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ABSTRACT

This study is an exploration into the pre-service preparation of secondary teachers of English. The investigation was prompted by three main factors that affect the teaching of English at secondary level: South Africa's new language policy and the role of English in the new democracy, far-reaching changes in the country's education policy, and the tendency world-wide for teachers not to be regarded as professionals in contemporary society.

The literature review focused on past and present conceptions of language teaching, views of language, the learner, and language learning, views of knowledge and views of the teacher. The concepts teacher education and teacher training were investigated and their relative merits compared, and three models for language teacher education were discussed.

In order to obtain first-hand information on the preparation of secondary teachers of English, questionnaires were sent out to two sets of respondents: all lecturers/tutors involved in such preparation at university faculties of education in South Africa, and excellent teachers of English in the Western Cape. It was assumed that the lecturers/tutors would know what was essential to this type of preparation; and that excellent secondary teachers of English would be professionals who would know what the teaching of English entailed and would be able to articulate what they viewed as essential to the pre-service course. The questionnaire provided for both restricted and unrestricted responses.

Both the literature review and the findings of the survey strongly suggest that pre-service preparation of secondary teachers of English should be along the lines of teacher education rather than teacher training. This implies that a process as well as a product orientated approach should be taken. Rather than merely providing students with a particular method, tools and skills which they apply unthinkingly in their classrooms, teachers should be educated to evaluate each individual teaching situation and to apply the methods and skills needed for that situation. This presupposes they have a sound knowledge of the theory and principles underlying different language teaching methods, an awareness of the different needs of their pupils, the confidence to
alter teaching techniques when necessary, knowledge of themselves and their pupils,
and that they be open to change.
OPSOMMING

Hierdie tesis is 'n ondersoek na die wyse waarop sekondêre Engels onderwysers voorberei word vir diens. Die ondersoek is geïniseer deur drie hooffaktores wat die onderrig van Engels op sekondêre vlak raak: Suid-Afrika se nuwe taalbeleid en die rol van Engels in die nuwe demokrasie, verreikende veranderinge in die land se onderrigbeleid, en die hedendaagse wêreldwyse beskouing dat die onderwyser nie 'n professionele persoon is nie.

Die literatuurstudie fokus op die vroeëre en hedendaagse beskouinge van taalonderrig, die leerder en die aanleer van taal, sienings oor kennis en sienings oor die onderwyser. Die begrippe *onderwyseropvoeding* en *onderwyseropleiding* is nagevors en hulle relatiewe meriete vergelyk, en drie modelle vir die opvoeding van taalonderwysers bespreek.

Om eerstehandse inligting in te win oor die voorbereiding van sekondêre Engels onderwysers is vraelyste aan twee groep e respondente gestuur: alle dosente betrokke by sodanige voorbereiding wat aan die opvoedkunde-fakulteite van alle Suid-Afrikaanse universteite verbond is, en uitstekende sekondêre Engels onderwysers in die Wes-Kaap. Daar is aanvaar dat dosente sou weet wat noodsaaklik is vir hierdie tipe voorbereiding, en dat uitstekende Engels onderwysers professionele mense sou wees wat sou weet wat die onderrig van Engels behels en sou kon verduidelik wat hulle as essensieel beskou vir sodanige voorbereiding. Die vraelys het voorsiening gemaak vir beide beperkte en onbeperkte response.

Sowel die literatuurstudie asook die bevindings van die ondersoek dui sterk daarop dat die voorbereiding vir diens van sekondêre Engels onderwysers eerder onderwyseropvoeding as onderwyseropleiding as riglyp behoort te neem. Dit impliseer dat sowel 'n proses- as 'n produkbenadering gevolg behoort te word. Eerder as om studente slegs van 'n bepaalde metode, hulpmiddels en vaardighede te voorsien wat hulle onnadenkend in hul klaskamers toepas, behoort onderwysers opgevoed te word om elke individuele onderrigssituasie te evalueer en daarvolgens die geskikste metodes en vaardighede toe te pas. Dit veronderstel dat hulle 'n grondige kennis sal hé van die teorie en beginsels onderliggend aan die verskillende onderrigmetodes, bewus sal wees.
van die verskillende behoeftes van hul leerlinge, die vertroue sal hê om onderrigtegnieke te verander waar nodig; selfkennis en kennis van hul leerlinge sal openbaar, en sal oop wees vir verandering.
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INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the investigation

This investigation into the preparation of secondary teachers of English was prompted by three main changes in the context of language teaching:

- South Africa’s new language policy and the role of English in the new democracy
- Far-reaching changes in South Africa’s education policy
- The tendency world-wide for teachers not to be regarded as professionals in contemporary society

Each of these is discussed briefly in turn.

1.1.1 South Africa’s new language policy and the role of English in the new democracy

Since May 1994, South Africa has had a new government under a constitution firmly based on human rights. Although the Constitution (Act No. 200 of 1993) is an interim one and there is at present a new draft constitution which is being circulated to give citizens the opportunity of influencing the contents of the final constitution (Sunday Independent, November 26, 1995) the human rights base is not set to change.

Language rights have been enshrined in the Constitution. According to the Constitution, there are now eleven official languages, with English as one of these. Multilingualism and multiculturalism are seen by policymakers as a resource, rather than a problem. This is implicit in Constitutional Principle XI which states that ‘(t)he diversity of language and culture shall be acknowledged and protected, and conditions for their promotion shall be encouraged’. However, the NEPI Report on Language
(1992:38) records a decision of the government of the day, in collaboration with the ANC that

[English] should be studied by all children. The reasons are that it is a language of access to a vast range of resources nationally and internationally, to higher education, to technology, to economic opportunities, the mother tongue of a sizeable number of South Africans, and a lingua franca both within the country and beyond its borders.

For the time being at least, English also seems set to remain one of the main mediums of instruction in secondary schools. Significant numbers of black parents have indicated that they want English as medium of instruction for their children (Ridge 1996, in press). This places a great responsibility on all teachers of English, but especially on secondary teachers. In most secondary schools English will be crucial as medium of instruction, and teachers will have to ensure that their pupils' proficiency in English is such that they can cope with their other subjects. Pupils' language needs are discussed in more detail in section 4.3.4.2.

Another aspect which merits attention is the question of what variety of English is to be taught. The notion of standard British English or even an internationally accepted English presents problems. Any language carries with it assumptions about culture, ideology, and social identity. In this sense, English may carry with it the concept of imperialism and of Western thought. In a country in which the majority of people are African, then, accepting standard English as their own may have disadvantages. Nevertheless, the argument for standard English to be taught is compelling. A standard is needed against which to test other varieties. Abrahams (1995) argues as follows:

[Language has always been subject to the shaping and invigorating influences of usage. Constant reference to a received standard, reliance on dictionaries and grammars and models of style, never prevented the modifications that usage brought about; it merely healthily retarded the process of change, by reminding us of the language we were using, to ensure the communicative community we needed if we wanted to read books and speak to strangers.

If English is to be one of the official languages as well as one of the main mediums of instruction, it is necessary for all people in South Africa to appropriate English for themselves. In one sense, South African English may then become a new language. Ndebele (1986:13) argues that 'this may happen not only at the level of
vocabulary, but also with regard to grammatical adjustments that may result from the proximity of English to indigenous African languages. However, to opt only for ‘people’s English’ in education would be shortsighted and patronising. A rich and varied diet is needed, as Dewey asserted at a conference in Cape Town more than sixty years ago:

Departure from the rigidity of the old curriculum is only the negative side. If we do not go on and go far in the positive direction of providing, through persistent intelligent study and experiment, a body of subject-matter much richer, more varied and flexible, and also more definite in terms of the experience of those being educated, we shall tend to leave an educational vacuum in which anything may happen (Dewey, J, 1934:26).

If proficiency in a language is a means for people to take their rightful place in society, then it is exactly the standard means of communication of that language they have to appropriate for themselves and which will lead to their empowerment. Standard English in this sense is one of the varieties of English people use, but because it is used as an international means of communication, in business, technology, higher education, and science, it is the variety which should be taught in all schools, without ignoring or discouraging other, local varieties (Widdowson 1993a: 124).

1.1.2 Far-reaching changes in South Africa’s education policy

The new education policy is based on the notion of lifelong learning: ‘Education should ... be regarded as a continuous process of acquiring knowledge, something of value beyond its capacity to enable people to pass examinations and accumulate certificates’ (Bengu, Business Day, 4 July 1995). The notion of lifelong learning presupposes that teachers will encourage an attitude of commitment to self-development in their pupils and that they demonstrate this commitment themselves. It also expects teachers to help pupils gain the skills they need for taking responsibility for their own learning, and to be able to cope with the demands of the workplace.

One of the changes brought about by the interim Constitution is that there is now one national ministry of education which must cater equally for the needs of all learners. This has resulted in ‘open’ schools, larger classes in formerly white schools, and multilingual classrooms being recognised as the norm. It also means that the secondary
school English teacher probably has to cater for the needs of first, second and third language speakers of English, perhaps even in the same class.

1.1.3 Teachers not regarded as professionals in contemporary society

Teacher professionalism is discussed in more detail in Chapter 3. Being a professional presupposes that one has studied in one’s field of expertise for a certain number of years, is capable of making decisions based on sound principles, is able to take responsibility for one’s actions, and is serious about one’s work. Unfortunately, teachers world-wide are not often regarded in this way. More and more decisions are made for them: education administrators decide on education policy, school administrators decide on school policy, syllabus makers and textbook writers decide what teachers will teach. Teachers themselves have very little say in the decision-making process (Brumfit and Roberts 1983; Lester and Mayer 1987; Protherough and Atkinson 1990, Diamond 1991; Kincheloe 1991; Widdowson 1990). There is the very real threat that teachers will be ‘managed’, will be required simply to do as administrators tell them. This will reduce teachers to being mere puppets. In the face of this, the researchers mentioned consider teacher professionalism to be essential. Brumfit and Rogers maintain that professionalism is needed as much to challenge those who make the decisions as it is to protect teachers themselves:

If teachers want either to co-operate fully with those who influence language teaching - or to challenge them - they must be able to interpret the reasons for the decisions which are being made on their behalf. They are not merely making linguistic decisions themselves all the time, but they are also at the mercy of others who make the decisions for them. Their main protection is that they are fully informed themselves (Brumfit and Rodgers, 1983:5).

The Minister of Education Sibusisu Bengu enters the same debate when he suggests that teachers are to be part of the decision-making process for education in South Africa: ‘We will lead but not dictate. If radical change is imposed on schools in the absence of participation by those whose interests and identities are at stake, the result will be predictably disastrous’ (Business Day, 4 July 1995). This makes it particularly important that South African teachers be educated to be professionals. The onus is on education faculties to prepare teachers for their roles in education. As Widdowson (1990:x-xi) argues, teachers who are not properly prepared can have no claim to
professional status. He maintains that standards of professionalism depend on a continual process of self-education through an evaluation of practice in reference to theory. Unless teaching is informed by principled pragmatism, it can make no claim to be a serious professional activity. It becomes hack work.

1.2 Outline of the research

Against this background, the pre-service preparation of teachers of secondary English was investigated in this thesis. The purpose of the research was to establish whether and how the issues mentioned earlier were being addressed in the preparation of language teachers, and to provide recommendations for such preparation based on the findings of the investigation and the literature review. In order to obtain a more balanced set of data, two sets of respondents were used: lecturers/tutors involved in the pre-service preparation of secondary teachers of English at university education departments, and excellent secondary teachers of English. It was felt that while the lecturer/tutor responses would indicate what was being offered in teacher preparation courses, the teacher responses would provide information on what was actually seen as essential in the field. Together, the responses would offer a clearer picture of the preparation needed to build a corps of sound secondary English teachers who would be able to face the challenges of teaching in a democratic South Africa.

It was decided not to differentiate between teachers of English first (L1) or second (L2) language. In a true L2 situation the L1 presence is so strongly felt as to make differentiation deceptive (see also section 4.3.4.2).

Chapters 2 and 3 constitute a review of the literature which informs this research. Chapter 2 describes past and current conceptions of teaching, learning, language, knowledge, the learner and the teacher, and how these influence language teaching and, in turn, language teacher preparation. In Chapter 3, the notions of teacher education and training are investigated and three models of language teacher education are discussed.

Chapter 4 is a report of the empirical research, including a discussion of the selection of the subjects, the choice of research method, and the questionnaires. An analysis of
the data and findings is undertaken in Chapter 5. Finally, recommendations both for further research and for changes in the pre-service preparation of secondary teachers of English are made in Chapter 6.

1.3 Literature review

Although no attempt has been made in this study to differentiate between teaching English L1 or L2 (see sections 1.2 and 4.3.4.2), the literature consulted is based mainly on research into second language learning and teaching. There are two reasons for this. One is that the bulk of research into language acquisition, learning and teaching has been done in this field. The second is that it is a moot point whether ‘pure’ English first language (L1) classes really exist in South African schools since second-language (L2) speakers have always been allowed to take L1 English.

1.4 Definition of terms

The terms ‘teacher education’ and ‘teacher training’ as used in this research are defined in Chapter 3. To avoid confusion, the term ‘teacher preparation’ is used when referring to the pre-service preparation of secondary teachers of English in general.
2.

WHAT IS LANGUAGE TEACHING?

2.1 Introduction

Any attempt to define language teaching must consider the assumptions on which it is based. Diamond calls these 'a characteristic ideology or set of guiding principles' (Diamond 1991: 8), while Pennington refers to 'a philosophy of teaching that connects performance goals to training methods and courses content' (Pennington 1990:132).

Some educationists base their view of teaching solely on the findings of empirical investigation. Others maintain that teaching is a 'mystical experience' which is unique in each new situation and which therefore cannot be described or replicated (Pennington 1990:132-133). In-between these two extremes, there are a number of conceptions which also merit attention. Any view of language teaching must also recognise that it does not take place in a vacuum, but within the 'aims and constraints' of the language curriculum (Johnson, 1989: xii, see also Boomer et al 1992). What happens in the language classroom, however, depends on the relationship between the teacher and the learners (Brumfit and Roberts 1983:77). This relationship between learners and teachers is informed not only by the underlying conception of language teaching, but also by how the teacher and learners view language, what is expected of the learners, conceptions of learning, the view of knowledge prevalent in the classroom and broader society, and the view of the teacher.

These six aspects are crucial to language teaching and by implication also to language teacher preparation: conceptions of teaching, view of language, view of the learner, view of learning, view of knowledge, and view of the teacher. Each of these aspects will be examined in more detail in this chapter.
2.2 Conceptions of teaching

According to Freeman and Richards (1993:193), teaching has been defined as a science, a technology, a craft and an art. A view of language teaching will depend on the underlying conception of teaching, and this in turn has direct implications for any definition of the competencies that are involved and how teachers should be prepared.

Freeman and Richards use a framework proposed by Zahorik (1986) to classify conceptions of teaching into three main categories: science/research conceptions, theory-philosophy conceptions, and art/craft conceptions. Although it could be argued that some conceptions could fall into more than one group (Freeman and Richards 1993:195, 1994:400-401; Edge 1994), the framework is a useful one on which to base this discussion. It should be noted that the teaching approaches and methods referred to in this discussion merely serve to illustrate the different conceptions of teaching. Only those which are pertinent to this research will be discussed. One such approach is Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). There are two reasons for this: one is that CLT has gained much support throughout the field of second language education (Brumfit and Roberts 1983:182). The second reason is that the current syllabus for English second language of the Western Cape Education Department is purported to be a 'communicative' syllabus. Teachers of English second language are expected to use this approach. Because of its emphasis on meaningful communication, teachers of English first language may be said to have used the approach.

2.2.1 Science/research conceptions

Science/research conceptions of teaching are based on experimentation and empirical investigation. Zahorik (1986:21) identifies three subgroups: teaching which operationalizes learning principles, teaching which follows a tested model, and teaching based on what effective teachers do.
2.2.1.1 Teaching which operationalizes learning principles

Freeman and Richards (1993:195) cite diverse examples from the field of second language teaching such as audiolingualism, task-based language teaching, and learner training as being representative of this group.

**Audiolingualism** was based on behaviourist research or stimulus-response approaches to learning. According to this view, language learning is a process of habit formation. Currently, audiolingualism has largely been replaced by cognitive and communicative approaches to language teaching. However, Widdowson cautions that behaviourist theory should not be condemned out of hand, since there are 'some aspects of language learning which have to do with habit formation' (Widdowson 1990:11). He quotes Lado in this regard:

> Nothing could be more enslaving and therefore less worthy of the human mind than to have it chained to the mechanics of the patterns of language rather than free to dwell on the message conveyed through the language. It is precisely because of this view that we discover the highest purpose of PATTERN PRACTICE: TO REDUCE TO HABIT WHAT RIGHTFULLY BELONGS TO HABIT IN THE NEW LANGUAGE, so the mind and personality may be freed to dwell in their proper realm, that is on the meaning of the communication rather than the mechanics of grammar (Lado 1957 in Widdowson 1990:12)

**Task-based language teaching** (TBLT) relies on research into second language acquisition. According to Long and Crookes

TBLT is distinguished by its compatibility with research findings on language learning, a principled approach to content selection, and an attempt to incorporate findings from classroom-centred research when making decisions concerning the design of materials and methodology (Long and Crookes 1992:45-46)

Task-based language teaching is tied to ongoing research to identify the kinds of tasks which will facilitate the acquisition of specific language structures and functions. Ideally, they should be learning tasks which will challenge learners to make use of 'whatever linguistic and other knowledge they possess' (Ridge, S 1995:3) since it seems that learning takes place when learners have to grapple with the language in order to communicate meaningfully (Long and Crookes 1992:35).
Learner training draws on research on the value of metacognitive strategies of learners. Research involves observing learners complete a task or asking them to articulate their thinking processes and learning strategies. It is assumed that the identified successful learning strategies can be taught to students, so as to make them more effective learners (Freeman and Richards 1993:197).

These three forms of language teaching are based on research findings and principles of quite different views of learning. They seem to view teaching as ‘a mirror image of learning’ (Freeman and Richards 1993:197), namely, habit formation, meaning-making and the use of successful thinking and learning strategies (for a discussion of views of language learning, see 2.5).

2.2.1.2 Teaching which follows a tested model

Exponents of this conception of teaching (notably Long and Long and Crookes, see Pennington 1990:133) claim that by means of observation, description and analysis of teaching it should be possible to extract certain skills, techniques and behaviours which make for successful teaching practice. These can be learned and replicated (Freeman and Richards 1993:197, Pennington 1990:133).

Critics of this conception of teaching assert that teaching cannot be reduced to a few skills, methods or techniques. Although teachers might very well learn crucial skills and useful techniques, they may not always be able to use them in quite the same manner as advocated in their own classrooms, or have the expected success (Freeman and Richards 1993:198).

2.2.1.3 Teaching based on what effective teachers do

In turning to teachers themselves as models of effective instruction, researchers have tried to overcome the criticism of isolating certain skills, techniques and behaviours by placing these in the context of what effective teachers do.

In trying to develop such a conception of teaching, researchers must identify effective teachers and then observe what they do in their classrooms. They must also define what constitutes an effective teacher. Generally, researchers identify those teachers as
effective whose pupils perform better on standardised achievement tests. But, as Freeman and Richards (1993:198-199) point out, 'this standard is hardly definitive or comprehensive. perhaps because there is not a research-based or political consensus on what constitutes teacher effectiveness or how best to assess it.'

Nevertheless, characteristics of so-called effective teachers have been identified and used as guidelines to prepare teachers (see Hunter 1982; Blum 1984). However, this view of teaching has not had much effect on language teaching (Freeman and Richards 1993:199).

Strictly scientifically/research-based approaches to teaching suggest that teaching is more successful when based on research findings. This assumption is based on two fallacies: one is that research findings are always reliable, and the other that teaching is a process which has learning as its product. Widdowson, cautions against the first assumption by stating that empirical evidence, persuasive as it may be, can be misleading. As an example he mentions the Bilingual Syntax Measure, which set out to ascertain whether or not language learners follow an acquisitional order when internalizing a language system, but actually provides evidence of accuracy order in performance (Widdowson 1990:16-18). As to the second, Freeman and Richards (1993:199) maintain that if teaching is simply viewed as a process which leads to learning as its product, then teaching consists of appropriate behaviours and the role of the teacher is reduced to acting on others' findings and principles:

This view is workable only if classrooms and learners are more alike than they are different so that they can become settings for implementation for teaching as defined by scientific findings. Such conceptions do not address the idiosyncrasies of particular classrooms or groups of learners nor do they examine individual teachers' contextual knowledge of their work' (Freeman and Richards 1993:199).

### 2.2.2 Theory- and values based conceptions of teaching

Zahorik (1986:21) writes of this second group: 'Their truth is not based on *a posteriori* conditions or on what works. Rather, their truth is based on what ought to work or what is morally right.' Conceptions of teaching based on 'what ought to
work' can be referred to as theory based: those that are based on beliefs of what is 'morally right', as values based.

2.2.2.1 Teaching based on theory

The principle underlying theory-based conceptions of teaching is that explanations or reasons for teaching in a certain way can be arrived at through rational thought. Freeman and Richards (1993:201) cite Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), an approach currently used extensively in second-language instruction, as well as the Silent Way, as examples of a conception of teaching based on theory.

CLT is based on a complex view of language and has been influenced by 'a range of theoreticians' (Van der Merwe 1994:1). Although the theory that underlies it draws on research in sociology, anthropology and social linguistics, proponents of CLT have not felt the need to provide research evidence that learning communicatively is more successful than any other way (for a more comprehensive discussion of CLT, see Savignon 1991, Widdowson 1990, Van der Merwe 1994).

Unlike CLT, the Silent Way, invented by Caleb Gattegno, does not rely on linguistic or language learning theories, but on a theory of how learning takes place (Brumfit and Rogers 1983:207, Freeman and Richards 1993:202). The major thrust of the method is that the teacher remain as silent as possible, leaving it to the learners to use their own resources to learn the language (Brumfit and Roberts 1983:207). It is interesting to note that Stevick (1990), a proponent of humanism in language teaching, views the Silent Way as a humanistic teaching method, as does Johnston (1993:338-340). The Silent Way could therefore also serve as an example of the conceptions of teaching based on values discussed in the next section.

2.2.3 Teaching based on values

Clearly, a conception of teaching based on empirical investigation or theory cannot be regarded as value-free because it privileges scientific research, rational argument and theoretical coherence. On the other hand, the views of teaching grouped under this heading generally have as their core the changing or restructuring of existing social
values in education in order, ultimately, to bring about changes in society. (Freeman and Richards 1993:203)

A values-based conception of teaching can lead to ‘teaching which is encouraged as morally, ethically, or politically advantageous or which is criticised on similar grounds’ (Freeman and Richards 1993:203). In South Africa, Christian National Education could be seen as a values-based view of teaching.

Conceptions of teaching based on values can often be radically different as they depend on the opposing values which proponents hold for the role of the education system in society, including its teachers, learners, and their classrooms (Freeman and Richards 1993:203).

Freeman and Richards cite action research, team teaching, learner-centred teaching, humanistic teaching and reflective teaching as examples of values-based conceptions of language learning.

They state that action research has developed in quite a different direction to what was originally intended. As it is currently practised in second language teaching, it involves individual research by a teacher in his or her classroom. This is quite different from what was originally intended. ‘In its early forms, action research aimed at developing participant’s views of, and solutions for, shared problems in their work environments’ (Freeman and Richards 1993:203-204). This would ultimately lead to the empowerment of all the participants in the research. Critics of action research in its present form argue that from being based on values of social critique and organisational change it has now embraced values of introspection which do not necessarily lead to positive change. Kenmis and McTaggart, for instance, are strongly critical of action research as it is currently practised in second language education:

Action research is not individualistic. To lapse into individualism is to destroy the critical dynamic of the group and to risk falling victim to the fallacious liberal notion that all educational practices, and values which they purport to realise, are equally defensible (Kenmis and McTaggart 1982, in Freeman and Richards 1993:204).

Action research is discussed in more detail in section 3.4.
Team teaching reflects the view that teachers are more successful when they collaborate with their peers. Proponents of team teaching such as Brumby and Wada (1990) assert that this kind of co-operation also benefits learners (Freeman and Richards 1993:204).

Learner-centred teaching is derived from the belief that learners are potentially self-directed and able to make responsible decisions. The teacher’s task is to help learners find their own preferred learning styles, develop skills for coping with the curriculum, set their own realistic objectives, and develop self-evaluation skills (Freeman and Richards 1993:205). One of the proponents of learner-centred teaching is David Nunan, whose book, *The learner-centred curriculum* provides a detailed account of this view of teaching.

Freeman and Richards note that although proponents of learner-centredness and those who derive their view of teaching from research into learning styles often advocate the same or similar practices, their justifications are quite different. ‘The learner-centred curriculum is based on values of learner decision making and autonomy; a learning-styles approach to teaching is based on the interpretation of empirical data’ (Freeman and Richards 1993:205).

Humanistic teaching, including the Silent Way (see 2.2.2.1), emphasises the learner’s uniquely human attributes, is committed to the freedom of the learner, and has a regard for human dignity (Johnston 1993:339). Because humanistic approaches encourage the learner to engage with the learning process, and aim to make classroom experiences meaningful, Widdowson (1990:13) maintains that

‘(t)hey serve as a valuable corrective to approaches which impose conformity on learners, reduce the scope of their participation as persons, and deny them the exercise of individual initiative in the learning process.

Nevertheless, he cautions that learning activities have cultural implications. Some activities designed to draw learners into learning may be construed by these very learners as an invasion of personal privacy, and so hinder, instead of facilitate learning.

Widdowson has another criticism against humanistic teaching as is the case with behaviouristic approaches, humanistic teaching emphasises the individual’s affective
dimension while ignoring the cognitive dimension. One of the main principles of behaviourism is that 'correct' behaviour can be reinforced by reward. So, for instance, students can be encouraged to learn certain language patterns by being given approval. Here, learning is controlled by what Widdowson calls 'affective regulation' (1990:14). According to the humanistic view, a feeling of well-being is conducive to learning, although in this case, learning is controlled by 'affective self-regulation'. However, learning also takes place under adverse circumstances. Widdowson maintains that learning is not necessarily brought about only by 'experiential well-being', but can also occur as a result of negative experiences (1990:14). Regulation, or adjusting behaviour, therefore belongs more to the cognitive than to the affective domain.

Learning is not simply a response to affective conditions, but a complex cognitive skill, a process of selection, acquisition, construction and integration (O'Malley and Chamot 1990:19).

Reflective teaching can be described as the teacher knowing the art and craft of teaching and considering it carefully both during and after interaction with their learners. In this way, teachers may improve their teaching and so enhance their own as well as their learners' learning. Reflective teaching is discussed in more detail in section 3.3.

Whereas science/research based conceptions of teaching rely on empirical findings to determine classroom practice and effective teaching, the main thrust of theory and values-based views is the 'rational and interpersonal nature of teaching and learning' (Freeman and Richards 1993:205). Both, however, emphasise a system over the individual: the teaching system over the individual teacher, and little recognition is given to the teacher's individual teaching style, views of classroom practice or personality. The last group of conceptions takes these into consideration (Freeman and Richards 1993:205).

2.2.4 Art/craft conceptions of teaching

Teaching is sometimes conceived of as being an art or a craft which depends on the individual teacher's skill or personality (Freeman and Richards 1993:205). Some proponents of the art/craft conception maintain that teaching cannot be described,
much less emulated, since each teaching act is unique. Pennington (1990:133) cites an earlier article in which she asserts:

From this perspective, teachers are born, spontaneously as it were, when they stand in front of the class and begin to teach. Hence, the only relevant experience for prospective teachers is actual teaching (Pennington 1989:9).

A more balanced view is one which maintains that natural teaching talent can be refined by encouraging the teacher to explore and reflect on his or her teaching. Zahorik, for instance, argues:

The essence of this view of good teaching is invention and personalization. A good teacher is a person who assesses the needs and possibilities of a situation and creates and uses practices that have promise for that situation (Zahorik 1986:22).

Fanselow (1987) cited in Freeman and Richards (1993:206) believes that ultimately we are responsible for our own learning and development. Teachers should therefore observe and explore their own and others’ teaching in order to improve their own. As Freeman and Richards point out, this conception of teaching coincides with the individualistic view of action research discussed in 2.2.3.

In an art/craft conception of teaching, success depends on the teacher and not on the approach or teaching method. This is not to say that the different methods and techniques are not important. However, it is more important that the teacher should be able to analyse each teaching situation and then decide which approach, method or technique would be suitable, rather than simply to use the method currently in vogue or the one he or she was trained in. This presupposes that the teacher have a sound knowledge of the underlying theories or principles of the particular approach or method he or she decides to use. Widdowson (1991) views this as pragmatic mediation, while Pennington (1990) refers to it as teacher professionalism. The burden of responsibility in this view of teaching therefore rests squarely on the teacher, not on an external method or linguistic theory. Freeman and Richards sum up as follows:

This intimate connection of individuality and responsibility is central to the art/craft conception of teaching. This view does not deny the importance of knowing about different methods of teaching and how to use them. However, it suggests that, unlike the conceptions previously discussed, commitments to a single form of instruction may impede the development of the teacher’s full
potential because they shift the sense of responsibility from the teacher to an externalised idea of the form of teaching. In the art/craft conception, the teacher has both the freedom to act and with it the burden of needing to assess and to understand the consequences of those actions (1993:206-207).

2.2.5 Essential teaching skills

Each of these three groups of conceptions also presuppose certain teaching skills. Scientifically based conceptions require the teacher to monitor learner performance on specific tasks to ensure appropriate use of language or learning strategies. Characteristics of effective teaching are extracted through research and teachers must then try to emulate these in their own classrooms (Freeman and Richards 1993:207).

Conceptions based on theories or values expect teachers to understand the principles fundamental to the method and then to teach in ways which represent those principles in the classroom. Freeman and Richards mention that in CLT, for instance, certain methods, techniques or tasks are often debated as being more or less communicative (1993:207). The essential teaching skills for this group are therefore those which reflect the particular values, theory or philosophy. Like scientifically based conceptions, these views of teaching are also prescriptive, but in a different way. Teaching methods are not based on empirical research, but on a wider or more general set of beliefs, values or theories.

In art/craft conceptions of teaching, teachers do not look to a general method or a particular set of teaching skills, but have to find out themselves what works in a given situation by a continuous process of decision making, observation, reflection and assessment (Freeman and Richards 1993:208).
Figure 2.1 illustrates the different principles of the three groups of conceptions.

According to scientifically based conceptions, teachers should
- understand the learning principles derived from a particular body of research
- develop criteria for tasks and activities based on these principles/findings
- monitor students' performance on tasks to see that desired outcomes, according to task criteria, are being achieved

According to theory- or values-based conceptions, teachers should
- understand the coherent theory and principles on which a particular set of practices is based
- select syllabi, materials, and tasks based on the theory/principles
- monitor their teaching to see that it conforms to the theory/principles
  or
- understand the values and beliefs which underlie a particular set of practices
- select those educational means (techniques, procedures) which conform to the values/beliefs
- monitor their implementation to ensure that the values/beliefs are being maintained

According to art/craft conceptions, teachers should
- treat each teaching situation as unique
- identify the particular characteristics of each situation
- try out different teaching strategies, procedures, techniques to address those characteristics
- reflect on and assess the efficacy of the strategies for the learners within that teaching situation
- through this iterative process, develop an internally consistent, personal approach to classroom practice which responds to the unique demands of the situation
2.3 Views of language

Conceptions of language teaching are closely related to views of language. Here, two of the ways in which language may be viewed are used to illustrate the possible influence on language teaching. It should be noted that assumptions about language, more particularly English, and the way they affect language teaching, are found in every chapter of this thesis (see, for instance, Chapter 1, section 1.1.1; Chapter 2, sections 2.7.6 and 2.7.7, Chapter 4, section 4.3.4.2, Chapter 5, sections 5.3.9.1 and 5.3.9.2).

Van der Merwe (1994:14-15) explores the difference between a linguistic and a human sciences perspective.

2.3.1 A linguistic perspective

According to some linguists, language is a code, 'a set of elements which can or cannot combine in various appropriate ways' (Van der Merwe 1994:15). These linguists see language as a closed system, isolated from the environment in which it occurs. A linguistic language system would most often include a description of the following:

- phonetics, or the actual sounds of a language
- phonology, which describes the way in which sounds are organised into systems which convey meaning
- syntax, which is concerned with the way in which words are put together to form meaningful sequences
- semantics, which is concerned with the nature of meaning
- pragmatics, which studies the way in which language can express feelings, ideas or meanings which are not normally associated with the words (Van der Merwe 1994:16, Brumfit and Roberts 1983:7-8).

