosa*, coercion, *unogona kushandisa* – (to force you can use -) [EXPLAINING] you might simply thought you might have to do it whether you want it or not. Isn't it?

Learners: Yes.

Teacher: It becomes force that's all the difference. So she has brought the idea *yokungozopusha manje*. (to push.) [COMMENTING] Literally *kupusha kwava nezvinhu zviviri* – *kune kupusha kokufosa* – *nokungo* - *unogona kupusha here nama* words *kana kuti kucoercer* both *namawords* and action. (Pushing has two aspects – there is pushing to force – can you push with words or to coerce with both words and action.) [EXPLAINING]

In the above excerpt, Teacher A code-switched to emphasise a learner's answer, to explain vocabulary and to comment on a learner's answer.

4.1.1.2 Code-switching by Teacher A: Findings from Interview with Teacher A

Teacher A revealed that his L1 is Shona, while the majority of his Class A learners, ninety-five per cent (95%) also have Shona as their L1, while five per cent (5%) speak other languages such as Zulu and Nyanja.

The teacher acknowledged that he sometimes code-switched when teaching English, especially when teaching registers, comprehension, prepositions, verbs, essay writing, and summary. Teacher A identified some of the functions of his code-switches as explaining difficult concepts and words, helping the language learner to express himself or herself, exemplifying, and cracking jokes. The teacher also pointed out that he sometimes code-switched naturally or spontaneously. In his own words, *“Sometimes as a Shona speaker it just happens naturally because it’s my first language. I normally use eh Shona when I try to make students understand the concepts that I will be talking about. There are certain eh concepts or words that will only be understood when I use vernacular. Eh there are certain meanings that can be grasped if you use the mother language, especially eh things to do with eh our culture and certain words that are difficult to explain in English but can be understood in Shona.”*

Teacher A explained the necessity for code-switching when teaching registers: *“If you try to explain the meaning of feeling and attitude in English it becomes very difficult, but suppose ... you do it in Shona and you give examples, they will understand better than they would in English.”*

Teacher A also justified code-switching in comprehension lessons, saying most of the comprehension passages in the English textbooks have settings that are European rather than African. On the code-switching function of joking, Teacher A explained: *“If you were to crack a joke in English, 95% of the class would not laugh at that joke.”*

Teacher A further highlighted the important role of the learners’ L1 in the teaching of English thus: *“It ... plays a very important role. Eh if I – because ... I don’t speak Ndebele and I have two, three students that are Ndebele, and when I use vernacular that is Shona to ... buttress my argument, at the end of the exercise ... after using vernacular, if I ask a Ndebele speaker, the Ndebele speaker will not have grasped the*

concepts, the Shona speaker will have grasped the concepts. So I think it helps sometimes to use vernacular because eh in addition to L2 (English) if you ... use Shona you will have aided your – your instruction. So I think it’s very important to use vernacular.”

Asked about his preferred L2 teaching methods, Teacher A said it *“depends on the nature of the topic but I prefer bilingual methods ... To my understanding, one who is a bilingual or multilingual will understand better.”* Teacher A also explained that he prefers methods that encourage discussion and in which the learners’ vernacular may come in, and he singled out Communicative Language Teaching (CLT).

4.1.1.3 Code-switching by Teacher A: Findings from Discussion with Class A Learners

In the focus group discussion with a sample of Class A, learners, all the learners confirmed that their teacher sometimes code-switched to explain some difficult words, when doing registers (to explain register concepts), when cracking jokes, when students are misbehaving, and generally *“when students don’t understand.”*

4.1.1.4 Class A Learners: Code-switching Functions and Frequencies (Findings from Lesson Observations)

Like their teacher, Class A code-switched moderately during the five lessons observed. The code-switches that I captured involved official exchanges between the learners and the teacher, but excluded the code-switches that may have been taking place as the learners interacted among themselves during the lessons.

Table 4.2 shows the eight code-switching functions of the code-switches by Class A learners during the five lessons.

Table 4.2: Class A Learners – Code-switching Functions and Frequencies

Code-switching Function	Frequency (Approximate)
Showing understanding	04
Explaining	15
Emphasising	17

Defining	19
Informing	01
Exemplifying	01
Total	57

The excerpts below show the situations in which Class A learners code-switched, and the possible functions of the switches.

In the first short excerpt, Class A was learning prepositions.

Teacher: Thank you. Sentence 5. Sentence 5. I want – before- before you read sentence 5, can you explain eh eh eh Zvabva’s relation sorry’s Zvabva’s position in relation to – if you can explain that in English eh Zvabva’s position in relation to Panashe. If you say he sits eh besides eh is it – what is the answer? *Ehe?* (Yes?) [INVITING PARTICIPATION] Explain to us. Yes?

Learner: Pa – Panashe *anogara paside paZvabva*. (Panashe sits beside Zvabva.) [EXPLAINING]

Teacher: Eh she says Panashe *anogara paside paZvabva*. (Panashe sits beside Zvabva.) [EMPHASISING] Who can – who can – do you have any other expression that you want to use – another definition that you want to – sorry. Yes?

Learner: Eh, umm. *Panashe anogara padivi paZvabva*. (Panashe sits beside Zvabva.) [EXPLAINING]

Teacher: Tinashe *anogara padivi paZvabva*. (Panashe sits beside Zvabva.) [EMPHASISING] Thank you. Eh sentence 5.

In the excerpt, the learners resorted to their L1 to explain the meaning of the sentence ‘Tinashe sits besides Zvabva’, with emphasis put on the preposition ‘besides.’

In another excerpt below, Class A was learning registers or oral communication.

Teacher: The language that you use when you converse with your teacher is different from the one that you use when you converse with your mother. Hmm? The last context? What else apart from the dress? Yes Bleh?

Learner: Ah eh *zvaunoita kana* – (what you do if -) [EXPLAINING]

Teacher: Speak up please.

Learner: *Zvaunoita kana uri kumba nezvaunoita kana uri muclass zvakasiyana*. (What you do at home and what you do in the classroom is different.) [EXPLAINING]

Teacher: *Sokudini?* (Like what?) [SEEKING CLARIFICATION] Give us an example.

Learner: *Munhu kana uri kumba unoona TV kana kubaya baya foni asi kana uri kuchikoro haumboiti zvokubaya baya foni.* (When at home you watch TV or play with your phone but at school you don't play with your phone.) [EXEMPLIFYING]

In the excerpt, the learner code-switched to explain, and exemplify, how one's behaviour at home differs from his/her behaviour while at school.

In the third excerpt below, Class A was also learning registers.

Teacher: Right and the last one is lazy. If you are rude what does it mean yes Shoko? Ah is this Shoko? Shoko is that one and that one. What's your name by the way?

Learner: Novusha.

Teacher: *He-e?* (What?) [SEEKING CONFIRMATION]

Learner: Novusha.

Teacher: Novusha?

Learner: If you are lazy *une vusimbe.* (you are lazy.) [DEFINING]

Teacher: Speak up.

Learner: If you are lazy *une vusimbe.* (you are lazy.) [EMPHASISING]

Teacher: That's what I want you to do. If you are lazy *une?* (what do you have?) [SEEKING EMPHASIS]

Learners: *Une vusimbe.* (You are lazy.) [EMPHASISING]

Teacher: *Une vusimbe.* (You are lazy.) [EMPHASISING]

In the excerpt, the learner code-switched to define the word 'lazy' and to emphasise that definition. This was at the instigation of the teacher.

In the fourth excerpt below Class A was learning vocabulary.

Teacher: You could not demonstrate the difference between minute and minute. Yes? Show the difference now ... yes?

Learner: Minute *tinenge tichireva kuti chinhu chidikidiki sitereki,* (we mean a very small thing) [DEFINING] minute *zvichireva kuti nguva* (meaning time) [DEFINING] *saka*

tikatarisa mutsara wacho zvichireva – tokwanisa kuona kuti zvinoreva nguva here kana kuti chinhu chidiki. (so if we look at the context we can tell if it means time or a very small thing.) [EXPLAINING]

Teacher: Thank. Thank you that's the difference between minute and minute. *Tichiri kugrade 1 taiti* clap hands (When we were in Grade One we would say clap hands) [INSTRUCTING] for him. Let's clap hands for him.

Learners: (Clap hands)

Teacher: Thank you. Eh and word 6, 'He purchased a beautiful car.' Who is that? Mr Hita purchased a beautiful car. Yes eh? You have forgotten?

Learner: Bought a beautiful –

Teacher: And our last eh sentence which has two parts to it. I suspect that the suspect ran away ... The first suspect? Yes?

Learner: The first suspect eh I suspect that the suspect ran away means think.

Teacher: I – *ha* – (what is it now) [HESITATION] think. Any other word? *Ha*? (Yes?) [INVITING PARTICIPATION]

Learner: Mistrust.

Teacher: Eh there is – you say there is mistrust? And any other? I think if you say I suspect I think that the suspect ran away eh and what is that? I suspect that the suspect ran away it makes sense. *Ehe.* (That's it.) [EMPHASISING] Who has a different meaning? Who has a different meaning? Hmm? Yes Z?

Learner: Eh the suspect *yokutanga ndeyokufungudzira*, (it's for not being sure) [DEFINING] then the – suspect *yechi two – nde – ndoyemunhu wacho.* (refers to the person.) [DEFINING]

Teacher: *Ndoyemunhu wacho waunodii?* (It refers to which person?) [CHECKING UNDERSTANDING]

Learner: *Waunenge uchifungidzira.* (The one you are suspecting.) [SHOWING UNDERSTANDING]

Teacher: Did you get the sense?

Learners: Yes Sir.

Teacher: Did you get the sense? She says *yokutanga kufungidzira kuti munhu wacho wakaba iyeye ndiye u- u- munhu unofungidzigwa*, (the first one refers to the thief, the one being suspected) [EMPHASISING] ran away.

In the excerpt, the first learner code-switched to define and explain the meaning of the word 'minute.' The second learner also code-switched, to define the word 'suspect',

and then to show understanding after the teacher had asked him a question to check the learner's understanding.

However, apart from the learner code-switching that took place between the formal exchanges between Teacher A and his learners, the learners also seemed to code-switch a lot during group discussions and during informal exchanges among themselves. As Teacher A observed during one of the lessons, *“Right, when – when I was moving around, I came across two or three groups that were discussing in Shona. I hope I will – you will be able to express yourself when I ask you to – to – to give us the meanings of the points that I have put on the chalkboard.”*

In the same lesson, I noted an instance in which a learner used code-switching to ask a fellow learner about the meaning of the word conceal, and the fellow learner also used code-switching to reply:

Learner A: Conceal *kudii kuviga here?* (What is to conceal is it to hide?)

Learner B: I think *kuisa*. (I think it is to put.)

4.1.1.5 Code-switching by Class A Learners: Findings from Interview with Teacher A

In the interview with Teacher A, the teacher confirmed that Class A learners indeed code-switched for a variety of code-switching functions, especially when they are facing difficulties, for example, to express themselves better during debates, and sometimes the learners code-switched spontaneously, but sometimes, the teacher instigated the learners' code-switching when he saw that they were facing difficulties.

4.1.1.6 Code-switching by Class A Learners: Findings from Discussion with Class A Learners

From the sample of Class A learners, it emerged that the majority of the learners spoke Shona as their L1, while one spoke Ndebele and one claimed that English was his home language. All the learners, except one, revealed that they code-switched during English lessons and the following situations, functions, or reasons were given:

“In discussions.”

“During group discussions.”

“When I can’t express myself in English.”

“When I can’t find the proper English word.”

“To explain ... complicated words.”

“If my colleagues speak to me in Shona I will just also use Shona.”

However, one learner stated: *“I don’t use Shona words. It’s an English lesson so (we) should use English words (only) so that we may learn (English). If we speak Shona words not any learning of English will be taking place. It’s like putting salt and sugar together.”*

When asked to express their views on code-switching by learners of English during English lessons, regardless of whether or not they themselves code-switched, the following excerpts were some of the responses by the learners:

“(Shona) should be used to understand definitions of English words through translation.”

“Shona is our mother language so it’s best to use Shona on some English words so that we understand them better then latter translate them into English.”

“For better explanation of some words it’s good to use Shona sometimes through translation.”

“I think it’s ok to use a bit of Shona as long as you don’t use it too much because at the the end of the day it’s still an English lesson but there are some situations where Shona needs to be used.”

“I think it’s inappropriate (to use Shona) ... because if you use Shona during the English lesson you won’t be able to ‘get hold of’ the English language better.”

“It’s an English lesson so we are supposed to use English.”

4.1.2 Teacher B and Class B: Extent and Functions of Code-switching

4.1.2.1 Teacher B: Code-switching Functions and Approximate Frequencies (Findings from Lesson Observations)

From the five lessons observed while Teacher B was teaching, it was observed that she code-switched minimally and her switches played the following possible functions: emphasising, seeking acknowledgement, seeking clarification, announcing, seeking confirmation, enquiring, and inviting participation. Table 4.3 shows these code-switching functions and the frequency of the occurrence for each.

Table 4.3: Teacher B – Code-switching Functions and Frequencies

Code-switching Function	Frequency (Approximate)
Emphasising	04
Seeking Acknowledgement	20
Seeking Clarification	01
Announcing	01
Seeking Confirmation	08
Enquiring	01
Inviting Participation	11
TOTAL	46

The excerpts below show the few instances in which Teacher B code-switched from Shona to English.

In the excerpt below Teacher B was teaching comprehension.

Teacher: Ok that's one point the second one? Yes Paida?

Learner: They wanted people to end up paying money for seeing the man.

Teacher: Yah they wanted people to pay money *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT]

Learners: Yes.

Teacher: Ah Nyasha did you have another point?

Learner: Ah it's the same point.

Teacher: It's the same? Ok. Eh explain what you understand by the phrase 'borrowed phrase – nest' in line 125. Borrowed nest, 125. Let's hurry up class, borrowed nest line 125. Yes?

Learner: Where he was staying was not his home.

Teacher: Yes it was a temporary shelter *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] Let's go on to 3. In your opinion what was the most dangerous thing the onlookers did to the old man? Nyasha?

Learner: Throwing stones at him and hitting him with eh iron bar.

Teacher: What was the most dangerous? You gave me two sentences. *Kurohwa nematombo here kana kubaiwa nebanga?* (To be stoned or to be stabbed?) [SEEKING CLARIFICATION] What is the most dangerous? Let's – let's go to that passage. (Reads passage) *Simbi inopiswa. Handiti? Wobaiwa nayo ichipisa.* (An iron rod is put into the fire and you are stabbed with it.) [EXPLAINING] So what was the most dangerous thing? Class? Yes Alfred? ...

Teacher: So, I want you to write questions 1 to 9. I want you to do this in the 6th period *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT]

Learners: Yes ma'am.

Teacher: And I want my books on time please. You are wanted *kuhall saka itai mukainda mouya monyora.* (at the hall so you will write when you come back.) [ANNOUNCING]

The above excerpt shows that Teacher B did very little code-switching.

In the excerpt below the teacher was re-capping the previous comprehension lesson.

Teacher: Ok number 6. In wha – yes Thulani?

Learner: The appearance of the man benefited Peliah and Elisander as they got money.

Teacher: Yes they got money *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] From the appearance of the old man. Number 7. How did the change of weather affect the health of the old man? Eh Nyasha?

Learner: It improved his health and his wings.

Teacher: Here please can we please let's go back to the passage because most of you did not get it right. Eh the time this passage was written it was during winter time *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] Do you agree that it was winter time?

Learners: Yes.

Teacher: So what happened when the weather changed? When the weather changed. Thulani?

Learner: It improved the man's health.

Teacher: Yes it was – it began to be sunny *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] And the man's health improved. You should take note of such things. Umm why did Elisander give a sigh of relief number 8? Sharpdine?

Learner: She gave a sigh of relief because she knew that the old man was no longer a problem to her life.

Teacher: Yes. I will read that answer. 'She sighed with relief because she knew the old man was no longer a problem in her life.' Number 9. Do you think the old man successfully flew away. Suggest where you think the old man eventually went. That is a two-part question. Yes Paida? Alfred?

Learner: I think the old man successf – succe – successfully flew – flew away and I think that he went to heaven.

Teacher: Yes. That's a two-part question *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] Some of you were just writing *kuti izvoni* (that) [EXPLAINING] he successfully flew away you did not suggest where he went. Suggesting is just a suggestion, what you think, *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] What you think happened. Thulani do you have a different answer?

Learner: Yes I think he successfully flew away and I think he went to another place or planet.

In the excerpt, Teacher B code-switched minimally for only two purposes, that is, to seek acknowledgement from the learners, and explaining.

In the other excerpt below, Teacher B was teaching vocabulary.

Teacher: Ok today we are going to look at a word game. Nyasha and Jonathan settle down. We are waiting for them. I want you to put these words into categories. Let's look at the example in the textbook. Eh cars, lorries, buses, bicycles ... belong to the category 'transport' so let's look at the examples on the board. Football, rugby, netball, tennis. Which category do these fall under?

Learner: Sports.

Teacher: Yes sports. Let's look at number 2. Shorts, trousers, vests ... Ah Sharpdine?

Learner: Clothes.

Teacher: Ah Independence Day, Workers' Day, Easter, Africa Day. If I don't know your name please you say your name first and then the answer. Yes?

Learner: Ngoni.

Teacher: *Ha?* (Yes?) [SEEKING CONFIRMATION]

Learner: Ngoni.

Teacher: *Ha?* (Yes?) [SEEKING CONFIRMATION]

Learner: Ngoni.

Teacher: Ngoni. Ok Ngoni?

Learner: Holidays.

Teacher: *Ha?* (Yes?) [SEEKING CONFIRMATION]

Learner: Holidays.

In the excerpt, Teacher B switched to the non-word Shona sound '*ha?*' which serves the function of inviting the learner to repeat his answer for confirmation.

4.1.2.2 Code-switching by Teacher B: Findings from Interview with Teacher B

Teacher B revealed that she speaks both Shona and Ndebele as her mother tongues. When asked if she code-switches during English lessons, she said she does so "*at times*" when her learners "*don't understand.*" When asked how often the teacher of English as a Second Language should code-switch, Teacher B, simply said code-switching "*should not be excluded.*"

However, when asked about the L2 teaching methods she prefers Teacher B said she prefers "*Exclusive use of English in most cases though at times I code-switch.*" She then revealed that she specifically uses the Direct Method for the reason that her

learners of English “*are better exposed to English, because they have less time to speak English, they speak Shona at home, speak Shona outside during break and lunch, so for exposure (they should be taught using the Direct Method.)*”

4.1.2.3 Code-switching by Teacher B: Findings from Discussion with Class B Learners

When asked if their teacher code-switched during English lessons, the following were the common responses from Class B learners:

“*Not always.*”

“*Not exactly.*”

“*Once in a while.*”

“*Not every time.*”

4.1.2.4 Class B Learners: Code-switching Functions and Frequencies (Findings from Lesson Observations)

Like their teacher, Class B learners showed that they code-switched to a minimal extent during the five lessons observed. The identified switches involved formal communication between the learners and the teacher, but exclude the switches that may have occurred as the learners conversed informally among themselves.

Table 4.4 shows the code-switching functions identified from the code-switches produced by the Class B learners.

Table 4.4: Class B learners – Code-switching Functions and Frequencies

Code-switching Function	Frequency (Approximate)
Explaining	06
Disagreeing	02
Defining	01

Emphasising	01
Total	10

The excerpts below show the few instances in which Class B learners code-switched during formal exchanges with their teacher during the English lessons. In the excerpt below, Class B learners were learning vocabulary.

Teacher: Yes. Ah Kudzai?

Learner: Cups, pans, pots, plates – utensils.

Teacher: Yes utensils or what? Yes? What is your name?

Learner: Tinotenda.

Teacher: Sorry?

Learner: Tinotenda.

Teacher: Tinotenda?

Learner: Cutlery.

Teacher: Yes or cutlery.

Learner: Cutlery *maknives*. *Maknives*. [EXPLAINING]

Teacher: Not just knives.

Learner: *Hazviiti*. (It's not it.) [DISAGREEING]

Teacher: Oh there is plate? Thank you for the correction. There is a plate there. So utensils. Kitchen utensil, *handiti*? (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT]

Learners: Yes.

Teacher: Thank you for the correction Tatenda. Number 8.

The excerpt illustrates a Class B learner code switching for the purpose of explaining and disagreeing.

In another excerpt below, Class B was still learning vocabulary.

Teacher: Eh new hands. Faith?

Learner: My best pupil was badly damaged in the accident.

Learners: Injured! Injured!

Teacher: No chorus answers class. Let her try. Faith?

Learner: My best pupil was badly injured in the accident.

Teacher: Yes not damaged. For interest's sake why did you laugh on page – on number 2? For 'injured' and 'damaged'.

Learner: ... injury it's like *kukuvadzwa*. (to be hurt.) [DEFINING]

Teacher: *Ha?* (What?) [SEEKING CONFIRMATION]

Learner: *Kukuvara*. (To be hurt.) [EMPHASISING]

In the excerpt the learner defines the word 'injured' by using its Shona equivalence 'kukuvadzwa' and emphasises the definition through the Shona alternative which is 'kukuvara.'

However, there also seemed to be numerous cases of Class B learners resorting to their L1 when informally communicating with each other during English lessons. In one instance when a learner was requesting for a book from a fellow learner, he used code-switching as follows: "*Ndipewo* book. (May I have a book). *Handiti une* two? (I can see that you have two)." In another instance, a learner was encouraging a fellow learner to raise his hands: "*Sumudza*. (Raise your hand)." In yet another instance, a learner used Shona to draw a fellow learner's attention to the fact that the teacher was inviting him to participate: "*Uri kudanwa*. (The teacher is calling your name)."

4.1.2.5 Code-switching by Class B Learners: Findings from Interview with Teacher B

When asked whether her English learners code-switched during English lessons, Teacher B revealed that the learners sometimes code-switched and gave the example of "*when explaining vocabulary*." She also said sometimes the learners code-switch spontaneously, or to use her own words, "*not knowingly*."

4.1.2.6 Code-switching by Class B Learners: Findings from Discussion with Class B Learners

The majority of the learners from the sample Class B six or sixty per cent (60%) said their L1 is Shona, while one said her home languages are Shona and English. Two said their mother languages are English and Shona, and one claimed that his L1 is English.

Of these, eight (80%) said they sometimes code-switched from Shona to English and the common situations of code-switching were “*when you can’t express yourself*”, and “*if you don’t know a word in English.*”

Two of the learners revealed that they did not code-switch at all.

4.1.3 Teacher C and Class C: Extent and Functions of Code-switching

4.1.3.1 Teacher C: Code-switching Functions and Approximate Frequencies (Findings from Lesson Observations)

An analysis of the excerpts from the five lessons observed for Teacher C reveals that she code-switched frequently, and for a multiplicity of functions which were identified. These are acknowledging/agreeing, seeking acknowledgement, emphasising, explaining, enquiring, commenting, checking understanding, eliciting, inviting participation, announcing, expressing disapproval, joking, exemplifying, seeking confirmation, giving instructions, disagreeing, reprimanding, informing, querying, clarifying, parallel translation, seeking clarification, expressing doubt, seeking comment, and seeking opinion. These twenty-five possible functions and approximate frequencies for each function are tabulated below:

Table 4.5: Teacher C – Code-switching Functions and Frequencies

Code-switching Function	Frequency (Approximate)
Acknowledging/Agreeing	17
Seeking Acknowledgement	89
Emphasising	79
Explaining	40
Enquiring	11
Commenting	14
Checking Understanding	23
Eliciting	13
Inviting Participation	27
Announcing	02
Expressing Disapproval	07
Joking	02

Exemplifying	02
Seeking Confirmation	06
Giving instructions	09
Disagreeing	03
Reprimanding	01
Informing	02
Querying	01
Clarifying	02
Parallel translation	01
Seeking Clarification	05
Expressing Doubt	01
Seeking Comment	04
Seeking Opinion	01
TOTAL	368

The excerpts below highlight some of the situations in which Teacher C code-switched, and the possible functions of the code-switches:

In the excerpt below Teacher C was teaching comprehension.

Teacher: What do you think was the purpose of the fire? From your reading so far *twukomana utwu twaa twuchimhanya twuchinopinda musango twuchinotsvaga huni dzokungovesa twuchingovesa*. (These small boys were running about into the bush to look for firewood to make a fire.) [EMPHASISING] What was the purpose of making that fire? Yes, Wed?

Learner: So that the pirates would see smoke.

Teacher: *Ehe*. (Yes.) [ACKNOWLEDGING/AGREEING] To make smoke so that they could be noticed and be rescued, *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] Alright, who suggested making the fire? Who suggested making the fire? From your reading of the passage who suggested making this fire? Yes, Decibel?

Learner: Ralph.

Teacher: It was Ralph, it was Ralph. And why do you think Piggy kept on grumbling and grumbling and grumbling throughout? Murmuring and murmuring and murmuring? *Nemhaka yei aingobva angon'un'una kungongun'una, nokungoratidza kuti haa, haasi kunwisisiwa navamwe vake, haasi happy?* (Why was he grumbling, showing that he was not being understood by his colleagues, he was not happy?) [EMPHASISING] *Vamwe vari kufara vachiita busy vachitsvaga huni iye akangoita stand aloof*. (Some are happy and busy looking for firewood but he is aloof.) [EXPLAINING] Yes, Prince?

Learner: Because they didn't let him speak.

Teacher: They didn't let him speak. They never allowed him to speak out his ideas, opinions, what he thought, how he felt *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] Right how did these boys give each other turns to speak? From your reading of the passage, how did they give each other turns to speak? Doreen come back! How did the boys give each other turns to speak? Hmm? *Mashaiwa? Mashaiwa?* (You can't find the answer? You can't find the answer?) [ENQUIRING] Tracy? *Uri kumbotsvaga* (You are still searching) [COMMENTING] hmm? You are still looking for the answer? Michael? Why is he not saying *kuti* (that) [EXPLAINING] this is my turn and now I have to speak? Yes Sharma?

Learner: By the conch.

Teacher: By the conch. Whoever had ah or whoever held the conch in his or her hands had the chance to, to speak, *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] *Saka chi conch ichi chaive chakatofanana nechii, tingati* (So this conch was like a what, let's say a) [EXPLANATION] symbol, something *chaimiririra kuti munhu wese achitotarisa kwa- kune akabata conch iroro* (which stood for making everyone look at its holder) [EXPLANATION] *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] *Ehe.* (Yes.) [EMPHASISING] And what do you think was this conch? *Chaimbori chii chinonzi conch ichi?* (What is it really called a conch?) [CHECKING UNDERSTANDING] Decibel?

Learner: I think it was a shell.

Teacher: She thinks it was a shell. What kind of shell? Shell *handiti tose tinoiziva? Takamboinda kurwizi uku. Kune twuma- twuma shells twe- twema snail ukatotwuona twunenge twurimo mumvura kana kuti panze pemvura kana kuti pajecha paya, unotowana something kuti paa- maa mune something chi empty chacho* but the inside *chainda pamwe chakatofo* and then *kwosara chekunze chacho kana kuti chi shell chacho*, (I suppose we all know a shell? We have gone to the river. There are small snail shells in the water or outside the water or on the sand and you can see that there was something in the shell but what was inside maybe died and then the shell remains) [EXPLAINING] *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] *Takambozviona here?* (Have we ever seen this?) [ENQUIRING]

Learners: Yes !

Teacher: *Ehe.* (Yes.) [EMPHASISING] That was the thing. What do you think was this shell? Eh ?

Learner: It was a sea shell.

Teacher: A sea shell of an animal. *Ko vamwewo munoti chii?* (What do the others have to say?) [ELICITING] It was a sea shell of an animal. *Vamwe munoti chii nechii shell ichochi ichi?* (What do the others have to say about this shell?) [EMPHASISING] *Chavaingoti kana wachibata wotonzi* (Which when someone held it this meant) [EXPLANATION] now it's your turn to speak, now you can speak whatever you want, now you are in control of the crowd. Miriam?

Teacher: A skull of a dead animal.

Teacher: A skull of a dead animal. *Ndoo zvaanofunga*. (That is what she thinks.)
[COMMENTING] *Ko vamwe munoti chii?* (What do the others have to say?)
[ELICITING] Selina? *He-e?* (Yes?) [INVITING PARTICIPATION]

Learner: An ostrich's shell.

Teacher: An ostrich's shell ha ha ha, the idea! *Ko vamwe munoti chii?* (What do the others have to say?) [ELICITING] *Munoti* (You are saying) [COMMENTING] ostrich shell, animal shell, sea animal shell? *He-e?* (Yes?) [INVITING PARTICIPATION] Yes Providence?

