

https://dspace.org/

The role of distance education materials in addressing the professional development needs of high school English teachers in Rwanda.

Sibomana, Emmanuel

2015-05-19
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/17807

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

The role of distance education materials in addressing the professional development needs of high school English teachers in Rwanda

Emmanuel Sibomana

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Humanities, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, in fulfilment of the requirements of the Award of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Applied Language and Literacy Education

Johannesburg, 2014

Copyright Notice

The copyright of this thesis vests in the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa, in accordance with the University's Intellectual Property Policy.

No portion of the text may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including analogue and digital media, without prior written permission from the University. Extracts of or quotations from this thesis may, however, be made in terms of Sections 12 and 13 of the South African Copyright Act No. 98 of 1978 (as amended), for non-commercial or educational purposes. Full acknowledgement must be made to the author and the University.

An electronic version of this thesis is available on the Library webpage (www.wits.ac.za/library) under "Research Resources".

For permission requests, please contact the University Legal Office or the University Research Office (www.wits.ac.za).

Abstract

Distance education is being used increasingly for both pre and in-service teacher education in both developed and developing countries (Robinson & Latchem, 2003; Kwapong, 2007; Perraton, 2010). In Rwanda, the Kigali Institute of Education (KIE) introduced its first distance education programme in 2001 with the aim of upgrading the qualifications of under-qualified high school teachers, including those who teach English, using printed materials as the main teaching/learning resource. This study has aimed to investigate the role of the 2010 version of these materials in addressing the professional needs of high school English teachers. It was centrally informed by theories of the sociologist of education, Basil Bernstein (1996, 1999), about curriculum and of the sociocultural psychologist, Lev Vygotsky (1978), on mediation, by Shulman's (1986, 1987) work on pedagogic content knowledge and by literature on English language teaching, on language teacher education and on distance education materials design.

The investigation involved textual analysis of a selection of KIE's distance education materials for English teaching and focused on the content selected for these materials and on the mediation of this content on the page. After this analysis, one section of these was re-designed by the researcher. Nine teacher-learners enrolled in the programme for English teaching were interviewed to determine their responses to both the KIE materials and to the redesigned section. The findings suggest that Kigali Institute of Education's distance education materials for English do not adequately address the academic and professional needs of high school English teachers for four main reasons. Firstly, the content selected for the materials does not respond sufficiently to the interests and needs of foreign language teachers of English. Secondly, it is not externally aligned to the curriculum at the level that these teachers are supposed to teach. Thirdly, the mediation of this content does not adequately support the development of subject and pedagogic content knowledge and skills of teacher-learners and encourages surface rather than deep learning (Biggs, 1987). Lastly, with the exception of sections on some literary genres, the materials list useful ideas and language teaching approaches and methods but consistently fail to explain to the teacher-learners how to teach different aspects of language. These findings suggest that these materials do not adequately assist teacher-learners to develop pedagogic content knowledge (Shulman, 1987) for the teaching of English. The limitations identified may result from a lack of knowledge, skills and experience in distance education materials and graphic design among the KIE materials designing team and from inadequate resource provision (including time) by the institution and suggest that there is a need for changes to the KIE distance education materials designing process.

Key words

Distance education, distance education materials, language teacher education, curriculum, pedagogy, mediation, materials design and redesign

Declaration

I declare that this thesis is my own unaided work. It is being submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of the Witwatersrand. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination at this university or at any other university.



Emmanuel Sibomana

13th day of October, in the year 2014

Dedication

To Marie Jeanne Nyirandamira, my beloved wife

To Rebecca Ashimwe Umuhoza, my daughter

To Athalie, my mother and Jonas, my late father

To my brothers, sisters and friends

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to the following:

The Almighty God for His infinite love and blessings to me.

The Government of Rwanda which, through the Rwanda Education Board, funded my PhD studies.

Professor Yvonne Reed, my supervisor, for her dedication to this research project. Her understanding of distance education materials and the design of these gave me deep understanding of the area and enabled me to complete this thesis.

Lecturers in the Languages, Literacies and Literatures Division of the WSoE for their insightful comments, questions and suggestions during both formal presentations and informal discussions of different phases and parts of my research and thesis.

PhD and MA students based in the Wits Humanities Graduate Centre, particularly Epimaque, Hilaire, Eunice, Bob, Sylvestre, Sigfrid, Janet, Pamela and Amini for their encouragement which kept me going even when things appeared to be tough.

The Humanities Graduate Centre staff for their fellowship and mutual support as a team. Professor Eric Worby, Mapule, Iggy, Joy, Beverly, Linet, Shepherd, Jeremy and Sifiso were more than friends to me.

All the Amazing Grace Seventh Day Adventist Church members, particularly Claude, Pascal, Nene, Zukile and the families of James, Jean de Dieu, Michael and Pastor Misiani for their moral and spiritual support.

My wife, Marie Jeanne and my daughter, Rebecca for their moral support during the course of my studies at Wits. They went through rough times when I was away from home, but they endured them. I now look forward to staying closer to them.

Abbreviations and acronyms

A'Level:	Advanced Level
CD ROMS:	Compact Disc Read-Only Memory
CLT:	Communicative Language Teaching
CODEL:	Centre for Open, Distance and E-Learning
COL:	Commonwealth Of Learning
DE:	Distance Education
DETA:	Distance Education and Teacher Education in Africa
DETYA:	Department of Education Training and Youth Affairs (New South Wales)
DFiD:	Department For International Development
DTP:	Distance Training Programme
EDC:	Education Curriculum (one of academic departments at KIE)
EFL:	English as a Foreign Language
ELF:	English Lingua Franca
ENG:	English
ESL:	English as a Second Language
GT:	Grammar Translation
ICT:	Information and Communications Technology
ICDE:	International Council of Distance Education
ITQ:	In-Text Questions
KIE:	Kigali Institute of Education
L2:	Second language
MA:	Master of Arts
NCATE:	National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education [in the US]
NCDC:	National Curriculum Development Centre
OER:	Open Educational Resources
O'Level:	Ordinary Level
ORF:	Official Recontextualising Field
PGCE:	Postgraduate Certificate in Education
PhD:	Doctor of Philosophy
PCK:	Pedagogical Content Knowledge

PRF: Pedagogic Recontextualising Field

REB: Rwanda Education Board

RNEC: Rwanda National Examinations Council

SAQ: Self-Assessment Question

SAIDE: South African Institute of Distance Education

SLA: Second Language Acquisition

SLTE: Second Language Teacher Education

SQ3R: Survey, Question, Read, Recite/recall and Revise/Review

TESSA: Teacher Education in Sub- Saharan Africa

TL: Target Language

TMA: Tutor-Marked Assignment

TTC: Teacher Training College

UNISA: University of South Africa

UPE: Universal Primary Education

Wits: University of the Witwatersrand

WSoE: Wits School of Education

ZPD: Zone of Proximal Development

List of figures

Figure 1: The concept of Zone of Proximal Development 43

Figure 2: Theory and key concepts informing the analysis of KIE DE materials for language teachers 60

Figure 3: Differences between speech and writing according to Module 1 Designers 119

Figure 4: The presentation of teaching approaches in Module 7 139

Figure 5: A section on 'Techniques for teaching the writing skills' in Module 7 157

Figure 6: An example of a lesson plan in Module 7 170

Figure 7: A 'reading log' copied from Module 7 178

Figure 8: Connecting teacher education programmes and teachers' teaching context: Theory and Practice of English Language Teaching 182

Figure 9: Connecting teacher education programmes and teachers' teaching context: Umthamo 4 184

Figure 10: Connecting teacher education programmes and teachers' teaching context: Language in Learning and Teaching 185

Figure 11: An example of feedback from 'Learners and Learning' 236

Figure 12: Front cover of Module 1 239

Figure 13: Front cover of Module 7 240

Figure 14: Front cover: Umthamo 4 241

Figure 15: Icons used in KIE DE modules 242

Figure 16: Space left for activity answers in Modules 1 and 7 246

Figure 17: Page density in Module 1 248

Figure 18: Page density in Module 7 249

Figure 19: An example of good feedback in Module 7 258

Figure 20: An illustration of lack of contextual knowledge development in KIE DE materials for English 263

List of tables

Table 1: Differences between textbooks and self-study materials 77

Table 2: Defining features of deep and surface approaches to learning 89

Table 3: The numbers of all teacher-learners and of those who participated in the study, per regional centre 106

Table 4: The weighting of content areas in KIE 'English as subject' modules 115

Table 5: Module 7 blocks and sections 132

Table 6: Module 1 blocks and sections 209

Table 7: Informants' pseudonyms and their respective centres 268

Table 8: Teacher-learners' views on content selected for KIE DE modules for English 270

Table 9: Teacher-learners' views on activities in KIE DE modules for English and in the redesigned section 282

Table 10: Comments on feedback in KIE DE modules for English and in the redesigned section 288

Table 11: Comments on layout in KIE DE modules for English and in the redesigned section 291

Table 12: Comments on the language use in KIE DE modules for English and in the redesigned section 295

Table 13: Differences between the writing pedagogy section in Module 7 and the redesigned section in terms of content 299

Table 14: Differences between the writing pedagogy section in Module 7 and the redesigned section in showing how to teach writing 300

Table of Contents

Copyright Notice ..... **ii**
Abstract ..... **iii**
Key words ..... **iii**
Declaration ..... **iv**
Dedication ..... **v**
Acknowledgement ..... **vi**
Abbreviations and acronyms ..... **vii**
List of figures ..... **ix**
List of tables ..... **x**
Table of Contents ..... **xi**
Chapter One: Introduction **1**
1.1 Introduction 1
1.2 Background to the research 3
1.3 Research aims and questions 6
1.4 Rationale 7
1.5 The context of the study 11
1.6 The concept of distance education 15
1.6.1 Definition 15
1.6.2 Historical background 16
1.6.3 Distance education in developing countries 18
1.6.4 Distance education for teacher education 19
1.6.5 Distance education for language teachers 20
1.7 Overview of the thesis 21
Chapter Two: Theoretical framework **22**
2.1 Introduction 22
2.2 Bernstein's theories of curriculum and pedagogy 23
2.2.1 Conceptualizing curriculum 25
2.2.1.1 Classification 26
2.2.2 Conceptualizing pedagogy 27
2.2.2.1 Framing 29
2.2.2.2 Recontextualization 32
2.2.2.3 Pedagogic models: competence and performance 34
2.3 Vygotsky's sociocultural theory 41
2.3.1 The zone of proximal development 42
2.3.2 Mediation 44
2.3.3 Application of sociocultural theory to language teaching 49
2.4 A constructivist approach to learning 53
2. 5 Conclusion 59
Chapter Three: Literature review **61**
3.1 Introduction 61
3.2 Knowledge for language teacher education curricula 61
3.2.1 Propositional and procedural knowledge 62
3.2.2 Knowledge for teachers 64
3.2.3 Knowledge for language teachers 65
3.2.3.1 Subject content knowledge 66

3.2.3.2 Content to extend teachers' language proficiency 68
3.2.3.3 Content to extend teacher-learners' pedagogic content knowledge 70
3.3 Design and mediation in DE materials 76
3.3.1 Teaching/learning objectives 79
3.3.2 Teaching/learning activities 80
3.3.2.1 Aims, clarity and diversity 84
3.3.2.2 The intellectual demand 85
3.3.2.3 The models of presenting content and activities 90
3.3.3 Visual elements 92
3.3.4 Layout 94
3.3.5 Use of a conversational/interactional style 95
3.3.6 Feedback to learners 95
3.4 Conclusion 97
Chapter Four: Methodology 99
4.1 Introduction 99
4.2 Research design 99
4.2.1 Textual analysis 100
4.2.1.1 Content analysis 102
4.2.1.2 Analysis of mediation strategies 103
4.2.2 The redesign of a section of KIE DE materials 104
4.3 Collection and analysis of participants' responses to the materials 105
4.3.1 The selection of participants 106
4.3.2 Interviews 108
4.4 Data analysis and interpretation 110
4.5 Ethical considerations 112
Chapter Five: Analysis of the content of KIE distance education materials for English and of their alignment with the Rwandan O'Level curriculum and examinations 114
5.1 Introduction 114
5.2 Overview of the content of KIE DE materials 115
5.2.1 Subject English Content 115
5.2.1.1 Linguistics 116
5.2.1.2 Grammar 121
5.2.1.3 Literature 122
5.2.1.4 Content to extend-teachers' language proficiency 125
5.2.2 Content to extend teacher-learners' pedagogic content knowledge 130
5.2.2.1 Methods of teaching speaking, listening, writing, grammar and vocabulary 133
5.2.2.2 Methods of teaching literature 165
5.3 The national O'Level curriculum and examinations for English 186
5.3.1 The national O'Level curriculum for English 187
5.3.2 The national O'Level English Examinations 189
5.3.3 The alignment of KIE DE materials for English to the O'Level national curriculum and examinations 193
5.4 Conclusion 200
Chapter Six: Analysis of mediation strategies adopted in the KIE distance education materials for English 208

6.1 Introduction 208
6.2 Mediation in KIE DE materials for English 209
6.2.1 Module access devices/elements 210
6.2.2 Teaching/learning objectives 215
6.2.3 Teaching/learning activities 220
6.2.4 Feedback to teacher-learners 231
6.2.5 Visual elements 238
6.2.6 Layout 244
6.2.7 A conversational/interactional style 250
6.2.8 The approach/es to mediation of knowledge foregrounded or backgrounded in KIE DE materials 255
6.2.8.1 Active learning 256
6.2.8.2 Drawing on teacher-learners' contexts 259
6.3 Conclusion 264
Chapter Seven: Teacher-learners' responses to KIE distance education materials for English and to the redesigned section of these 268
7.1 Introduction 268
7.2 Teacher-learners' views on the content chosen for inclusion in KIE DE modules for English 269
7.3 Teacher-learners' views on the content selected and on mediation in KIE DE modules for English and in the redesigned section 280
7.3.1 Teacher-learners' views on activities 281
7.3.2 Teacher-learners' views on feedback 287
7.3.3 Teacher-learners' views on layout 290
7.3.4 Teacher-learners' views on language use 294
7.3.5 Teacher-learners' views on content that addresses writing pedagogy and on the mediation of this content in the KIE DE materials and in the redesigned section 298
7.4 Teacher-learners' general comments on the KIE DE programme 307
Chapter Eight: Conclusions and Recommendations 314
8.1 Introduction 314
8.2 Key findings and conclusions 314
8.2.1 Findings from the analysis of content 315
8.2.1.1 Subject content 315
8.2.1.2 Pedagogic content 317
8.2.2 Findings from the analysis of mediation strategies 319
8.2.3 Findings from interviews with teacher-learners 322
8.3 Recommendations 322
8.3.1 Content selection 323
8.3.2 Content mediation 323
8.3.3 Support for materials designers 325
8.4 Limitations of the study 327
8.5 Avenues for further research 328
8.6 Conclusion 330
Reference list 331
Appendices 373
Appendix 1: Information letter to the teacher-learner 374

Appendix 2: Interview consent form (for teacher-learners) 375
Appendix 3: Guide questions for interviews with teacher-learners.....376
Appendix 4: The redesigned section.....378
Appendix 5: The ethics letter.....397

Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Introduction
1.2 Background to the research
1.3 Research aims and questions
1.4 Rationale
1.5 The context of the study
1.6 The concept of distance education
1.6.1 Definition
1.6.2 Historical background
1.6.3 Distance education in developing countries
1.6.4 Distance education for teacher education
1.6.5 Distance education for language teachers
1.7 Overview of the thesis

1.1 Introduction

In discussing the need for the provision of high quality distance education (DE) for teacher professional development, Perraton (1993), in Perraton (1995), notes that society has steadily expected more of teachers in the variety of tasks they have to perform, in the skills they have to master and in the imagination required of their work. In similar vein, stressing the centrality of teachers' roles in education and development, Kwapong (2007, p. 219) maintains that the "quality of human capital in any nation depends upon the quality of education it offers, which is determined by the quality of the teachers who provide the service." This scholar argues for a qualitative increase in the provision of teacher education.

Mays (2014) reports that many countries are unlikely to have met the goals set for Education for All by 2015 and they are unlikely to do so even beyond this date using traditional methods. This is why one of the strategies that is being increasingly used to provide teachers with both pre and in-service teacher education is distance education. Holmberg (1995, p. 1) points out that DE "is practiced in all parts of the world to provide study opportunities for those who cannot - or do not want to - take part in classroom teaching." The unprecedented expansion of DE is likely to continue in the future especially as more developing countries, such as Rwanda, introduce

and/or expand its role in their education systems. With reference to Africa as a whole, Shabani and Okebukola (2001) suggest that the decision to use and expand DE has been due mainly to the increasing demand for education on the one hand, and the inability of governments to meet the learning needs of large numbers of their nationals on the other.

Distance education for in-service teachers is considered to be cost-effective because it allows teachers to study and work at the same time (Kwapong, 2007; Abedi & Badragheh, 2011). In addition, "there are examples from both developing and developed countries, to show that teacher training at a distance has the potential to reach large groups of teachers and to have an impact on the development of national education systems" (Kwapong, 2007, p. 224). In 2001, in order to address an identified shortfall in the provision of quality teacher education, the Kigali Institute of Education[1] (KIE) introduced its first distance education programmes for high school teachers in Rwanda, including programmes for those who teach English. The teachers whom this programme is intended for are those with high school certificates, most of whom have had no teacher training (KIE, 2009). It should be noted that teachers of both English and French constitute a large part of a cohort that registered for the KIE DE programme at the beginning of 2010, the programme which is the focus of this study. In fact, of the 1115 teacher-learners in this programme 599 (53.81%) are studying both French and English, to teach these subjects at the Ordinary Level[2] (O'Level) of secondary education and to prepare learners for the O'Level national examination.

This chapter is made up of the following sections: background to the research, research aims and questions, rationale, the context of study, the concept of distance education and an outline of the thesis chapters.

[1] In 2013, all higher learning public institutions were merged into one university, the University of Rwanda (UR). Kigali Institute of Education then became the College of Education. However, the name Kigali Institute of Education has been consistently used in this thesis because this is the name that was used when the instructional materials that were analysed were designed.

[2] In Rwanda secondary education is divided into two levels: the Ordinary level (O'Level), which covers the first three years, and the Advanced Level (A'level), covering the last three years.

1.2 Background to the research

There is a pressing need for more and for more qualified teachers worldwide. In his key note address at the 2013 DETA[3] Conference, Bob Moon indicated that if Universal Primary Education (UPE) is to be achieved by 2015, there is need for 1,7 million new teachers worldwide, and 1 million of these are needed in Africa. With reference to Rwanda, the 1994 war and genocide, which resulted in the death of many teachers, worsened the already existing problem of teacher shortage in terms of number and quality when schools reopened in 1995. In 1999, a survey found that up to 65% of secondary teachers were under-qualified[4] (Rwanda Ministry of Education, 1999). In the government's endeavours to reconstruct the country, the revitalisation of the education system and the enhancement of the quality of teaching have been important focus areas.

KIE was established in 1999 to help address the shortage of qualified teaching staff at the secondary level (Mukamusoni, 2006). Given the high number of under-qualified secondary school teachers, these could not be all taken out of schools to be offered professional development, as there were no other teachers to replace them. Thus, DE was chosen as a viable mode of educational delivery for this targeted group of educators (Mukamusoni, 2006). Robinson and Latchem (2003, p. i) have defined DE as "an educational process in which teachers and learners are separated in space and/or in time for some or all of the time of study in which the learning materials take over some of the traditional role of the teacher." This education model allows students to study from places other than university or college premises. Therefore, DE was considered to be appropriate for teacher development in Rwanda because it

[3] Distance Education for Teacher Education in Africa.

[4] The term "under-qualified" used to refer to these teachers seems inappropriate. In fact, they have A-Level (Matriculation) certificates and have majored in different subjects (Mathematics, Biology, Physics, English, French, etc.) which they are hired to teach at high school. Therefore, with the exception of a few who attended Teacher Training Colleges (TTCs), they do not have any pedagogical background. Even those who attended TTCs were trained to teach at the primary level. This is why I suggest that they should be referred to as unqualified. It follows that the DE programme that KIE has designed for them is not really in-service. However, given that the programme is designed for people who are already teaching, I found it inappropriate to refer to it as a pre-service programme. Thus, the term 'in-service' will be used to refer to this programme throughout this study.

enabled teacher-learners to continue to meet professional and social commitments (Sharma, 2000), as they can mostly study from their homes or work places using specially designed materials.

It should be noted, however, that offering English language teacher education at a distance in Rwanda is particularly challenging: it is not only a new endeavour, but it is also being undertaken in a country where English is a foreign language in which only 7% of the population can read and write as shown by the 4th Population and Housing Census in Rwanda[5] (National Institute of Statistics of Rwanda - NISR, 2014). This means that English teacher-trainees, who are not home language speakers of English, are being trained in an environment where this language is not widely used. This lack of exposure to English may impede the extension of these trainees' knowledge of and proficiency in English; this is a significant issue given that English is now the only medium of instruction in Rwandan schools from Grade Four onwards.

Despite the limited number of speakers of English in the Rwandan population, this language has a long history in Rwandan education because it was introduced as a school subject in Rwandan secondary education in the 1960s. It was allocated six lessons per week for 'Arts' pupils, and two lessons for others. An 'Official English Programme', supposed to be used in secondary schools, was published by the National Curriculum Commission in 1975 and in 1976, the National Office for Secondary School Curriculum Development created an English language section in charge of standardizing English programmes in secondary education and organizing English teacher education/training. Similarly, an English language department was created at the National University of Rwanda. Despite this long history, however, it was only in the early 1990s that English was introduced in the national broadcasting media and no literature existed in English in this country until 1994, apart from the few textbooks that were used in schools. Moreover, English had never been taught at the primary level before 1994.

[5] The National Institute of Statistics of Rwanda notes that this information was self-reported and was "not verified through a literacy test or similar means" (p. 43), which suggests that the percentage may be even lower.

The year 1994 was a turning point in the history of English in education in Rwanda. After the 1994 genocide, many Rwandans who were born in exile came back home. Many of them had been to or had grown up in Anglophone countries and spoke English. They spoke neither French nor Kinyarwanda, the only official and most widely used languages in Rwanda at that time. In order to respect these citizens' rights and to enable them to fulfil their responsibilities, English was made an official language alongside Kinyarwanda and French as stipulated in Article 5 of the 2003 constitution: "[T]he national language is Kinyarwanda. Official languages are Kinyarwanda, French and English." Since then, the use of this language in different areas of life has increased. It has been taught as a school subject at all levels of education and, until 2008, it was used as a medium of instruction from grade four to grade twelve, in schools that were attended by English speaking learners. In tertiary education, depending on the language spoken by the lecturer, both English and French were used as media of instruction.