A purely linguistic perspective would result in teachers seeing language as a subject or a set of knowledges rather than a tool to be exploited by its users for their own benefit.
2.3.2 A human sciences perspective

Human scientists view language rather differently. Although they might agree that language is a system of signs, their main concern is what it is used for. What do people do with language? Basically, people use language to transmit information, either vocally or graphically. This might sound simplistic until one takes into account the circumstances, place and time in which the information is transmitted, as well as the transmitter and the receiver of the information and their particular relationship and/or circumstances. Mindful of this, human scientists view language as an open system ‘interacting with, changed by, and changing, its environment’ (Van der Merwe 1994:16). At its simplest, a human scientist’s description of language would therefore include not only all the aspects of a linguistic system but also knowledge of, and the ability to use, this linguistic system as well as social knowledge appropriately.

A view of language that is currently being explored by poststructuralists is that language is part of people’s social identity, and places them in a social context (see also section 2.4.3). According to this view, language is never a neutral medium of communication. Peirce makes this quite clear when she asserts:

It is through language that a person negotiates a sense of self within and across different sites and at different points in time, and it is through language that a person gains access to - or is denied access to - powerful social networks that give learners the opportunity to speak. (Peirce 1994:13).

Theory- and values-based as well as art/craft conceptions of teaching would be more likely to espouse a human sciences view of language. Communicative language teaching is a case in point. It relies on a complex view of language, especially with regard to meaningful, appropriate communication. Because of the emphasis on communication, however, some teachers have followed a reductionist approach: communication is simply getting the message across. This view takes no account of the complexity and richness of language, or its social setting. It also ignores the fact that language is a powerful social tool which can be used to empower or disempower people. Paradoxically, then, there is a return to a simple linguistic perspective. Ridge (1994:2) counters this reductionist view by pointing out that in order to communicate effectively, a ‘comprehensive knowledge of language is needed’. To support her
argument, she draws on various researchers. Hymes (1972), for instance, maintains that people need to know

1. whether (and to what degree) something is formally possible
2. whether (and to what degree) something is feasible in virtue of the means of implementation available
3. whether (and to what degree) something is appropriate (adequate, happy, successful) in relation to a context in which it is used and evaluated
4. whether (and to what degree) something is in fact done, actually performed, and what its doing entails.

(Hymes 1972:281)

Added to this, people also need to have certain communicative competences. These are discourse competence, grammatical competence, strategic competence and sociolinguistic competence. Language users also need to be aware that language use has certain functions. Halliday (1975:18-20) distinguishes seven functions of language use.

1. the instrumental function: using language to get things
2. the regulatory function: using language to control the behaviour of others
3. the interactional function: using language to create interaction with others
4. the personal function: using language to express personal feelings and meanings
5. the heuristic function: using language to learn and discover
6. the imaginative function: using language to create a world of the imagination
7. the representational function: using language to communicate information

Even from this brief description of views of language it would seem that language teachers need to know more about language than some linguists would have us believe. In South Africa, where English still has much social, political and economic power, all teachers of English need to have a sound understanding of what constitutes language. If they do not, they will be unable to provide their pupils with a powerful tool to enable them to take their rightful place in society.
2.4 Views of the learner

2.4.1 The learner as passive recipient of knowledge

Although most teachers, both pre-service and in-service, would probably disapprove of Dickens’s Mr Gradgrind dispensing knowledge for ‘the benefit of all the little pitchers’, ‘this view of the learner as an empty vessel having to be filled with knowledge is more prevalent than one would expect. Learners, especially school pupils, are often viewed as having no ‘legitimate’ knowledge, no knowledge worth having. They come to school in order to gain worthwhile knowledge. Not knowledge gained from their peers, but knowledge dispensed to them by the teachers. A possible reason for this view in South Africa may be the legacy of an education policy which espoused the Calvinist view of children as being deficient and having to be led towards adulthood by a responsible adult (Ashley 1989).

2.4.2 The learner as active participant in the learning process

Certainly, if, as is desirable, the language teacher is a specialist, then he or she will have superior knowledge about language and language teaching and must impart this knowledge to the learners. Nevertheless, viewing language learners as empty vessels would deprive both the teachers and the learners of a powerful tool. That tool is what learners already know about language and communication. As human beings we all possess a complete language system, that of our mother tongue. This system can be utilised to extend the learner’s communicative abilities in the mother tongue or to learn to communicate in a completely new language (Breen and Candlin 1980:93). In multilingual classrooms, active recognition of the learners’ mother tongue by using the learner as a resource could prevent a view of the learner as being stupid or backward because he or she is not competent in the medium of instruction.

The wider call for democracy has led many educators to adopt a less authoritarian stance in the classroom. A democratization of the classroom places the focus on the learner and his or her needs and expectations rather than on the teacher, and the learning content. Learner-centered teaching also takes into account the abilities, skills, learning style, and personality of the learner. This does not mean that the learner is
passive while all his or her needs are being catered for. The learner is expected and encouraged to participate actively in the learning process. In fact, this view of the learner is based on the assumption that learning only takes place if the learner is engaged in the learning process (Van der Walt 1990:28. Widdowson 1990:18). This presupposes that the learner assume various roles and responsibilities. In the communicative language classroom, Breen and Candlin see the learner as assuming the role of negotiator between the self, the learning process and the object of learning. As negotiator, the learner has certain responsibilities:

- contributing as much as he or she gains
- taking responsibility for his or her own learning
- being committed to communication in the language

In addition, the learner also has to adopt the role of manager. This entails providing feedback about his or her interpretation of what is being learnt and the appropriateness of the approach or method used to the personal learning style. In adopting these two roles, the learner therefore also becomes a teacher, not only of his or her peers, but also of the teacher (Breen and Candlin 1980:101). Another role learners have to assume is that of manager, since they have to manage their own learning (Wright 1987).

2.4.3 The poststructuralist view: the language learner's social identity

According to this view, the learner's social identity places a learner into the language learning context. Theorists into second language acquisition have presumed that learners can choose how and when they will interact with target language speakers and that it is a sign of the learners' motivation if they gain access to the target learning community. Peirce finds this theory problematic since learners are very often inhibited in their learning by the social context in which they find themselves. '(P)ower relations play a crucial role in social interactions between language learners and target language speakers' (Peirce 1995:12). Also, describing learners as motivated or unmotivated, introverted or extroverted, inhibited or uninhibited without considering the social restrictions or power relations which might cause these behaviours, is too simplistic. Peirce therefore proposes a theory of social identity based on the premise that power
relations impinge on learners' ability or not to learn and communicate. She further argues that it is investment rather than motivation that is the deciding factor in learners' interaction with the target language and its speakers. 'The notion of investment conceives of the language learner, not as ahistorical and unidimensional, but as having a complex social history and multiple desires' (1995:9). This has important implications for multilingual classrooms in South Africa.

These three views of the learner, as passive receptacle of information, as dynamic participant in the learning process, and as having a social identity, are closely related to particular views of language, of learning, of knowledge and of the teacher. They three are looked at briefly in turn.

2.5 Views of language learning

Brown views learning as being every bit as complex as language. He attempts to define it as follows:

- Learning is acquisition or "getting".
- Learning is retention of information or skill.
- Retention implies storage systems, memory, cognitive organization.
- Learning involves active, conscious focus on and acting upon events outside or inside the organism.
- Learning is relatively permanent, but subject to forgetting.
- Learning involves some form of practice, perhaps reinforced practice.
- Learning is a change in behaviour.

(Brown 1980:7)

Each of these statements about learning also point to different areas of inquiry and lead on to a number of subfields of psychology such as acquisition processes, perception, memory, recall, subconscious and conscious learning, forgetting, learning styles and strategies, reinforcement, and the role of practice. When learners learn a language, all these variables come into play (Brown 1980:7-8).
2.5.1 Natural language learning

The view that language learning is enhanced when classroom behaviour follows the natural process of language acquisition is derived from second language acquisition research (Widdowson 1990:47). Such research is concerned with the developmental stages in second language acquisition and the assumption is that if such research is successful, then all language teachers have to do to facilitate learning is to devise tasks that conform to this natural sequence of learning acquisition. (For a comprehensive discussion of second language acquisition, see Ellis 1994). However, as Widdowson points out (1990:140), this research has not yielded any definitive findings and even if it did, it is not self-evident that natural learning is necessarily the most effective. To him, the very concept of teaching goes against the grain of natural learning since it "presupposes invention and intervention which will direct learners in ways they would not, left to their own devices, have the opportunity or inclination to pursue" (1990:48).

Neither does Widdowson believe that natural learning is necessarily more effective than learning "induced by artifice" (1990:150). He asserts that civilizations have always sought to improve on nature and that education is there to direct natural talents so that the learner will acquire knowledge and ability. Once acquired, they can be used to challenge the very conventions that produced them.

2.5.2 Language learning as process

In learning a language, learners often use what they know about communication in their mother tongue to come to grips with communicating in the target language. This learning process cannot be explained as linear or logical. Learning often occurs in spurts and cannot be separated into discrete and unconnected skills (Smyth 1991:12).

Some experts explain learning as a problem-solving process. As early as 1910, Dewey described learning as a problem-solving process which takes place in five successive stages.

1. A state of doubt, cognitive perplexity, frustration, or awareness of difficulty.
2. An attempt to identify the problem, including a rather nonspecific designation of the ends that are sought, the gap to be filled, or the goal to be reached, as defined by the situation that sets the problem.

3. Relating these problem-setting propositions to cognitive structure, thereby activating relevant background ideas and, previously received problem solutions which, in turn, are reorganized (transformed) in the form of problem-solving propositions or hypotheses.

4. Successive testing of the hypothesis and reformulation of the problem if necessary.

5. Incorporating the successful solution into cognitive structure (understanding it) and then applying it both to the problem at hand and other exemplars of the same problem (Dewey 1910, in Brown 1980:84)

Since language learners' main task is to find out how to learn the target language, one of the main thrusts of communicative language teaching is the setting of problem-solving tasks to stimulate appropriate communication in the target language. Ideally, these tasks should have a clear purpose and involve the learners in negotiating meaning. The success of a task-based approach 'as an activator for language learning will depend on the extent to which they engage the learners in conceptual and communicative activities which they feel are worthwhile in their own right. It is crucial, however, that learners engage in a particular task not as a language exercise, but as a 'purposeful problem-solving activity' (Widdowson 1990:172).

2.6 Factors which influence language learning

How do learners learn? Those who perceive learners as 'pitchers' to be filled (see 2.4.1) presume that learners simply receive knowledge, which they either remember voluntarily or must be coerced into remembering. Other educationists argue that learners learn by imitation and involvement (Widdowson 1990, Wright 1991:18). Currently, most educationists would agree that learning is most successful when learners are aware of a clear purpose.

2.6.1 Learners' own views

It might be useful at this stage to reflect on some learners' own views of how they learn best. According to Boomer et al (1992:16-17) they learn best if they are
engaged, can explore, and, finally, reflect on the learning that has taken place. These three activities presuppose certain conditions in which learning takes place.

For learners to be engaged, they must want to learn or be interested in the learning they have to do. They therefore need to know what and why they need to learn. They need to have a personal investment in the learning process. Finally, the learning they do must be relevant. It should relate to what they already know and enable them to draw on their own experience.

For learners to explore, they need individual learning experiences. Not all learners learn in the same way, nor is their prior knowledge the same. They need to be made aware of a range of learning options. They need to speculate, hypothesise, theorise, and experiment. ‘We understand best when we can do things for ourselves and arrive at new knowledge by discovery, by trial, application, and often reshaping and reapplication’ (Boomer et al 1992: 17). Learners also need to relate to their peers and their teacher, as well as working on their own. They need to explore in a safe environment, being encouraged and challenged, not threatened. They need to be able to make mistakes and know that they will not be punished for them (1992:17).

Lastly, learners also need to reflect on what they have done. They need to share their work with others and feel that they have achieved something worthwhile. From this reflection and sharing other challenges should emerge which will again engage the learners’ interest and encourage them to learn (Boomer et al 1992:18). Galloway (1991:73) offers a similar list of learner needs which will enable learners to take control of their own learning.

2.6.2 Learning and constraints

Modern educationists would probably agree with the above factors which influence learning but one of the main factors is surely our whole system of education. Human beings have to learn. The very fact that children are required to go to school to be taught and to learn is based on the assumption that learning takes place within some kind of framework or constraints. Widdowson defines learning as ‘essentially an implied act of social conformity’ (1990:150). We learn because we have to fit into or
challenge the particular society in which we find ourselves. In this sense too, we learn language 'to get a better grasp of the world so that we can turn it to our advantage' (Widdowson 1990:103).

2.6.3 Motivation, investment, and learning

Drawing mainly from the field of social psychology, researchers into second language learning such as Garner and Lambert see success in learning a language largely as the result of the learner’s motivation. Motivation to learn a second language is seen either as instrumental or as integrative. Instrumental motivation refers to the desire to learn a language for utilitarian purposes, while integrative motivation refers to the desire of the language learner to integrate with the target language community (Peirce 1995:16-17).

Peirce, however, argues that these conceptions of motivation are inadequate since they do not capture the complex relationships of power, identity and language learning. Rather than instrumental or integrative motivation, she proposes that the learner’s investment in the target language is a powerful learning tool:

The conception of instrumental motivation generally presupposes a unitary, fixed, and ahistorical language learner who desires access to material resources that are the privilege of target language speakers. In this view, motivation is a property of the language learner - a fixed personality trait. The notion of investment, on the other hand, attempts to capture the relationship of the language learner to the changing social world. It conceives of the language learner as having a complex social identity and multiple desires. The notion presupposes that when language learners speak, they are not only exchanging information with target language speakers but they are constantly organizing and reorganizing a sense of who they are and how they relate to the social world. Thus an investment in the target language is also an investment in a learner’s own social identity, an identity which is constantly changing across time and space (Peirce 1995:17-18).

2.7 Views of knowledge

As Widdowson rightly observes, the nature of knowledge depends on the acknowledgement of existing conceptual frameworks. 'To know is to have formulated experience in reference to given categories these categories are not inscribed
immutably in the mind: they can be altered to accommodate new experience. But they cannot be altered unless they are first apprehended’ (Widdowson 1990:5).

There are three different views of knowledge that are pertinent to education and teaching in general and to language teaching in particular: the traditional Western view of knowledge, the constructivist view of knowledge and the poststructuralist view of knowledge. Each of these views operates from an existing framework.

2.7.1 The traditional Western view of knowledge

The traditional Western view of knowledge is that knowledge worth knowing, ‘legitimate knowledge’, is derived from scientific research. This knowledge is objective or value-neutral and context-free. As Rajah (1993:96) explains:

Only facts generated by this procedure are utilised in explanation and discovery, while other forms of knowledge, such as those derived intersubjectively, are marginalised on the grounds that they cannot be empirically verified.

This view of knowledge is based on the assumption that the universe is ordered and unproblematic ‘one in which objectivity, replicability, validity, reliability, causal explanation, and most important, control are possible and desirable’ (Rajah 1993:96). Since knowledge is seen as objective data, it can be transmitted by the teacher to the pupil. In this way, the world can be controlled.

2.7.2 The constructivist view of knowledge

Contrary to the traditional view that knowledge is so much objective data that can be transmitted by the teacher to the learner, constructivists maintain that knowledge is constructed in the mind of the learner (Bodner 1986:873). Most constructivists relate their view of knowledge to Piaget’s theory of intellectual development. According to Bodner, ‘Piaget argued that knowledge is constructed as the learner strives to organize his or her experiences in terms of preexisting mental structures or schemes’ (1986:873). Although human beings have cognitive functions such as organisation and adaptation which remain constant throughout life, they also have cognitive structures which change qualitatively and quantitatively with age and experience. Any new
information or experience is either assimilated or accommodated. Applying a pre-existing scheme or structure to interpret sensory information is known as assimilation. The process by which existing knowledge is modified to accommodate new data or experiences is called accommodation (Bodner 1986:873, Widdowson 1990:39).

From this point of view, knowledge is therefore not objective or simply a replica of reality. Learners assimilate or accommodate information and make it fit their particular conception of reality:

.. learners construct understanding. They do not simply mirror and reflect what they are told or what they read. Learners look for meaning and will try to find regularity and order in the events of the world even in the absence of full or complete information (Bodner 1986:874).

If knowledge is constructed in the mind of the learner, how then can groups of people share the same knowledge? Constructivists assert that knowledge must ‘work’, it must ‘fit’ reality, so besides knowledge being constructed, it is also always being tested

\[(K)\text{nowledge is viable as long as it works, as long as it stands up to the constraints of our experiences. The concepts, ideas, theories, and models we construct in our minds are constantly being tested as a result of our experiences, and they survive in a pragmatic or instrumental sense only as long as they are useful (Bodner 1986:875).} \]

It therefore, a group of student teachers who come from similar middle class backgrounds and share the same language have the same academic and practical course, they will in a sense, share common knowledge, which someone coming from a different background will not.

Constructivists, then, view knowledge not as objective, but as subjective.

2.7.3 A poststructuralist view of knowledge

While poststructuralists agree with constructivists that knowledge is individually constructed, they also assert that this knowledge is not shaped by individuals alone. Rather, it is shaped by political, historical, economic and social factors. Knowledge should not be used to perpetuate the existing order or power structures, but rather be applied to change them to bring about a more just society. For instance, language
knowledge should not be made available to enable people to take their 'deemed' or 'proper' place in society, but to empower them to take their rightful place in it. Poststructuralists therefore ask questions such as: Whose knowledge is seen as legitimate? Which social structures does this kind of knowledge perpetuate? Whom does this kind of knowledge empower? Whose interests does this kind of knowledge serve? (Peirce 1989, 1990, 1995, Stevenson 1993). The knowledge per se is therefore not as important as what it actually represents.

2.7.4 Ways of knowing

The three views of knowledge discussed above influence the way human beings, and more pertinently to this research, teachers, get to know things. Many teachers' knowledge about research into education and learning is not obtained from their own thorough reading of the research accounts nor even from their own research or observation, but simply on hearsay, in conversations with colleagues. Masemann (1990:467) maintains that in this way, certain well-known research findings become part of everyday wisdom. Teachers collect snippets of knowledge that they apply in particular circumstances as they deem fit. Teachers also acquire information about new methods and approaches by attending workshops, and by reading articles in professional journals. If the knowledge is prepackaged in the form of handouts, so much the better.

This way of obtaining knowledge shows an over-reliance on the so-called 'legitimate knowledge' generated by academics and researchers. This knowledge is usually based on quantifiable, scientific data which claims to be objective (see 2.7.1). In the Western world, this way of knowing or making sense of the world is quite acceptable. '(S)cientific research and positivistic forms of inquiry enable people to gather large amounts of information, analyze it, and produce generalizable statements that help them deal with unpredictability and uncertainty' (Masemann 1990:470). For many, it is the only legitimate form of knowledge. Teachers often use research findings to lend legitimacy to new approaches they try out in the classroom. However, there are other civilisations which do not accept as valid any knowledge that they have not themselves experienced. Cognisance of these other forms of knowledge, as well as the fact that
'objective data' can often be used to prove the opposite of what it set out to do (Klees 1989, in Masemann 1990:467; see also Widdowson 1990:16-18 and section 2.2.2) has led to the search for other, more holistic ways of knowing. These ways of knowing are informed by feminist, environmental and peace paradigms. Instead of treating knowledge as isolated facts, these paradigms see knowledge as an integrated whole (Masemann 1990:471).

In a sense, then, there has been a shift from regarding knowledge as wholly objective and isolated from its context, and able to be transmitted intact, to a recognition that knowledge is not neutral, is constructed by the individual and cannot be isolated from its social context.

2.7.5 What language teachers need to know

It goes without saying that language teachers, particularly communicative language teachers, need to have a thorough knowledge of the language they hope to teach their pupils. They also need to know the approaches, methods, techniques and skills they can use to teach the language. More than that, they need to know when to apply these skills and techniques, and what particular approach will be most suitable in a particular situation. They therefore need to know the language, its use and usage, as well as the ways and means to teach it. This knowledge, according to Richards (1991) is called content knowledge and instructional knowledge. But over and above knowing the language and the means to teach it, teachers also need to know about the kinds of language knowledge they need to introduce to their learners and they need to have insight into the learners themselves.

2.7.6 Kinds of language knowledge

In a poststructuralist society, where educational goals and actions are more and more being scrutinised for their contributions to 'liberating human potential and advancing social justice' (Stevenson 1993:8) it is pertinent to ask: What kinds of knowledge do teachers, within the confines of a prescribed syllabus, select and present to learners? (See also 2.7.3) Language teachers in particular must recognise that a language is not neutral, but carries with it the norms and values of a particular culture and world view.
'Language and culture are inextricably intertwined' (Ridge 5 1995:5). Teachers of English also need to recognise that although English is the most widely spoken written language in the world, 'an Aladdin's lamp' affording its speakers entrance to the international arenas of business, technology, and science (Kachru 1986:1), it is also seen as a language of 'cultural intrusion', as being 'the property of elites, expressing the interests of the dominant classes' (Cooke 1988 in Peirce 1989:402; see also Ndebele 1986). Language, like knowledge, cannot be separated from its social context. Clearly, language teachers need to reflect on these questions when deciding how to teach the language and literature syllabus.

2.7.7 Knowledge about language learners

Observation, writing down what has been observed, and then reflecting on what has been written, allows both learners and teachers to gain knowledge about learners' progress in the target language. Language teachers need to know how to teach their learners the target language. One of the things poststructuralists assert that language teachers need to know in order to do this is that 'motivation is not a fixed personality trait but must be understood with reference to social relations of power that create the possibilities for language learners to speak' (Peirce 1995:26). It is the learners' investment in the language that encourages them to use it (see 2.6.3). But this investment must be understood in regard to the multiple, changing and contradictory identities of language learners. What Peirce is arguing is that human beings, rather than one dominant, unique identity, have multiple identities which change over time.

Whereas humanist conceptions of the individual - and most definitions of the individual in SLA research - presuppose that every person has an essential, unique, fixed, and coherent core (introvert/extrovert; motivated/unmotivated; field dependent/field independent), poststructuralism depicts the individual as diverse, contradictory, and dynamic, multiple rather than unitary, decentred rather than centred (Peirce 1995:15).

Peirce further argues that the individual's multiple identity is also a site of struggle. Each individual takes up certain social positions and these are structured by relationships of power. For instance, 'the learner may be the youngest child in a very restricted household, but head prefect at school, may be excellent at maths, but
struggle with the target language. Some of these positions may be in conflict with others (Peirce 1995:15). This clearly influences the learner’s language use.

2.8 Views of the teacher

Conceptions of teaching, learning and the learner, language, and knowledge all shape various views of the teacher. In an education system where knowledge is regarded as so much objective data and learners as empty vessels which have to be filled, the teacher is seen primarily as a transmitter of knowledge. This view is perpetuated in an hierarchical education system where teachers generally do not have an active part in planning the curriculum, but must transmit what has been set to their pupils. In a sense, this view is legitimate, since teachers do have to operate within the confines of the curriculum or their specific subject syllabus (Johnson 1989, Widdowson 1993:261). However, teachers are also more and more being viewed as partners or collaborators in learning with their pupils, as facilitators of learning and as pragmatic mediators between the theory and practice of teaching. Although they are bound by the curriculum, they are viewed as being able to negotiate it in order to make learning more meaningful for the pupils and themselves (Boomer et al 1992). That teachers have a central role to play in the learning process is clear from the above. However learner-centred the classroom, it is the teacher who has to set the parameters within which the learners will learn, the teacher who guides and channels their learning (Harmer 1995, Widdowson 1987). Because of this, ‘learner-centred’ is perhaps an incorrect term, since it ignores the important role of the teacher. Ridge (1995a) suggests that ‘learning-centred’ is a more suitable term because it emphasises what should be happening in the classroom while at the same time acknowledging the roles of both teacher and learners.

2.8.1 Teachers as partners or collaborators in learning

According to this view, teachers do not come to the classroom with all the relevant knowledge intact. They are not the only ones in the classroom to have access to legitimate knowledge. The pupils also bring their knowledge and experience to the classroom and share it with their peers and the teacher. Both teacher and pupils become active learners, sharing knowledge, investigating, experiencing and reflecting.
on their learning. Teachers are not only partners in learning with their pupils, however, but also with other teachers. The conception of teachers as collaborative learners sees teachers learning from other teachers’ practice, not being threatened by it, reflecting on their own and others’ practice and being supportive of each other (Smyth 1991).

2.8.2 Teachers as facilitators

According to this view, the teacher’s main task is to facilitate the learning process. As a facilitator, the teacher must manage the learners, the classroom and the subject content in such a way that optimal learning takes place. For this, the teacher needs to know and accommodate the different learning styles of the pupils. The teacher must, however, also be aware of his or her own preferred teaching style and be willing to adapt or change it (Ridge 1994:6). Although the teacher must also be an instructor, he or she must know when to stand back and let learning happen (Britton 1986:157). As a facilitator of learning, the teacher is responsible for the classroom community:

Our role becomes that of seeing that that community, far from continuing as a captive audience for any instruction we care to offer, becomes a genuine learning experience for its members, a learning experience that draws upon and capitalises on both their in-school and their out-of-school experiences (Britton 1986:157).

2.8.3 Teachers as pragmatic mediators

Widdowson (1990) proposes a mediating role for teachers. Language teachers are inundated with research from linguistics, psychology, sociology, philosophy and education. They cannot afford to ignore this research, since it could be relevant to their teaching. Who is to judge whether the research is relevant to their teaching or not? Widdowson suggests that teachers must determine the relevance by acting as pragmatic mediators between theory and pedagogy. Rather than simply implementing new ideas in the form of teaching materials in the classroom as Masemann (1990:467, see 2.7.4) suggests they often do, teachers should consider the ideas themselves and see how they fit into their own experience of teaching.

The relationship between linguistic theory, the description of a particular language based upon it, and the way that language is actualised as behaviour in contexts of use is analogous to the relationship between a pedagogic theory of language learning, the devising of teaching materials based upon it, and the way
that language is most effectively actualized for learning in the contexts of particular classrooms (Widdowson 1990:31).

Two interdependent processes are involved in pedagogic mediation: appraisal and application. Appraisal focuses on theory and implies that teachers lock critically at the ideas in the context of their own theoretical domain and then assess whether they can be transferred to the practical teaching domain. 'Appraisal, then, is a conceptual evaluation based on a proper understanding of the ideas proposed, and it is directed at establishing a set of valid principles of general relevance' (Widdowson 1990:31).

The second mediating process, application, is concerned with practice and also consists of two stages. During the first stage ideas are put into operation. Then a second process of evaluation takes place to establish the practical effect of the ideas. 'Application is an empirical evaluation based on teaching experience and has to do with the devising of effective techniques specific to particular circumstances' (Widdowson 1990:31).

Application can lead to reappraisal and the ultimate acceptance or rejection of the new ideas. Since there is no real way of ascertaining whether it was the original idea, or the way in which it was put into operation, that was faulty, mediation remains a continuous process of appraisal and application. Widdowson sees this continuous process as essential to teaching: 'If this process is arrested and teaching reduced to the manipulation of a set of techniques, or conformity to a fixed method, then pedagogy as such ceases to exist' (1990:32).
The mediation process can be set out in the following way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEORY</th>
<th>PRACTICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPRAISAL</td>
<td>APPLICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in principle)</td>
<td>(of technique)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Diagram](image)

*Figure 2.2 The process of pragmatic mediation (Widdowson 1990:32)*

This view of teachers as pragmatic mediators presumes that teachers are researchers themselves, not only consumers or appliers of research. As such, it has implications for teacher preparation. Some of these implications are discussed in the following chapter.

### 2.9 Conclusion

In this chapter, a closer look was taken at language teaching, more especially the manner in which conceptions of teaching, language, learners and learning, of knowledge and of the teacher influence one another. All these aspects ultimately have implications for the education of language teachers. Language teacher education, therefore, is the focus of Chapter 3.
3.

WHAT IS LANGUAGE TEACHER EDUCATION?

3.1 Introduction

As with language teaching (see 2.1) it is impossible to define language teacher education without considering the assumptions on which it is based. If one accepts that language teacher preparation will have as its basis a theory or conception of language teaching (Freeman 1989; Freeman and Richards 1993) then different theories or conceptions will lead to different views of what are essential teaching skills and how language teachers need to be prepared (Freeman 1991; 1993:194). Perhaps this is also one of the reasons why there is so much confusion about the terms teacher preparation, teacher development, teacher training and teacher education in the research literature. Pennington, for instance, under the heading *Comparison of training approaches* states that language teaching "requires education and training" (Pennington 1989:92). She does not distinguish between those who *train* teachers and those who *educate* them. ‘Those who educate language teachers differ in their views about the appropriate orientation for pre-service preparation’ (1989:93, my emphasis). She distinguishes between competency-based and holistic approaches to language teacher education, but entitles the figure in which these two approaches are illustrated *Different emphases in two approaches to teacher training* (1989:93). It seems that the terms *education* and *training* have been and continue to be used interchangeably (Widdowson 1993:268; Larsen-Freeman 1983:265; Brumfit and Roberts 1983:155; Freeman 1989:37). It is, perhaps, useful to examine these terms more closely and establish how they are used in this research.

3.2 Teacher training and teacher education

Even when distinguishing between teacher training and teacher education, researchers find it difficult to follow the distinction through and still refer to pre-service teachers as teacher *trainees* and to those responsible for their preparation as teacher *trainers*,
instead of using student teachers and teacher educators, for instance (see Larsen-Freeman 1983; Meyer 1990).

3.2.1 Teacher training

The primary distinction researchers make between training and education is that training prepares teachers for specific teaching situations while education prepares them for any teaching situation (Larsen-Freeman 1983; Freeman 1989, Widdowson 1990). Despite her assertion that she views training as part of education, Larsen-Freeman nevertheless supplies a neat distinction (1983:265):

The training process: The educating process:

The training process is situation-oriented. Since the trainer can customize the training to the situation, finite objectives can be specified.

The educating process is individual-oriented. Objectives are more general and are stated in terms of developing an individual’s skills so that he or she can adapt to and function in any situation.

The content of the training program is matched to the finite objectives. The information is transmitted from the trainer to the trainees.

Students are educated to be independent learners to have the capacity to generate their own learning as needed (Harrison and Hopkins 1967. 439).

Trainees are expected to do as the trainer (or the acknowledged model) does. The emphasis is on obtaining results that conform as closely to the model as possible.

Students learn how to set objectives, define problems, generate hypotheses, gather information, make decisions, and assess outcomes. The emphasis is on the process, not the result.

Criteria for success can be specified. Measurement of these and therefore of the degree of the trainer’s success is immediately attainable.

Since objectives are more open-ended, assessment is based on the progress students have made towards meeting the objectives. Success is more relative than absolute.
From this description, it is clear that the training of language teachers will entail the teaching of methods, skills and techniques teachers can use to teach learners a language and to manage their classrooms. For communicative language teaching, for instance, pre-service teachers would be trained in task-based teaching, groupwork methods and problem-solving activities. The teacher trainer passes on ideas, methods, practical experience and skills to the teachers (pre-service or in-service). The assumption (unarticulated or articulated) is that these things work in the classroom. Teachers must simply apply them. As Ridge (1994:2) points out, teachers will then have 'a set of glib “answers”’. The problem with this type of teacher preparation is that it assumes that all teaching situations are the same and that teachers should accept unquestioningly what researchers, curriculum planners and textbook writers present to them (Widdowson 1990:62, 1993:269). For those who view teaching as based solely on empirical research or on theory/values, this type of preparation is acceptable, since it emphasises a particular method or approach and does not see teachers as capable of producing their own, legitimate research. Widdowson (1993:269) sums up this narrow view of training as follows: ‘Teacher training, defined in this way, clearly calls for relatively non-reflective submission to authority.’ Confusion arises when researchers take a broader view. Johnson (1989), for instance, does not view training in these narrow terms. He asserts that training encompasses more than mere methods and techniques. In what he calls professional training, pre-service teachers learn not only methods, skills and techniques, but also their appropriate implementation. For the purposes of this research, however, the narrow view of training is taken.

As conceptions of language, learning, learners and knowledge have grown, so more and more educationists have realised that a narrow type of training is inadequate since it does not prepare teachers to make intelligent choices, develop their own theories of teaching, to become reflective about what they do in the classroom, nor to take responsibility for their own development as teachers (Richards and Nunan 1990:xi). During the early eighties Brown (1980:vii) asserted that teacher training courses should not present one or two methods and a number of techniques ‘in cookbook fashion’, and thereby expect trainees to be adequately prepared to teach. Teaching is far more complex than this (Widdowson 1990, 1993).
3.2.4 Teacher education

Whereas teacher training can be seen as the transmission of knowledge and product orientated, teacher education is holistic and process orientated. Teacher education sets out to prepare teachers to cope with the complexities of teaching. Although teachers need to have skills and to know about approaches, methods, and techniques, they need to know when to apply these approaches and methods. They therefore need to make choices. Larsen-Freeman asserts that teacher education is primarily a process of teaching students to make appropriate choices. "Since there are few facile answers in teaching and no universally acclaimed recipes for pedagogic success, making informed choices is what teaching is all about" (Larsen-Freeman 1989:266). In order to make informed choices, teachers need a heightened awareness of the situation and their own behaviour, a positive, open attitude so as to explore the choices available, adequate knowledge of the options that exist, and skills to implement the chosen option (Larsen-Freeman 1983:266-267).