The excerpt shows that Teacher C code-switched frequently and the code switches play the possible functions of emphasising a question, agreeing to or emphasising a learner's answer, seeking acknowledgement for her explanation using the word 'handiti?', enquiring whether the learners have not found the answer, commenting on her observations, checking the learners' understanding, eliciting a response from the learners, as well as inviting the learner to participate.

In another excerpt below, Teacher C was teaching summary.

Teacher: (Reads passage) Right from there what can you say ah, makes Piggy hurt and bitter. Fro where I have read from the two paragraphs I have just read, can you identify something which makes ah, Piggy bitter or hurt, bitter and hurt, from that paragraph? (Silence) *Zvii zvatinoti ndizvo zvinomurwadza* (What is it that hurts him) [EMPHASISING] from what I have just read? Adolf?

Learner: Ah, he was not allowed to speak.

Teacher: *Uhu*. (Yes.) [ACKNOWLEDGING/AGREEING] He was never allowed to?

Learners: Speak.

Teacher: To speak. Right... (Reads passage) What makes him hurt? What makes him hurt from what I have just read? Dumisani?

Learner: The never paid attention to what he said.

Teacher: They never paid attention to what he said. *Vanga vasingateerei zvaanotaura*. (They did not listen to what he said.) [EMPHASISING] To what he, said. *Handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] Alright 'Shut up!' They shut him, they shout him down. They never paid attention to what he said as well as? Hmm? As well as what? Hmm? ... Yes Esnath?

Learner: The always shouted at him.

Teacher: They shouted at him. *Ndozvimwe zvinoita kuti afeele* (That's part of what makes him feel) hurt and bitter. [EMPHASISING] *Anorwadziwa nazvo*. (It hurts him.) [EMPHASISING] (Reads passage) What else makes him feel bitter and hurt in, para- from this paragraph? *Panashe Mazuru?* Speak up.

Learner: The laughed at him.

Teacher: *Ehe-e*. (Yes.) [ACKNOWLEDGING/AGREEING] What else? What else? Justin? *Tiri tese here?* (Are we together?) [CHECKING UNDERSTANDING]

Learner: Yes.

Teacher: Tell us your contribution. *Ha-a?* (Yes?) [INVITING PARTICIPATION]

Learner: He tried to say something and they never listened to him.

Teacher: Umm he tried to say something and they never listened to him. Ah Faith?

Learner: It is him who laughs.

Teacher: Umm it is him who laughs and not the group of boys, so this one is out, *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] Eh what makes him hurt and bitter?

Learner: They treat him as a second class citizen.

Teacher: (Laughs) They treat him as a second class citizen. *Ehe*. (Yes.) [ACKNOWLEDGING/AGREEING] What is meant by this point? They treat him as a second class citizen? What do you mean?

Learner: They considered him inferior.

Teacher: They considered him inferior. *Ndizvo?* (Is that correct?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] Alright, what else, do we get from the paragraph. Which makes him bitter, hurt? *Unobhowekana, unorwadziwa*. (He is hurt by that.) [EMPHASISING] Yes?

Learner: They make jokes about him or mock him.

Teacher: They mocked him? *Ha-a?* (Really?) [EXPRESSING DOUBT] They mocked at him? Hmm? *Vakamu mocka papi apa?* (Where is the mocking here?) [SEEKING CLARIFICATION] Ryan?

Learner: Line 250.

Teacher: 250? 'Then he laughed so strangely that they were hushed. Looking at the flash of his spectacles in astonishment, they followed his gaze to find the solo joke.' So they, they, they mocked him? *He-e?* (Is that so?) [SEEKING CONFIRMATION] *Vanomu mocka here apa?* (Do they really mock him here?) [EMPHASISING]

Learners: No.

Teacher: What makes him bitter and, hurt? Springs?

Learner: They never took one of his advice.

Learner: They never took one of the advice ah *apa ndofunga tataura kuti* (I think we earlier on said) [CLARIFYING] they never paid attention to what he said. They never took his advice. They took away his specs. *Handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] *Ndoo maspecs aya, handiti vakashandisa maspecs acho iwayo kubatidza moto?* (Those are the same specs, isn't it that they used the specs to make the fire?) [EXPLAINING] They took away his?

Learners: Spectacles.

Teacher: Specs. They used his specs to light the, the fire *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] Alright, yes Deline?

Learner: *Izvozvo zviru mupassage one.* (All that is in) [MAKING A CORRECTION]

Teacher: *Mupassage one?* (In) [QUERRYING] Even in this passage. *Tino - tinozviona pana* (We see it here) [EXPLAINING] 'Then he laughed so strangely that they were hushed. Looking at the flash of his spectacles in astonishment...' *Apa vava kutorangarira kuti maspectacles awa zvaakaita, awa tisu tamadii, tamashandisa.* (Now they remember that they were the ones who had used the specs.) [EXPLAINING] *Handiti kufirst paragraph passage tasiya achiti* (Isn't it that in the first passage we left him saying) [EXPLAINING] 'I can't see, just blurred vision.' *Handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] Because *maspecs abatwabatwa.* (the specs have been tampered with.) [EXPLAINING] *Handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] *Saka izvozvo zvakato - ndezvimwe zvinomubhowa kuti maspecs ake, vari kutoona kutoti iye haachatodii? Haachatooni.* (That's part of what hurts him because of his specs and they can see that he can't see any more.) [EMPHASISING] *Saka izvozvo futi zvinongodii? Zvinomu hurta.* (So that again does what to him? It hurts him.) [EMPHASISING] It's something which hurts him. What else? (Reads passage) *Handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] The way he speaks shows that he is hurt. (Reads passage) What makes him, hurt? What makes him bitter? *He-e?* (Yes?) [INVITING PARTICIPATION] Eh?

Learner: The way they looked at him.

Teacher: The way they looked at him. The way they looked at him. The way they looked at him. *Munomboziva here kuti kana ukatarisa munhu, munhu anogona kutozviona kuti hii apa ndiri kuvengwa zvisingaiti?* (Do you know that by merely looking at someone you can tell that they hurt you?) [EXPLAINING] *Munombozviziva?* (Do you realise that?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT]

Learners: Umm.

Teacher: Umm. The eye, will tell a lot. So he could feel hurt, because of how the other boys looked at?

Learners: Him.

In the above excerpt, the teacher again showed that she code-switched frequently for the purposes of emphasising her answer, acknowledging or agreeing to an answer, emphasising a learner's answer, seeking acknowledgment from the learners, checking

learners' understanding, inviting a learner to participate, seeking clarification of a learner's answer, seeking confirmation of a learner's answer, querying a learner's observation, as well as explaining a point.

In the third excerpt below, Teacher C was teaching registers or oral communication.

Teacher: Alright. Today we want to discuss or we want to learn about language registers. What is language registers? What is language registers? *Ha-a?* (Yes?) [INVITING PARTICIPATION] Nomsa?

Learner: Polite language.

Teacher: Polite language. Polite language. *Ehe?* (Yes?) [INVITING PARTICIPATION] Polite language. Selina?

Learner: Suitable way of speaking.

Teacher: Suitable way of speaking. *Ehe?* (Yes?) [INVITING PARTICIPATION] Dumisani?

Learner: Appropriate way of speaking in different situations.

Teacher: Appropriate way of speaking. Way of speaking in different situations. *Aha?* (Yes?) [INVITING PARTICIPATION] Who else has got a different or another explanation or definition of what language register is? *Ha-a?* (Yes?) [INVITING PARTICIPATION] Tracy? You seem to have something?

Learner: A variety of language according to use.

Teacher: A variety of?

Learner: A variety of language according to use.

Teacher: Of language according to? According to use. Yes a variety of language according to use. Alright which means ah, if we say a variety of language according to use, which means language suits situations *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] Language suits situation, language suits places, language suits time *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] Eh. For example you are at a funeral. You can't go there and greet people as if all is well *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] You just have to show that it is a, funeral. So the way is governed or is directed by the situation, is controlled by, the situation, at a funeral, at a party. When you are at a party you can't speak as if you are at a funeral. It's quite different *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT]

Learners: Yes.

Teacher: And then the place, obvious, maybe you are in the school yard, you are speaking to the school head, the way you speak to her would be quite different from the way you - you would speak to her when you are in the playground out there. *Handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT]

Learners: Yes.

Teacher: *Ehe*. (Yes.) [EMPHASISING] And then the time. Sometimes it's party time even if you are in the school yard. It's party, time. It's time to party now, so you might use language which suits the time, *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] Alright ah, let's say you are in town. You are in? In town. You get into Pick n Pay Supermarket, and you want to buy your groceries, you meet your headmistress there. How would you greet her? How would you greet her? Hmm? *Unovamhorosa sei?* (How would you greet her?) [EMPHASISING] Yes?

Learner: Good afternoon ma'am?

Teacher: He said he would say 'Good afternoon ma'am.' Good afternoon ma'am. What about the others? How would you greet her? *He-e* (Yes) Dumisani? [INVITING PARTICIPATION]

Learner: Good afternoon ma'am. How was your day?

Teacher: Good afternoon ma'am. How was your day? Justin?

Learner: Hello hello ma'am how are you?

Learners: (Laughter)

Teacher: Hello hello there and how are you ma'am? *Ehe?* (Yes?) [INVITING PARTICIPATION] Yes?

Learner: Nice to meet you ma'am how do you do?

Teacher: Nice to meet you ma'am how do you do? Hmm? *Saka mose ndozvamunongoita izvozvo zvandaudzwa nevamwe?* (Is that what you all would say?) [ELICITING] *Kana kuti vamwe venyu mototi* (or some of you would say) ah, [EXEMPLIFYING] then you change direction. You avoid him. You run away from him. *He-e?* (Yes?) [INVITING PARTICIPATION] Wed, how would you greet him? Hmm?

Learner: I will just say 'Good afternoon ma'am.'

Teacher: 'Good afternoon ma'am. How are you this, afternoon?' *Handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT]

Learners: Yes.

Teacher: Eh. You will be very formal, even if you are at the, city centre, in the, shops. You will sound very formal because you respect her, *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] What if you meet your friend there? Pick n Pay how would you greet her?

Learner: Hey what's good dude?

Teacher: Hey what's?

Learner: What's good dude?

Teacher: Hey what's good today?

Learners: Dude.

Teacher: *He-e?* (Yes?) [SEEKING CONFIRMATION] Dude? Alright. Hey what's good dude? Alright you would show that he is your friend, *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] He is your friend. You are of the same age. You share the same language. You even use you even use slang. How is it? *He-e?* (Yes?) [INVITING PARTICIPATION] How is it?

Learner: Waal waal waal.

Teacher: Waal waal waal. How is it? Something like that, *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] Right but if you meet, ah, ah, *sekuru, sekuru* (uncle, uncle) [PARALLEL TRANSLATION] Mr Njini there. How would you greet him? *He-e?* (Yes?) [INVITING PARTICIPATION] Mr Njini *sekuru (uncle)* [EMPHASISING] how would you greet him? *Ha-a?* (Yes?) [INVITING PARTICIPATION] Sharlom?

Learner: Afternoon uncle.

Teacher: Afternoon uncle. Yes?

Learner: Hi grandpa.

Teacher: Hi grandpa? High grandpa? Hi grandpa? Are you really going to do that, or to say that? Hi grandpa?

Learners: No!

Teacher: Hmm?

Learners: Yes! / No!

Teacher: *Ha-a?* (Yes?) [SEEKING CONFIRMATION] Would you greet him this way?

Learners: Yes! / No!

Teacher: Would you greet him this way? Hi grandpa?

Learners: No!

Teacher: He is a parent you can't say hi grandpa, *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] Eh?

Learner: Good day uncle.

Teacher: Good day uncle. Eh?

Learner: How are you senior citizen?

Teacher: How are you senior citizen? How are you senior citizen? Wouldn't he feel offended somewhere somehow? Hmm? *Hava feeli kuti ndamockiwahere ipapo paunenge uchiti* (Will he not feel mocked when you say) senior citizen? [SEEKING CLARIFICATION] *Vanozivaka vana sekuru, kuti* senior citizen *zvinorevei vanenge vachitonyatsoziva*. (They know what senior citizen means) [COMMENT] *Vano - havagoni kuzo* feela offended *here kana kuti? Vanongozvi accepta?* (Won't he not feel offended? He just accepts it?) [SEEKING CLARIFICATION] Maybe it depends, it depends maybe you are used to him, *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] So he will - he won't feel offended if you are used to him. But

if you are not used to him he would obviously feel offended, *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] Right what about Abel how would you greet him?

Learner: Ah I would say how are you doing today grandpa?

Teacher: How are you doing today grandpa? Yes?

Learner: Hello great people how do you do?

Teacher: Hello great people how do you do? Great people? *Hoo?* (Really?) [EXPRESSING DOUBT] Alright. Anyway I'm sure by now you have discovered that when you are addressing the headmistress, you stand to be very formal and?

Learners: Respectful!

Teacher: *Handiti?* (You see.) [EMPHASISING] Office *yavo, chero vasiri mu office, ndoo inodeterminakuti uva – uva – uve* (Her office determines that you be) very formal and respectful [EXPLAINING] *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] And then your classmate, or your friend, you are very informal and unrespectful. *Unotongotaura zvwada*, (You can say whatever you want) [EXPLAINING] you can even use slang because he is your age-mate. *Haumurespecti, haumukudzi*. (You don't have to respect him.) [EXPLAINING] And then uncle Njini, *sekuru* (uncle) [PARALLEL TRANSLATION], you respect him *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] You respect him. You will be respectful though you can be informal, here and there but you will be respectful, *uchivakudza uchiratidza kuti unovaremekedza unovapa nzvimbo yavo* (showing him that you give him his due respect) [EXPLAINING] and you are very polite to him, *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] Alright, and then we have six, several situations in our text. Let's turn to page *ani?* (which?) [ENQUIRING] Alright, with your friend as you are seated there, page 176, page 176. Right, appropriateness in language register. Right, appropriateness in language register means using the correct word, tone and style of speaking to a particular, person *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] Here is an example. Imagine you have passed your mid-year exams and you can't wait to break the news to other people. You meet in town a friend, a close elderly uncle and the local priest. You obviously wouldn't be, wouldn't use the same style of speaking to each of them *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] That would be inappropriate, the way you would speak to a friend, the way you would speak to a close uncle, the way you would speak to the priest, it would be different, *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] Alright ah that would be inappropriate if you speak in the same style to your friend, to the priest and to the uncle. Perhaps you might say to your friend 'Hi Maria guess what? I have passed my results. Yes, I did it!' *Handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] You are talking to your? Your friend. And then when you are talking to your uncle you might say, depending on how close to him you are, 'I have passed my exams uncle Phiri.' I have passed my exams uncle?

Learners: Phiri.

In the above excerpt, Teacher C again demonstrated that she code-switched frequently and I identified the functions of her code switches as inviting participation,

seeking acknowledgement, emphasising, eliciting a response, parallel translation of an English word into Shona, expressing doubt about a learner's answer, as well as enquiring.

4.1.3.2 Code-switching by Teacher C: Findings from Interview with Teacher C

Teacher C revealed that her L1 is Shona. When asked whether she code-switches, the teacher said that she sometimes code-switches to explain when learners have difficulties in understanding, but sometimes she just code-switches spontaneously. She also revealed that she code-switches when sharing jokes with the learners. In her own words, *“If you don’t express it (joke) in Shona they just look at you and never respond but if you express it in Shona then they will find the joke and laugh.”*

The teacher also reaffirmed that she indeed code-switches when she revealed that she normally employs bilingual teaching methods with her English class *“because I find them helping so much because even if I use the ... English Language through and through, I will find that pupils will be blank – they won’t understand but if I use both (English and Shona), then I will find pupils participating showing that they are really understanding what is taking place.”*

However, Teacher C conceded that the L2 teacher should not over-rely on code-switching when she pointed out that, *“Here and there we might use Shona so that our pupils will understand but at the same time it should be very minimal, very minimal so that we emphasise the language we are teaching.”*

4.1.3.3 Code-switching by Teacher C: Findings from Discussion with Class C Learners

When asked whether their teacher code-switched in the English lessons, the overwhelming response was *“sometimes.”* Some of the functions of the code-switches by Teacher C were identified by her learners as *“giving instructions”, “for explaining some statements”,* and *“when cracking jokes.”*

4.1.3.4 Class C Learners: Code-switching Functions and Frequencies (Findings from Lesson Observations)

An analysis of the five lessons observed in Class C reveals that the learners code-switched minimally as only a few instances of L1 use were identified during the formal exchanges with the teacher. This is shown in the Table 4.6.

Table 4.6: Class C Learners – Code-switching Functions and Frequencies

Code-switching Function	Frequency (Approximate)
Disagreeing	04
Acknowledging	01
Informing	01
Showing Understanding	02
Making a correction	01
Total	09

The following excerpts show some of the situations in which Class C learners code-switched, and the possible functions of the code-switches. In the first excerpt, the learners use a Shona word to ask a fellow learner to repeat himself for the purpose of clarity.

Teacher: But she did not greet her. You didn't greet her. Express your greetings first before you launch your, issue. Alright, next.

Learner: Good afternoon Mrs Japi. Please, I have an appointment. Can you please come after me?

Teacher: Alright. How is that address? Asking for permission to be served first?

Learners: *Ngaadzokorore*. (He should repeat.) [SEEKING CLARIFICATION]

Teacher: *Hanzi dzokorora*. (They say you should repeat.) [EMPHASISING]

Learner: Good afternoon Mrs Japi. Please, I have an appointment. Can you please come after me?

In another short excerpt below, the learner switches to Shona to explain why he thinks a fellow learner's answer is appropriate.

Teacher: She is saying it's inappropriate. Maybe the person won't accept, won't appreciate being addressed as elder. Eh?

Learner: I think it's still appropriate because *muChikaranga* (In Shona) [EXPLAINING], Shona it's like you are saying *mhoru mudhara*. (Hello old man.) [EXPLAINING]

Learners: (Laughter)

In addition to minimally code-switching during formal conversations with their teacher, Class C learners appeared to be code-switching a lot when they conversed among themselves in group or pair discussions and exchanges. For example, the code switched utterances below were noted as Class C learners conversed among themselves:

“Unenge wagara utorimo muline macho. (You are in the line already.)” [EXPLAINING]

“Chirungu chakuvhara apa. (The English Language has confused you here.)”
[TEASING]

“Apa unofanigwa kuva respectful. (Here you ought to be respectful.)” [EXPLAINING]

“Unosvika woti excuse me. (You go to him and say excuse me.)” [EXPLAINING]

“How do you do haishandi apa. (How do you do is inappropriate in this case.)”
[DISAGREEING]

“Priviledge ndipewozve dictionary. (Priviledge may I borrow your dictionary.)”
[REQUESTING]

4.1.3.5 Code-switching by Class C Learners: Findings from Interview with Teacher C

In the interview with Teacher C, the teacher revealed that her English class code-switched *“many times”* and she gave group discussions as examples of situations in which the learners code-switched.

4.1.3.6 Code-switching by Class C Learners: Findings from Discussion with Class C Learners

From the sample of Class C Learners, eight (80%) gave Shona as their L1 and one said her L1 is Zulu and another gave Ndebele as her mother language.

From the sample, seven of the English learners said they resorted to their L1 during English lessons and the following were their responses:

“Sometimes we speak Shona to each other but English to the teacher.”

“If it is necessary (we code-switch) for example when you know the answer in Shona so I just explain it in Shona.”

“It depends on situation. When it becomes too difficult for me (I code-switch).”

“(I code-switch) to explain something.”

“I speak both (Shona and English). I speak in English when answering the teacher’s questions.”

“I speak to my friend she also knows Shona and I know Shona so it’s better for us to speak in Shona.”

“(I code-switch) in group discussions.”

When probed to give further reasons why they code-switched, the following reasons were proffered:

“We don’t normally think in English.”

“Translation helps.”

“For understanding, especially vocabulary.”

“For communicating with my desk mate.”

“For better understanding.”

The Class C learners who said they did not code-switch during English lessons gave the following responses:

“I don’t speak in Shona during English lessons ... pupils should learn to speak English and should learn to speak it throughout the lesson ... for the benefit of others ... those who can’t speak English throughout the lesson.”

“We learn Shona in Shona so we should learn English in English.”

“When writing compositions we use English and when we are speaking to other people like (the) Ndebele we use English.”

4.1.4 Teacher D and Class D: Extent and Functions of Code-switching

4.1.4.1 Teacher D: Code-switching Functions and Frequencies (Findings from Lesson Observations)

Like her counterpart at School B (Teacher C), Teacher D code-switched frequently for a variety of possible functions which comprise emphasising, commenting, explaining, complimenting, checking understanding, acknowledging/agreeing, joking, enquiring, inviting participation, giving instructions, reprimanding, seeking confirmation, expressing surprise, seeking acknowledgement, seeking opinion, commanding, advising, informing, demonstrating, apologising, exemplifying, warning, thanking, seeking clarification, eliciting, expressing disapproval, clarifying, and appealing. Table 4.7 shows the approximate frequencies of occurrence for each code-switching functions identified in Teacher D's code switches.

Table 4.7: Teacher D – Code-switching Functions and Frequencies

Code-switching Function	Frequency (Approximate)
Emphasising	32
Explaining	20
Complimenting	01
Checking Understanding	08
Acknowledging/Agreeing	26
Joking	08
Enquiring	05
Inviting Participation	10
Giving Instructions	18
Reprimanding	12
Seeking Confirmation	26
Expressing Surprise	03
Seeking Acknowledgement	13
Seeking Opinion	01
Commanding	02
Advising	01
Informing	06

Demonstrating	01
Apologising	01
Exemplifying	07
Warning	01
Thanking	01
Seeking Clarification	03
Eliciting	03
Expressing Disapproval	01
Clarifying	02
Appealing	01
Commenting	15
TOTAL	228

The excerpts below show some of the situations in which Teacher D code-switched, and the possible functions of the code-switches:

In the excerpt below, Teacher D was teaching summary writing.

Teacher: Right two seconds underline the key words. Right that should not take very long. Which are the key words? Cecil?

Learner: Adventure loving.

Teacher: Do we have that in our question? *Ha?* (Do we have that?) [EMPHASISING] Do we have that? Our question is that one. We just want to, underline the key words. Right let's have from another group or pair. Gordon?

Learner: (Inaudible)

Teacher: Do not give us the answers. We are still working on the question so that we understand what we are required to do. Right which are the key words? Which are the keywords? We have forgotten that stage? Which are the key words? Yes Memo-Memory?

Learner: Certifier.

Teacher: *Ha?* (What?) [SEEKING CONFIRMATION]

Learner: Certifier.

Teacher: Cert- do we have cert- certifier here?

Learners: No.

Teacher: Hmm, we are all getting lost, why? Yes, eh?

Learner: Describe what Garai did.

Teacher: Right. I will leave out describing. *Munenge makanganwaka*. (It looks like you have forgotten.) [COMMENTING] *Tinoda, mavara, anotiudza achitungamirira kuti* question *inoda kuti tiite chii*. (We want the words which lead us to what the question demands.) [EXPLAINING] *Maona?* (You see?) [EMPHASISING] Eh. *Sezvataitirwa na - ndVincent*. (Like what Vincent has done.) [ACKNOWLEDGING/COMPLIMENTING] Question *inoda kuti tiite chii?* (What does the question demand?) [EMPHASISING] *Saipapa* (Like here) [EXEMPLIFYING] what have you been doing? Where did you get that from, if you have not identified the key words? *Tapabata here ipapo?* (Is that clear?) [CHECKING UNDERSTANDING]

Learners: *Ehe*. (Yes.) [ACKNOWLEDGING/AGREEING]

Teacher: Right. So now we are saying, we are looking for, what Garai did so now we move on to the next step. What did Garai do? Then you give those answers. Are we clear here?

Learners: Yes ma'am.

Teacher: Phidelis, *tiri tese mwanangu?* (are we together my son?) [CHECKING UNDERSTANDING]

Learner: Yes ma'am.

Teacher: *Heya*. (That's fine.) [ACKNOWLEDGING] Right. So we underline, what Garai did. That guides us. *Ndozvatiri kupinduraka*. (That is what we are answering.) [EXPLAINING] *Imi mangomanyira nemhaka yokuti chinyaya ichi makachihwisisaka vana Joseph mava kungomhanyira ku - kuita asi tiri kuda chii?* (You rushed to answer because you may have understood the story but what does the question demand?) [COMMENTING] *Ndopane nyaya*. (That is the crux of the issue.) [EMPHASISING] *Handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT]

Learners: Yes.

Teacher: Right what Garai did so when you- when you turn this question down, this is what you should do, *zvatagara tichingoita* (what we have always done) [EMPHASISING] we do not underline the whole, question. *Tinounderliner chii?* (What do we underline?) [CHECKING UNDERSTANDING]

Learners: *Makey words*. (The key words.) [SHOWING UNDERSTANDING]

Teacher: *Ehe patiri- patiri kupindura ipapo, ndopatino underliner*. (Yes the very aspect we are addressing that's where we underline.) [EMPHASISING] *Handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] Right, now that we have identified the key parts of the question, we know what we, are required to do. *Handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] Describing what Garai did so now let's have the first person to give us the summary. A volunteer before I volunteer you.

In the excerpt, Teacher D displayed her tendency to code-switch frequently, apparently to emphasise her question, to seek confirmation of a learner's answer, to explain, to emphasise, to comment on her observation, to acknowledge or compliment a learner for his answer, to exemplify, to check learners' understanding, to seek acknowledgement, and to invite learners to participate.

In the excerpt below, Teacher D was teaching aspects of literature, which is part of the Zimbabwe Junior Secondary English syllabus.

Teacher: *Ko zvasasina kana chair nhai vanangu?* (Oh there is no chair my children?) [EXPRESSING SURPRISE] No spare chair ... *Iripo iyi? Zvakana.* (Ok it's here.) [ACKNOWLEDGING] *Chiisa kumashure uko.* (Place it at the back there.) [GIVING INSTRUCTION] ... Morning class.

Learners: Morning ma'am.

Teacher: We want to read our second story for our literature exercise. Unit 11. But we go back to page- what's the page? Check on page 5. *Mabhuku edu akasiyana sei vamwe?* (Why are our books different?) [EXPRESSING SURPRISE] Literature, literature practice. Right. Writing a book review. We want to write a story review. Before I give you what to do, we want to look at the aspects we want to cover. Page - *unoshandisa kose, vhurai kose.* (you open both sides.) [GIVING INSTRUCTION] *Tinee tichidai, tichienda nekumberi.* (We do this, going forward.) [DEMONSTRATING] Writing a story review. Ah Derrick *womboregedzazve mwanangu unganooka kuwana book uchishandisa ruoko one.* [REPRIMANDING] (stop that or you will not catch up with us, you are using one hand.) *Inongori lesson one iyi.* (It's still the same lesson.) [EXPLAINING] Time *yose yatakaruza malesson edu maviri* (We lost a lot of time for two lessons.) [COMMENTING] so let's be fast.

Learners: We do not have the exercise books.

Teacher: And where - *ha?* (Oh!) [EXPRESSING SURPRISE] *Hoo mhanya shamwari.* (Rush my friend.) [COMMANDING] Thanks. Ruler *yako padhuze.* (Your ruler should be close by.) [GIVING INSTRUCTION] We are not sharing at all. Do not provide the answers as yet. We are writing neatly. Big enough letters. *Ndiani uya? Hautani kukanganwa iwe!* (Who is that? You are too forgetful!) [REPRIMANDING] *Vapedza sumudzai maoko.* (Those who are through raise your hands.) [GIVING INSTRUCTION] Who did not get his or her composition exercise book? Sorry *shamwari.* (my friend.) [APOLOGISING] You can use your rough work exercise book and then you will transfer when you get the exercise book. Derrick you are very slow. *Inoiswa pai?* (Where on earth did you put your ruler?) [REPRIMANDING] Where is your ruler? A very bad habit. *Haudi kuibudisa mubepa nokuti inew one.* (You don't want to take it out because it's new.) [JOKING]

Learners: (Laughter)

Teacher: Ruler *inobiwa*. (will be stolen.) [COMMENTING] Write title, we underline. *Kusheya hapana kana nguva yatinombowana yokuti tisheye*. (We don't have the time to share rulers.) [INFORMING] *Iwe unenge une - une ruler yako*. (You should have your own ruler.) [EMPHASISING] Write the title. We underline. Write about the author, you wrote the title? You wrote the title?

Learners: Yes.