In 2008, English was made the only medium of instruction at all levels of education, from Grade 1 to university, replacing French which had been used since the beginning of the colonial era. In 2011, It was decided that English be used as medium of instruction from Grade 4, with Kinyarwanda being used in lower Grades (Grade 1-3) [6]. This new status for English calls for a qualified teaching force, first, to offer pre and in-service education/training to teachers of English, second, to teach English as a subject at different levels of education and, third, to use English as a medium instruction to teach other subjects. The latter is a serious challenge as pointed out by the former Rwandan Minister of Education, Dr Charles Muligande (Kwizera, 2009). As has been mentioned, KIE is using DE as one of the strategies to train high school teachers of English.

It should be noted that English is now widely used on private and public radio stations and in printed media. It also serves as a lingua franca for communication

[6] These decisions were made by the Rwandan Cabinet which convened on October 8th 2008 and on 11 February 2011, respectively. Available at http://www.primature.gov.rw/, accessed on 10 October 2010

between people who do not share any other language spoken in Rwanda, and between Rwandan people and those from other member countries of the East African Community, which are important to Rwanda for the purposes of regional cooperation.

1.3 Research aims and questions

The present research aimed to identify and analyse elements in the design of DE materials for high school English teachers in Rwanda, which enable and/or constrain their professional development. As will be explained further in Chapter Five, design includes content selection, sequencing and mediation on the page. In relation to this general aim, the research sought to do the following:

1. Analyse the content selected (e.g. what is foregrounded, backgrounded or ignored) in KIE DE materials for English (with regard to content knowledge for teaching English as a high school subject, the pedagogy *of* the materials and the extension of teachers' own English language proficiency);
2. Identify the extent to which this content is aligned with the Rwandan high school O'Level curriculum and examinations for English;
3. Analyse how this content is mediated on the page;
4. Redesign a section of the materials and obtain responses from some of the teachers enrolled in the KIE programme to both KIE DE materials and the redesigned section.

Given that the research focused on the use of DE materials to address the professional needs of Rwandan high school teachers of English, this research sought to address the following key question:

What elements in the design of DE materials for high school English teachers in Rwanda enable and/or constrain their professional development?

In this regard, the following sub-questions were addressed:

1. What content is selected for KIE DE materials for English teachers (with regard to content knowledge for teaching English as a high school subject, the pedagogy of the materials and the extension of teachers' own English language proficiency)?
2. To what extent is this content aligned with the Rwandan high school O'Level curriculum and examinations for English?
3. How is this content mediated on the page?
4. How do teacher-learners respond to KIE DE materials and to redesigned versions of sections of these materials?

1.4 Rationale

Separation in terms of time and/or space between the teacher and the learner is the main characteristic of DE. To bridge the gap left by the absence of the teacher, DE relies on technical media (e.g. printed or online materials) both for subject matter presentation and interaction/communication (Holmberg, 2001; Mishra & Gaba, 2001; Phillips, 2007). Thus, media are so important in DE that there can be no DE without them (Bourdeau & Bates, 1996).

Instructional materials for DE include printed materials, audiotapes, CD ROMS, Radio and Television (Ipaye, 2005) and increasingly, in some contexts, on-line materials (such as those designed by TESSA and OER Africa). According to Ipaye, "print is the foundation of distance education from which all other delivery systems have evolved" (Ipaye, 2005, p. 94) and it is the "mainstay of distance education system all over the world" (Mishra, Ahmad & Rai, 2001, p. 52). In fact, print materials relatively have a number of advantages: they can be used any time and in any place, are accessible for learners in rural areas where access to advanced technology is limited, are portable (Ipaye, 2005; Danaher and Umar, 2010), allow individualization of information, function in a wide range of study environments, are easily accessible for

revision (Holmberg, 1995) and no infrastructure, electricity, or any machine is required for reading the message from them (Mishra, Ahmad & Rai, 2001).

Therefore, print materials are the main medium used in pre and in-service teacher education at a distance, particularly in developing countries such as Rwanda where access to ICT is limited (Moyo, 2003, Leary & Berge, 2007; Phillips, 2007; Burns, 2011). For this reason, as suggested by Fung (2005), research on print materials should not be neglected. This is why KIE print materials which address both English as subject and the teaching of English (pedagogy) are the focus of this study. In fact, they are not only still a very important medium in DE in general, but they are the only medium used by KIE DE teacher-learners (KIE, 2009).

According to Shabani and Okebukola (2001), DE materials should usefully replace the teacher by simulating the classroom situation as much as possible. More precisely, Rowntree (1986) states that self-instructional materials must carry out all the functions a teacher would carry out in the conventional classroom situation. Therefore, DE materials should be designed appropriately by competent staff to offer distance learners opportunities similar to those in on-campus education, including "the kind of help they might expect from their ideal teacher or trainer in a classroom" (Rowntree, 1992, p. 126). In short, DE materials should be "a substitute for both a conventional textbook and the exposition of a teacher" (Holmberg, 1995, p. 68). Unfortunately, there is a shortage of people qualified in distance education in general and in instructional design in particular, especially in Africa (Shabani and Okebukola, 2001, C.O.L., 2002; Moyo, 2003; Aderinoye, Siaciwena & Wright, 2009; Biao, 2012).

As a result, institutions of learning in Africa, including KIE, have recruited staff for DE programmes from on-campus courses. Despite the staff being competent in their subject areas, they may lack skills in designing and developing DE materials (Mukamusoni, 2006). This can be noted in the following extracts from the instructions to KIE DE materials designers: "you all have postgraduate qualifications and are subject specialists but you don't necessarily have teaching or communication

skills in Distance Education" (KIE 2009). Moreover, research in the field of DE in Africa which could assist KIE lecturers appears limited (Adekanmbi, 1999; Mishra & Gaba, 2001; Nonyongo, 2007; Kumi-Yeboah, 2010). In particular, scholars (for example, Magnus, 1996; Moyo, 2003; Aderinoye, Siaciwena & Wright, 2009) identify limited research in DE in general, and lack of evaluation of DE materials in use in Africa as some of the barriers to the success of DE in this continent. Such limitations are mainly due to a lack of research culture and skills in evaluation (UNESCO, 2001; Moyo, 2003; Biao, 2012). I suggest that this may be one of the reasons why, as Kumar (2000) notes, many of the distance and open learning institutions have not been able to produce high quality materials which really address the learning needs of a distance learner.

With reference to DE for language learning, Wang and Sun (2001, p. 540) point out that "research in the area of language learning at a distance has occupied only a marginal status in the entirety of distance education research, both in terms of quantity and quality." It is important, therefore, to analyse KIE DE materials for English to see how (if at all) and to what extent they address the professional needs of KIE DE language teacher-learners. The proposed research may contribute to filling the gap outlined above in that the analysis of DE materials used in one African country could be of interest to DE materials designers in other parts of the continent.

The first set of KIE DE materials was used by teacher-learners in the first DE intake between 2001 and 2006. The second and revised set has been in use by the teacher-learners in the second and third intakes in January 2010 and July 2011 respectively. It should be noted that fourteen years after the introduction of KIE's DE programme, the only research studies that have been conducted on it have been a "descriptive qualitative case study" (Mukamusoni, 2006) and a multi-country assessment of the use of DE and ICTs in education with a focus on Rwanda, by the Joint International Council of Distance Education (ICDE) and the World Bank (Rumbles, 2003). In the latter, the KIE DE programme is given very limited attention: 3 out of 117 pages. There has also been a mid-term review of the first intake of the KIE Distance Teacher

Training Project (Pennells and Coldevin, 2003) and a short review of KIE DE programme undertaken by Christine Randell and Tony Mays on behalf of the South African Institute for Distance Education (SAIDE) in 2006 (Mays, 2006). The review was reported in a single page.

Focusing on different aspects of the KIE DE programme, all these studies/evaluations identified problems with the programme's teaching/learning materials and/or factors that could create such problems. As has been noted previously, for example, KIE lecturers had to prepare materials for the programme as an 'add on' to their normal duties (Rumble, 2003), and most of them "complained of being overworked and overloaded" (Mukamusoni, 2006, p. 4). Such a situation could potentially affect the design and the quality of KIE DE materials in a negative way. With reference to the materials themselves, Rumble (2003) indicates that the first cohort of KIE DE teacher-learners were critical of the insufficiency of ITQs in the materials; they also indicated that page density in KIE DE materials made content difficult to understand. Pennells and Coldevin (2003) also pointed out that these materials were not sufficiently focused on what teachers do in the classroom. In a brief review of the KIE DE programme undertaken by SAIDE in 2006, it was also noticed that "to adapt the curriculum to speak more to the actual experience of the learner and the teacher in the classroom" was one of the main challenges faced by this programme (Mays, 2006, p. 4). In spite of these critiques, there has been no detailed textual analysis of KIE DE materials and no thorough investigation of teacher-learners responses to them. Therefore, this study is relevant and is actually long overdue.

In addition, the new status of English in Rwanda makes the teaching of it an issue that deserves attention if Rwandan school leavers and higher education graduates are to be proficient users of this language. Therefore, it is hoped that findings from this research will be of value to all those who wish to offer high quality DE opportunities to teachers of English in Rwanda (and perhaps elsewhere). In fact, this study aims to establish whether the materials in the programme for English teaching are likely to meet teachers' needs and if not, to make recommendations for improvement. Moreover, as a lecturer at KIE who will eventually tutor in some of KIE

DE modules for English, I also feel that it is one of my responsibilities to investigate the quality of mediation of the knowledge and skills that prospective teachers of English receive from KIE. The quality of mediation, according to Johnson and Golombek (2011, p. 6) "is absolutely critical to understanding, supporting, and enhancing the development of teaching expertise in SLTE[7] programs."

1.5 The context of the study

The study focused on a DE programme run by Kigali Institute of Education (KIE). KIE is a young public institution of higher learning in Rwanda, founded in 1999 to address the shortage of qualified teachers at the secondary level of education in Rwanda.

Since its establishment, KIE has made significant strides. It has evolved into a dual mode institution offering distance and on-campus teacher education programmes in various disciplinary areas ranging from diploma to Honours degrees. This is how it has moved from 300 on-campus students in 1999 to around 6594 students[8] in the academic year 2013-2014. It also has two affiliated "Colleges of Education" (Kavumu and Rukara) that train teachers for diplomas in the different subjects which they teach in O'Level classes. In partnership with Pan African Tele Education (funded by the government of India) and the University of South Africa (UNISA), KIE offers programmes that range from certificates to Masters degrees. It also offers Postgraduate Certificates in Education (PGCE) for unqualified high school teachers[9], a postgraduate certificate in learning and teaching in higher education and Masters in Gender and Development and in Curriculum and Instruction. Moreover, it is also a home for the Confucius Institute, a Chinese Language Centre teaching Chinese in Rwanda. All these achievements show that KIE is a growing institution.

[7] Second Language Teacher Education
[8] This number includes 3863 on-campus, 2210 DE and 529 posgraduate and Masters students.
[9] These are teachers who have degrees in various fields but who have not studied pedagogy.

KIE Distance Training Programme (DTP)

As stated in section 1.1, the KIE teacher DE programme known as KIE Distance Training Programme (DTP) started in 2001. It was initially a donor funded project for which the DfID provided funds and the World Bank provided technical and material support. The DfID funds covered all the costs of the programme and teacher-learners were not asked to pay anything. It was decided that he programme would follow the same curriculum as the pre-service training programme offered by KIE with each teacher enrolled studying two teaching subjects plus education. It was anticipated that it would take KIE DE students three years to complete what is covered in two years by on-campus students as the latter study full-time. From its inception, the target beneficiaries of this programme have been the aforementioned 65% of high school teachers whose qualifications are not beyond a high school certificate.

The programme started with 500 teachers following a three-year DE programme, leading to the award of a Diploma in Education. It should be noted that while the programme developers expected it to take three years, it actually took six years for the first diplomas to be awarded in 2007, mainly because the programme was run from within a contact-based institution and dependent on full-time academics to write the study materials (Mays, 2006). The following are the combinations which the programme started with:

- Mathematics & Physics with Education
- Biology & Chemistry with Education
- French & English with Education
- English & Literature with Education[10]

At the completion of the programme, these teachers are supposed to be qualified to teach at the lower level (O' Level) of high school. At a later stage, Rumble (2003) points out, there was an intention to introduce a Bachelor's degree programme at a distance, but this has not started yet. Those who would go on to gain a bachelor's

[10] This combination was created mainly for the teacher-learners who were teaching English, but were not able and/or willing to study (and teach) French. It was not included in the subsequent intakes.

degree would supposedly be qualified to teach in the upper level of high school. Nevertheless, some of those who were awarded Diplomas in 2007 subsequently joined and graduated from other higher learning institutions in Rwanda with Bachelor's Degrees in different fields in which they could secure admissions. It should be noted that since 2010, KIE has been registering teacher-learners in its DE programme each year. The 2010 intake was the focus of this study, and, therefore, interviews were conducted with participants from this intake while textual analysis involved the DE materials used by this cohort.

The KIE DE programme is offered in mixed mode with the main mode of learning being printed materials supported by two optional weekend tutorials each month with local tutors at provincial study/learning centres. There is also a compulsory two week face-to-face session for each module (in each of the three areas: English, French and Education) with KIE lecturers in which the teacher-learners are supposed to ask questions about what they have not understood during their self-study. There are four regional centres where teacher-learners from the same region have their face-to-face sessions: Rwamagana, Kabgayi, Butare and Nyundo.

It should be noted that while the KIE DTP is a project affiliated to KIE, it was established as a semi-autonomous entity. Initially, it had its own administrative and technical staff and its own budget but did not have its own teaching force; it had to rely on KIE on-campus faculty staff for the development of learning materials. However, the development process was "managed and executed by the staff (course coordinators, production assistants, translators, editors, illustrator, typesetter/layout keyboarders) of the Distance Training Office" (Rumble, 2003, p. 36). At that time no KIE faculty staff had experience with any aspect of DE, including the writing of learning materials. To address this problem, KIE lecturers who were to prepare the materials were offered initial training in almost all aspects of DE by external experts, notably those from the University of London (Mukamusoni, 2006). After participating in this training, these lecturers were expected to write for the DTP over and above their normal duties (Rumble, 2003), and most of them "complained of being

overworked and overloaded" (Mukamusoni, 2006, p. 4). All these factors are likely to have had an impact on the quality of the materials.

As pointed out by Rumble (2003), DfID had no specific plans to continue funding the programme. Thus, the Government of Rwanda needed to find alternative ways of funding the programme should it find the programme worth continuing. Since 2010, the programme has been entirely funded by the government of Rwanda and this change has financial consequences for teacher-learners. For instance, those who registered in the 2010 and 2011 cohorts have had to pay tuition fees like any other tertiary education students. To this end, they are given a loan by the Rwandan Education Board (REB). They also have to pay for their transport, accommodation and food when they come to study/learning centres for weekend tutorials and face-to-face sessions. Furthermore, teacher-learners in the third cohort have had to buy the DE materials (modules) that they are using to learn. These factors further explain why the materials should be of high quality and meet the teacher-learners' needs.
The DTP has now become part of the KIE's Centre for Open, Distance and E-Learning (CODEL), and its staff members have been integrated into KIE. It should be noted, however, that the KIE teaching force has changed considerably since the training on DE materials writing was offered to them by experts from the University of London. Many lecturers and former DTP staff members have left and others have joined KIE. Those who joined KIE after the training may not have the knowledge and skills required to develop these materials. In an attempt to address this issue, the CODEL has prepared '*A Handbook for Course Writers*' (KIE, 2009), which gives the information about DE and DE materials writing. However, such a handbook may not provide sufficient support for a person who has had no experience of DE to write good DE materials: such novices may need involvement in practical exercises and activities in order to acquire the knowledge and required skills for DE materials development.

It should be noted that while all subject content modules for English (Modules 1 to 4) are prepared by the Faculty of Arts and Languages at Kigali Institute of Education, the pedagogy module is prepared by the Faculty of Education because, KIE argues,

pedagogy is the responsibility of this Faculty. That is why the pedagogy module for English is Module 7, following six other Studies in Education modules produced by the Education Faculty. What is interesting is that though these pedagogy modules are produced by the Education Faculty, they are designed and taught by lecturers in the Faculties in which the different subjects are located. For instance, the pedagogy module for English is designed and taught by lecturers in the Faculty of Arts and Languages, the pedagogy module for Mathematics by lecturers in the Science Faculty, etc. It should also be noted that each module is designed by a team different from the others, with some lecturers taking part in the design of more than one module.

1.6 The concept of distance education

It is important to understand how DE, as a relatively new educational field, has been defined and how it has evolved so far.

1.6.1 Definition

A number of authors use the term Distance Learning (DL) instead of Distance Education (for example Rowntree, 1992 & 1994; Lockwood, 1994; Fung, 2005; Ipaye, 2005; Mishra & Panda, 2007; Kwapong, 2007). However, Keegan (1990), cited in Rowntree (1992), prefers the term “distance education” because it includes both distance learning and distance teaching. The term "distance education", originally used in England and the Commonwealth, became more widely accepted in 1982, when the UNESCO-affiliated ICCE, the International Council for Correspondence Education, changed its name to ICDE, the International Council for Distance Education (Bourdeau and Bates, 1996). Distance Education is the term that is used in this study. However, given that the KIE DE programme is known as the KIE Distance Training Programme (DTP) in the discourse of KIE, DTP is the term that was used during interviews with participants in the programme.

DE has been defined as “a method of education in which the learner is physically separated from the teacher” (Abedi & Badragheh, 2011, p. 295), which implies non-

contiguous teaching and learning (Holmberg, 2001) and in which "the learning materials take over some of the traditional role of the teacher" (Robinson and Latchem, 2003, p. i). Separation between the teacher and the learner implies that learners study mostly on their own at a time, place and pace of their own choice, relying mainly on DE media/materials. Therefore, DE is often regarded as "an innovation which gives students a high degree of independence" (Holmberg, 1995, p. 8), and in which students are viewed as "as self-directed learners" (Bourdeau and Bates, 1996, p. 268). Thus, DE materials should be structured in such a way that learners can do most or all their learning from the materials alone (Phillips, 2007).

1.6.2 Historical background

Teaching and learning by correspondence is the origin of what is today called DE (Holmberg, 1995). Correspondence education, according to Holmberg, denotes "teaching in writing, by means of so-called self-instructional texts combined with communication in writing, i.e. correspondence between students and tutors" (1995, p. 3). While correspondence mediated education has undergone several changes to become what is today known as DE, some of its defining characteristics have remained the same. These are a separation between the learner and the teacher (Wang and Sun, 2001) and a resultant reliance on learning materials.

In order to reduce the presumed negative effects of the separation of teachers and students, face-to-face contact sessions at a university, either at local centres or in weekend or residential schools (Robinson and Latchem, 2003; Abedi & Badragheh, 2011) were introduced. This aspect separates DE from correspondence education (Welch and Glennie, 2005). In addition, self-instructional texts have been improved to help distance learners, who usually work in isolation (Shabani and Okebukola, 2001).

DE has evolved through five periods commonly known as five generations of DE which are largely defined with regard to the media and instructional options that were available at a particular time (Taylor, 2001). These generations, however, are

not mutually exclusive as many of them use several models associated with more than one generation (Burns, 2011). These generations are:

- *The first generation*: correspondence-based, characterized by large amounts of written or printed material given to students; communication between the student and the teacher was limited (Wright, Jeffs & Wood, 1995).
- *The second generation*: print materials integrated with broadcast TV and radio, audio and videocassettes, and increased student support (Wright, Jeffs & Wood, 1995).
- *The third generation*: the invention of hypertext and rise in the use of teleconferencing (i.e., audio and video) (Bernard et al., 2004).
- *The fourth generation*: characterized by technologies (e-learning or Internet-based learning) which have made it possible for DE learners to communicate and interact effectively with their teachers and other students (Postle & Tyler, 2010).
- *The fifth generation*: a high degree of learner control and two-way communication (Bernard et al., 2004), based on the further exploitation of new technologies (Taylor, 2001). It aims to capitalize on the features of the Internet and the Web.

The development of telecommunications and electronic communication media (which are associated with the fifth generation) has opened further possibilities for DE (Ascough, 2002), notably by increasing student interaction and collaboration (Beldarrain, 2006). This has added an online aspect of learning to DE, hence the current term “online distance education”, which characterizes the type of DE supplemented by computer-mediated delivery of courses through internet and World Wide Web (Ascough, 2002). These advanced computer technologies offer the means to provide distance learners with access to increased human interaction (Jennings, 1995) among a number of physically separated locations (Ascough, 2002). Thus, technology has transformed the traditional DE into a more dynamic and interactive learning method (Abedi & Badragheh, 2011).

With reference to language learning at a distance, Jennings (1995, p. 104) notes that the integration of computers and telecommunications systems "provides learners with direct access to native speakers across national boundaries." This association with online learning has resulted in DE gaining more and more importance (Peters, 2010). Unfortunately, not many countries and institutions of learning in developing countries have access to these facilities. Even in the second decade of the twenty-first century, KIE DE seems to be of the second generation. While there is no use of broadcast media in the KIE DE programme, it has student support offered by local tutors and KIE lecturers in weekend tutorials and face-to-face sessions, during which the content of the printed materials is mediated.

1.6.3 Distance education in developing countries

Despite the progress that has been made in DE internationally, developing countries are still struggling to introduce and sustain high quality DE in their education systems. For instance, Moyo (2003) indicates that despite the growth of DE globally, DE largely remains underdeveloped in Africa mainly because of underfunding. Other challenges include the absence DE policies, social acceptance of DE products, the relevance of DE programmes, low level of utilization of ICT and lack of trained personnel in the philosophy, principles and methods of DE (Biao, 2012). As a result of such constraints on the provision of quality, there are still imbalances between the quality of what is provided for teachers enrolled in DE programmes in developed countries on the one hand, and in developing countries on the other (Robinson and Latchem, 2003). Since "the strength of a country's DE system is directly related to the country's economic stature" (Leary and Berge, 2007, p. 136) and many African economies are still quite weak, there is no surprise that the Sub-Saharan Africa is lagging behind in DE development (Moyo, 2003; Leary and Berge, 2007).

With reference to Rwanda, DE does not have a long history as the first DE programme to be undertaken in the country is the KIE DPT that started in 2001. Nevertheless, all the institutions of higher learning in Rwanda have developed flexible/open course programmes (evening and weekend) in order to accommodate

students who are not able to study as full-time or on-campus students mainly because of work commitments.