Freeman (1989:31) calls the process whereby Larsen-Freeman’s four constituents of language teaching are taught to both pre-service and in-service teachers education. The two main strategies in the educating process, according to Freeman, are training as defined in section 3.2.1, and development. Knowledge and skills can be taught by training. Development is not as direct a strategy as training, as it involves the teacher’s attitude and awareness. The ultimate aim of development is for teachers to become more self-critical and to generate their own solutions to the problems they encounter in the language classroom. Teacher development and Freeman’s model of teacher education are discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

Widdowson (1984, 1990) distinguishes broadly between education and training, but one can assume, from his explanation of his view of education, that it agrees with that of Freeman. He sees teacher education as focusing "not on the application of readymade problem-solving techniques but on the critical appraisal of the relationship between problem and solution as a matter of continuing enquiry and of adaptable practice" (1990:62). This view would encompass what Freeman calls teacher development with its focus on awareness and attitude.
Widdowson is adamant that teacher education does not deny providing student teachers with the relevant techniques, but these should be seen as procedures to exploit, not applied unthinkingly. However, he does advocate that for pre-service courses, the emphasis should fall more on training, as he defines it, than on education. As reasons for this he gives the fact that beginning teachers need to know the ‘basics of professional activity’ - those which relate to classroom management and those which have to do with acculturation in the teaching environment. They need to become members of a group, to fit into a teacher corps.

In their initiation into both the craft and culture of pedagogy, it is in the interests of novice teachers to conform in order to place their relations with pupils and fellow teachers on a secure base and so to get established in their role. In view of this, it seems clear that pre-service or initial preparation needs to pay particular attention to training (1990:64).

Although he does see these courses as encouraging an ‘awareness of wider theoretical implications’ he sees this mainly as a long-term investment (1990:65) and more in the area of in-service provision. Ultimately, Widdowson sees teacher education as leading to teachers becoming pragmatic mediators between theory and practice (see 2.8.3).

Education, then, encompasses knowledge transmission of skills, techniques, approaches and methods, as well as instilling in teachers an awareness of what they are about, an open, enquiring attitude towards both theory and practice and the recognition that they are responsible for their own learning. Clearly, education is an ongoing process which does not end at the completion of the pre-service course. This is the view of education used in this research.

Aspects of language teacher education which address the teacher’s attitude and awareness are reflective teaching, action research, and teacher development. Following Richards and Lockhart (1994:3) these three are based on the assumptions that:

- an informed teacher has an extensive knowledge base about teaching
- much can be learned about teaching through self-inquiry
- much of what happens in teaching is unknown to the teacher
- experience is insufficient as a basis for development
critical reflection can trigger a deeper understanding of teaching.

In the next sections, reflective teaching, action research and teacher development are discussed in more detail.

3.3 Reflective teaching

John Dewey’s theory of reflective thinking, especially his distinction between routine and reflective action, is widely acknowledged as having influenced theories of reflective teaching (see Zeichner and Liston 1987, Bartlett 1990, Roos 1995). According to Dewy, routine action is guided mainly by tradition, external authority and circumstance, while reflective action ‘entails the active, persistent and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in view of its theoretical foundation and practical consequences’ (R 1995:138, see also Zeichner and Liston 1987:24).

Proponents of reflective teaching such as Zeichner and Liston (1987) and Cruikshank and Applegate (1981) also draw on one or more of Van Manen’s (1977:226-7) three levels of reflectivity. The first level is one of technical rationality and the primary concern is to apply educational knowledge to improving teaching practice. The second level is concerned with practical action. This requires explaining and clarifying the underlying assumptions and predispositions of teaching actions and evaluating the educational consequences of these actions. The third level, critical reflection, requires practical action to be evaluated against moral and ethical criteria (Zeichner and Liston 1987:25).

Cruikshank and Applegate’s view of reflective teaching lies more or less at the first level of reflection. They see reflective teaching as ‘an opportunity to consider the teaching event thoughtfully, analytically and objectively’ (Cruikshank and Applegate 1981:4). The focus is on the events and individuals in the classroom alone and reflection is synonymous with thinking. Teaching techniques are regarded as the most important means to improve practice (Bartlett 1990:202).

While acknowledging the first level as necessary, Zeichner and Liston (1987:23) are much more concerned with Van Manen’s other two levels of reflectivity, which take a
much broader view of reflective teaching. Their student-teaching course at the University of Wisconsin is for those who

are willing and able to reflect on the origins, purposes, and consequences of their actions, as well as the material and ideological constraints and encouragements embedded in the classroom, school, and societal contexts in which they live. These goals are directed toward enabling teachers to develop the pedagogical habit and skills necessary for self-directed growth and toward preparing them, individually and collectively, to participate as full partners in the making of educational policies (Zeichner and Liston 1987:23).

This broader view of reflective teaching expects teachers to become not merely excellent transmitters of received knowledge, but to become active partners in the teaching-learning process, to make professional judgements not only within the confines of their own classrooms, but within the framework of the school in its social context. Some researchers call this critical reflective teaching.

3.3.1 Critical reflective teaching

Critically reflective teachers are not only expected to improve their own teaching and take charge of their own self-growth, they are also expected to be aware of and reflect on ethical and moral matters pertaining not merely to the school, but also to broader society (Bartlett, 1990; Wallace 1991; Zeichner and Liston 1987; Richards and Lockhart 1994). Critical reflective teaching is in line with the poststructuralist view of teaching and knowledge (see 2.7.3, 2.7.4, 2.7.6). It is most pertinent for teachers of English in South Africa, not least because of the hegemony of status and power of the language (see Peirce 1989, Heugh 1993).

For teachers to become critically reflective, Bartlett suggests they ask ‘what’ and ‘why’ questions rather than ‘how to’ questions. Some of the more general questions have already been mentioned in 2.7.3. The following are more specifically aimed at secondary teachers of English:

- What caused me to become a secondary teacher of English?
- Do these reasons still exist for me now?
- What does it mean to be a teacher?
- Is the teacher I am the person I am?
Where did the ideas I embody in English teaching come from historically?
- How did I come to appropriate them?
- Why do I continue to endorse them now in my teaching?
- Whose interests do these ideas serve?
- Who has power in my classroom and how is it expressed?
- How do power relationships in my classroom influence my interactions with students?
- How might I teach differently?
- What is the nature of the knowledge that guides my teaching of content?
- Who creates this knowledge?
- How did this knowledge emerge during the evolution of teaching?
- Whose interests does this knowledge about secondary English teaching serve?
- How do I personally work to uncover the contradictions in my teaching?
- How does what I do affect the opportunities in life of pupils?
- What connections do I make with organizations outside the school to demonstrate my active role in society?
- Do I wish to uncover the 'hidden curriculum' - the inconsistencies - in my teaching?

(Adapted from Bartlett 1990:206-207; see also Smyth 1989:7)

From these questions it is clear that being critically reflective does not mean being negative, but being able to see one's actions 'in relation to the historical, social, and cultural context in which (one's) teaching is actually embedded' (Bartlett 1990:205; see also Smyth 1989:3). Being critically reflective requires teachers to move out of their comfort zone and to live at the limits of their knowledge and competence (Galloway 1991:70). It should also not be equated with merely gaining personal insights, illuminating as these may be. Smyth cites Beyer and Apple in this regard:

It involves both conscious understanding of and actions in schools on solving our daily problems. These problems will not go away by themselves, after all.
But it also requires critically reflective practices that alter the material and ideological conditions that cause the problems we are facing as educators in the first place (Beyer and Apple 1988, in Smyth 1989:3).

In this sense, it should give teachers ‘executive responsibility and powers-of-change’ (Silcock 1994:282). This kind of reflection requires guidance, initially from experts, ultimately from within (Galloway 1991:70).

3.3.2 A process for reflection

Silcock (1994:282) warns of the dangers of becoming attached to a single model of reflection, since reflection should be utilised for a specific purpose, not simply for its own sake:

Crucially, reflection obeys purpose: its form is charged from the outset by ego-driven intent. A teacher’s purpose may be to make individual judgements within unique circumstances; it may also be to apply a learned rule to a familiar setting.

Nevertheless, the following principles listed by Bartlett (1990:207) can guide teachers in the process of reflection:

• The issue upon which the teacher reflects must occur in the social context where teaching occurs.

• The teacher must be interested in the problem to be resolved.

• The issue must be ‘owned’ by the teacher - that is, derived from his or her practice.

• Reflection on the issue involves problem solving from the teaching situation in which the teacher is located.

• Ownership of the identified issue and its solution is vested in the teacher.

• Systematic procedures are necessary.

• Information (observations) about the issue must be derived from the teacher’s experience of teaching.

• The teacher’s ideas need to be tested through the practice of teaching.

• Ideas about teaching, once tested through practice, must lead to some course of action. There is tension between idea and action which is
reflexive, once it is tested the action rebounds back on the idea which informed it.

- Hence, reflective action may be transformed into new understandings and refined practice in teaching.

Clearly, the process of reflective teaching is not linear, but cyclical. Bartlett sees the reflective cycle as comprising five activities or elements: mapping, informing, contesting, appraising, and acting (see also Smyth 1989). It is important to note that one may pass through the reflective cycle several times, that the activities are not sequential and that one activity may be omitted while moving through the cycles (Bartlett 1987:208-209). The activities which constitute the reflective cycle are illustrated in Figure 3.

Figure 3.1 The elements of a cycle for the process of reflective teaching (Bartlett 1990:209)

3.3.2.1 Mapping (What do I do as a teacher?)

Mapping is essentially gathering information or evidence about teachers' own teaching, their ideas of teaching, and of others who influence them. The emphasis is on observation and description. It is important to focus on one particular aspect of teaching at a time. Information can be gathered by recording lessons, videotaping them or by journal writing (Bartlett 1990:209-210).
3.3.2.2 Informing (What is the meaning of my teaching?)

Once the mapping has been done, teachers must then seek the meaning behind the maps. For instance, teachers might go back to their description of a lesson and reflect on what they intended and what actually happened. This may be done individually or in collaboration with other teachers, students, or pupils. During this phase, teachers might also try to see the lesson sequence from the point of view of their students or pupils (Galloway 1991). During this stage the principles behind the teaching are beginning to be uncovered (Bartlett 1990:210-211).

3.3.2.3 Contesting (How did I come to be this way?)

During the contesting phase teachers challenge their ideas and reasons for teaching in a particular way. This is meant to expose the assumptions that teachers hold and involves a search for inconsistencies and contradictions in what we do and what we think' (Bartlett 1990:212). Teachers are often unaware of what they do in the classroom. For instance, teachers may think that what they are doing is in the best interests of their pupils, but when contesting this view, they might come to the conclusion that they actually have their own best interests at heart (Bartlett 1990:212).

3.3.2.4 Appraisal (How might I teach differently?)

Contesting a particular teaching practice leads teachers to look for alternatives. ‘Appraisal begins to link the thinking dimension of reflection with the search for teaching in ways consistent with our new understanding’ (Bartlett 1990:212-213).

3.3.2.5 Acting (What and how shall I teach now?)

Although acting is listed as the last activity in the reflective teaching process, it does not mark the end of the cycle. As teachers continually reflect on what they do, they enact the cycle again and again.

3.3.3 Journailling

Many researchers advocate journal writing as a most effective way to encourage reflection, since writing in itself is a reflective process which leads to discovery and
thus to learning (Galloway 1987, Bailey 1990, Bartlett 1990:209, Porter et al 1990:227, Richards and Lockhart 1994:7). Contrary to popular belief, writing is also considered to be a social activity. Some researchers see it as ‘discourse among people with shared interests’ (Porter et al 1990:227). In respect of journal writing by student teachers they argue as follows:

Teachers in preparation are exploring new ideas but they are also exploring the ways in which members of the language teaching profession talk and write about these ideas. Journals help these student teachers to become members of this discourse community by giving them opportunities to write within it and to get responses from their teachers, who are active and practised members. These exchanges give students both a real audience within the community and a developing sense of being a member of the community (1990:227).

According to Porter et al. journaling is also in keeping with the communicative approach to language teaching which advocates active learning, learner involvement and a process- rather than a product-orientated approach to language learning. Journals are not only most useful for reflecting on actual teaching practice, but can also be used by student teachers to reflect on teaching theory and by pupils to reflect on what is happening in the classroom. Often, pupils’ and students’ writing proficiency improves quite considerably if they keep a journal (own observation).

3.3.3.1 Procedures for using journals in pre-service teacher education

Porter et al (1990:228) advocate the use of journals in all types of pre-service teacher classes:

...for those of a theoretical nature, such as a survey of sociolinguistics or of second language acquisition (SLA), to those of a more practical nature, such as a survey of methodologies, a materials-preparation class, or a practicum involving extensive observation and/or teaching.

Journal assignments should be an integral part of a course and students must write and hand in their journals regularly. Since journaling is usually a new experience for students, Porter et al provide some suggestions of what to write about:

For theory-oriented classes:

- React to/describe class discussions
• Ask questions about readings/discussions
• Relate readings/discussions to your own experiences
• React to describe something that you read
• Argue for/against something you read/discussed
• Explore pedagogical implications of readings/discussions
• Fit new knowledge into what you already know
• Question the applications, motivations, uses, or significance of what you have learned

   Additional questions for method classes, practice-teaching or micro-teaching:
• React to class demonstrations, observations, teaching/tutoring experiences
• Make connections between course content and previous experiences you have had as a teacher or language learner
• Argue for/against a particular technique or procedure

For use with students' 'products' such as lesson plans, research reports, oral presentations, assignments, and examinations:
• Describe your progress or problems with the current assignment/exam.
• React to my evaluation of your last assignment/exam.

   (Adapted from Porter et al 1990:228-229)

Journalling will be more effective if students know the following 'ground rules':

• The journal is not a personal diary
• The journal is not the place to take notes, but 'to go beyond notes by exploring, reacting, making connections'
• Journal entries do not need to be polished pieces of writing
• Although it is not marked, the journal deserves the same serious attention as any other assignment or exam (Porter et al 1999:229).
3.3.3.2 The lecturer/tutor response to student journals

The lecturer/tutor response to journal entries is crucial to the effectiveness of this type of reflection. Student teacher journals work best if they take the form of an ongoing dialogue with the lecturer/tutor. Responses can range from providing students with references for further reading, encouraging comments, acknowledgement of particularly useful insights, requests for clarification, to points of agreement and disagreement. The lecturer/tutor may also give general feedback to the whole class after reading the journals, perhaps as a starting point for a class discussion which will benefit all the students. (Porter et al 1990:230-231).

3.3.3.3 Benefits of journalling

Journalling is a form of self-inquiry so its benefits are not that easily discerned by outsiders. Researchers who have listed benefits support these with evidence from student journals. Clearly, someone who dislikes writing will not derive much benefit from this form of reflection (Bailey 1990:224; Porter et al 1990:231). Nevertheless, it is useful to consider the following:

- Students can get help with areas of course content where they are having difficulties. Tutors/lecturers can respond in the journals or discuss problem areas with the whole class.

- Journalling promotes autonomous learning by encouraging students to formulate their own theories and ideas about teaching (see also Kutz 1992:75).

- Students gain confidence in their ability to learn, to make sense of difficult material, and to have original insights. They are not passive learners, but have to interact with their tutor/lecturer. This interaction leads to a more collegial relationship, which benefits both the student and the tutor/lecturer.

- Journalling leads to more productive class discussion. Because students have already prepared the ground while journalling, class time can be used for in-depth discussion of issues.
• Journalling encourages students to make connections between course content and their own teaching.

• Journalling creates interaction beyond the classroom, both between tutors/lecturers and students and among students. It is a valuable dialogue for those students who find it difficult to speak in class.

• Journalling makes the class more process-orientated, which is in line with communicative language teaching.

• Journalling helps the lecturer/tutor understand the students better and vice versa.

(Adapted from Porter et al 1990:231-238).

Bailey (1990:224) cautions that merely writing a journal, although helpful, does not yield maximum benefit. That comes with rereading the entries and trying to find patterns. 'In reworking, rethinking, and interpreting the diary entries, teachers can gain powerful insights into their own classroom behavior and motivation' Bailey 1990:225).

Clearly, the benefits of journalling are such that it should be seriously considered in any language teacher education course. Although it may mean more work for the lecturer/tutor as well as the students, it should ultimately lead to much more satisfying classroom interaction and better prepared teachers.

3.3.4 Reflective practice teaching

One of the aims of teacher education as defined in this research is to narrow the gap between theory and practice. Reflective teaching and action research (see 3.4) are two ways in which teachers, who are usually seen as practitioners, can become more aware of the theories underlying their teaching or be led to a 'more conscious understanding of the principles and concepts underlying (their) actions' (Stern 1983:27; see also Swan 1993:243).

Practice teaching, whether it be micro-teaching, where students observe another's lesson and then discuss what happened, or the actual period of teaching practice
students have to perform at a school, can be utilised to achieve this aim. Reflection on practice teaching can be done by journaling (see 3.3.3). The following approach suggested by Ramani (1987) is useful in micro-teaching, both pre-service and in-service:

Stage 1: Lecturer/tutor asks class to form groups and to discuss which three things they would be interested in looking at while watching a videotaped lesson. This previewing exercise is meant to elicit the hidden criteria students have for evaluating teaching. Since these criteria will also influence their own teaching, it is necessary to make them explicit so they can be examined. They form a teacher’s ‘pre-theoretical map’ because they reveal what the teacher thinks is important in the teaching-learning process. It is crucial that the observation criteria should be their own, not the lecturer’s.

Stage 2: Each group’s views are written up on the board. No criteria are discussed, except to eliminate overlap.

Stage 3: Lecturer/tutor provides minimal background information on the videotaped lesson. No methodology is discussed at this stage.

Stage 4: The class views the lesson and takes notes if they want to.

Stage 5: Lecturer/tutor asks class to discuss two questions in groups:

Which parts of the lesson did they consider most satisfactory, and why?

Which parts did they consider least satisfactory, and why?

These questions are meant to elicit the class’ real and subjective responses to the lesson.

Stage 6: Responses are put on the board.

Stage 7: Discussion of responses may lead to revision of original assumptions.

Stage 8: Lecturer/tutor provides a follow-up handout summarising students’ insights, listing general theoretical questions raised by these and suggesting relevant reading materials.

(Adapted from Ramani 1987:4-7)

Since this approach focuses on the classroom process rather than on the teacher’s performance, it is also a good way to provide feedback after student teacher
observation sessions. Alternatively, student teachers can be asked to compile, in groups, their own observation schedules and apply them to a videotaped lesson. After group discussion and reflection, the schedules can be modified and used to evaluate each participant's own videotaped lesson. This leads to more reflection and possible modification of the observation schedules. The procedure can be repeated any number of times until a final draft is arrived at. Swan (1993:249) maintains that 'the formative administration by student teachers themselves of an observation schedule which they have designed, modified, and sequentially tried out in a number of lessons, including their own, can be a powerful means of teacher development, in a way that can never happen when observation schedules are compiled and administered in the traditional manner'.

3.3.4.1 A reflective creative planning model

Using a reflective or creative planning model rather than a rational 'means-end' one will help student teachers to create lessons based on sound language theories and methodology rather than transmission-of-knowledge, product-orientated lessons (Cain 1989).

The rational means-end planning model stems from the 'scientific management era' and follows a four-step procedure: formulating behavioral objectives; choosing appropriate learning activities, organising the activities; and selecting evaluation procedures to assess whether the stated objectives have been met (Cain 1989:6). The model is illustrated in Figure 3.2.
Unit/lesson title

Rationale
(Why are you teaching this? What is the theory? Standard level?)

Unit objectives
(In student terms)

Introductory activity

Activities
(What things will you do to accomplish your objectives? These activities are not necessarily in order.)

Culminating activities

Materials
(What do you need to accomplish your objectives and carry out your activities?)

Evaluation
(How do you plan to assess a pupil’s accomplishment of your objectives?)

Figure 3.2 Rational means-end planning model (adapted from Cain:1989:6)

The rational means-end model encourages student teachers to accomplish their teaching objectives in spite of their pupils. This means that the lesson or unit becomes more important than the pupil’s needs (Cain 1989:25).

Cain’s creative planning model is intended to encourage student teachers to reflect on their lesson plans and take into consideration the many variables involved: the curriculum; the pupils’ needs; the classroom; the educational theory and research and management strategies. The model consists of three stages: a pre-planning, planning and post-planning stage.

During pre-planning, student teachers observe their pupils, research the content area, think about suitable methods, decide on classroom management strategies and how to cope with discipline problems. Cain suggests that this preplanning be done by journaling (see 3.3.3).

After the pre-planning stage, student teachers begin to create their unit or lesson plans, incorporating their preplanning observations and research.

The post-planning stage takes place after each lesson. Student teachers reflect on their lesson and decide what aspects of their unit or lesson encouraged the teaching-learning
process, what did not, and why. Post-planning often leads student teachers back to the pre-planning stage to revise their plans and strategies to meet their pupil’s needs. Figure 3.3 illustrates Cain’s creative planning model.

**Creative planning for creative teaching**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-planning</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Post-planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brainstorming</td>
<td>Organising</td>
<td>Experimenting and testing by teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researching</td>
<td>Sequencing</td>
<td>Evaluating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting</td>
<td>Visualising</td>
<td>Reorganising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating</td>
<td>Integrating</td>
<td>Internalising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborating</td>
<td>Designing</td>
<td>Storing away</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Creating sound methods

*Figure 3.3 Creative planning for creative teachers (Cain 1989:8)*

Cain (1989:27) asserts that her creative planning model encourages student teachers to create classroom environments conducive to self-discovery and therefore to real learning, not only for their pupils, but also for themselves.

### 3.3.4.2 A triadic-relationship model of practice teaching

It is often said that university departments of education have no idea of what is actually happening in schools and that they therefore do not prepare their students to meet the challenges of the ‘real world’. Meyer (1990:441) reports that student teachers often find their courses too theoretical. These views support the argument that there is a gap between theory and practice. One way to bridge the gap between what is happening in teacher preparation courses and school classrooms is the formation of a triadic relationship between the institutional lecturer, the student, and the school supervisor who work together in mutually supportive roles (Adams 1991). This implies that the school’s English department and the English methods lecturer share the same concerns regarding the teaching of English. Adams argues as follows:
To provide the proper climate for initial teacher education it seems clear that the models and inspiration provided by the school subject department are of paramount importance and that the choice of school, both for initial experience and teaching practice, must depend upon the professional knowledge and judgement of the subject methods lecturer (Adams 1991:69).

Adams is even more specific when he asserts that the school department must be the right one for a particular student. This means that the lecturer/tutor must work quite closely with the school department and should ideally be involved with in-service work. The aim is to ‘seek out and develop the best of present practice into what may become the common practice of the future’ (Adams 1991:69).

3.3.4.3 Problems experienced with reflective teaching

Researchers who advocate a reflective approach to teaching are the first to point out that it does not come easily and that it takes time (Wallace 1991; Swan 1993; Richards and Lockhart 1994). Swan cites Sprinall and Sprinall when she maintains that ‘giving up old habits is a painful process, akin to grieving. Such habits, one suspects, must include habitual modes of thinking as well as ways of behaving. Teachers, then, will find their beliefs about teaching and modes of classroom behaviour difficult to change’ (1993:246). Student teachers may find the whole process profoundly unsettling, even more so if they are introduced to reflective teaching only in the English method course, rather than in all their teacher preparation courses. Another problem is that reflective teaching cannot be ‘taught’. Although there are certain techniques which may be used to facilitate the process, it is something that evolves in the individual. This very process of evolving, of becoming aware of one’s own values and beliefs, of being able to analyse one’s own practice and examine its ethical, moral and political basis, cannot be attained in the diploma year (Roos 1995:140). This is frustrating to teacher trainers who want to deliver a ‘finished product’ at the end of the diploma year. And teacher educators must remember that they themselves will also have to become reflective teachers with their students, that they will have to become part of the process just as much as their students. Student teachers will not become reflective practitioners if they are given lectures and notes on the reflective process. Nevertheless, these can not be reasons for not introducing student teachers to the reflective process.
(If the principles of transparency and co-operative, democratic decision-making are to be implemented in a meaningful and responsible way at all levels in education, teacher education curricula will have to move beyond the view of teacher education as we know it - a process during which prospective teachers are equipped with theoretical knowledge and unquestioned ideas about teaching practice only (Rooi 1995:140).

3.4 Action research

Action research in language teaching has been mentioned briefly in section 2.2.3. In language teaching, it is essentially classroom-centred rather than classroom-orientated research, since the teacher is the researcher and not the subject of the research. The originators of this research, Kemmis and Mc Taggart (1982:5) view action research as follows:

The linking of the terms ‘action’ and ‘research’ highlights the essential feature of the method: trying out ideas in practice as a means of improvement and as a means of increasing knowledge about the curriculum, teaching and learning. The result is improvement in what happens in the classroom and school, and better articulation and justification of the educational rationale of what goes on. Action research provides a way of working which links theory and practice into one whole: ideas-in-action.

Although it has been variously defined (Nunan 1992:17), Kemmis and Mc Taggart argue that action research has three essential characteristics: It should be carried out by practitioners (in this instance, classroom teachers) and not outside researchers, it should be collaborative, and it should lead to change (Nunan 1992:17). As mentioned in section 2.2.3, Kemmis and Mc Taggart consider that research carried out by an individual is not action research. Cohen and Manion (1985) hold a similar view, emphasising that action research is situational, collaborative and should lead to an improvement in the current state of affairs (Nunan 1992:17).

Nunan (1992:18) takes a different view:

While collaboration is highly desirable, I do not believe that it should be seen as a defining characteristic of action research. Many teachers who are interested in exploring processes of teaching and learning in their own context are either unable, for practical reasons, or unwilling, for personal reasons, to do collaborative research. The work that such people carry out should not necessarily be excluded as action research. I would also dispute the claim that action research must necessarily be concerned with change. A descriptive case study of a particular classroom, group of learners, or even a single learner
counts as action research if it is initiated by a question, is supported by data and interpretation, and is carried out by a practitioner investigating aspects of his or her own context and situation.

It could be argued that action research in language teaching is always collaborative, even when an individual teacher conducts an investigation in his or her own classroom without the aid of other teachers or an outside researcher, since the teacher and pupils work together to find solutions to a particular problem. Pupils, 'as participants in the learning/teaching operation, have a role in the evaluation process... They do not just generate data, but enter into collaboration in the continuous monitoring of classroom activity and its effects' (Widdowson 1990:59).

Nunan (1992:18) lists seven steps in action research.

1. Initiation: teacher identifies a real problem in the classroom situation which needs to be solved.
2. Preliminary investigation: teacher collects data through observation and recording of happenings in the classroom.
3. Hypothesis: teacher formulates a hypothesis after reviewing the data from the preliminary investigation.
4. Intervention: teacher develops a plan of action to address the problem.
5. Evaluation: teacher observes, reflects on and evaluates the effects of the plan of action.
6. Dissemination: teacher shares findings with colleagues.
7. Follow-up: teacher investigates other methods.

Action research therefore involves the teacher in a cycle of planning, action, observation and reflection (Widdowson 1990:32; Nunan 1992:19; Richards and Lockhart 1992:12).

Widdowson (1984; 1990) argues that teacher research should essentially be aimed at bringing together theory and practice and cautions against action research if it is not
based on theory and make academic research. Teacher research should never be 'uninformed and accidental' but should be conducted within the framework of the 'academic disciplines of languages, psychology, sociology and education' (1989:61). Also, it should lead to an improvement in the teaching-learning situation and so be of benefit to the learners and only 'incidentally' to the teacher's own (1996:59).

Widdowson's view of teacher research, that of pragmatic mediation, which could be defined as action research in the sense that it is classroom-centred, conducted by the teacher, informed by theory and might ultimately lead to an improvement in teaching practice, has been discussed in section 2.8.3.

For Wallace (1991) too, action research should merge theory and practice. 'Action research helps to undermine the dichotomy between theory and practice' (1991:56). It should focus on practical problems and the solutions should therefore also be practical. Wallace does not feel that the findings of action research should necessarily have to be generalisable: 'The "findings" of such research might be primarily specific, i.e. it is not claimed that they are necessarily of general application, and therefore the methods might be more free-ranging than those of conventional research' (1991:57).

It would seem then, that action research is a valuable tool in the ongoing education of teachers. From the above it might seem that action research can only be engaged in by in-service teachers. However, pre-service teachers can be initiated into it during their teacher preparation. Student teachers can record their own lessons, reflect on what has happened during the lesson and identify a problem area. They can then, with the aid of the teacher educator and/or their peers, decide on a strategy to solve the problem, apply it in follow-up lessons, and evaluate whether the strategy has improved the situation (Ramani 1987:3-11). Fleisher (1993:173) argues that having a transcript of a lesson is valuable because it alerts teachers to problems which they had perhaps not been aware of before. Because they have to provide evidence from the transcript to support their claims or intuitions, they cannot simply make subjective remarks but must be more rigorous. If student teachers are initiated into action research during their preparation and can be made to see its value, they are more likely to adopt it as part of their teaching once they are fully-fledged teachers.
3.5 Teacher development

Teacher development is generally accepted to be an ongoing process. ‘It is a term used in the literature to describe a process of continual intellectual, experiential and attitudinal growth of teachers (Lange 1990:250). Some researchers have distinguished between teacher education and teacher development, arguing that education can be presented by others, while development is something which can be done only by and for oneself (Wallace 1991:3) Others, such as Swan (1993:243) and Freeman (1989:37), equate it with teacher education as defined in this research. Reflective teaching and action research can therefore be seen as forms of teacher development. It is to be hoped that teachers who are educated in this way will continue to develop throughout their teaching career, becoming more and more able to make autonomous decisions and to participate in formulating education policy. In order to continue developing, however, teachers need what Freeman calls a ‘collaborator’: a mentor, supervisor or peer (1989:38) and a supportive environment. Close collaboration between schools and university could allow teachers to have both. Teacher educators would know what was happening in the schools and focus their course accordingly while teachers would have insight into the teacher education course and could become involved in pre-service training. Support could also take the form of in-service or continuing education. However, this should not take the form of lectures and handouts, but challenge teachers to examine their practice and theories Workshops which pose questions rather than supply pat solutions are more supportive of reflective teaching (Masemann 1990:466). Teacher education as defined in this research could place teachers firmly on the road to continuing development.

3.6 Teacher professionalism

The concept of teacher education explored in this research should also foster teacher professionalism. Professionals are normally expected to take their chosen work seriously; to base what they do on sound theories; to continue to develop in their profession and to take responsibility for their actions (Pennington 1990; Richards 1990, Wallace 1990; Widdowson 1990). Professionals do not regard their professional knowledge or theory base as static, but open to ‘modification and improvement
through constant inquiry and reflection’ (Lester and Mayher 1987:203). Further, professionals are recognised by their ability to choose strategies for action in ever-changing circumstances (Lester and Mayher 1987:205). Professionals are also seen by some researchers as able to bring about ‘change through action’. Ur (1992:57) explains this concept in the following way:

Professionals are:

- primarily concerned with real-time action
- think in order to improve action
- are interested in finding out what works
- are immediate agents of real-world change
- are evaluated by the extent to which change seen as valuable is brought about by action.

Mere teacher training cannot develop teacher professionalism, since it offers only techniques, methods and strategies. Teachers who are trained are prepared to function in whatever the teacher trainer thinks the typical classroom is supposed to be like, not to adapt to a changing education system in a changing world. This is a major problem of the education system in post-apartheid South Africa. Professionalism is crucial for all teachers, but especially so for secondary teachers of English if they are to meet both the educational and social language needs of their learners satisfactorily.

3.7 A model for language teacher education

The model for language teacher education discussed here is one proposed by Freeman (1989) based on work done by Larsen-Freeman (1983). Once the model has been discussed, a closer look is taken at two South African teacher education programmes, a pre-service one by Meyer (1990) based on an earlier (1986) version of Freeman’s model, and an in-service one by Burkett (1995) following Freeman’s model, but also based on his later work. The model and the programmes were chosen because they reflect to a greater or lesser degree the definition of language teacher education discussed in this chapter. The two programmes were specifically chosen for their South African context.
3.7.1 Freeman's model of teaching and related strategies for language teacher education

Freeman (1989:27) argues that language teacher education has become fragmented and unfocused since it has often focused on different disciplines such as applied linguistics, methodology and language acquisition while overlooking the core: teaching itself. He views the lack of a theory of language teacher education as a shortcoming which handicaps language teacher education and argues:

one must have a clear definition of language teaching as the subject matter of language teacher education in order to develop a coherent view of the overall process of language teacher education and to suggest appropriate strategies for carrying out that process. In other words, how we define language teaching will influence, to a large extent, how we educate people as language teachers.

(Freeman 1989:28)

Freeman suggests two interlocking proposals: a model for describing language teaching as a process of decision making based on the constituents of knowledge, skills, attitude, and awareness, and two general strategies for educating language teachers: training and development, based on the first proposal (see also Larsen-Freeman 1983 and 3.2.2).