Teacher: *Ehe-e*. (Yes.) [EMPHASISING] We underline. Then we skip as usual, skip a line, write author but we leave that part blank. *Asi kana pane ah wazomuwana*. (Unless you flater find him or her.) [EXPLAINING] You may get that from the library. *Kana wasangana nenyaya yacho iyi*. (When you meet this story elsewhere.) [EMPHASISING] And then setting. We are not given the name of the place or places where the activities took place but all the same we can talk about is it rural setting or urban setting. We can talk about the village. Where do you think the activities took place... so we can talk about an urban or rural – rural setting. Right and then with characters, we have two groups. Write characters. Which group do you think I'm talking about? Godson?

Learner: Major and minor characters.

Teacher: *Ha?* (What?) [SEEKING CONFIRMATION]

Learner: Major and minor characters.

Teacher: *Aha-a*, (Yes) [ACKNOWLEDGING/AGREEING] that's it. Major and minor characters. So, first we have major or main characters, character or characters. And then we move on to minor characters. Right I'm saying under characters we have two groups. *Maziso enyu ari kuratidza kuti muri kutambudzika*. (Your eyes show lack of understanding.) [COMMENTING] Right, under characters, right, so we talk about the major. Do we have one major character or if they are more than one, then you write major character or characters, then you list them down. Then we move on to, minor. And I'm sure you will be comfortable to estimate. We know the characters we know the number of people who are there. You can't leave 5 lines for major character or characters. *Mu – muna vanhu vangani vanganzi mamajor kana minor characters?* (How many people are there who can be called major and minor characters?) [EXPLAINING] According to you. How many people do you think are major, and how many would you say are, minor? Just estimate *wosiya space yokunyora mazita acho*. (leave some space to write the names.) [GIVING INSTRUCTION] I'm getting this from the textbook *yamuinayovo imi*. (which you also have.) [INFORMING] You can look at the aspects I'm talking about. Right, then we move on to theme. By theme, we are looking at the main idea of the story. *Dingindira riri munyaya iyi*. (The theme of the story.) [EMPHASISING] The theme of the story. And then, the mood of the story. How do you feel as you go through the events in the story? I once gave you the examples from the mood in which you watch – how do you feel when watching horror movies, *kana mamovie aya eku – eku* Nigeria? (Nigerian movies.) [EXEMPLIFYING] *Muchivona zvinonakidza celebrating mabirthday*. (Seeing them celebrating birthdays.) [EXEMPLIFYING] How do you feel as you watch people at a funeral? How do we feel *uchiona vanhu vaka – vachivavirana vamwe vachiurayana, nhai*, (seeing people at loggerheads and killing each other.) [EXEMPLIFYING] so those events give the mood

of the story. So now, we will be following these – the aspects as you answer the questions. *Handiti muriko kupage 5 ne 6 kokutanga uku?* (Am are right to assume we are all on pages 5 and 6?) [SEEKING CONFIRMATION]

Learners: Yes.

Teacher: *Ehe.* (Yes.) [EMPHASISING] *Ndozvichati guider izvozvo.* (That will guide us.) [EXPLAINING] As you work on this. Unit11. We use the second passage. Giving the title, which you think is relevant. Right is there any part which is not clear before you work on this? Or as you work on that, *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING CONFIRMATION] You – you come across something which is not clear, and then you have to seek for ad – assistance from me. Right so go on. *Usanetsa neighbour wako.* (Don't bother your neighbour.) [GIVING INSTRUCTION] *Iwe kana usina kuhwisisa, itobvunza.* (Where you are not clear seek clarification.) [GIVING INSTRUCTION] Neighbour *wako mwana wechikoro wakaita sewe.* (Your neighbour is a pupil just like you.) [COMMENTING] *Saka usamunetsa.* (Dont bother him or her.) [GIVING INSTRUCTION] *Kana muchida kutaururana,* right you are free to do that, but *kwete zvokunetsa kubvunza kuti kwahi – ha-a...* (You can discuss but not to bother asking what I said, no.) [WARNING] How do we group the major and minor characters? Somebody asked that question. How do you tell that this is a major character, or minor character? Can somebody else – yes?

Learner: A major character is a character who features often and a minor character just features less.

Teacher: Right, in other words she is trying to say major characters play major roles, important roles, and then, the minor characters, they support, they make the events, happen. They just support. Otherwise without the minor characters – both group – groups are important. Because without the minor characters, the major characters will not be able to, play those major roles. Do you understand that?

Learners: Yes.

Teacher: Eh *pasina aka – hakuna aka – asina kukosha.* (Everyone is important.) [EXPLAINING] *Handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] *Tiri pano pachikoro kuti teacher vakoshe ndiwe mwana wavuya.* (Here at school for the teacher to be considered important it's because of you the pupil.) [EXEMPLIFYING] *Ukasavuya, hapana teacher.* (If you don't come to school the teacher becomes irrelevant.) [EXPLAINING] *Handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] Eh. *Saka ndizvozvo.* (So that's it.) [EMPHASISING] Minor character, *akangokoshavo samajor character.* (is as important as the major character.) [EMPHASISING] The minor part *yaano player iyoyo, inoita kuti nyaya iende mberi, zvichiita kuti chii, humajor hwacho huwonekere.* (The minor part he or she plays makes the plot unfold, making the role of the major character come out.) [EXPLAINING] Right so finish up your – your homework. I will get the exercise books *pandinouya mangwana.*(when I come tomorrow.) [INFORMING] *Maita.* (Thank you.) [THANKING]

The above excerpt again shows Teacher D's propensity to frequently switch to the learners' L1, and I identified the functions of her code-switches as expressing surprise, acknowledging a situation, acknowledging/agreeing to a learner's answer,

demonstrating what the learners should do, reprimanding a learner, commanding, apologising to a learner, informing learners, seeking confirmation, emphasising, as well as exemplifying.

In the third excerpt below, Teacher D was teaching reading comprehension.

Teacher: We take our books out. Unit 18. A Christmas Carol. Did we find out what a carol is? Who has an idea of what a carol is, or maybe after reading through the passages we will be able to say what a carol is. Right, what time or which month of the year do we have Easter? When do we have this? Yes?

Learner: April.

Teacher: *Ha?* (What?) [SEEKING CONFIRMATION]

Learner: April.

Teacher: April? Right. March-April end of March, beginning of April, that's when we have Easter. What happens at Easter? Ah? You don't know what happens, during this period? What do we mean by Easter? *Ha?* (Yes?) [INVITING PARTICIPATION] Charlene?

Learner: At Easter we go to church and the pastor teaches us about Jesus's death and resurrection.

Teacher: Yes thank you if we don't go to church we do not learn about Jesus's death and resurrection ha ha ha! Right anyone – anyone else?

Learner: At Easter we celebrate the death and resurrection of Jesus.

Teacher: Right. *Aha-a.* (Right.) [EMPHASISING] So we can celebrate Easter at home, in churches and wherever we are. Right, now we have this heading 'An Easter Carol.' What do you think it is? Do we have carols at Easter only? When again do we have carols? *Ha?* (Yes?) [INVITING PARTICIPATION] Nash?

Learner: At Christmas time.

Teacher: *Ha?* (What?) [SEEKING CONFIRMATION]

Learner: At Christmas time.

Teacher: At Christmas time? So what do you think ca – carol – carol means? Carol we are talking about music, and when we sing the carols they are sung loudly and happily. If we look at Christmas time, what do we have at Christmas time? What do we celebrate? Christmas? Shelton?

Learner: The birth of Christ.

Teacher: *Ehe.* (Yes.) [ACKNOWLEDGING/AGREEING] *Kana muchiita mabirthday enyu handiti munenge muchifara maradio achiridzwa*, volume *iri pamusorosoro.* (When you are celebrating your birthdays you will be enjoying yourselves playing music at high volume.) [EXEMPLIFYING] So when we celebrate the birth of – we

commemorate the birth of Jesus Christ we will be very very happy. Now, here is Easter. We have talked about birth and resurrection, but then how come we are talking about carol? A carol is sung loudly and happily. Now this is Easter, where Jesus is dead. *Ha?* [EMPHASISING] But then we are singing loudly and happily. How come? *Zvasangana pa – paita muroyi kanhi apa zvasangana papi?* (How come, has a witch come onto the scene?) [JOKING] Tatenda?

Learner: They were celebrating the resurrection of Jesus.

Teacher: Right resurrection. So if you go through the passage I'm sure you have the clear picture of what happened or what happens in this story. Now, we have a picture which guides us, that picture, it has something. We begin our story clearly. Right I will read the first paragraph. (Reads passage) *Ini ndatokoniwa kuita zvamai ava.* (I have dismally failed to mimic the mother.) [COMMENTING] And the next statement: 'She hardly took a breath.' *Ha?* [EMPHASISING] I was reading very fast trying to imitate how the mother talked to – her son. Who can read for us again? Teacher *ndakoniwa.* (I have failed.) [JOKING]

Learners: (Laughter and clearing of throats)

Teacher: *Ndiani angativerengera ubve waita mai chikomana ava?* (Who may read for us trying as much as possible to imitate the mother?) [GIVING INSTRUCTION] *Aiwa toreva munhu anotoverenga.* (No we mean someone who can actually read.) [CLARIFYING] Tatenda?

Learner: (Reads passage)

Teacher: Right sorry sorry. The first statement – we read it normally but then when we get to – the direct speech, what mother really said, *handiti?* (Isn't it?) [SEEKING CLARIFICATION] *Ehe-e ndopanoita* bombarding *ipapo.Pavasina kana kufema.* (Yes that's where the bombarding takes place, where the mother didn't pause for breath.) [EXPLAINING] Right, get on.

Learner: (Reads passage)

Teacher: *Zvaita here apa?* (Did he accurately imitate the mother.) [INVITING COMMENTS]

Learners: *Aiwa! Aiwa!* (No! No!) [DISAGREEING]

In the above excerpt, again Teacher D code-switched frequently and her code switches served the following possible functions: seeking confirmation, inviting learner participation, emphasising, acknowledging/agreeing, exemplifying, joking, commenting, giving instruction, clarifying, seeking clarification, as well as inviting comments.

4.1.4.2 Code-switching by Teacher D: Findings from Interview with Teacher D

In the interview, Teacher D revealed that her L1 is Shona.

The teacher revealed that she sometimes, or *“when there is need”*, code-switched when teaching English, in order to explain and illustrate concepts, when learners do not understand the concepts.

When asked about the L2 methods she employs in her teaching of English, Teacher D stated that she preferred *“Methods that develop the liking of English because some may resort to remaining quiet if they are forced to speak in English only ... to some extent methods that encourage the use of L1.”*

4.1.4.3 Code-switching by Teacher D: Findings from Discussion with Class D Learners

When asked if their teacher code-switched during English lessons, the sample of Class D Learners unanimously agreed that she code-switched, as illustrated in the following two direct quotes:

“When there is need to use Shona, like when we we don’t understand what she is saying in English so she can use Shona.”

“When there is a story which has an aspect of our daily lives, so there are some eh I mean culture, which is in English, which we don’t know, so she tries to put it in Shona to ‘enlight’ ... she has to explain it thoroughly in Shona.”

4.1.4.4 Class D Learners: Code-Switching Functions and Frequencies (Findings from Lesson Observations)

Like their Class C counterparts at School B, Class D learners showed that they code-switched minimally in formal exchanges with the teacher during the five lessons that were observed. Table 4.8 shows the code-switching functions of the code-switches that were produced by Class D learners.

Table 4.8: Class D Learners – Code-switching Functions and Frequencies

Code-switching Function	Frequency (Approximate)
Acknowledging	01
Showing Understanding	01
Informing	02
Disagreeing	01
Joking	01
Seeking Clarification	01
Total	07

The excerpts below illustrate the few instances in which Class D Learners code-switched in formal classroom exchanges with their teacher. In the short excerpt below, the learner code switches when she informs the teacher that the learners' exercise books are in the staffroom.

Teacher: So we use that exercise book. The composition exercise book. *Aha?* (Yes?) [INVITING PARTICIPATION]

Learner: *Mabhuku ari kustaffroom.* (The books are in the staff room.) [INFORMING]

Teacher: *Hoo!* (Oh by the way!) [ACKNOWLEDGING]

In another short excerpt below, the learners respond to the teacher's question in Shona because the teacher has asked her question in Shona.

Teacher: Ah! You want to hear the first paragraph and then you listen. When I read for the second time no it's listening throughout so let's get ready. *Kwasara vanhu vangani uku? Promise nani?* [How many people are yet to come? Promise and who else?] [ENQUIRING]

Learners: *NaShelton.* (And Shelton.) [INFORMING]

In the third short excerpt below, the learner seeks clarification from the teacher through a code-switched question.

Teacher: 'How to write vividly' just take the heading as it is. How to write vividly...

Learner: *Kana tanyora sense yachona tinoisa mumabackets?* (When we have identified the sense do we enclose the answer in brackets?) [SEEKING CLARIFICATION]

Teacher: *A-aa... Kana maa maisa mumabackets chiregai zvakadaro.* (No but if you had put the answer in brackets no problem.) [CLARIFYING] But underline.

Apart from code-switching minimally during formal exchanges with their teacher, I noted that Class D learners tended to code-switch a lot when conversing among themselves as depicted in the utterances below:

“*Une dictionary here?* (Do you have a dictionary?)” [REQUESTING]

“Comprehension *iya yatakanyora yakanga yakaipa.* (That comprehension exercise was really tough.)” [COMMENTING]

Learner A: Has it improved?

Learner B: *Zvakangofanana.* (No change.) [COMMENTING]

“*Chinyarara* the teacher is coming. (Keep quiet the teacher is coming.)” [WARNING]

“*Ndibatsirewo pasentence iyi.* (Can you help me on this sentence.)” [SEEKING ASSISTANCE]

4.1.4.5 Code-switching by Class D Learners: Findings from Interview with Teacher D

Teacher D revealed that her English learners code-switched when learning English and she gave as an example group or pair-work situations as instances in which they code-switched. “*Yes if I give them say some work to do in groups or in pairs aha instead of discussing in English they use their own home language.*”

4.1.4.6 Code-switching by Class D Learners: Findings from Discussions with Class D Learners

From the sample of Class D Learners, nine (90%) said Shona was their mother tongue, while one gave English as his L1.

When asked if they code-switched during English lessons, all of the Class D Learners (including the one who said his L1 was English) said they sometimes code-switched and the following are some of their responses:

“*Sometimes, to explain words.*”

“Yes when I can’t pronounce some English word then I translate to Shona.”

“Sometimes, for my peers to understand.”

“Yes for the teacher and my peers and the teacher to understand.”

“When I can’t translate a Shona word into English.”

“When my friend doesn’t understand English ... to simplify.”

“To understand the words I can’t understand in English.”

4.2 TEACHERS’ PERCEPTIONS ON LEARNERS’ CODE-SWITCHING

To address the second sub research question, the teachers who were interviewed were asked how they reacted when their learners switched from Shona to English during English lessons. The learners were also asked how their teachers reacted when they (the learners) code-switched. In addition, I also took note of how the four teachers reacted in instances when their learners code-switched.

4.2.1 Findings from Interview with Teacher A

Teacher A had mixed feelings about the code-switching done by her learners of English. He revealed that, on one hand, he was sometimes tolerant of his learners’ L1 use because students are more comfortable expressing themselves in Shona, and so *“it would be doing a disservice if we do not allow Shona.”* He added that *“If you were to force students to speak in English they wouldn’t learn.”* To further express his tolerance of code-switching by learners of English, Teacher A gave the following example: *“At one school where I taught, students who spoke in Shona were supposed to have their names written down so that they would be forwarded to the headmaster for punishment but you would have a class that would be ... silent from six to six.”* Teacher A also showed his positive attitude towards learners’ code switching by observing that *“Not allowing students to use Shona is suppressing the child who might have a very important point to express.”* Apart from being tolerant of learners using their L1 during the learning of English, Teacher A showed that he even encouraged the learners to sometimes resort to their mother tongue. *“Sometimes I ask them to express themselves in Shona if I see that they have difficulties.”*

On the other hand, Teacher A revealed that he sometimes discouraged his learners from using Shona because *“We normally teach for exams so normally our methods are tailor-made to suit exams so at times we encourage them to use English ... We might encourage them to use English though they can’t express themselves because of Ministerial regulation ... Heads say they (learners) should use English.”*

4.2.2 Findings from Discussion with Class A Learners

The sample of Class A learners revealed that their teacher has mixed feelings on their code-switching, depending on situation. The following are some of their responses:

“Usually he says nothing.”

“He just keep quiet because he often uses Shona.”

“He appreciates it since he knows that English is challenging.”

“He will translate the Shona word into English so that we know the English meaning.”

“He sometimes corrects me by using the English words to replace my Shona words.”

“He does nothing because he too sometimes speaks Shona during English lessons.”

“He discourages you when explaining easy words because you would always use Shona even in exams.”

“He discourages you because in essay writing if you take a Shona proverb and translate it into English it becomes wrong.”

4.2.3 Findings from Lesson Observations (Class A)

From the five lessons that were observed in Class A, Teacher A showed that he tolerated and even encouraged his learners to code-switch as he sometimes repeated the learners’ code switched answers for emphasis, or asked the learner to repeat his code-switched answer, or to put his or her answer into Shona, or simply acknowledge the answer. In one instance, the teacher acknowledged that he had come across a

group discussing in Shona and hoped that that group would be able to express their answers in English.

In the following excerpt the teacher asked the learners to explain the meaning of the sentence 'Zvabva sits besides Panashe', with focus on the preposition 'besides'.

Teacher: *Ehe*. (Yes.) Explain to us.

Learner: Pa- Panashe *anogara paside paZvabva*. (Panashe sits beside Zvabva.)

Teacher: Eh she says Panashe *anogara paside paZvabva*. (Panashe sits beside Zvabva.) Who can who can – do you have any other explanation that you want to use – another definition that you want to – sorry. Yes?

Learner: Eh umm Panashe *anogara padivi paZvabva*. (Panashe sits beside Zvabva.)

Teacher: Panashe *anogara padivi paZvabva*. (Panashe sits beside Zvabva.) Thank you.

In the excerpt, the teacher shows not only his acceptance, but also his tolerance of the learners' code-switched explanations by repeating the code-switched explanations for emphasis. In the excerpt below, the teacher asked learners to explain the meaning of 'character.'

Teacher: And what is character? That's my last question before we look at the situations.

Learner: *Unhu hwako*. (Your character.)

Teacher: Character, speak up please.

Learner: *Unhu hwako*. (Your character.)

Teacher: *Unhu hwako*. (Your character.) If you would speak up.

Learner: *Unhu hwako*. (Your character.)

Teacher: *Unhu hwako* (Your character) becomes eh character and manner.

In the above excerpt, the teacher again shows his tolerance and acceptance of the learner's use of Shona by asking the learner to repeat his answer loudly and also by repeating the answer himself.

In another excerpt below, the teacher was teaching guided composition and asked learners to explain what 'hailstorm' means.

Teacher: And the next one is hailstorm. Hailstorm what is a hailstorm? Hailstorm yes?

Learner: *Mamvuramabwe*. (Hailstorm.)

Teacher: Eh did you hear what he said?

Learners: Yes.

Teacher: Speak up.

Learner: *Mamvuramabwe*. (Hailstorm.)

Teacher: *Mamvurama* – *mamvuramabwe* (*Hailsorm*) that's eh maybe that's Karanga and then Zezuru what do you call it? *Ha?* (Yes?) Yes?

Learner: *Chimvuramabwe*. (Hailstorm.)

Teacher: *Chimvuramabwe*. (Hailstorm.) That's hailstorm.

In the above excerpt, the teacher actually invites the learners to give the Zezuru word (a dialect of Shona), showing his tolerance of the use of Shona by his learners.

4.2.4 Findings from Interview with Teacher B

Teacher B displayed an ambivalent attitude towards her learners' code-switching. When asked if she thought her pupils should code-switch she said, "*I think it's ok because children are socialised to speak in their first language and they have less time speaking in English.*" She also acknowledged that by code-switching, learners expressed themselves freely.

However, when asked how she reacts to her learners' code-switching, Teacher B revealed that she prefers her learners not to code-switch when she said, "*I just encourage them to express themselves in English.*"

4.2.5 Findings from Discussion with Class B Learners

When asked how their teacher responded when they resorted to their L1, Class B Learners showed that the teacher would either assist them to translate their answer into English, or advise them how to become fluent in English, or ignore the learner's answer. The following were their responses:

“She will assist you to say it in English.”

“She will say it’s good to try and tell you the English word.”

“She encourages you to read English novels.”

“She usually says speak in English or she simply ignores your answer or question.”

“Our teacher encourages us to use English only during English lessons so that we can be used to it and be able to talk to other people from other countries and to improve our English in composition writing.”

“She encourages us to use English so as to have no problems when writing English exams.”

“Sometimes the teacher doesn’t mind but sometimes she orders me to speak in English.”

“If you do so the teacher reminds you not to do it again or she sometimes scolds you if she is in a bad mood.”

“She may not accept the answer, saying practice makes perfect so she encourages us to learn to speak in English.”

“Sometimes the teacher punishes us because no English exam is written in Shona.”

4.2.6 Findings from Lesson Observations (Class B)

In the few instances in which her learners code-switched, Teacher B allowed the learners to code-switch without interruption. In one instance, she sought confirmation of a learner’s code-switched utterance and in another instance she asked the learners if they were satisfied with a learner’s code-switched explanation. In yet another instance, she simply ignored a learners’ code-switched answer and moved on to the

next question. This shows her tolerance of and reservations about code-switching by her learners.

In the excerpt below, Teacher B was teaching subject verb agreement.

Teacher: A series of workshops is/are planned for next term?

Learner: A series of workshops is planned for next term.

Teacher: Is it correct class?

Learners: Yes ma'am.

Teacher: Why? No chorus answers. Paida?

Learner: *Zvakangofanana. Pamusoro pakanzi workshops apa pakanzi series. Zvokuti dai taida kuti was apa panhamba 5 taiti a swarm of bee. (It's the same. Above it's workshops. If we wanted to use 'was' on number 5 we would say a swarm of bee.)*

Teacher: Sharpdine what do you have to say?

Learner: Eh *dai panga pa* – (If) eh like for example like series – *mirai mirai* – (wait wait)

Teacher: Eh Tatenda?

In the above excerpt, the teacher has allowed the learners to code-switch and does not reprimand them for doing so, indicating that she could be tolerant of code-switching by her learners.

In the excerpt below the teacher was still teaching subject verb agreement.

Teacher: Ok what's the answer? What's the answer now?

Learners: Is.

Teacher: You read the whole sentence.

Learner: Eh a pack of wild dogs is terrorising the villagers.

Learners: *Ha-a!* (No!)

Teacher: Is the subject and the verb eh is it the number ok? Because earlier we said a park of wild dogs they are many. *Handiti?* (Isn't it?) A pack of wild –

Learner: It's one pack. Pack *chinhu* one. (Pack means one thing.)

Teacher: Do you agree?

Learners: Yes ma'am.

In the excerpt, when the learner code-switches to explain why 'is' is correct, the teacher shows her tolerance of the code-switched explanation by asking the other learners if they agree with the explanation.

4.2.7 Findings from Interview with Teacher C

When asked how she reacted to her learners' code-switching, Teacher C expressed mixed feelings when she stated that, *"Sometimes I stop them from speaking in Shona and encourage them to use English though at times such kind of pupils will keep quiet."*

4.2.8 Findings from Discussion with Class C Learners

Class C Learners revealed that their teacher reacted differently to their code-switching, depending on the situation. Below are some of the learners' responses:

"Sometimes she will not mind."

"She will just ignore because she has the habit of speaking Shona in the English lesson so she doesn't mind."

"Sometimes she asks me to say the same thing in English but sometimes she encourages me to explain in Shona if I can't do it in English. Sometimes she changes my Shona words into English."

"She does not do anything because she wants the students to elaborate themselves in a way they feel comfortable."

"She tells me to try speaking in English so as to get used to it but sometimes she continues listening while I'm using Shona."

"She says correct language please!"

4.2.9 Findings from Lesson Observations (Class C)

From the five lessons observed when Teacher C was teaching, there was very little code-switching by learners during formal exchanges with the teacher. However, in those few instances, the teacher actually repeated the code-switched answers for

emphasis, or explained in Shona, or did not say anything about it, showing her tolerance of the learners' use of Shona. In the excerpt below the teacher was teaching comprehension and she asked the learners to explain the word 'tirade'.

Teacher: They were now listening to the tirade. How the - the speaker spoke. How did he speak? It was? Eh?

Learner: With anger.

Teacher: With anger? Eh? Violet? Rather it was just an outburst. *Wakaita zvoku-zvoku* – (What he did was to -)

Learner: *Zvokuputika*. (To explode.)

Teacher: Eh *ku* – yah *wataura zvakana kuputika handiti, munhu neshungu unodii? Unoita zvokuputika*. (Yes you are right he exploded isn't it, in anger what does one do? You explode.) It was an outburst *handiti?* (Isn't it?)

In the excerpt above, Teacher C showed her acceptance of the learner's use of Shona by not only initiating the answer in Shona, but by also acknowledging the answer and repeating it for emphasis.

4.2.10 Findings from Interview with Teacher D

Teacher D expressed her intolerance of her learners' code-switching, giving the reason that if learners avoid code-switching, they will learn the L2 through oral practice in English, which they will then convert into writing. In her own words, *"I discourage them because they have to learn the second language. It is more challenging than their home language so they have to practise as much as they ... can because when they discuss they have to practise orally so that whatever they will have discussed then they will put it down in writing so there should ... be time for them to use the second language."*

4.2.11 Findings from Discussion with Class D Learners

When asked how their teacher reacted to their use of L1 in the English Lessons, Class D Learners revealed that their teacher's reaction was either that of tolerance and understanding, or intolerance, to outright condemnation. Below are their responses:

"Sometimes they (she) condemn(s) it. They (she) just like – tell(s) you to speak in English."

“They (she) say(s) that they (she) don’t understand the language you are speaking.”

“Sometimes they (she) can also understand like when the teacher sees that you are trying to say something, they can ask you to speak in Shona, so you can express yourself clearly.”

“She won’t provoke it so – so that you can express yourself.”

“To encourage you to speak in English many times, she threatens you that if I see you speaking in Shona, I will punish you.”

4.2.12 Findings from Lesson Observations (Class D)

There were very few instances of learner code-switching in the learners’ formal exchanges with their teacher during the five lessons observed. However, in those few instances the teacher showed her tolerance of learner code-switching by, for example, asking them a question in Shona, thereby instigating a response in Shona. The teacher also responded in Shona to a learner’s code-switched question. In one instance the learner asked for clarification through a code-switched utterance and Teacher D also clarified through a code-switched utterance.

In the excerpt below the teacher asked a learner to read a comprehension passage at a fast rate, mimicking how a character had spoken.

Teacher: Right, sorry sorry. The first statement, we read it normally but then when we get to – the direct speech – what mother really said, *handiti?* (Isn’t it?) *Ndopanotangira* bombarding *ipapo. Pavasina kana kufema.* (That’s where the bombarding begins. Where she did not pause for breath.) Right, get on.

Learner: (Reads passage).

Teacher: *Zvaita here apa?* (Has he accurately imitated the mother?)

Learners: *Aiwa! Aiwa!* (No! No!)

In the excerpt, the teacher shows that she tolerated the learners’ Shona response by actually asking the question in Shona.

In the excerpt below, the learner seeks clarification, through code-switching, to find out whether the answers should be put in brackets.

Learner: *Kana tanyora sense yacho tinoisa mumabrackets?* (When we have found the sense do we enclose the answer in brackets?)

Teacher: *A-aa. Kana maa maisa mumabrackets chiregai zvakadaro.* (No but if you had put it in brackets no problem.) But underline.

The teacher showed that he appreciated the learner's code-switched question by clarifying and explaining in code-switched English.

4.3 LEARNERS' PERCEPTIONS ON TEACHERS' CODE-SWITCHING

To address the third sub-question, sampled secondary school learners of English were asked what they thought about code-switching by their teachers of English. This question drew mixed reactions, but the majority of the learners revealed that they saw it as acceptable for their teacher to code-switch from English to their (learners') L1.

4.3.1 Findings from Discussion with Class A Learners

Class A Learners expressed mixed reactions to the teacher's code-switching. Some said they saw it as acceptable for the teacher to code-switch during English Lessons and the major reasons given were that it breaks monotony, makes jokes more interesting, and makes learners understand better. Those who were against code-switching by their teacher argued that the teacher might pass on the habit to learners, and that it would affect their English. Other reasons which were given are that, the examination will be in English only, and that since they are English lessons they must be taught in English only. Below are their responses:

"I feel that the teacher should code-switch because English is our second language and Shona is our mother language. It makes the lesson more interesting, rather than speaking English throughout the whole lesson, it will become monotonous. Also, some jokes are interesting when they are said in Shona, they may not make sense when they are spoken in English."