1.6.4 Distance education for teacher education

According to Robinson and Latchem (2003, p. i), DE "is increasingly used in teacher education in developing and industrialized countries … to help achieve the target of education for all by 2015." In similar vein, Kwapong (2007, p. 224) points out that DE has been used extensively in teacher education "to provide pre-service teacher preparation, upgrade academic qualifications, and in-service continuing professional development." This author states that a particular advantage of DE is that it provides access to professional development for teachers in remote areas without convenient access to higher education institutions (Kwapong, 2007). Thus, it is no wonder that a large proportion of the world's DE learners are teachers (Robinson & Latchem, 2003). In fact, the experiences of many developed and developing countries have shown that, if properly organized and managed, DE can enable countries to train a larger number of teachers in a shorter time and with lower costs than can conventional campus-based teacher education (Danaher and Umar, 2010).

Another advantage of using DE for teacher training is that reflection on theory and practice is encouraged by the context of study (McGrath, 1995) because teachers are studying and working at the same time. This offers an added advantage that they can try and/or apply ideas from the course immediately to their current teaching context (Nunan, 2002). In this way, DE can help in bridging the divide between theory and practice for which teacher education programmes have been criticized (Johnson and Arshavskaya, 2011). In fact, teacher candidates have complained that they have few opportunities to engage in the activities of actual teaching until the internship that often comes towards the end of the program (Johnson and Arshavskaya, 2011). This validates McGrath's (1995, p. 70) argument that "most of what is taught in intensive programmes evaporates before it can be applied in the classroom", which is unlikely in in-service teacher education.

1.6.5 Distance education for language teachers

Hanson & Wennö (2005, p. 278) note that "since communication is such an important aspect of language learning, opinions have been expressed that teaching languages at a distance cannot be as practicable and effective as campus-based courses." This has been the view of a number of scholars (for example Davis, 1988; Sharma & Williams, 1988; Leach, 1995). Hanson & Wennö (2005) go further to suggest that it is difficult to believe that DE techniques could work for languages, given the limited nature of communication in DE, which communication is the primary aim of and a means for language teaching. For Leach (1995), it is unquestionably the case that some things cannot be taught at a distance for teachers of language.

Based on the arguments in the above paragraph, one would easily conclude that teaching language at a distance is an endeavour that is not worth undertaking. However, Shale (1990), cited in Hanson & Wennö (2005), insists that all of what constitutes the process of education when the teacher and the learner are able to meet face-to-face also constitutes the process of education when they are physically separated. This view is also supported by the transactional distance theory which proposes that the essential distance in DE is transactional, not spatial or temporal (Gorsky and Caspi, 2005). This transactional distance, Moore (2007) argues, is relative rather than absolute. Therefore, "teaching-learning programmes are *not* dichotomously either 'distance' or 'not distance' but they have 'more distance' or 'less distance" (Moore, 2007, p. 91, italics in the original). Thus, bridging the distance is a problem in all kinds of education, not a problem specifically for DE (Hanson and Wennö, 2005). Rowntree (1992) goes even further to argue that DE materials can offer experiences that few classroom teachers can offer. These include the permanence of the medium that a learner can revisit anytime and anywhere, without the interference from reactions of one's classmates.

While it is true that there are differences between on-campus and DE, different types of interventions and support structures can make each of the two models of

education effective. For example, “more traditional forms of distance language learning that used print, audio and video materials are being supplemented by opportunities for interaction and collaboration online” (White, 2003, p. 1). This increases opportunities for learners to be involved in communication, which is lacking in media (especially print) only based DE. Unfortunately, KIE DE teacher-learners, who are participants in this study, do not have access to such opportunities, which is likely to be an obstacle to their development of communication skills.

1.7 Overview of the thesis

This thesis consists of eight chapters. Chapter One has introduced the study by providing its background and stating its rationale before addressing the concept of distance education and describing the context of this study, the Kigali Institute of Education. Chapter Two, Theoretical Framework, discusses the main theories that informed the study. Chapter Three, Literature Review, addresses concepts and issues pertaining to distance education and language teacher education. The Methodology Chapter (Chapter Four) explains how the research was conducted: how the informants were selected and how data was collected, analysed and interpreted.

Chapters Five, Six and Seven present and analyse the findings of the research. Chapter Five focuses on the content selected for KIE DE materials for English and on the alignment of this content with the Rwandan O’Level curriculum and examination for English while the focus of Chapter Six is the mediation strategies that are adopted in the KIE DE materials. Chapter Seven reports on data from interviews with selected KIE DE teacher-learners, in which they were asked to respond to both the KIE DE materials and the redesigned section. Chapter Eight, concludes the thesis and makes recommendations for improvements to the KIE DE materials and programme before discussing the limitations of the study and suggesting possible avenues for further research.

Chapter Two: Theoretical framework

2.1 Introduction
2.2 Bernstein's theories of curriculum and pedagogy
2.2.1 Conceptualizing curriculum
2.2.1.1 Classification
2.2.2 Conceptualizing pedagogy
2.2.2.1 Framing
2.2.2.2 Reconceptualisation
2.2.2.3 Pedagogic models: competence and performance
2.3 Vygotsky's sociocultural theory
2.3.1 The zone of proximal development
2.3.2 Mediation
2.3.3 Application of sociocultural theory to language teaching
2.4 A constructivist approach to learning
2.5 Conclusion

2.1 Introduction

The central theoretical work that has informed this study is that of the sociologist of education, Basil Bernstein and of the sociocultural psychologist, Lev Vygotsky. Key concepts developed by these theorists are discussed separately and the chapter concludes with a diagrammatic representation of the interconnectedness of many of the concepts that inform the analysis of data and the interpretation of findings of the study.

Bernstein's theories have been selected because he "arguably tells us more about curriculum than any other writer. He provides a well-developed set of concepts and criteria for understanding curriculum (and for doing research), and his work has been particularly influential in developing countries" (Harley, 2010, p. 1). One of the reasons why his work has been influential is that, as pointed out by Moore and Maton (2001), in Wheelahan (2010b, p. 200), his analysis of the relationship between structures of knowledge, related social relations and the social practices of knowledge producers "provides us with greater insights that we can use to distinguish between different social practices that privilege the knower rather than the object of knowledge." In this study key concepts from Bernstein's work have

been used to interpret the findings of the textual analysis of the KIE DE materials and, to a lesser extent, to interpret some of the findings from the interviews with teacher-learners.

As one aim of the study has been to analyze the extent to which interactive learning approximates are built into KIE DE materials in order to facilitate teacher-learners' construction and acquisition of knowledge, Vygotsky's theorization of human cognitive development, especially his concept of mediation, has also framed the study.

2.2 Bernstein's theories of curriculum and pedagogy

This section is in two parts: the first addresses curriculum and associated concepts and the second, pedagogy and related concepts.

Bernstein proposes a model of three pedagogic rights against which any educational initiative can be evaluated: the right to individual enhancement, the right to be included and the right to participate (1996, p. 6). With reference to the first right, Bernstein states that "enhancement is not simply the right to be *more* personally, *more* intellectually, *more* socially, *more* materially, it is the right to the means of critical understanding and to new possibilities" (2000, p. xx, italics in the original) or possible futures (Singh, 1997). Here, Bernstein seems to imply enhancement of an individual's capacities for independent and self-reliant decision making. He identifies this right as "the condition for confidence" (2000, p. xx), which confidence teachers and learners need to have individually in order to act independently. According to Wheelahan (2010a), this right enables an individual to make his or her own decisions without being influenced by external pressures.

The second right is the right to be included "socially, intellectually, culturally and personally" (Bernstein, 2000, p. xx). Regarding this right, Bernstein cautions that "to be included does not necessarily mean to be absorbed. Thus, the right to be included

may also require a right to be separate, to be autonomous" (2000, p. xx). In my view, Bernstein is suggesting that while inclusion may entail adherence to certain social regulations, the individual does not need to follow them blindly: he or she has the right to apply his or her own judgment and act accordingly. It should be noted that the community where learning takes place has to be inclusive as a condition for a realization of this right (Wheelahan, 2010a).

With reference to the third right, Bernstein (2000) wants his readers to be clear about what he means by the word 'participate'. He argues that participation is not just about discourse and discussion, but also about "practice, and a practice that must have *outcomes*" (p. xxi, italics in the original). Put differently, this is the right to contribute to or initiate changes which take place in society or in pedagogic practices (Singh, 1997). As Bernstein goes on to argue, "it is the right to participate in the construction, maintenance and transformation of order" (2000, p. xxi). Whilst the first right operates at the individual level, the second operates at the social level and the third at the political level. One can conclude that an education that gives learners (in the case of this study, teacher-learners) access to these rights will have prepared them for their roles as critical citizens in a democratic society.

For Bernstein, an education which gives all learners equal access to these rights is one "which enables reflection on *what* is to be acquired and *how* it is to be acquired" (1996, p. 8, italics added). Here, I suggest that he refers to two pillars of any educational programme: curriculum and pedagogy, which he addresses through the concepts of classification and framing of knowledge, the concepts that he uses to analyze pedagogic contexts and practices (Morais et al., 2001). This study has been framed by these two concepts because it is located in a given pedagogic context (KIE DE programme) in which the two concepts are important for the selection of content and for the way this content is mediated on the page in KIE DE materials for teachers of English. In fact, while "classification refers to *what* (content selection), framing is concerned with *how* meanings are put together (mediation), the forms by which they are to be made public, and the nature of the social relationships that go with it" (Bernstein, 1996, pp. 27; italics in the original; words in parentheses added by the

writer of this thesis). For Bernstein, the two concepts are equally important. Therefore, I have chosen to use both of them in an analysis of the content in and the pedagogy of KIE DE materials.

2.2.1 Conceptualizing curriculum

In conceptualizing curriculum, Bernstein starts with a consideration of discourse as a singular, "which has appropriated a space to give itself a unique name" (1996, p. 23). He gives examples of physics, chemistry, sociology, psychology as singulars. He also states that in some disciplines the very strong classification of singulars has undergone a change in the direction of a regionalization of knowledge, with a region being created as a result of the recontextualizing of singulars. He gives examples of medicine, architecture, engineering and information science as disciplines in which the development of regionalizations of knowledge can be seen (1996, p. 23). Reed (2010, p. 40) considers teacher education as a further example of such regionalization of knowledge, a suggestion which I agree with. For Bernstein, "any regionalization of knowledge implies a recontextualizing principle: which singulars [courses] are to be selected, what knowledge within the singular [content] is to be introduced and related?" (1996, p. 23).

In theorizing curriculum, Bernstein (1975) introduces the concept of codes which he defines as the underlying principles or rules, which determine the organization of educational knowledge. For Bernstein, "curriculum types can be described firstly in terms of principles by which units of time and their contents are brought into a special relationship with each other" (Bernstein, 1975, p. 85). Thus, as explained by Singh and Harris (2010, p. 251), "curriculum types can be categorized in terms of the amount of time devoted to particular contents in the school timetable, and whether specific contents are deemed optional or otherwise by students." I suggest that the amount of space in the materials and time allocated in the curriculum to particular units in DE materials can also be considered as a curriculum categorization factor. Moreover, I suggest that the response that students have to the content (optional or otherwise) is likely to be influenced by the time and space allocated to these, among

other factors. The textual analysis of the KIE DE materials includes analysis of the focus of the programme in terms of content, the relative space and/or time accorded to content units together with the types of knowledge selected. It should be noted that the nature of the relationships between curriculum units also has a role to play in the teaching/learning process. To discuss these relationships, Bernstein uses the concept of classification.

2.2.1.1 Classification

Singulars within the same region relate to one another, and the nature of these relationships depends on what Bernstein (1996) calls classification. Classification refers to the degree of insulation between two categories of discourse in a curriculum: physics, geography, language, etc. (Bernstein, 1996, p. 20). When the degree of insulation between categories is high, classification is strong and when it is low, classification is weak. Within strong classification, "each category has its unique identity, its unique voice, its own specialized rules of internal relations" (p. 21). In other words, when curriculum is strongly classified, school subjects or university courses are clearly demarcated from one another, each having its own rules and discourse. On the other hand, "in the case of weak classification, we have less specialized discourses, less specialized identities, less specialized voices" (p. 21); the curriculum is integrated, with the subjects/courses intersecting with one another.

Bernstein has formulated two basic rules that generate the classification model: "where we have strong classification, the rule is: things must be kept apart. Where we have weak classification, the rule is: things must be brought together" (2000, p. 11). Therefore, when classification is strong, relationships between curriculum units are closed, when it is weak, the relationships are open (Singh and Harris, 2010). In the same sense, a curriculum with clear distinctions between what is learnt in the classroom (or through a course of independent study) and what is learnt in everyday life can be described as strongly classified (Hoadley and Jansen, 2009). Such a curriculum is more likely to use specialist language that one needs to understand in order to access it, while a weakly classified curriculum may be more likely to use

everyday language (Hoadley and Jansen, 2009). It should be noted that in a strongly classified curriculum, “contents are not open to public discussion and challenge” (Bernstein, 2000, p. 10). Bernstein (2000) states that in analysing curricula it is important to ask in whose interest is the apartness of the things, and in whose interest is the togetherness and integration.

Bernstein (1999) also theorizes curricula in terms of the vertical and horizontal discourses through which knowledge is made available. In the social sciences and humanities, vertical discourse “takes the form of a series of specialized languages within specialized modes of interrogation and specialized criteria for the production and circulation of texts” (Bernstein, 1999, p. 159). As for the horizontal discourse, it “entails a set of strategies which are local, segmentally organized, context specific and dependent.” It refers to common-sense, everyday, segmentally organised knowledge that is “likely to be oral, local, context dependent and specific, tacit, multi-layered, and contradictory across but not within contexts” (Bernstein, 1999, p. 159). Within this horizontal discourse, knowledges, competences and literacies are “embedded in on-going practices … and directed towards specific, immediate goals, highly relevant to the acquirer in the context of his/her life” (Bernstein, 1999, p. 159, 161). Given the context dependency of the horizontal discourse, related pedagogic practice may vary with context variables (place, times, classes, learners, teachers, teaching/learning aids, etc.). Alternatively, the same pedagogic practices may produce different outcomes in different contexts.

2.2.2 Conceptualizing pedagogy

Scholars who have defined pedagogy include Gore who defines it as “the process of knowledge production” (1993, p. 5), Daniels (2001, p. 1) who defines it as “forms of social practice which shape and form the cognitive, affective and moral development of individuals” through a conscious activity by one or more person(s) and Bernstein who, in addition to defining it, elaborates on what it involves as follows:

> Pedagogy is a sustained process whereby somebody(s) acquires new forms or develops existing forms of conduct, knowledge, practice and criteria, from somebody(s) or something deemed to be an appropriate provider and evaluator. Appropriate either from the point of view of the acquirer or by some other body(s) or both. (1999, p. 259).

The above quotation suggests the existence of two categories of people in a pedagogic act: the knowledge acquirer (the learner) and the knowledge producer (the teacher or the material designer in the case of DE). However, these roles are not fixed: both the learner and the teacher create and acquire knowledge in the teaching/learning process (Richards and Rodgers, 2001; Gultig, 2001; Schwartz et al., 2009). Bringing the two categories together, Lusted (1986) defines pedagogy as a relation between the teacher, learner and the knowledge they co-construct. For Bernstein it is this relation that shapes "pedagogic communications and their relevant contexts" (Bernstein and Solomon, 1999, p. 267), defining what counts as valid transmission of knowledge. A teacher's pedagogic choices are very important for learning because, I suggest, it is through these that learning is organized in order to meet learners' needs, including the need for 'epistemic access' (Shay, 2013).

Epistemic access refers to access to powerful knowledge as opposed to knowledge of the powerful (Young, 2010). Powerful knowledge, according to Young (2010), provides reliable and 'testable' explanations of ways of thinking, is the basis for suggesting realistic alternatives, enables those who acquire it to see beyond their everyday experience, is conceptual as well as based on evidence and experience, is always open to challenge, etc. In short, this type of knowledge is more liberating than constraining because "it enables new, as yet unimagined, ways of thinking that are essential for innovation" (Shay, 2013, p. 577). In other words, as Koole argues, epistemic access includes "notions of both *knowing* and *understanding*" (2010, p. 207, italics in the original). On the other hand, knowledge of the powerful refers to the knowledge authorised by those in power and does not afford the learner an opportunity to challenge it. It can be argued that this type of knowledge enables learners to 'know' but not to 'understand'. Thus it seems to undermine learner

autonomy and, as Wheelahan (2010a) argues, merely reproduces social inequality. Therefore, it can be argued that effective pedagogies are those that offer learners epistemic access or access to powerful knowledge, which is likely to result in the achievement of Bernstein's (1996) three pedagogic rights outlined earlier.

In conjunction with the concept of classification, Bernstein uses the concept of framing to "provide the means of understanding the process of symbolic control regulated by different modalities of pedagogic discourse" (1996, p. 19) and to examine power relations, especially between the acquirer and the transmitter in the pedagogic act.

2.2.2.1 Framing

Framing refers to "the controls of communication in local, interactional pedagogic relations: between parents/children, teacher/pupil, social worker/client, etc. … framing regulates the realization rules of the production of the discourse" (Bernstein, 1996, pp. 27-28). According to Singh (2002), framing is about how specialist expert knowledge is transformed into pedagogic forms in order to make it accessible to those outside the specialist domains. In the recontextualizing field of school/classroom, this pedagogised knowledge is translated by teachers and students in different ways. Bernstein indicates that recontextualising implies that the information given by the transmitter is adapted according to the perceived needs of the learners (Bernstein and Solomon, 1999) and reactions (Bourne, 2008). In the KIE DE programme, materials designers and teacher-learners are involved in such 'translation'.

Framing of and control over the learning process

The relationships between the transmitter and the acquirer are regulated by framing (Bernstein, 1996) and crucial to these relationships is control over the 'what' and the 'how' of the transmission process. Framing refers to the nature of the control over:

- the selection of communication;
- its sequencing (what comes first, what comes second);
- its pacing (the rate of expected acquisition);
- the criteria, and
- the control over the social base which makes the transmission possible (Bernstein, 1996, p. 27).

The question of "*who* controls *what"* (Bernstein, 1996, p. 27; italics in the original) is crucial to learners' access to the three rights outlined in section 2.1 and to powerful knowledge (Young, 2010) and the answers depends on the nature of the framing. For Bernstein (1996, p. 27), "where framing is strong, the transmitter has explicit control over selection, sequence, pacing, criteria and the social base." This implies that when framing is strong, the space for learners to construct their own knowledge may be reduced. Conversely, "where framing is weak, the acquirer has more apparent control over the communication and its social base" (Bernstein, 1996, p. 27), which increases his or her role and input in the learning process. Weak framing is associated with such concepts as learner-centredness, active learning, teacher as a coach/facilitator (Singh and Harris, 2010), which are associated with constructivism and transformation (Singh, 1997). Since constructivism is an approach to learning suggested by the instructions to KIE DE materials designers (KIE, 2009), it is important in this study to identify the extent to which this approach is evident in these materials. This is done by looking at the opportunities that the type of framing used in these materials provides for learners to construct their own understanding.

Bernstein also argues that framing values can vary with respect to particular elements of practice. For example, it is possible to have weak framing over pacing but strong framing over other aspects of the discourse. According to Bernstein, the nature of the framing of a curriculum also constructs the roles of the acquirer and what is expected of him or her as part of learning. He uses the term "labels" to refer to how the acquirer is regarded depending on the nature of framing:

> where the framing is strong, the candidates for labelling will be terms such as conscientious, attentive, industrious, careful, receptive. Where the framing is apparently weak, then conditions of candidature for labels will become equally trying for the acquirer as he or she struggles to be creative, to be interactive, to attempt to make his or her own mark (2000, p. 13).

It could be argued that strong framing is more likely to encourage a passive response from the acquirer, which may inhibit his or her learning potentials. It could also be argued that strong framing is less likely to foster his or her capacity to think and come up with his or her own solutions to or perspectives on the posed problem; he or she has to receive, retain and, eventually, reproduce the transmitter's ready-made solution (a behaviourist approach to learning). In fact, "the stronger the framing, the smaller the space accorded for potential variation in the message (what was said and its contextual realization)" (Bernstein and Solomon, 1999, p. 271).

By contrast, weak framing is more likely to challenge the acquirer to bring and apply his or her knowledge and skills to the learning act and come up with his or her own solutions to a problem. Consequently, the acquirer's input is recognized and valued, which may lead to learner independence and construction of own knowledge. In effect, strong framing entails reduced options while weak framing allows for a range of options (Bernstein, 1996). It should be noted, however, that acquirers need some knowledge base from which to make decisions, which may require the curriculum developers to move between strong and weak framing. In the absence of this base, the construction of one's own knowledge may be difficult. I suggest that decisions in this regard will be influenced by the learning context, the courses, the acquirers involved, among other aspects. KIE DE materials designers, viewed as experts in a particular discipline, should take all these aspects into consideration when designing their materials.

Bernstein (1996) argues that framing is a function of two types of rules: the rules of the social order and the rules of the discursive order. The rules of social order determine the role of the acquirer and "refer to the forms that hierarchical relations

take in the pedagogic relation and to the expectations about conduct, character and manner" (p. 27). As for the rules of discursive order, they "refer to selection, sequence, pacing and criteria of the knowledge" (p. 28). I suggest that the former relate to the respective roles of the transmitter and the acquirer in the learning process, while the latter relate to what is made available to be acquired/learned. Bernstein calls these rules regulative discourse and instructional discourse respectively. These two, according to Bernstein (1996), constitute pedagogic discourse. The instructional discourse is made up of rules which create conditions that allow the construction of knowledge and skills of one kind or another and rules regulating their relationship to each other, while the regulative discourse is made up of rules which create particular conditions for a given kind of social order.

It should be noted that the relationship between classification and framing is so strong that "framing relations could lead to a change in the classificatory relations. In this way, framing relations could challenge the power relations imposing or enabling the classification" (Bernstein and Solomon, 1999, p. 271). This may be why Bernstein states that the two should not be separated (Bernstein and Solomon, 1999) as they are equally important in learning. In fact, the type of learning that takes place is a function of classificatory relations (relations between categories) and the degree of strength of the framing (the relations within categories) (Bernstein and Solomon, 1999). Therefore, I suggest that DE materials and programme developers should consider the relationships between these two concepts very carefully, to create conditions that are conducive for learning.