In Freeman’s model, language teaching and language teacher education are seen as interrelated. ‘The former, as a process, is the content of the latter, which is itself a process. Thus, language teacher education is concerned with the learning and teaching of language teaching’ (1989:28).

Understanding of language teacher education is needed on two levels: a view of what language teaching is, and a view of how to educate individuals in such teaching. Freeman asserts that while applied linguistics, methodology and research on second language acquisition all contribute to the knowledge on which language teaching is based, ‘they are not, and must not be confused with, language teaching’ (1989:29).

Language teaching deals with the processes of language teaching, while the others help to define and articulate the knowledge and skill base of language teaching. Therefore
'knowledge of these areas alone will (not) necessarily enable or equip language teachers to teach' (1989:29)

If the distinction between language teaching itself and the areas of inquiry on which it is based is blurred, this leads to two major misconceptions that jeopardise the success of language teaching education:

1. Language teacher education is generally concerned with the transmission of knowledge, specifically about applied linguistics, and language acquisition, and of methodology and the skills and techniques required for this.

2. Transmission of knowledge will lead to effective practice.

In order to improve practice, therefore, teacher educators must determine how people learn to teach (1989:30).

3.7.1.1 Constituents of language teaching

Freeman's model defines both the process and the structure of language teaching. Language teaching is described as involving four constituents that interact through the teacher's decision making (structure or content). These are: knowledge, skills, attitude, and awareness.

Knowledge includes what is being taught (the subject matter), to whom it is being taught (the students - their backgrounds, learning styles, language levels, and so on), and where it is being taught (the sociocultural, institutional, and situational contexts).

Skills define what the teacher has to be able to do: present material, give clear instructions, manage classrooms and so on.

Knowledge and skills constitute the 'knowledge-base of teaching' (1989:31). Freeman cites Shulman (1986): 'this knowledge base is not fixed but tends to evolve and be redefined throughout the teacher's professional life. Nonetheless, it remains the broad foundation on which the teacher's decisions are based'. Freeman asserts that from the point of view of knowledge transmission, language teacher preparation concentrates
almost exclusively on these two constituents. This is not to deny their importance, but they alone are not sufficient to educate language teachers.

Other factors enhance the use of skills and knowledge but are often seen as idiosyncratic and not systematically addressed. One of these is *attitude*, which Freeman defines as ‘a stance one adopts toward oneself, the activity of teaching, and the learners one engages in the teaching/learning process’ (1989:32). Teacher attitude is distinct from learner attitude and has been identified as a ‘critical variable’ in language teaching. Although there are various instruments to test it, research findings do not go much beyond ordinary common sense. One reason may be that it is a very personal constituent which is best studied by the individual. In this regard Freeman mentions diary studies, which ties in with reflective teaching. Freeman admits that attitude is a complex issue to include in teacher education, but maintains that that is no reason to neglect it or to ignore its importance in language teaching (1989:33).

The superordinate, unifying constituent in Freeman’s model is *awareness*. ‘Awareness is the capacity to recognize and monitor the attention one is giving or has given to something. Thus one acts on or responds to the aspects of a situation of which one is aware’ (1989:33). Awareness should not be confused with *attention*. Freeman distinguishes between the two as follows: Awareness functions as a binary distinction, whereas attention is a matter of degree. One is either aware of something or one is not. Within that awareness, one focuses attention on various things. Awareness therefore embraces and monitors attention. Since it integrates and unifies the other three constituents, knowledge, skills and attitude, awareness can explain why teachers grow and change. Awareness is also fundamental to the way in which a teacher uses the other three constituents and it is the ‘creative link’ in the language teacher education process (1989:34-35).

Freeman’s descriptive model of teaching is depicted in Figure 3.3.
According to Freeman, this model as a static one, needing a mobilising force. This is the fifth constituent, decision making. 'As a process, teaching is definitely not static; it involves constant shifts, negotiations, actions, and responses to a myriad of variables. Therefore the final element in this model must be one that captures the dynamism of the process, and that element is decision making' (1989:36). These define the content of language teacher education.

3.7.1.2 Two educating strategies

Language teacher education is an interactive process between the student teacher and another person whom Freeman calls the ‘collaborator’. This last can be either the
teacher educator, a supervisor, another teacher, mentor, or peer. In language teacher education, the student teacher and the collaborator are involved in a collaborative process to bring about some form of change in the student teacher's decision making based on knowledge, skills, attitude or awareness (Freeman 1989, 38). Freeman elaborates on this change as follows:

- It does not necessarily mean doing something differently, but can be a change in awareness which might affirm previous behaviour.
- The change is not necessarily immediate or complete but can evolve over time.
- Some changes are quantifiable and therefore observable, others are not.
- Some types of change can come to closure, while others are open-ended; this is linked to the quantifiability of the change.

Change can be brought about using two strategies, either training or development.

Training

According to Freeman, training is a direct strategy which the collaborator can apply to produce quantifiable change in the behaviour of student teachers. Training constitutes isolating and presenting those aspects of teaching which are considered trainable, such as specific teaching strategies. The student teacher then practises these skills and ultimately masters them. By setting certain criteria within a time frame, the collaborator can assess whether the student teacher has mastered the strategy.

Training, as a strategy, is clear and direct. It originates with the collaborator, is implemented by the teacher, and is evaluated either by the collaborator or by the two together. It is based on an assumption that through mastery of discrete aspects of skills and knowledge, teachers will improve their effectiveness in the classroom. Furthermore, training assumes that this mastery of discrete aspects can and does aggregate into a whole form of teaching competence (Freeman 1989, 39-40).

Although training is an effective teacher education strategy, it can often have shortcomings, mainly because of the fragmented view it takes of teaching (see 3.2.1).
Freeman argues that development as strategy is holistic and integrated, and advocates its use to address those complex aspects of teaching which cannot be dealt with in a fragmented way.

Development is a strategy of influence and indirect intervention that works on complex, integrated aspects of teaching, these aspects are idiosyncratic and individual. The purpose of development is for the teacher to generate change through increasing or shifting awareness. (Freeman 1989:40).

Through development, the collaborator endeavours to trigger the teacher’s awareness of what he or she is doing. By asking questions, by making personal observations in a detached way, by sharing personal teaching experience, the collaborator aims to start the teacher on a process of reflection, criticism, and refinement of his or her classroom practice.

While training can be viewed as a direct, intervening strategy to effect quantifiable change, development is far less direct and predictable. Freeman asserts that ‘it is highly dependent on the individual teacher, the collaborator, and their interaction’ (1989:41).

An interesting aspect of development as strategy is that it is ultimately the teacher who generates solutions or new understanding, with or without the help of the collaborator. These solutions are based on the teacher’s, not the collaborator’s, understanding and awareness of the situation. Freeman sees this as the critical difference between the two strategies. In training, the onus is on the collaborator to identify both the problem and supply the solution. In development, although the collaborator must certainly have an understanding of the issues, the solutions do not need to be those the collaborator knows or might have implemented. Teacher development has been discussed in section 3.5. Freeman’s educating strategies are depicted in Figure 3.4.
Freeman’s distinction between training and development is very similar to Larsee-Freeman’s distinction between education and training (see 3.2.1).

Freeman argues that his model of integrating the process of language teaching with the strategies of training and development will strengthen the coherence of language teachers’ work and may also help to keep at bay the ‘pressures and panaceas in the growing call for accountability in teacher education generally’ (1989:43). However, like many educationists who advocate a more reflective approach to teaching, he is uncertain of the actual role language teacher education plays in teachers’ self-development and cites Lortie (1975) who asserts: ‘Teachers are largely self-made, the internalization of common knowledge plays only a limited part in their movement to work responsibly’ (1989:43). In a subsequent paper, Freeman (1992) argues that teacher education should not be seen as influencing the way teachers ‘have, but rather as ‘recasting how they think about what they do in the classroom’ (1992:1).
3.7.2 An English second language method course for the higher diploma in education (Meyer 1990)

This course was designed for implementation at the Education Department of Rhodes University as part of their English as a second language across-the-curriculum project. It is based mainly on earlier (1986, 1987, 1989) versions of Freeman’s model discussed in section 3.7.1 and has the following aims:

• to develop a course within the Faculty of Education which would provide intending teachers of English (at all levels) with a full method course in teaching English as a second language;
• as much exposure to the practice of language teaching as possible;
• critical reflection on the process of training, (asking ourselves what we are doing and why we are doing it).

(Meyer 1990:424, 425)

It should be noted that Meyer does not distinguish between student teachers and teacher trainees, and teacher educators and trainers as this research does. Also, Meyer equates development with education as defined in section 3.2.2.

3.7.2.1 Training and development

A point of difference between Meyer’s and Freeman’s views of training and development is that rather than seeing them as two distinct strategies, Meyer sees them as two ends on a single continuum (1990:459) as depicted in Figure 3.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRAINING</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trainer-centred</td>
<td>Trainee-centred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrete practice</td>
<td>Holistic practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantifiable</td>
<td>Not quantifiable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>Open-ended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescriptive</td>
<td>Non-prescriptive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.5 The training development continuum (Meyer 1990:429)
Meyer also argues that it is possible to deal with knowledge and skills using a developmental rather than a training strategy if this means that 'relevant knowledge is negotiated by the trainee and the trainer, or that skills are practiced holistically rather than discretely' (1990:429). Nevertheless, Meyer views Freeman's strategy of development (3.7.1.2) as of cardinal importance to teacher education. He offers three arguments in favour of a teacher-development rather than a teacher-training approach. The first of these is 'trainee-centredness', which, he agrees with Freeman, should be at the centre of development (1990:430). As justification for this trainee-centredness, Meyer draws on Nuttall and Murray (1986) and Britten (1985:225) who state that pre-service teachers do not come to the course without any prior knowledge of what constitutes teaching and what constitutes a language. Meyer feels that it is particularly important to constantly negotiate 'the gap between trainees' previous experience and the skills and methodology to which they are being exposed in the course' (1990:432) especially if 'the ideological gap between a training institution and the prevailing school ethos is wide' (Britten, 1985b:225). In order to determine student teacher's prior knowledge and experience of language teaching, Meyer administered a pre-course questionnaire. The findings gave him an idea of the range of language teaching models to which the students had been exposed as well as the areas of second language learning on which he could build (1990:432).

Meyer's second argument to justify a development rather than a training strategy is the positive response of his pre-service teachers to his developmental approach in the method course. For instance, the students enjoyed the 'learning-cell approach' used for seminar work. This approach is a form of self-access work. Students study a paper and then teach it to a peer. This is followed by general class discussion on the particular aspect (1990:434; see also Stein and Hanks 1992).

The third reason is based on the perception of life-long learning. No teacher is ever fully qualified. Following a development strategy should encourage independence and a commitment to continued learning in the pre-service teacher since it offers not just skills, but strategies for further learning.
However, Meyer qualifies his stance on development in two ways. The first qualification is that the strategy is more suited to language teacher education of university graduates who have native-speaker competence of English rather than "less-well educated students whose command of English is not as advanced" (1990:435).

The second is that he does not advocate ignoring training as strategy completely. While not dismissing the second qualification, the first begs the question as to when pre-service teachers of English who are less well-educated will ever be able to, or entitled to, benefit from an approach that is learning-centred. If the teachers are not educated, how can they educate their pupils? Meyer seems to advocate a retaining of the status-quo. What has emerged from the discussion of development and training, however, is that teacher education should include both.

3.7.2.2 Modelling

A crucial point made by Meyer and others is the modelling by the teacher educator of the desired pre-service teacher behaviour (1990:435). Teacher educators cannot expect their students to adopt a learner-centred approach in the classroom if they themselves practice a teacher-centred one. If pre-service teachers are to become reflective teachers, engaging in action research and taking responsibility for their own learning, then that behaviour must be modelled by the teacher educator. Meyer has consciously adopted procedures which foster learning, such as the learner-cell technique, small-group work and problem solving tasks. It is interesting to note that Heneen (1992:15) does not view modelling as important in itself. Rather, he argues that if student teachers are taught as they are expected to teach, and encouraged to examine how the instruction they are receiving embodies what they are learning about teaching, their understanding of the discourse they share with their educators will develop through their experience of it. The shared discourse, here, is the 'professional discourse' or 'theory' of the teacher education community, while the student teachers' experience can be seen as the 'practice' of teaching. Seen in this light, theory and practice, rather than being two separate aspects of teaching which have to become integrated, become 'different ways of thinking about and articulating the classroom reality' (Freeman 1992:15).
3.7.2.3 Attitude development

Although teacher attitude is regarded as a crucial factor in teacher preparation, very little research exists as to how it can be developed (Britten 1985a:123). Some of the techniques suggested by Britten were used in the course, such as a pre-course questionnaire to identify student teachers’ skills and attitudes at the start of the course, ongoing formative evaluation of the course to gauge attitudes during the course, and creating a non-directive learning climate. Student teachers were also asked to keep journals for reflection on the course (1990:436).

Attitude development can also be facilitated if the centre of authority gradually shifts from the teacher educator, to the peer group and finally to the student teacher (Britten 1988). This shift can be accomplished by incorporating the following awareness-raising and experiential components into the course:

Awareness-raising components:

- Reduce lecturing as course progresses.
- Discovery learning wherever possible.
- When practicable, individual students prepare topics for presentation to others.
- A steady increase in the amount of self-access work.
- Case studies for problem solving in the later stages of the course. Student teachers should consider how to apply relevant methods in problem situations rather than merely reciting the method.
- Regular samples or elicitation of student teachers’ attitudes, with questionnaires for self-report and discussion.
- Maximum small-group discussion earlier in the course - with serious consideration given to their outcomes. Little or no group work later.
- Less theoretical coverage of background disciplines, to allow more time for the above.
Experiential components:

- Practice teaching distributed, not masted. If block practice is unavoidable, there should be part-time observation and feedback before and after. The practice teaching period should be extended as possible, since attitude change occurs fastest during this time (Winne 1982:68).

- Increasing amounts of unobserved practice teaching.

- More and more self-assessment reported to the teacher educator without supervisory or peer feedback.

- Deferred practical assessment. The longer the probationary period leading up to practical assessment, the better the chances of transfer.

(Adapted from Meyer 1990:437-438)

Meyer states that most of the awareness-raising components were incorporated in the course, but that it was not possible to incorporate all the experiential components, especially the last one (1990:438).

3.7.2.4 Classroom focus

Widdowson (1990) regards teaching skills as crucial to beginning teachers. Teacher education should always be based on classroom practice. Meyer cites Lee (1974) who shares Widdowson’s view. The fact that most of the student teachers in Meyer’s course found micro-teaching to be the most useful component of the course during the first term supports Widdowson’s and Lee’s view.

Students often complain that teacher education courses are too theoretical. Meyer’s course proved to be no exception. According to him, the answer would be to follow Ramani’s approach of using videotaped lessons as a basis for developing theory (see 3.3.4). Meyer also mentions a similar approach suggested by Nuttal and Murray (1986) where aspects of classroom language, both written and spoken, are discussed and reflected on by student teachers (Meyer 1990:443).

Meyer agrees with Freeman’s point that language teaching does not consist merely of knowledge and skills. Rather, he sees language teaching as an expression of the teacher’s entire personality, ‘including his or her knowledge, skills, attitudes and awareness’ (Meyer 1990:443).
3.7.3 An in-service teacher education programme (Burkett 1995)

Although the following programme is an in-service one, it can be adapted for pre-service teachers. It could be argued that pre-service teachers are in-service when they do their practice teaching in the schools (Ridge, E 1995b).

The programme, developed by the Centre for Continuing Education and the Education Department at the University of Port Elizabeth, is for a fourth year non-graduate specialisation course for in-service teachers of English to speakers of other languages. It was launched in 1993.

3.7.3.1 Issues raised when planning the course

Burkett states as their chief concern "that the pedagogical process should reflect what the teachers were learning about teaching and that this process should enable them to deepen and inform their understanding of their own practice" (1995:4). This follows Freeman's two premises:

First, that teacher education has to deal with teacher's conceptions of teaching, how they think about and carry out what they do in classrooms.

Second, that teacher education must examine how these conceptions are put together and how they can be influenced or developed.

(Freeman 1992:5)

During the planning stage, the following questions emerged:

- What view of teaching is embodied in the programme and how does this match with the views held by participants?
- How do teachers learn to teach? What structures and processes need to be set up to support the development of their teaching?
- What do second language teachers need to know?

(Burkett 1995:5)

Burkett does not claim to have found definitive answers, but feels that the process of grappling with these questions combined with self-examination was invaluable. This supports Meyer's notion of lifelong learning (see 3.7.2.1). However, Widdowson's
cautionary statement that teacher research should lead to an improvement of the teaching-learning situation and so primarily be for the benefit of the learners and only 'incidentally' to the teacher's own (1990:57; see also 3.4) should be remembered.

The overall goal of the programme, emphasizing teacher attitude and awareness, is informed by Freeman's model (see 3.7.1), and findings of the Teacher Education and Learning to Teach (TELT) study of the National Center for Research on Teacher Learning at Michigan State University (1992) which indicate that the process of learning to teach is more important than course content. The goal of the diploma and its objectives are the following:

OVERALL GOAL

For course participants to examine their own practices, needs, and understanding of learning in order to become more generative and self-sufficient as teaching professionals

Such teachers:
• continually examine learning, both their own and that of their students
• know their subject matter
• are able to match their teaching to their students' strengths and needs
• are able to identify problems in their classrooms, schools and communities, to generate creative responses to those problems, and to evaluate the effectiveness of their responses
• are able to collaborate effectively with colleagues and students
• are confident of their role and the contributions they can make in their schools at local and national levels

(Burkett 1995: Appendix A)

In order to achieve these objectives, three things were needed: structures both within and beyond the programme, on macro and micro levels, engaging in processes, and building relationships. Burkett argues that this conception, rather than the more traditional curricula/course one, encourages learning and development (1995:9, 11).

Structures: At the micro level, all tasks, assignments and activities had to be reflected on in terms of their purpose, medium through which they would be performed, and
relevance. At the macro level, the teachers themselves were a learning community: a safe place within which they could question and discuss their ‘growing and changing understanding of their learning and classroom practice’ (Burkett 1995:9). More formal structures on the macro level were a conference at the end of the fourth semester planned and presented by the teachers themselves, an ongoing support group and partner schools. The conference gave teachers the opportunity to develop their organising skills. They invited their colleagues to attend in order to share some of their learning. This supports Adams’ view that schools and education departments should work more closely together (Adams 1991, see also 3.3.4). The ongoing support group is crucial for continuing the professional development that was started with the programme. The aim is to continue supporting the teachers in exploring their teaching, to develop mentoring skills, and to encourage the establishment of teacher forums to aid professional development. Support groups like this will do much to create the environment conducive to reflection, the ‘safe place’ in which teachers can explore, question and reflect on their own and others’ practice.

Processes:

The processes employed in the programme are based on Freeman’s framework of Discourse-explanation, which, according to him

...focusses on how participants construct and articulate their explanations for what they do in their classroom practice, and for how and why they do it. The basic premise is that articulation is a form of reconceptualisation which can lead to change. Change is not necessarily behavioral: it may also be interpretative - understanding why one does what one does. (personal communication 1993, in Burkett 1995:7).

Freeman (1992) provides a more comprehensive explanation of the different discourses in a paper on research into teacher education. Essentially, his argument is the following:

- Teaching is the integration of thought and action.
- People come into teacher education programmes with deeply held conceptions of teaching and learning.
- Teacher education can influence teacher’s understandings by helping them to articulate their given explanations for what they do.
• The process of articulation - making the tacit explicit - brings into play new discourse and with it, different ways of conceptualising teaching.

• The teacher has access to different ways of conceiving what is happening in practice, which can create collisions between different discourses as sources of explanation.

• These collisions of explanation can lead to shifts in classroom practice.

(Freeman 1992)

This explanation of what happens in teachers' minds could also be used to explain the process of reflection essential to reflective teaching (Freeman 1992, see also 3.3.2).

Tasks such as watching and reacting to a videotaped lesson were specifically planned to help teachers articulate their understanding of a particular event. The tasks were performed individually, in groups, in pairs or triads. Teachers were then asked to reflect on what they had observed or experienced, sometimes by journaling or by discussion after a lesson (see 3.3.3 and 3.3.4). Once teachers had articulated their understanding of a concept, they were encouraged to develop explanations for these, derived from their own experience, but developed through their interaction with the other teachers (Burkett 1995:10).

3.7.3.2 Relationships

Teaching and learning are essentially social processes and as such flourish in a supportive environment. The programme tried to establish a learning community which included the teachers as well as the teacher educators (Burkett 1995:11). The ongoing support group and partner schools also encourage the forming of supportive relationships.

3.8 Conclusion

In this chapter, different conceptions of what constitutes teacher education were discussed. The difference between training and education was explained and the view of teacher education taken in this research was set out. Reflective teaching, action research, teacher development, reflective practice teaching and teacher professionalism were explained as ways in which this view of teacher education could be realised. As
examples of teacher education, a model by Freeman as well as two South African teacher education courses were looked at. Together with Chapter 2, this chapter forms the literature study on which the view of teacher education as defined in this research is based. In the next chapter, the experimental design is discussed.
4. THE SURVEY: DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

4.1 The research aims

This study is an exploration into the pre-service preparation of secondary teachers of English. Against the background of South Africa’s transition to democracy and the concomitant changes in education and language policies in South Africa, the study attempts to find answers to the following questions:

- what kind of pre-service secondary teacher preparation in English is regarded as essential by lecturers and tutors who are involved in such preparation at university departments of education
- what kind of pre-service preparation these lecturers/tutors offer their students
- how these lecturers/tutors view the teaching of English now and in the future
- what these lecturers/tutors view as essential to their own development as teachers
- what excellent secondary teachers of English regard as essential to pre-service secondary teacher preparation
- how these teachers were prepared for the teaching of secondary English by university education departments
- what these teachers view as essential to their own development as teachers
- how they view the future of secondary English teaching
The responses to the questionnaires should also indicate whether pre-service teacher education rather than mere training will aid secondary teachers of English in becoming professional teachers, able to take responsibility for their own learning and decisions in the language classroom.

4.2 The research assumptions

The two assumptions on which this research is based are:

that lecturers/tutors who are involved in pre-service preparation of secondary teachers of English will know what is essential to this type of preparation and that this will be reflected in their courses, and

that excellent secondary teachers of English will be professionals who will know what the teaching of English entails and will be able to articulate what they view as essential to pre-service teacher preparation.

4.3 Method used in the research project

Rather than interviewing the subjects personally, it was decided to send out questionnaires. Apart from being a more cost-effective method, less time-consuming and more convenient, it would also ensure anonymity since there would be no contract with the respondents. This last would also ensure reasonable objectivity.

4.3.1 Selection of the subjects

Sampling procedures could not be employed as the actual universe was too small in the case of both sets of subjects. Since there was no guarantee that the subjects selected for the survey would respond, using random sampling would have seriously limited the data. As it was, 53 questionnaires were sent out to lecturers/tutors. This constituted the whole lecturer/tutor corps involved in teaching secondary English method at universities departments of education throughout the country at the time of the investigation.

As far as excellent teachers were concerned, obvious constraints, among them, those of time and cost, made it important to choose only one education body out of the nine
in the country. The Western Cape was chosen because of its convenience. Permission to send out questionnaires to teachers was obtained from the Education Department (Addendum C).

Because of the smallness of the universe, this investigation can be seen as a pilot study for larger, more comprehensive research. Replicative studies could be used to see the extent to which the trends that were revealed in this study are indicative of the state of affairs throughout the country.

4.3.2 The subject's used in the study

Modern research recommends that the views of various stakeholders be used. It was therefore decided to send questionnaires to two sets of possible respondents. One set comprised lecturers and/or tutors of English method at university departments of education. The other set consisted of excellent secondary teachers of English.

4.3.3 Selecting the lecturer/tutor universe

Generally, secondary teachers of English in South Africa complete a degree course with at least two years of English before doing a higher education diploma at a university education department, with English method as one of their courses. This four year course qualifies them to teach English at secondary schools.

In order to gain insight into what lecturers of English method at university departments of education consider to be essential to pre-service secondary teacher preparation, questionnaires were sent to every English method lecturer and/or tutor at all the universities in South Africa. It seemed imperative to obtain information from all the universities concerned, first, because the universe was so small and second, because the pre-service teacher preparation courses for prospective secondary teachers of English differ from university to university. The information thus gained could then be seen as representing the views of lecturers/tutors involved in pre-service secondary teacher preparation in English throughout the country. To ensure a good response, every attempt was made to contact at least one lecturer at each of the universities personally. Fifty-three lecturer/tutor questionnaires were sent out, with a covering letter (Addendum A1). Since not all the universities have the same number of
lecturers/tutors involved in English method at secondary school level, a list of the universities and number of questionnaires sent to each is given below.

University of Bophuthatswana 1
University of Cape Town 1
University of Fort Hare 1
University of Natal - Durban 2
University of Natal - Pietermaritzburg 11
University of the North 3
University of the Orange Free State 1
University of Port Elizabeth 1
Potchefstroom University for CHE 2
University of Pretoria 1
Rand Afrikaans University 2
Rhodes University 2
University of South Africa 8
University of Stellenbosch 3
University of Transkei 1
University of Venda 1
Vista University 9
University of the Western Cape 1
University of the Witwatersrand 1
University of Zululand 1

4.3.4 Selecting the teacher universe

The teacher universe was selected according to three guidelines: only excellent secondary teachers of English would be considered, there would be no distinction between L1 and L2 teachers, and the sample would be restricted to the Western Cape region.

4.4.1 Excellent secondary teachers of English

Rather than selecting teachers at random, it was decided to follow Protherough and Atkinson’s example (The making of English teachers 1991) and to send questionnaires only to ‘excellent’ or ‘very effective’ teachers of English (Protherough and Atkinson 1991:3). Protherough and Atkinson state only that they wanted to be ‘much more selective’ (1991:3). However, it was felt that the responses of these teachers would provide a more accurate picture of what was essential in a pre-service course. Since they had been identified as being excellent teachers, they had possibly benefitted from such a course and, if not, could provide information as to how such a course could be improved, because they would have had to develop themselves, as it were. The relative merits of the argument that excellent teachers are born, not made, or that teaching is an art which depends largely on the characteristics of the particular teacher have already been discussed. Pennington (1990:133) states that ‘teacher preparation can be of value for helping to refine natural abilities and for synthesizing elements of the teaching “craft” into an individual teaching style.’ To identify excellent teachers of English, Protherough and Atkinson relied on the information provided by English advisors and English tutors at university departments of education (1991:3). The same course was followed in this research. It was felt that personal recommendation by
different experts would be as reliable as any other set of criteria. Also, since no official list of excellent English teachers is available, there seemed to be no other, efficient way to identify these teachers.

Secondary teachers were chosen to make the universe move uniform. It may be assumed that a significant number of secondary teachers of English have a university degree and a higher education diploma.

4.3.4.2 No distinction between L1 and L2 teachers of English

In selecting the subjects, no distinction was made between L1 and L2 teachers. The reasons for this are briefly discussed below.

As South Africa moves towards becoming a truly democratic society, the distinction between English L1 and L2 seems set to become blurred. Instead of distinguishing between L1 and L2 languages and offering this option at school, it would more democratic to establish what exactly these languages will be used for. If English is to be used for communication only within a particular circle of people who have particular sets of knowledge and experiences in common, then ‘communication’ at the simplest level is probably, all that is needed. This type of communication does not make undue linguistic demands on people. However, as Widdowson (1991:102) argues ‘we do not only communicate with people with whom we share our personal lives.’ What must pupils be able to do with English, both at school and in the broader society? One thing many pupils have to do is come to grips with their other school subjects through medium of English. Many black pupils have up to now had English as medium of instruction and this situation does not seem set to change (see 1.1.2).

One of the reasons mentioned is that the majority of parents have indicated that they want English as medium of instruction for their children. Even if parents opt for gradual or sudden transfer from the mother tongue to English or even for some of the subjects only to be taught in English from std 3 onwards, pupils will still have English as medium of instruction for part of their primary school and all of their high school careers. Clearly, the English needed by these pupils is not L2 but the same as that needed by English mother tongue speakers.
Up to now, English has been one of the dominant languages in South Africa, as well as a lingua franca. It has been, and still is, a lingua franca in the workplace. Ridge (1996:4) rightly states that ‘the demands of the workplace, however conceived, do not make distinctions between L1 and L2. All workers have to have an appropriate level of proficiency at using the language for certain purposes.’ Not only workers, however, but all citizens, if they are to take their rightful place in a democratic society. English has international status as an academic language, as the language of business, trade, finance and technology. It is one of the languages used most often in South African courts since most lawyers, advocates and judges are still white. To exacerbate matters, it is unfortunately so that in the broader society, people are often marginalized or looked down upon as being intellectually deficient because of their inability to communicate in the dominant or official language (Krasnick 1986:192). If our society is to become truly democratic, then, it would seem that the need is not, as Ridge (1992: 77-98) points out, ‘for a “second language”, but for a language which will empower (people) to participate fully in the economic and social life of the country.’ This, of course, is not to say that English should be promoted at the cost of the other official languages, but that pupils be given an effective tool to use.

4.3.4.3 Sample restricted to the Western Cape region

Because of time constraints and to make the process of selection as efficient as possible, only excellent secondary teachers of English in the Western Cape region were considered for the sample.

After obtaining permission from the Western Cape Education Department to conduct the research, I contacted the superintendents of education for the central Cape Town region, the Tygerberg region, the Worcester region and the Oudtshoorn region. The heads of Teacher Centres in these regions were also approached for names. The principal subject advisor for the House of Representatives and the superintendent of education for the Western Cape Education Department were also contacted. Further names were provided by my supervisor, a lecturer in English method at the University of Stellenbosch, and lecturers in English method and in Linguistics at the University of the Western Cape. Although it was not the purpose of the research to compare the
opinions of the different races, pains were taken to obtain names representing the various racial groups in South Africa so that the sample would be representative.

Questionnaires were sent to schools in the following towns and suburbs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albertinia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlone</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaufort West</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belhar</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellville</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonteheuwel</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bothasig</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgetown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Town</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Tijger</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diep River</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durbanville</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgemead</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factreton</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firgrove</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fransch Hoek</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guguletu</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopefield</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalk Bay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaya Mandi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khayelitsha</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knysna</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraaifontein</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuils River</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landsdowne</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langa</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loevenstein</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manenberg</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossel Bay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mowbray</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muizenberg</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newlands</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noorder Paarl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean View</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oudtshoorn</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paarl</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parow</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravensmead</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riversdale</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rondebosch</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruysterwacht</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt River</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset West</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellenbosch</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strand</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strandfontein</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table View</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamboerskloof</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlaeberg</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windmill</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worchester</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wynberg</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Initially, one hundred teachers seemed a large enough group. In order to enhance the reliability of the research findings, however, a questionnaire was sent to each teacher named. In addition, a lecturer at the University of the Western Cape offered to hand out ten questionnaires to excellent teachers she knew so in the end 163 questionnaires were sent out. Although each questionnaire was sent personally addressed to a specific teacher, the questionnaire was not marked in any way to identify the respondent* and the covering letter (Addendum B1) made it clear that neither the name of the school nor the name of the teacher concerned would be mentioned in the research.

4.5.3: The questionnaires

The questionnaires are modelled on Protherough and Atkinson's questionnaire used in their research on the making of English teachers (see Appendix in Protherough and Atkinson 1991). Their questions as to qualifications, experience, and membership of English-related organisations as well as those pertaining to the school curriculum were used, but adapted to reflect the situation in South Africa. Protherough and Atkinson also included questions on teacher personality, careers in English teaching and questions for those teachers who had moved on to other jobs. Since those aspects are beyond the scope of this research, no such questions appear in the present questionnaires.

The lecturer/tutor questionnaire (Addendum A1) and the teacher questionnaire (Addendum B1) are very similar. The first seven questions, which cover the respondent's age, gender, academic qualifications, teaching experience, and membership of English-related organisations, are exactly the same for both questionnaires. The contents of questions 9, 10 and 11, which cover aspects of teacher perception, teaching environment, the curriculum, and own limitations are essentially the same, but the actual questions have been adapted to suit the different respondents of the questionnaires. The last five questions are the same for both sets of

*It is sometimes the practice to have a covert means of identification. This was felt to be an act of bad faith and so no such means was used.
respondents. The discussion of the questions is therefore relevant to both questionnaires.

4.3.5.1 Discussion of the questions

It must be stated at the outset that the questions set cannot be regarded as objective. In fact, it seems questionable that any research is ever wholly objective (Nunan 1992). Every researcher has a certain agenda when selecting questions for a questionnaire. At the very least, researchers are influenced by their particular world view, by the reading that has been done, as well as by the responses they hope to get. In this particular case, I was certainly influenced by the ideas of teacher education and teacher professionalism and all that these terms entail (see for instance question 8, and the discussion in Chapter 3) and this is reflected in the questionnaire. Although the findings of this research have certain limitations, they are valid for this particular piece of research. The findings take these limitations into account.