“When the teacher uses Shona I find the lesson will be enjoyable.”

“When the teacher code-switches we as students understand his explanations better.”

“Shona should be separated from English. This is to encourage pupils to get used to English for use in the exams. Also, my mother language is Ndebele so it’s difficult for me to understand the teacher when he uses Shona during the English lesson.”

“I like it when the teacher uses Shona because it helps some of the kids who do not easily get a point in English but better understand it when it is explained in their mother tongue.”

“It’s good when the teacher switches to my home language for my better understanding for example to explain the word ‘rude’ in register.”

“It is good when the teacher explains a point in detail so that everyone could understand.”

“The teacher should not use Shona because it affects our English. Exams are written in English so if the teacher uses Shona this will affect us when writing our exams. Also, it will make us develop a bad habit of using Shona all the time.”

“The teacher should use English only. Since it is an English lesson it needs to be taught in English.”

“It’s good only when cracking jokes but for explaining words English should be used.”

4.3.2 Findings from Discussion with Class B Learners

The major theme that emerged from this Form 1 class on the issue of code-switching by the teacher was that it is good for learners’ understanding, though some were also against it, arguing that the teacher should lead by example. One of the learners referred to code-switching by the teacher as a *“wrong path.”* The responses below capture their sentiments.

“It’s good for the teacher to use Shona to express herself clearly to students who do not understand.”

“It’s ok for the teacher to use Shona during English lessons because some complex words cannot be easily understood if explained in English.”

“The teacher should continue to use Shona words because we sometimes come across confusing words which will be better understood in Shona.”

“The teacher should use Shona but not all the time. It helps pupils to understand better.”

“I like it when the teacher uses Shona since it makes everything clear and sensible to everyone.”

“The teacher should speak in Shona but on rare cases, only when the class failed to understand the teacher’s explanations.”

“It’s not good for the teacher to speak Shona during English lessons because he should lead by example. We should learn English from him.”

“I don’t like it because if he switches to Shona we will also use Shona but he is the one who should lead us by example, so if he leads us on wrong path we will also go wrong.”

“It’s good because we will understand better.”

4.3.3 Findings from Discussion with Class C Learners

Class C Learners also expressed their mixed feelings about code-switching by the teacher, saying it is good to make learners understand, for example instructions and jokes, and that the teacher should not be blamed for code-switching because it can occur spontaneously. Some, however, believed that it is not good to code-switch because it disadvantages those whose first language is not Shona, and because the teacher is an English teacher (who should act as a model).

The responses below capture the learners' sentiments regarding code-switching by the teacher.

“On the other hand it’s good because some people don’t understand English, especially my colleagues and it will help part of the class ... it doesn’t also help because some people let’s take for example someone comes from Europe, he or she doesn’t know Shona so for you to speak to him in English, eh we have to learn to speak English other (rather) than Shona during English lessons.”

“It’s good for the teacher to use Shona because the teacher will be trying to make you understand. After explaining in Shona and the teacher asks if we ... understand, there will be an overwhelming response.”

“The teacher must use Shona but not oftenly for understanding of instructions.”

“The teacher should use Shona when necessary for example (for) instructions and jokes.”

“If the teacher uses Shona it’s a disadvantage to those (learners) who don’t understand Shona.”

“The teacher should not use Shona but students should because teacher is an English teacher who passed so she must use English.”

“I don’t blame the teacher for speaking in Shona because Shona can just pop out of your mouth.”

“The teacher should switch to Shona so that what he is saying will be clear to those who do not understand (English).”

4.3.4 Findings from Discussion with Class D Learners

Class D Learners also expressed the view that code-switching by their teacher of English is good for the learners' understanding, and that it accommodates all students. However, one of the learners condemned the teacher's use of code-switching, saying

it negatively affects the learners' grasp of English, while another saw code-switching by the teacher as not being necessary. One learner said that they should learn English from the teacher. The following are the responses from the Class D learners on code-switching by the teacher:

"It is good for the teacher to use Shona a little for better understanding. There are some slow learners who cannot get what what the teacher will be saying so Shona must be used to explain hard concepts."

"The use of Shona by the teacher makes us understand some concepts which might be strange to us."

"When my teacher uses Shona during English lessons this makes me to understand better."

"It's good for the teacher to use both English and Shona because if she uses English only this will make difficult for us to understand since most of the time we speak Shona."

"She should use Shona words so that the students might not feel neglected because children who can't understand English will not be able to participate. They will feel that they are the worst students in the class."

"It's better for the teacher to speak Shona to shed light on the students so they can later speak English fluently."

"The teacher should use Shona because if she speaks English only my colleagues – some of them might be in topsy-turvy situation if the teacher doesn't speak in Shona."

"If the teacher uses Shona during English lessons this will negatively affect the students' grasp of English."

"I don't see any benefit for us when the teacher uses Shona."

“The teacher should use English only because pupils should be able to speak and understand English by learning from the teacher.”

4.4 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CODE-SWITCHING AND NEW ENGLISHES; TEACHERS’ PERCEPTIONS ON TEACHING THE LOCAL VARIETY OF ENGLISH

4.4.1 Findings from Interview with Teacher A

When asked if he thought there was a relationship between code-switching and New Englishes, Teacher A said he believed code-switching is part of New Englishes since no language remains static. He observed that code-switched New Englishes are a result of people’s quest to show their culture and identity. In Teacher A’s own words, *“Yes native languages are having an influence on English varieties. Zimbabwean English is full of code-switching – full of Shona words. Code-switching is part of New English as people seek to show their culture and identity through language.”*

When asked if the code-switched variety of English should be officialised and taught in schools, Teacher A said he believed, to some extent, this variety should be taught in the schools, as long as it makes sense, as learners will understand it better. Teacher A added: *“We should accept our own modifications of English. It makes us eh original. In any case eh what is termed ‘standard’ is an adoption of other cultures. We should eh speak English according to our own standards.”*

Teacher A, however, observed that *“we are a product of colonialism where we dignify ‘standard’ English.”*

4.4.2 Findings from Interview with Teacher B

Teacher B revealed that she was of the view that there was a relationship between code-switching and New English varieties and she attributed this to L1 influence on L2, and the influence of social and cultural factors. *“Yes code-switched English is a variety of English and it shows the influence of the L1 on the L2. It is a result of socio-cultural factors.”*

However, Teacher B said she believed that schools should only teach ‘standard’ English because this would enable learners of English to develop the ability to

proficiently converse with any speaker of English from any part of the world. She opined that if the code-switched English variety were to be officialised in the schools, *“at the end of the day we won’t be producing internationally up to standard pupils.”* She said she believed that code-switching should only be a transitional phase to English proficiency, which will end once full target language competence has been achieved, adding that *“Schools should only accept standard English because the English exam does not test such code-switched varieties.”*

4.4.3 Findings from Interview with Teacher C

Teacher C revealed that she viewed code-switched New Englishes as a reality and attributed them to L1 influences and one’s origin. Said Teacher C: *“Yes code-switched New Englishes are a reality because the L1 influences one’s communicative style. The place of origin determines one’s language variety.”*

However, Teacher C said she believes that the New Englishes compromised the mastery of ‘standard’ English and, therefore, should not be officialised in the school curriculum. *“We should teach standard English because if we teach the Zimbabwean variety of English pupils will face problems in composition writing as they will produce ridiculous idioms which are unacceptable in the final examination.”* The code-switched variety *“affects English. If it was possible to use English only it would be better but the problem is that pupils do not always understand without code-switching,”* said Teacher C.

4.4.4 Findings from Interview with Teacher D

Teacher D felt that code-switching is part of New Englishes emanating from L1 influence. Asked about the possibility of teaching the code-switched variety in schools, Teacher D revealed that she thought the code-switched variety should be taught since learners are likely to be able to express themselves better in the code-switched English variety. She also observed that there is nothing wrong in teaching the code-switched English variety as it is a reflection of what is happening in the wider Zimbabwean society. Said Teacher D: *“Such varieties are a reality in our communities and people communicate and solve human problems through them. Therefore they must have a place in our school systems. Insistence on ‘standard’ English means fighting against reality and hence the schools should find ways to improve these*

varieties so that they enrich the communication world. Even in workplaces there is code-switching. We train children to fit into society, to be a part of society. If what we teach them is to make them relevant then there is no problem in teaching the code-switched variety in schools.”

4.5 SUMMARY

The chapter presented the findings of the study that emerged from lesson observations, interviews with teachers, and focus group discussions that were held with the learners of English. The chapter focused on the extent to which the four teachers of English and their learners at the two secondary schools in Masvingo District code-switched during English lessons. The code-switching functions of the teachers' and learners' code switches were identified. The chapter also presented findings on the four teachers' perceptions on their learners' code-switching as revealed through interviews with the teachers, lesson observations, and focus group discussions. Also presented in this chapter are findings which show the learners' perceptions on their teachers' code-switching and these findings were obtained from the focus group discussions with the learners. Finally, the chapter also presented findings showing the four teachers' perceptions on the relationship between code-switching and emerging varieties of English or New Englishes, as well as the teachers' perceptions on the teaching of New Englishes vis-a`-vis the so-called standard varieties of English.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

5. INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, I interpret and discuss the findings of the study. I start by focusing on the extent and functions of code-switching by the four teachers and their learners. Then I focus on the teachers' perceptions on their ESL learners' code-switching, and the learners' perceptions on their teachers' code-switching. Where necessary, findings from interviews, focus group discussions on the above issues are compared and contrasted. The chapter also discusses the findings on the teachers' views on the relationship between code-switching and New Englishes, and their views on the teaching of New Englishes. The findings of the study are discussed in relation to the theoretical framework and literature reviewed in Chapter Two of the study.

5.1 CODE-SWITCHING BY TEACHERS AND LEARNERS: EXTENT AND FUNCTIONS

5.1.1 Code-switching by Teachers

The overall picture that emerged from this study is that all the four teachers who participated in the study code-switched into the language of the majority of the learners (Shona), which also happens to be the four teachers' L1, when teaching English. What differed was the extent to which the teachers code-switched, with the two teachers at School B (a rural day secondary school), namely Teacher C and Teacher D, code switching frequently. One of the teachers at School A (an urban boarding secondary school), Teacher A, code-switched moderately, while Teacher B code switched minimally. There was, thus, more teacher code-switching at the rural day secondary school than at the urban boarding secondary school.

The fact that all the four teachers spoke Shona as their L1 but taught English as their second language makes them bilinguals, that is, individuals who are fluent in one language, but who can produce *'complete and meaningful utterances in the language'* (Haugen, cited in Butler and Hakuta, 2006:114). The four teachers also fit into the category of bilinguals since they have access to two linguistic codes (Hamers and Blanc, 2000), in this case Shona and English.

Thus, this could partially explain the teachers' code-switching when teaching English, since code-switching is a common phenomenon among bilinguals (Malmkjaer, 1991). This observation is shared by Jenkins (2009), who states that speakers who have

more than one language available to them may code-switch as a matter of choice, and for other pragmatic and expressive reasons. Similarly, Chimbganda and Mokgwathi (2012:30) observe that *'code-switching cannot be wished away. As long as learners and teachers live in a community which is bi- or multilingual, there will always be need to use alternate language codes which can best express their ideas.'*

Because all the four teachers who participated in the study sometimes resorted to their L1 (Shona), which is also the L1 of the majority of their learners, the notion of additive bilingualism seems to apply to them. In additive bilingualism, the addition of a second language or culture is unlikely to replace the L1 and culture, and the L1 is not discarded as the medium of instruction (Baker, 2006).

For Teacher A, who code switched moderately during the five lessons that I observed, and for Teacher C and Teacher D who code switched frequently, their stance seems to fit into what Macaro (2001) calls the 'optimal' position, in which the teacher sees the L1 as having a beneficial role in the L2 classroom. For Teacher B, her stance seems to fit into the 'maximal' position, in which, while the teacher may agree in principle that all teaching and learning should be in the target language, the teacher, albeit grudgingly, concedes that, in reality, some L1 will be used (Macaro, 2001).

In the interview with Teacher A, whom I observed to be code switching moderately, the teacher described the extent of his code-switching as *'sometimes.'* This was corroborated by his learners, who revealed that their teacher *'sometimes'* code-switched to explain difficult words and concepts, to crack jokes, to help students understand, and to deal with misbehaving students. In the interview with Teacher A, he identified the functions of his code-switching as explaining difficult concepts and words, helping the language learners express themselves, exemplifying, and cracking jokes. The teacher also revealed that he sometimes code-switched naturally or spontaneously. However, when I observed Teacher A teaching, I identified many more functions of his code-switching, including emphasising, explaining, checking understanding, inviting participation, seeking confirmation, seeking emphasis, seeking acknowledgement, defining, seeking clarification, giving instructions, acknowledging/agreeing, eliciting, commenting, commanding, showing the teacher's hesitations, as well as drawing attention. This suggests that, indeed, most of the time

when the teacher code-switches, he could be doing it not only naturally or spontaneously as the teacher himself acknowledged, but also unconsciously. This is confirmed by Ferguson (cited in Baker, 2006:295) who observes that code-switching:

is not only very prevalent ... but also seems to arise naturally, perhaps inevitably ... Moreover, because teaching is an adrenalin-fuelled activity, making numerous compelling demands on one's attentional resources, much switching takes place below the level of consciousness. Teachers are often simply not aware of when they switch languages, or indeed if they switch at all.

Teacher A also confirmed that he code-switched because he preferred bilingual methods of L2 teaching. The teacher could have been making reference to such bilingual methods as the Grammar-Translation Method which relies heavily on translation into and out of the target language (Thornbury, 2000; Richards and Rodgers, 2007), and in which instructions were given in the language learners' L1 (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). Another of such methods is Dodson's Bilingual Method (Dodson, 1967) in which the teacher would give the meaning of an L2 sentence in the L1, and the New Concurrent Method (Jacobson, 1990), in which the teacher switches from one language to another with the aim of strengthening both the L1 and the target language (Chamot and Stewner-Manzaneres, 1985). Teacher A also expressed her preference for Communicative Language Teaching, in which though *'the target language should be used ... during communicative activities'* and *'the target language is a vehicle for communication'*, judicious use of the learners' L1 is permitted (Larsen-Freeman, 2000:132).

In the interview that I held with Teacher B, whom I found to be code-switching minimally during the five lessons that I observed, the teacher revealed that she code-switched 'at times', and that she did so when her learners 'don't understand'. However, in my observations of Teacher B's lessons, I noted that the teacher code-switched on very few occasions for purposes of emphasising, seeking acknowledgement, seeking clarification, announcing, seeking confirmation, enquiring, and inviting participation but mostly through the word '*Handiti*', which she seemed to be uttering more out of habit than for pedagogical functions. My observation that Teacher B code-switched minimally was corroborated by Teacher B herself, who in the interview that I held with

her, revealed that she preferred exclusive use of English although she sometimes code-switched. Teacher B also revealed that she particularly preferred the Direct Method, a method in which meaning is put across '*directly in the target language through demonstration and visual aids, with no recourse to the students' native language*' (Diller cited in Larsen-Freeman, 2000:23). The Direct Method also advocates avoidance of translation (Chaves and Hernandez, 2013), and its basic premise is that L2 learning should be modelled along '*first language learning: Lots of active oral interactions, spontaneous use of the language, no translation between the first and the second language...*' (Brown, 1987:57). Teacher B's learners also alluded to the fact that Teacher B code-switched minimally when they pointed out that she code-switched '*not exactly*', '*not always*', '*once in a while*' and '*not every time*.'

In the interview that I held with Teacher C, whom I found to be code-switching frequently during the five lessons that I observed, the teacher revealed that she code-switched '*sometimes*', for the purpose of explaining when learners have difficulties in understanding, and when cracking jokes. She added that she believes that teacher code-switching in the English classroom should be minimal. However, she also indicated that she may not be aware of the other occasions in which she might be code-switching. This was proved to be true, since the lessons observed revealed that the teacher code-switched frequently, not only for explaining when learners had difficulties in understanding and for cracking jokes, but also for purposes of acknowledging/agreeing, seeking acknowledgement, emphasising, enquiring, commenting, checking understanding, eliciting learner responses, inviting participation, announcing, expressing disapproval, exemplifying, seeking confirmation, giving instructions, disagreeing, reprimanding, informing, querying, clarifying, parallel translation, seeking clarification, expressing doubt, seeking comment, as well as seeking learners' opinions.

Teacher C also confirmed that she code-switched when teaching English, and like Teacher A, revealed her preference for Bilingual methods. From the perspective of her learners, Teacher C code-switched '*sometimes*', and they singled out giving instructions, explaining, and cracking jokes as some of the functions of their teacher's code switches.

In the interview that I held with Teacher D, the teacher also described the extent to which she code-switched as *'sometimes'*, or *'when there is need'*, and she cited explaining and illustrating concepts to make learners understand as some of the functions of her code switches. However, I observed that, like her counterpart (Teacher C), Teacher D code-switched for numerous other functions, thereby lending credence to the observation that much of the code-switching done by teachers takes place at sub-conscious level (Ferguson cited in Baker, 2006). The numerous functions of Teacher D's code switches, which she did not reveal during the interview, include emphasising, complimenting, checking understanding, acknowledging/joking, enquiring, inviting participation, giving instructions, reprimanding, seeking confirmation, expressing surprise, seeking acknowledgement, seeking opinion, commanding, advising, informing, demonstrating, apologising, warning, seeking clarification, eliciting learner responses, expressing disapproval, clarifying, appealing, and commenting. In the focus group discussion that I held with Teacher D's learners, the learners confirmed that their teacher code-switched when teaching English and they singled out explaining for understanding as the major function of the teacher's code switches.

An analysis of the four teachers' code-switching functions (especially Teacher A who code-switched moderately, and Teachers C and D who code-switched frequently) identified during the lesson observations and those teacher code-switching functions that were confirmed by the teachers themselves as well as by their learners, reveals that the teachers' code-switching is not meaningless or a deficit to be stigmatised, but it is a phenomenon that serves a wide range of functions (Kamwangamalu, 2010). This is confirmed by Das (2012) whose study shows that code-switching can be used as a strategy to fulfil certain objectives, among them to minimise differences between interlocutors, to signal language preference, to obviate difficulties by failure to find correct referential terms in one language, and to lower language barriers between speakers and the audience.

From the lessons observed, especially for Teachers A, C and D, it emerged that the teachers' code-switching plays the major pedagogical function of making the L2 learners understand. From the lessons taught by these three teachers, the following are some of the code-switching functions that featured prominently and which point to

the teachers' desire to enhance understanding among their learners of English: defining, explaining, emphasising, clarifying, exemplifying, seeking clarification, and checking understanding. These functions could also be linked to an attempt by the teachers to lower the language (English) barriers between the speakers (the teachers) and the audience (the learners of English) (Das, 2012).

From the interviews that I held with the four teachers, it came out that helping the second language learners to understand is the major reason for the teachers' code switches. This can be identified from the reasons for code-switching that were put forward by the teachers themselves, for example, explaining difficult concepts and words, and exemplifying (Teacher A), code-switching when learners do not understand (Teacher B), code-switching when learners have difficulties in understanding (Teacher C), and code-switching when explaining and illustrating concepts when learners have not understood (Teacher D).

In the focus group discussions that I held with the learners of English, the learners (Class A, C and D) also revealed that their teachers mainly code-switched to facilitate the learners' understanding, that is, to explain difficult words and register concepts when learners do not understand (Class A), to explain some statements (Class C), and when the learners do not understand what the teacher is saying, to explain in Shona (Class D). In the discussions with the learners from the three classes on their teachers' code-switching, the word 'explain' is common, pointing to the fact that the learners see the need to make them understand as the primary reason behind their teachers' code-switching.

Apart from the four teachers' code-switching to enhance learner understanding, the other pedagogic, pragmatic and expressive functions of the teachers' code-switches that appeared to be common (especially for Teachers A, C, and D) that emerged from the lesson observations, the interviews with the teacher and the focus group discussions with the learners of English include inviting participation, seeking confirmation, seeking acknowledgement, seeking emphasis, acknowledging/agreeing, commenting, eliciting, giving instructions, reprimanding, expressing disapproval and joking.

Some of the teacher code-switching functions that emerged in this study seem to fit into Ferguson's (2003) categorisation of code-switching for the curriculum (for example explanation, clarification, exemplification, emphasising, checking understanding), code-switching for management of classroom discourse (for example, reprimanding, expressing disapproval, eliciting learner responses, inviting participation), and code-switching for interpersonal relations (for example joking).

Similarly, the teacher code-switching functions that emerged in this study also seem to be closely related to Brice and Roseberry-McKibbin's (2001) suggestion that teachers could adopt strategies of code-switching that centre around vocabulary issues (such as defining and explaining as unearthed in this study), classroom organisation and management (such as giving instructions and reprimanding), for building relationships with the learners (such as joking), and for clarification of points.

Some of Baker's (2006) teacher code-switching categories, that is, emphasising, substituting words (defining using the L1 equivalence of a word), clarifying, as well as creating humour, were also identified in the current study. The L2 teachers' code-switching functions that came out in this study also roughly correspond with the teacher code-switching functions that were identified by Al-Nofaie (2010), namely eliciting language, checking comprehension, giving instructions, checking for sense, testing, and facilitating teacher-student relationships.

What emerged in this study regarding code-switching by teachers of English also seem to confirm what emerged in Yevudey's (2013) study, in which the researcher established that teachers in ESL classes in Ghana code-switched for explanations, acknowledgements, to call on learners to participate, as well as to repeat sentences (for emphasis) in the learners' L1, so as to enhance the learners' understanding.

Some of the teacher code-switching functions that were identified in the current study were also observed by Yataganbaba and Yildirim (2015), in their study of Turkish EFL Young Language Learner teachers' code-switching. The teacher code-switching functions which they identified correspond with those that I identified in the current study on two secondary schools in Zimbabwe. These include translation (from L2 to L1), giving instructions, explaining, clarifying, confirming, checking comprehension, and signalling humorous situations (joking).

Similarly, Bozorgian and Fallapour (2015) investigated the amount and purpose of L1 use in EFL classrooms by teachers and learners, and some of the teacher code-switching functions that came out of their study are more or less similar to those that came out of the current inquiry. They include translation, evaluation of students' contributions (commenting), giving instructions, eliciting students' contributions, making announcements (informing), repeating students' utterances (emphasising), signalling teacher false starts (or hesitations), as well as creating humour (joking).

What came out of the current study (especially from Teacher A who code-switched moderately, and Teacher C and Teacher D who code-switched frequently in the lessons that I observed) also confirms the results of Nyawaranda's (2000) study on the beliefs of two Zimbabwean secondary school ESL teachers on the role of Shona in English lessons. In Nyawaranda's study, one of the two teachers regarded English and Shona as playing a complementary role in the teaching of English, with Shona playing the pedagogical function of bridging the gap between the learners' L1 and the target language, repeating for effect, instilling a sense of confidence in the learners, explaining lexical items that may be non-existent in the target language, giving contextual cues, and accommodating learners' lack of proficiency in English. However, the central reason was to enhance understanding of concepts.

It could also be suggested that the four teachers who participated in the current study (notwithstanding the differing frequencies of their code switches), could also have been code-switching deliberately to show that, while they were teaching English, which is a second language to them and the majority of their learners, their preferred language is Shona. Shona is their L1 and the L1 of most of their learners. This is supported by Jenkins (2009), who observes that speakers who have more than one language available to them may code-switch as a matter of choice, as well as for other pragmatic and expressive reasons.

From the perspective of Myers-Scotton's Markedness Approach (cited in Kamwangamalu, 2010), it could also be suggested that the four teachers in the current study code-switched as an unmarked (expected) choice signalling solidarity and in-groupness identity between the teachers of English and their learners. This is in light

of the fact that the teachers shared Shona as their L1 with the majority of the learners, with English being an L2 for both the teachers and the learners.

However, the words '*sometimes*' (or '*at times*', '*once in a while*', '*not every time*', '*not always*' and '*not exactly*' for Teacher B) recurred when the teachers were asked whether they code-switched when teaching English and also when the learners of English were asked whether their teachers code-switched. This could mean all the four teachers who participated in the current study, irrespective of their differing degrees of code-switching, are aware of the possible negative impact of code-switching in the teaching of ESL.

One of the disadvantages of code-switching in the L2 classroom was alluded to by Teacher A, who, though acknowledging the usefulness of code-switching, pointed out that her class is made up of learners whose L1 is Shona and some whose L1 is Ndebele. The teachers' L1 is Shona. Thus, when the teacher code-switches, he switches to Shona, making the Shona speakers understand concepts better, however, at the expense of their Ndebele counterparts. This negative effect of code-switching is also acknowledged by Cook (2002), who observes that, in cases where classroom members do not share the same first language, code-switching may create problems for some learners who will feel excluded in the teaching and learning process because the teacher cannot relate to all the mother tongues of the learners in the classroom.

Another disadvantage of teacher code-switching in L2 teaching is given by Moduopela (2013) who argues that code-switching through repetition of instructions and ideas by the teacher may slow down the rate at which learners acquire the target language, an observation shared by Sert (2005), who avers that over-reliance on code-switching may make L2 learners listen only to the L1 repetition, ignoring the L2 utterance, thereby limiting the learners exposure to the L2.

5.1.2 Code-switching by Learners

During official exchanges between Teacher A and his learners (Class A), I observed that the learners code-switched moderately just like their teacher, perhaps because some of the learners' code-switching was initiated by their teacher. However, when interacting among themselves, Class A learners code-switched a lot. For Class B,

Class C and Class D, the learners code-switched minimally during formal exchanges with their teacher. However, among themselves, they code-switched a lot.

Findings from the lessons that I observed show that, in the instances where the learners code-switched, this was for purposes of explaining, emphasising, defining, exemplifying, showing understanding, disagreeing, informing, seeking clarification, acknowledging, and making a correction. These functions seem to point to an attempt by the learners of English to put across their meaning so as to be understood by their teachers and their classmates, and also to understand their teacher better.

In the interviews that I held with the four teachers of English, all of them confirmed that their learners code-switched when learning English, and that they did so when they faced difficulties in expressing themselves, when explaining vocabulary, during pair work and group work, and sometimes spontaneously. This again points to the need by learners to be understood by their teachers and also to understand each other.

In the focus group discussions that I held with the learners of English, they also revealed that they code-switched during English lessons, mainly when they cannot express themselves in English, to substitute unknown English words, to explain complicated words, and in group discussions. The main reason for doing that, as was also pointed out by their teachers, was to understand and be understood better.

The fact that the ESL learners at the two secondary schools under study code-switched primarily when facing difficulties seems to suggest that their interlanguage could be a contributing factor to the learners resorting to their L1. In the interlanguage continuum theory, the language learners' L2 system is somewhere between their L1 and the L2 (Brown, 1987). The L2 learners try to express themselves to their interlocutors (teachers of English in the current study) but have little proficiency in the TL (Duran, 1994). Thus, they code-switch, creating their own learner language varieties, which are systematic, variable and creative (Klein, 1986).

Furthermore, it might be suggested that, because the ESL learners at the two secondary schools code-switched to express themselves clearly implies that they resorted to code-switching as a communication strategy, a tactic *'used by the non-*

fluent learner during L2 interaction, in order to overcome specific communication problems' (Mitchell and Myles, 1998:94), so as to achieve mutual understanding between interlocutors (Dornyei and Scott, 1997). The function of such communication strategies is also viewed as a way to '*overcome breakdowns during oral communication*' (Ugla et al, 2013:131). A communication strategy employed to overcome breakdowns in communication, such as code-switching in the current study, is viewed by McDonough (1995) as an achievement strategy, a strategy that learners resort to so as to compensate for their lack of language competence. Most taxonomies of communication strategies seem to confirm that code-switching by learners can be viewed as a communication strategy (Faerch and Kasper, 1983; Tarone cited in Brown, 1987; Dornyei, 1995). Bialystok (1990) identifies problemacy (perceived problems that may interrupt communication in language learning or language production) as a common feature in the various definitions of communication strategies, and this is true of the definitions offered by Faerch and Kasper (1983), Poulisse (1990) Mitchell and Myles (1998), Ellis (2009), Hedge (2000), and Ugla et al. (2013).

However, although Bialystok (1990) identifies the other features of communication strategies as intentionality and consciousness, two of the four ESL teachers whom I interviewed in this study were of the opinion that their learners of English sometimes code-switched spontaneously or naturally, thus confirming Malmkjaer's (1991) observation that code-switching is a common phenomenon among bilinguals. According to Fromkin and Rodman (1998), this occurs when there are groups of bilinguals who speak the same two languages. In the current study, Shona and English are spoken by most learners. This spontaneous code-switching by the learners of English at the two secondary schools studied confirms Cook's (1993) observation that communication strategies may also be employed even in the absence of a communicative problem. This also confirms that code-switching has become a common feature of Zimbabwe's linguistic landscape, for example, in music (Mugari, 2014) in rural and urban settings (Veit-Wild, 2009), in literature (Veit-Wild, 2009; Nyota and Mapara, 2011), and in politics (Share and Machivenyika, 2014).