2.2.2.2 Recontextualization

Bernstein (1996) defines pedagogic discourse as an ensemble of rules or procedures for the production and circulation of knowledge within pedagogic interactions. In the words of Morais (2002), pedagogic discourse refers to what is transmitted, how it is transmitted, and the respective roles of the transmitter and the acquirer in the learning process. In so doing, it appropriates various discourses and "unmediated discourses are transformed into mediated, virtual or imaginary discourses …

pedagogic discourse selectively creates imaginary subjects" (Bernstein, 1996, p. 47). For example, carpentry (outside pedagogy) is transformed (or recontextualised) into woodwork in the classroom context (inside pedagogy). Therefore, pedagogic discourse is a recontextualising principle which

> creates reconceptualising fields … and agents with recontextualising functions … We can distinguish between an official recontextualising field (ORF) created and dominated by the state and its selected agents and ministries and a pedagogic recontextualisation field (PRF) consisting of pedagogues in schools and colleges, and departments of education, specialised journals, private research foundations (Bernstein, 1996, p. 47-48).

It should be noted that the recontextualising principle "not only recontextualises the *what* of pedagogic discourse, what discourse is to become the subject and content of pedagogic practice, but it also contextualizes the *how*; that is *the theory of instruction*. The theory of instruction … contains within itself a model of the learner and of the teacher and of the relation" (Bernstein, 1996, p. 49; emphasis in the original). In other words, in recontextualising the different discourses, the recontextualising agents determine the content to be learned, how it will be learned and the relative roles of and relationships between the transmitter and the acquirer. I suggest that all the above aspects can be seen explicitly in official curricula and programmes or implicitly in what happens in classrooms or in self-instructional materials in the case of DE. Through the analysis of KIE DE materials for English, I aim to identify and analyze the content selected for these materials, the ways in which this content is mediated and the types of transmitters and acquirers constructed by these selections and by the mediation strategies.

Both the pedagogic recontextualising field (PRF) and the official recontextualising field (ORF) are important because "which discourse is appropriated depends more and more upon the dominant ideology in the ORF and upon the relative autonomy of the PRF" (Bernstein, 1996, p. 67). As pointed out by Singh and Harris (2010), in many countries the pedagogic recontextualising field is increasingly regulated by the official recontextualising field as the State regulates more fully not only what is

taught in schools, but how it is taught and evaluated. The latest curricula for schools in South Africa and in Rwanda are examples of this close regulation, with the regulative discourse setting "the limits and possibilities of what is thinkable and un-thinkable in relation to school knowledge, student and teacher identities, and classroom order" (Singh, 1997, p. 7).

According to Turner-Bisset (1999), agents within the PRF select and organize, according to the principles or rules of specific pedagogic discourses, texts from a number of knowledge bases or domains, such as subject knowledge, teaching knowledge, content knowledge of learners and knowledge of self. KIE DE materials designers are located in the PRF and, therefore, work as reconceptualising agents dealing mainly with instructional discourse. Their reconceptualisation of English for language teacher education and as a school subject is analyzed in this study. In their turn, the teacher-learners in the KIE DE programme also play a recontextualising role. It is important, therefore, to analyze how these teacher-learners are educated to play their recontextualising role as teachers of English to high school learners. This analysis is mainly undertaken for Module 7 (the language pedagogy module).

2.2.2.3 Pedagogic models: competence and performance

Bernstein (1996) identifies two types of pedagogic models "on the basis of what counts as knowledge (curriculum); how learning takes place (transmission); and what counts as a legitimate display of learning (evaluation)" (Singh, 1999, p. 9). These three concepts are pertinent to my study which looks at the content selected for KIE DE materials for English and how this content is mediated. Though evaluation is not my focus, it is indirectly discussed through the analysis of (assessment) activities in these materials.

Bernstein gives the labels 'competence' and 'performance' to the two pedagogic models that he has conceptualised. In a performance model of pedagogic practice the emphasis is "upon a specific output of the acquirer, upon a particular text the acquirer is expected to construct, and upon the specialized skills necessary to the

production of this specific output, text or product" (Bernstein, 1996, p. 57-58). In other words, the focus of the performance model is on the product the acquirer has to produce as a result of learning, the actual performance.

On the other hand, competences which, I suggest, are at the heart of the competence model of pedagogy, "are intrinsically creative and tacitly acquired in informal interactions. They are practical accomplishments" (Bernstein, 1996, p. 55). Here, the emphasis is not just on the product, but also and especially on the process and the efforts the learner puts into achieving these accomplishments. In contrast to the performance model, Bernstein argues, "the concept of competence carries a potential antagonism to communication, specialized by explicit and formal procedures and their institutional base" (1996, p. 55), which implies weak framing. In characterizing the two models, Hoadley and Jansen (2009) point out that the competence model is characterized by the idea of integration between subjects, is learner-centred and makes strong links between school learning and real life. On the other hand, the performance model stresses the importance of separate subject disciplines and does not draw extensively from real life.

The differences between the foci of the two models entail different classroom pedagogic practices. The competence curriculum

> is interested in learner's competences which are believed to be innate. Thus knowledge is not imposed from the outside, but the competences that learners already have are sought on the inside. Thus it encourages teaching that draws from a learner's own experiences and 'everyday knowledge' and, in turn, assists learners in using their new learning in their lives and work (Hoadley and Jansen, 2009, p. 175).

Given that the focus is on what the learner has in him/herself, this model is learner-centred and helps "learners take control of their learning and the teacher's role tends to be covert" (Hoadley and Jansen, 2009, p. 175). Again, since "a competence curriculum blurs the line between school learning and everyday experience" (Hoadley and Jansen, 2009, P. 175), there is no specific or more important place for

learning: it can happen anywhere and at any time. In this model, there is no specific sequence for knowledge presentation; it varies from learner to learner and, therefore, learners may express the outcome in different ways (Hoadley and Jansen, 2009). Concerning the management of learning space, competence models provide acquirers with "considerable control over the construction of spaces as pedagogic sites as there are no regulatory boundaries limiting access and movement" (Bernstein, 2000, p. 46). Conversely, in performance models, "intricacies for acquirers to construct their own pedagogic space are restricted" (Bernstein, 2000, p. 46). From the above it can be argued that competence models have features that are usually associated with constructivism, an approach implied by the instructions to KIE DE materials designers. As indicated in the discussion of framing, when acquirers do not have a base on which to construct new knowledge (and need to acquire it), performance models may be a better option. The instructions given to KIE DE materials designers about adopting a constructivist approach suggest that the institution favours a competence model, in both the pedagogy *of* the materials and the pedagogy *in* the materials.

In contrasts to a curriculum based on a competence model, a curriculum based on a performance model

> tends to be very specific about what content must be learnt, and in what order; focuses on depersonalized, formal 'school knowledge' rather than on everyday knowledge and experience; … builds knowledge and understanding in a specific sequence (Hoadley and Jansen, 2009, p. 177).

Therefore, learners do not have many choices with regard to how they learn. They are obliged to follow the sequence set by the teacher, who is in charge of the learning process and "responsible for initiating learners into the mysteries, rules, and understandings of the discipline" (Hoadley and Jansen, 2009, p. 183). In addition, all learners are expected to produce the same (explicit) outcomes at the same time. Those who cannot do so are said to have failed, irrespective of any other outcome they produce; in effect, any outcome that has not been detailed by the teacher does not count as achievement. In this case, access to knowledge may not be a right for

all, but “a private property, with various kinds of ‘fences’ [such as examinations] around it to exclude those who don’t have it or have failed to get it” (Hoadley & Jansen, 2009, p. 183). This may be detrimental to learners’ individual development and intellectual growth because it may limit their thinking and creativity. This study is interested in identifying which of the two models is dominant in the KIE DE materials and in reflecting on their implications for KIE DE teacher-learners.

Bernstein (1996) discusses elements of curriculum which are realized differently in the two models with reference to the following features:

- categories of time, space and discourse;
- pedagogic orientation to evaluation;
- pedagogic control;
- pedagogic text;
- pedagogic autonomy;
- pedagogic economy.

Discourse

Within a competence model, pedagogic discourse is likely to take the form of projects, themes, ranges of experience, etc. in which acquirers have an apparently great measure of control over selection, sequence and pace (Bernstein, 1996, p. 58). Here the emphasis is on the realization of competences that the acquirers already possess or are thought to possess. In performance models, pedagogic discourse takes the form of “specialization of subjects, skills, procedures which are clearly marked with respect to form and function” (Bernstein, 1996, p. 58). According to Bernstein, the acquirers have relatively less control over selection, sequence and pace, and the emphasis is on the acquirers’ texts (performances). These texts are graded and the resultant stratification is used to differentiate acquirers as regards to their knowledge (Bernstein, 1996).

I understand Bernstein to be suggesting that competence models value acquirers' potentials and make use of these in developing competences. By giving learners a degree of control over the acquisition process, this model puts them at the centre of the process. Thus, it can be argued that the pedagogy here is learner-centred. As for a performance model, it presents the transmitter's highly structured instruction to be mastered by the acquirer for him or her to produce a 'perfect' text. With its emphasis being on the product (text), this model seems not to have the learners at its centre.

Evaluation

Evaluation, a universally accepted integral part of teaching and learning (Agrawal, 2004) and an indispensable component of DE systems (Shabani and Okebukola, 2001), is also viewed differently within the two models. Within a competence model, the emphasis is on what is present in the acquirer's product. For instance, about an acquirer's designed image the teacher is likely to say "what a lovely picture, tell me about it" (Bernstein, 1996). It is assumed that whatever is present in the acquirer's product is important and can be used to help him or her develop further. By contrast, within a performance model, the emphasis is upon what is absent from the product. For instance, about a painting of a house completed by an acquirer, the teacher is likely to say "what a lovely house, but where is the chimney?" (Bernstein, 1996).

Since the emphasis in the performance model is upon what is absent in the acquirer's product, criteria will be explicit and specific (Bernstein, 1996; Morais, 2002). It seems that the performance model does not recognize the acquirer's efforts because what matters seems not to be what he or she has accomplished but what he or she has failed to accomplish, even when what he or she has achieved is far superior to what he or she has failed to do. Thus, instead of encouraging him or her to move forward, such comments as the above may discourage him or her. After all, with reference to Bernstein's example, a house without a chimney is a house and

not all houses have chimneys. But since the expectations are explicitly stated, the acquirer has necessarily to meet them to be "successful".

I suggest that the performance model does not encourage learners to reflect deeply and critically from various perspectives on what they are learning/have learnt. Thus, it may not always be appropriate for education in general, and for higher education in particular, where "the opportunity to engage in and develop critical thinking has been considered a defining feature" (Anderson & Garrison, 1995, p. 186). This study aims to identify the extent to which KIE DE materials involve teacher-learners in critical thinking especially because "it is important for all sectors of education to prepare individuals who are able to think well and for themselves" (Pithers and Soden, 2000, p. 237). In fact, these teacher-learners need to be able to think critically in relation to both what they learn/teach and how they learn/teach it, which links to Bernstein's (1996) three pedagogic rights.

Autonomy

A competence model allows for relatively greater autonomy compared to a performance model. A competence model considers that "any particular context and practice will be dependent upon particular features of acquirers and their contexts" (Bernstein, 1996, p. 61). It can be argued that competence models are learner-focused and that this is why "the pedagogic resources required by competency models are less likely to be pre-packaged as textbooks or teaching routines" (Bernstein, 1996, p. 61-62). In performance models, however, "any particular pedagogic practice and acquirer's performance is subordinated to external curriculum regulation of the selection, sequence, pacing, and criteria of the transmission" (Bernstein, 1996, p. 62), leaving little room for his or her autonomous movements. The extent to which KIE DE module designers foster the teacher-learners' autonomy is interrogated in the analysis of KIE DE materials.

Economy

Concerning the economic aspect of these models, Bernstein (1996, p. 62) notes that in teacher education "the transmission costs of competence models are likely to be higher than the costs of performance models." This, according to Bernstein, is because the theoretical base of competence models makes the costs of training teachers likely to be high. With reference to DE materials development, in addition to being specialists in their subjects, DE materials designers need additional knowledge and skills and time to write high quality DE materials. As noted by Abedi & Badragheh (2011, p. 297), "the time and work associated with teaching at a distance exceeds the normal requirements of campus-based instruction." Therefore, insufficient resources and time may lead to the adoption of performance models in educational programmes in general and in DE programmes in particular to the possible detriment of the programmes.

It should be noted that Bernstein's (1996) concepts of classification and framing and his pedagogic models are not normative but descriptive because, as Louw and Jensen (2013) suggest, different students thrive in different environments. For instance, Bernstein associates a weakly classified and framed curriculum with active learning and learner agency. At the same time, Louw and Jensen (2013, p. 108) suggest that a strongly classified and framed curriculum "can support students looking for clear-cut and high visibility assistance and structures to support their learning processes".

Pedagogic communication

In order to discuss pedagogic communication, Bernstein introduces the concept of the pedagogic device, "a theory of construction of pedagogic discourse, its distributive, recontextualising and evaluative rules, and their social basis" (1999, p. 157). In discussing Bernstein's theory of pedagogic knowledge, Singh (2002) views the pedagogic device as an ensemble of rules or procedures via which knowledge is converted into classroom talk, curricula and online communication. This device is

very important because, as “a carrier or a relay of skills of various kinds” (Bernstein, 1996, p. 39), it influences what is relayed.

Pedagogic communication acts on meaning potential or the potential knowledge that is available to be transmitted and/or acquired (Singh, 2002). In other words, the quality of transmission is largely influenced by the nature of pedagogic communication. Unfortunately, as Bernstein notes, many studies have focused on the relayed (message/content) to the detriment of the relay, “without which no message is possible” (Bernstein, 1996, p. 39). In my view, studies on pedagogic communication should not be neglected because “the carrier of communication, in some fundamental way, regulates what is carried” (Bernstein, 1996, p. 41). This is why my study addresses both the relay and the relayed in KIE DE materials for English or, in other words, the pedagogy *of* and *in* the KIE DE materials for English.

2.3 Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory

Vygotsky argues that knowledge is a social construction that is developed and learned through social interaction (Vygotsky, 1978). For him, human cognitive development takes place through social interaction and this idea is central to his sociocultural theory (Donald, Lazarus and Lolwana, 2002). For Vygotsky, human cognition and learning are social and cultural rather than individual phenomena (Kozulin et al., 2003). Thus, learning “originates in and emerges out of participation in social activities” (Johnson and Golombek, 2011, p. 2) and, therefore, the social environment mediates learning (Turuk, 2008). Stressing the centrality of the learner’s surrounding social environment for learning, Vygotsky states that “all the higher functions originate as actual relations between human individuals” (Vygotsky (1978, p. 57).

Lantolf and Thorne (2007, p. 201) describe factors in the social environment as follows:

> Practically speaking, development processes take place through participation in cultural, linguistic, and historically formed settings such as family life and peer group interaction, and institutional contexts such as schooling, organized sports activities, and work places, to name only a few.

Therefore, people such as peers, parents, teachers, and other mentors play a crucial role in the cognitive development of individuals, notably by mediating learning. The role of such people becomes more crucial in the systematic learning that takes place in learning institutions such as schools, where a particular type of mentor (teachers or materials designers in DE) helps learners acquire knowledge in a pre-planned sequence and according to certain principles. In so doing, mentors should consider mentees' intellectual growth potentials and shape their support accordingly. Vygotsky refers to these potentials as the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), and this concept is the focus of the next section.

2.3.1 The zone of proximal development

Turuk (2008) points out that the ZPD originated in the value that Vygotsky attached to predicting a child's (or any learner's) future capabilities. It is "regarded as a remarkable contribution to the field of education and learning process" (Turuk, 2008, p. 245) and the most celebrated of all the Vygotskian concepts in educational literatures (Chaiklin, 2003). According to Vygotsky,

> the zone of proximal development defines these functions that have not yet matured but are in the process of maturation, functions that will mature tomorrow, but are currently in an embryonic state. These functions could be termed the 'buds' or 'flowers' of development rather than the 'fruits' of development … It [the ZPD] is the distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers (1978, p. 86).

Lui (2012, p. 2) uses the following image to illustrate the ZPD:




Figure 1: The concept of Zone of Proximal Development

Raymond (2000, p. 176) defines the ZPD as the "distance between what children can do by themselves and the next learning that they can be helped to achieve with competent assistance". According to Donald, Lazarus and Lolwana (2002), the ZPD refers to "that critical space where a child [or any other developing person] cannot quite understand something on her [*sic*] own, but has the *potential* to do so through proximal interaction with another person" (2002, p. 59, italics in the original). This is "a space where we can see what an individual might be able to do with assistance" (Johnson and Golombek, 2011, p. 6) from another person who helps him or her to think forward into that space. This other person acts as a mediator and the above definitions stress his or her role in the child's or any other learner's development. In other words, the ZPD can be described as the child's (or learner's) potentials today that may materialize tomorrow under the guidance of a more knowledgeable person. This notion is important because "it provides a particularly important message about how to help learners when they are 'stuck' at any stage in their learning" (Williams and Burden, 1997, p. 65-66) and is, therefore, an important analytical tool in the planning and evaluation of instruction (Hedegaard, 2005).

I suggest that the extent to which the learner's potential is realized is influenced by the nature of social interactions he or she has had with the mediator(s); that is the

type of mediation and how it has taken place. Johnson and Golombek (2011) suggest that the quality of mediation depends on the ability to assess learners' ZPD and to take actions that are within the ZPD (Wessels, 2010) in order to enhance learners' potentials. In fact, effective teaching takes into account what students already understand and what they still need to work on (Lui, 2012). In spite of learning being mainly a learner's activity, mediation (and hence the mediator) is a very important element for successful materialization of the learner's potential.

2.3.2 Mediation

This concept has its origin in Vygotsky's sociocultural theory, particularly with reference to the concept of the ZPD outlined above. It is based on one of the fundamental concepts of sociocultural theory: the claim that the human mind is mediated (Lantolf, 2000). Mediation refers to the way interaction with culture, context, language, and social interaction shapes human cognitive development (Johnson and Golombek, 2011). For Donald, Lazarus and Lolwana (2002), mediation is an action of helping a person to form connecting links in a process of understanding. According to Turuk (2008, p. 251), mediation refers to "the part played by other significant people in the learners' lives, people who enhance their learning by selecting and shaping the learning experiences presented to them." Put differently, mediation refers to the provision of opportunities and a platform by some knowledgeable people for the social interaction that is central to and fosters learning.

Mediation is such an important element in the learning process that Vygotsky considers it the "engine that drives development" (Donald, Lazarus and Lolwana, 2002, p. 59). In fact, it brings into being a series of developmental processes which were not at all possible without it (Hedegaard, 2005). For Vygotsky, the role of a teacher is to facilitate (mediate) learning appropriately in different learning environments, contexts and settings. In effect, mediation emphasizes the role played by human and symbolic intermediaries placed between the individual learner and the material to be learned (Kuzulin, et al., 2003) to solve problems that cannot be

solved in the same way in the absence of these intermediaries (Turuk, 2008). Indeed, conceptual development emerges over time, depending on the agency of the learner and on the affordances and constraints of the learning environment (Johnson and Golombek, 2011).

The idea behind mediation seems to be that a person is able to perform a certain number of tasks alone but will perform more (and eventually better) in collaboration with (a) mediator(s) (Chaiklin, 2003). In this way, mediation is closely related to the ZPD in that its quality largely depends on the ability of the mediator to assess what support the learner needs (Johnson & Golombek, 2011). Therefore, according to Robertson, Fluck and Webb (2003), mediation aims at facilitating effective learning behaviour by

- expanding the learner's zone of proximal development;
- providing the learner with insights into him/herself as a learner;
- providing the learner with insights into the effectiveness of the learner's present capabilities, processes and strategies;
- enhancing the transference of learning into new situations which the learner will encounter;
- increasing the capacity of the learner to scaffold and mediate their own learning in future, and thus, is largely about;
- learning how to learn.

By achieving the above, mediation reduces the need for scaffolding by increasing the capacity of learners to provide their own scaffolding (Robertson, Fluck & Webb, 2003), leading to learner autonomy, what should be the broader aim of all education endeavours (Neupane, 2010). Thus, the end aim of mediation is not to have learners acquire and store and reproduce the information in examinations, but to enable them to use it to develop their independent thinking and problem-solving skills (Williams and Burden, 1997). This is the approach recommended to KIE DE materials designers (KIE, 2009) and is interrogated in this thesis in order to establish whether and how these materials achieve this.

The concept of scaffolding, which is associated with mediation, is defined as the "role of teachers and others in supporting the learner's development and providing support structures to get to that next stage or level" (Raymond, 2000, p. 176), after which the responsibility is shifted to the learners (Turuk, 2008). This responsibility shift is the ultimate aim of scaffolding (Lui, 2012). In other words, when scaffolding learning teachers need to provide temporary supporting structures to help learners develop new understandings that they would not be able to manage on their own (Hammond and Gibbons, 2005). Scaffolding should be continually revised in response to the emerging capabilities of the learner and, once the learner has internalized the problem solving process and can take on the learning responsibility, the teacher should withdraw the scaffold (Turuk, 2008). Thus, the end aim of scaffolding is the learner's capacity to learn on his or her own or to be an autonomous learner, one of Bernstein's (1996) three pedagogic rights.

Such an approach echoes Vygotsky's (1978, p. 86) belief that "what the child is able to do in collaboration today he [sic] will be able to do independently tomorrow." According to Williams and Burden (1997), this is what a sociocultural approach to education advocates: not just a theory based education, but one which develops skills and strategies that enable an individual to continue to learn in order for him or her to develop and grow as a whole person. To achieve this, the approach emphasizes the importance of what the learner brings to any learning situation as "an active meaning-maker and problem-solver" (Turuk, 2008, p. 248). As pointed out by Donato (1994), sociocultural theorists believe that true learning occurs when the learner actively transforms his or her world and does not merely conform to it. This suggests that despite the important role of the mediator in learning, the learner's role in his or her learning remains central and active.

It should be noted that while Vygotsky emphasizes the social environment in the child's or learner's development, he also acknowledges the 'small' role of biological

factors in this process[11]. Turuk (2008, p. 249) notes that according to Vygotsky, the child can operate "only within certain limits that are strictly fixed by the state of the child's development and intellectual possibilities". Therefore, since they are all different, children (or learners) will not necessarily learn the same things and in the same way, despite interacting with the same social environment. Thus, mediation strategies and devices should be diversified in order to accommodate as many types of learners as possible.

To return to mediation, Kozulin (2002, p. 23) points out that many teachers believe that learning materials are so highly structured that the meaning embedded in them is "sufficiently transparent to students and that the situation therefore does not warrant intensive [human] mediation." This is unlikely to be the case for all learning materials but should be the case for well-designed self-instructional or DE materials with built-in mediation. As they use these materials, DE learners should be able to learn on their own because of the ways in which the designers have mediated knowledge. In other words, designers should provide interactive opportunities that assist learners to move through their ZPD. To this end, a number of DE materials design elements need to be taken into consideration. One aim of this study is to identify how much "mediational" work has been done in KIE DE materials for English, notably by investigating the presence or absence of these design elements in these materials.