4.3.5.2 Questions 1 - 7

As mentioned in section 4.3.5, questions 1 to 7 relate to the respondent’s age, gender, qualifications, experience and membership of English-related organizations. Questions 1 to 6 do not require discussion, since they are form and serve as a framework in which to place the respondents. Question 7, on membership of English-related organizations, was regarded as quite important as it was felt that both teacher educators and excellent teachers would probably belong to one or more of such organizations for reasons of self-improvement and of keeping up with the latest developments in their field (see Brown 1994). If this proved to be true, then such information could become part of the recommendations.

4.3.5.3 Question 8a and b

Question 8a and b aims to identify major omissions in the pre-service course. Respondents were asked to choose from a list of nine aspects: task-based teaching, action research (see 3.4), reflective teaching (see 3.3), closer links between schools and the education faculty, school-based training, a supervisory teacher, practice
teaching, and micro-teaching. Clearly, all the aspects mentioned, except school-based teaching, are those identified in the literature study as important to such a course in which the teacher is to be educated to become a professional (see Chapter 3). To make the question less restrictive, respondents were also given the opportunity to write down any aspects that they felt were relevant. It was also a means of obtaining more data. In 8b, respondents were asked to place three of the aspects in order of importance. This was done to obtain some idea of the overall importance of the aspects. It would also be interesting to see if the lecturers and the teachers chose the same three aspects.

### 4.3.5.4 Question 9

Question 9 is set out in the same way as question 8, but pertains to the actual teaching situation and the limitations of the practitioner. In the lecturer/tutor questionnaire, the following aspects were listed: structure of H Ed course, structure of English Method course, student numbers, limitations of own techniques, limited experience, limited knowledge of applied linguistics, and limited school contact. In the teacher questionnaire, the following aspects were selected: the English curriculum, ethos of the school, too many pupils in one class, limitations of own techniques, limited experience, and limited knowledge. Again, respondents were given the opportunity to mention any other aspects and were also asked to place three of the aspects they had chosen in order of importance. Initially, question 9 was formulated differently. For lecturers/tutors, it read: ‘What, at present, are the chief obstacles to presenting your course to student teachers satisfactorily?’ while for teachers the formulation was: ‘What, at present, are the chief obstacles to your teaching satisfactorily?’ The aspects were the same as those in the present question but with no opportunity to specify any others. Field testing revealed that the question was too restrictive. Respondents would be obliged to focus only on particular pre-selected aspects. Consequently, question 9 was reformulated so that it had a similar format to question 8.

### 4.3.5.5 Question 10

Question 10 is the first of two questions in the questionnaires where respondents were given lists of aspects which they had to rate according to a five-point scale. Question
10 covers a range of aspects pertaining to the English curriculum, classroom management, planning of work, teaching across the whole ability range of pupils, and developing teaching material. The assumption here is that no pre-service course for secondary English teachers can exist outside the school and the English curriculum. In an article on challenges for teacher trainers in South Africa, Ridge (1994:2) agrees with Pennington (1989) and Breen et al (1989) when she asserts that ‘the teacher-training curriculum is inextricably related to the school curriculum in which it is embedded’. It seems clear, then, that it is important to ascertain how effectively teachers have been and still are prepared to meet the challenges of the curriculum.

4.3.5.6 Question 11

Question 11 covers the main influences on teachers and their work, from academic subject study and other English teachers through to journal articles and workshops. As with questions 8 and 9, respondents were also given the opportunity to mention any other aspects they considered to be important. In question 11 respondents were also asked to name any books or articles relating to English which they had found particularly helpful. This information should be most useful to other teachers and lecturers.

4.3.5.7 Question 12

Question 12 is the first of five questions which required respondents to give their own opinion. The question asked respondents to indicate in what way their view of the nature of English teaching had changed since they began teaching. The assumption here is that pre-service education is only a first, albeit crucial, step towards teacher professionalism and ultimately, excellent teaching. It is assumed that professional teachers will be aware that they never teach in isolation and that their teaching will have to change as the immediate and long term needs of their pupils change. Widdowson (1990:2) points out that ‘(t)he contexts of language teaching, like the more general social contexts in which they are located, are continually changing, continually challenging habitual ways of thinking and the patterns of past certainty...’ The challenge for both teacher educators and teachers is not only to make their
students aware of the fact that knowledge is never complete, but also to realise this themselves and demonstrate it in their teaching.

4.3.5.8 Question 13

Question 13 asks respondents what they see as the most urgent problems facing secondary teachers of English in South Africa at the moment. It will be useful to have the data from those who are in the field and those who prepare student teachers. The data obtained can be used as a framework for planning a pre-service teacher education course since ways of overcoming these problems will have to be found without good teaching being compromised. The data should also be useful to both lecturers and teachers, since teachers are usually judged on their ability to teach, while student teachers are judged by teachers in schools. From a careful reading of the comments, it should also be possible to gain some idea of whether the respondents view the problems as challenges rather than as obstacles.

4.3.5.9 Question 14

Question 14 requires respondents to anticipate the most important changes in secondary English teaching over the next ten years. As argued in section 4.3.5.9, the data obtained will be useful to both sides, and a careful reading of the comments should give some indication how respondents view these changes.

4.3.5.10 Question 15

Protherough and Atkinson (1991: 116) assert that 'it is a commonplace that good English teachers are also good learners'. Since teacher development is an ongoing process, it seems important to provide teachers with in-service courses or workshops which will aid their development as professional teachers. However, it seems that often these courses do not meet the needs of the teachers they are aimed at, and so teacher development is minimal. According to Protherough and Atkinson (1991: 117) this is the situation in England. There is no evidence to show that the situation is any different in South Africa. The obvious remedy for this situation is to ask teachers what they need, and then devise in-service courses which take clear account of these needs.
The lecturers/tutors were asked the same question, since they are clearly not excluded from ongoing development. It will be interesting to see if the data supports the notion of ongoing learning.

4.3.5.11 Question 16

Question 16 asks: ‘Ideally, how do you think secondary teachers of English should be trained?’ Since the respondents are either lecturers/tutors of English method or excellent teachers of English, the answers could help to provide a blueprint for future pre-service courses for secondary teachers of English. Question 16 also serves as a check for question 8, where the answers are mainly pre-selected. If respondents’ suggestions reflect the thrust of question 8, this will support the view of teacher education proposed in this research.

4.3.6 Conclusion

It is unfortunate that better returns were not obtained for both questionnaires. Only 24 out of a possible 53 lecturer/tutor questionnaires were returned, (45.28%), while 50 out of a possible 163 teacher questionnaires were returned (30.67%). This is, perhaps, a problem in any system which requires respondents to mail their responses. Since cooperation was entirely voluntary and anonymity had been guaranteed, there could be no question of pressure being brought to bear. While the returns are disappointing, the findings from the analysis of the questionnaires should nevertheless provide information on what some lecturers/tutors and teachers regard as essential to pre-service secondary teacher preparation in English, and whether or not this corresponds to the notion of teacher education as defined in this research. The findings of the research are reported and discussed in the next chapter.
5.

REPORT ON FINDINGS OF THE RESEARCH PROJECT

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the findings of the analysis of the teacher and the lecturer/tutor questionnaires are reported. Before recording the data, the following procedural decisions were made:

The questionnaires were numbered for easy reference.

Since questions 8, 9 and 11 each have an ‘other’ category which allows for an unrestricted response, a qualitative method was used to analyse the data. The method suggested by Radnor (1994) was broadly followed. First, each response was listed and coded. Once this had been done, it was possible to identify broad categories. Each response was carefully read in the context of the whole questionnaire and placed into a category. The number of responses in the category was used as an indication of the importance of that category, and so it was possible to ascertain which category showed a general tendency. The categories for each question and their specific responses are recorded as part of the following tables:

- Question 8: Tables 5.3-5.4.1
- Question 9: Tables 5.5-5.8
- Question 11: Table 5.13

The responses to questions 12 to 16, which are open questions, were also analysed in this way. However, the categories were not compared with one another, since some responses fell into one or more category. These categories, with their coded responses, are recorded in the following tables in Addendum D:

- Question 12: Table 5.15
The items are dealt with as they occur in the questionnaires. The findings of both sets of questionnaires are discussed under each item and comparisons which seem significant are made. Respondents' actual comments are also quoted where pertinent.

5.2 General information (questions 1-7)

As mentioned in section 4.8, questions 1 to 6 are pertinent to this research only in the sense that the information serves as a useful framework for the actual research. The findings will therefore not be discussed in great detail. The data pertaining to General Information is given in Tables 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 in Addendum D.

5.2.1 Age in years (question 1)

Of the 24 lecturers/tutors who responded, only one declined to give his/her age. Nine (37.5%) lecturers fell into the 41-50 category, seven (29.2%) into the 31-40 category and five (20.8) into the 50 and older category. Only two lecturers/tutors were younger than 31. The teachers' ages were similar. Of the fifty teachers, twenty (40%) fell into the 41-50 category, seventeen (34%) into the 31-40 category, and nine (18%) into the 50 and older category. Only four teachers were younger than 31. These findings suggest that excellent teachers are made, not born, and that natural talent for teaching needs to be developed. If teachers receive proper preparation, that is, if they are educated instead of merely trained, one might find that they become effective at their work sooner rather than later.

5.2.2 Gender (question 2)

It is generally agreed that the teacher corps in most countries consists of more women than men. (Masemann 1990:473. Protherough and Atkinson (1991:23) state that
teaching is commonly perceived to be "women’s work". This perception is supported by their findings and also by the findings of this research. More than half of the respondents of both sets of questionnaires were women (67.7% of lecturers/tutors; 62% of teachers).

5.2.3 Qualifications (question 3)

5.2.3.1 Academic qualifications

Fifteen lecturers/tutors (62.5%) indicated that they had academic qualifications in English. Of these, four had a BA with English major, four had an English honours degree and six had an MA in English. One lecturer had English II.

Nine lecturers/tutors did not provide their academic qualifications in English. Of these, one had an M Sc. (ESP) which seems to indicate a qualification in English for special purposes. This respondent described his present post as follows: ‘Lecturer responsible for Method of English (HED), Language of Science (BSc) and Language Learning and Methodology’. Five respondents had a PhD; one had an MA in general linguistics, and one had a B Paed (Arts).

The secondary teachers in this research were academically well-qualified in English. Thirty-seven (72.4%) had majored in English. Of these, eleven also had an honours degree, two had a master’s degree in English, and one had a PhD in Translation Studies. One respondent indicated only that he had a PhD in English and Linguistics. The three others indicated that they had an MA, an M Phil, and a B Bibl. and an MA respectively but gave no indication of the type of English qualification. From the information provided one could, however, assume that all three respondents had an advanced language qualification. Six teachers had English II.

5.2.3.2 Professional qualifications

Sixteen lecturers (66.6%) had at least one professional teaching qualification in English. Of these, four had an H Ed, five (20.8%) had a B Ed, and seven had an M Ed. Five (20.8%) other respondents had a D Ed, but not necessarily in English.
Of the teachers, twenty-six had at least one professional qualification in English. Twelve (24%) had an H Ed, one had an STD, and six (12%) had a B Ed and an M Ed respectively. One had a DSE (PG). Twenty-four teachers (48%) therefore had no professional qualification in English. However, four of these did have a professional teaching qualification: three (6%) had a B Ed without English, and one had an M Ed without English. This still means that 40% of teachers did not have a professional qualification. This finding is significant since it would seem that a professional qualification is not seen as essential to obtaining a post to teach secondary English.

5.2.4 Teaching experience (question 4)

5.2.4.1 Lecturers tutors

It would seem that the teaching of English method at university departments of education in South Africa is mainly the responsibility of lecturers (66.7%). Only four respondents were senior lecturers, one was an associate professor and two were professors.

Except for three, the lecturers generally had had initial secondary teaching experience. The majority (87.5%) had taught at secondary schools. and five of these had also taught at primary schools. Only one lecturer had only primary school experience. Their years of teaching full time at schools ranged from one to fifteen, with the mean number of years being eight. The majority (66.6%) had between one to four years of secondary teaching at schools. In the remaining group, one respondent claimed to have taught at thirteen schools during a period of four years, while another had taught for a period of seven years at twenty! Ten (41.7%) had previously taught at a college of education, three (12.5%) at a technicon and nine (37.5%) at another university.

5.2.4.2 Teachers

It seems as though excellence does not go unrewarded in our education system. Although there were only two principals among the teacher respondents, there were seven deputy principals, two English advisors and one head of a teacher centre.
Twenty-one respondents were either subject heads or heads of department. Only fourteen of the 50 respondents were assistant teachers.

All the respondents had had some previous teaching experience. The majority had taught in secondary schools (96%) and apart from ten (20%), had had no primary school experience. Only three had previously taught at a college of education. Other teaching experience ranged from part-time teaching of English For Special Purposes to pupils under the Department of Education and Training; teaching at a technicon, technical college, business school, adult night schools, NGO community projects, to teaching in the SA defence force and ‘cram college’.

The number of years the teacher respondents had taught ranged from three-and-a-half to 36 years, with a mean of 16 years. Most teachers in the sample had taught at between one and six schools (96%), with only one teacher having taught at seven schools.

5.2.5 Membership of English-related organisations (question 7)

The aim of question 7 was to give some indication of the respondents’ level of professional commitment. For the lecturers, this level was very high, since only four (16.7%) out of 24 respondents did not belong to English-related organisations and only three (12.5%) had never belonged to any. This finding is supported by the response to question 11f where fourteen (58.4%) of the 24 lecturers rated English-related organisations as either of some importance or very important, and three (12.5%) rated them as crucial.

It was also established from the data of questions 7 and 11 that of the twenty lecturers/tutors who belonged to English-related organisations, twelve (60%) rated membership of such organisations as being of some importance to very important, while three (15%) rated membership as crucial. Table 5.2 (see p 101) illustrates these findings.

Only twenty (40%) of the 50 teacher respondents belonged to English-related organisations. Thirty (60%) did not belong to any organisations at present and twenty (40%) had never belonged to any. These findings are supported by the rating of
question 11f where only six teachers (12%) rated membership of English-related organisations as very important to their development as language teachers and three (6%) rated them as crucial. Of the former, one, and of the latter, two, did not belong to any English-related organisations. It is difficult to suggest a reason for this discrepancy other than that the respondents misread the question, although each rating was clearly explained. Another twenty (40%) rated them as of some importance. One teacher, who did not and never had belonged to any English-related organisation, nevertheless felt that membership was so important that it should be made compulsory for student teachers! (See 5.3.13.2.3)

Of the twenty teachers who did belong to English-related organisations, thirteen (65%) rated membership as being of some importance to very important, while one (5%) rated it as crucial. From these findings it would seem that their membership is regarded as important by the majority of both sets of respondents. The findings for both lecturers/tutors and teachers are given in Table 5.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Of no importance</th>
<th>Of little importance</th>
<th>Of some importance</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Crucial</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers/tutors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The organisations listed range from study groups at teacher centres to professional organisations such as SAALA and SAALT. The organisations are listed in Addendum F.

Since respondents were not asked to give reasons for non-membership, one can only speculate as to the reasons for their lack of interest. It is possible that teachers simply find teaching so time consuming and exhausting that they have little time or energy left to contribute in any way to these organisations or even to attend meetings. Quite a few teachers mentioned exhaustion and their workload as obstacles to their teaching satisfactorily (question 9a). Being an active member of such organisations is not only
time consuming, but also quite expensive, as few schools cover the teachers' expenses incurred by attending conferences. There is also no account taken of membership by the Education Department - active membership does not lead to promotion. It could also be that teachers see the organisations as being mainly for academics and not for practitioners. Another reason could be that lecturers/tutors do not encourage student teachers to join professional organisations or attend their conferences, let alone ask them to try their hand at writing articles for professional journals. If lecturers made a conscious effort to share the insights gained from conferences and alerted student teachers to articles or research papers, students might possibly see the benefits of joining such organisations (Ridge E. 1995c).

5.3 Information pertaining to the investigation

5.3.1 Aspects essential to teacher preparation (question 8: lecturer/tutor)

Table 5.3: Aspects essential to teacher preparation (question 8: lecturer/tutor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g) Practice teaching</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Action research</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Task-based teaching</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Reflective teaching</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) School-based training</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) A supervisory teacher</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Closer links between schools and the education faculty</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Micro-teaching</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other *</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Other includes:
- Applied linguistics / Good theoretical background (3)
- Workshops to implement teaching ideas (2)
- Teacher awareness of being curriculum developers rather than implementors (1)
- Ethnographic observation (1)
- Communication and membership of English-related organisations (1)
- Drama-in-education (1)
The table indicates that practice teaching was seen as essential by 22 lecturers/tutors (91.7%). This finding is not borne out by respondents’ reaction to question 16, since only four (16.7%) saw extended or sustained practice teaching as being ideal for teacher preparation. Respondents possibly considered practice teaching as a given and therefore did not feel the need to mention it, or else they felt the amount of practice teaching to be sufficient. It is also possible that those who considered some sort of mentor system or school-based training as the ideal preparation (see 5.3.13.1.4) saw this as practice teaching. These aspects were mentioned only four times, however, so this supposition does not lend sufficient support to the thrust for practice teaching. It was not possible to check the findings for micro-teaching in this way, since neither the lecturers/tutors nor the teachers specifically mentioned micro-teaching in their answers to question 16. This may indicate that micro-teaching is not highly rated by the respondents or is not much used.

Two-thirds of respondents (83.3%) rated action research as essential, and task-based and reflective teaching were rated as essential by eighteen respondents (75%). From these findings it is clear that respondents recognise the value of these aspects. School-based training and a supervisory teacher were rated as essential by fifteen respondents (62.5%) each and fourteen (58.3%) rated closer links between schools and the education faculty as essential. These findings are supported by the fact that sixteen respondents (66.6%) who marked one or more of these items also indicated that some kind of mentor system or apprenticeship system would be ideal for teacher preparation in question 16. Micro-teaching was rated as essential by less than half the respondents (41.7%).

The responses in the ‘other’ category were all coded and categorised as explained in the introduction (5.1) Because of the range of responses, it was impossible to narrow down the list of categories any further. Aspects the respondents regarded as essential are listed in order of the most number of responses per category below Table 5.3 (see above).

From the number of responses in each category, it is clear that these were aspects individual respondents felt were important rather than a general tendency.
When asked to place three of the items in order of importance, practice teaching was ranked by five respondents (20.8%) as most important, by two (8.3%) as next most important, and by another five as third most important. Reflective teaching was rated by four respondents (16.6%) as most important, by nine (37.5%) as next most important and by another four as third most important. Action research, which twenty respondents (83.3%) had rated as essential in question 8a, was listed by only ten (41.6%) in question 8b (four placed it first, five placed it second, one placed it third). School-based training, which was also rated as essential by more than half the respondents (62.5%), was low on the list when it came to order of importance. Only eight respondents listed it; four placed it first, and two each placed it second and third.

These findings are given in Table 5.4 in Addendum D.

From the findings of question 8a, one would have expected a higher percentage of respondents to have listed practice teaching in 8b, and from the findings of question 8b, that more respondents would have rated reflective teaching as essential in question 8a. The seemingly contradictory findings highlight one of the problems inherent in structural questions: the answers given are elicited. Respondents had to choose among the items that had been selected for them. There may also have been some confusion as to what exactly constitutes reflective teaching. One respondent, who listed task-based teaching, reflective teaching and school-based training in that order commented that these were ‘basic, first order skills i.e. these are necessary but not sufficient conditions for good teaching’. Another reason could be that respondents regarded these items as important, but not as important as the first three they listed.

In spite of these contradictory findings, however, the respondents’ answers to question 16 indicate that they did regard action research, task-based teaching and reflective teaching as important to teacher preparation. Twenty respondents (83.3%) who marked one or more of these items in 8a also indicated that teacher education as defined in this research was an ideal means of teacher preparation. (see Table 8.4a in Addendum D).

One respondent found it too difficult to place any of the items in order of importance: ‘I don’t think you can single one out in this way - too closely linked.’ This response
touche on a problem incurred when setting up the questionnaire. It is difficult to separate aspects which seem so interrelated. Reflective teaching, for instance, would include reflection on theory, which is also part of action research. Action research might lead to task-based teaching. Reflection is also extremely useful in micro-teaching and practice teaching (see 3.3.4). A reflective teacher would also realise the benefits of closer links between schools and the education faculty and a supervisory teacher. All of the items could actually be seen as essential to teacher education as defined in this research.

5.3.2 Major omissions from course of preparation (question 8: teachers)

Table 5.5: Major omissions from course of preparation (question 8: teacher)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Omissions</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Action research</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Task-based teaching</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Closer links between schools and the education faculty</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Reflective teaching</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) School-based training</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) A supervisory teacher</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Micro-teaching</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Practice teaching</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Other includes:
- Constructive ways of disciplining pupils (3)
- English as medium for holistic education (2)
- Establishing interaction between schools (1)
- Sound method - innovation (1)
- Applied linguistics / Good theoretical background (1)

One can assume that if teachers marked items as having been major omissions from their course of preparation, they considered that these items would have made a difference to their teaching. However, the problem of elicited answers (see 5.3.1) also applies here.
Of the items listed, action research, task-based teaching, closer links between schools and the education faculty and reflective teaching were rated by twenty or more teachers as having been major omissions. Thirty-two teachers (64%) rated action research as having been a major omission. Twenty-four teachers (48%) rated task-based teaching, twenty-three (46%) rated closer links between schools and education faculty and twenty (40%) rated reflective teaching as major omissions.

In the case of the other items, 30% or fewer marked these as having been major omissions from their preparation.

Respondents were also asked to specify any other aspects that they felt had been major omissions. There were only eight 'other' responses. Some of the aspects mentioned could be placed into the following two categories: constructive ways of disciplining pupils (three responses), and sound method and innovation (two responses). The following three aspects were mentioned by only one respondent each: establishing interaction between schools, English as medium for holistic education, and a good theoretical background/applied linguistics. The categories and responses appear below Table 5.5 above.

As in the case of the lecturers/tutors, this list of aspects largely gives an indication of what individual teachers considered as essential to their teaching rather than a general tendency.

When given the opportunity to consider the importance of the items, in question 8b, respondents acknowledged the value of action research and task-based teaching, and to a lesser extent, of reflective teaching. Action research was rated either first, second or third by 35 respondents (70%), while 29 respondents (58%) rated task-based teaching first, second or third. Reflective teaching was rated by half the respondents as either first, second or third. The information gained from question 16 (see Table 5.5a in Addendum D) supports these findings. Twenty nine teachers (58%) who marked task-based teaching, action research, and/or reflective teaching in question 8a also indicated that the ideal teacher preparation should include these aspects. These findings are significant. Although most teachers were not members of professional organisations, they presumably kept abreast of these fairly new developments in language teaching. It
could be argued that teachers gain this type of information from journal articles or books on language teaching, or while engaged in further study. One teacher had a problem in answering this particular question. She did not know whether the items were to be rated as important in themselves or ‘how much I needed to have had these in my training’. From the formulation of question 8a, it should have been clear that the rating applied to the importance of the aspects to the teachers’ preparation. This variation in interpretation could affect the findings. However, from the low rating of practice teaching in 8a (14%) and its equally low ranking in 8b (16%) it was presumed that most of the teachers had interpreted the question correctly. The findings are given in Table 5.6 in Addendum D.

5.3.3 Comparison of findings of question 8

Clearly, practice teaching has been and still remains essential in teacher preparation. Only seven (14%) teachers rated this as a major omission from their course, and the overwhelming majority of lecturers/tutors (91.7%) rated it as essential.

Action research was the major omission for teachers (64%) and it was also rated as essential by the majority of lecturers/tutors (83.3%). It could be argued that action research is a fairly recent development in language teaching and that this is the reason for most teachers not having had any exposure to it. On the basis of the lecturer/tutor responses one might assume that action research is part of language teacher preparation in SA at present.

Task-based teaching was also regarded by nearly half the number of teachers (48%) as a major omission, while being rated as essential by the majority of lecturers/tutors (75%). Again, one could argue that the teachers in this universe did their teacher preparation at a time when the notion of task-based teaching with its connotations of learner-centredness and communicative language teaching was fairly new, and one would assume that it is part of the language teacher preparation course at present. The above findings suggest a strong similarity between what teachers see as essential and what lecturers consider important in the teacher preparation course.
Although more than half the lecturers (58.3%) saw closer links between schools and the education faculty as essential to teacher preparation, almost half the teachers (48%) considered this aspect to have been a major omission. It seems that, although this aspect is considered essential by a significant percentage, adequate links have yet to be established. This is confirmed by the finding in question 9a where 66.7% of lecturers/tutors considered limited school contact as one of the chief obstacles to their teaching satisfactorily (see 5.3.4). If this aspect is so important to both parties, one wonders what obstacles prevent the desired contact.

Although micro-teaching was not considered by teachers to have been a major omission from their course of preparation, only ten lecturers/tutors (41.7%) saw this item as essential. It may be that lecturers/tutors regard practice teaching as taking the place of micro-teaching. It is also possible that some lecturers/tutors do not use micro-teaching because they are involved in distance education at UNISA and VISTA (eight and nine questionnaires respectively were sent to these universities).

The findings for school-based training raise interesting questions. This item was rated by fifteen lecturers/tutors (62.5%) as being essential to teacher preparation, while only fifteen teachers (30%) rated it as a major omission. School-based training can be seen either as training mainly by schools, where ‘apprentice teachers’ work under an experienced teacher and there is little or no preparation by education departments, or as schools taking a larger share in teacher preparation. However conceived, school-based training has never been the practice in South Africa, so the teachers would not have had any experience of it. The low rating could be indicative of their being unwilling to shoulder the extra responsibility of ‘training’ a student teacher. On the other hand, since teachers did not have experience of school-based training, they might not conceive of it as being important. There is a third possibility. Teachers as a group tend to be conservative. Innovation is not generally welcomed or sought.

It is surprising that more than half the lecturers/tutors saw school-based training as essential, since the ‘apprenticeship model’ has been severely criticised abroad for its emphasis on practice and the inevitable neglect of sound theoretical principles. If lecturers had been doing their reading, they would be less enthusiastic about it.
Protherough (1991:50), for instance, argues that teaching can not be reduced to mere routines and skills which student teachers imitate. This is also the thrust of the literature review in this research (see Chapter 3).

### 5.3.4 Chief obstacles to teaching effectively (question 9a and b: lecturers/tutors)

Table 5.7: Chief obstacles to teaching effectively (question 9: lecturer/tutor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacle</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g) Limited school contact</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Structure of H Ed Course</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Student numbers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Structure of English method course</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Limitations of own techniques</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Limited experience as lecturer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Limited knowledge of applied linguistics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Other includes:
- **Obstacles relating to own institution or circumstances:**
  - Distance education - inadequate contact (5)
  - Limited time because of practice teaching each semester (4)
  - Lack of interdisciplinary contact (1)
  - Shifts in colleague's commitment (1)
  - Not enough specialisation in subject matter (1)
- **Obstacles relating to students:**
  - Students' linguistic incompetence (2)
  - Students' poor experiential knowledge (1)
  - Students' perception of teaching (1)
  - Non-participation in class (1)
- **Obstacles relating to education policy:**
  - No official language policy (1)
  - Nature of the school curriculum (1)
For more than half the lecturers/tutors, the chief obstacles were limited school contact (66.7%), and structure of the HED course (58.3%). The structure of the English method course and student numbers were respectively rated by eight (33.3%) respondents as being among the chief obstacles.

From the 'other' obstacles listed, three broad categories could be discerned: obstacles relating to respondents' own institution or circumstances (twelve responses), obstacles relating to students (five responses), and obstacles relating to education policy (two responses). The three categories and the specific obstacles mentioned appear as part of Table 5.7 above.

Since items a, b, and c could also be seen as obstacles relating to respondents' own institution, it would seem that this category causes respondents the most frustration, followed by limited school contact.

One of the obstacles relating to education policy, 'nature of the school curriculum' (q), is also related to the fact that lecturers/tutors have little contact with schools. The respondent explained what he meant by the nature of the school curriculum as follows: '...limits what students see as acceptable i.e. focus on process, on concepts and on "new" English (teaching media or post-colonial literature) not seen as "relevant" by students because of "what is" in schools at the moment'. This problem is touched on by Boomer et al (1992), and Ridge (1992). Ridge maintains that language teacher education must take place in the context of the language curriculum, while Boomer et al maintain that the curriculum can be negotiated. Lecturers/tutors therefore have a responsibility to prepare their students to teach creatively within the confines of the curriculum, and to interpret the demands the syllabus makes.

The findings for question 9b are given in Table 5.8 in Addendum. It was difficult to interpret the findings for this question as the responses were incomplete. Two respondents did not answer the question. Six others answered it incompletely by ranking only one or two aspects. The respondent who found it difficult to place the aspects mentioned in question 8a in order of importance (see 5.3.1) had the same difficulty with this question. In this case, however, her response seems unfounded. The aspects mentioned can not be seen as too closely linked. They can actually be placed
into two categories: obstacles pertaining to own limitations and obstacles pertaining to the course structure. Two respondents listed aspects they had not mentioned under 'other' in question 9a. One respondent wrote down 'limited school contact' three times.

Nevertheless, if the responses to 9b are used as a control mechanism for the responses to 9a, the following emerges: 'limited school contact' (g), which was marked by 66.7% of respondents, was ranked most important by three out of 22 respondents (13.6%), by seven out of twenty (35%) as next most important, and by eight out of sixteen respondents (50%) as third most important. Although this response does not quite support the findings of question 8 regarding closer links between the education faculty and schools, it seems of some concern to lecturers.

'Structure of H Ed course' (a), which was marked by fourteen respondents (58.3%), was rated most important by nine out of 22 (40.9%), as next most important by two out of twenty (10%), and as third most important by one out of sixteen respondents (6.25%). Since the structure of the course is clearly a major obstacle for more than half the respondents, further research into the exact nature of the problem seems necessary.

'Structure of method course' (b) and 'student numbers' (c), the two aspects which were marked by eight (33.3%) were ranked by very few respondents. Here, again, the problem of elicited answers mentioned in 5.3.1 and 5.3.2 is evident. The aspects referring to lecturer/tutors' own limitations (d, e, f), which were not significantly marked, were also ranked by very few respondents. This is a disturbing finding. Acknowledgement of one's limitations in an area should not be seen as a vote of no-confidence in one's own abilities, but rather as a sign of professionalism, of being aware that knowledge is never complete and that ongoing learning is as important to those who teach as it is to those who are taught.

Of the five obstacles categorised under 'own institution/circumstances', 'limited time to teach' (k) was ranked as most and third most important once, 'distance education and the resulting limited contact' (j) was ranked three times as most important and twice as third most important, while of the four obstacles categorised under 'student-
related', two (h and r) were ranked as most important once and one (i) as next most important once. Clearly, although the obstacles can be categorised, most of them are not common to all or even a few lecturers/tutors but are unique to the respondents' circumstances.

3.3.5 Chief obstacles to teaching successfully (question 9: teachers)

Table 3.9: Chief obstacles to teaching effectively (question 9: teacher)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacle</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Too many pupils in one class</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Ethics of the school</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) The English curriculum</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Limitations of own techniques</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Limited experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Limited knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Other includes:
- Obstacles relating to the education department:
  - People responsible for education legislation / Vogue curriculum changes (6)
  - Low salary / demotivation of teachers (3)
  - Limited or no resources / Boring, outdated language textbooks - no money for new (2)
- Obstacles relating to the school:
  - Demands on time: marking load, too many classes, admin, no time to plan lessons (7)
  - Little contact with other English teachers (1)
  - Lacking an English classroom (1)
  - Inflexible timetable (1)
  - Rigidity of staff (1)
- Obstacles relating to pupils:
  - Pupils too stretched by other school demands (1)
  - Reluctance of pupils to co-operate: compulsory subject, discipline (2)

From the table it is clear that the aspects teachers consider as obstacles are chiefly school-related (c, b, a).

Marginally fewer teachers than lecturers/tutors (7=14% as opposed to 4=16.6%) considered their own limitations to be obstacles to their teaching satisfactorily. One
teacher, although she did not mark the item, commented: 'Maybe (difficult to be objective)'. Considering that both sets of respondents rated ongoing development highly (question 10; see 5.3.8.1 and 5.3.8.2) this finding seems to indicate that respondents do not really know what it means to be a reflective teacher. The type of courses teachers listed for question 15 (see 5.3.12.2) also seems to indicate that teachers' own limitations are more serious than they are willing to concede.

Seventeen different 'other' obstacles were listed. On a first reading of the responses, five were categorised as 'demands on time'. It was later possible to place the other twelve obstacles into the following broad categories: education policy-related (eleven responses), school-related (ten responses), and pupil-related obstacles (three responses). Since the responses in the 'demands on time' category were all school-related, this category was incorporated into the latter. The categories are basically the same as those used for the lecturer/tutor responses. The categories and the specific obstacles mentioned appear as part of Table 5.9 above.