5.2 TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS ON LEARNERS' CODE-SWITCHING

In the interview that I held with Teacher A (urban boarding secondary school), the teacher expressed that he was sometimes tolerant of his learners' code-switching and gave the reason that he found the learners to be more comfortable expressing their views when they code-switched. He also observed that, not allowing Shona in his class of English would tantamount to doing a disservice to the learners or suppressing the students, thus making them fail to learn. The teacher revealed that, sometimes, he actually encourages the learners to code-switch to their L1 when they face difficulties in expressing themselves. Teacher A's view seems to agree with the findings of Storch and Aldosari's (2010) study on the use of the L1 in L2 teaching and learning. The researchers concluded that *'the use of the L1 by the learners seems to serve important cognitive, social and pedagogical functions.'*

Teacher A's perception of his learners' code-switching also seems to be informed by the Common Underlying Proficiency (CUP) model of L2 acquisition (Cummins cited in Baker, 2006) which holds that an L2 learners' skills that have been developed in the L1 would positively transfer to the L2 and aid acquisition of literary skills in the L2 (Talebi, 2014). This model holds that *'Conceptual knowledge developed in one language helps to make input in the other language comprehensible'* (Suliman, 2014:359). The L1 and the L2 are, thus, seen as existing side by side and complementing each other (Baker, 2006).

Teacher A's tolerance and encouragement of his learners' L1 also seems to be in support of Additive Bilingualism, which promotes the development of both the L1 and the L2 and encourages language users to be flexible in both languages, arguing that the second language and culture are not likely to replace or displace the L1 and culture (Baker, 2006). The L1 is not done away with as the language of instruction. Teacher A's positive perception of his learners' code-switching also confirms McMillan and Rivers' (2011) study, in which some native-English speaker teachers of EFL at a university in Japan were of the view that students should be allowed to use their L1 in the EFL classroom to facilitate learner-learner interaction and peer assistance, to cater for students' low L2 proficiency, to build rapport through humour, and as a needs analysis for the L2 learners.

However, Teacher A also revealed that he sometimes discouraged learners from code-switching when learning English because of examinations (which do not allow code-switching), and because of the Ministry of Education's English-only policy at secondary school level in Zimbabwe. The issue of policy also came out in Nyawaranda's (2000) study on L2 teachers' beliefs about the use of Shona in the teaching of English in Zimbabwe, in which study one of the participating teachers believed in the use of Shona. Nyawaranda concluded that this teacher's use of Shona in English lessons is in contradiction with Zimbabwe's language policy on instruction, which states that all instruction from the third grade of the primary school (before the policy was amended in 2006 to make English the compulsory medium of instruction from the first year of secondary education), except in the teaching of local languages should be in English. According to Nyawaranda (2000:39), thus the:

continued use of Shona in ESL instruction, let alone its use in the teaching of other subjects, shows the complexity of choosing what language to use in the classroom. This complexity demonstrates that language use in the classroom cannot be effectively legislated by language policy.

The issue of policy that was given as a reason why some teachers shun code-switching in L2 teaching, sometimes despite their beliefs in its usefulness, also came out in Simasku, Kasanda and Smit's (2015) study, in which some secondary school teachers in Namibia were hostile to code-switching, citing the country's language policy on instruction, and, in turn school rules, which insist on English exclusivity.

In the focus group discussion that I held with Class A learners, learners confirmed that their teacher was largely tolerant of their code-switching since he sometimes did not say anything when they code-switched. Sometimes he appreciated it, and sometimes he would translate the learners' Shona words into English. This would suggest that Teacher A recognises the important role that the learners' L1 can play in L2 learning as advocated by researchers such as Nyawaranda (2000), Cook (2001; 2002; 2012) Macaro (2000; 2001; 2005), Deller and Rivonluciri (2002), Choong (2006), Yevudey (2013), Yataganbaba and Yildirim (2015), and Bozorgian and Fallahpour (2015). However, they also pointed out that, sometimes, the teacher discouraged them from code-switching when explaining 'easy' words, showing that the teacher recognises the

negative impact of code-switching if it becomes unnecessarily habitual. Eldridge (1996), Macaro (2005), Siegel (2009), and Sampson (2011) also allude to some negative effects of the learners' L1 in L2 teaching and learning.

In the lessons that I observed when Teacher A was teaching, the teacher also showed his tolerance of learners' code-switching by repeating his learners' code-switched utterances for emphasis. The teacher asked the learner to repeat his or her code-switched answer so that the other learners could hear it clearly, by acknowledging the code-switched answer, or by actually asking the learner to code-switch his or her answer to Shona. Worth noting was that Teacher A never discouraged, nor did he ever reprimand his learners for code-switching, pointing to the teachers' recognition of the important role of the learners' L1 in ESL teaching and learning.

In the case of Teacher B, (School A), while she expressed the view that it is all right for learners of ESL to code-switch because they are socialised to speak in their L1, in which they express themselves freely, her overall stance seems to be that the learners should use English only in the English lessons. In the interview, Teacher B revealed that she encourages learners to speak in English rather than code-switch. This was confirmed by her learners, who revealed that when they code-switched, the teacher sometimes did not mind, but sometimes she assisted the learners to express themselves in English. The teacher sometimes provided the English words for the learners and encouraged the learners to read English novels (to facilitate mastery of the target language). Sometimes she ignored the learners' code-switched answers or questions, sometimes she encouraged the learners to use English only, sometimes she ordered them to use English only, sometimes she reminded them not to use Shona again, sometimes she scolded the learners, sometimes she rejected their code-switched answers, and at other times she punished the learners for code-switching. However, in the five lessons that I observed Teacher B teaching, she displayed an indifferent attitude in the few cases in which the learners code-switched during official interactions with the teacher.

Teacher B's stance, thus, seems to coincide with what Macaro (2001) calls the 'maximal' position on code-switching. The position is apparent where the teacher may

agree in principle that all teaching and learning should be in the target language, but, then, he or she begrudgingly concedes that, in reality, the L1 will be used.

By exhibiting a seemingly overall negative attitude towards her learners' use of their L1, Teacher B seems to subscribe to the Separate Underlying Proficiency (SUP) hypothesis of L2 acquisition (Cummins, cited in Baker, 2006), which sees a negative relationship between the L1 and the L2 and postulates that *'proficiency in L1 would be separate from proficiency in L2 and that language representations would be stored separately in an individual's operating system ... L1 would impede learning in L2 or delay its development'* (Talebi, 2014:215).

Teacher B's stance also seems to fit, to some extent, into the Subtractive Bilingualism model, which demotes the L1 (Baker, 2006), and in which learners are moved away from their L1. The second language and culture are acquired to replace or demote the L1 language and culture (Ndamba, 2013).

Seemingly in support of Teacher B's apparently negative view of the learners' use of their L1 in L2 learning is Eldridge (1996), who observes that code-switching by L2 learners may result in the acquisition of a hybrid L2 variety, and that the L2 learners will be severely linguistically deprived when communicating with target language monolinguals. Siegel (2009) also associates code-switching with the notion of negative transfer, in which the L1 is inappropriately used when using the L2. In addition, Sampson (2011) is of the view that if code-switching is allowed for all communicative functions in the classroom, learners may over-use it even when they have the resources to express themselves in the L2. Teacher B is also a believer, to a greater extent, of the notion of L2 exclusivity (Krashen and Terrell, 1983), a notion whose premise is that language learners acquire the L2 through the same natural way they learn their L1 (that is, by listening to it and speaking it).

In the interview that I held with Teacher C (rural day secondary school), although she expressed a partially negative view of her learners' code-switching by stating that sometimes she stops them from speaking in Shona, she acknowledged that this tends to make the learners quiet during English lessons. This observation is shared by Nguyen (2010) who suggests that if teachers are tolerant of their L2 learners' L1 use,

this could encourage their participation in the ESL classroom. Thus, the teacher's attitude to learners' L1 use should be positive so that learners are not humiliated when they use their L1 to aid the development of the L2.

From the focus group discussion that I held with Class C learners, however, it emerged that, like Teacher A of School A, Teacher C was largely tolerant of her L2 learners' use of their mother tongue, as the learners revealed that when they code-switched, sometimes the teacher did not mind, sometimes she simply said nothing about it, and sometimes she encouraged them to explain in Shona. However, at other times she also encouraged the learners to use the 'correct' language, which is English.

Teacher C's tolerance and acceptance of her learners' code-switching to Shona during English lessons was also confirmed during the five lessons that I observed, in which the teacher would sometimes repeat the learner's code-switched answers. Sometimes she would explain a learner's answer in Shona, and sometimes she would not say anything about a learner's code-switching.

In largely tolerating her learners' use of their L1, like Teacher A, Teacher C seems to be informed by the Additive Bilingualism which promotes the development of both the L1 and L2 and encourages the users' flexibility in both (Baker, 2006), The teacher also seems to be influenced by Cummins' Common Underlying Proficiency (CUP) model (Cummins cited in Baker, 2006), whose basic premise is that, when the child learns one language, he or she acquires skills and metalinguistic knowledge that can be depended on when working in another language. Thus, the model provides the foundation for the development of both the L1 and the L2. In other words, according to Suliman (2014:359), *'Conceptual knowledge developed in one language helps to make input in the other language comprehensible.'*

Also, Teacher C's apparent tolerance seems to point to her recognition of her learners' multi-competence, which is defined as the compound state of the mind with two grammars (Cook, 2002). Cook (2012) also states that multi-competence does not see the virtue of making the learners use the L2 only, since the concept of multi-competence means that the L1 is always present in the language users' minds. Hence it would be artificial and sometimes inefficient to avoid its use. In support of L2

teachers' positive attitude towards L2 learners' use of their L1 is Corder (1992), who argues that L2 learners possess a language system which is potentially available to aid L2 acquisition, and the learners know something about what language is for, as well as its communicative functions and potentials. Similarly, Harbord (1992:35) argues that allowing use of the L1 in the L2 classroom is a humanistic approach which allows learners to express themselves and to be themselves, thus rigidly *'eliminating or limiting the native language does not appear to guarantee better acquisition, nor does it foster the humanistic approach that recognises learners' identities as native speakers of a valuable language that is much a part of them as their names.'*

Regarding Teacher D's (rural day secondary school) perceptions on her learners' code-switching, findings from the interview that I held with her differed with results from the results obtained from the focus group discussion that I held with her learners, and from results obtained from the lessons that I observed when Teacher D was teaching. This may show that what a language teacher believes in and what she does in practice may differ.

In the interview, Teacher D expressed that she is intolerant of her learners' switching to their L1, giving the reason that if they avoid code-switching, they will learn English through oral practice, which they can convert into writing. With regard to code-switching by her learners, Teacher D, thus, seems to believe in Krashen's Input Hypothesis (Krashen, 1985), the Direct Method (Richards and Rodgers, 2007), and the Natural Approach (Krashen and Terrell, 1995), all of which advocate dispensing with the learners' L1 in L2 learning. Teacher D's view that her learners must be encouraged to use English also, to some extent, coincides with one of the basic tenets of Communicative Language Teaching, which is that, although judicious use of the learners' L1 is permitted, *'whenever possible, the target language should be used during communicative activities ... students ... realise that the target language is a vehicle for communication....'* (Larsen-Freeman, 2000:132).

However, from the focus group discussion that I held with Class D learners, it emerged that Teacher D's attitude towards her learners' code-switching is flexible; it ranges from tolerance, understanding, intolerance, to outright condemnation. Perhaps Teacher D's partial intolerance to her learners' use of their L1 could explain why there

was very little learner code-switching during official exchanges with their teacher in the five lessons that I observed when Teacher D was teaching.

However, Teacher D also displayed her tolerance and acceptance of her learners' code-switching during the five lessons that I observed. During the lessons, although there were very few instances of learner code-switching (during official classroom exchanges with the teacher) in some of those few cases, the teacher actually instigated learner code-switching by asking a question in Shona, or responding in Shona to a learner's code-switched question, or using a code-switched utterance to clarify a point to a learner who had asked for clarification through code-switching.

5.3 LEARNERS' PERCEPTIONS ON TEACHERS' CODE-SWITCHING

From the focus group discussions that I held with the learners of English at the two secondary schools, a common theme that emerged from the majority of the learners is that code-switching by teachers of ESL is good as it makes the learners understand what is being taught.

The learners seemed to be in agreement with their teachers, all of whom revealed, in the interviews that I held with them, (including Teacher C who in practice was found to be code-switching minimally) that they mainly code-switched to make learners understand when they are facing difficulties (Teacher A), when learners do not understand (Teacher B), to explain when learners are facing difficulties (Teacher C), and to explain and illustrate concepts which learners would not have understood (Teacher D).

The issue of teacher code-switching to make learners understand or comprehend what is being taught also seems to be common among the teacher code-switching functions suggested or suggested by many scholars and authors. These include dealing with vocabulary issues, clarification of points of understanding (Brice and Roseberry-McKibbin, 2001), repetition for clarity of meaning (Sert, 2005), code-switching for curriculum (Ferguson, 2003), to lower language barriers between speakers (teachers) and audience (learners), code-switching to emphasise a point (for clarity), to express a concept that has no equivalent in the culture of the other language, to clarify a point (Baker, 2006), and teacher code-switching for explaining and elaborating concepts

(Clegg and Afitska, 2011). Halbach (2012:33) also seems to allude to the importance of teacher code-switching to aid learner understanding by observing that the learning of new and complex material requires the L1 medium because:

As students move up into higher grades, and the contents that have to be taught become increasingly more complex, teachers find it more difficult to deal with the challenge ... the combination of new concepts to be learnt with a foreign medium to do so. Not knowing how to face this challenge, many students finally resort to students L1 for these more complex explanations.

Most studies that have been carried out on L2 teacher code-switching also seem to have identified learner understanding as a common teacher code-switching function. Examples are translation, asking L1 equivalence, explaining, clarifying, checking comprehension (Yataganbaba and Yildirim, 2015), translation, contrasting (L1 and L2) utterances, repeating students utterances (for emphasis and clarity) (Bozorgian and Fallahpour, 2015), teacher code-switching to convey and check comprehension of grammar and meanings (Choong, 2006), teacher code-switching for content transmission (explanation and parallel translation) (Canagarajah, 1995), teacher code-switching as a compensatory strategy to cater for low L2 proficiency among learners (Makulloluwa, 2013). Further examples that reflect code-switching to make learners comprehend include teacher code-switching to explain, to clarify, to make comparisons between the L1 and the L2 (Lasagabaster, 2013), teacher code-switching for complex definitions and instructions, for aiding vocabulary learning, for translating, for comparing the L1 and the L2 (McMillan and Rivers, 2011), teacher code-switching to explain questions and statements, to facilitate understanding and vocabulary acquisition through repetition of statements by translation (Yevudey, 2013), and teacher code-switching to repeat for effect, to explain lexical items, to give contextual cues and to accommodate learners' lack of proficiency in English (Nyawaranda, 2000).

Also on the need for teachers to use code-switching for learners understanding as revealed by the learners in the current study, Macaro (2005) observes that some (slow) learners get frustrated when they cannot understand the teacher's L2 input. The learners, therefore, are comfortable with the teacher's code-switching so as to

understand words and phrases. Macaro (2005:70) also alludes to the fact that even fast learners may also have a positive attitude to teacher code-switching since *'There is no evidence pointing in the direction of higher achieving learners (or fast learners) feeling more at ease with L2 exclusivity.'*

Furthermore, the learners' belief that their teachers of ESL should code-switch for the learners' understanding also confirms findings from the lessons that I observed, in which many of the teacher code-switching functions that I identified when the four teachers were teaching seemed to aim at making learners understand. These teacher code-switching functions include emphasising, explaining, checking understanding, exemplifying, clarifying, translating, and defining.

In the current study, the learners' positive perception of their teachers' code-switching seems to confirm Atkinson's (cited in Nyawaranda, 2000) argument that a teacher who ignores the students' L1 in the classroom is most likely to teach with less than maximum efficiency. In agreement is Macaro (2000) who argues that code-switching has no negative impact on the quantity of learners' L2 production, but may actually increase and improve it if expertly done. L2 teachers who do not code-switch also deny their learners translation which is an important learning task. The teachers also deny their learners pre-learning activities which trigger appropriate combinations of listening strategies, as well as certain classroom activities that are useful (Macaro, 2005).

The other reasons that were given by the learners for their favourable perception on their teachers' code-switching in the current study were that it breaks monotony and makes jokes interesting (Class A and Class C), accommodates all students (Class D), and that teacher code-switching can occur spontaneously so the teacher should not be blamed for it (Class C).

The teacher code-switching function of joking that was advocated by some of the learners in my current study seems to be common among code-switching functions that have been proposed or identified by many scholars and researchers. For instance scholars identified teacher code-switching for building relations with learners (Brice and Roseberry-McKibbin (2001), teacher code-switching for affective functions

(building solidarity and intimate relations with learners, thereby creating a supportive language environment in the classroom) (Sert, 2005), teacher code-switching to make a friendly environment and reduce students' anxiety (Bozorgian and Fallahpour (2015), teacher code-switching to create an effective classroom environment (Makulloluwa, 2013), teacher code-switching for building rapport with students and for creation of humour (McMillan and Rivers, 2011), teacher code-switching for establishing good relationships in the classroom (Cliff and Afitska, 2011), teacher code-switching for facilitating teacher-student relationships (Al-Nofaie, 2010), and code-switching for interpersonal relations (Ferguson, 2003).

In the interviews that I held with the four teachers who participated in this study, the teacher code-switching function of cracking jokes also came out (Teacher A and Teacher C). In the lessons that I observed, Teacher A, Teacher C and Teacher D also had instances in which they code-switched to create humour and this had the impact of making learners happy, thereby creating a friendly and favourable L2 learning environment.

It also emerged from the learners' responses that teacher code-switching is good because it accommodates all learners in the learning process (assuming the learners share the same L1). This is supported by Alenezi (2010) who observes that the teacher's code-switching can build learners' confidence and invite participation. This also confirms Simasiku's (2014), which established that secondary school ESL teachers in Namibia believed that their code-switching had a positive effect on learner participation and made the learners enthusiastic and happy. In a related study, Simasiku, Kasanda and Smit (2015) found out that ESL secondary school teachers in the Caprivi Education Region of Namibia believed that code-switching had the effect of keeping learners actively involved in the lessons and that it stimulated learner participation.

It also emerged from the study that the some of the learners of English were tolerant of their teachers code-switching because code-switching can occur spontaneously. This is confirmed by Ferguson (cited in Baker, 2006:295), who states that teacher code-switching:

seems to arise naturally, perhaps inevitably, as a pragmatic response to the difficulties of teaching content in a language medium over which pupils have no control ... much switching takes place below the level of consciousness. Teachers are often simply not aware of when they switch languages, or indeed if they switch at all.

Sert (2005) also observes that the use of code-switching by teachers is not always done consciously.

The fact that the majority of the learners in my study viewed their teachers' code-switching in a positive light suggests that the learners preferred that the teachers should use bilingual approaches and methods of L2 teaching such as the Grammar-Translation which relies on translation (Nhan and Lai, 2012), Communicative Language Teaching which allows judicious use of the learners' L1 (Larsen-Freeman, 2000), Dodson's Bilingual Method in which the teacher gives meanings of target language sentences in the L1, (Dodson, 1967), the New Concurrent Method in which the teacher switches from one language to the other at key points (Jacobson, 1990), and Community Language Teaching in which the teacher translates students' L1 utterances into the L2 (Curran, 1976). The implication is that the majority of the learners of English from the two secondary schools, thus, seemed to prefer teachers who use cross-lingual teaching techniques in which the learners receive input in the L2, but the L1 is also used to clarify meaning, thereby helping the learners and satisfying their needs. The assumption is that the learner will develop the L2 in relation to the L1 (compound bilingualism) (Madrid and Sanchez, 2001).

However, in the focus group discussions, some of the learners of English – though they were in the minority – revealed an unfavourable perception of their teachers' code-switching. The reasons that came from Class A learners (urban boarding secondary school) for being against their teacher's code-switching were that the teacher might pass on the habit of code-switching to the learners, that code-switching by the teacher (negatively) affects their English, yet the examination will be written in English only. Thus, the learners felt that English should be taught in English only.

Those learners from Class B (urban boarding secondary school) who were against code-switching by their teacher argued that the teacher should lead by example (through using English only) and desist from following the 'wrong path' (code-switching). Class C learners (rural day secondary school) who would rather their teacher of English not code-switch argued that the teacher's code-switching was not good because it disadvantaged those whose L1 was not Shona. The other reason that was given was that the teacher should lead by example and act as a model the learners should learn English from.

From Class D (rural day secondary school), the learners who were averse to the teacher's code-switching gave the reason that it affected their (learners') grasp of English negatively, a view which also came from Class A. The other reason that was given was that learners should learn English from their teacher, a view which also came from Class B and Class C.

The learners' view that the teachers' code-switching would have a negative effect on their learning of English seems to be confirmed by Modupeola (2013) who says teacher code-switching by repetition may slow down the rate of target language learning. Similarly, Sert (2005) asserts that over-reliance on code-switching by L2 teachers may limit learners' exposure to the target language.

The learners who felt that the teachers' code-switching negatively affected their grasp of English could also be understood in relation to what some scholars and authors refer to as negative transfer, in which the learners' L1 is seen as interfering with the learning of the L2 (Odlin, 1993; Brown, 2000; Pavlenko, 20011; Dulay and Burt cited in Maniam, 2010). Siegel (2009) actually points out that code-switching may be associated with the notion of negative transfer.

That some of the learners were against the teachers' code-switching because they wanted their teachers of English to lead by example or to act as models from whom they should learn English, appears to confirm one of the findings of Nyawaranda's (2000) study, in which one of the teachers who participated in the study desisted from using the learners' L1 (Shona) when teaching English, seemingly because she considered herself as a good model for her learners of English. This suggested that

she was afraid that the learners might develop a negative attitude towards English if Shona was used, and that the students might be deprived of the opportunity to practice English for examination purposes. The issue of English examinations, which are written in English only in Zimbabwe, also came out as one of the reasons why some of the learners in the current study (Class A) had a negative perception of the teacher's code-switching.

Another reason that was given for some of the learners' negative perceptions on teachers' code-switching was the fear that the teacher might pass on the habit to learners (Class A). This is confirmed by Sampson (2011) who argues that if learners feel that code-switching is allowed for all functions in the classroom, they may over-use code-switching even when they have the proper linguistic resources to express themselves in the target language.

Apart from the above reason, it was also pointed out that the teacher's code-switching tended to disadvantage those learners whose L1 was not Shona. This was also revealed by Teacher A in the interview, in which he observed that, after explaining in Shona, the students whose L1 is Shona tended to understand better, at the expense of their Ndebele classmates. This observation is also shared by Cook (2002) who explains that, in instances where classroom members do not share the mother tongue, code-switching makes some learners feel left out of the learning process since the teacher cannot speak the first languages of all the learners in the classroom.

In a study related to the current study, Simasiku (2014) established that some ESL teachers in secondary schools, in Namibia, felt that their students were sad when their teachers code-switched, because the learners expected the lessons to be conducted in English, but were disappointed when code-switching was used. In another study, Simasiku, Kasanda and Smit (2015) found out that the majority of ESL secondary school learners in the Caprivi Education Region of Namibia preferred that their teachers use English only because they believed English is the medium through which they should learn English and that it is also the medium of instruction. Another reason was that the teacher should use English only so that everyone can understand since the learners had different mother tongues, and because English is compulsory and

perceived to be beneficial, and also because it is a school policy to use English only. This serves to show the high status that is accorded to English in Namibia.

The same situation also obtains in Zimbabwe, thus this could also explain why some learners in the current study preferred that the teachers use English only. The high status that is given to English in Zimbabwe, according to Chiwome (1996:7), dates back to the colonial era, when:

The English Language was prestigious ... It was the medium of instruction. For that reason it came to be viewed as the gateway to success. Its literature was viewed as world literature ... Candidates aspired towards passing English, the language without which the Cambridge School Certificate would not be valid.

Even after Zimbabwe gained her political independence from Britain in 1980, English continued to enjoy its high status across many facets of life. Nyawaranda (1998:48) states that:

English is a very important subject on the school curriculum. Because of its high status as an official language, because of its perceived international status, and because it is a compulsory subject at 'O' Level, English receives a disproportionate amount of attention in the secondary school curriculum; in fact, it takes the lion's share of the time allocated to subjects on the school's time table. Even outside the school life, English is still highly regarded in the wider community.

In the current study, the learners who were of the view that English should be taught in English only seemed to be advocating that their teachers of English use the monolingual approach to L2 teaching. This argument promotes the English-only paradigm, which views the L1 as interfering with L2 acquisition. These learners who were against code-switching by their teachers, thus, appeared to prefer to be taught English through approaches and methods such as the Natural Approach which focuses on comprehensible input in the target language (Richards and Rodgers, 2007). This is an approach in which *'The classroom is the source of input for the*

language students, a place where they can obtain the comprehensible input necessary for language acquisition ...' (Krashen and Terrell, 1995:59).

A related method is the Direct Method, in which classroom instruction is given in the target language only, with total exclusion of the learners' L1 (Richards and Rodgers, 2007). These monolingual approaches and methods are associated with what Madrid and Sanchez (2001) refer to as intralingual techniques, which are mostly within the target language, and the target language is used as the exclusive frame of reference (coordinate bilingualism).

Such approaches, methods and techniques seem to be in keeping with the Acculturation Model of L2 acquisition, which posits that SLA is influenced by acculturation, *'the social and psychological integration of the learner with the target language (TL) group'* (Schumann, 1978:29). Schumann argues that the extent to which the L2 learner acculturates to the TL group determines the degree to which the learner acquires the second language. Acculturation *'brings the learner into contact with TL-speakers and verbal interaction with those speakers brings about the negotiation of appropriate input which then operates as the immediate cause of language acquisition'* (Schumann, 1986:385).

5.4 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CODE-SWITCHING AND NEW ENGLISHES; TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS ON THE TEACHING OF THE LOCAL ENGLISH VARIETY

All four teachers of English at the two secondary schools who participated in the present study felt that there is a relationship between New Englishes and code-switching. They observed that the New Englishes are a result of the contact between English and local languages. This observation is shared by Adedimeji (2007) who acknowledges that English has become a global language that is susceptible to the subtleties and idiosyncracies of regional linguistic behaviours. For Lee (2012:191), *'The relentless expansion of the language (English) in diverse sociolinguistic contexts has also brought about the development of new recognised forms and norms of English in local contexts.'* Alimi (2011) also alludes to the fact that New Englishes emerge as a result of the contact between English and local languages when the author observes that Botswana English (BE) has features which show its co-existence

with Setswana, notably Setswana words and/or translations. Kirkpatrick (2007:5) also confirms that New Englishes are influenced by local languages when the author defines local varieties or nativised varieties as *'newer varieties that have developed in places where English was not normally spoken and which have been influenced by local languages and culture.'*

The four teachers' perception of the existence of a relationship between code-switching and New Englishes is shared by Kamwangamalu and Moyo (2003) who observe that Lesotho, Malawi, Swaziland (LMS) Englishes are made up of borrowed cultural vocabulary from local languages. Similarly, Jenkins (2009:95) seems to discern a relationship between code-switching and New Englishes by stating that because *'almost all Asian-English speakers are bi- or multilingual and make extensive use of CS (code-switching), it seems logical to include this phenomenon in grammars and dictionaries of Asian English.'* Norrish (1997) also perceives a relationship between code-switching and local English varieties both of which the author describes as features of multilingual societies.

When asked about their perceptions on the teaching of the local variety of English, Teacher A (School A) and Teacher D (School B) revealed that they believed that there was nothing wrong in teaching the local variety of English as long as it makes sense as learners will understand better (Teacher A and Teacher D), and because the local code-switched English variety is a reflection of what is happening in the wider Zimbabwean society (Teacher D). These two teachers' belief that the local English variety should be taught in the schools could explain why both of them code-switched (moderately for Teacher A and frequently for Teacher D) in the English lessons that I observed. This was confirmed by the teachers themselves, as well as by their learners.

Teacher A and Teacher D's perception that the local variety of English could be taught as long as it makes sense coincides with Jindapitak and Teo's (2013) argument that it is a myth to expect pure English when English is spoken by non-native speakers in non-native contexts. This is supported by Kadenge (2009:158) who contends that African Englishes which were once stigmatised as non-standard have now gained prestige, and that such varieties are *'a distinct, systematic, endo-normative variety of*

English, which cannot be judged by the norms of the older varieties such as British English or American English.'