It is the intention of the designers of the KIE DE programme for English that teacher-learners be provided with guidance in becoming mediators in their turn. In order for them to be able to play this role, KIE DE teacher-learners need different types of knowledge, foremost of which is pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1987). The KIE DE materials aim to meet teachers' needs in this regard in Module 7, *French and English Teaching Methods*. Therefore, mediation in this module is looked at not only in terms of how content is presented on the page, but also, and especially, in

[11] Vygotsky argues that biological factors are insufficient to account for our ability to voluntarily and intentionally regulate our mental activity (Lantolf and Thorne, 2007) and suggests that all higher-level cognition is inherently social (Johnson and Golombek, 2011).

terms of how, and the extent to which, the module prepares teacher-learners to mediate content to their own learners.

However, providing a "range of mediatory practices in the absence of sustained face-to-face contact between a learner and the experienced practitioner of a task" (Moll, 2002, p. 18) is one of the challenges of distance educators. Addressing this challenge in DE materials may be difficult because, before or during the design process, the materials designers may not have enough information on learners' initial and evolving ZPD. However, since feedback in DE materials is, of necessity, anticipatory and not just responsive (Moll, 2002), DE materials designers have to make assumptions about their readers' previous socialisation experiences and about their current developmental level (Reed, 2010) and, according to Moll (2002), to build a learning pathway between learners' already acquired knowledge and what they still need to acquire. DE materials designers can achieve this by using a number of mediation devices and strategies which are unique to or are used in a special way in self-instructional materials. Such devices and strategies include access devices/elements, teaching/learning objectives, teaching/learning activities, feedback, visual elements, layout and a conversational style (see section 6.2 for an extensive discussion). In short,

> the relation between a learner and a more experienced other that characterises spontaneous, face-to-face learner-teacher contacts has to be reproduced in some other form, by means of a combination of materials-mediated activity, training and reflective, experiental learning tasks in local context (Moll, 2002, P. 19).

By way of example, DE materials can respond to learner diversity in terms of levels of knowledge and competence by, for instance, instructing learners to engage in or to bypass certain activities depending on their level of knowledge. Obviously, some materials do this better than others and there is a limit to what DE materials can achieve in offering learning support, no matter how well structured it is (Moll, 2002). This is one of the reasons why contact sessions were added to the correspondence mode of learning, as has been explained in section 1.6.2.

2.3.3 Application of sociocultural theory to language teaching

Sociocultural theory views human learning, including L2[12] acquisition, as heavily dependent on the context in which it takes place (Johnson, 2006) and for which participation in socially-mediated activities is essential (Turuk, 2008). Applying this theory to language teaching, Johnson and Golombek suggest that

> a major contribution that a sociocultural theoretical perspective makes for [*sic*] SLTE is to explicate the relationship between teacher professional development, on the one hand, and the cultural, institutional, and historical situations in which the development occurs on the other (2011, p. 8).

As a result of this relationship, Johnson (2006) suggests, curricula for teacher education which are not linked to the context where the teacher-trainees will be teaching may not be effective. This scholar seems to imply that the approach of "producing generalizable knowledge for teachers" (Muller, 2009, p. 217) or providing them with a 'one size fits all' type of knowledge (Bertram, 2011, p. 13) and considering it enough is inappropriate. This is because context knowledge itself is an integral part of the knowledge that teachers need to have (Olphen, 2008; Bertram, 2011) in order for them to make informed decisions on whether to adopt, question or modify the application of suggested teaching methods and approaches in their classes. Unfortunately, as noted by Johnson (2006), the above approach has long influenced language teacher education, notably by providing teachers with a codified body of knowledge about language, language learning and language teaching without relating it to any particular sociocultural context (Freeman and Johnson, 1998). Connelly and Clandinin (2000), in Bertram (2011), refer to this approach as teacher education 'by injection'.

One possible consequence of the situation outlined in the above paragraph is teachers who know what (and maybe how) to teach but who do not have "the essential procedural knowledge to confront the realities of the classroom" leading to their knowledge and skills being often "disconnected in any substantive way from the practical goal-directed activities of actual teaching" (Johnson and Golombek,

[12] Second Language

2011, p. 2). To counteract this, content should not be separated from pedagogy and the context where it takes place. In fact, "*what is taught* is fundamentally shaped by *how it is taught*, and vice versa. Likewise, *what is learned* is fundamentally shaped by *how it is learned*, and vice versa" (Johnson and Golombek, 2011, p. 3; italics in the original) and, normally, the how largely depends on the teaching/learning context.

A number of scholars have argued that separation between the 'how' of language teaching and the context where it takes place is often the case in countries where English is not a dominant language. One reason for this is that in such countries, teaching methods and materials from the "centre" may be difficult to adapt to local needs and contexts (Leki, 2001). For instance, it is reported that Communicative Language Teaching has failed in South Korea due to limited oral language proficiency of the local teaching force, which has led to teachers continuing to enact curricula in traditional non communicative ways (Johnson, 2006). That is why Freeman and Johnson (1998) suggest that the knowledge-base of foreign-language teachers should include knowledge of the social context of learning (i.e. classrooms), because learning cannot be fully understood without it. The situation in South Korea is not very different from that in Rwanda where both learners' and teachers' proficiency in English is also limited (Sibomana, 2010; Pearson, 2013). Given that the KIE DE programme aims to equip teacher-learners with both content and pedagogic knowledge (KIE, 2009), this study investigates how (if at all) the two are linked to each other (if at all) and how they are situated in the Rwandan context, by analyzing one content module and the single pedagogy module for English.

In order to solve problems related to the separation between teaching methods/approaches and contexts, Freeman and Johnson (1998, p. 405) suggest that the knowledge-base of language teacher education must respond to the question: "who teaches what to whom, where?" In other words, teacher, learner, learning and context variables should all be given due consideration in language teacher education. In their view "language cannot be understood apart from the sociocultural environments in which it takes place and the process of establishing and navigating social values in which it is embedded" (Freeman and Johnson, 1998,

p. 409). For example, instead of teaching SLA (Second Language Acquisition) theories as part of teachers' professional preparation, "attention may be better focused on creating opportunities for L2 teachers to make sense of those theories in their professional lives and settings where they work" (Johnson, 2006, p. 240). Put another way, in course materials theoretical knowledge should be applied, whenever possible, to practical tasks situated in specific contexts.

Based on the claims of scholars such as Shay (2013) that different professions/occupations are underpinned by different kinds of knowledge and thus require different kinds of curriculum, it can be argued that a student specializing in linguistics and one specializing in language teaching should be taught SLA theories differently, because the aims of the two programmes are different. Bartels (1999), in Banegas (2009), makes the claim that, linguistic knowledge will be more meaningful to student-teachers if the latter can see how they can use it for language teaching. Therefore, Bartels continues, "linguistic teaching should be for developing knowledge of interlanguage analysis, and developing skills in analysing second language learning in specific students" (Banegas, 2009, p. 44). In similar vein, I suggest that the KIE DE materials for language teachers should contain many activities which require teacher-learners to reflect on and relate the disciplinary knowledge they acquire from their studies to their classroom contexts, especially because, as in-service teacher-learners, they have the opportunity to do so immediately. This could enable them to establish which approaches and methods work or do not work in particular contexts amongst those suggested in the materials. In fact, as Johnson (2006, p. 240-241) notes,

> knowledge that informs activity is not just abstracted from theory, codified in textbooks, and constructed through principled ways of examining phenomena, but also emerges out of a dialogic and transformative process and reorganizing lived experiences.

In the instructions to its DE materials designers, KIE also emphasizes the importance of creating a link between what DE teacher-learners acquire in the programme and

their teaching context (KIE, 2009). One of the aims of this study is to establish the extent to which these instructions are acted upon by KIE DE materials designers.

With reference to the extent to which teacher education programmes are/should be contextualized, Muller suggests that all teacher education curricula contain elements of both 'conceptuality' and 'contextuality' and can, therefore, "be located along a conceptual-contextual coherence continuum" (2009, p. 217). According to this scholar, a conceptually coherent curriculum (i) has coherence appropriate to a traditional discipline, associated with an epistemological or disciplinary core, (ii) involves highly codified knowledge, with a hierarchy of abstraction and conceptual difficulty and (iii) involves more 'know-why', more research/disciplinary development, and less application/practice. On the other hand, a contextually coherent curriculum (i) has coherence appropriate to a disciplinary region, associated with multiple epistemological sub-cores or interdisciplinary core, (ii) is relatively 'horizontal' and 'applied' and (iii) involves more 'know-how', more application/practice, and less research disciplinary development (Muller, 2009, p. 217).

While some scholars (for example, Freeman and Johnson, 1998; Johnson, 2006; Johnson and Golombek, 2011) insist on the contextualization of teacher education programmes, Muller (2009) introduces a note of caution in relation to such contextualization. He indicates that too much focus on contextual knowledge to the detriment of conceptual knowledge can lead to teacher-learners having important gaps in their disciplinary knowledge. Thus, while contextual knowledge is important, it should not be at the expense of the conceptual knowledge that is essential to professional practice (Muller, 2009). In fact, the issue is not necessarily whether a curriculum is or should be conceptual or contextual, but how it draws from the two types of curriculum coherence to meet teacher-learners' professional needs. These needs include both conceptual and contextual knowledge.

2.4 A constructivist approach to learning

According to KIE (2009, p. 1), KIE DE materials should "help in-service secondary school teachers acquire more subject knowledge, develop their analytical and reflective capacity and improve the quality of their teaching." For this to be achieved, these materials should adopt a learner-centred approach rather than the traditionally content-centred approach of textbooks, engage teacher-learners' experience, help learners apply the knowledge to their own situation and stimulate critical thinking (KIE, 2009). The above statements in the instructions to KIE DE materials designers suggest a constructivist orientation to learning and one element of the analysis undertaken in this study focuses on the orientation(s) to learning evident in the materials that KIE has produced for teacher education. As suggested by Tenenbaum et al. (2001), the concept of constructivism, seems to have crucial implications for instructional design in DE settings.

Constructivism as a theory of knowledge growth and life-long development is built on a philosophy of pragmatism (Schwartz et al., 2009), according to which learning is an active process and knowledge is constructed (Kintsch, 2009). The constructivist theory maintains that individuals create or construct their own new understandings or "individual interpretations of their experiences" (Zarei, 2008, p. 282) through the interaction of what they already know and believe and the ideas, events, and activities with which they come in contact (Cannella & Reiff, 1994) in their immediate learning and broader social environments (Tenenbaum et al., 2001). This suggests that learning is a learner's act in that he or she is the one who constructs knowledge. The constructivist approach is in line with Bernstein's (1996) competence model of pedagogy which focuses more on the learning process and individual learner's achievements than on the learning product and pre-determined learning performances.

The constructivist theory, as well as learner-centred educational practice, gives a central role to the learner whose role "is conceived of as one of building and transforming knowledge" (Zarei, 2008, p. 282) while the teacher becomes a

facilitator of the learning act. This is because constructivism emphasizes knowledge construction rather than knowledge transmission (Zarei, 2008) and the communication between the teacher and the learner is conceived of as a means for "orienting" students' efforts at construction (Larochelle and Bednarz, 1998). Therefore, learners are no longer considered as passive recipients of knowledge but as active organizers and creators of it. Thus, constructivism has a compelling account of an active, engaged learner at the centre of the learning process (Bruner, 1990) for "no matter how much energy and effort we expend, it is the learner who has to do the learning" (Nunan, 1995, in Richards, 2008, p. 164).

Dewey (1916) states that the aim of education is to enable individuals to continue their education, and the overarching aim of learning is continued capacity for growth. Thus learners need to be educated in ways that develop their capacity for lifelong learning and creativity in this ever-changing world by fostering flexibility, creativity, problem-solving ability, information-finding skills and a lifelong readiness to learn (Scardamalia and Bereiter, 1991 & 1996, cited in Daniels, 2001). This is particularly the case for teacher development because it is a life-long process (Crandall, 2000; Solis, 2009) that "can be started but never finished" (Underhill, 1999, in Huimin, 2010, p. 60) and for language teacher education as it "is a life-long process that should occur both inside and outside organized teaching and learning contexts" (Kelly et al., 2004, p. 19). Life-long learning is more relevant in the current rapid rate of knowledge production which requires teachers to continuously update and upgrade their knowledge (Singh and Harris, 2010). In addition, a number of scholars (Lortie, 1975; Murdoch, 1994; Freeman and Johnson, 1998; Valencia, 2009; Singh & Harris, 2010) argue that teachers tend to teach by replicating the practices of their own teacher training classrooms. Thus, for them to be able to teach their learners to constructively adapt to ever-changing teaching/learning environments, teacher educators need to adopt the same approach in their teaching.

As Jordan and Pillay (2009) suggest, the task of an effective teacher is not to make learners memorize and repeat ideas, but to encourage them to think critically and to develop personal values through discussion, exploration and exposure to a variety of

ideas and challenges. Thus one of the aims of this study is to establish whether, how and to what extent KIE DE materials encourage teacher-learners to critically reflect on what they learn. As Fung (2005, p. 175) notes,

> with the growing acknowledgement of the constructivist view of learning and the recognition of the importance of teacher reflection, it is a challenge for distance educators to demonstrate how a learning mode which relies largely on media can promote teachers' construction of their own viewpoints and reflection on their practice.

In relation to constructivist theory, some of its proponents issue a note of caution. First, Gultig (2001) notes that the espousal of constructivism does not mean throwing out all ideas about learning or teaching methods associated with earlier theories because new ideas often build on older ones. Indeed, it is one of several other ways of thinking about how knowledge and understanding are formed (Ismat, 1998). Second, learner-centredness and engagement do not exclude teachers' roles and responsibilities in the learning process (Nunan, 1998). Learning requires some kind of guidance (scaffolding) which can come from the teacher or from the nature and organization of the instructional texts (Kintsch, 2009). For the teacher-learners enrolled in the KIE DE programme, this guidance should come from both the instructional texts and from local tutors and KIE lecturers through weekend tutorials and face-to-face sessions.

Kintsch (2009, p. 234) states that "the level of guidance should support the goal of keeping the learner actively engaged; it must motivate the learner, by challenging him [*sic*] or by interesting him [*sic*], to engage in the laborious task of comprehension." However, the optimal level of guidance (scaffolding) that should be provided for learners is difficult to determine, as it is a function of several factors. These include the nature of the material, the background of the learner, as well as the stage of learning (Kintsch, 2009). Keeping these factors and the purpose of providing learners with guidance in mind, DE materials designers and programme developers may benefit from the following observation offered by Kintsch:

> Minimal guidance, such as in unconstrained discovery learning, is not generally effective, because it makes demands that easily exceed the resources of the learner, especially learners who lack appropriate background knowledge. However, maximal guidance, as in forms of instruction that reduce the learner to a passive information recipient, can also be counterproductive when it prevents the learner from the active, deep processing of the text that is required for the construction of adequate situation models (2009, p. 235).

It is important to note that constructivism is not supported by all educationists. There are those who argue that constructivist pedagogies are inconsistent with cognitive architecture because they withhold information that can readily be told or demonstrated (Kirschner, Sweller and Clark, 2006; Schwartz et al., 2009). Others argue that constructivism presents learners with too much irrelevant information, making this approach inefficient. For such educationists, the best way to teach is to include only relevant information and exclude all "noise" from the instruction (Schwartz, et al., 2009). These critics seem to imply that learning matter should be presented without background information and context. However, as Schwartz et al. (2009, p. 45) note, "if instruction removes all background variability for the sake of efficiency, students will not be prepared for new situations where they must discern on their own what is relevant and what is extraneous." In such a situation, the goal of much formal schooling, which is to provide students with a foundation of knowledge on which they can build new knowledge once they leave school (Schwartz et al., 2009) will hardly be attained.

Kintsch (2009) also criticizes constructivism for extolling the virtues of minimal guidance to learners irrespective of the context. He states that the right amount of guidance is determined by the characteristics of the learner and the to-be-learned material; that it is, therefore, not necessarily minimal guidance. For this reason, Kintsch concludes that "the eventual goal is to have a self-guided learner, but what is the best road to that goal is not so clear, which is one of the things the 'constructivist' controversy is all about" (2009, p. 233). I am not intending to carry this debate any further as it is not the focus of my study.

Constructivism aims to foster critical thinking and to create motivated and independent learners (Gray, 1997) and a teacher who encourages a constructivist approach sees critical thinking as the heart of the teaching and learning process (Davis-Seaver, 2000). Critical thinking enables the learner to adapt to the ever changing teaching/learning environment using his or her knowledge and skills. With reference to KIE DE materials for English, I look at different learning aims and activities and the way designers present the learning material to learners, in order to identify the extent to which they foster critical thinking as recommended (KIE, 2009). Critical thinking is one of the skills needed by teacher-learners and the course designers of KIE DE programme urge materials designers to encourage it (KIE, 2009).

It should be noted that KIE course designers do not use "critical" in the way that this concept is used by critical discourse and critical literacy theorists and researchers such as Fairclough (2003) and Janks (2010). They use it in accordance with Astleitner's (2002, p. 53) understanding of critical thinking as

> a higher order-thinking skill which mainly consists of evaluating arguments. It is a purposeful, self-regulatory judgment which results in interpretation, analysis, evaluation and inference, as well as explanations of the evidential, conceptual, methodological, or contextual considerations upon which the judgment is based.

For Watts (1997, p. 314), critical thinking is "a process of internally examining and exploring issues of concern, triggered by certain experiences, which create and clarify meanings in terms of self and others, and which results in changed conceptual perspectives and relationships." These definitions suggest that the critical thinker brings his or her experiences to the thinking process, which experiences get changed and/or enriched in this process.

According to Nosich (1993), the change resulting from critical thinking is so profound that in the end a critical thinker is not the same person only with better abilities but another person altogether. This happens through objective analysis of opposed arguments or viewpoints, recognizing their relevance (if any). Thus, a person who thinks critically desires to explore alien, potentially threatening viewpoints, and

questions his or her own deeply-held beliefs (Paul, Willsen and Binker, 1993). In fact, as Nosich (1993, p. 17) points out, a critical thinker is

> someone who is able to think well and fair mindedly not just about her [*sic*] own beliefs and viewpoints, but about beliefs and viewpoints that are diametrically opposed to her [*sic*] own. And not just to think about them, but to explore and appreciate their adequacy, their cohesion, their very reasonableness vis-à-vis her [*sic*] own.

This questioning of one's own belief is very important as a factor in the changes aimed at in learning programmes. Indeed, "when a thinker can comfortably question her own deeply-held beliefs, and restructure them when they are found wanting, she [*sic*] can certainly comfortably adapt to the rush of everyday social and technological changes" (Paul, Willsen and Binker, 1993, p. 17). The title of Richard's (1993) book, '*Critical Thinking: What Every Person Needs to Survive in a Rapidly Changing World*', suggests that we all need critical thinking to survive in the current changing world, a view that is held by a number of scholars (e.g. Halpern, 1998; Richard & Elder, 2002). Therefore, it can be argued that all education endeavours should aim at developing learners' critical thinking, among other skills (Facione, 2011), especially because education is training for life (Holowchak, 2009). In effect,

> critical thinking implies a fundamental, overriding goal for education in school and in the workplace: always to teach so as to help students improve their own thinking. As students learn to take command of their thinking and continually to improve its quality, they learn to take command of their lives, continually improving the quality of their lives (Paul, Willsen and Binker, 1993, p. 23).

In order to develop their critical thinking learners need to be involved in learning activities that require and thereby foster critical thinking skills. For Duron, Limbach and Waugh (2006), critical thinking is deemed to take place when students are required to perform at the analysis, synthesis, and evaluation levels of Bloom's (1956) taxonomy. These scholars have also specified what is involved in each of these levels. They state that

> analysis was defined as critical thinking focused on parts and their functionality in the whole. Synthesis was defined as critical thinking focused on putting parts together to form a new and original whole. Evaluation was defined as critical thinking focused upon valuing and making judgments based upon information" (2006, p. 160).

Without downplaying the importance of Bloom's lower levels of cognitive ability (knowledge, comprehension and application), Duron, Limbach and Waugh suggest that "teachers should provide many opportunities for students to engage in the upper levels of Bloom's taxonomy where critical thinking takes place" (2006, p. 161). The extent to which (if any) KIE DE materials designers encourage teacher-learners to think critically in their learning has been interrogated in this study.

2. 5 Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the theories and key concepts that informed this research. These include the theories of the sociologist of education, Basil Bernstein, about curriculum and pedagogy and those of the sociocultural psychologist, Lev Vygotsky, about human cognitive development. The concepts of classification, framing, recontextualization, and competence and performance models of pedagogy from Bernstein's work and those of mediation and the zone of proximal development from Vygotsky's work have been discussed in relation to the materials designed for the KIE DE programme for language teachers. The chapter also discussed the application of sociocultural theory to language teaching and of a constructivist approach to teaching/learning in relation to teacher education. It concludes with the diagram presented on page 60, in which I have attempted to show the relationships between the theories and concepts discussed. In the first half of Chapter Three, content for language teacher education is reviewed. This is followed by a review of literature on mediation strategies in distance learning materials.




Figure 2: Theory and key concepts informing the analysis of KIE DE materials for language teachers

Chapter Three: Literature review

3.1 Introduction
3.2 Knowledge for language teacher education curricula
3.2.1 Propositional knowledge and procedural knowledge
3.2.2 Knowledge for teachers
3.2.3 Knowledge for language teachers
3.2.3.1 Subject content knowledge
3.2.3.2 Content to extend teachers' language proficiency
3.2.3.3 Content to extend teacher-learners' pedagogic content knowledge
3.3 Design and mediation in DE materials
3.3.1 Teaching/learning objectives
3.3.2 Teaching/learning activities
3.3.2.1 Aims, clarity and diversity
3.3.2.2 The intellectual demand
3.3.2.3 The models of presenting content and activities
3.3.3 Visual elements
3.3.4 Layout
3.3.5 Use of a conversational/interactional style
3.3.6 Feedback to learners
3.4 Conclusion

3.1 Introduction

This chapter is divided into two main parts. The first part discusses the content for language teacher education curricula aimed at extending both teachers' subject English content knowledge and their pedagogic content knowledge – PCK (Shulman, 1987) and skills to teach English. The second discusses the designing of distance education materials, focusing on elements that are used to mediate the content in these materials.

3.2 Knowledge for language teacher education curricula

Before addressing the kinds of knowledge that need to be included in language teacher education curricula, I briefly discuss one type of knowledge classification which, I suggest, should inform teacher education curricula developers. This classification divides knowledge into two categories: Propositional and procedural knowledge.