Although obstacles relating to education policy had marginally more responses than school-related obstacles, if the latter are considered together with the responses in 9a, then school-related obstacles are those that bother teachers most. This finding is similar to the finding for lecturers/tutors. The obstacles mentioned by the teachers ranged from demands on time and an inflexible timetable to lacking an English classroom and the rigidity of staff. An education system in transition with its concomitant uncertainties and limited resources, as well as low salaries also seemed to demotivate teachers. The fact that both school related and education policy related aspects were regarded as obstacles were echoed by the responses to question 13: 'What do you see as the most urgent problems facing secondary teachers of English in SA at the moment?' (see 5.3.10.2).

The same difficulties experienced in interpreting the lecturer/tutor responses for 9b were experienced in the case of the teacher responses. The teacher responses to 9b were also incomplete. Thirteen teachers did not answer the question. Three of these commented that they did not understand the question. One respondent did rank the aspects, but commented that she did not know whether they were to be regarded as
obstacles to herself or as obstacles for teachers in general. This is the same complaint one teacher mentioned for question 8b. Fifteen of those who did attempt the question, ranked either one or two items instead of three.

Nevertheless, the responses to question 9b do serve as a control mechanism for the responses to 9a. The three items which were most rated, were also those that were the most ranked (see Table 5.10 in Addendum D).

'Too many pupils in one class' (c), which was marked by eighteen respondents, was ranked most important by nine out of 37 respondents, as next most important by ten out of 30, and as third most important by six out of 22. This aspect seems to be cause for concern to teachers, since it was consistently mentioned in questions 13 and 14 (see 5.3.10.2 and 5.3.11.2).

'Ethos of the school' (b), which was marked by ten respondents, was rated most important by seven out of 37 respondents, as next most important by six out of 22, and as third most important by five out of twenty respondents.

'The English curriculum' (a), which was marked by nine respondents, was rated most important by eight out of 37 respondents, as next most important by six out of 30, and as third most important by three out of 22.

As in the case of the lecturer/tutor responses, the aspects relating to own limitations (d, e, f) which were not significantly marked, were also ranked by very few respondents.

Of the five obstacles categorised under 'school related' ‘demands on time’ (g) seemed to be the most important. It was rated most important six times, next most important once and third most important once. The only other two obstacles (p) were 'rigidity of staff' (p) (once as second most important) and 'inflexible (once as third most important). These last seem to be relevant to the particular circumstances rather than being a general tendency.

In the 'education policy related' category, 'people responsible for education legislation' (m) was ranked once each as most important and as next most important,
while 'limited resources' (j) and 'low salary - demotivation of teachers' (k) were ranked once as most important.

The obstacles under 'pupil related' were not ranked at all.

As in the case of the lecturer/tutor responses to this particular question, no general tendency can be identified.

5.3.6 Evaluation of course (question 10: lecturers/tutors)

In question 10 lecturers/tutors were asked to rate how effectively their department prepared student teachers in certain aspects. Items a to f, i, j and q pertain to the English syllabus, while items g and h (knowledge of language structure and language use), while certainly pertaining to the syllabus, are more pertinent to student teachers themselves. Items m to p pertain to classroom management, while items k, l, r and s are skills teachers need in the new South African education system. Two respondents had difficulties in answering this question. One maintained that it was difficult to assess the preparation of students in a particular course component if one did not teach that component oneself. The other said that the course content was never discussed at meetings. Both these responses seem to be evidence of a lack of effective communication within the department itself.
Table 5.11 illustrates the findings for question 10.

Table 5.11: Evaluation of course (question 10: lecturer/tutor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Inadequately</th>
<th>Adequately</th>
<th>Effectively</th>
<th>Very Effectively</th>
<th>Not response</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Organizing encouraging talking and listening</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Organizing encouraging drama</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Encouraging and evaluating written work</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Selection of prescribed texts</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Selection of textbooks</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Encouraging the reading and writing of poetry</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Knowledge of English use</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Knowledge of English language structure</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Ways of working with media</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Planning coherent programme of work</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Teaching across the whole ability range</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) Preparing pupils for leaving school at end of year</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m) Advanced level teaching</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n) Classroom management and control</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o) Management of small group work</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p) Management of large classes</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q) Developing language teaching material</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r) Working with children with special needs</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s) Teaching English in a multilingual classroom</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings of this question present a rather bleak picture of the preparation of secondary teachers of English. Ideally, student teachers should be well prepared for their task, but from the findings it is clear that this is not the case. Less than half the lecturers/tutors rated any of the items at 4 or 5 (effectively or very effectively). Item 0 came closest: eleven lecturers/tutors (45.8%) considered that they effectively prepared their students to manage small-group work.
In general, the majority of respondents considered that student teachers were 'not at all' to 'adequately' prepared in terms of aspects pertaining to the English syllabus (items a-f, i, j, q). More than half considered their student teachers to be 'not at all' to 'adequately' prepared in language structure and language use (items g, h) and aspects pertaining to classroom management (k, l, r, s).

It is crucial that secondary teachers of English in South Africa should be able to teach across the whole ability range (k), and be able to teach English in a multilingual classroom (s). Yet an overwhelming majority of lecturers/tutors (91% and 70.8% respectively) rated the preparation for these in the categories 'not at all' to 'adequate'. Student teachers are even less well prepared for preparing pupils for leaving school at the end of Std seven. One lecturer wrote 'relevance?' next to this item. The relevance of this aspect can not be called into question. The SA Constitution makes provision for pupils to be provided with ten years of free education in state schools. This would take pupils up to the end of Std seven. The IEB has accordingly been preparing appropriate tests and examinations. Teachers of English in such schools will have to provide pupils leaving at the end of Std seven with an adequate language tool so that they will not be unduly handicapped in the workplace and the broader society. However, since it is a very recent decision, it is not surprising that few departments have prepared their students in this respect.

Less understandable is the fact that 70.8% of respondents considered that their students were being 'not at all' to 'adequately' prepared to be able to teach English in a multilingual classroom. The multilingual classroom is something which has been anticipated for some years and has already been implemented in many schools.

5.3.7 Evaluation of course (question 10: teachers)

In question 10, teachers were asked to evaluate their own courses of preparation for teaching secondary English. The list of items was the same as that for the lecturers/tutors. Unlike the latter, who evaluated their present courses, the teachers, because of their age range (from early twenties to 50 and older) evaluated courses dating from the sixties to the present. This would clearly have some effect on the rating of items i, k, l, r and s, since these pertain more to current practice.
This becomes clear when these items are looked at separately. Forty of the 50 teachers (80%) did not consider themselves to have been effectively prepared to use the media in their teaching (i), while 39 (78%) were not effectively prepared to teach across the whole ability range (k). All the teachers (96%) who marked item l (preparing pupils for leaving school at the end of std seven) were not effectively prepared for this. Only two teachers considered themselves to have been very effectively prepared to work with children with special needs. Item s (teaching English in a multilingual classroom) was rated 4 by three teachers and 5 by one teacher. This means that only four teachers considered themselves effectively prepared to teach English in a multilingual classroom.

In general, the majority of teachers considered themselves to have been ‘not at all’ to ‘inadequately’ prepared in aspects relating to the English syllabus (items a-f, i, j, q) and aspects pertaining to classroom management (items k, l, m-p). The responses were evenly spread for items g and h with a mean of 3.3 and 3.4 respectively.

The findings for question 10 appear in Table 5.12.
The teachers’ evaluation of their course of preparation presents an even bleaker picture than that of the lecturers/tutors. In this case, the percentages of those who considered that they had been only inadequately to adequately prepared in all the respects listed was even higher than those of the lecturers/tutors. The mean percentage was lower for all the items listed except for item m (advanced level teaching). Strangely enough, these findings are not substantially supported by the findings for question 11b, where teachers had to rate the training course on a scale of one to five (see 5.3.8). Here, exactly half the respondents rated the course from ‘of no importance’ to ‘of some importance’ (4% + 16% + 14% = 4%%), while the other half rated it as being ‘very
importance' and 'crucial' (32%+16%=48%). One respondent did not answer the question.

Nevertheless, it is cause for concern that preparation for teaching secondary English was not rated higher. One of the reasons for teachers' rating their course of preparation so low may be that they consider the course 'too theoretical'. One young teacher (age range 21-30), who argued for a much more practical course in question 16, commented: 'The HDE course is too theoretical - one works with a perfect child in a textbook - in reality it is far from this! When one starts teaching one tends to rely heavily on instinct and on what one remembers from one's own schooldays!' It could be argued that the instinct teachers rely on is an 'educated' one - one which has been schooled during the course of preparation - but the fact that teachers revert to methods they remember from their schooldays is cause for concern. The problem of this kind of transfer has been addressed in the literature on language teaching (see for instance Nolasco and Arthur 1986, Cain 1989, Pennington 1989, Athanazes et al 1992) and was the topic of Freeman's paper at the Third International Conference on Teacher Education in Second Language Teaching held in Hong Kong in March 1995. The teacher preparation course run by CENCE also attempts to address this problem (Burk, et al 1995; see 3.7.3).

Another teacher made the following comments: 'In retrospect, I consider my training as an English teacher as ineffective on the whole, but then, I believe that teachers are born and not often made. So many of the needed skills come instinctively and through experience and through independent reading and other post-graduate study' (respondent's emphasis). The question of instinct has been addressed above. The question of teachers being born, not made, has been touched on in section 4.3.4.1. Of course, the respondent undercuts her original statement of teachers being born by mentioning reading and further study, or else sees 'training' as formal course work. This does not, however, call into question the fact that she considers her course of preparation to have been lacking.
5.3.3 Aspects important and helpful to development of a language teacher (question 11)

In question 11, respondents were again given a list of aspects which they had to rate from 1 to 5, where 1 indicated 'of no importance to the development of a language teacher' and 5 indicated 'crucial to his/her development'. In the discussion, items a and b (academic subject study and teacher training course) are categorised as initial teacher preparation, while items e to g and i (in-service courses, membership of subject-related organisations, further academic study, and workshops) are categorised as part of lifelong learning. Item h (books and articles) is essential for both initial and ongoing teacher education. Items c and d (heads of departments and other English teachers) are categorised as human resources. The aspects were included because they are regarded as important to teacher education as defined in this research as well as lifelong learning. Clearly, other categorisations are possible.

In order to make the question less restrictive, respondents were also asked to mention any other aspects they thought important to language teacher development.

The third part of the question required respondents to list any books or articles which they had found particularly helpful. The purpose of this question was to obtain a list of useful references for both teachers and lecturers.

The two sets of responses for the first two parts of question 11 are discussed separately. The responses to the request for books and articles are discussed together.
5.3.8.1 Lecturer tutor responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Of no importance</th>
<th>Of little importance</th>
<th>Of some importance</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Crucial</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Academic subject study</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Teacher training course</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Heads of departments at school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Other English teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) In-service courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Membership of English-related organizations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Further academic study</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Books or articles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others mentioned:
- NGO Education Services (1)
- Travel (1)
- Staff development (1)
- Ethos of school (1)
- How teachers themselves were taught (1)
- Practice teaching - with help in planning - extended critique (1)
- Emphasis for culture - film, theatre, reading (1)
- Effective merit system to motivate teachers (1)
- Study groups (1)

Lecturers/tutors regarded both an academic and a professional qualification as essential to language teacher development. Items a and b were rated from 'very important' to 'crucial' by the majority of respondents (54.2%+29.2%=83.4% for a, 41.7%+37.5%=79.2% for b). The majority of lecturers/tutors also regarded ongoing development or lifelong learning (e, f, g, i) as important. Of the aspects mentioned in this category, further academic study (g) was rated as being 'of some importance' to 'crucial' by 95.8% of respondents (37.5%+33.3%+25%=95.8%). This finding supports the findings for item a. Twenty respondents (12.5%+45.8%+25%=83.3%) rated in-service courses (e) as being 'of some importance' to 'crucial'. Seventeen respondents (29.2%+29.2%=12.5%=70.9%) rated membership of English-related organizations (f) as being 'of some importance' to 'crucial', which supports the findings of question 7 (see 5.2.5). Workshops (i) was also rated in the same way by the majority of respondents (25%+27.2%=41.7%=95.9%). Clearly, most of the lecturers/tutors...
support the notion of a sound theoretical and practical background as well as ongoing development. This finding is also supported by the responses to question 16 (see 5.3.13.1.1 and 5.3.13.1.2).

The majority of lecturers/tutors regarded heads of department as being ‘of some importance’ to ‘crucial’ (20.8%+37.5%+16.7%=75%), and all of them also rated English teachers in this way. This supports the notion by Burkett (1995) of a supportive environment (see 3.7.3.1) and also Freeman’s (1989) of a ‘collaborator’ being necessary for ongoing development (3.7.1.2).

Respondents were also asked to list any other aspects they thought were important. Nine other aspects were listed. As was the case in question 8b, it was difficult to categorise the various aspects. Some aspects can, however, be placed in the categories mentioned above. For instance, ‘practice teaching with help in planning and extended critique’(t), ‘studygroups - working together to produce good material or have effective techniques demonstrated’ (w), and ‘staff development’ (q) could fall under ongoing development or lifelong learning. ‘Travel’ (p), ‘enthusiasm for culture - films, theatre, c.s. and reading for pleasure’ (u) could also be included in lifelong learning, although these aspects pertain more to the individual’s personality than the teaching of English. Nevertheless, it could be argued that these are also ways of obtaining an ‘educated intuition’ which leads to enriched teaching.

The two other aspects mentioned relate to aspects mentioned in this research. For instance, ‘how teachers themselves were taught’ (s) touches on the problem of transfer mentioned in 5.3.7 while an ‘effective merit system to motivate teachers’ (v) relates to the problem of no incentives for teachers to belong to English-related organisations mentioned in 5.2.5.
5.3.8.2 Teacher responses

Table 5.14: Evaluation of aspects important and helpful to the development of a language teacher (question 11: teacher)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Of no importance</th>
<th>Of little importance</th>
<th>Of some importance</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Crucial</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Academic subject study</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Teacher training course</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Head of departments or school</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Other English teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) In-service courses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Membership of English-related organizations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Further academic study</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Books or articles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Workshops</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others mentioned:
- Practical experience (1)
- Common sense (1)
- Own understanding of world (1)
- Subject advisors (2)
- SGG Education Services (1)
- Environmental educational principles (1)
- Learning from one's own mistakes and failures (6)

The teachers had to indicate how important and helpful the aspects mentioned had been to their own development.

In the category 'initial teacher preparation', academic subject study (a) was rated by many more teachers (28%+36%=64%) as 'very important' to 'crucial' than the teacher training course (b) (32%+16%=48%). This is understandable since so many teachers (48%) do not have a professional qualification in English (see 5.2.3.2). However, compared to the lecturer/tutor responses (see 5.3.8.1), the percentages are quite low.

In the category 'ongoing development or life-long learning' workshops (i) was rated highest, with forty-five teachers rating this item as being 'of some importance’ to 'crucial' (28%+38%+24%=90%). The teachers were therefore only slightly less enthusiastic about this item than the lecturers/tutors (95.9%). Although some respondents were unenthusiastic about in-service courses (i) (see 5.3.12.2), the majority rated them as being 'of some importance’ to 'crucial'.
It could be argued that these two items are of practical value to teachers. Thirty-eight teachers (76%) as opposed to 23 lecturers/tutors (95.8%) rated further academic study (g) as being 'of some importance' to 'crucial' (24%+26%=50%). Fewer teachers (58%) than lecturers/tutors (70.8%) rated membership of English-related organisations (f) as being 'of some importance' to 'crucial' (40%+12%=52%) which again was predictable since fewer teachers than lecturers/tutors belonged to these organisations (see 5.2.5). Although fewer teachers than lecturers/tutors considered a sound theoretical and practical background and lifelong learning as important to the development of language teachers, the findings for both sets of respondents indicate that the majority of respondents regarded them as essential for language teachers. This was also supported by the responses to question 16 (see 5.3.13.2.1 and 5.3.13.2.2).

As was the case for the lecturers/tutors, the majority of teachers also regarded heads of departments as being 'of some importance' to 'crucial' (32%+32%+14%=78%). One respondent, who rated this item either 3 or 4, commented, 'depends on the hod.' Most teachers seemed to find them helpful, but it must be remembered that close on half these respondents (42%; see 5.2.4) are heads of departments themselves. Marginally fewer teachers than lecturers/tutors rated other English teachers as being 'of some importance' to 'crucial' to their own development (92% as opposed to 100%). The 'NGO educational services' mentioned by one respondent under 'others' could perhaps also fall into this category.

Only twelve responses were given in the 'other' section. Six teachers considered that learning from their own successes and failures and interaction with pupils (a) had been important to their own development. This was the only 'other' aspect that both the lecturers and teachers mentioned. One respondent each mentioned practical experience (j) and common sense (k). Both these aspects are problematic since they are not specific enough. It does not follow that practical experience makes one an excellent teacher. For instance, a teacher who has been teaching in the same manner for twenty years may have plenty of practical experience, but his or her teaching has not developed at all. 'Common sense' needs to be looked at critically too: whether it will develop the teacher in the sense that his or her teaching will improve depends largely
on the teacher's world view. Another respondent mentioned his understanding of the world around him, and environmental educational principles on its own, the first aspect is open to the same criticism as the two aspects mentioned previously. However, it has probably been influenced by the second aspect, which supposes a holistic view of the learner and the environment. These aspects support the thrust of this thesis. One respondent mentioned subject advisors (I), who can be categorised with heads of departments and other English teachers. As mentioned in 5.3.8.1, human resources support the argument for a supportive environment and a 'collaborator' or mentor.

5.3.8.3 Books

Of the 23 lecturers/tutors (95.8%) who considered books to have been 'of some importance' to 'crucial' to the development of language teachers, eight (33.3%) rated them as being 'very important', and the other eight rated them as being 'crucial'. Unfortunately, only eight of these sixteen actually listed any books. The others simply said that there were too many to mention. One respondent very generously listed twelve books, while most listed more than one. The list consists mainly of theory and resource books for teachers.

Both sets of respondents seem to find books and articles invaluable. Forty-eight teachers (96%) considered them to have been of some importance to crucial to their development. Forty-one (82%) of these rated books and articles at either 4 or 5. Of these, thirty (60%) listed books and articles. The percentages in all cases are therefore higher for the teachers than the lecturers/tutors. Where the lecturers/tutors listed an average of five books, the teachers listed an average of three books. The teachers' list is not as focused on language teaching theory as the lecturer/tutors', but ranges from books and articles on education and resource books on language and literature, language textbooks and study aids, to books on self-improvement, novels about school, newspapers, and the back page of popular magazines. The list reflects not only what teachers read for their own background, but also what they use as teaching aids in the classroom.
More than one hundred books or articles were listed by the respondents, which appears to indicate that there is no obvious book or journal that is considered seminal by the whole group. Clearly, both sets of respondents read widely, both in their field and beyond. From this finding one could argue that lecturer/tutors and teachers of secondary English are guided by their own needs, circumstances, and particular world view rather than by prescription. The only journal mentioned by a substantial number of respondents was Crux (one lecturer/tutor, eighteen teachers).

Most of books and articles, including their bibliographical details, have been listed in Addendum E. Only those whose complete bibliographical details could not be traced have not been listed. The Addendum has been included as a useful source for teachers and lecturers/tutors of secondary English.

5.3.9 Changes in respondents' view of the nature of English teaching (question 12)

Question 12 is the first of the purely 'open' questions. The data was analysed as explained in 5.1. The number in brackets after the responses indicates the code of the response as it is listed in Table 5.15 in Addendum D.

A total of 23 responses was coded for both sets of respondents.

5.3.9.1 Lecturer/tutor responses (responses 4, 6-8, 15-21)

Only one respondent did not answer this question, but the responses of six others could not be used because they had misread the question. The aim of the question was to elicit how respondents' own view had changed and with it, their teaching of English. The six respondents mentioned ignored the 'own view' and elaborated on the nature of English teaching in general. An example of such a response is: 'Because of the drastic shift in syllabuses the nature of English teaching at secondary & high school level should change. In line with the communicative approach to language teaching must be how to deal with overcrowded classrooms'. It was decided to ignore these responses since they might slant the findings.

Most respondents reported that their views of the nature of language teaching had changed. Except for one respondent, those who maintained that they had not changed
radically or not at all (4) did not elaborate on their views. The respondent who did, explained as follows: ‘I have always felt that all teaching must be communicative, i.e., go beyond facts and have meaning for the learner as he/she is at that stage. When the English teaching field moved from linguistic to communicative competence I felt “right all along”, happy and engaged fully. However, I had to learn to “let go” of the security of grammar as an organizing principle and learn to grasp “interaction” and see how it fed into general educational goals. I still need to think to get the balance ‘connections right’. There is evidence of a distinct shift in focus here, and a candid recognition that the shift is not complete.

Respondents reported mainly that their view of language had changed and that this had influenced their teaching. It seems that language is viewed less as a subject than a tool: ‘from skills based to holistic, concerned with the need to comprehend, interpret, make sense, meaning’(6) and therefore the focus changes from ‘grammar as organizing principle to interaction, from accuracy to fluency’(19); there is a shift from ‘language/literature based to the communicative approach and integrated teaching’(7) and consequently teaching has become more ‘pupil/student-centred’(8). The realization that language is a tool has led one respondent ‘away from the idea of “Africanizing” English teaching to the idea that English has a role of making learners “literate” in a number of cultures... “popular culture” vs “high culture”; “ethnic cultures”; “post-colonial cultures” etc.’(17) These responses are clear evidence of a move towards the view of language espoused by the communicative approach, which has been advocated for teaching English Second Language. This approach presupposes a much more active role for the learner but at the same time, demands much from the teacher in terms of a sound knowledge of the language and meeting the needs of the learners in a variety of ways. Respondents realise this when they comment: ‘it takes a dedicated teacher with a sympathetic attitude to teach’(16), and ‘there is no one effective way of teaching’(20). Although one respondent still sees teaching as largely a matter of inspiration, he ‘now sees the need for development of metacognitive strategies and the role of teaching as one of enablement’(23).

Only one respondent reported having reverted from a more pupil-centred approach to a mainly teacher-centred one: ‘When I started I was determined to let pupils do their
own language, learning individually and in groups (this was before “communicative language teaching” as a concept). But pressure from headmaster and the general ethos of Afrikaans high school gradually forced me to adopt mainly teacher-centred methods. She did not explain whether her teaching had changed in any way since she started lecturing. This response emphasises the importance of a supportive environment, and a sound knowledge of the underlying principles of any language teaching approach.

5.3.9.2 Teacher responses (responses 1-14, 22-23)

Fifteen teachers either did not answer or misread the question. An example of such a misreading is the following comment: ‘a number of support programmes have emerged that promote the teaching of English’. Again it was decided not to use these responses.

A few teachers also reported that their views had not changed radically. Unlike the lecturers, the teachers elaborated on their comments, but this did not really help. One teacher commented: ‘According to Departmental policy I have concentrated more on Communicative Language Teaching through the years. My own views have not changed radically’. Unfortunately, she did not explain what her views were. From the response one could assume that she did not herself support a communicative approach. Another respondent wrote: ‘Very little change, in fact. I’m probably the same idealistic English teacher in many ways’. One teacher was very enthusiastic about the English first language syllabus of the Cape Education department. ‘No real changes - in 16 years! NB This is only true for “white education”. I believe the 1986 Eng I syllabus to be a good and practical syllabus - it has worked’. This comment does not really explain why her views have not changed.

Perhaps because of the communicative thrust of the English Second Language syllabus for Western Cape schools, more teachers supported the view of language as a tool rather than merely a subject. Apart from the responses quoted for the lecturers (6, 7, 8, 17, 19) one respondent commented that his view had changed ‘from language as a subject to language as part of human nature’. Some respondents felt that their teaching had become less ‘textbook bound’ and ‘syllabus orientated’, and ‘more learner centred’; they were now ‘linking English to pupil’s experience’ and
'encouraging self-motivated learning' (11, 12). One young respondent, having tried the Communicative Approach, sounded a note of caution: 'Second language - all teaching cannot be communicative - the basics in language are still required.' This response supports Van der Merwe's (1994) findings. Many teachers who think they teach communicatively in fact do not. The Communicative Approach has always recognised the importance of structure and correct language but these should not be taught in isolation (Widdowson 1990:98). The second comment also touches on an inherent weakness of the approach, that 'nothing is prescribed, nothing is proscribed' (Ridge 1994:1). Its very diversity presupposes that teachers should know what they are about. The response also seems to imply that this particular respondent did not have a sophisticated view of communicative teaching.

Like the lecturers/tutors, the teachers also reported changes in how they viewed their role and in their teaching style. One respondent had changed from using the 'lecture method to 'becoming a facilitator' (13); another, who said his view had 'changed radically in every respect' explained this by adding: 'I now have a healthy dislike for exams' (5); while another felt that he had gained some 'common sense' and did the minimum while 'pupils do the work' (10). One wrote that he had changed 'from being idealistic to realistic about pupils' abilities' (14).

5.3.9.3 Conclusion

The majority of both sets of respondents reported a change in their view of the nature of language teaching, some, especially in the case of the teachers, more from necessity than from personal conviction. This last finding possibly has something to do with the fact that fewer teachers than lecturers read books relating to language teaching theory (see 5.3.8.3). It is also clear that while some respondents regarded this change in attitude as positive and challenging, others were not quite as confident. Unfortunately, these responses must be taken at face value. However, further research is necessary to ascertain exactly what respondents mean when they make certain statements. When lecturers/tutors claim that their view of language teaching has changed from being teacher-centred to pupil-centred do they demonstrate this in their work with students? When respondents say they teach communicatively, are they really concerned with
meaning or are they satisfied if pupils/students 'get the message across'? What do they mean when they say they are facilitators? Do they simply set up a task sheet and let learners get on with it? Ridge (1992) and others have cautioned against a narrow view of facilitation.

If these teachers had been educated by lecturers/tutors who were also reflective teachers, one might feel more confident about the changes reported.

5.3.10 The most urgent problems facing secondary teachers of English in SA at the moment (question 13)

The purpose of this question was to ascertain whether lecturers/tutors were aware of the problems teachers were facing. At the first reading of both sets of responses, 34 different responses were recorded. Response 1 was 'not applicable'. After close scrutiny, the other 33 responses were narrowed down to three broad categories. Problems were

- pupil-centred (responses 3, 4, 7-8, 10, 14, 18, 25-27, 31)
- teacher-centred (responses 3, 6, 10, 13-16, 20-24, 30, 33-35)
- education policy-centred (responses 2, 5, 9, 11-12, 18-19, 21-23, 28-29, 31-32)

Some responses fell into more than one category, so the percentages of responses in each category could not be compared. The categories, with their numbered responses, are recorded in Tables 5.16.1-16.3 in Addendum D.

The two sets of responses are discussed separately. The lecturer/tutor responses are discussed first, followed by the teacher responses. Where responses overlap or are the same, they are referred to under the teacher responses, but are not discussed again.

5.3.10.1 Lecturer-tutor responses

All the respondents answered this question

5.3.10.1.1 Pupil-centred problems (responses 3-4, 7-8, 10, 25, 27, 31)
The main problems mentioned in this category are the result of the transition to democracy in SA. Because of the policy of open schools, teachers are having to cope with ‘vast numbers of non-mother tongue speakers’ (10). Since resources must now be more equitably spread, respondents mentioned the problem of a ‘high pupil-teacher ratio’ (3) which results in overcrowded classes, an increased marking load and discipline problems, and ‘multilingual classes’ (14). This situation will lead to a ‘lowering of standards’ (7). There is also the problem of the ‘shift from exams to continuous assessment’ (31). Some respondents suggested that pupils’ ‘articulation and pronunciation’ were a problem - one respondent specifically mentioned Afrikaans-speaking pupils (4) - and that pupils were reluctant to read, to think critically and were generally apathetic (8).

Other respondents saw the drive for literacy more as a challenge than a problem: teachers were having to teach English ‘to empower pupils, and to develop independent learning styles’ (25); they had to ‘enable pupils to communicate and understand effectively to meet the demands of society’ (27).

5.3.10.12 Teacher-centred problems (responses 3, 6, 10, 13-16, 30, 33-35)

The challenge of teaching large classes, possibly with mother-tongue and second and third language speakers of English all in one class (14, 10) pose special problems for teachers in respect of resources, teaching approach and style. Not alone does the new dispensation pose problems for teachers, there are also problems relating to the teachers themselves. Many teachers are underqualified or underprepared and lack a basic knowledge of applied linguistics (13). One respondent claimed that teachers were unable to ‘devise their own curriculum’ (34).

All these, coupled with the challenges of having to find ‘effective ways of meeting pupil needs - from std seven school leavers to critical appreciation’ (35) and the uncertainty of the whole education system, leads teachers to be ‘uncertain about their own teaching, standards and posts’(16).

Some respondents considered teachers to have problems changing their view of English. Teachers were thought to find it difficult to change ‘their own mindsets: they
are unable to see legitimate English in modern culture" (30) or accept 'the changing notion of the "aesthetic canon" (i.e. is Shakespeare appropriate? What is a good book? Africanisation etc.)' (33) which means that what they teach seems largely irrelevant to their pupils. One respondent elaborated as follows: 'The mindset of English as "humanising", as protection against popular/low culture takes them unable to link with pupil worlds of video games, film, comix and thus less able to teach effectively.' This same respondent saw a problem in what he called 'the knee-jerk reaction that the solution to mixed race classrooms is African novels'. He explained as follows: 'Two problems with this. Firstly, African novels like Things fall Apart are as alien to township Africans as The Great Gatsby. Secondly, it leaves the foss - the role of English - uncalled for.' It seems that respondents have problems with the form English should take. This aspect was discussed briefly in section 1.1.1.

Although this study is not about literature, it seems important to comment on these perceived problems. One way of becoming familiar with different cultures is, of course, through literature. Ridge (1995:6) points out that 'For access to the complex integration of signals which a particular culture uses, there is no better route than through the literature'. Since the English language owes much to Shakespeare, secondary pupils must be introduced to him:

It is unthinkable that people learning English at secondary school level should not know about Shakespeare, and have some sense of a few of his characters - Hamlet, for example, and "To be or not to be". The reason is not the primacy of the British tradition, but the fact that Hamlet and Shylock and Macbeth are part of the cultural vocabulary of a very wide interpretive community (Ridge 1995:6).

However, secondary pupils also need to study South African and African literature, since, although the language used is English, it provides a distinctly African world view. Ridge (1995:6) makes this point when he argues:

It is impossible to study Achebe properly without recognising the debt to Dickens. However, it is also impossible to study Achebe properly without recognising the distinctive lens on the world, partly individual, wholly African. Students of English, wherever they are, need to make acquaintance with the different English speech and cultural - and hence interpretive communities. That is a major reason for studying South African literature.
Only two respondents mentioned the problem of low salaries and the resulting demotivation: 'Poor teacher salaries lead to low morale' (15).

5.3.10.1.3 Education policy related (5, 9, 21, 22, 31, 32)

Over and above the problems mentioned in the previous sections relating to open schools and compulsory schooling for all up to std seven, lecturers/tutors considered political interference in the education system, poor administration and the implementation of one curriculum (5) to be problems for language teachers at this stage. Coupled with these were insufficient funds, and resources and facilities (9). There was also the perception that in their efforts to make English relevant to all pupils, education administrators were sacrificing classical literature for African literature (21).

Teachers would have to teach pupils the 'basics of language rather than an appreciation of language' (22). Political interference would also lead to a system of 'learning and teaching for certification, a process rather than a product approach' (32). There seemed to be some confusion about the actual policy to be followed, since some respondents considered there to be a shift from exams to continuous assessment (31). This is certainly not a 'product approach'. Perhaps respondents fear that, in the drive to affirm pupils, assessment will not be stringent enough. This fear is certainly inherent in the 'problem of standards' (7).

5.3.10.2 Teacher responses

Forty-one teachers answered this question.

5.3.10.2.1 Pupil-related problems (responses 3-4, 7-8, 10, 14, 17-18, 25-27)

The teachers' responses were mainly the same as those of the lecturers/tutors. Response 31 (shift from exams to continuous assessment) was the only one not mentioned. The discussion of the lecturer/tutor responses therefore also applies here. What can be discerned, however, is that teachers really see coping with large numbers and all its ramifications as a major problem. The problem of encouraging pupils to read
(26) echoes the problems mentioned by lecturers/tutors of pupils being reluctant to read (8) and lack of pupil confidence (17).

5.3.10.2.2 Teacher-centred problems (responses 3, 6, 10, 13-16, 20, 24)

Again, the teachers' and lecturer/tutors' responses were similar and broad patterns could be discerned. An increased workload was leaving teachers with little time for research. One respondent considered it difficult to 'bring imagination and joy to teaching' under the present circumstances (24). Two respondents felt that 'teachers were not being viewed as professionals' (20) One of these elaborated on the problem as follows: 'teachers are not viewed or treated as professionals. This leads to a lack of confidence and an ambivalent attitude towards teaching. English teachers should be empowered to view themselves as intellectuals, as professionals who have the skills and experience to make informed decisions in their area of expertise. This means that teachers must be consulted and involved, even on policy-making issues. Teachers should be invested with the power to use discretion and discernment, rather than be treated like glorified bureaucrats.' This argument supports the view of teacher professionalism set out in section 3.6.