Furthermore, Teacher A and Teacher D's belief that there is nothing wrong in teaching the local English variety is also in tandem with Matsuda and Matsuda's (2010) argument that because English in expanding circle situations (Kachru, 1992) has a multiple of international and intranational uses, the traditional model of setting a single target English variety has become problematic. Instead, consideration for intelligibility (word or utterance recognition) and comprehensibility (word or utterance understanding) as goals of English instruction no longer appears to be farfetched.

In support of this notion, is Groves (2010) who calls for a flexible attitude to new English varieties in the classroom. Lowenberg (cited in Groves, 2010) also proposes that differences between 'standard' English and local varieties should be taken into account when testing learners. Also in support of teaching local varieties of English is Alimi (2011) who proposes the inclusion of Botswana English (BE) and other New Englishes in vocabulary teaching in schools in Botswana and other 'Outer Circle' countries.

Sharing the same view is Kirkpatrick (2007) who feels that it would be advantageous to 'Outer Circle' countries (such as Zimbabwe) if they choose an endonormative or nativised (local) model of English to be taught in schools. Kirkpatrick argues that local teachers would be advantaged in choosing the local model since they speak that language. Thus, their self-confidence and self-esteem would be boosted. In addition, the teachers' multi-competence would be recognised and exploited in the classroom. If 'Outer Circle' countries choose the exonormative or native speaker model of English, the value and legitimacy of the non-native local teacher's own model would be undermined and the non-native speakers would be required to teach a language variety which they do not speak, thereby reducing their self-confidence.

The two teachers who argued for the teaching of the local variety of English in the present study seem to confirm the findings of Prashanti and Bhavani's (2016) study on secondary school teachers' perspectives on the teaching of pronunciation, accents and local varieties of English in India. The researchers found out that the teachers were of the view that, although both native-speaker (NS) and the Indian model of

English are important varieties, the teachers seemed to prioritise native speaker norms and the majority of the teachers wanted to retain their L1 identity instead of speaking like native speakers of English.

In a related study, Tweedie (2013) established that, though non-native English speaking teachers of English in Singapore were against the teaching of Singlish (local variety of English in Singapore), their native speaker counterparts saw Singlish as a valid variety of English in Singapore. In the present study, I got insights from the two teachers into the possibility of accepting the Zimbabwean variety in the schools. Similarly, Tweedie got some insights from language teachers into the possibility of accepting Singlish not as a hindrance to developing proficiency in 'standard' English, but as a potentially useful tool for making learners achieve 'standard' English proficiency. In relation to this, Matsuda and Matsuda (2010:372) argue that *'To overlook alternative (local variety) uses of English can actually work against the goal of helping students develop an accurate understanding of how the English Language works and how it changes over time.'*

However, the other two secondary school teachers of English who participated in the present study, Teacher B (School A) and Teacher C (School B), expressed a negative perception of the teaching of the local variety of English. The reasons that were put forward were that teaching the standard variety would make the learners of English develop the ability to proficiently converse internationally (Teacher B), and that the Zimbabwe School Examination Council English examinations do not allow for the local variety of English (Teacher B and Teacher C).

Teacher B's negative view of teaching the local English variety could explain why she code-switched minimally as was evident in the lesson that I observed. This was confirmed by her learners, that she rarely code-switched, although she herself described her own code-switching as *'at times.'* As for Teacher C who code-switched frequently during the lessons that I observed which, was confirmed by her learners and herself, her stance against the teaching of the local variety of English is contradictory. This seems to imply that the teacher sees code-switching as a means to an end ('standard' English proficiency), not an end in itself (teaching the local English variety as a recognised variety with its own value). This is supported by

Tweedie (2013) who intimates that local English varieties like Singlish in Singapore may be accepted not as a barrier to Standard English, but as a potentially helpful tool towards learners' Standard English proficiency.

Also worth noting is that Teacher B and Teacher C's belief that teachers should not teach the standard variety of English only because the English examinations in Zimbabwe do not tolerate local variety features such as code-switching, seems to confirm Norrish's (1997) observation that the devaluation of local English varieties is strengthened by both local and international examination boards that set up specific (standard) models of phonology and syntax. This issue of examinations which do not accommodate the local variety of English is also one of the reasons why some learners in the current study (Class A) gave against their teacher's code-switching.

The other reason that was given for the teaching of the standard variety only in the current study (Teacher B) was that the standard variety enables learners to develop the ability to communicate proficiently at international level. Such a sentiment also emerged in Young and Walsh's (2010) study on the beliefs of 'non-native English speaking' teachers from Europe, Africa and Asia about the usefulness and appropriateness of teaching English varieties such as English as an International Language (EIL) and Lingua Franca (ELF). The study established that the majority of the teachers who participated in the inquiry advocated for the Standard English variety, purportedly to address learners' needs and expectations, such as the needs of the learners who would in future go to the USA, Canada, UK, New Zealand and Australia for higher education and employment. In a related study by Tweedie (2013), 'non-native speaking' teachers of English, in Singapore, also showed a negative perception of the local English variety called Singlish. In support of the teaching of the dominant or 'standard' English varieties also are Matsuda and Matsuda (2010:372) who argue that:

as long as the dominant varieties prevail in public perception and teaching material ... language teachers have the obligation to make those discursive resources available to students so students can appropriate them for their own purposes ... To not make the dominant codes available to students who

seek them would be doing disservice to students, leading to their economic and social marginalisation.

5.5 SUMMARY

This chapter interpreted and discussed the findings of the current inquiry into the impact of code-switching on the teaching and learning of ESL at two secondary schools in Zimbabwe. Firstly, I discussed the findings that addressed the research question on the extent and functions of the teachers' and learners' code-switching. The discussion then focused on the four teachers' perceptions on their learners' code-switching, followed by the learners' perceptions on their teachers' code-switching. The last segment of the discussion focused on the four teachers' perceptions on the relationship between code-switching and New Englishes, as well as their perceptions on the possibility of teaching the local variety of English. In the discussion, findings from the three data collection tools of lesson, namely observations, interviews and focus group discussions, were triangulated in keeping with the dictates of the qualitative research paradigm. The findings were also discussed in relation to relevant aspects of the theoretical framework such as bilingualism, interlanguage, communication strategies, code-switching, L2 teaching approaches and methods, as well as the notion of New Englishes. Where necessary, the discussion also linked the results to related studies that were carried out by others on the various aspects that the current study was concerned about.

CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6. INTRODUCTION

This final chapter of the study summarises the study, makes conclusions and offers recommendations to language policy planners, to the Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education, to ESL teachers, as well as to examination boards such as the Zimbabwe School Examinations Council (ZIMSEC). A recommendation is also made for further research.

6.1 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The overall purpose of the study was to investigate secondary school teachers' and learners' beliefs about the use of code-switching or use of the learners' L1 in the teaching and learning of ESL in secondary schools in Zimbabwe, using two secondary schools in Masvingo District as a case study. This was against the observation that teachers' beliefs have a bearing on what transpires in the classroom (Gardner and Miller, 1999; Altan, 2006; Brown, 2009; Agudo, 2014). Learner beliefs too are viewed as having an influence on how the learners attempt to learn a language (Richards and Lockhart, 1995; Dornyei, 2005).

Four research questions guided the inquiry. The first one focused on the extent to which the ESL teachers and learners who took part in the study code-switched when teaching and learning English. The question also focused on identifying the possible functions of the teachers' and the learners' code-switching. The second research question solicited for information on the ESL teachers' perceptions on their learners' code-switching, while the third research question sought to establish the learners' perceptions on their teachers' code-switching. The fourth research question sought to address two aspects of the study, namely the teachers' perceptions on the relationship between code-switching and New Englishes, as well as the teachers' perceptions on the teaching of the local variety of English.

The study was informed by bilingualism, models of bilingualism and related concepts such as theories of Second Language Acquisition (SLA), Communication Strategies, code-switching, and New Englishes. Data were collected through observations of twenty ESL lessons in four classes, interviews with four teachers of English, as well

as focus group discussions with a sample of four groups of learners from the four classes.

One of the major findings of the study is that all four teachers who participated in the inquiry code-switched when teaching English. This emerged from the lesson observations and was confirmed by the teachers themselves as well as by their learners. What differed was the extent to which they code-switched. The teachers code-switched for a multiplicity of pedagogical and other communicative functions such as explaining, emphasising, clarifying, seeking clarification, exemplifying, seeking confirmation, acknowledging/agreeing, defining, inviting participation, commenting, giving instructions, eliciting, joking, commanding, enquiring, informing, announcing, reprimanding, expressing disapproval, seeking acknowledgement and other functions. However, the main reason for the teachers' code-switching appeared to be to enhance learners' understanding and understanding between the teachers and the learners. The teacher code-switching functions that were revealed in the present study seem to fit into the categories identified and/or suggested by authors such as Nyawaranda (2000), Brice and Roseberry-McKibbin (2001) Ferguson (2003), Kamangwamalu (2010), Al-Nofaie (2010), Das (2012), Yevudey (2013), Yataganbaba and Yildirim (2015), as well as Bozorgian and Fallapour (2015).

However, the teachers also expressed an awareness of the possible negative impact of code-switching in L2 teaching and this is also noted by scholars such as Sert (2005), Cook (2002), as well as Moduopela (2013).

The study also found out that the ESL learners who participated in the investigation used code-switching as a communication strategy. This was confirmed by the learners themselves, as well as by their teachers. The learners revealed that the main reason for their code-switching was to understand each other better and be understood by their teachers. It emerged, however, that the learners generally code-switched minimally during formal classroom exchanges with their teachers but they code-switched frequently when interacting amongst themselves. Such learner code-switching that is primarily meant to compensate for lack of target language competence or to avoid communication breakdowns is confirmed by scholars such as

McDonough (1995), Dornyei and Scott (1997), Mitchell and Myles (1998), as well as Ugla (2013).

From the lesson observations, interviews with the four teachers and the focus group discussions held with the ESL learners, it emerged that the teachers were largely tolerant of their learners' code-switching as it fostered learner understanding and made expression of ideas and thoughts easier. This suggests that the teachers viewed the learners' L1 as playing a positive role in L2 learning. This is espoused in the theory of Additive Bilingualism (Baker, 2006), and the Common Underlying Proficiency (CUP) model (Cummins, cited in Baker, 2006). Scholars such as Macaro (2005), Nguyen (2010), (Cook, 2012), Deller and Rivonluciri (2002), and Choong (2006) also believe that learners L1 has a positive impact on L2 learners.

However, some reservations were also expressed by the teachers about their learners' code-switching, thereby confirming the views and/or findings of authors such as Eldridge (1996), Sert (2005), Siegel (2009), Sampson (2011), and Simasiku, Kasanda and Smit (2015).

What also emerged from the study is that the ESL learners had a largely positive perception of their teachers' code-switching as a tool that facilitates understanding. This useful function is alluded to by Brice and Roseberry-McKibbin (2001), Ferguson (2003), Sert (2005), Baker (2006), Clegg and Afitska (2011), and Moduopela (2013).

On the other hand, some of the learners, though being a minority, expressed an unfavourable perception of their teachers' code-switching and this is supported by scholars such as Sert (2005), Sampson (2011), Moduopela (2013), and Simasiku (2014).

The inquiry also revealed that all four teachers of English who participated in the study viewed code-switching as being related to the notion of New Englishes and this is confirmed by Norrish (1997), Kamwangamalu and Moyo (2003), Adedimeji (2007), Kirkpatrick (2007), Jenkins (2009), Alimi (2011), and Lee (2012).

Finally, the study established that two of the four teachers of English were agreeable to the teaching of the local variety of English, thereby echoing the views and/or findings of such authors as Kirkpatrick (2007), Kadenge (2009), Groves (2010), Matsuda and Matsuda (2010), Alimi (2011), Jindapitak and Teo (2013), Tweedie (2013), as well as Prashanti and Bhavani (2016).

However, the other two teachers expressed their preference for the teaching of the 'standard' variety of English, thus, confirming studies by Matsuda and Matsuda (2010), Young and Walsh (2010), and Tweedie (2013).

From the findings of the study, it can, thus, be concluded that code-switching by ESL teachers and learners is very much alive in secondary schools in Zimbabwe and that both teachers and learners find it to be a useful L2 teaching and learning tool. However, they are also aware of the possible negative impact of the phenomenon in the L2 classroom.

It can also be concluded that teachers are aware of the relationship between code-switching and New Englishes, and that these New Englishes are legitimate varieties that can be taught in schools. However, the 'standard' variety is still the dominant variety that is enjoying a higher status, and, therefore, some teachers prefer that the variety continue to be taught.

6.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the findings of the study and the conclusions reached in the preceding section, therefore, recommendations to language policy planners, the Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education, ESL teachers, as well as to the national examination board, are made. Recommendation is also made for further research.

To language policy planners in Zimbabwe and other 'Outer Circle' countries, I recommend that the English-only policy in secondary education be revised, as code-switching evidently plays an important pedagogic function teaching not only ESL, but apparently other subjects. This is supported by Nyawaranda (2000:39), who posits that the:

continued use of Shona in ESL instruction, let alone its use in the teaching of other subjects, shows the complexity of choosing what language to use in the classroom. This complexity demonstrates that language use in the classroom cannot be effectively legislated by language policy.

There might also be need for a paradigm shift on the part of language policy planners in Outer Circle countries such as Zimbabwe from the current exo-normative model to the endo-normative or nativised model, which would be advantageous not only to teachers by legitimising the teachers' own model thereby boosting the ESL teachers' self-confidence and self-esteem (Kirkpatrick, 2007), but also learners who may easily identify with this model and, thus, find it easier to master.

To the Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education, I recommend that workshops be convened for ESL teachers so that they are sensitised not only to the important role that code-switching may play in ESL teaching and learning, but also to how best this teaching and learning tool may be contextually employed without compromising the learners' mastery of the target language.

To ESL teachers, I recommend that they should desist from being servants of either monolingual or bilingual teaching approaches and methods of L2 teaching, but that they should be guided by Kumaravadivelu's (2006) Postmethod pedagogy in which the teacher's decision whether to code-switch or not, when to code-switch and how frequently to code-switch may be premised on principles of particularity (sensitivity to context), practicality (teacher-generated theory of practice), and possibility (a critical reflection of prevailing social and historical conditions). In short, Kumaravadivelu argues for what works in the classroom and I am inclined to agree with him. In support of this is Larsen-Freeman (2000) who rejects absolutism or the belief that a single specific method is the best, and thus advocates for relativism or pluralism. The author avers that *'rather than adopting or rejecting methods in their entirety as being suitable for a particular context, different methods or parts of methods, should be practised in the same teaching context'* (Larsen-Freeman, 2000:1820).

It would be prudent for ESL teachers to decide whether or not to code-switch, when and how frequently, by taking into cognisance what Prabhu (1990) calls a sense of

plausibility. This is a sense of the teacher's subjective understanding or personal conceptualisation of teaching carried out in the classroom and its envisaged effect. It is a kind of pedagogical intuition that emanates from a teacher's experience as a learner, teacher exposure to teaching methods, what the teacher knows or thinks about other teachers' actions or opinions, and the teacher's experience as a parent or caretaker. In support, Tribble (1997) calls for teacher independence, avoidance of fixed ideas, and promotion of fashionable formulas, exploration of principles and experimenting with teaching techniques in the classroom (of which code-switching may be one such technique).

To examination boards of 'Outer Circle' countries such as the Zimbabwe School Examinations Council, I recommend, without advocating for acceptance or condoning of errors, that the examination boards be sensitive to aspects of local English varieties rather than prescribe exo-normative or native speaker models, which both ESL teachers and learners would find difficult or impossible to achieve. It is my submission that the goal of L2 instruction should be communicative competence, not necessarily native-speaker proficiency. This is supported by Brown (1987), Richards and Rodgers (2007), Hoff (2013), and Ohmaye (1998).

Finally, although this study has apparently gained useful insights into the use of code-switching in ESL teaching and learning in secondary schools in Zimbabwe, and contributed to the body of knowledge on L2 pedagogy, there might be need for further research into what is obtaining at other types of secondary school such as mission boarding schools and private schools.

REFERENCES

Adedimeji, M.A. 2007. 'The linguistic features of Nigerian English and their implications for 21st Century English pedagogy.' Paper presented at the 24th Annual Conference of the Nigerian English Studies Association (NESA) themed 'English in the Nigerian Environment: Emerging Patterns and New Challenges (UYONESA 2007), University of Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, 18-21 September 2007, pp. 1-20

Adendorff, 1996. The functions of code switching among high school teachers and students in KwaZulu and implications for teacher education. In K.M. Bailey & D. Nunan (eds.) *Voices from the language classroom: Qualitative research in second language education*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 300-406.

Agudo, J.D. 2014. 'Analysing Spanish learners' beliefs about EFL learning.' *Porta Linguarum*, vol. 22, pp. 285-301.

Aitchison, J. 1987. *Words in the mind: An introduction to the mental lexicon*: Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Alenezi, A.A. 2010. 'Students' language attitude towards using code-switching as a medium of instruction in the College of Health Sciences: An exploratory study.' *ARECLS*, vol. 7, pp. 1-22.

Alimi, M.M. 2011. 'Incorporating lexical features of New Englishes in vocabulary instruction.' *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 118-150.

Al-Nofaie, H. 2010. 'The attitudes of teachers and students towards using Arabic in EFL classrooms in Saudi public schools: A case study.' *Novistas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 64-95.

Altan, M.Z. 2006. 'Beliefs about language learning of foreign language-major university students.' *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, vol. 31, no.2, pp. 45-52.

Altenaichinger, A. 2003. Theories of second language acquisition. In *Second language acquisition: The interface between theory and practice*. Summary of findings of a project-based linguistic seminar. Department of English Studies, University of Graz, Austria, pp. 404-412.

Aslam, M. 2009. *Teaching of English*. Delhi: Foundation Books.

Ayeomoni, M.O. 2006, 'Code-switching and code-mixing: style of language use in childhood in Yoruba speech community.' *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 90-99.

Baker, C. 2006. *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Baldauf, R.B. 1993. 'Fostering bilingualism and national development through school second language study.' *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, vol. 14, nos. 1-2, pp. 121-134.

Benson, E. 2001. 'The neglected value of codeswitching research in the United States.' *Language and Communication*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 23-36.

Best, J.W. & Khan, J.V. 2014. *Research in education*. Essex: Pearson Education.

Bhatia, T.K & Ritchie, W.C. 2006. *The handbook of bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Bialystok, E. 1990. *Communication strategies: A psychological analysis of second language usage*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Bialystok, E. 2001. *Bilingualism in development: Language, literacy, and cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Borg, M. 2001, 'Teachers' beliefs.' *English Language Teaching Journal*, vol. 55, no. 2, pp. 186-188.

Bozorgian, H. & Fallapour, S. 2015. 'Teachers' and students' amount and purpose of L1 use: English as a foreign language (EFL) classrooms in Iran.' *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 67-81.

Brice, A. & Roseberry-McKibbin, C. 2001. 'Choice of languages in instruction.' *Teaching Exceptional Children*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 10-16.

Brown, A. 2009. 'Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective foreign language teaching: A comparison of ideas.' *The Modern Language Journal*, vol. 1, pp. 46-60.

Brown, H.D. 1987. *Principles of language learning and teaching*. Oxford: English Language Book Society with Oxford University Press.

Brown, H.D. 2000. *Principles of language learning and teaching*. Harlow: Pearson ESL.

Butler, Y.G & Hakuta, K. 2006. Bilingualism and Second Language Acquisition. In T.K. Bhatia & W.C. Ritchie (eds.) *The handbook of bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Byram, M. 1993. Questions of identity in foreign language learning. In J. Lo Bianco, A.J. Liddicoat & C. Crozet (eds.) *Striving for the third place: Intercultural competence through language education*. Melbourne: Language Australia, pp. 91-100.

Canagarajah, A.S. 1995. 'Functions of code-switching in the ESL classrooms: Socialising bilingualism in Jaffna.' *Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 173-195.

Canale, S. & Swain, M. 1980. 'Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language testing and teaching.' *Applied Linguistics*, vol. 1, pp. 89-112.

Castro, D.C., Ayankoya, B. & Kasprzak, C. 2011. *The new voices/ Nuevas voces: Guide to cultural and linguistic diversity in early childhood*. Baltimore: Brooks.

Chamot, A.U. & Stewner-Manzanares, G. 1985. *A summary of current literature: English as a Second Language. Part C agenda*. Rosslyn: Inter-America Research Associates.

Chaves, O. & Hernandez, F. 2013. 'EFL teaching methodological practices in Cali.' *Profile*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 61-80.

Chimbganda, A.B. & Mokgwathi, T. 2012. 'Code-switching in Botswana's ESL classrooms: A paradox of linguistic policy in education.' *International Journal of English Linguistics*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 21-32.

Chimhundu, H. 1997. *Intergovernmental conference on language policies in Africa*. Final Report. Harare: UNESCO.

Chiwome, E.M. 1996. *A social history of the Shona novel*. Eiffel Flats: Juta.

Choong, K.P. 2006. *Teachers' College, Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL and Applied Linguistics*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 1-3.

Clark, A. 2011. *An invitation to social research: how it's done*. Belmont: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Clegg, J. & Afitska, O. 2011. 'Teaching and learning in two languages in African classrooms.' *Comparative Education*, vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 61-77.

Cohen, A.D. 1998. *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. London: Longman.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. 2011. *Research methods in education*. London & New York: Routledge.

Cook, V. 1993. *Linguistics and second language acquisition*. London: McMillan Press.

Cook, V. 2001. 'Using the first language in the classroom.' *Canadian Modern Language Review*, vol. 57, pp. 402-427.

Cook, V. 2002. *Portraits of the L2 user*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Cook, V. 2008. *Second language learning and language teaching*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Cook, V. 2012. 'Multi-competence.' Viewed 30 March 2013, homepage.ntlworld.com/Vivian.c/Writings/Papers/MCentry.htm

Constitution of Zimbabwe Amendment (No. 20), 2013. Harare: Government Printers.

Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. 2008. *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques, procedures for grounded theory*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Corder, S.P. 1971. 'Idiosyncratic dialects and error analysis.' *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 9, pp. 147-159.

- Corder, S.P. 1992. A role for the mother tongue. In S. Gass and L. Selinker (eds.) *Language transfer in language learning*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing.
- Creswell, J.W. 2009. *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Creswell, J.W. 2013. *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Crystal, D. 1997. *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. 1997. *The Cambridge encyclopaedia of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. 2008. *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Curran, C.A. 1976. *Counselling learning in second language*. Apple River: Apple River Press.
- Das, B. 2012. 'Code-switching as a communicative strategy in conversation.' *Global Media Journal: Indian Edition*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 1-20.
- Davidson, C. 2009. 'Transcription: Imperatives for qualitative research.' *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, vol. 8, no. 2. Viewed 10 August 2015, <http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/IJQM/article/viewArticle/4205>
- Deem, R. 2002. 'Talking to manager-academics: Methodological dilemmas and feminist research strategies.' *Sociology*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 835-855.
- Deller, S. & Rinvoluceri, M. 2002. *Using the mother tongue*. London: Delta Publishing.
- Denscombe, M. 2010. *The good research guide for small scale social research*. London/Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. 2008. Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (eds.) *The landscape of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Diaz, R. 1985. 'The intellectual power of bilingualism.' *Second language learning by young children*. University of New Mexico, Albuquerque: Southwest Hispanic Research Institute.
- Dodson, C.J. 1967. *Language teaching and the bilingual method*. London: Pitman.
- Dornyei, Z. 1995. 'On the teachability of communication strategies.' *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 75-85.

- Dornyei, Z. 2005. *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in Second Language Acquisition*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Dornyei, Z. & Scott, M.L. 1997. 'Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies.' *Language Learning*, vol. 47, pp. 173-210.
- Dube, R. & Cleghorn, A. 1999. 'Codeswitching in Mathematics lessons in Zimbabwe.' *Zimbabwe Journal of Educational Research*, vol. II, no. 1, pp. 1-11.
- Duran, L. 1994. 'Toward a better understanding of code switching and interlanguage in bilinguality: Implications for bilingual instruction.' *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students*, vol. 14, pp. 69-88. Viewed 12 July 2013, <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/pubs/jeimls/vol14/duran.htm>
- Duranti, A. 2007. 'Transcripts, like shadows on a wall.' *Mind, Culture and Activity*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 301-310.
- Edwards, J. 2003. The importance of being bilingual. In J.M. Dewaele, A. Housen & L. Wei (eds.) *Bilingualism: Beyond basic principles*. New York: Multilingual Matters, pp. 28-42.
- Edwards, J. 2006. Foundations of bilingualism. In T.K. Bhatia & W.C.Ritchie (eds.) *The handbook of bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, pp.7-31.
- El-Dali, H.M. 2012. 'L1 and second language learning: A non-stop debate.' *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, vol. 1, no. 2, April 2012, pp. 8-32. Viewed 1 May 2013, www.hrmars.com/admin/pics/668.pdf
- Eldridge, J. 1996. 'Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school.' *English Language Teaching Journal*, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 303-311.
- Ellis, R. 1985. *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. 1994. *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. 2006. *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. 2009. *Second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Faerch, C. & Kasper, G. 1983. *Strategies in interlanguage communication*. London: Longman.
- Ferguson, G. 2003. 'Classroom code-switching in post-colonial contexts: Functions, attitudes and policies.' *AILA Review*, vol. 16, pp. 38-51.
- Finocchiaro, M.B. & Brumfit, C. 1983. *The functional-notional approach: from theory to practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Fitzgerald, H. 1999. Adult ESL: What culture do we teach? In C. Crozet, A. Liddicoat & J. Lo Bianco (eds.) *Striving for the third place: Intercultural competence through language education*. Melbourne: Language Australia, pp. 127-147.
- Fontana, A. & Frey, J.H. 1994. Interviewing: The art of science. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (eds.) *A handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage, pp. 361-376.
- Fraenkel, J.R. & Wallen, N.E. 1990. *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fromkin, V. & Rodman, R. 1998. *An introduction to language*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Gardner, D. & Miller, L. 1999. *Establishing self-access: From theory to practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gardner-Chloros, P. 2009. *Code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gebhard, J.G. & Oprandy, R. 1999. *Language teaching awareness: A guide to exploring beliefs and practices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gibbons, J. 1994. 'Depth or breadth? Some issues in LOTE teaching.' *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp.1-22.
- Gora, R.B. 2013. 'Continuity and change: Towards a national language policy for education in Zimbabwe.' *Online Journal of Social Sciences Research*, vol. 2, issue 5, pp. 123-129. Viewed 30 July 2013, <http://www.onlineresearchjournals.org/JSS>
- Gray, D.E. 2014. *Doing research in the real world*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Green, J. & Thorogood, N. 2014. *Qualitative methods for health research*. London: Sage.
- Grijalva, S.D.C. & Barajas, E.R. 2013. 'Pre-service teachers' beliefs about language teaching and learning: A longitudinal study.' *Profile*, vol. 15, no.1, pp. 81-95.
- Grim, F. 2010. 'L1 in the L2 classroom at the secondary and college levels: A comparison of functions and use by teachers.' *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 193-209.
- Grosjean, F. 1982. *Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Grosjean, F. 2010. *Bilingual: life and reality*. Cambridge & London: Harvard University Press.

- Groves, J. 2010. 'Error or feature? The issue of interlanguage and deviations in non-native varieties of English.' *HKUB Papers in Applied Language Studies*, vol. 14, pp. 108-129.
- Guba, e.g. 1981. 'Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries.' *Education, Communication Technology Journal*, 29, pp. 75-91.
- Hachipola, S.J. 1998. *A survey of the minority languages in Zimbabwe*. Harare:University of Zimbabwe Publications.
- Halasa, N.H. & Al-Manaseer, M. 2012. 'The use of the first language in second language learning reconsidered.' *College Student Journal*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 71-81.
- Halbach, A. 2012. 'Adapting content subject tasks for bilingual teaching.' *Encuentro*, vol. 21, pp. 34-41.
- Hamers, J.F. & Blanc, M.H.A. 1990. *Bilinguality and bilingualism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harbord, J. 1992. 'The use of the mother tongue in the classroom.' *ELT Journal*, vol. 46, no. 4, pp. 350-355.
- Harmer, J. 2007. *The practice of English Language Teaching*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Hawkins, E.W. 1999. 'Foreign language study and language awareness.' *Language Awareness*, vol. 8, nos. 3-4, pp. 124-142.
- Hedge, T. 2000. *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hennink, M., Hutter, I. & Bailey, A. 2011. *Qualitative research methods*. London: Sage.
- Hoff, M.S.T. 2013. *L1 use in EFL instruction*. Masters' Dissertation. Oslo: University of Oslo.
- Howatt, A.P.R. & Widdowson, H.G. 2004. *A history of English Language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jacobson, R. 1990. Allocating two languages a key feature of a bilingual methodology. In R. Jacobson & C. Faltis (eds.) *Language distribution issues in bilingual schooling*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp. 3-17.
- Jagero, N. & Odongo, E.K. 2011. 'Patterns and motivations of code switching among male and female in different ranks and age groups in Nairobi, Kenya.' *International Journal of Linguistics*, vol. 1, no. 1:E40, pp. 1-13.