3.2.1 Propositional and procedural knowledge

A number of scholars (for example Ryle, 1945; Carr, 1995; Wagner, 2002; Eraut, 2002; Fantl, 2012, Meadows, 2012) have classified knowledge into two categories: propositional or declarative knowledge (knowledge-that) and procedural knowledge (knowledge-how). Fantl (2012) defines declarative knowledge as explicit knowledge of a fact or, in the words of Wagner (2002), factual knowledge, and procedural knowledge as knowledge that is manifested in the use of a skill. Ryle (1945) refers to these two types of knowledge as "knowing that something is the case" and "knowing how to do things" respectively. Adams (2009) suggests that the distinction between the two types of knowledge is a result of the intuition that the way we know facts seems different from the way we know skills.

Fantl (2012) further divides knowledge-how into two types of knowledge: theoretical and practical knowledge. In the context of teacher professional knowledge, these two types of knowledge-how can be equated with (i) knowledge of how learners learn and how to teach effectively and (ii) the actual ability to teach, which are two aspects of pedagogic content knowledge (Shulman, 1987). Winch (2013) refers to these two categories of knowledge as know-how[13] and knowledge by acquaintance respectively. This further subdivision of knowledge-how might have resulted from the fact that, as Ryle (1945), Eraut (2002) and Fantl (2012) argue, knowing (having theoretical knowledge about) how something is done does not necessarily translate into the ability to do it. To illustrate this argument, Fantl (2012) suggests that someone who learns how to run a restaurant by reading a book and someone who learns about how to run a restaurant by working in a restaurant have different kinds of knowledge about how to run it: the former has theoretical knowledge or what Winch (2013) calls 'know-how' while the latter has what Winch (2013) calls knowledge by acquaintance or practical knowledge.

[13] For Winch (2013) 'know-how' "is a very different form of practical knowledge, one that is formal and is grounded in propositional knowledge and not in everyday experience, ideological underpinnings or tacit knowledge." In other words, he argues that know-how is an integral aspect of propositional knowledge.

It can be argued that the knowledge of the one who learns through reading may not equip him or her to actually run a restaurant effectively. He or she may need to learn how to put the knowledge into practice for a certain period of time in order to acquire the *ability* to run a restaurant because, as Eraut (2001, p.2) argues, "even when ideas on a paper are appreciated and understood, considerable further learning is required to use them in practical situations". Carr (1995) asserts that "a satisfactory account of professional preparation can only be one which tries to do proper justice to the place in such preparation of both theory or rational principles *and* practical experience" (Carr, 1995, p. 314; italics in the original). In his view, practical professional training is primary for teachers (or any other professional), but he also values the role played by theory "not for its own sake, but in order to illuminate, improve and enhance practice" (1995, p.314). In fact, as he goes on to argue, "while theory is certainly not sufficient for effective practice it is *necessary* and practice cannot be regarded as rationally grounded unless guided by theory" (Carr, 1995, p.314; italics in the original).

Some authors argue that while the two types of knowledge are distinct, they are also interrelated (Yilmaz & Yalcin, 2012) and interdependent (Fenstermacher, 1994, Soled, 1995). While the two types of knowledge are likely to be acquired differently, learning each type may be equally challenging and thus both require careful mediation.

It should be noted that the theoretical part of procedural knowledge can easily be included in distance education materials. However, it may be a challenge to help teacher-learners/trainees to develop the practical procedural knowledge that they need, using distance education materials. This is because the teacher educator/trainer is not there to provide practical guidance on how things are done and to help identify and correct the errors that teacher-learners/trainees may make. It seems that the main way (if not the only one) that can be used to address practical procedural knowledge is to include classroom based learning activities and scenarios and encourage the teacher-learners/trainees to critically reflect on these in relation to their own teaching as has been done in some DE materials such as those that are

used in Chapters Five and Six. See pages 182-185 of this thesis for examples of how this can be done.

3.2.2 Knowledge for teachers

According to Ball, Thames and Phelps (2008, p. 389), “there is content knowledge unique to teaching - a kind of subject-matter - specific to professional knowledge.” Citing Pineda (2002), Faez (2011) points out that the term ‘teacher knowledge base’ has been primarily regarded as referring to the basic knowledge and skills required for teaching, that is subject matter knowledge and pedagogic knowledge. More specifically, Moon, Leach and Stevens (2005) suggest that teachers need to know about the subject generally, about the subject as it exists in the curriculum being taught and about the most effective pedagogic strategies associated with it. Shulman terms these three categories of knowledge subject matter knowledge, curricular knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge (PCK).

Shulman (1987) argues that PCK is “the category most likely to distinguish the understanding of the content specialist and that of a pedagogue” (1987, p. 8) and defines it as teachers’ interpretations and transformations of subject-matter knowledge in the context of facilitating student learning. In second/additional or foreign language teaching, PCK refers to “what teachers know about teaching the target language to empower students to communicate across linguistic and cultural borders” (Olphen, 2008, p. 5). PCK is uniquely constructed by teachers, subject specific, deeply rooted in their everyday work and, therefore, an essential component of their on-going learning (Solis, 2009). This significance of PCK in teacher education may have inspired Freeman and Johnson (1998) to call for a 'reconceptualization' of the knowledge base in language teacher education so that teachers focus more on the activity of teaching itself. Johnston and Goettsch go so far as to argue that “language teaching is first and foremost an educational enterprise, not a linguistic one” (Johnston and Goettsch, 2000, p. 438).

3.2.3 Knowledge for language teachers

Day and Conklin (1992), in Day (1993, p. 3-4), describe three components of knowledge for teachers of English as a second or foreign language. The first component is content knowledge which, according to these scholars, includes knowledge of the subject matter or what ESL/EFL teachers teach. Courses in syntax, semantics, phonology and pragmatics and literary and cultural aspects of the English language are some of the examples that they give. To this, Lafayette (1993) in Faez (2011, p. 32) adds knowledge of linguistic structures as well as knowledge of applied linguistics (e.g. knowledge and understanding of second language acquisition, fossilization, input/output processing, contrastive analysis/grammar, and error correction). The second component is pedagogic knowledge or that knowledge of generic teaching strategies, beliefs, and practices, regardless of the focus of the subject matter (how we teach). Day and Conklin suggest that aspects of this type of knowledge include classroom management, motivation and decision making. Shulman (1987) believes that pedagogical knowledge informed by psychology, pedagogy, philosophy among others, is also part of this knowledge. In the KIE DE programme, pedagogic knowledge is offered to all KIE DE teacher-learners through modules in Studies in Education which are not analyzed in this study.

The third and last component is pedagogic content knowledge which, as Day and Conklin point out, refers to the specialized knowledge of how to represent content knowledge in diverse ways that students can understand, how students come to understand the subject matter, what misconceptions and difficulties they are likely to encounter when learning it, and how to overcome these (how we teach ESL/EFL in general; or how we teach ESL/EFL reading or writing in particular, for example). It includes, for example, knowledge about teaching ESL/EFL skills (reading, writing), teaching English grammar, TESOL materials evaluation and development, EFL/ESL testing, TESOL program and curriculum evaluation and development, TESOL methods, etc. (Day and Conklin, 1992, in Day, 1993). Shulman (1987) refers to this category of knowledge as PCK applied to ELT.

In order to assist teacher-trainees to master these three types of knowledge, Day (1993) advises language teacher educators to use an integrative model that involves the student-teacher in reflective and practical activities. For Richards (2008), this integrated model is important because the specialized knowledge base of English language teaching is obtained through both academic study and practical experience. In order for reflective activities to be beneficial, they "have to be a critical part of the students' entire program of studies, […] regardless of the type of knowledge with which they are concerned" (Day, 1993, p. 11) rather than being used occasionally. Therefore, teacher education programmes should encourage the application of content and pedagogic knowledge directly to teacher-learners' own teaching and reflection on this application whenever possible. This reflection is an important catalyst for connecting theory to practice (Valencia, 2009) and, therefore, is likely to improve teacher-learners' teaching. The following sections address different types of content for ESL/EFL teacher education programmes.

3.2.3.1 Subject content knowledge

With reference to content knowledge, a range of scholars have described what a language teacher needs to know about language. For Murray and Christison (2011), teachers of English need to understand how English 'works', how it is learned and their role in the English language classroom. Leach (1995) suggests courses on each of the four language skills (speaking, listening, reading and writing) while Fillmore and Snow (2000) contend that teachers need to know a great deal about oral language and how written language contrasts with speech. Summarizing content knowledge for language teachers, Olphen (2008, p. 4) argues that it encompasses "all the necessary elements that help language learners to communicate both verbally and non-verbally across linguistic and cultural borders." Breaking down content knowledge into courses, Fillmore and Snow (2000) suggest that language teachers should take courses in:

- *Languages and Linguistics*: an introduction to linguistics motivated by such educational considerations as language structure, language in literacy development,

language use in educational settings, the history of English, and the basics of linguistic analysis.

- *Language and Cultural Diversity*: cultural contrasts in language use, particularly in teaching and learning.
- *Sociolinguistics for Educators:* language policies and politics that affect schools, students and language values.
- *Language Development*: issues in language development, with a special focus on academic language development in school-aged children.
- *Second Language Learning and Teaching*: second language instruction and subject-matter instruction in the language that students are acquiring.
- *The Language of Academic Discourse*: the language used in teaching and learning school subjects, especially the structure of academic discourse, and how this register contrasts with that of informal communication.
- *Text Analysis and Language Understanding in Educational Settings*: an examination of how language structures and style in written texts affect comprehensibility, and guide teachers in deciding what aspects of text to target for instructional attention (Fillmore and Snow, 2000, p. 32-34).

It is interesting to note that Fillmore and Snow (2000) do not make explicit reference to grammar which is an important component of language content knowledge. Despite a number of scholars arguing that grammar should be taught implicitly (Canale and Swain 1988; Rutherford, 1988; Lee, 2000; Hinton & Hale, 2001), others (for example Turuk, 2008; Janks, 2009) suggest that teachers need a course about grammar and how to teach it. Janks (2009) argues that language teachers need explicit knowledge about the grammar of the languages they are teaching because such knowledge enables them to choose what to teach so that learners will be able to use the language more effectively.

Furthermore, while “literature as a content area can be used to enrich students' awareness of the linguistic and rhetorical structure of literary discourse” (Akyel and Yalçin, 1990, p. 178), this course is rarely mentioned in the EFL teacher education

curriculum. One exception is the NCATE[14] Program Standards for Foreign Language Teacher Preparation (Faez, 2011).

3.2.3.2 Content to extend teachers' language proficiency

English language proficiency is a serious challenge for all KIE DE teacher-learners as it is for many other educated Rwandans as well (Pearson, 2013). While residential face-face-sessions constitute one of the opportunities for teacher-learners to extend their proficiency, the analysis offered in this thesis is limited to the strategies and opportunities which are available in the modules. In order to do this, it is important to consider literature on the issue of language teachers' proficiency.

Some scholars have argued that language proficiency is the most essential characteristic of a good language teacher (Lange, 1990, in Murdoch, 1994) and a booster of his or her confidence (Murdoch, 1994; Banegas, 2009). Thus, it is no surprise that some teacher-trainees identify language proficiency as their number one priority in the teacher education curriculum, even above ELT methodology (Murdoch, 1994). Indeed, teachers' lack of confidence in their language proficiency affects their teaching skills, subject matter knowledge (Faez, 2011) and their learners' proficiency in the target language (June, 1991; Nel & Müller, 2010). In fact, for the learners in the classes teachers are the main and sometimes the only model of communicative competence in contexts such as Rwanda where English is a foreign language (Banegas, 2009). Therefore, the extension of teachers' language proficiency becomes a particular concern (Howard & McGrath, 1995) and the effectiveness of a pedagogical focus which fails to address this core anxiety is questionable (Murdoch, 1994).

However, there appears to be little literature devoted to content and procedures for systematically extending teachers' language proficiency in teacher education programmes. Indeed, language teacher education itself is an under-researched area

[14] National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education [in the United Staes]

(Peacock, 2009) and related literature is “slight compared with the literature on issues such as methods and techniques for classroom teaching” (Richards & Nunan, 1990, p. xi) and curriculum designers tend to overlook it (Murdoch, 1994). Interestingly, there is a considerable emphasis on proficiency testing for teachers (Norris, 1999; Elder, 2001).

Listening and speaking proficiency can be improved through classroom interactions in a teacher educational programme (White, 2004). However, such interactions are limited in DE as a result of the absence of face-to-face instruction (Haworth & Parker, 1995). Thus, several measures have been taken by DE programme developers to bridge this gap. These include a combination of face-to-face and DE (Haworth & Parker, 1995), which is the case with the KIE DE programme, intensive courses in countries where the target language is widely spoken (Phillips, 1991; Hallam, 1995; Kelly et al., 2004), the use of advanced communication technologies giving learners access to a range of social environments (Jennings, 1995; Beldarrain, 2006), etc. However important they are, these measures do not provide “real” natural interaction settings (with the exception of courses and stays in the target language speaking countries). It should be noted that of these measures KIE uses the mixed mode of DE only, mainly due to lack of funds for implementing other measures.

Apart from the measure mentioned in the above paragraph, a number of tasks can be included in DE materials to help DE learners develop their language proficiency. Hanson and Wennö (2005, p. 291) emphasize the importance of written production for language proficiency by citing Linnarud (1986 p. 23) who argues that “practice in one [language] skill is beneficial to other skills.” Thus writing tasks that engage learners in a deep critical thinking may have a positive effect on other parts of language performance and can compensate for lack of face-to-face interaction (Hanson and Wennö, 2005). One reason for this is that “the students’ written proficiency is the language skill least unfavorably affected in distance learning” (Hanson and Wennö, 2005, p. 292). Some teacher-trainees also indicate that reading/writing activities are of great value in developing speaking skills (Murdoch,

1994). Thus, designers of DE materials for language should include many of these in their materials, as one strategy to extend their learners' proficiency.

3.2.3.3 Content to extend teacher-learners' pedagogic content knowledge

> The teacher can transform understanding, performance skills, or desired attitudes or values into pedagogical representations and actions … so that the unknowing can come to know, those without understanding can comprehend and discern, and the unskilled can become adept (Shulman, 1987, p. 7).

In addition to subject knowledge and proficiency in the language to be taught, teachers of language must have a pedagogic 'knowledge base' (Akbari & Tajik, 2009) from which to teach. For Bertram (2011), such knowledge includes knowing how learners come to know a specific subject (language in this case) and how the context in which they are teaching shapes the teaching and the learning of their subject. Indeed, a teacher may know the correct grammatical forms and rules of English (or any language) but fail to explain them in ways that students can make sense of and can use intentionally (Johnson & Golombek, 2011). The lack of this type of knowledge has been identified as a serious challenge for EFL teachers in some Asian countries as their pre-service education focused on linguistics and literature at the expense of teaching practice (Huimin, 2010). This situation may result from a long-standing separation between what to teach and how to teach, positioning pedagogical knowledge as secondary to disciplinary knowledge of a particular field (Johnson and Arshavskaya, 2011).

It is frequently argued that the main purpose of teaching a language is to enable learners to communicate in it (e.g. Ellis, 1996), which suggests a strong relationship between language and communication. Indeed, many of the scholars who have defined what language is (for example, Sapir, 1921; Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000; Downing and Locke, 2002; Ghose, 2004; Evans & Green, 2006; Andrewes, 2011) have had communication at the centre of their definitions. For instance, (Andrewes, 2011,

p. 5) argues that “language is communication by its very nature”. Downing and Locke (2002) consider it impossible to isolate a language from its communicative purpose. This may be why Spolsky (1998, p. 44) argues that “languages are not just known, but used” in order to ‘get our ideas across’ (Evans & Green, 2006). Therefore, a general theory of second/additional or foreign language learning must allow for all the complexity of what it means to know and use a language (Spolsky, 1998) or, in other words, to have communicative competence.

Communicative competence

The concept of communicative competence was proposed by Hymes (1972), who argued that the ‘appropriateness of sociocultural significance of an utterance’ (and not its correct form) should be the focus of language learning (Canale and Swain, 1980). This is because contextual relevance is important for one’s knowledge of language since meaning in communication is context dependent (Hymes, cited in Kamiya, 2006). In fact, for someone to say that they know a language, they must know “when to speak, when not, … what to talk about with whom, when, where, in what manner” (Hymes, 1972, p. 277). In sum, a competent language user should know how to express him or herself and how to interpret other people’s language according to the context. For Canale and Swain (1980, p. 29-30), such a user needs to have four competences:

1. *Grammatical competence*: knowledge of lexical items and of rules of morphology, syntax, sentence-grammar semantics, and phonology;
2. *Sociolinguistic competence*: sociocultural rules of use and rules of competence;
3. *Discourse competence*: the ability to combine language structures into different structures of cohesive texts (e.g. political speech, poetry);
4. *Strategic competence:* verbal and non-verbal communication strategies that may be called into action to compensate for breakdown in communication due to performance variables or to insufficient competence.

In order for these four types of competence to be addressed, much of the current literature (for example Richards, 2006; Scheckle, 2009; Belchamber, 2010; Andrewes, 2011; Illés, 2012) in the field of language teaching argues that communicative

approaches to language teaching should be adopted by second/additional and/or foreign language teachers.

Communicative Language Teaching

Communicative approaches to language teaching came about as a result of language being looked at in terms of its function in social transactions, echoing Vygotsky's ideas of the role of language as a social tool for communication (Turuk, 2008). Its main aim is to prepare learners for a role in a foreign language speech community (Andrewes, 2011). Therefore,

> Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) advocates teaching practices that develop learners' abilities to communicate in a second language. It represents a change of focus in language teaching from linguistic structure to learners' need for developing communication skills (Chang, 2011, p. 17).

Illés (2012, p. 505) suggests that language teaching programmes should "enable learners to cope with the challenges of communication in the twenty-first century" notably by emphasizing language use over form.

It should be noted, however, that what makes CLT unique is not a focus on communication; with the exception of adherents of grammar translation method, communication has always been the objective of language teaching (Savignon, 1983; Paulston, 1992; Andrewes, 2011), though perhaps to different extents. What makes CLT unique is its emphasis on *how* to help learners achieve communicative competence: "using English [or any other language] to learn it" (Howatt, 1984, p. 279). This is why teachers who take a communicative approach try to give learners many opportunities to speak, read and write in the target language (Scheckle, 2009).

While little has been written about the learning theory on which CLT is based (Richards and Rodgers, 2001), the following are the elements of an underlying learning theory:

- *The communication principle*: activities that involve real communication promote learning;
- *The task principle*: activities in which language is used for carrying out meaningful tasks promote learning;
- *The meaningfulness principle*: language that is meaningful to the learner supports the learning process. Learning activities are consequently selected according to how well they engage the learner in meaningful and authentic language use rather than merely mechanical practice of language patterns (Richards and Rodgers, 2001, p. 161).

These principles imply a central and active role of the learner in the learning process, which makes CLT a learner-centered (Al-Humaidi, 2007) and an experience-based (Richards and Rodgers, 2001) approach to language learning. As explained by Scheckle (2009), CLT means that "the learner's learning is more important than the teacher's teaching." This learner-centered pedagogy is the approach which KIE claims to adopt in its academic programmes (Rutebuka, n.d), and should be apparent in the KIE DE materials that are a focus of this study.

Despite its merits, CLT has been accused of placing heavy demands on the learner and having difficult requirements in terms of logistics (Al-Humaidi, 2007), neglecting the learning context (Bax, 2003) and of imposing imported methodologies and denying the teacher's creativity in class (Hu, 2005). However, CLT, as an approach based on a diverse set of principles that reflect a communicative view of language and language learning, can be used to support a wide variety of classroom procedures (Richards & Rodgers, 2001) and can be adapted to various contexts, in different ways, depending on the teaching context, learners' age, level, learning goals, etc. (Richards, 2006). It can, and in the view of some authors should, be used in tandem with various methods because, as Belchamber (2010, p. 62) argues, "if CLT is our single, overriding approach, we are restricting ourselves and ignoring the needs of the disparate environments that are our teaching settings."

Other challenges of implementing CLT include big class sizes, the pressure to cover the curriculum, lack of resources to support the dynamic teaching required for communicative methods (Burnaby & Sun, 1989) and grammar-focused exams (Jin, Singh & Li, 2005; Belchamber, 2010). These, however, are not insurmountable. What seems more difficult is the creation of an atmosphere of genuine communication (which is a requirement for CLT [Canale and Swain, 1980]) in the target language for learners who have no real-life need for communication in that language (Burnaby and Sun, 1989), while the classroom itself is not conducive to "real-life exchanges in English" (Belchamber, 2010, p. 61). The challenges become more daunting when learners and teachers do not have the required minimum target language skills to be able to communicate (Burnaby and Sun, 1989) as is often the case in Rwanda, while teachers using the CLT approach need to provide reliable language models to learners (Andrewes, 2011). This may be why Scheckle (2009) suggests that CLT works better in a second language context rather than in a foreign language context such as Rwanda. It should be noted that the O'Level curriculum for English states that "the role of the teacher is to help the students acquire communicative competence using appropriate methods and approaches" (Rwanda National Curriculum Development Centre - NCDC, 1998, p. 2). Therefore, this study investigates how the KIE DE materials that are designed for teachers of English prepare them for the above role in an EFL context, notably by indicating to them how to adopt communicative approaches such as CLT in their classes.

In addition to the critiques and challenges of implementation discussed in the previous paragraphs, some misconceptions have emerged about the CLT approach. Thompson (1996) has identified four of these. The first one is "CLT means not teaching grammar", which seems to result from the fact that CLT was "a reaction against the heavy emphasis on structure at the expense of natural communication" (1996, p. 10). Such a focus on structure has been the dominant approach in the teaching of English in Rwanda, and is believed to be responsible for the limited proficiency in this language among educated people (Sibomana, 2010). However, instead of precluding the teaching of grammar, CLT advocates the teaching of

grammar in a way that allows learners to internalize (not memorize) and use it (Wang, 2010).

The second misconception, “CLT means teaching only speaking”, resulted from CLT being influenced by “the general movement in linguistics towards giving primacy to the spoken language” (Thompson, 1996, p. 11) and from the fact that “for many learners, the main uses that they are likely to make of the language are oral” (p. 12). On the contrary, however, the possibility for a teacher to integrate all four language skills into a curriculum, and even into one lesson is one of the major advantages of CLT (Geyser, 2008).