In view of recent teacher strikes for better salaries it is interesting that low salaries were viewed as a problem by only four teachers. This seems to refute the view that good salaries will ensure quality teachers. However, the universe of this particular research was too small and there was no way of ascertaining whether any of the teacher respondents were underpaid. Perhaps, too, the other problems mentioned are much more pressing at this stage.

5.3.10.2.3 Education policy related (responses 2, 5, 9, 11-12, 18-19, 21-23, 28)

In this category, many more problems were mentioned by teachers than lecturers/tutors.

Teachers saw education administrators' language-teaching policy as a problem. One respondent described this problem as follows: 'To run the three-ring circus effectively to move everyone along a proficiency incline - mother-tongue pupils, second and third language pupils, so that everyone is stimulated and no-one is neglected. (I fear for the
precious gifted). In the teachers' view, oral had become more important and grammar and writing were being compromised (2) and Standard British English was not being used as a model (18). The respondent who considered this last to be a problem did not explain what she meant by Standard British English: Is it an 'acceptable' accent and correct pronunciation? Is it writing conventions? Ridge E (1995d:296) argues that Standard English is not tied to an accent, or a particular spelling code. ‘The standard most commonly affirmed by linguists is that which has widest currency’. Teachers need to look critically at what they perceive to be correct and acceptable and distinguish between linguistic (a concern with power) and language needs. Clearly, because standard English is so widely used, it needs to be taught at school: ‘Not to teach standard English is to deny empowerment to the majority of pupils: effective entry will be denied them into whole areas of social and professional life’ (Ridge 1995d:229).

However, pupils should also become acquainted with the variety of other Englishes. Ideally, they should be taught to discern when to use which variety, in other words, they should have a sense of appropriacy. For instance, classroom discussions need not always take place in standard English. ‘There is no reason to assume that it is a condition of good learning for discussion to take place in standard English, even though final texts produced in an academic or formal context would privilege that variety’ (Ridge 1995d:297, see also section 1.1.1).

Two respondents mentioned varying standards (23). One of these explained that this meant ‘breaking away from a reliance on prescribed texts and procedure and generating new teaching material’.

Some teachers mentioned specific problems related to insufficient funds and a lack of facilities. One complained about the non-existence of a media centre (19), others about the unavailability of suitable teaching material and the unaffordability of good textbooks.

5.3.10.3 Conclusion

From the discussion of these responses it is clear that lecturers/tutors are well aware of the problems teachers have to contend with. Certainly, many of the problems mentioned are legitimate, but they are not insurmountable. For instance,
multilingualism can be seen as a resource rather than a problem (Heugh 1993). However, teachers who have not been educated have not been taught to teach in any situation (see 3.2.1) and will find it difficult, if not impossible, to adjust. Also, the situation of teaching English in multilingual classes in South Africa is very different from that in Britain, America and Australia where most of the research into English second and foreign language teaching and learning has been done. The approaches advocated can not simply be transferred to our situation. There, English is the language of the majority; here, although still a dominant language, it is a minority one. In South Africa at present, many learners whose knowledge of English is very rudimentary have it as medium of instruction (see 4.5.2b). The recent decision by Sibusisu Bengu (Die Burger 15 November 1995 p1) that pupils will be required to pass in one language only in order to move up into the next standard will also influence the teaching of English.

The problems related to teacher attitude to English seem to be more a question of teachers’ perceptions of what a language is or what English stands for. English seen as a last bulwark of civilisation is certainly a problem. English seen as a useful tool to be exploited to the user’s benefit poses a challenge rather than a problem. This, however, presupposes that teachers of English are educated and have a sound knowledge of the language and of the most effective ways it can be taught. In addition, it presupposes that teachers anticipate learners’ needs and do their utmost to meet them.

5.3.11 Most important changes in secondary English teaching over the next ten years (question 14)

The purpose of this question was again to establish whether both sets of respondents agreed on the type of changes which they anticipated. In a sense, question 13 and 14 overlap, since many of the problems mentioned result from changes in the country and education policy.

The same procedure for interpreting the responses as in question 13 was followed. A total of 38 responses was narrowed down to four categories. The categories arrived at, with the codes of the responses in brackets, are the following:
• teaching style (responses 2-3, 7, 9, 12-13, 20, 24-27, 34-35, 38)
• teaching content (responses 4-6, 8, 10-11, 18-19, 21-23, 29, 33, 36, 37)
• effect on teachers (responses 2, 3, 7, 9, 12, 14-16, 24, 31)
• effect on pupils (responses 4, 7, 9, 12, 14-16, 24, 28, 32, 35)

The categories, with their numbered responses, are recorded in Tables 5.17.1-5.17.4 in Addendum D.

5.3.11.1 Lecturer tutor responses

All the respondents answered the question.

5.3.11.1.1 Teaching style (responses 2, 5, 7, 9, 12-13, 26-27, 34-35, 38)

The changes in teaching style mentioned by the respondents can be divided into two groups: those having to do with increased use of electronic media, especially in financially strong schools, and those pertaining to the thrust for literacy.

Respondents felt that most ‘financially grave’ schools would have computers (3), so language teaching would become progressively computerised (34). One respondent suggested that closed circuit television and radio would be increasingly used (26).

Changes pertaining to the thrust for literacy again have to do with large and/or multilingual classes which would mean ‘less effective teaching and evaluation’(7, 9). One respondent felt that there would be smaller classes (12). This will certainly be the case in traditionally black schools. Another thought there would be an ‘increase in groupwork (35). This is a positive change. When properly managed, groupwork has distinct advantages, even in large classes (see 5.3.11.1.4)

Respondents also predicted that there would be ‘practical training for non-specialists’ (2) and ‘in-service training’ (13). Again, these are positive changes, since they will benefit both teachers and pupils. By contrast, one respondent said that specialists would be used to deal with the range of different requirements (38).
5.3.11.2 Teaching content (responses 4, 5, 8, 10-11, 18, 21-23, 33, 36, 37)

Many changes predicted have to do with the quality of English. Respondents predicted that English would be politicised: ‘A lot of politically correct appointments made in English curriculum development (already a factor in Gauteng)’ (36). This would probably lead to a poorer quality of English being accepted (4) and the needs of first-language speakers being neglected (18). The emphasis would be on communication skills and functional English rather than on literature (10), although four respondents predicted that there would be a differentiation between academic English reserved for the few, and Peoples’ English (8). One respondent commented as follows: ‘There will be a choice of English courses with less emphasis on skills and knowledge thought necessary for tertiary education and more provision for courses in effective use of language e.g. writing of reports, letters, oral presentation to a variety of audiences.’

Some respondents felt that South African English would be more acknowledged and that there would be opportunities to ‘explore our unique SA-ness’, by studying South African writers and culture (11). One respondent was less concerned about the general lowering of standards (4). Instead, he predicted ‘a deconstruction of the notions of standards’ (21) which would probably lead to a more ready acceptance of the different varieties of English: ‘accommodating Englishes’ (22). Two respondents predicted that the divisions between L1 and L2 would collapse (33; see also section 4.5.2b). One respondent predicted that the syllabus would become even more integrated (23), another, that learning strategies would be incorporated (37). Life skills would become an important component of the English curriculum (37).

5.3.11.3 Effect on teachers (responses 2, 3, 7, 9, 12, 31, 38)

Responses 2, 3, 7, 9 and 12 have already been mentioned in 5.2.16.1.1. If these changes do occur, then those teachers who are underqualified and underprepared will have the opportunity to upgrade their knowledge and skills. Those who are in schools where computers are being used in the teaching of English will have to look for methods of using them to the learners’ benefit (for an innovative way of involving both student teachers and pupils, see Adams 1991: 59-63). Response 12, that there will be smaller classes, will certainly make those teachers’ lives less stressful. If specialists are called in to deal with the range of different requirements, those teachers who are
specialists may find themselves being called to other schools to share their expertise. On the other hand, this might also be an opportunity to forge closer links between the education faculty and schools: lecturers would have an opportunity to teach in the schools and so gain the practical experience some feel they need (5.3.1). One respondent anticipated 'the inclusion of Applied Linguistics in teacher training courses' (31). This is to be welcomed. Ridge (1994: 1) points out that there is too little time in teacher preparation courses to give 'students a basic grounding in Applied Linguistics'. However, she argues that such a grounding is essential if teachers are to follow Widdowson's notion of 'pragmatic mediation' (Widdowson 1990, see also 2.8.3).

Three respondents predicted a move toward continuous assessment and less emphasis on examinations. This is in line with a process rather than a product approach. Such a move will require teachers to find ways of effectively evaluating pupils' work in terms of the progress shown so that the final assessment is a realistic reflection of the pupils' progress.

5.3.11.1.4 Effect on pupils (responses 4, 7, 8, 12, 24, 32, 35)

Only responses 4 and 7 (see 5.3.11.1.1 and 5.3.11.1.2) can be seen as having a negative effect on pupils learning English. All the other changes mentioned will probably lead to a 'happier, more highly motivated group of learners' (32). Being in smaller classes (12) will certainly benefit those pupils who need it most, while continuous assessment will enable pupils to build up portfolios of their own work which will show their progress more effectively than tests and examinations. If pupils build up portfolios of their work, they can rewrite pieces at any stage and then present their best work for evaluation. They themselves will be able to see their progress and so become involved in their own learning. Although there might be less emphasis on skills needed for tertiary education, more pupils will be taught to communicate effectively (see 5.3.11.2). Groupwork (35), if efficiently managed, will certainly benefit pupils. Ridge (1995:6) argues in favour of groupwork as follows:
learners tend to be less threatened by one another and so more willing to venture ideas and solutions than they are in relation to the teacher. They are also better listeners and readers than speakers and writers, this means they are better critics than producers, and so set standards of aspiration. Finally, by using groupwork, regardless of the size of the class, the teacher is more likely to be involving each pupil actively in learning (Ridge 1995:6).

5.3.11.2 Teacher responses

Forty-six teachers answered this question. One respondent did not anticipate any changes.

5.3.11.2.1 Teaching style (responses 2-3, 7, 9, 12-13, 20, 25-27)

In general, teachers predicted the same changes as lecturers/tutors. Two other changes predicted by one respondent each were that there would be a move towards an assembly line approach (20), which contradicts the process approach mentioned in 5.3.11.1, and team teaching (25), which echoes the prediction of specialists being called in (see 5.3.11.1.3) and will call for a sharing of skills and expertise (see 2.2.3).

5.3.11.2.2 Teaching content (responses 4-6, 8, 10-11, 18-19, 21-23, 29)

Except for responses 33, 36 and 37, teachers mentioned all the changes mentioned by lecturers/tutors. Four respondents also predicted that there would be an overemphasis on oral communication with correct grammar and spelling neglected (6). Although teachers did not mention that English would be politicised (36), this perception possibly lies behind the response.

5.3.11.2.3 Effect on teachers (responses 7, 9, 12, 14-16)

Four teachers predicted that pupils would be made more responsible for their own learning (15). Possibly this change was predicted because of the size and multilingual nature of the classes rather than a different perception of learning (see 2.5). How this change will affect teachers will depend very much on their views of teaching, learning and knowledge (see Chapter 2).
It was clear from responses 14 and 16 that some teachers were very despondent about the effect that the education policy in general would have on teachers. Two respondents predicted that teachers would be overloaded and that they would have little time to prepare or give pupils individual attention (14). Two others predicted that good English teachers would become scarce: there would be a 'drain of young, dynamic teachers' and 'intelligent, motivated ones' would not enter the profession (16). Although very few respondents were this negative, the possibility of this happening cannot be ignored.

5.3.11.2.4 Effect on pupils (responses 4, 7, 12, 14-16, 24, 28)

Over and above the changes also predicted by lecturers/tutors, one respondent anticipated bridging and remedial courses for pupils (28). Some private and Model C schools already offer such courses. If these courses set out to meet pupils' needs rather than to attempt to bring them up to the school's notion of what constitutes an 'acceptable standard of English', then they will certainly benefit pupils.

5.3.11.3 Conclusion

As mentioned earlier, some of the responses for question 13 and 14 are essentially the same so the conclusions reached from the findings of question 13 are also relevant here.

The changes predicted by both sets of respondents are essentially positive. Certainly, pupils from previously black schools, as well as their teachers, should benefit from the changes mentioned. All pupils should benefit from continuous assessment and more groupwork and pupils and teachers alike should benefit from specialists being called in to teach certain aspects of the syllabus. If multilingualism is seen as a resource rather than a problem, this should lead to a richer language background and an affirmation of other languages and cultures.

5.3.12 In-service courses for own development (question 15)

The purpose of this question was to ascertain what kinds of in-service courses both sets of respondents would like. After a first reading a total of 40 responses were
coded. Thirty-nine of these were narrowed down to four categories. Response 1 was 'not applicable'. The categories, with the codes of the responses in brackets, are the following:

- upgrading skills (responses 2, 4-6, 8-16, 20, 26, 33)
- personal focus (responses 17, 19)
- other (responses 7, 25, 29, 30)

The categories, with their numbered responses, are recorded in Tables 5.18.2-5.18.4.

5.3.12.1 Lecturer tutor responses

Nineteen respondents answered this question. Of the five who did not answer the question, one said that he might need some courses 'as the dilemmas of changing classroom requirements become clearer'. Another respondent found the question vague.

5.3.12.1.1 Upgrading skills (responses 2, 5-6, 9, 11-12, 33)

Most of the requests in this category were for in service courses on 'coping with large/multicultural classrooms/different cultures' (11). This supports the findings of the previous two questions, where large, multilingual classes were seen as a major problem and also as a major change. Respondents also wanted courses on 'practical things that work' (2), 'interesting new methods of teaching the basics, co-operative learning and international trends' (5), and 'curriculating from teacher level upwards' (6). Guidelines on assessing students' work, (12) particularly 'oral assignments' (9) would also be welcomed. One respondent did not necessarily want a course for himself but one where teachers would be 'skilled in competency-based teaching in English literature' (33).
5.3.12.1.2 Content (responses 18, 31–32, 34–40)

Respondents seem eager to learn about the new trends in teaching. One respondent wanted a workshop on the ‘role of L1 and L2 in multilingual settings’ (31). Theoretical content included critical pedagogy (36), reflective teaching (39), second language development (35), transactional spoken and written communication (37), second language development (35) and courses which were research orientated (34). More practical courses required included ‘information courses on the latest resources’ (18), the teaching of developmental reading (36), and how to produce video material (40). One respondent was eager to ‘explore the crisis facing English worldwide’ (32).

5.3.12.1.3 Personal focus (response 17)

The only lecturer/tutor response in this category was ‘courses where lecturers/teachers define their own needs and agendas’.

5.3.12.1.4 Other (response 29)

Two respondents wanted the in-service courses to be in the form of workshops (29).

5.3.12.2 Teacher responses

Forty-five teachers answered this question. Three respondents did not consider in-service courses helpful. ‘No thanks. They are all boring anyway’. ‘I’ve seldom found these departmentally-run ones helpful’, and ‘Personally, I’ve never been keen on the above. I much prefer self-study as well as consulting experienced teachers if I have a problem’.

5.3.12.2.1 Upgrading skills (responses 2, 4–6, 8–16, 20, 26)

The teachers’ needs in this category were very similar to those of the lecturers/tutors. Courses most indicated were 11, 2, and 5. apart from the courses also mentioned by lecturers/tutors, one respondent wanted ‘ideas on creativity’ (4). Teachers wanted courses on structuring questions and answers (8), using the media (15), ‘developing skills to develop pupils’ own creative and imaginative skills’ (16). Two teachers were
interested in the Communicative Approach, one wanted material that could be used for teaching in this way (10). One teacher wanted ‘marking grids for written work’ (20). One respondent wanted ‘group/individual planning programmes, involving teaching objectives closely linked to ability of pupils - preceded by some aptitude/ability/needs assessment’ (14). Another considered regular in-service courses to be essential (13). His response to the question was: ‘to go on a refresher course of approximately one week every year or every second year. All language teachers should go - the courses could be held at different times of the year.’

5.3.12.2.2 Content (responses 3, 18, 21, 23-24, 27-28, 27-28)

Only one of the responses (18) was also mentioned by lecturers/tutors. In general, the course content mentioned reflects the situation individual teachers find themselves in at present.

Two respondents wanted discussion of prescribed books each year (3), while one wanted an interpretation of the syllabus (21). Two wanted courses on adult and basic literacy (23) while another needed a course on language teaching (24). One wanted courses on bridging and remedial courses (27). One respondent was not specific about the content of courses, but wanted them to be ‘practical, scientifically sound, internationally exposed…’ This could mean either that ideas from abroad should be presented or that these courses should be internationally accepted. He also wanted teachers to be examined once they had completed such a course and ‘rewarded by a worthwhile diploma’.

From the responses it is clear that the teachers in this study are more interested in practical applications than theory at this stage. This finding is supported by Masemann (1990:466), who has been presenting in-service courses for the last ten years. Given a choice, ‘(t)eachers tended to select a part of the curriculum that was most “practical” in terms of their needs and to ignore the overall complexity of the topic at hand. There was also a notable attraction to prepared handouts and practical information on classroom practice’. She regards this practice as ‘quite understandable in the light of job demands’. She does state, however, that workshops ‘expressing a particular integrated philosophy that teachers can apply in a variety of situations without having
all the solutions specifically spelled out are well received'. This reflects a shift to a more reflective approach to teaching and is something that presenters of courses should bear in mind.

5.3.12.2.3 Personal focus (responses 17, 19)
Besides courses where teachers could define their own needs, four respondents also wanted courses run by teachers for teachers.

5.3.12.2.4 Other (responses 7, 25, 29, 30)
Apart from workshops (29), which four respondents mentioned, one teacher wanted a course on how to bridge the gap between the school and the community (25), and another a course on life skills (30). From these two teachers' responses to question 8, (see 5.3.2) where they mention the same aspects, it is clear that these are aspects specific to the two teachers' situation. One respondent considered any kind of in-service course to be helpful (7).

5.3.13 Ideal teacher preparation (question 16)
At the initial reading of the questionnaires, 40 responses were coded. On a second reading, these were refined to 28. Twenty-seven of these responses were ultimately placed into five categories. Response 1 was 'not applicable'. The categories, with the codes of the responses in brackets, are the following:

- emphasis on academic qualifications (responses 2-3, 9, 12, 17, 27)
- emphasis on practical preparation (responses 3-4, 6, 8, 10, 25-26)
- emphasis on course content (responses 5-6, 10-11, 14, 16, 20-21)
- other (responses 13, 15, 18, 28)

The categories, with their numbered responses, are recorded in Tables 5.19.1-5.19.4 in Addendum D.
5.3.13.1 Lecturer/teacher responses

Only one respondent did not answer this question.

5.3.13.1.1 Emphasis on academic qualifications (responses 2, 3, 9, 12, 17, 27)

Because of its emphasis on an academic grounding, arguments for the retention of the existing course of preparation (2) were also included in this category. This involves a university degree with at least English II followed by one year of professional preparation at a university education department. Three respondents argued for an apprenticeship system but with at least two to three academic English courses at a college or university. Six respondents argued that ideally, teachers should major in English and Linguistics so that they would have a sound grounding in both literature and language (9). Seven argued for a solid theoretical background followed by a professional course offering advanced ideas on method bases on theory (12). One respondent wanted teachers to have at least an honours degree in English, (27) while another advocated that there should be a ‘rigorous selection process’: only students who had ‘at least’ English III should be allowed to do the professional course. Clearly, the respondents are convinced of the necessity of academic qualifications. This finding is supported by the finding for question 11 (see 5.2.13).

5.3.13.1.2 Emphasis on practical preparation (responses 3-4, 6, 8, 10, 26)

Respondents emphasised the need for thorough practical preparation. Three respondents wanted an apprenticeship system combined with two or three academic courses in English (3), while two wanted the diploma course extended, (26) and three wanted practice teaching extended (4). One respondent was even more specific: she suggested sustained practice teaching of at least one term to a year with the student teacher having full responsibility for one or two classes (8). Eight respondents argued that the course should be much more practical. It should be pupil-orientated with all aspects of teaching and classroom management covered (6). One respondent wanted student teachers to be prepared to teach English in Africa: ‘English teachers will need to be made aware of strategies to deal not only with multilingual classes but with differing levels of proficiency within them’ (10).
5.3.13.1.3 Emphasis on course content (responses 5, 6, 10, 11, 16, 20-21)

Six responses suggested that the degree course for teachers of English should be less literature orientated. The basic rules of language should also be covered and students' own ability to use the language monitored (5). One respondent, who emphasised that he was referring specifically to black English second language teachers argued as follows: 'We should reteach the whole std 5-10 syllabus. By that I mean we should redo everything our students were supposed to have done. In this way we can at least be assured that they have the rudiments of basic English language curricula.' This argument was supported by another respondents' comment: 'Students have to be taught basic language skills; tenses, concord, adverbs. They do not know this.' She thought it important that literature not be neglected, since her experience with student teachers had been that 'they didn't do poetry at school at all, so they know nothing about it' (respondent's emphasis).

These responses suggest that a different degree course than the one generally offered is necessary for those wanting to teach English. Teachers of English need not only a literary background, but also a sound grounding in language. This issue is discussed in more detail in Chapter 6.

As mentioned in 5.3.13.1.2, courses should cover all aspects of teaching and classroom management (6). This argument is supported by Widdowson (1990:64; see 3.2.2). Teachers should also be prepared for the problems and changes mentioned in sections 5.3.10 and 5.3.11 (10). Eight responses were for teacher education as defined in this research: a course which integrates life skills and promotes reflective teaching and the notion of lifelong learning (11). One respondent argued that 'students should have a basis of an education which encourages growth and development rather than complacency. Reflective teaching should therefore feature prominently in the course they do.'

Two responses were specifically language related. One was that student teachers should be taught 'good critical language skills (which would include the ability to diagnose language difficulties)' (21). The other was that they should develop 'a strong analytical sense of how culture works in society (some semiotics/cultural studies
background) (20). There was also a plea for students to be taught ‘how to prevent burnout and stagnation’ (16). The same respondent who argued for the whole of the std 5-10 syllabus to be retaught offered a blueprint for a ‘whole year of college-school based training (practice teaching)’. Lessons would take the form of workshops and would include the following components: learning by doing, language across the curriculum, genre discourse analysis, the four basic language skills, literature, assessment, life-long learning, audiovisual material, lesson design, critical thinking, school administration, ethnographic observation and community projects.

5.3.13.1.4 Emphasis on structure of course (responses 2, 3, 7, 19, 23-24)  
Respondents considered various course structures to be ideal. All these included an academic and a practical component. Since only a few responses specifically considered course structure, it may be assumed that most respondents considered the present structure adequate (2) and that the actual course content was more important. Over and above those responses suggesting some sort of apprenticeship system (3), one response was for teachers to have four years of college followed by one year of teaching practice and another two years of college (19). Four respondents argued for some kind of mentor system for student teachers, which would also mean closer links between schools and education faculties (7). Four responses addressed the methods course itself. Interdisciplinary integration was seen as important: ‘Method course itself should be carefully integrated so that the multifaceted nature of language teaching is fully acknowledged’. This respondent also argued for the method course to be given more time in the HED set-up so that the central focus is on training as a language teacher (other subjects serve this purpose rather than being disparate disciplines) (23; respondent’s emphasis). Two other respondents wanted more time for specialisation in subject matter (24).

5.3.13.1.5 Other (responses 15, 18, 28)  
One respondent argued that student teachers should be encouraged to have contact with NGO’s (15) since this would help with the ‘curriculatng for the Limited English Proficient, the Learning Disabled and the Gifted Child’. Two were adamant that lecturers should have classroom experience: ‘Lecturers have to be ex-teachers.” No
lecturer fresh from university can train teachers of English if he/she has not taught for at least 5 years'. They should also practice what they preach: ‘We, as tutors, need to model all the teaching skills and strategies that our own students missed out on’ (18; respondent’s emphasis). One respondent felt that a good textbook was essential in teacher preparation.

5.3.13.2 Teacher responses

Forty-seven respondents answered the question. Responses 10, 19-20, 24-27 were not given by these respondents. It could be argued that the responses given for this question are based not only on what teachers perceive as important to such a course, but also what they perceive as lacking in the student teachers who come to them during their practice teaching.

5.3.13.2.1 Emphasis on academic qualifications (responses 2, 3, 9, 12, 17)

The responses given by the teachers for this category were also given by the lecturers/tutors. There is general agreement that a sound academic background in English was essential for teacher preparation.

5.3.13.2.2 Emphasis on practical preparation (responses 3-4, 6, 8)

Again, the responses given by the teachers for this category were also given by the lecturers/tutors. Both sets of respondents considered practical preparation essential to good teaching.

5.3.13.2.3 Emphasis on course content (responses 5-6, 11, 14, 16, 21)

The only response not made by the lecturers/tutors was 14. Four respondents thought it important that student teachers should have insight into adolescents and their problems. This should be part of the psychology course student teachers do in their HED year, but one respondent felt that student teachers were not sufficiently discriminating enough: ‘they tend to lump all adolescents together emotionally and intellectually and that causes classroom management problems.’

5.3.13.2.4 Emphasis on structure of course (responses 3, 7, 23)
All the responses given by the teachers were also given by the lecturers/tutors. Six respondents argued for some kind of apprenticeship system combined with academic courses in English (3). Eleven considered a mentor or supervisor for student teachers, and the resulting closer links between the school and the education faculty as essential (7). One respondent suggested that a senior teacher be responsible for a student teacher and that apart from visiting the student's class, teacher and student team teach and team mark. Another respondent argued as follows: 'I feel educ. faculties are sometimes rather arrogant; the assumption is that they teach to their concept of the ideal. I have come across univ. educators who are so condemningly for e.g of the syllabus, that they have only a partial knowledge of its contents! ...I think schools need to be approached with a very clear set of requests from the ed. faculties so that students’ teaching prac can be more meaningful.' This last comment is supported by Adams (1991; see also 3.3.4.2).

Only one respondent argued for interdisciplinary integration (23).

5.3.13.2.5 Other (responses 13, 15, 18, 28)

One respondent considered that joining English-related organisations should be made compulsory for student teachers. This respondent does not herself belong to any organisations (question 7), but marked membership as crucial in question 11.

5.3.13.3 Conclusion

From the responses given by both sets of respondents it is clear that the preparation of secondary teachers of English is a complex one. Both a sound academic grounding in language and literature and thorough practical preparation are essential. The call seems to be for an extension of practice, either extended practice teaching or in-service training. The course content should be both theoretical and practical, covering all aspects of language teaching and classroom management, and encouraging students to become reflective teachers. Closer links between schools and the education faculty are also essential.

Recommendations on the findings are made in the following chapter.
6.

RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Introduction

Since this research was an exploration into perceptions of the preparation of secondary teachers of English rather than an empirical experiment, it is difficult to present firm conclusions or recommendations. However, both the literature review and the findings of this research project strongly suggest that the preparation of secondary teachers of English should go beyond teacher training as defined in Chapter 3. This is especially necessary because of the changing nature of the education system in South Africa, the changing views of the nature of language, learning and knowledge, and the changing view of language teaching. This thesis has argued that teachers must be educated so that they are better able to meet the needs of their pupils in any teaching situation. This means that over and above having the skills (methods, techniques, materials, tools) of teaching which come with thorough training, teachers should have a sound grasp of the theory and principles underlying their particular view of language teaching and learning. This should enable them not only to make informed choices in their teaching practice, but also to make valuable contributions to education policy as well as challenge decisions made by education administrators, if necessary. They should also have a solid grounding in language use and usage. Finally, they should be made aware of their strengths and limitations and be prepared to continue developing. This last is probably the most difficult to achieve, since it involves the teacher in actively seeking self-knowledge, something which is not easily measured. Because teacher education is seen as a lifelong process, pre-service teacher education must be both process and product orientated. It should set teachers on the path of ongoing development and learning.

Teacher education is a complex matter. It is more than the teaching of skills, approaches and methods, or the handing out of tips of what works in the classroom and what does not. It is more than ensuring that students have a thorough knowledge
of language and how it affects our intellectual, psychological and social development. It is a highly personal matter, and each educator will approach it differently. At the very least, though, it presupposes that educators themselves will practise what they preach, that they will also be critically, effective, collaborative learners, pragmatic mediators and facilitators of their students' learning, just as they expect or encourage their students to become. Teacher educators should also be committed to lifelong learning and development. Teacher education demands that lecturers/tutors provide their students with a grounding in both the theory and practice of language learning and teaching, instilling in their students a sense of its complexity.

6.2 Further research

As was mentioned in section 4.4, this research project could serve as a pilot study for a much more comprehensive, countrywide survey. It also opens up a range of research possibilities for individual departments of English in education faculties. Clearly, however, the questionnaire would need to be refined and adapted. Some of the questions need to be reworded to remove ambiguity and to see that the purpose of the question is better served. One important aspect that could be explored is to what extent what lecturers/tutors see as essential to teacher preparation does indeed form part of their courses.

Since the majority of lecturers/tutors indicated that the structure of the HED course was an obstacle to their teaching satisfactorily, identification of the precise nature of the problem would seem useful. This could well be a valuable means of improving the effectiveness of the courses offered.

Ways in which closer links between schools and the education faculty could be established should also be sought, since both teachers and lecturers/tutors consider this important.

It is evident from the findings that many teachers consider teaching in a multicultural setting to be a particular problem. In order to help teachers meet challenges posed by multicultural classrooms, research projects seem essential.
The literature review revealed that there was little South African material available. It seems imperative that research be done to explore pre-service language teacher education in a South African context.

There are many issues pertinent to pre-service language teacher education that this thesis has not touched on. One of these is language policy and how it affects teacher education. Certainly, this is an area which needs to be carefully researched.

Subsequent research could explore whether the type of course suggested in this research had the hoped for result.

6.3 Recommendations for educating secondary teachers of English

The recommendations focus on two aspects: the areas identified by both sets of respondents as important to language teacher preparation, and the manner in which teachers of secondary English should be prepared.

The areas identified as important for teacher preparation were

- a thorough knowledge of English use and usage

- a sound theoretical and practical grounding in language teaching, which includes all aspects of the English curriculum

- collaboration between the university department of education and the school

- some kind of mentor or support system for teachers

- longer, or sustained periods of practice teaching

- an ability to cope with the challenges of a new language policy and education system and

- lifelong learning.

Manner should not be seen as another method. The shortcoming of a teaching method is that it is imposed on the class rather than that it evolves from what is actually
happening in the class (Nunan 1991: 248, see also Meyer 1990 and Burkett 1995). Rather, the recommendations should be seen as one way of setting students well on the way to having

- a knowledge of the theoretical foundations of language learning and language teaching
- the analytical skills necessary for assessing different teaching contexts and classroom conditions
- an awareness of alternative teaching techniques and the ability to put these into practice
- the confidence and skill to alter (their) teaching techniques as needed
- practical experience with different teaching techniques
- informed knowledge of (themselves) and (their) students
- interpersonal communication skills, and
- attitudes of flexibility and openness to change.

(Brown 1994:426)

Two aspects relating to content need to be mentioned. One is that teachers should have a thorough grounding in English. The other is that they should be able to teach confidently within the boundaries of the English curriculum. 'Curriculum', as used here, includes 'all the factors which contribute to the teaching and learning situation' (Johnson 1989: xi, Marshall 1992; see also question 10 of the questionnaire and section 5.3.6).

Being proficient in English is important for all teachers of English, but especially so for secondary teachers (see 1.1.1). Fudge (1990: 33) argues that teachers 'must have a sophisticated knowledge of language and of the skills needed to create appropriate learning environments for all high school children' (see also 4.3.4.2). This includes a critical awareness that 'language is the carrier of a range of social perceptions, attitudes, and goals (Ndebele: 10; see also 1.1.1) and also that it is part of a learner's social identity (see 2.3.2). Ridge presents a persuasive argument for an integrated course much like those prescribed for lawyers and accountants. The academic English courses student teachers would follow would not only consist of literature study as a
means of ‘stimulating and extending students’ but also ‘a broader based course in language study’ (Ridge 1990:37: see also Hutchings 1989:28) which would improve students’ language proficiency and also introduce them to communicative language teaching, an approach which can be used for teaching English first and second language. Ideally, the language course would demonstrate to students the range and richness of ‘language in action’ (Ridge 1990:37) as well as encouraging the critical awareness mentioned earlier.

If student teachers are taught communicatively, they are already being introduced to the second language syllabus for secondary English, which touches on the second aspect mentioned. Teachers must teach within the parameters of the English curriculum, and teacher educators must show them how this is done. This includes various teaching approaches, methods, and techniques, setting tests and examinations, but also continuous assessment, choosing textbooks and set works, generating suitable material, and all aspects of classroom management. It is also crucial that student teachers should be able to prepare pupils to leave school at the end of standard seven (see 5.3.6).