Jarvis, S. & Pavlenko, A. 2001. *Crosslinguistic influence in language and cognition*. New York: Routledge.

Jenkins, J. 2009. 'Points of view and blind spots: EFL and SLA.' *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 137-162.

Jessner, U. 2008. 'Teaching third languages: Findings, trends and challenges.' Universite de Lausanne. Viewed 28 July 2013, doi : 10.1017/S0261444807004739

Jindapitak, N. & Teo, A. 2003. 'The emergence of World Englishes: Implications for English Language teaching.' *Asian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp.190-199.

Johnson, K.E. 1994. 'The emerging beliefs and instructional practices of pre-service English second language teachers.' *Teaching and Teacher Education*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp.175-191.

Kachru, B.B. 1985. 'Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English Language in the Outer Circle.' In R. Quirk & H. Widdowson (eds.) *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, B.B. 1992. Teaching World Englishes. In B.B. Kachru (ed.) *The other tongue: English across cultures*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, pp. 355-365.

Kachru, Y. 2009. World Englishes and language education. In S.J. Nero (ed.) *Dialects, Englishes, creoles and education. ESL applied linguistics professional series*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, pp. 19-37.

Kadenge, M. & Mabugu, P. 2009. 'The phonological characteristics of Shona loanwords from English.' *NAWA Journal of Language and Communication*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 101-116.

Kadenge, M. 2009. 'African Englishes: The indigenisation of English vowels by Zimbabwean native Shona speakers.' *The Journal of Pan African Studies*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 156-173.

Kafes, H. 2011. 'A neglected resource or an overvalued illusion: L1 use in the foreign language classroom.' *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 128-140.

Kamwangamalu, N.M. & Moyo, T. 2003. 'Some characteristics of Englishes in Lesotho, Malawi and Swaziland.' *Per Linguam*, vol. 19, nos. 1-2, pp. 39-54. Viewed 29, May 2013, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5785/19-1-88>

Kamwangamalu, N.M. 2010. 'Multilingualism and code-switching in education.' In N.C. Hornberger & S.L. McKay (eds.) *Sociolinguistics and language education*. Salisbury: Multilingual Matters, pp. 116-142.

Karim, K. & Nassaji, H. 2013. 'First language transfer in secondary language writing: An examination of current research.' *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 117-134.

Kayaoglu, M.N. 2013. 'Poor and good learners' beliefs and their influence on their language learning strategy use.' *Novistas-ROYAL (Research on youth and language)*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 36-54.

Kessler, C. & Quinn, M.E. 1980. Positive effects of bilingualism on Science problem-solving abilities. In J.E. Alatis (ed.) *Current issues in bilingual education*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Kim, E. 2006. 'Reasons and motivations for code-mixing and code-switching.' *Issues in EFL*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 43-61.

Kirkpatrick, A. 2000. 'The disadvantaged monolingual: why English alone is not enough.' *Australian Language Matters*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 5-7.

Kirkpatrick, A. 2007. *World Englishes: Implications for international communication and English Language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kitzinger, J. 1994. 'The methodology of focus groups: The importance of interaction between research participants.' *Sociology of Health and Illness*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 103-121.

Klein, W. 1986. *Second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kramsch, C. 2000. 'Second language acquisition, applied linguistics and the teaching of foreign language.' *Modern Language Journal*, vol. 84, pp. 311-326.

Krashen, S.D. & Terrell, T.D. 1983. *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. Hayward: The Alemany Press.

Krashen, S.D. & Terrell, T.D. 1995. *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. London: Prentice Hall Europe.

Krashen, S.D. 1985. *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and implications*. New York: Longman.

Krashen, S.D. 2005. The acquisition of English by children in two-way programs: What does the research say? In V. Gonzales & J. Tinajero (eds.) *Review of Research and Practice, National Association of Bilingual Education*, vol. 3, pp. 1-19.

Kumaravadivelu, B 2003, *Beyond methods: Microstrategies for language teaching*, Yale University Press, New Haven.

Kumaravadivelu, B. 2006. *Understanding language teaching: From method to postmethod*. Mahwah: Laurence Erlbaun Associates.

Lantolf, J. & Thorne, S.L. 2007. Sociocultural Theory and second language learning. In B. Can Patten & J. Williams (eds.) *Theories in Second Language Acquisition*. Mahwah: Laurence Erlbaum, pp. 201-224.

Larsen-Freeman, D. 2000. *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lasagabaster, D. 2013. 'The use of the L1 in CLIL classes: The teacher's perspective.' *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 1-21.

Lee, H.L.J. 2010. 'Code switching in the teaching of English as a second language to secondary school students.' *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, vol. 6, pp. 1-45. Viewed 2 August 2015, www.melta.org.my

Lee, K-Y. 2012. 'Teaching intercultural English learning/teaching in World Englishes: Some classroom activities in South Korea.' *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 190-205.

Leedy, P.D. 1985. *Practical research: Planning and design*. Mcmillan, New York: MacMillan.

Levine, G.S. 2011. *Code choice in the language classroom*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Lightbown, P. & Spada, N. 2006. *How languages are learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lofland, J et al 2006. *Analysing social setting: A guide to qualitative observation and analysis*. Belmont: Wadsworth Thomson.

Lucy, J.A. 1997. 'Linguistic relativity.' *Annual Review Anthropology*, vol. 26, pp. 291-322. Viewed 3 May 2013, www.staff.science.uva.nl/~michiell/docs/LingRel.annurev.anthro.26.1.291.pdf

Mabugu, P. 2009. 'African Englishes: The indigenisation of English vowels by Zimbabwean native Shona speakers.' *The Journal of Pan African Studies*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 156-173.

Macaro, E. 2000. Issues in target language teaching. In K. Field (ed.) *Issues in modern foreign languages teaching*. New York: Routledge/ Falmer, pp. 171-189.

Macaro, E. 2001. 'Analysing student teachers' code switching in foreign language classrooms.' *Modern Language Journal*, vol. 85, pp. 531-548.

Macaro, E. 2005. Code-switching in the L2 classroom: A communication and learning strategy. In E. Llurda (ed.) *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession*. New York: Springer, pp. 63-84.

Macaro, E. 2009. Teacher use of code-switching in the second language classroom, In M. Turnbull and J. Dailey-O'cain (eds.) *First language use in second and foreign language learning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Macaro, E. 2014. 'Overview: Where should we be going with classroom code-switching research?' In R. Barnard & J. McLellan (eds.) *Code-switching in English-medium classes*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, pp. 10-23.

Madrid, D. & Sanchez, E.G. 2001. 'Content-based second language teaching.' *Present and Future Trends in Teaching TEFL*, pp. 101-134.

Mahmoud, A. 2000. 'Modern standard Arabic versus non-standard Arabic: Where do Arab students transfer from?' *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, vol. 13, pp. 126-136.

Makulloluwa, E. 2013. 'Code-switching by teachers in the second language classroom.' *International Journal of Arts and Sciences*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 581-598.

Maleki, A. 2007. 'Teachability of communication strategies: An Iranian experience.' *System*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 583-594.

Maleki, A. 2010. 'Techniques to teach communication strategies.' *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, vol. 1, no. 5, pp. 640-646.

Malmkjaer, K. 1991. *The linguistics encyclopedia*. London: Routledge.

Maniam, M. 2010. 'The influence of first language grammar (L1) on English Language (L2) writing from Tamil school students: A case study from Malaysia.' *Language in India*, vol. 10, pp. 1-209. Viewed 10 May 2013, www.languageinindia.com

Mareva, R. & Mapako, F.P. 2012. 'The prevalence and forms of code-switching and code mixing in readers' comments on selected news articles in *The Herald Online*.' *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 35-43.

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G.B. 2006. *Designing qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Marungudzi, T. 2014. 'Deploying a sense of plausibility: The role of English-Shona code-switching in Zimbabwe.' *International Journal of English and Education*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 462-477.

Mashiri, P. 2002. 'Shona-English code-mixing in the speech of students at the University of Zimbabwe.' *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, vol. 20, pp. 245-261.

Matthews, B. & Ross, L. 2010. *Research methods*. New York: Pearson Longman.

Matsuda, A. & Matsuda, P.K. 2010. 'World Englishes and the teaching of writing.' *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 369-374.

- Mavhunga, F.J. 2006. 'Africanising the school curriculum: A case for Zimbabwe.' *Zimbabwe Journal of Educational Research*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 440-456.
- May, S., Hill, R. & Tiakiwai, S. 2004. *Bilingual/immersion education: Indicators of good practice*. Final Report to the Ministry of Education, University of Waikato, New Zealand.
- McDonough, S. 1995. *Strategy and skill in learning a foreign language*. London: Edward Anorld.
- McLaughlin, B. 1987. *Theories of second language learning*. London:Edward Anorld.
- McMillan, B.A. & Rivers, D.J. 2011. 'The practice of policy: Teacher attitudes towards "English-only" System, vol. 39, pp. 251-263.
- Mei, A. & Nathalang, S.S. 2010. 'Use of communication strategies by Chinese EFL learners.' *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 33, no. 3, June 2010, pp. 110-125.
- Menezes, V. 2013. 'Second Language Acquisition: Reconciling theories.'
- Merriam, S.B. 1998. *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Josse-Bass.
- Merriam, S.B. 2009. *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M.B., Huberman, A.M. & Saldana, J.M. 2013. *Qualitative data analysis: A methods resource book*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Miles, R. 2004. 'Evaluating the use of L1 in the English Language classroom.' School of Humanities, Centre for English Language Studies. Department of English, University of Birmingham.
- Mitchell, R. & Myles, F. 1998. *Second language learning theories*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moduopela, O.R. 2013. 'Code-switching as a teaching strategy: Implications for English Language teaching and learning in a multilingual society.' *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 92-94.
- Moodley, V. 2014. *Introduction to language methodology*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press Southern Africa.
- Morgan, D.L. 1988. *Focus groups as qualitative research*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Mufanechiya, T. & Mufanechiya, A. 2010. 'The use of English Language as the medium of instruction in the Zimbabwean junior primary schools.' *NAWA Journal of Language and Communication*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 115-127.

- Mufwene, S.S. 2010. *The ecology of language evolution*. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.
- Mugari, V. 2014. 'Code-switching in Zimbabwean urban grooves music.' *Language Matters: Studies in the Languages of Africa*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 224-236.
- Mukenge, C. & Chimbarange, A. 2012. 'A discourse analysis of the use of code-switching in the film Yellow Card.' *International Journal of Linguistics*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 581-589.
- Muthivhi, A. 2008. 'Language policy, classroom practice and concept learning in a Grade One Tshivhenda classroom.' *Southern African Review of Education*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 23-35.
- Myers, M.J. 2008, 'Code-switching in content learning.' *Realising Content and Language Integration in Higher Education*, pp. 43-48.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 1993. *Duelling languages: Grammatical structures in code-switching*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ndamba, G.T. 2013. *A critical review of policy on Language-in-Education for Africa: A case of Zimbabwe*. Doctoral Thesis. Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- Nemser, W. 1971. 'Approximate systems of learners.' *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 115-124.
- Nguyen, M.H. 2010. 'Encouraging reluctant ESL/EFL learners to speak in the classroom.' *The Internet TESL Journal*, vol. XVI, no. 3. Viewed 30 July 2014, <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Nguyen-ReluctantSpeakers.html>
- Nhan, N.T. & Lai, H.T. 2012. 'The current state of the art in ELT with special reference to use of the first language in EFL classes in Vitnam.' *Language in India*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 558-575. Viewed 13 November, 2014, www.languageindia.com
- Nhapulo, M.A. 2013. 'Teacher and learner beliefs and expectations about English language teaching and learning at a Mozambican university.' *Afrika Focus*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 81-109.
- Norrish, J. 1997. 'english or English? Attitudes, local varieties and English Language Teaching.' *TESL-EJ: Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, vol. 3, no. 1. Viewed 15 January, 2015, tesl-ej.org/ej09/a2.html
- Nunan, D. 1992. *Collaborative language learning in teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. 2000. *Language teaching methodology*. Edinburg:Pearson Education Limited.
- Nunan, D. 2003. 'The impact of English as a global language on educational policies and practices in the Asia-Pacific region.' *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 589-613.

Nunan, D. & Carter, R. 2001. *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. & Lamb, C. 1996. *The self-direct teacher: Managing the learning process*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nyawaranda, V. 2000. 'The use of mother tongue (Shona, L1) in second language (English, L2) instruction and learning in Zimbabwe: A case for common underlying hypothesis.' *Zimbabwe Journal of Educational Research*, vol. 12, no. 1.

Nyawaranda, V. 2003. 'Doing qualitative research study.' *Zimbabwe Bulletin of Teacher Education*, vol. 12, no.1, pp. 1-3.

Nyawaranda, V. 1998. *Teachers' beliefs about teaching English as a Second Language (ESL)*. PhD Thesis. McGill University, Canada.

Nyota, S. & Mapara, J. 2011. 'New linguistic features in the Shona novel: A study of Mabasa and Mavesera's novels. *Abuja Journal of English and Literary Studies (AJELS)*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 156-173.

Nziramasanga, C. 1999. *Report of the Presidential Commission of Inquiry into Education and Training*. Harare: Government of Zimbabwe.

Odlin, T. 1993. *Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ohmaye, E. 1998. Simulation-based language learning: An architecture and multi-media learning tool. In R.C. Schank (ed.) *Inside multi-media case based instruction*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 1-101.

Onuegbuzie, A.J. & Leech, N.L. 2007. 'Sampling designs in qualitative research: Making the sampling process more public.' *The Quarterly Report*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 238-254.

Pajares, M.F. 1992. 'Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, vol. 62, no. 3, pp. 307-332.

Pavlenko, A. 2011. *Thinking and speaking in two languages*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Pearson, J. 2003. *Human communication*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Peresuh, M. & Masuku, J. 2002. 'The role of the bilingual in the bilingual-bicultural education in Zimbabwe.' *Zambezia*, vol. XXIX, no. 1, pp. 27-37.

Poulisse, N. et al. 1990. *The use of compensatory strategies by Dutch learners of English*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Prabhu, N.S. 1990. 'There is no best methodology – why?' *TESOL Quarterly*, vol.24, no.2, pp. 161-176. Viewed 17 July, 2013, eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ416668

Prashanti, G. & Bhavhani, D.K. 2016. 'Secondary school teachers' perspectives on teaching pronunciation, accents and varieties.' *International Journal of English Language, Literature and Humanities*, vol. IV, issue 1, pp. 164-176. Viewed 20 February 2016, <http://www.ijellh.com>

Punch, K.F. 2005. *Introduction to social research*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Rafomoyo, M. 2014. 'O-Level results: Delving into failure matrix.' *The Sunday Mail*, 16-22 February 2014, p. 11.

Raschika, C., Sersombe, P. & Chi-Ling, H. 2009. 'Conflicts and tensions in code-switching in a Taiwanese EFL classroom.' *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, vol. 12, pp. 123-136.

Richards, J.C. 1997. Social factors, interlanguage and language learning. In J.C. Richards (ed.) *Error analysis: Perspectives on second language acquisition*. London & New York: Longman, pp. 64-91.

Richards, J.C. & Lockhart, C. 1995. *Reflective teaching in second language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J.C. & Rodgers, T. 1995. *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J.C. & Rodgers, T. 2007. *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J.C. & Schmidt, R. 2002. *Longman Dictionary of Language and Applied Linguistics*. London: Longman.

Romaine, S. 1994. *Language and society: An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sampson, A. 2011. 'Learner code-switching versus English only. *ELT Journal*, vol. 66, no. 3. Viewed 13 January 2016, eltj.oxfordjournals.org/.../11.../elt.ccr067

Savignon, J.S. 1983. *Communicative competence: Theory and classroom practice*. London: Addison Wesley.

Scattergood, E. 2003. 'Encouraging the use of strategies to improve communication in the EFL classroom.' *The Language*. Viewed 7 May, 2013, <http://www.ialt-publications.org/tlt/articles/2003/o6/scattergood>

Shenton, A.K. 2004. 'Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects.' *Education for information*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 63-75.

Schneider, E.W. 2003. 'The dynamics of New Englishes: From identity construction to dialect birth.' *Language*, vol. 79, no. 2, pp. 233-281. Viewed 28 May, 2013 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4489419>

Schumann, J. 1978. *The pidginisation process: A model for Second Language Acquisition*. Rowley: Newbury Publishers.

Schumann, J.H. 1986. 'Research on acculturation model for second language acquisition.' *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, vol. 7, no. 5, pp.379-392.

Sert, O. 2005. 'The functions of code-switching in ELT classrooms.' *The Internet TESL Journal*, vol. IX, no. 8. Viewed 20 May 2013, <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Sert-CodeSwitching.html>

Share, F. & Machivenyika, F. 2014. 'Apologise or face the boot, VP told.' *The Herald*, 17 October 2014. Viewed 17 October, 2014, www.herald.co.zw/apologise-or-face-the-boot-vp-told/

Sharma, K. 2006. 'Mother tongue use in English classroom.' *Journal of NELTA*, vol.11, nos.1-2, pp. 80-87.

Shizha, E. 2012. 'Reclaiming and re-visioning indigenous voices: The case of language of instruction in Science education in Zimbabwean primary schools.' *Literacy Information and Computer Education Journal (LICEJ)*, Special Issue, vol.1, no. 1, pp. 785-793.

Sidhu, K.S. 1984. *Methodology of research in education*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers.

Siegel, J. 2009. Keeping creoles and dialects out of the classroom: Is it justified? In S.J. Nero (ed.) *Dialects, Englishes, creoles and education. ESL and applied linguistics series*. New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, pp. 39-70.

Silverman, D. 2000. *Doing qualitative research*. London: Sage.

Silverman, D. 2010. *Doing qualitative research*. London: Sage.

Simasiku, L. 2014. *The perceptions of Grade 10 English Second Language teachers about the effects of code switching in their classrooms in the Caprivi Education Region*. PhD Thesis. Windhoek: University of Namibia.

Simasiku, L., Kasanda, C. & Smit, T. 2015. 'Barriers to code-switching in English second language medium classrooms.' *International Journal of English Literature and Culture*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 7-13.

Simasiku, L., Kasanda, C. & Smit, T. 2015. 'Can code switching enhance learners' academic achievement?' *English Language Teaching*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 70-77.

Simensen, A.M. 2002. *Teaching and learning foreign languages: Issues and ideas*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget

Simensen, A.M. 2007. *Teaching a foreign language: Principles and procedures*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

Simon, D.L. 2001. Towards a new understanding of code-switching in the foreign language classroom. In R. Jacobson (ed.) *Code-switching Worldwide II*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Spratt, M. 1985. Should we use the L1 in the monolingual FL classroom? In A. Matthews, M. Spratt, & L. Dangerfield (eds.) *At the chalkface: Practical techniques in language teaching*. London: English Language Book Society/ Edward Arnold, pp. 198-202.

Stern, H.H. 1983. *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stewart, D.W., Shamdasani, P.N. & Rook, D.W. 2007. *Focus groups: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Storch, N. & Aldosari, A. 2010. 'Learners' use of first language (Arabic) in pair work in an EFL class.' *Language Teaching Research*, vol. 14, pp. 355-375.

Storch, N. & Wiggleworth, G. 2003. 'Is there a role for the use of the L1 in an L2 setting?' *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 760-770. Viewed 30 April 2013, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3588224>

Sridhar, S.N. 1994. 'A reality check for SLA theories.' *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 800-805.

Suliman, A. 2014. 'The interference of mother tongue/native language in one's English Language speech production.' *International Journal of English and Education*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 356-366.

Talebi, S.H. 2014. 'Cross-linguistic transfer among Iranian learners of English as a foreign language.' *Issues in Educational Research*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 212-227.

Tarone, E. 1983. 'Communication strategies, foreigner talks, and repair in interlanguage.' *Language Learning*, vol. 30, pp. 417-431.

Tarone, E. 1983. Some thoughts on the notion of 'communication strategies'. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (eds.) *Strategies in interlanguage communication*. London: Longman, pp. 61-74.

Tarone, E., Cohen, A. & Dumas, G. 1983. A closer look at some interlanguage terminology: A framework for communication strategies. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (eds.) *Strategies in interlanguage communication*. London: Longman, pp. 4-14.

The Herald, 13 February 2014, Harare: Zimpapers.

Then, D.C.O. & Ting, S. 2011. 'Researching code-switching in teacher classroom discourse: Questioning the sufficiency of informant reports.' *Language, Society and Culture*, vol. 3, pp. 8-18.

Thornbury, S. 2000. *How to teach grammar*. Harlow: Longman.

Tomlinson, B. 2005. English as a Foreign Language: Matching procedures to the context of learning. In E. Hinkel (ed.) *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*. Mahwah: Laurance Erlbaum, pp. 137-154.

Tribble, C. 1997. *Writing: Language teaching: A scheme for teachers*: Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tweedie, M.G. 2013. *Singlish in the classroom: Native speakerism and native and non-native speakers of English in Singapore*. Phd Thesis (Unpublished), University of Southern Queensland.

Ugla, R.L. 2013. 'Study of communication strategies used by Malaysian ESL students at tertiary level. *International Journal of English Language Education*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 130-139.

Van Dulm, O. 2007. *The grammar of English-Afrikaans code-switching. A feature checking account*. Doctoral Dissertation, Radbond University, Nijmegen.

Veit-Wild, F. 2009. 'Zimboficious- the creative potential of linguistic innovation: The case of Shona-English in Zimbabwe.' *Journal of Southern African Studies*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 683-697.

Victori, M. & Lockhart, W. 1995. 'Enhancing metacognition in self-directed language learning.' *System*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 223-234.

Viriri, E. & Viriri, M. 2013. 'The prevalence of code-switching in secondary schools where English is the official language of instruction: A case study of Buhera South District.' *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 227-234.

Wachira, A.W. 2006. 'Multilingualism in Kenya: Focus on language use and its implications.' *TRANS. Internet-Zeitschrift fur kulturwissenschaft ten*, no. 16/2005. Viewed 27 November, 2015, http://www.inst.at/trans/16Nr/o3_2/wachira16.htm

Wardhaugh, R. (2010). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.

Wei, L. 2000. *The bilingual reader*. London & New York: Routledge.

Wells, G. & Nicholls, J. (eds.) 1985. *Language and learning: An interactional perspective*. London & Philadelphia: The Falmer Press.

Wenden, A.L. 1991. *Learner strategies for learner autonomy*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

White, C. 2008. *Lessons from good language learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, J. 2006. 'Combining communication strategies and vocabulary development.' *The Internet TESL Journal*, vol. 2, no. 7. Viewed 10 May 2013, <http://istelj.org/Techniques/Williams-CommunicationStrategies.html>

Xhaferi, B. 2012. 'Communication strategies in the written medium.' *The Reading Matrix*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 121-132. Viewed 25 April 2013, www.readingmatrix.com/articles/september_2012/xhaferi.pdf

Yataganbaba, E. & Yildirim, R. 2015. 'EFL teachers' code switching in Turkish secondary EFL language learner classrooms.' *International Journal of Linguistics*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 82-101.

Yates, S.J. 2004. *Doing social science research*. London: Sage.

Yevudey, E. 2013. 'The pedagogical relevance of code-switching in the classroom: Insights from Ewe-English code-switching in Ghana.' *Ghana Journal of Linguistics*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 1-22.

Young, T.J. & Walsh, S. 2010. 'Which English? Whose English? An investigation of 'non-native' teachers' beliefs about target varieties.' *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 123-137. Viewed 13 February, 2016, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07908311003797627>

Yule, G. 1985. *The study of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yule, G. 2012. *The study of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zelasko, N. & Antunez, B. 2000. 'If your child learns in two languages.' *National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education*. Viewed 13 July, 2013, http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/9/IfYourChildLearnsInTwoLangs_English.pdf

Zimbabwe School Examinations Council (ZIMSEC) (1996). *Ordinary Level English Language Syllabus (1122)*. Harare: ZIMSEC.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: Classroom Observation Schedule

(a) School:

(b) Date:

(c) Class:

(d) Class Size:

- (e) Teacher:
- (f) Time:
- (g) Lesson Topic:
- (h) Instances of Teacher Code-switching (Direct Quotes):
- (i) Frequency of Teacher Code-switching:
- (j) Instances of Learner Code-switching (Direct Quotes):
- (k) Teacher's Reactions to Learner Code-switching:
- (l) Frequency of Learner Code-switching:

APPENDIX 2: Interview Guide Questions

- (a) At what level do you teach English?
- (b) What is your first language?
- (c) What is the main home language of the learners in your English class?
- (d) Do you make use of the learners' home language when you teach English?
- (e) What are your reasons for code-switching or avoiding code-switching?
- (f) Do you think the learners' first language should have a role in the teaching of English at secondary school level in Zimbabwe? What are your reasons?
- (g) Second language teaching methods may be divided into monolingual methods and bilingual ones. Which of these do you employ in your English lessons? What are your reasons?
- (h) Do your pupils make use of their first language in the English lessons? If they do, in what situations do they code-switch and how do you react to their code-switching?
- (i) Many varieties of English have emerged in the world and some authorities believe code-switching has become an aspect of such New Englishes. What are your own views on this?
- (j) Do you think New Englishes should have a place in the school system? What are your reasons?

APPENDIX 3: Focus Group Discussions Guide

- (a) What is your home language?
- (b) Do you use your home language during English lessons? If you do, in what situations do you do so?
- (c) If you use your home language, what does the teacher say or do about it?
- (d) Do you think your home language should be used by you and your teacher during English lessons? What are your reasons?
- (e) Does the teacher use your home language during English lessons? If he /she does, in what situations does he /she do so? Do you think this is good or bad for you and in what ways?
- (f) Is there anything else you would like to say about the use of your home language during English lessons?

APPENDIX 4: Sample of Lesson Transcripts

Teacher A, School A, Class A, Form 3

Teacher: We have a visitor today. His name is Mr Mareva. He wants to see how we – how we learn. Have you already greeted him?

Learners: Yes sir!

Teacher: Thank you. I want you to take out pieces of paper. Alright ah – I want you to – to look at me and observe what I do, then you construct a sentence that describes the action. For example if I do this, and if I were to ask you to say a sentence, you would then say eh ‘The piece of chalk is eh – the piece of chalk is in the pocket.’ Have you – have you – have you understood my instruction?

Learners: Yes sir.

Teacher: Thank you. The next sentence that I want you to construct is eh – that will be sentence number 2, eh, eh here is a desk, and here is a piece of chalk. I want – want you to construct a sentence telling me where the piece of chalk is. Number 2, is it number 2 or 3?

Learners: 3.

Teacher: Number 3. The question number is what, Magumbo?

Learner: 3.

Teacher: Right, here is Tinashe, and here is Tadiwa. I want you to construct a sentence telling me where Magumbo sits in relation to Tadiwa and Tinashe. You don’t seem to understand. Tadiwa – sorry Magumbo, *unogara papi?* [EMPHASISING] Sentence *yacho ichibudisa* Tadiwa *na – na*Tinashe, [EXPLANATION] position *yaani?* [ELICITING] *Ya*Magumbo. [EMPHASISING] Sentence eh 4, I want you to construct a sentence telling me what I’m doing. Mr Hita is writing – right that’s the sentence eh ... Sentence 5, I want you to tell me – that’s – Zvabva isn’t it? And eh? Zvabva and?

Learners: Panashe.

Teacher: And – and Panashe? Munashe?

Learners: Panashe.

Teacher: I want you to construct a sentence telling me where Zvabva sits in relation to – to Panashe, to Munashe. Here is an exercise book and here is a desk. I want you to construct a sentence telling me where the book is ... That's sentence, sentence 7. Here is my red ball point pen and here is Tinashe's head. I want you to construct a sentence telling me the ball point is – I want you to construct a sentence telling me where the ball point pen is. How many sentences have we constructed?

Learners: 7.

Teacher: 7 sentences. I want you to exchange – I want you to exchange your exercise books. 7 sentences. Did you exchange your exercise books? Have you exchanged?

Learners: Yes sir.

Teacher: I want you to read your first sentence. Who can read his or her first sentence? Yes?