The third misconception is that “CLT means pair work, which means role play” (Thompson, 1996, p. 12). The problem here is not the use of pair work or role play per se (as they are good strategies to get learners involved) but how they are used. Thompson points out that instead of taking pair work as a way to get all learners practicing [the same thing] at the same time, it should be used “as a potential preliminary stage to any contribution from the learners” (1996, p. 13), by allowing them to freely discuss a topic within the limits of the lesson.

The fourth and last misconception is that “CLT expects too much from the teacher” (Thompson, 1996, p. 13). As CLT lessons tend to be less predictable, teachers have to be ready to listen to what learners say and not just how they say it, they have to use a wider range of management skills than in the traditional teacher-dominated classroom, etc. Thompson acknowledges that these are often features of lessons in which a CLT approach is used, but calls them a misconception because while they are used as reasons to reject CLT, they can also be presented as reasons to embrace it. They give teachers the opportunity to re-evaluate their beliefs and practices, to develop their skills, to enjoy themselves in their work and to avoid dull repetition of the same predictable set of materials or activities (Thompson, 1996).

It should be noted that some language pedagogy scholars (for example Andrewes, 2011) suggest that the teaching of English has entered a post-communicative

language learning era because “the social context that gave rise to classical CLT teaching can be seen to have changed discernibly in the last two decades” (Andrewes, 2011, p. 8). This social context, according to Andrewes, is that people no longer learn English in order to use it in an English-speaking country, but in companies and/or organization that have chosen English as a lingua franca for exchanges in which very few or no native speakers are involved. In such exchanges, numerous issues that were emphasized by CLT (minor grammatical inaccuracies, native speaker-like cultural references, etc.) are no longer relevant for the needs of average English Lingua Franca (ELF) language users. However, Andrewes himself admits that ‘post-communicative’ is not a useful concept because it implies that communication is no longer the aim while language teaching “has by its very nature always been communicative” (p. 11).

Many language education scholars have written about the teaching of various aspects of a language curriculum in a communicative way or, in other words, using CLT. Relevant literature is discussed in Chapter Five in the sections in which I analyze the teaching of reading, writing, listening, speaking and vocabulary in the KIE DE materials (see section 5.2.2).

3.3 Design and mediation in DE materials

In spite of the current importance and practicality of online materials (Guri-Rosenblit, 2009), print is still the dominating medium used in DE in some education contexts such as that of teacher education in Rwanda. For both print and online materials, DE materials designers need to make sure that “the materials are self-instructional, the content is appropriate, its presentation is interesting to the learners, the subject matter is logically and gradually developed in simple language to motivate the students to complete their studies” (Mishra, Ahmad & Rai, 2001, p. 53). Rowntree (1990) states that the purpose of a DE materials writer is not simply to have his/her learners read and remember but to have them read and understand the materials in such a way that they can relate the content to what they already know

and apply it in new situations. KIE urges its DE materials designers to assist teacher-learners to achieve the above by stimulating, provoking, and challenging the teacher-learners to acquire new skills and knowledge (KIE, 2009). Given that DE materials are meant to be self-instructional (Lockwood, 1997), they should be different from text/reference books written for on-campus students. Lockwood (1997) differentiates between self-instructional materials and textbooks as follows:

Textbooks	**Self-instructional materials**
- Assume interest	- Arouse interest
- Written for teacher use	- Written for learner use
- No indication of study time	- Give estimate of study time
- Designed for wide market	- Designed for particular learners
- Rarely state aims and objectives	- Always give aims and objectives
- Usually one route through	- May be many ways through it
- Structured for specialists	- Structured according to needs of learner
- Little or no self-assessment	- Major emphasis on self-assessment
- Seldom anticipate difficulties	- Alert to potential difficulties
- Occasionally offer summaries	- Always offer summaries
- Impersonal style	- Personal style
- Dense content	- Content unpacked
- Dense layout	- More open layout
- Readers' view seldom sought	- Learner evaluation always conducted
- No study skills advice	- Provide study skills advice
- Can be read passively	- Require active response
- Aim at scholarly presentation	- Aim at successful teaching

Table 1: Differences between textbooks and self-study materials

The pedagogy in the KIE DE material is supposedly in accordance with the guidelines contained in a handbook for course writers. This handbook is intended for all KIE DE course materials designers, irrespective of the subjects for which they design the materials. It suggests that the materials should be:

- complete: with no missing parts: activities, blocks summaries, references etc.,
- effective: maintaining learners' attention, using an informal friendly tone and style, many in-text questions and feedback; identify difficulties and suggest possible solutions, and

- self-sufficient: include all necessary information so that a learner will not need to look for other resources which are not available (KIE, 2009).

Concerning the teaching approach, KIE DE materials designers are advised to adopt "a learner-centred approach … engage students' experience and take into account the needs of the learners" (KIE, 2009, p. 2). With reference to mediation, the handbook suggests that DE materials should:

- always give learning objectives to orient learners' attention;
- guide, motivate, explain and assess the learning progress;
- stimulate, provoke, and challenge students to acquire new skills and knowledge;
- break content into manageable blocks, sections with study time;
- provide introductions and summaries within the module and within individual units;
- help learners apply the knowledge to their own situation;
- use a clear, concise and effective communication with each learner. In DE text, there should not be any room for misunderstanding;
- use a direct, simple, conversational style of writing;
- use a more personal, informal and interactive style than in books;
- use attractive visual presentation with enough white space in the margin to allow learners add their own comments;
- use a style that enables the student to interact with the material rather than passively read from the beginning to the end of each block (KIE, 2009, p. 2-3).

These instructions are in line with Lockwood's aforementioned characteristics of good DE materials and with what Leach considers as characteristics of quality DE materials: "good layout, use of headings, clarity of instructions, good contextualization, referral back to previous learning, clear learning aims, summarization and review and consistency of style and presentation" (1995, p. 36). One aim of this research is to investigate the extent to which these relevant instructions are taken into consideration by KIE DE module designers. This is the focus of Chapter Six. The next sections of this chapter are devoted to a discussion of mediation elements in DE materials.

3.3.1 Teaching/learning objectives

According to Race (1992, p. 47), “an objective is a statement of what your learners should be able to do when learning has been achieved successfully” or, in other words, a statement of intended outcomes (Mishra, 2004). Objectives reflect a desired change in the learners’ behaviour resulting from the involvement in a learning process (Mishra, 2005). Thus, they are part of the teaching/learning process and an essential component of self-instructional materials (Mishra, 2005), notably because they determine the kind of interaction that learners need to have with the materials for them to learn (Phillips, 2007). As a result, they need to be aligned with the overall purpose of learning (Biggs, 2003).

Clear objective statements are considered to be important in DE: they tell learners what they are expected to get out of the materials and they help materials designers decide what to put into these (Rowntree, 1994). According to Rowntree (1992, p. 52), teaching/learning materials are most effective if they are driven by precise objectives because “if the view of learning held by developers is trivial or irrelevant, nothing will reveal this more quickly than a glance at their suggested objectives.” In DE, learners, who are adults, need to understand the value of what they are required to learn, an issue that is addressed by the statement of objectives (Siminyu & Kisiki, n.d.). Thus, objectives work as a road map for the learning journey, showing learners where they are heading to (Rahman, 2006). Therefore, objectives should cover the entire section in question (Rahman, 2006) helping to define the depth to which that content is to be studied (C.O.L., 2005) because DE learners make use of these to work through the materials (Mishra and Gaba, 2001).

It should be noted that Holmberg (1995) disagrees with behavioural objectives on the grounds that verbal descriptions of what learners should be able to do have limitations. For him, such descriptions focus not on what learners should learn or know, but on what they should be able to do after the course of study and on their responses [to stimuli], rather than what they think or feel as indicators of learning. In addition, behavioural objectives expect all learners to have very similar responses as

a result of learning, while each learner constructs his or her own knowledge personally (Williams & Burden, 1997; Tenenbaum et al., 2001) and, therefore, "students learn different things from the same course" (Holmberg, 2005, p. 168). In this study, however, statements of behavioural objectives will be used as a benchmark for analyzing objectives in KIE DE materials, despite the above identified limitations. This is because, in addition to KIE (2009) instructing its DE materials designers to set such objectives, several DE scholars (for example IGNOU, 1989, 2000; Sharma, 2000; Mishra, 2004 & 2005) support the use of these. For instance, Mishra (2005) argues that formulating objectives in behavioural terms is one of the criteria to measure the quality of DE materials. One advantage of behavioural objectives is that they enable learners to know what they must learn or achieve in a particular unit (IGNOU, 1989). With reference to explicitness and the level of knowledge that the objectives aim to encourage, Shabani and Okebukola (2001, P. 83) suggest that course objectives need to "extend beyond the assimilation of knowledge to the skills which students should be able to develop in order to review, analyze, synthesize, apply and communicate what they have learned."

3.3.2 Teaching/learning activities

This section addresses teaching/learning activities as discussed in the distance education literature. It focuses on several aspects of these, including aims, clarity, variety, the intellectual demand that they place on teacher-learners, the roles that teacher-learners are expected to play as readers and the kind/s of learning approach/es that they are encouraged to adopt. Teaching/learning activities refer to the tasks given to learners by the teacher in order to help them to learn actively. They constitute opportunities to realize key learning objectives (Lockwood, 1992) because learners are likely to be able to use important ideas once these are made the subject of an activity (Rowntree, 1990). Thus, activities need to be closely aligned with objectives (Phillips, 2007) and every objective in a distance education module should be covered by some learner activity. This approach encourages active learning (Race, 1992), application of and reflection on what is learned and its

implications (Lockwood, 1992). In this regard, Lockwood identifies five assumptions behind the design of activities in DE materials:

- activities are an integral part of the teaching;
- interest and enthusiasm can be created via activities;
- a variety of format and types of activities avoids the danger of teaching becoming stale through repetitive and predictable exercises;
- activities contribute to the order and structure of the material;
- completion of activities fosters learner independence (1995, p. 73).

Given their association with active learning and learning by doing (Rowntree, 1990), learning activities are particularly important in DE: "the quality of an open learning module is closely connected to the quality of the things learners DO while using it" (Race, 1992, p. 61, capitals in the original). Therefore, as Lusunzi (1999, p. 4) argues, "the use of instructional activities to effect better distance teaching is not optional, but mandatory." In addition, learning activities influence how learners learn. For instance, "students will adopt a surface approach if they perceive [from activities] that it is what the course and assessment requires or if that approach best enables them to deal with the demands of the course" (Kember, 2000, p. 108). Thus, care needs to be taken to produce high quality learning activities in DE materials.

The views of learners using DE materials also indicate the importance of learning activities. In a survey conducted by Duchastel and Whitehead (1980), reported in Lockwood (1992), these researchers found that for a unit that did not contain any activities, nearly 60% of the students said the absence of these hindered their study. This supports Lockwood's claim that learners regard activities as "contributing to their understanding of the course content, the particular ideas, relationships, procedures and techniques that are at the centre of the teaching" (Lockwood, 1992, p. 100). Moreover, activities contribute to the interactive nature of DE materials (Gachuhi & Matiru, 1989; Lusunzi, 1999), hence the reference to them as 'interactive devices' by Mishra and Gaba (2001).

While Rowntree (1990) argues that there are no specific rules regarding the frequency of activities in DE materials, he suggests that designers should not present

more than three pages of reading without asking learners some questions or to do some tasks. He states that what learners have been reading about will have been forgotten after reading four to five pages without being required to do something. Such a situation may give learners the impression that they are not reading to learn and, therefore, rob the materials of their teaching nature. Thus the frequency of activities in DE materials should be relatively high.

Two types of questions constitute activities: (1) Self-Assessment Questions (SAQ) and (2) In-Text Questions (ITQ). Rowntree (1990) notes that the former may appear severally together at the end of approximately an hour of reading in order to test major objectives. They can be equated to the evaluation that comes at the end of a lesson. Race (1992) considers them to be the most important single factor that governs successful learning in DE materials. They are "essential both in facilitating the processing of texts and in providing learners with feedback on the effectiveness of their processing" (Howard and McGrath, 1995, p. 9).

While I recognize the importance of SAQs in learning, I suggest that they should always be accompanied by appropriate and timely feedback and used in tandem with ITQs. In fact, SAQs seem to be mainly meant for learners to check how much they have learned. Thus they are reactive rather than proactive and may, therefore, not necessarily help learners to learn. As for, ITQs, they are rhetorical questions used at frequent intervals to create a dialogue between the instructional materials and the learner (Lusunzi, 1999) and between the designer and the learner to make conversation flow and to promote interactive learning (Rowntree, 1990; Shabani & Okebukola, 2001). These can be compared to the frequent questions that a teacher asks in a class in order to stimulate learners' thinking about the content and issues being studied. The teacher (DE materials writer) may build on answers likely to be given by learners to introduce and teach new content rather than merely using SAQs to check how much learning has occurred.

Despite the importance of activities in learning, distance learners may not always complete them (Rowntree, 1992; Lockwood, 1992; Holmberg, 1995) but jump

immediately to the answers if these are provided (Ipaye, 2005). Two reasons for this are the trivial or the time consuming nature of some activities (Mishra and Gaba, 2001). To increase the likelihood of students attempting activities, Lockwood (1992) and Mulphin (1995) suggest simple techniques such as providing a space within the activity for students' answers and providing a time indication for the activities. In short, great care needs to be taken to set activities in such a way that learners are encouraged to attempt them.

With reference to the positioning of activities and corresponding follow-up feedback/answers and/or comments, Lockwood identifies three common formats:

- *throughout the text* – at the point when questions are posed with immediate follow-up comment;
- *in a separate activity booklet* – to which the learner is referred for both the task(s) and feedback provided;
- *grouped at the beginning or end of sections –as pre- or post-tests –*, with answers grouped in a series of appendices (1992, p. 84).

The first format is consistent with the tutorial-in-print model (which is recommended to KIE DE materials designers) and is often the most natural and engaging method to adopt (Lockwood, 1992). In order for this format to be effective, learners should attempt the questions before looking up answers (Mulphin, 1995). This may be why KIE places answers at a distance from the activities (at the end of a block). While this may not necessarily prevent those who are determined to ignore the question from turning immediately to the answer (Lockwood, 1992), it can, at least, encourage those who wish to attempt the activities to do so. The second format has more to do with financial reasons than pedagogic ones because integrating activities in DE materials can result in expensive print costs (Lockwood, 1992). As for the third format, it is used for diagnostic reasons: to identify what learners know about the topic, subject, theme, etc. to be studied (or that has been studied) so that decisions can be made on how to present the new content. From a pedagogic viewpoint, I suggest that the first format is the most helpful for actual learning since follow-up comments help learners to continuously check their progress and adapt their learning accordingly.

A possible negative side of activity questions in DE materials is that learners may think that getting correct answers (similar to designers' model answers) to these questions means achieving learning aims. Thus, they may be tempted not to think beyond the confines of these questions. As a solution, Marland and Store (1982), in Holmberg (1995), suggest that the purposes of model answers or solutions and how to use them should be explained to students. Another challenge is the control exerted by the tutorial-in-print model over students since they have to be kept within known (or assumed) parameters to enable specific feedback to be given (McKillop, 1998). This may limit students' creativity in their engagement with self-instructional materials. To minimize all the above mentioned possible shortcomings, materials designers need to take features of good learning activities into consideration. The following sections discuss some of these.

3.3.2.1 Aims, clarity and diversity

Lockwood (1992) suggests that if the activities give reasons why they are worth completing, students are more likely to invest in them. In addition, designers must make sure that activities and related instructions are as clear as possible: "the activities should be unambiguous; the students shouldn't have to second guess. The instructions should be clear and the questions should be answerable, unless they are being used to develop critical thinking and they are of the open-ended, 'what if' type" (Swales, 2000, p. 3). In order to help learners identify the activities in self-instructional texts, Lockwood (1992) advises designers to use the 'student stopper'. He suggests that the 'student stopper' can take the form of a narrow frieze across the page, a row of keyboard characters, a bold line, icons and typographical symbols (questions marks, traffic lights, quill pens and pencils, etc.), indenting activities, putting them in a box or using a different type of face or colour for them, etc.

One other feature of activities that can increase the likelihood of learners attempting the activities is "to provide a diversity of activity types to meet individual needs and study styles" (Fung, 2005, p. 182). Diversity helps avoid monotony (Rowntree, 1990) and boredom resulting from dealing with the same type of activity throughout the

materials. In fact, in the same way variety is built into face-to-face teaching, activities of differing formats should also be incorporated into DE materials in order to vary intellectual demands (Lockwood, 1992). Thus Rowntree (1990) suggests that designers should strive for balance between brief activities and lengthy ones, those requiring written answers and those merely requiring thoughts, closed questions and open questions. Variety in questions also encourages learners to use different skills and think from different perspectives and at different levels (Lockwood, 1992). In short, the more varied the activities are, the more interesting and constructive they are likely to be for learners, and the less the risk of learners skipping them (Race, 1992).

3.3.2.2 The intellectual demand

If it is accepted that the purpose of education is to stimulate inquiry skills and knowledge creation rather than encouraging learners to memorize a body of knowledge (Jordan & Pillay, 2009), DE materials designers should set activities that encourage learners to go beyond memorization. During an investigation of the activities within the Open University Arts foundation course by Henderson (1977), cited in Lockwood (1992), it was concluded that the activities pitched at a low level and perceived as trivial, were invariably ignored. Such activities had major implications for further study as they discouraged students from attempting further activities. Thus, activities should be challenging enough for students to estimate that by attempting them they will get new insights into the study matter. With reference to this, Pearson and Johnson (1978) in Phillips (2007), identify three types of questions:

- *text-explicit questions* or factual recall questions testing key information that students have to understand and remember. For example, '*What is the hidden curriculum?*'
- *text-implicit questions* requiring learners to do some sort of inferencing and 'read between lines'. For example, '*Why do you think the Taba model is called the grass-roots model?*'

- *script-based questions* requiring learners to use their prior knowledge or schema to answer the questions. For example, '*Give specific examples of constructivism in your classroom.*' (2007, p. 5).

According to Phillips (2007), text-implicit and script-based questions encourage learners to make connections among the ideas within the chapter and connections with their experiences in the workplace (integration). These connections are crucial in in-service teacher education if teacher-learners are to be encouraged to link what and how they learn to what and how they teach in their classrooms. While text explicit questions also help in learning, they are less likely to foster learners' critical thinking abilities. Therefore, these questions should be much fewer than those which require the "highest levels of creativity, interaction, and production from the trainees" (Murdoch, 1994). In effect, as Phillips (2007) argues, effective teaching encourages learners to bring their own experiences and examples to learning and to use and apply the ideas in the materials in their work or personal life. The extent to which this is done depends on the level of engagement that learning activities expect from learners. In order to explain the different levels of learning engagement, Freebody and Luke (1990) developed the Four Roles/Resources Model while Biggs (1987) came up with deep and surface approaches to learning.

The role of the reader (the Four Roles/Resources Model)

Freebody and Luke (1990) have identified four roles of a successful reader which they summarize as follows: code breaker (decoding the codes and conventions of written, spoken and visual text), text participant (comprehending written, spoken and visual texts), text user (understanding the purpose of different texts for different cultural and social functions) and text analyst (understanding how texts position readers and listeners).

Freebody (1992) posits that a successful reader needs to develop and sustain these resources to play the above four roles in his or her engagement with text. In educational contexts, the level at which learners play the four roles in reading

educational texts will depend on, among other factors, the way related learning (and assessment) activities are set. For example, if these activities require learners to be code breakers and text users only, these learners may not play the text participant and text analyst roles. In so doing, learners may not develop complete understanding of the content of the texts that they read.

That is why, in their further notes on the Four Resource Model, Freebody and Luke (1999) indicate that effective literacy draws on a repertoire of practices that allow learners to play the four roles effectively, as they engage in reading and writing activities. In other words, any reading and writing activity should encourage learners to climb the ladder up to the text-analyst level which is related to critical thinking (Freebody and Luke, 1999), one of the prime aims of education. In fact,

> all of these four roles form part of successful reading as our culture currently demands it and … therefore, any program of instruction in literacy … needs to confront these roles systematically, explicitly, and at all developmental points (Freebody, 1992).

I suggest that this is still a challenge for many educational programmes as teachers themselves may not be able to play all these roles. It is important, therefore, to examine whether and how (if at all) the needs of teacher-learners in the KIE DE programme are addressed in this regard, by looking at the approach to learning that the programme adopts.

Deep and surface approaches to learning

According to Warren (2004), approaches to learning describe what students do when they go about learning and why they do this in particular ways. In this regard, two approaches (a deep approach and a surface approach) have been identified by Biggs (1987), describing the ways in which students engage in the context of the specific task to be accomplished (Beattie, Collins & McInnes, 1997).

As implied by their names, these two approaches differ in terms of how deeply (or how shallowly) they encourage learners to engage with the learning matter. Learners using a deep approach draw on their background knowledge to develop their own understanding and interpretation of what they learn. According to Warren (2004) deep learning involves a critical analysis of new ideas, leading to understanding and long-term retention of these to be used for problem solving in unfamiliar contexts. Thus, this approach should be encouraged in teacher education, particularly because teachers need to apply what they learn to their ever-changing classroom contexts.

In contrast to deep learning, "surface learning is the tacit acceptance of information and memorization as isolated and unlinked facts" (Warren, 2004)[15]. Learners using this approach only read and reproduce what they learn, usually without much thinking about what it means to them individually; they neither internalize it nor relate it to what they already know. That is why they are likely to find it difficult to recognize the same matter presented differently or in a different context. Entwistle and Entwistle (1991, p. 206) summarized the differences between the two approaches in the table on the next page:

[15] The chapter from Warren's (2004) book was accessed online at ttp://stbweb02.stb.sun.ac.za/tutors/documents/deep%20and%20surface%20approaches%20to%20learning.pdf. Page numbers were not indicated; this is the reason why the page is not indicated for the above quotation.

Approach[16]	Orientation	Characteristics
Deep approach	**Knowledge transforming**	- Intention to understand for oneself - Interacting vigorously and critically with the content - Relating ideas to previous knowledge and experience - Integrating components through organising principles - Relating evidence to conclusions - Examining the logic of the argument
Surface approach	**Knowledge reproducing**	- Intention simply to reproduce parts of the content - Accepting ideas and information passively - Concentrating only on assessment requirements - Not reflecting on purpose or strategies - Memorising facts and procedures - Failing to distinguish guiding principles or patterns

Table 2: Defining features of deep and surface approaches to learning

Warren (2004) argues that the adoption of either of the two approaches by learners depends on the design of the learning opportunities. In other words, teachers and other designers of learning such as DE materials designers are the ones who strongly influence the approach that learners will take in their learning notably through learning/teaching and/or assessment activities and objectives. If all these activities and objectives demand is the reproduction of information, learners will probably adopt a surface approach. However, if the activities encourage learners to critically think about what they are reading, they are likely to adopt a deep approach. With reference to which of the two approaches is more effective, Biggs (1987) holds the view that teaching that induces surface learning does not produce effective learning as it encourages memorizing and regurgitation. For him, teaching needs to encourage deep learning; constructive alignment (Biggs, 1996 & 2003) is a powerful way of achieving this. Thus, teaching/learning aims, objectives, approaches, methods, and outcomes should be aligned constructively; that is, they all should encourage learners to adopt active and deep learning approaches so that "it is difficult [for learners] to escape without learning what is intended should be learned" (Biggs, 2003a, p. 1).