Having an integrated four year course for teachers of secondary English would provide lecturers with the time needed to set student teachers on the path to becoming reflective teachers. Reflective teaching is essential to teacher development since it involves teachers in a continuous process of thinking about their teaching and actions. Like action research or pragmatic mediation, it also serves to narrow the gap between theory and practice, and involves the teacher in a process of lifelong learning. As mentioned in section 3.3, all aspects of the course, such as theory, practice teaching, micro-teaching and language courses can be used to encourage individual, pair or group reflection.

An integrated course would also offer the opportunity for more, and longer periods of sustained practice teaching. Student teachers could, for instance, have a term’s practice teaching each year. During this time, apart from observation, they could take responsibility for one or two classes. However, they should not be left to their own devices, but should be guided by a mentor, supervisor or collaborator, as suggested by
Freeman (1989, see also 3.7.1.2). This could either be a teacher or a lecturer. Sustained practice teaching would give student teachers the opportunity to become acquainted with class management, administration, continuous assessment and also the setting and marking of tests and examinations. Under expert guidance, they could be introduced to action research (see 3.4) to encourage them to base practice on theory or language teaching principles. Student teachers could also team teach with their class teachers. The advantage of this type of practice teaching is that students would have the opportunity of trying out in practice what they have learnt in class, of reflecting on their teaching, and of discussing any problems or insights with their mentor. Teacher educators would then have much more insight into individual students’ needs and could address these specifically rather than merely giving general feedback.

It has been mentioned in Chapter 3 that reflective teaching and ongoing development need a supportive environment. A mentor or collaborator is part of this supportive environment, as is the English department at which the students study. But the school itself, or at least its English department, should also be part of this environment. Both sets of respondents in this research saw the need for closer links between schools and the education faculty. The advantages of close co-operation are numerous: Lecturers/tutors would have more insight into the day-to-day affairs of the school, which could inform the courses presented to students. Both lecturers and teachers would be able to gain new insights from discussion and perhaps team teaching together. Discussion between lecturers and teachers about what is expected of student teachers during practice teaching would lead to more satisfying teaching experiences for student teacher, pupils and teachers. Ultimately, such collaboration would benefit lecturers, teachers, students and pupils. Longer, sustained periods of practice teaching and a reciprocal relationship between schools and the education faculty might also help prevent student teachers from reverting to teaching as they themselves were taught.

The move to downsize English Education to being part of a broad Didactics department will have serious implications for the degree to which a strong sense of ‘English’ or identification with English teaching can be inculcated.
If an integrated course is not possible, student teachers may have to have an additional language course, similar to the one mentioned previously, in their HED year. The diploma year would need to be restructured to provide more time for such a course. This should not pose too much of a problem, since many courses overlap in respect of course content (for instance, thinking skills are taught in three different courses at one university: in English Method, in Educational Psychology and in Philosophy of Education). Reflective teaching, including action research, could be introduced in the diploma year. Practice teaching could be extended in that students could perhaps teach an extra class one afternoon a week. An extended period of teaching practice of three to four weeks, with regular contact between lecturers and students, could come during the middle and towards the end of the diploma year. However, as Ridge (1990:38) argues, an integrated course is the more satisfactory option.

As part of their ongoing development, student teachers should also be encouraged to attend workshops and professional conferences. They should also be introduced to the many English language teaching journals and be encouraged to read as widely as possible, not only teacher resource books but anything which will broaden their general knowledge. It is evident from the list of books, journals and articles provided by the respondents that reading widely is an excellent way of ensuring continuous development. Lastly, it seems imperative that there should be in-service courses for both teachers and teacher educators. Unfortunately, such courses are not readily available in South Africa at this stage.

6.4 Conclusion

The recommendations made have focused on how the preparation of secondary teachers of English can be improved so that ultimately there will be a corps of truly professional teachers who will be able to meet the changing needs of their learners, make informed choices and suggest curriculum improvements. As they stand, these recommendations may seem pat: a neat package. Teacher educators who implement all or some of them will realize they are anything but that. Presenting a recipe for educating secondary teachers of English would defeat the purpose of this research and undermine teacher education itself. It is extremely difficult to tease out the
complexities of teacher education, and much must perforce be left to the critical reflection of individual teacher educators, whose decisions need to be informed by education and language policy, their own knowledge and insights, the needs of their students, and, more especially, the likely future pupils. Teacher education is a time-consuming, expensive process, but, as Margaret Meek (1985:27) argues:

Contrary to popular belief, teachers are made not born. They become expert as other experts do, by a progressive understanding of what they are about. What all teachers need is the chance and the possibility to develop their understandings in the company of their professional peers and others whose expertise enhances their own. They need regular challenging encounters with new ideas, new pedagogies, new research, and other teachers. It takes money and it takes time, but nothing less will suffice.
ADDENDUM A1

LECTURER / TUTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

WHERE A CHOICE IS GIVEN, PLEASE CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE ITEM(S)

1. Age in years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41-50</th>
<th>50 and older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Gender: Male Female

3. Qualifications:
   - BA (English major)
   - MA (English)
   - BA (Hons)
   - M Ed
   - B Ed (English)
   - Other (please specify): ..........................................................

4. Experience:
   Please describe your present post: .............................................

In which kinds of institutions have you taught?

I have previously taught in
   - primary school
   - secondary school
   - college of education
   - other (please specify): ..........................................................

5. Number of years spent teaching full-time in school: ......................

6. Number of schools in which you have taught: ................................

7. Membership of English subject-related organizations:
   Please name any to which you belong or have belonged:
   Current membership: .............................................................
   Previous membership: ............................................................
8a. Which of the following do you consider to be essential to the preparation of student teachers?
   a) Task-based teaching
   b) Action research (trying out ideas in practice as a means of improvement and of increasing knowledge about the curriculum, teaching and learning)
   c) Reflective teaching (assessing the origins, purposes and consequences of one’s teaching at all levels)
   d) Closer links between schools and the education faculty
   e) School-based training
   f) A supervisory teacher
   g) Practice teaching
   h) Micro-teaching
   i) Other (please specify)

8b. Choose three of the above and place them in descending order of importance:
   1.
   2.
   3.

9a. At present, which of the following are the chief obstacles to presenting your course to student teachers satisfactorily?
   a) Structure of H Ed course
   b) Structure of English method course
   c) Student numbers
   d) Limitations of own techniques
   e) Limited experience as a lecturer
   f) Limited knowledge of applied linguistics
   g) Limited school contact
   h) Other (please specify)

9b. Choose three of the above and place them in descending order of importance:
   1.
   2.
   3.
In questions 10 and 11, please rate each item by circling the appropriate number.

10. How effectively do you think student teachers are prepared by your department in each of the following respects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>NOT AT ALL</th>
<th>INADEQUATELY</th>
<th>ADEQUATELY</th>
<th>EFFECTIVELY</th>
<th>VERY EFFECTIVELY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Organizing/encouraging talking and listening</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Organizing/encouraging drama</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Encouraging and evaluating written work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Selection of prescribed texts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Selection of textbooks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Encouraging the reading and writing of poetry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Knowledge of English use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Knowledge of English language structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Ways of working with the media (newspapers, TV, videos, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Planning coherent programmes of work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Teaching across the whole ability range</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Preparing pupils for leaving school at the end of Std 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Advanced level teaching (matric and beyond)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Classroom management and control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Management of small-group work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Management of large (40+) classes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Developing language teaching materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Working with children with special needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Teaching English in a multilingual classroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How important and helpful to the development of a language teacher do you consider each of the following to be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Of no importance</th>
<th>Of little importance</th>
<th>Of some importance</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Academic subject study</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Teacher training course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Heads of departments at school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other English teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. In-service courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Membership of English-related organizations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Further academic study</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Books or articles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Workshops</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others (please specify):

If you have rated h. (Books or articles) at 4 or 5, please list any book(s) or article(s) relating to English that have been of particular importance to you in the last few years:

...
12. In what way has your view of the nature of English teaching at secondary level changed (if at all) since you began teaching? 


13. What do you see as the most urgent problems facing secondary teachers of English in SA at the moment? 


14. What do you anticipate will be the most important changes in secondary English teaching over the next ten years?
15. For your own development as a tutor/lecturer, what kinds of in-service courses would you most welcome?

16. Ideally, how do you think secondary teachers of English should be trained?
ALDENDUM A2

6 AP Venter Avenue
Uniepark
Stellenbosch
7600
7 June 1995

Dear Colleague,

I am at present engaged in research for an M Ed (English) at the University of Stellenbosch. The topic of my thesis is the education of secondary teachers of English at universities. In order to establish what teachers perceive as essential in a pre-service course, I have compiled a questionnaire for teachers.

However, I also need to know how lecturers and tutors of prospective teachers of English view their H Ed English method course and have therefore also compiled a lecture/tutor questionnaire. I should be most grateful if you would complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me as soon as possible. Please use the stamped, self-addressed envelope included for this purpose. Neither your name, nor the name of the university at which you teach will be mentioned in the research. Your opinions are crucial to my research so I would really value your cooperation.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
AUDENDUM B 1

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE
WHERE A CHOICE IS GIVEN, PLEASE CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE ITEM(S)

1. Age in years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21 -30</th>
<th>31 - 40</th>
<th>41 -50</th>
<th>50 and older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Gender: Male Female

3. Qualifications:
   - BA (English major)
   - BA (Hons)
   - H Ed
   - B Ed (English)
   - MA (English)
   - M Ed
   - Other (please specify)

4. Experience:
   Please describe your present post.

   In which kinds of institutions have you taught?
   I have previously taught in
   - primary school
   - secondary school
   - college of education
   - other (please specify)

5. Number of years spent teaching full-time in school

6. Number of schools in which you have taught

7. Membership of English subject-related organizations:
   Please name any to which you belong or have belonged:
   Current membership: Previous membership:
8a. In view of your later experience, which of the following were major omissions from your course of preparation for teaching English?
   a) Task-based teaching
   b) Action research (trying out ideas in practice as a means of improvement and of increasing knowledge about the curriculum, teaching and learning)
   c) Reflective teaching (knowing the art and craft of teaching and considering it carefully both during and after interaction with pupils)
   d) Closer links between schools and the education faculty
   e) School-based training
   f) A supervisory teacher
   g) Practice teaching
   h) Micro-teaching
   i) Other (please specify)

8b. Choose three of the above and place them in descending order of importance.
   1.
   2.
   3.

9a. At present, which of the following are the chief obstacles to your teaching satisfactorily?
   a) The English curriculum
   b) Ethos of the school
   c) Too many pupils in one class
   d) Limitations of own techniques
   e) Limited experience
   f) Limited knowledge
   g) Other (please specify)

9b. Choose three of the above and place them in descending order of importance.
   1.
   2.
   3.
In questions 10 and 11, please rate each item by circling the appropriate number.

10. When you began teaching, how effectively did you feel you had been prepared in each of the following respects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT AT ALL</th>
<th>INADEQUATELY</th>
<th>ADEQUATELY</th>
<th>EFFECTIVELY</th>
<th>VERY EFFECTIVELY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Organizing/encouraging talking and listening</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Organizing/encouraging drama</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Encouraging and evaluating written work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Selection of prescribed texts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Selection of textbooks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Encouraging the reading and writing of poetry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Knowledge of English use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Knowledge of English language structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Ways of working with the media (newspapers, TV, radio, etc)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Planning coherent programmes of work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Teaching across the whole ability range</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Preparing pupils for leaving school at the end of std seven</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Advanced level teaching (matric and beyond)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Classroom management and control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Management of small group work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Management of large (&gt;40) classes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Developing language teaching materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Working with children with special needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Teaching English in a multilingual classroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. How important and helpful to your development as a language teacher do you consider each of the following to have been?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Of no importance</th>
<th>Of little importance</th>
<th>Of some importance</th>
<th>Crucial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Academic subject study</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Teacher training course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Heads of departments at school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other English teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. In-service courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Membership of English-related organizations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Further academic study</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Books or articles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Workshops</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others (please specify): ..............................................................................................................................................

If you have rated h. (Books or articles) at 4 or 5, please list any book(s) or article(s) relating to English that have been of particular importance to you in the last few years:

........................................................................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................................................................
Please answer the remaining questions briefly in your own words in the spaces provided. Add further comments on a separate sheet if you wish.

12. In what way has your view of the nature of English teaching at secondary level changed (if at all) since you began teaching?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

13. What do you see as the most urgent problems facing secondary teachers of English in SA at the moment?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

14. What do you anticipate will be the most important changes in secondary English teaching over the next ten years?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
15. For your own development as a language teacher, what kinds of in-service courses would you most welcome?

16. Ideally, how do you think secondary teachers of English should be trained?

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Please place it in the envelope provided and post it by 28 July 1995.
ADDENDUM B2

6 AP Venter Avenue
Uniepark
Stellenbosch
7600
7 July 1995

Dear Colleague

I am at present engaged in research for an M Ed (English) at the University of Stellenbosch. The topic of my thesis is the education of secondary teachers of English at universities. In order to establish what teachers perceive as essential in a pre-service course, I have compiled a questionnaire for teachers.

Since you have a reputation as an excellent teacher of English, I should be most grateful if you would complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me by 28 July 1995. Please use the stamped, self-addressed envelope included for this purpose. Neither your name, nor the name of the school at which you teach will be mentioned in the research. However, your opinions are crucial to my research and may lead to positive changes in teacher education.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
ADDENDUM C

Western Cape Education Department
iSebe leMfundo leNtshona Koloni

Name
Mnr. D.A. Norton

Position
Onderwyshoof

Reference
L.15/73/7/2

Telephone
403-6100

Kantoor van die
Office of the
Onderwyshoof

Postbus
Postbus

Huisnr
Huisnr

Department
Directorate

Dorp/Stad
Town/City

Pos nrs
P.O. Box

Postbus
Postbus

Stellenbosch
Stellenbosch

7600
7600

Me. A. Alberts
AP Venterlaan 6
Uniepark
STELLENBOSCH

7600

Gaagte me. Alberts

NAVORSINGSAANVOE: A CURRICULUM MODEL FOR EDUCATING SECONDARY
TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

1. U brief van 7 Junie 1995 het betrekking.
2. U aansoek om navorsing in skole van die Wes-Kaap Onderwysdepartement te doen, word goedgekeur onderhewig aan die volgende voorwaardes:

2.1 Die hoofde/onderwyseres staan onder geen verpligting om u met u ondersoek behulpzaam te wees nie.

2.2 Die hoofde/onderwyseres/skole mag in geen opsig uit die ondersoekresultate gediens nie kan word nie.

2.3 Alle reëlings in verband met u ondersoek moet deur usef getref word.

2.4 Die ondersoek mag nie gedurende die vierde kwartaal afg. handel word nie.

2.5 Voordat u met u navorsing by skole begin, moet u 'n aanbevelingsbrief van u studieleier indien.

2.6 Die voorwaardes 2.1 - 2.4 moet ongewysig aan die betrokke skoolhoofde voorgele word.

2.7 'n Kort opsomming van die inhoud, bevindinge en ar-beve-
lings met betrekking tot die navorsing moet aan die Direkteur: Onderwysnavorsing en Eksamens beskikbaar gestel word.
2.8 Beneewens die kort opsomming in par. 2.7 verlang die departement dat u ook 'n eksemplaar van u volledige verslag stuur aan:

Die Direkteur: Onderwysnavoring en Eksamens Waal-Kaapse Onderwysdepartement Privaatzak 9114 KAAPSTAD 8000

3. U word sukses met u studies toegewens.

Vriendelike groete
Die uwe

n. WND. ONDERWYSHOOF
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 years and older</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUALIFICATIONS</td>
<td>ACADEMIC QUAL IN ENGLISH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA (English major)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA (Joint (English))</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MA (English)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PhD (English and Linguistics)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSc ESP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B Prof Ed + English II</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL QUAL IN ENGLISH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEd(English)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HEd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEd</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DSE (Eng)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STD Eng L II</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAN NOT DETERMINE IF ENGLISH QUAL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POS II</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dep PHD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTHER ACADEMIC QUAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B BEd</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MA General Linguistics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M Phil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEd A/B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PhD Translation Studies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B Ed (Arts)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTHER PROFESSIONAL QUAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEd without English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perf dip in Drama</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEd without English</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D Ed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dip in school library science</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENT POST</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior lecturer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant teacher</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary part time teacher</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Vice Principal / Deputy Head</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English advisor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult Education teacher - music English</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Pos. HOD / Subject head</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head of teacher centre</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.1.2. General information (question 1-6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Tutor</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREVIOUS TEACHING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPERIENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of education</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technician / Technical college / College</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult night school / NGO community projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University / Further training</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star Cadet School</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior subject advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Defence Force</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cram College</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF YEARS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF SCHOOLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirteen</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>Aspects</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Respondents who ranked aspect as most important</td>
<td>Practice teaching</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task-based teaching</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action research</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflective teaching</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School-based training</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sound method innovation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closer links between schools and the education faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A supervisory teacher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Micro-teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Respondents who ranked aspect as second most important</td>
<td>Reflective teaching</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action research</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School-based training</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A supervisory teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practice teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Micro-teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closer links between schools and the education faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task-based teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Respondents who ranked aspect as third most important</td>
<td>Practice teaching</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflective teaching</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closer links between schools and the education faculty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A supervisory teacher</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task-based teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School-based training</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Micro-teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sound method innovation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.4.1: Cross check between questions 8 and 16 (lecturer-tutor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% out of total number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Those that chose a in question 8 and indicated 11 or 12 in question 16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those that chose b in question 8 and indicated 11 or 12 in question 16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those that chose c in question 8 and indicated 11 or 12 in question 16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those that chose d in question 8 and indicated 7 or 3 in question 16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those that chose e in question 8 and indicated 7 or 3 in question 16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those that chose f in question 8 and indicated 7 or 3 in question 16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those that chose g in question 8 and indicated 4 or 8 in question 16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5.6: Importance of major omissions from course of preparation (question 8: teacher)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Omissions</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Respondents who ranked aspect as most important</td>
<td>Action research</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task-based teaching</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School-based training</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflective teaching</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Precise teaching</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Micro-teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closer links between schools and the education faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English as medium for holistic education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiation, problem-solving, public relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constructive ways of disciplining pupils</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sound method - innovation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A supervisory teacher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Respondents who ranked aspect as second most important</td>
<td>Action research</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflective teaching</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task-based teaching</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School-based training</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A supervisory teacher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closer links between schools and the education faculty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Micro-teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constructive ways of disciplining pupils</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applied linguistics / Good theoretical background</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practice teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Respondents who ranked aspect as third most important</td>
<td>Task-based teaching</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action research</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflective teaching</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closer links between schools and the education faculty</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A supervisory teacher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School-based training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practice teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Micro-teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5.6.1: Cross check between questions 8 and 16 (teachers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice in Question 8</th>
<th>Choice in Question 16</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of Total Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>11 or 12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>11 or 12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>11 or 12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>7 or 3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>7 or 3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>7 or 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.8: Importance of obstacles to teaching effectively (question 9: lecturer/tutor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Obstacle</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Respondents who ranked as</td>
<td>Structure of H Ed Course</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most important</td>
<td>Limited school contact</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure of English method course</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students' non-participation in class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited time because of practice teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>each semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited experience as lecturer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student numbers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students' linguistic incompetence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited knowledge of applied linguistics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limitations of own techniques</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Respondents who ranked as</td>
<td>Limited school contact</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second most important</td>
<td>Student numbers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure of English method course</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure of H Ed Course</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students' poor experiential knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students' linguistic incompetence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No official language policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited knowledge of applied linguistics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limitations of own techniques</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited experience as lecturer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Respondents who ranked as</td>
<td>Limited school contact</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>third most important</td>
<td>Distance education / Inadequate contact</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure of English method course</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure of H Ed Course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited time because of practice teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>each semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature of school curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student numbers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited knowledge of applied linguistics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limitations of own techniques</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited experience as lecturer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>Obstacle</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Respondents who ranked aspect as most important</td>
<td>Too many pupils in one class</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The English curriculum</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethos of the school</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demands on time: marking load, classes, admin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limitations of own techniques</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited experience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited, no resources/ outdated language textbooks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low salary, demotivation of teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Respondents who ranked aspect as second most important</td>
<td>Too many pupils in one class</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The English curriculum</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethos of the school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limitations of own techniques</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demands on time: marking, classes, admin, planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People responsible for education legislation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rigidity of staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Respondents who ranked aspect as third most important</td>
<td>Too many pupils in one class</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethos of the school</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The English curriculum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limitations of own techniques</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited experience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demands on time: marking, classes, admin, planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People responsible for education legislation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inflexible timetable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.15  How view of the nature of English teaching at secondary level has changed (question 12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency: lecturer/tutor</th>
<th>Frequency: teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Not applicable/did not answer question</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Not all teaching can be communicative - basics still required</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Term and year plan needed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Not radically/not at all</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Healthy dislike for exams</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) From skills-based to holistic - concerned with need to comprehend, interpret, make sense</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Shift from lang/lit based to communicative approach</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) More pupil-centred</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Even more convinced that there should be differentiation between Eng. higher grade for school leavers and those who need it for tertiary study</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Common sense - teachers do minimum - pupils work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) From textbook bound to linking with pupils’ experience</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) From syllabus-orientated to self-motivated learning/teaching across the curriculum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) From lecture method to being a facilitator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) From idealistic to realistic about pupils’ abilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) From pupil centred to teacher centred due to ethos of school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.15 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency: lecturer/tutor</th>
<th>Frequency: teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16) Realisation that it takes a dedicated teacher with a sympathetic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitude to teach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Away from the idea of africamising Eng teaching to idea that</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng has role of making pupil literate in a number of cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) Focus on pleasure/enjoyment of lit rather than analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) From grammar as organising principle to interaction/accuracy to</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fluency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) Realisation that there is no one effective way of teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) Significantly in every respect</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) From language as subject to language as part of human essence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23) Previously saw teaching largely as a matter of inspiration - now</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>although important, see the need for development of metacognitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.16.1  The most urgent problems facing secondary teachers of English: Pupil-centred (question 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category: Pupil-centred</th>
<th>Frequency: lectures/ tutor</th>
<th>Frequency: teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 High pupil-teacher ratio</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Pronunciation and articulation of Afrikaans speakers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Problem of standards</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Pupils reluctant to read and think critically/pupil incapacity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Vast numbers of non-mother-tongue speakers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Multicultural/multilingual classes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Lack of pupil confidence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Not using SDE as model</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Teaching English to empower pupils/developing independent learning styles</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Encouraging reading</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Relevance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Shift from exams to continuous assessment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.16.2 The most urgent problems facing secondary teachers of English: Teacher centred (question 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category: Teacher centred</th>
<th>Frequency: lecturer/tutor</th>
<th>Frequency: teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 High pupil-teacher ratio</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Teacher exhaustion/desmotivation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Vast numbers of non-mother-tongue speakers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Underqualified/underprepared teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Multicultural/multilingual classes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Low salaries/low morale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Uncertainty about their own teaching, posts and standards</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Teachers not viewed as professionals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Bringing imagination and joy to teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Own mindsets: unable to see legitimate Eng. in modern culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Changing notion of aesthetic canon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Finding effective ways of meeting pupils’ needs: from std 7 school leavers to critical appreciation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.16.3 The most urgent problems facing secondary teachers of English: Education policy related (question 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category: Education policy related</th>
<th>Frequency: lecturer/tutor</th>
<th>Frequency: teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Grammar and writing compromised: Oral more important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Poor administration by education departments/political interference</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Insufficient funds/ facilities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Current pass requirements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Not using SBE as model</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Sacrifice of classical for African literature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Teaching pupils basics of language rather than an appreciation of language</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Varying standards</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Relevancy of English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Shift from exams to continuous assessment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Learning and teaching for certification/product rather than process</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.17.1  Most important changes in secondary English teaching over the next ten years: Teaching style (question 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category: Teaching style</th>
<th>Frequency: lecturer/tutor</th>
<th>Frequency: teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Practical training for non-specialists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Computers in financially strong schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Larger classes - less effective teaching/ evaluation/ discipline</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Accommodation of vast numbers of non-English speakers/third world learners</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Teaching smaller classes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 In-service training</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Assembly line approach</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Alternative evaluation of pupils’ work/continuous assessment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Team teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Closed circuit television and radio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Multilingual classrooms</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Language teaching progressively computerised</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Increase in group work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Use of specialists to deal with range of different requirements in multilingual classes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.17.2 Most important changes in secondary English teaching over the next ten years: Teaching content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category: Teaching content</th>
<th>Frequency: Lecturer/teacher</th>
<th>Frequency: Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Poorer quality English accepted/general lowering of standards</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Movement away from Eurocentric literature</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Over-emphasis on oral communication with correct spelling and grammar rare</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Differentiation between academic English (reserved for few) and people’s English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Communication skills/functional English rather than literature study</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 SA English and our unique South Africanness/ African culture and writers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Curriculum: neglect of first-language speakers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Dichotomy between English as means of communication and as an Arts subject</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Deconstruction of the notions of standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Development of more cosmopolitan language variants/accommodation of Englishes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Integration of syllabus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Life-skills above all</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Collapse of divisions between L1 and L2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Politicisation of English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Incorporation of language learning strategies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.17.3 Most important changes in secondary English teaching over the next ten years: Effect on teachers (question 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category: Effect on teachers</th>
<th>Frequency:</th>
<th>Frequency:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lecturer/tutor</td>
<td>teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Practical training for nca-specialists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Computers in financially strong schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Larger classes - less effective teaching/evaluation/discipline</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Accommodation of vast numbers of non-English speakers/third world learners</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Teaching smaller classes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Scarcity of good teachers: dynamic, intelligent, motivated ones not entering profession</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Pupils made responsible for their own learning/collaborative learning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Overloading of teachers/ lack of time for prep. and individual attention</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Alternative evaluation of pupil’s work/continuous assessment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Inclusion of applied Linguistics in teacher training courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Use of specialists to deal with range of different requirements in multilingual classes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.17.4  Most important changes in secondary English teaching over the next ten years: Effect on pupils (question 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category: Effect on pupils</th>
<th>Frequency: lecturer/tautor</th>
<th>Frequency: teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Poorer quality of English accepted</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Larger classes - less effective teaching/ evaluation/ discipline</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Accommodation of vast numbers of non-English speakers/third world learners</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Teaching smaller classes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Scarcity of good teachers: dynamic, intelligent, motivated ones not entering profession</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Pupils made responsible for their own learning/collaborative learning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Overloading of teachers/ lack of time for prep. and individual attention</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Alternative evaluation of pupil’s work/continuous assessment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Bridging and remedial courses for pupils</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 A happier, more highly motivated group of learners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Increase in group work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.18.1 In-service courses for own development: Upgrading skills (question 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category: Upgrading skills</th>
<th>Frequency: lecturer/labor</th>
<th>Frequency: teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Practical things that work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Ideas on creativity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Interesting new methods of teaching basics/co-operative learning/international trends</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Curriculum from teacher level upwards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Structuring questions and answers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Evaluation of oral assignments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Material for communicative teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Coping with large, multilingual classes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Assessment of learners’ progress</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Compulsory general refresher course lasting about one week every year or two</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Group/individual planning programmes: needs and pupil centered</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Courses on teaching using the media: TV, video, recordings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Developing skills to develop pupils’ own creativity and imagination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Marking grids for written work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Team teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Competency based teaching of English literature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.18.2  In-service courses for own development: Content (question 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category: Content</th>
<th>Frequency: lecturer</th>
<th>Frequency: teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Discussion of prescribed books each year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Information courses on latest resources - thinking behind the new syllabus etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Marking grids for written work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Interpretation of syllabus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Materials development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Adult literacy and basic literacy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Language teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Bridging and remedial courses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Scientifically sound, given by experts, examined and rewarded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Role of L1 and L2 in multilingual settings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Exploration of 'crisis' facing English worldwide</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Research orientated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Second language development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Teaching of developmental reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Transactional spoken and written communication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Critical pedagogy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Reflective teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Production of video material</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.18.3  In-service courses for own development: Personal focus (question 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category: personal focus</th>
<th>Frequency: lecturer/tutor</th>
<th>Frequency: teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 Courses where teachers/lecturers define their own agendas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Courses run by teachers for teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.18.4  In-service courses for own development: Other (question 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category: Other</th>
<th>Frequency: lecturer/tutor</th>
<th>Frequency: teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Any kind</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 How to bridge gap between school and community</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Workshops</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Life skills</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category: Emphasis on academic qualifications</td>
<td>Frequency: lecturer/tutor</td>
<td>Frequency: teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 University degree and one year teachers' college or university education department</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Apprenticeship system combined with two or three academic English courses at college or university</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Trained to have sound knowledge of both literature and language/English III and Linguistics III</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Solid theoretical background, methods based on theory</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Rigorous selection of well-qualified trainees (English III minimum)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Upgrading of required basic qualifications: at least English honours</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category: Emphasis on practical preparation</td>
<td>Frequency: lecturer/tutor</td>
<td>Frequency: teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Apprenticeship system combined with two or three academic English courses at college or university</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Practice teaching extended</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Much more practical: All aspects of teaching and classroom management covered/pupil orientated</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Sustained practice teaching: one term to at least a year with full responsibility for one or two classes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Prepared to teach English in Africa: multilingualism; English across the curriculum; lack of resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Teacher training course only at tertiary institutions; more time for training</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Extended diploma course</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category: Emphasis on course content</td>
<td>Frequency: lecturer/tutor</td>
<td>Frequency: teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 University courses less literature orientated; basic rules of language covered; own ability to use language monitored</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Much more practical: All aspects of teaching and classroom management covered; pupil orientated</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Prepared to teach English in Africa: multilingualism; English across the curriculum; lack of resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Life skills integrated/ life-long learning/ reflective teaching/teacher education (as defined in research)/in-service training</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Insight/knowledge of adolescents and their problems</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Taught how to prevent burnout/stagnation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Focus on language as popular form of expression; how culture is produced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Good critical language skills and ability to diagnose language difficulties</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.19.4  Ideal language teacher preparation: Other (question 16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category: Other</th>
<th>Frequency: lecturer/tutor</th>
<th>Frequency: teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 Compulsory membership of English-related organisations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Contact with NGO's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Lecturers must have classroom experience/practise what they preach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Good textbook essential</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADDENDUM E

List of books, journals, magazines, reports and articles

Books

Language texts

1. Australian textbooks

2. COOPER, Brenda. Comprehension passages.

3. ECKERSLEY. Comprehensive English grammar

4. First language textbooks


6. HEATON, JB. English grammar.


17 New comprehensive English practice 6-10


22 STEYL, E. Tackle tenses


Theory and resource books for teachers

1. ALDERSEN, STANSFIELD and KRAHNKEN. Review of English language tests.


6 CARSON, T. 1991. *What kind of knowing is critical action research?*


30. KNIGHTS ET AL. *Major Shakespearean critics*.


Stellenbosch University https://scholar.sun.ac.za


44. O' LAUGHIN. Rethinking science education.


49 SHARWOOD SMITH 1994. *Second language learning: theoretical foundations*


**Others**


5. HARVEY and BLANCHARD. *Situational leadership*.

6. HUNTER. *The blackboard jungle*.


8. OHLSON, S. 1990. *Why the revolution is not here yet*.


Journals

1. Applied Linguistics Journal
2. Crux
3. Eltic Reporter
4. English Language Teaching Journal
5. English Teaching Forum
6. Insights
7. Journal for language teaching
8. Leadership
9. SAALT Journal
10. Stimulus
11. TESOL Quarterly
12. Thrust

Magazines

1. Back page of Your Family magazine
2. Bua!
3. Upbeat

Reports, colloquiums, bulletins and projects


5. MACDONALD, CA. 1993 Towards a new primary curriculum for South Africa: the main report of the Threshold 2 Project. Pretoria: HSRC.

6. Multi-literacies project,


Monographs, study aids


2. New literacy studies.


Articles

1. Articles by the Cognitive Development Centre.

2. Articles in the Education Gazette. Education Department selected article guide.

3. Articles on the British school system.
4 LONG and PORTER 1985. Groups in the classroom.


8 NASSP Bulletin articles.


10 Research articles from Educational Library Services


ADDENDUM F

LIST OF ENGLISH-RELATED ORGANISATIONS

ALA Association for Language Awareness
ASEFSA
AVETSA
Educational Library Services
ELTIC
ENGLISH ACADEMY
English Study Committee
English Study Group/Teacher Centres
English Textbook Review Committee
ESA
Gifted Child Education Committee (Teacher’s Centre)
IATEFL International Association for Teaching English as a Foreign Language
International Communication Organisation
International Reading Association
John Bell Trust Language Project
NESSLATT
NTS
Owl Club
SAAAL
SAAD
SAALA  South African Applied Linguistics Association
SAALT  South African Association for Language Teachers
SAARDE
SACCE  South African Council for English Education
SATESOL South African Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages
SATI  South African Translators' Institute
SAVAL
Shakespeare Society of South Africa
Speech Communication Organisation
Teacher Associations
TESOL  Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages
Wescaro Western Cape Reading Association
Western Cape Curriculum Committee
Western Cape Prescribed Works Committee
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