Learner: The piece of work is under the table. I will write that statement. The piece of chalk – under the table. Right I have written the sentence there and in that sentence there is a certain word which we call a preposition who can identify that preposition? Yes?

Learner: Under.

Teacher: Under. So we are looking at prepositions but before I tell you the rules that govern the use of prepositions we want to read four sentences from sentence 1 to 7 and then we look at characteristics of a preposition. Read to me sentence 2. Read me sentence 2. Yes Nigel?

Learner: Magumbo sits between Tinashe and Tadiwa.

Teacher: Magumbo sits between Tinashe and Tadiwa. Which is our preposition there?

Learners: Between.

Teacher: Between. So you underline – ah you tick 'between.' What it means is ah, Magumbo *unogara pakati pa* – [CHECKING UNDERSTANDING]

Learners: *Pa*Tinashe *na*Tadiwa. [SHOWING UNDERSTANDING]

Teacher: *Pakati paTinashe nani?* [EMPHASISING]

Learners: *NaTadiwa.* [SHOWING UNDERSTANDING]

Teacher: Thank you. That's what it means. Eh sentence 3. Sentence 3 yes? Giles?

Learner: Mr Hita is writing on the chalkboard.

Teacher: Mr Hita is writing on the chalkboard. Which is our preposition there? Yes?

Learner: On.

Teacher: On. Sentence 4. Yes eh?

Learner: *Zvabva sits besides Panashe.* Eh *Zvabva sits besides eh Panashe.* Which is our preposition? Yes?

Learner: Besides.

Teacher: Thank you. Sentence 5. Sentence 5. I want – before- before you read sentence 5, can you explain eh eh eh *Zvabva's* relation sorry's *Zvabva's* position in relation to – if you can explain that in English eh *Zvabva's* position in relation to *Panashe*. If you say he sits eh besides eh is it – what is the answer? *Ehe?* [INVITING PARTICIPATION] Explain to us. Yes?

Learner: *Pa – Panashe anogara paside paZvabva.* [EXPLAINING]

Teacher: Eh she says *Panashe anogara paside paZvabva.* [EMPHASISING] Who can – who can – do you have any other expression that you want to use – another definition that you want to – sorry. Yes?

Learner: Eh, umm. *Panashe anogara padivi paZvabva.* [EXPLAINING]

Teacher: *Tinashe anogara padivi paZvabva.* [EMPHASISING] Thank you. Eh sentence 5. Sentence 5. I'm tired of seeing the same hands. Eh? Sentence 5. Yes Doreen?

Learner: The ball point is on top of *Tinashe's* head.

Teacher: Ah the ball point is on eh what is it, on top of or on eh on eh *Tinashe's* head. What is our preposition there?

Learners: On.

Teacher: Thank you. And eh is that another sentence?

Learners: No.

Teacher: Yes eh Zvabva?

Learner: The book is on the desk.

Teacher: The book is on the desk. Our preposition please?

Learner: On.

Teacher: Yes?

Learner: On.

Teacher: On is our preposition. Thank you so we are looking at eh prepositions. And eh ah sorry mark that exercise out of ah 7. You have got to give a – a – a mark for a full stop. Then a mark for the preposition. A mark for – yes 14 out of 14? Give it back to the owner. 14 out of 14? Clap hands for them. Thank you. Clap hands for them. Right very good. 12? 14 is very good. 13 is – good. Thank you. Thank you. Clap hands for them.

Learners: (Clap hands)

Teacher: Right so we were looking at eh – at eh prepositions, and I will give you characteristics of eh prepositions. Eh first one is eh prepositions eh work with eh with verbs. Eh *hazvirevi kuti eh zvinoinde zvose kubasa*. [JOKING]

Learners: (Laughter)

Teacher: *Zvinoreva kuti preposition inosevenza – paunongo constructa preposition inoshanda nei?* [EXPLAINING]

Learners: *Neverb*. [SHOWING UNDERSTANDING]

Teacher: *Neverb*. [EMPHASISING] Can I have an example of a verb? We already have examples of prepositions. Can I have examples of verbs? Yes?

Learner: That.

Teacher: *He-e?* [INVITING PARTICIPATION]

Learner: That.

Teacher: That is not a verb. Yes? Thank you for trying.

Learner: Jump.

Teacher: Jump. Any other?

Learner: Play.

Teacher: Play. So eh prepositions work with verbs for example eh 'She jumps over the durawall.' There is 'jump' and there is 'over.' Then we have produced eh – we have used a preposition with a verb. The second one is eh – certain verbs have many or work with – work with many prepositions. Can you think of a verb that has many prepositions? *Amwe maverb anosevenza nemapreposition akawanda.* [EMPHASISING] Can you think of one – I have – one good example is one that begins with a – an 'l' Loo- loo- loo-?

Learners: Look. Let's identify prepositions that work with 'look.' The first one?

Learner: At.

Teacher: Look at. Who can construct a sentence using 'look at.'? Yes again?

Learner: She is looking at the teacher.

Teacher: She is looking at eh the teacher. And our verb is 'look' our preposition is – any other preposition that works with 'look'? Yes, yes look, look, look, look?

Learner: Look after.

Teacher: *He-e?* [INVITING PARTICIPATION]

Learner: Look after.

Teacher: Though it sounds like a phrasal verb, yes look after. Any other?

Learner: Look after.

Teacher: Eh look after. And eh look?

Learner: On.

Teacher: Look eh?

Learner: On.

Teacher: Look eh – look eh do we have a preposition ‘look on’?

Learner: Look on the table.

Learners: (Laughter)

Teacher: We don’t have ‘look on.’ Instead we have look?

Learner: On/ to.

Teacher: Eh look?

Learner: For.

Teacher: For. So certain verbs have many prepositions. Whether they produce phrasal verbs or what, what we know is this is a verb, and that is a preposition. Then eh – eh construct a sentence using ‘look for’. Who can construct a sentence using ‘look for’? Yes Doreen?

Learner: I’m looking for Precious.

Teacher: I’m looking for eh Precious. Eh and then - certain verbs have no prepositions. Eh an example is eh comprises. Who can construct a sentence using ‘comprises’? There is no preposition remember. Eh I’m tired of seeing the same hands. Yes eh that’s eh?

Learner: Hazel.

Teacher: *Ha?* [SEEKING CONFIRMATION]

Learner: Hazel.

Teacher: Hazel?

Learner: Our class comprises boys and girls.

Teacher: Our class comprises boys and girls. What does it mean? What does it mean? You raise your hand and talk Zvabva you have an idea, yes?

Learner: *Muclass medu mune vasikana nevakomana.* [EXPLAINING]

Teacher: Umm did you understand that?

Learners: Yes.

Teacher: The class comprises boys and girls and she says *mu class medu mune vakomana nevasikana.* [EMPHASISING] Another verb is 'discuss.' Who can construct a sentence using 'discuss'? Yes?

Learner: We are here to discuss History.

Teacher: We are here to discuss History. Not to – we are here to discuss – what's the verb – what's the preposition that you normally give it?

Learner: About.

Teacher: Not we are to discuss about eh History. Discuss?

Learner: History.

Teacher: So I have given you the three rules here, rule number 1, certain prepositions work with – sorry prepositions it's a must – prepositions work with verbs – *chero – chero zvaita sei.* [EMPHASISING] Preposition *inototi – chainosevenza nacho chii?* [SEEKING EMPHASIS]

Learners: Verb.

Teacher: And - here are examples of verbs: jump – then the next one, certain verbs have many prepositions or work with many prepositions, verb one, *mapreposition pamwe 7,* [EXEMPLIFYING] *asi zvichibudisa* different meanings. [EXPLAINING] *Handiti?* [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT]

Learners: Yes.

Teacher: Then the next one, certain verbs have no prepositions. Verb – verb *iroro harina basa nepreposition –* [EMPHASISING] *asi taiti maprepositions anofamba namaverb* [EMPHASISING] *asi harina basa nazvo rinosevenza riri roga,* [EMPHASISING] and we have given you two examples. One is 'comprises' and the next one is eh is 'discuss'. Now, I want you to take out your language exercise books

and write ... write 'prepositions.' Sentence one. We will discuss – History. If I give you a dash, don't take it for granted that that you should supply the dash with a preposition. Because I have said if you look at our instructions, one our instruction sorry preposition – one says certain verbs have no prepositions. Eh 2. We should eh abide - school rules. Abide – school rules. Number 3. I proposed love – Tinashe. I proposed love – Tinashe. I proposed love – Tinashe. Number 4. We entered - the building. Number 5. She insisted – going. She insisted - going home. Number 6. The shirt sells – ten dollars. Number 7. We should desist – stealing. We should desist – stealing.

Learner: Spelling?

Teacher: Spelling?

Learner: Desist.

Teacher: De- who can help her? Spelling desist?

Learners: D-e-s-i-s-t.

Teacher: Though I normally like chorus answers, that's the correct spelling of desist. 7. I stay – Masvingo. I stay – Masvingo Province. Number 9. We should comply – instructions. And number 10. We went to town – bus. We went to town – bus. Have we supplied answers?

Learners: Yes.

Teacher: Thank you. Let's exchange. Faster. We have only 5 minutes to do this exercise. Eh mark eh full stops. If a – the sentence has no full stop, write a double caret, to show omission of a full stop. And eh omission of a full stop is eh sorry what's the spelling of the word omission – of a full stop eh is a gross error that leads one to dismally fail. What does this statement mean if I say a f- omission of a full stop is a gross error that makes one dismally fail? Who can tell us what it means? Who can tell us what it means? If you write a sentence or sentences it becomes a gross error which makes one fail. Yes?

Learner: *Zvinoreva kuti* – [EXPLAINING]

Teacher: Speak up did you hear what he said?

Learner: Maybe *zvinoreva kuti kana ukanyora* sentence *isina* full stop, it means *inenge iri* incomplete, therefore *inoita kuti ufoire*. [EXPLAINING]

Teacher: Therefore *inoita kuti u - ufoire*. [EMPHASISING] *He-e? Ukanyora* sentence *isina* full stop, *chero mu* composition *chero mu* language, *kureva kuti iwewe unofaira, nemhosva yokuti hauna kuisa* full stop. [EXPLAINING] So full stops are very important. Ha? Thank you. Mark all the full stops, then give us – supply us with answers. The first one? Faster we have no time yes?

Learner: We discussed History.

Teacher: We discussed History. There is no preposition. 2? No it can't be you alone. 2? Yes eh?

Learner: We should abide by school rules.

Teacher: We should abide by school rules. 3? Yes?

Learner: I proposed love to Tinashe.

Teacher: I proposed love to – to –

Learner: To Tinashe.

Teacher: Tinashe. And what – yes sentence 4? Sentence 4? Yes eh?

Learner: We entered into the building.

Teacher: We entered in the building. Is it correct? Is that correct? Yes?

Learner: We entered the building.

Teacher: We entered the building. Thank you.

Learner: (Sighs)

Teacher: Sorry. Sentence 5. Sentence 5. Yes Milicent?

Learner: She insisted on going home.

Teacher: She insisted on going home. Thank you very much. Ah sentence eh 6? Yes?

Learner: The shirt sells at ten dollars.

Teacher: The shirt sells at ten dollars. What is another preposition? 'At' and/ or? Or 'for.' Now this is English it's not Shona. If you say the shirt sells 'at' in Shona what does it mean? If you say the shirt sells 'at', 'at' is what in Shona? 'Pa'. [DEFINING]

Learners: *Pa*. [EMPHASISING]

Teacher: *Pa*. [EMPHASISING] *Ha?* [SEEKING CNFIRMATION] *Hazvirevi kuti hembe inotengeswa panzvimbo inonzi ten dollars.* [JOKING] Ten dollars *ichiita senzvimbo.* [EMPHASISING]

Learners: (Laughter)

Teacher: It's a preposition. The shirt sells 'at' or 'for'. 7? Is it 7 or 8?

Learners: 7.

Teacher: 7? Yes?

Learner: We should desist from stealing.

Teacher: Thank you Nyasha. We should desist from stealing. 8? 8? Yes Doreen?

Learner: I stay in Masvingo Province.

Teacher: I stay in Masvingo Province. 8? 9? 9? Yah?

Learner: We should comply with school instructions.

Teacher: We should comply with school instructions. The last one. The last one.

Learner: We went to town by bus.

Teacher: We went to town by bus. Not 'We went to town with the bus.' If you say I went to town with a bus, *iwe apa, bhazi apa, unoona iwe apa muchidii?* [EXPLAINING]

Learners: *Muchiinda*. [SHOWING UNDERSTANDING]

Teacher: *Mose muchiinda*. [EMPHASISING]

Learners: (Laughter)

Teacher: So 'We went to town by bus.' That exercise is marked out of 20. Give it back to their owner.

Teacher B, School A, Class B, Form 1

Teacher: Can you find a chair for the visitor. Eh Mr Mareva will be joining us for today's lesson. He just wants to observe how behaved 1A1 is. Can someone go out to find a chair?

Learners: Yes.

Teacher: In the meantime one please can give Mr Mareva a chair whilst another is coming.

Ok after this lesson I want to collect your exercise books. Let's go to page 161. 161. Ok we are continuing from the passage 'The old man with wings 1.' This is part two. Can someone recap on that previous eh comprehension passage. What do you still remember about the old man with wings? What do you still remember about the old man with wings? Yes Nyasha?

Learner: He was dressed like a rabbit.

Teacher: Yes. Anyone else yes Alfred?

Learner: He had few hair left on his scalp.

Teacher: ... Yes anyone else Mitchelle?

Learner: He had the accent of a sailor.

Teacher: Yes he had the accent of a sailor. Anyone else? Anyone else? ... Same hands. Why?

Learner: Some thought he was the devil.

Teacher: Yes some thought he was the devil. Yes?

Learner: Some thought he was the mayor of hell.

Teacher: Yes anyone else ... Jonathan?

Learner: Some thought he was an evil.

Teacher: Umm?

Learner: Some thought he was a circus animal.

Teacher: Yes some thought he was a circus animal ... So we all remember the passage *handiti* [EMPHASISING] so let's go to today's passage. Who is going to read for us first? Ashley?

Learner: (Reads the passage)

Teacher: It's ok. Let's have someone reading the next passage. A girl. You can let a girl read it. Paida?

Learner: (Reads passage)

Teacher: Alfred.

Learner: (Reads passage)

Teacher: Yes someone else? Michelle?

Learner: (Reads passage)

Teacher: Next passage.

Learner: (Reads passage)

Teacher: Umm. Next reader. Rudo?

Learner: (Reads passage)

Teacher: Next reader. Next reader. Umm what's your name by the way?

Learner: Tashinga.

Teacher: Tashinga. Sorry.

Learner: (Reads passage)

Teacher: You can continue reading.

Learner: (Reads passage)

Teacher: Ok let's answer the questions. Number 1. Suggest two different ways in which the fence might be useful. Suggest two different ways in which the fence might be useful. Line 114. Can someone read line 114 for us. Nyasha.

Learner: (Reads line 114)

Teacher: Yes suggest two ways – two different ways in which the fence might be useful. Same hands. Yes Ashley?

Learner: (Inaudible)

Teacher: Ha can you come again?

Learner: (Inaudible)

Teacher: Ok that's one point the second one? Yes Paida?

Learner: They wanted people to end up paying money for seeing the man.

Teacher: Yah they wanted people to pay money *handiti*? [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT]

Learners: Yes.

Teacher: Ah Nyasha did you have another point?

Learner: Ah it's the same point.

Teacher: It's the same? Ok. Eh explain what you understand by the phrase 'borrowed phrase – nest' in line 125. Borrowed nest, 125. Let's hurry up class, borrowed nest line 125. Yes?

Learner: Where he was staying was not his home.

Teacher: Yes it was a temporary shelter *handiti*? [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT]

Let's go on to 3. In your opinion what was the most dangerous thing the onlookers did to the old man? Nyasha?

Learner: Throwing stones at him and hitting him with eh iron bar.

Teacher: What was the most dangerous? You gave me two sentences. *Kurohwa nematombo here kana kubaiwa nebanga*? [SEEKING CLARIFICATION] What is the

most dangerous? Let's – let's go to that passage. (Reads passage) *Simbi inopiswa. Handiti? Wobaiwa nayo ichipisa.* [EXPLAINING] So what was the most dangerous thing? Class? Yes Alfred?

Learner: I think the most dangerous thing – I think the most dangerous thing was that – was the hot iron which was used to – I think it was the red-hot, red-hot iron which was used to brand cattle.

Teacher: Ok let me go on to number 6. In what way did Peliah and Elisander benefit from the appearance of the old man? Same hands.

Learner: They benefited money from the people who came to see the old man.

Teacher: Is that correct class?

Learners: Yes.

Teacher: Ashah and your group you are making noise. What are you discussing?

Learner: We were discussing question number 6.

Teacher: What were you saying about question 6? Yes come again.

Learner: They benefited money from the people who came to see the old man.

Teacher: Is that correct class?

Learners: Yes ma'am.

Teacher: So, I want you to write questions 1 to 9. I want you to do this in the 6th period *handiti?* [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT]

Learners: Yes ma'am.

Teacher: And I want my books on time please. You are wanted *kuhall saka itai mukainda mouya monyora.* [ANNOUNCING]

Learners: Yes ma'am.

Teacher C, School B, Class C, Form 3

Teacher: What do you remember about the first part of the story?

Learner: It was about little boys who were trapped in a little island...

Teacher: *Ehe* [ACKNOWLEDGING/AGREEING] that is what he still remembers. What about the others? What do you still remember about the first part of the passage, 'Lord of the flies.' Providence?

Learner: They used twigs to make smoke so that they could be helped.

Teacher: Dumisani, what do you still remember?

Learner: They used twigs to make the fire.

Teacher: Alright. Anyway roughly that is what the story is all about, that is the first part of the passage. And now this morning we want to read the second story and get to know what really happened to the young boys, *handiti?* [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] Alright let's read silently, on your own...

Teacher: What do you think was the purpose of the fire? From your reading so far *twukomana utwu twaa twuchimhanya twuchinopinda musango twuchinotsvaga huni dzokungoves twuchingovesa.* [EMPHASISING] What was the purpose of making that fire? Yes, Wed?

Learner: So that the pirates would see smoke.

Teacher: *Ehe.* [ACKNOWLEDGING/AGREEING] To make smoke so that they could be noticed and be rescued, *handiti?* [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] Alright, who suggested making the fire? Who suggested making the fire? From your reading of the passage who suggested making this fire? Yes, Decibel?

Learner: Ralph.

Teacher: It was Ralph, it was Ralph. And why do you think Piggy kept on grumbling and grumbling and grumbling throughout? Murmuring and murmuring and murmuring? *Nemhaka yei aingobva angon'un'una kungongun'una, nokungoratidza kuti haa, haasi kunwisisiwa navamwe vake, haasi happy.* [EMPHASISING] *Vamwe vari kufara vachiita busy vachitsvaga huni iye akangoita* stand aloof. [EXPLAINING] Yes, Prince?

Learner: Because they didn't let him speak.

Teacher: They didn't let him speak. They never allowed him to speak out his ideas, opinions, what he thought, how he felt *handiti?* [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] Right how did these boys give each other turns to speak? From your reading of the passage, how did they give each other turns to speak? Doreen come back! How did the boys give each other turns to speak? Hmm? *Mashaiwa? Mashaiwa?* [ENQUIRING] Tracy? *Uri kumbotsvaga* [COMMENTING] hmm? You are still looking for the answer? Michael? Why is he not saying *kuti* [EXPLAINING] this is my turn and now I have to speak? Yes Sharma?

Learner: By the conch.

Teacher: By the conch. Whoever had ah or whoever held the conch in his or her hands had the chance to, to speak, *handiti?* [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] *Saka chi conch ichi chaive chakatofanana nechii, tingati* [EXPLANATION] symbol, something *chaimiririra kuti munhu wese achitotarisa kwa- kune akabata conch iroro* [EXPLANATION] *handiti?* [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] *Ehe.* [EMPHASISING] And what do you think was this conch? *Chaimbori chii chinonzi conch ichi?* [CHECKING UNDERSTANDING] Decibel?

Learner: I think it was a shell.

Teacher: She thinks it was a shell. What kind of shell? Shell *handiti tose tinoiziva? Takamboinda kurwizi uku. Kune twuma- twuma shells twe- twema snail ukatotwuona twunenge twurimo mumvura kana kuti panze pemvura kana kuti pajecha paya, unotowana something kuti paa- maa mune something chi empty chacho but the inside chainda pamwe chakatofa* and then *kwosara chekunze chacho kana kuti chi shell chacho,* [EXPLANATION] *handiti?* [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] *Takambozviona here?* [ENQUIRING]

Learners: Yes !

Teacher: *Ehe.* [EMPHASISING] That was the thing. What do you think was this shell? Eh ?

Learner: It was a sea shell.

Teacher: A sea shell of an animal. *Ko vamwewo munoti chii?* [ELICITING] It was a sea shell of an animal. *Vamwe munoti chii nechii shell ichochi ichi?* [EMPHASISING]

Chavaingoti kana wachibata wotonzi [EXPLANATION] now it's your turn to speak, now you can speak whatever you want, now you are in control of the crowd. Miriam?

Teacher: A skull of a dead animal.

Teacher: A skull of a dead animal. *Ndoo zvaanofunga*. [COMMENTING] *Ko vamwe munoti chii?* [ELICITING] Selina? *He-e?* [INVITING PARTICIPATION]

Learner: An ostrich's shell.

Teacher: An ostrich's shell ha ha ha, the idea! *Ko vamwe munoti chii?* [ELICITING] *Munoti* [COMMENTING] ostrich shell, animal shell, sea animal shell? *He-e?* [INVITING PARTICIPATION] Yes Providence?

Learner: Tortoise shell.

Teacher: Tortoise shell. Eh?

Learner: A type of a shell.

Teacher: A type of a shell. It was just a type of a shell. Eh Natasha?

Learner: A fish's shell.

Teacher: A fish's shell. A fish shell that was a fish shell that conch. Alright, I would want to take out your language exercise books...

Teacher D, School B, Class D, Form 1

Teacher: ... I think the three titles given, they are all relevant because the story is about Garai. Let's read through it and then we discuss what Garai did... Right, I was saying the three titles we have been given, they are quite relevant to it meaning, we have said before, the title of the passage summarises what we find, in that particular passage and if we go through the passage under those title, under those titles, we find that eh the information is about, Garai. So now we want to- let's take down the following headings. I want you to- to shortly before we do it in our exercise books, to discuss a bit, in pairs or in groups, summarise, oh sorry sorry sorry. Write a summary, write this

somewhere, even on a rough sheet of paper. Write a summary, describing, what Garai did. Write a summary describing what Garai did. Right we are not moving. Where you are discuss, so in threes or in pairs let's look at, what Garai did. After some minutes we will have some volunteers, a few volunteers... Right let's pause at this point and try to find out what we got so far and... let's take a look at key words which you identified, key words which will guide us, which will guide us. Remember, a summary is just like a footbridge. We have to understand what the summary demands us. What does the question, want us to do? So which words did you underline as the key ones? So that we work along those lines. You answered separately?

Learners: Yes.

Teacher: Right two seconds underline the key words. Right that should not take very long. Which are the key words? Cecil?

Learner: Adventure loving.

Teacher: Do we have that in our question? *Ha?* [EMPHASISING] Do we have that? Our question is that one. We just want to, underline the key words. Right let's have from another group or pair. Gordon?

Learner: (Inaudible)

Teacher: Do not give us the answers. We are still working on the question so that we understand what we are required to do. Right which are the key words? Which are the keywords? We have forgotten that stage? Which are the key words? Yes Memo-Memory?

Learner: Certifier.

Teacher: *Ha?* [SEEKING CONFIRMATION]

Learner: Certifier.

Teacher: Cert- do we have cert- certifier here?

Learners: No.

Teacher: Hmm, we are all getting lost, why? Yes, eh?

Learner: Describe what Garai did.

Teacher: Right. I will leave out describing. *Munenge makanganwaka.*
[COMMENTING] *Tinoda, mavara, anotiudza achitungamirira kuti question inoda kuti tiite chii.* [EXPLAINING] *Maona?* [EMPHASISING] *Eh. Sezvataitirwa na - ndiVincent.*
[ACKNOWLEDGING/COMPLIMENTING] *Question inoda kuti tiite chii?*
[EMPHASISING] *Saipapa* [EXEMPLIFYING] *what have you been doing? Where did you get that from, if you have not identified the key words? Tapabata here ipapo?*
[CHECKING UNDERSTANDING]

Learners: *Ehe.* [ACKNOWLEDGING/AGREEING]

Teacher: Right. So now we are saying, we are looking for, what Garai did so now we move on to the next step. What did Garai do? Then you give those answers. Are we clear here?

Learners: Yes ma'am.

Teacher: Phidelis, *tiri tese mwanangu?* [CHECKING UNDERSTANDING]

Learner: Yes ma'am.

Teacher: *Heya?* [ACKNOWLEDGING] Right. So we underline, what Garai did. That guides us. *Ndozvatiri kupinduraka.* [EXPLAINING] *Imi mangomanyira nemhaka yokuti chinyaya ichi makachihwisisaka vana Joseph mava kungomhanyira ku - kuita asi tiri kuda chii?* [COMMENTING] *Ndopanenyaya.* [EMPHASISING] *Handiti?* [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT]

Learners: Yes.

Teacher: Right what Garai did so when you- when you turn this question down, this is what you should do, *zvatagara tichingoita* [EMPHASISING] we do not underline the whole, question. *Tinounderliner chii?* [CHECKING UNDERSTANDING]

Learners: *Makey words.* [SHOWING UNDERSTANDING]

Teacher: *Ehe patiri- patiri kupindura ipapo, ndopatino underliner.* [EMPHASISING] *Handiti?* [SEEKING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] Right, now that we have identified the key parts of the question, we know what we, are required to do. *Handiti?* [SEEKING

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT] Describing what Garai did so now let's have the first person to give us the summary. A volunteer before I volunteer you.

Learners: (Laughter)

Teacher: Tatenda you are hesitating... Why? Eh? Yes?

Learner: Garai-

Teacher: Come to the front. Ha? Ah whatever you have don't worry. Whatever you have. No matter how little it doesn't matter...

Learner: (Reads her summary)

Teacher: Thank you very much our first volunteer... that was wonderful. Let's have something else...

Learner: (Reads her summary)

Teacher: Thank you very much wonderful girl... boys with talent. Let's have a boy. Ah *vana baba zvadiizve?* [JOKING]

Learners: (Laughter)

Teacher: *Zvaipa?* [ENQUIRING] Thank you very much those who presented. If we look at what we got, our summary, there, what tense is that verb? *Ha?* [INVITING PARTICIPATION] What tenses? Gordon?

Learner: Past tense.

Teacher: *Ha?* [SEEKING CONFIRMATION]

Learner: Past tense.

Teacher: Past tense. And the people who presented they were able to, construct sentences in the past tense. We are looking at what Garai did so now, I want us- by the way how many paragraphs for our summary? How many?

Learners: One!

Teacher: *Hoo* [ACKNOWLEDGING/AGREEING] Right. We want to write good summaries. Just about, ah you don't even get to half a page. So what you will do, you

first write on the- in your rough exercise book or piece of paper. You practise you improve that summary until it is less than half a page, but you will condense all that information about what Garai did. *Ha? Tiri kuhwisisana?* [CHECKING UNDERSTANDING] *Usatanga kungoti njo mubhuku unoona wazadza* page. [GIVING INSTRUCTION] Ah that will not be a good summary. Just say, as briefly as you can, what Garai did. So you first practise roughly and somewhere. You will not be able to finish so you complete this, over the weekend but we are starting now. Right, let's start making our plans. We have done- we have written our composition corrections? *Ha?* [ENQUIRING]

Learners: Yes ma'am.

Teacher: So we use that exercise book. The composition exercise book. *Aha?* [INVITING PARTICIPATION]

Learner: *Mabhuku ari kustaffroom.* [INFORMING]

Teacher: *Hoo!* [ACKNOWLEDGING] Sihlobo go and get those exercise books. *U- u- ubvise amwe mabook andakaisa pakati.* [GIVING INSTRUCTION] *Uchangomaona asiri mabook ecomposition.* [EXPLAINING] If there is anything which is not clear, now is the time to be assisted. *Hatidi vanhu vanongopushira pushira basa rakangosviba kudai.* [REPRIMANDING] Yes?

Learner: The topic?

Teacher: This is our question. This is the question. Eh? Tatenda?

Learner: So we just write the question as it is...?

Teacher: Yes. Write a summary describing what Garai did, and we have already underlined the key words, so we are writing about, what we know. Anything else which you need clarification? *Haikona kuzoitirana nharo.* [GIVING INSTRUCTION]