[16] Label added by the writer of this thesis

3.3.2.3 The models of presenting content and activities

Another important element of DE materials is the choice of model for presenting content and learning activities (Holmberg, 1995). Lockwood (1994) identifies three models for presenting learning matter (or devising activities) in self-instructional materials: tutorial-in-print, reflective action guide and dialogue. A number of DE scholars (such as Rowntree, 1994; Howard and McGrath, 1995; Cadorath, Harris and Encinas, 2002; Mishra and Panda, 2007; Reed, 2010) have discussed these models. As the tutorial-in-print model is the one explicitly stated in the instructions to KIE DE materials designers (KIE, 2009), the analysis focuses mainly on this model and how it is adopted (if at all) in KIE DE materials for English.

The tutorial-in-print model was devised by Rowntree (1990) as a simulation of a tutorial in face-to-face teaching because whatever course developers want to say to the individual learner needs to be written. According to Lockwood (1992), materials designers using this model should consider what the teacher would be doing and what the learner would be expected to do, in a situation whereby the teacher aims to teach a topic as effectively as possible. Learners are expected to participate in discussion and in an array of activities (such as exercises and questions) for which the tutor provides support and feedback (McKillop, 1998). The aim of these frequent (activity) questions is "to check that they [learners] have understood the ideas being discussed and can comment on them or apply them" (Rowntree, 1994, p. 14) and to encourage deep learning. Thus, "learning from a tutorial-in-print is like having a good human coach or tutor, working with you one-to-one" (Rowntree, 1992, p. 134).

In order for self-instructional materials designers to teach individual learners, they should:

- help the learners to find their way into and around your [designer's] subject, by-passing or repeating sections where appropriate.
- tell them what they need to be able to do before tackling the material.
- make clear what they should be able to do on completion of the material (e.g. in terms of objectives).

- advise them on how to tackle the work (e.g. how much time to allow for different sections, how to plan for an assignment, etc.).
- explain the subject matter in such a way that learners can relate it to what they know already.
- encourage them sufficiently to make whatever effort is needed in coming to grips with the subject.
- engage them in exercises and activities that cause them to work with the subject-matter rather than merely reading about it.
- give the learners feedback on these exercises and activities, enabling them to judge for themselves whether they are learning successfully.
- help them to sum up their learning at the end of the lesson (Rowntree, 1986, p. 82-83).

However, recreating the face-to-face experience in writing is one of the greatest challenges for DE materials designers (Mulphin, 1995) mainly because there is no possibility of negotiating meaning in the ways available to participants in face-to-face instruction (Bloor and Bloor, 1992, in Richards, 1995). In fact, as Lockwood (1992) points out, tutorial-in-print can simulate a personal tutor only if the tutor can predict fairly accurately the sort of response a learner is likely to make. This is difficult to achieve in the absence of face-to-face interaction (Richards, 1995), which is another reason for contact sessions, which were introduced to supplement correspondence education (Robinson and Latchem, 2003; Abedi & Badragheh, 2011). In order to simulate the dialogic model of face-to-face, Rowntree suggests that designers "should aim to draw responses from readers and get them to learn by DOING" (1990, p. 119, capitals in the original). He suggests the following sequence in a tutorial-in-print:

1. new teaching;
2. questions or instructions for the activity;
3. answer(s) and/or author's comments on activities; and
4. new teaching (as in 1) (Rowntree, 1990, p. 127).

However important the tutorial-in-print model may be in DE materials, its critics point out its potential limitations. For instance, Marton and Säljö (1997) have shown

that frequent SAQs and ITQs can interrupt the students' interaction and engagement with the text, resulting in a surface approach to learning. The reason for this, as pointed out by McKillop (1998), is that students may merely study the text to answer the questions and compare their answers to the writer's model answer, without getting involved in the meaning of the text as a whole. This surface approach is more likely to happen when the main objective of students is to pass their exams and gain further qualifications. It should be noted that KIE positions its DE teacher-learners in this way: their main motivation is to pass their exams and get degrees (KIE, 2009). Thus, designers of self-instructional materials need to think carefully about the position and frequency of SAQs and ITQs in their materials.

3.3.3 Visual elements

According to Lowe, while illustrations have traditionally played a secondary role to text for presentation of content, such a role seems inappropriate "in our increasingly visually oriented society" (1995, p. 288). In fact, written language based pedagogy is no longer sufficient for literacy practices that are needed in our information age (Kress and van Leeuwen, 2001) where a "written text is only one part of the message, and no longer the dominant part" (Walsh, 2006, p. 26). In DE pedagogy, the effective use of visuals is a distinguishing feature of any high quality DE course (Gachuhi and Matiru, 1989). Indeed, good DE materials are visually interesting due to the way graphs, charts, diagrams, pictures, cartoons, tables and other visuals are used (Race, 1992). According to Rowntree (1990), these have several functions such as decoration, amusement, expression, persuasion, illustration, description, explanation, simplification, quantification and problem-posing. By so doing, visuals are likely to increase learners' motivation and engagement with and uptake from the materials (Holmberg, 1995). In some cases, illustrations can be used to achieve conciseness because a picture can be worth a thousand words (C.O.L. & The Asian Development Bank, 1999). In fact, solid prose can be transformed into graphic organizers, tables, lists, cartoons, maps, photographs, etc. (Phillips, 2007).

In other instances, drawings or photographs can be used to provide examples, which are also very important in DE materials (Rowntree, 1994). In fact,

> good open learning materials will include plenty of examples. The best teachers have always known that people may have difficulty with abstract ideas. Learners often can't really grasp new ways of looking at the world unless they are given plenty of telling examples (Rowntree, 1992, p. 132).

As has been noted earlier, DE materials should represent the teacher in almost all respects (Shabani and Okebukola, 2001). Thus the illustrations which would be provided by the teacher (who is physically absent) should be built into the materials where possible. These, together with other aspects of DE materials, contribute to these materials' self-instructional nature. In order to increase the effectiveness of visual elements, Rowntree (1990) urges designers to let the learner know why these have been included, especially for explanatory and problem posing pictures. In addition, this scholar suggests that whenever the designers regard a certain image as vital in developing learners' understanding, they should base an activity upon it in order to to bring learners to examine it more closely.

Despite research reported in educational literature suggesting that using visuals in teaching is likely to result in a greater degree of learning (Stokes, 2001), learners need to be apprenticed into visual literacy in order to use visuals appropriately. In fact, visual literacy, defined as "the ability to 'read,' interpret, and understand information presented in pictorial or graphic images" (Wileman, 1993 in Stokes, 2001, p. 12), is a type of literacy on its own, with its own rules and procedures. Therefore, as Sayer suggests, "we have to learn to read illustrations as we have to learn to read text. Many people are less literate at using and interpreting illustrations than text" (Sayer, n.d., p. 18). This calls for sufficient explanations and instructions in relation to the visuals that have been included in the materials, in order for students not to get confused as regards the purpose of these.

3.3.4 Layout

> Page layouts can significantly influence the likelihood that textbooks and instructional materials will communicate what your [sic] intend (Silverman, 2004).

Layout refers to the general appearance of the pages or, in other words, the way information is laid out on the pages of learning material. It influences how well the materials communicate to students (Silverman, 2004) and is a major resource for constructing text by both writers/teachers and readers/learners (Bezemer & Kress, 2010). Layout includes elements such as the margins, line spacing, length of paragraphs, font size, and placement of images, among others. Holmberg (1995) notes that layout and general typography of a printed course may exert an influence on its teaching effectiveness. As noted by Race (1992, p. 97) "for an open learner, there is nothing worse than being confronted with a double page spread of unbroken text … there isn't a rest." The following are some ways of making DE materials *un*interesting (italics in the original) as identified by Race:

- make pages too busy by using too many distractions;
- make pages too full of too much information;
- make pages too much like each other;
- use exactly the same size print for important things and for passing comments;
- use long paragraphs, taking up most of a page;
- have few headings or subheadings;
- have few illustrations, diagrams, carts, graphs, and so on (Race, 1992, p. 137).

As DE materials are meant to be self-instructional, their layout should help learners to feel as comfortable as possible while using them, to provide interest in using them, notably by avoiding what Race listed. Layout also has to do with the provision of white space or a wide margin (Rowntree, 1990) for students to write in (Race, 1992) their comments, questions, observations, references, etc., which play an important role in learning. For Silverman (2004), pages that contain long paragraphs of small type and little white space are less likely to hold a student's attention.

3.3.5 Use of a conversational/interactional style

> Our aim in education is to communicate clearly and effectively with learners. To do this in open and distance learning we usually recommend that writers use a direct, simple, conversational style of writing (Sayer, n.d., p. 19).

Richards (1995) emphasizes the importance of a conversational style, which can be achieved by using personal pronouns, contractions, rhetorical questions, and maintaining a light touch without ignoring the human angle. To this end, Rowntree (1990) challenges the designers to write as if they are sympathetic coaches or tutors explaining their subject to an individual learner notably by exhorting, provoking and sympathizing with him/her. In other words, DE materials designers should write as if they were interacting with the learner using a tutorial-in-print model (Rowntree, 1990, 1992; McKillop, 1998) based on principles of 'guided didactic conversation' (Holmberg, 1995). In short, the conversation that takes place in a face-to-face classroom should also be identifiable in DE materials (Mishra and Gaba, 2001). With reference to the use of personal pronouns to achieve a conversation style, Rowntree (1990) advises materials designers to refer to learners as 'you' and to themselves as 'I'. When they need to use 'we', he recommends that they should make sure that it is clear who 'we' refers to.

3.3.6 Feedback to learners

> A distinctive feature of self-instructional material is that learners receive continuous feedback to help them monitor their learning and check on their performance as they progress through the teaching package (Lockwood, 1998, p. 8).

According to Rowntree (1992, p. 130), we all need feedback in order to learn. It prompts our critical reflection and enables us to do differently next time" if we have not met the requirements of an activity or a test. With reference to feedback in self instructional materials, Kintsch (2009, p. 233) suggests that "learning from text is by its very nature a constructive process, guided through feedback." In effect, as Rowntree states, after learners have done something, they need feedback to confirm

their understanding or improve it. Thus, “activity plus feedback play a vital role in helping the learner to learn” (Rowntree, 1994, p. 101).

In spite of the importance of feedback in self-instructional materials, Rowntree (1990) notes that it is often not given and when it is given, only answers are printed with no indication of the criteria on which they are based. In this case, learners who get the same answer as that shown in the book may be ignorant of whether they have reached it by the ‘best’ route. Thus, course developers should not consider “as self-evident the reasoning behind correct answers or proper solutions once a correct reply has been provided” (Holmberg, 1995, p. 78). While Race (1992) states that learners who get the right answer have no problem, I suggest that knowing the right answer does not necessarily guarantee the ability to justify it. This possible inability to justify answers can bring learners to labour under the illusion that having the same answers as those of the designers means maximization of learning (Mishra and Gaba, 2001). Similarly, those with different or ‘wrong’ answers may not know to what extent they were working on the right lines or where they made mistakes (Rowntree, 1990). In fact, learners need to know the basis on which an answer is ‘right’ or ‘wrong’, and this can be addressed by feedback. Moreover, “good feedback causes thinking” (Black & William, 2003, p. 631), irrespective of the nature of the answer that has been given. Therefore, feedback is one of the mediation strategies which can assist learners to reflect on and grasp the content in a constructive way.

Effective feedback should minimize learners’ passivity (Ipaye, 2005) and increase the likelihood of them attempting the activities. In fact, as Rowntree (1992, p. 131) points out, “learners may be disinclined to spend much time on activities if the author doesn’t feed them back some relevant comments.” After all, there will hardly be a pertinent reason why learners should engage in attempting the activities if there is no way they will know whether they have done as required or not, and, more importantly, why. The following are the different forms that feedback can take:

- the correct answer if there is one;
- sample answers if more than one is possible;
- responses that have been made by others;

- the result of a choice learners have made;
- advice as to how they can assess their own answer;
- questions about what they have learned from the activity;
- sympathy about difficulties they may have had;
- reassurance about possible errors they may have fallen into (Rowntree, 1992, p. 131).

It is advisable to vary these forms according to the nature of the activity and the tyoe of answers expected from learners. What designers of DE materials need to bear in mind is that if the feedback learners get is both helpful and stimulating, it is more likely that they (learners) will use their materials in the way they (designers) intend (Race, 1992).

Another important aspect of appropriate feedback is its timeliness since the point at which feedback is provided is critical (Lockwood, 1998). In effect, learners may be forced into unnecessary confusion due to spending too much time on learning without being asked to do something and/or receiving feedback on what they do. That is why Lockwood (1998) suggests that self-instructional material should provide feedback continuously through ITQs (which are absent in KIE DE materials) and other activities.

3.4 Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the selection of content for EFL/ESL teacher education programmes, focusing on two types of knowledge: (i) subject English content knowledge and (ii) pedagogic content knowledge applied to ELT. It has been pointed out that teachers need knowledge of the subject (English) as it is specified in a particular curriculum and of the best approach/es and methods to make such knowledge accessible to learners. The chapter also discussed the design of DE materials and mediation strategies used to mediate content in these. It has been indicated that as self-instructional materials, DE materials need to be designed such

that in such a way that learners can understand the content without much assistance from the teacher, because the latter is not often (if at all) available. In other words, DE materials designers should do their best to make their materials teach on their own. Designers of DE materials can achieve this by effectively using a number of mediation strategies such as well designed learning/teaching objectives and activities, constructive feedback, carefully designed layout and carefully designed images, just to mention a few.

Chapter Four: Methodology

4.1 Introduction
4.2 Research design
4.2.1 Textual analysis
4.2.1.1 Content analysis
4.2.1.2 Analysis of mediation strategies
4.2.2 The redesign of a section of KIE DE materials
4.3 Collection and analysis of participants' responses to the materials
4.3.1 The selection of participants
4.3.2 Interviews
4.4 Data analysis and interpretation
4.5 Ethical considerations

4.1 Introduction

As stated in Chapter One, this study aims to investigate the role of DE (printed) materials in addressing the professional development needs of high school teachers of English in Rwanda. This chapter focuses on the research design, data collection, analysis and interpretation, to explain how I proceeded in order to answer the research questions which are (i) what content is selected for KIE DE materials for English teachers? (ii) to what extent is this content aligned with the Rwandan high school O'Level curriculum and examinations for English? (iii) how is this content mediated on the page? and (iv) how do teacher-learners respond to KIE DE materials and to a redesigned version of a section of these materials? The chapter ends with a note on research ethics.

4.2 Research design

The research is a three phase project. In the first phase a textual analysis of selected DE materials for teachers of English in the first three years of the Rwandan high school was undertaken. In the second, some sections of the analyzed materials were redesigned with this redesign informed by the textual analysis, literature reviewed for this analysis and a review of other DE materials for teachers. In the third, selected

teacher-learners enrolled in the KIE DE programme were interviewed about their responses to both the original modules and the redesigned section.

4.2.1 Textual analysis

McKee (2005, p. 1) states that "when we perform textual analysis on a text, we make an educated guess at some of the most likely interpretations that might be made of a text". In fact, texts are likely to enable various interpretations: the one(s) the writers expect readers to construct and the one(s) actually constructed by the reader(s). Thus, McKee (2005, p. 2) proposes "a form of textual analysis whereby we attempt to understand the likely interpretations of texts by people who consume them." Textual analysis is very important for this study, given that teacher-learners' interpretations of KIE DE materials/texts are likely to influence how they study and what they take from the materials into their own teaching.

In somewhat similar vein, Bezemer and Kress (2008) argue that textual analysis enables the formulation of hypotheses about text designs which are more or less securely founded because all texts have

> *potentials* of a quite specific kind, which in their specificity allow an unlimited (in number) yet constrained (in semantic scope) number of readings. These potentials can be understood as the sign-makers' shaping of signs such that the text-as-complex-sign fits the purpose of a rhetor (who frequently is also the designer), the designer and their sense of audience (Bezemer and Kress, 2008, p. 4-5, italics in the original).

Designers and re-designers of DE materials and researchers with an interest in these designs are advised to get responses from the users of these materials (Evans, 1995). However, the users (teacher-learners in the case of this study) may not always provide enough information with regard to elements of the design of DE materials because they may not be consciously aware of all these elements and/or are able to articulate what they, at least tacitly, know. For example, Reed (2005) found that teachers, who were invited to give critical feedback on materials that they had used

for their studies and to suggest improvements to these materials, responded mainly as 'satisfied customers', even though there was evidence in their assignments that they had found some of the materials difficult to understand. She suggests that the main reason for their limited critique was that her informants had been trained to be "passive receivers of knowledge who did not question the authority of their teachers" (Reed, 2005, p. 271). The fact that the Rwandan educational system has been oriented more to a 'banking approach' (Freire, 2007) than to a critical one, even at the university level (Sibomana, 2010; Hunma & Sibomana, 2014) may limit the depth and criticality of the informants' responses. In addition, KIE DE teacher-learners "have no previous experience of distance learning, and cannot be assumed to have the study skills required for successful distance learning" (KIE, 2009, p. 4). As a result, they may find it difficult to provide a 'critical' kind of judgment of the materials designed for distance learning. Therefore, textual analysis was chosen as the starting point for the study. It was anticipated that the redesigned section of the KIE materials would stimulate discussion of similarities and differences between the two sets of materials and of teacher-learners preferences.

It should be noted that while there is an extensive literature on textual analysis, mainly related to media texts (e.g. Fairclough, 2003; Janks, 2010), little has been published on the analysis of DE materials for teacher education. Some exceptions include Fung (2005) and Reed (2010). As has been pointed out in Chapter One, DE is a new endeavour in Rwanda and to date research on the KIE DE programme has been limited to a 'descriptive qualitative case study' (Mukamusoni, 2006) and a multi-country assessment of the use of DE and ICTs in education with a focus on Rwanda, by the Joint International Council of Distance Education (ICDE) and the World Bank (Rumbles, 2003) in which KIE DE received very limited attention: 3 out of 117 pages. There has also been a mid-term review of the first intake of the KIE DTP (Pennells and Coldevin, 2003) and a short review of KIE DE programme by the South African Institute for Distance Education (SAIDE) in 2006 (Mays, 2006), which review was reported on one page. There has been no detailed textual analysis of KIE DE materials or investigation of teacher-learners' responses to them.

In this study, the textual analysis focuses mainly on two modules: Module 1, *Introduction to Language & Literature*, (ENG 101) and Module 7, *French and English Teaching Methods*, (EDC 203). Module 1, the first of four modules for subject English, was chosen because it is the very first module that KIE DE teacher-learners received. Ideally, it should be a module that engages their interest and supports them in becoming independent learners. Module 7, the last of seven modules for Education Studies, was chosen because it is the only module which aims to specifically address the teaching of English. For both modules, the focus of the textual analysis is on (i) the content selected (content analysis) and (ii) the mediation of this content on the page (activities, layout, language, visual design).

4.2.1.1 Content analysis

According to Leedy and Ormrod (2010, p. 144), content analysis involves "a detailed and systematic examination of the contents of a particular body of materials for the purpose of identifying patterns, themes, or biases." These scholars also point out that content analyses are typically performed on forms of human communication such as books, newspapers, transcripts of conversations, etc. For Bloor and Wood (2006) the purpose of content analysis is to describe the characteristics of the document's content and the effect of the content on the reader, among other aspects. For educational texts, this effect is crucial and therefore content analysis is used to examine the content selected for KIE DE modules for English and to offer suggestions about the possible effect of this content on KIE DE teacher-learners' learning.

The content of texts used for educational purposes is selected from a large body of literature available in singulars (or disciplines) or regions and this selection is motivated by both ideological and pedagogical factors (Bernstein, 1996). I suggest that these factors include the aims of the course/programme, the philosophy of education dominant in the society, the designers' knowledge and skills, and the available resources, among others. Thus, an analysis is undertaken of content selected for KIE DE materials with regard to the aims of the KIE DE programme, the

aims of the Rwandan high school O'Level curriculum and the aims and philosophy of Rwandan education in general. The focus of the analysis is on three types of content commonly included in English teacher education programmes: (1) subject English content, (2) content to extend teacher-learners' own proficiency in English and (3) content to extend teacher-learners' pedagogic content knowledge and skills. The content analysis aims to identify what is included or excluded, foregrounded or backgrounded, in regard to each type of content and to reflect on possible implications of these decisions.

4.2.1.2 Analysis of mediation strategies

Experienced DE materials developers point out that the way content is presented on the page in printed DE materials is likely to strongly influence the learners' use of and engagement with the materials (Rowntree, 1994; Race, 1992; Lockwood, 1994). That is why the textual analysis considers learning/teaching aims and activities, layout, language and visuals (images, drawings, graphics) as important pedagogic and meditational aspects of the KIE DE materials.

The strategies used by materials developers to attempt to actively engage teacher-learners are analysed as it is frequently argued that success in DE requires the active participation of learners (Leach, 1995) who need to interact with and appropriate the materials in order for learning to take place (Rowntree, 1992; Shabani and Okebukola, 2001). Lockwood (1994) identifies three models for devising activities in self-instructional materials: tutorial-in-print, reflective action guide and dialogue. The first model is used when the materials designers can predict the learner's response to a question or activity. Here, learning takes the form of "tell and test" and feedback consists of "correct" answers. According to the reflective action guide, the learner is expected to perform some action in the real world, and get involved in thinking critically and reflectively about it. Materials designers' feedback usually offers a range of possibilities but foregrounds the preferred responses without any of these being privileged in the feedback. The dialogic model involves the thinking of the writer and the learner in a communicative mode and presents multiple

perspectives. According to Mishra and Panda (2007, p. 16), "good distance learning materials show characteristics of all the above three categories [models] depending on the pedagogical requirements of the topic/subject."

4.2.2 The redesign of a section of KIE DE materials

Findings from the textual analysis of KIE DE materials, literature on the design of DE materials (see Chapter Three, section 3.3), literature on writing pedagogy (see Chapter Five, section 5.2.2.1), and examples of DE materials which have received recognition for their quality[17] were used to inform the redesign of a section of the KIE Module 7 that focuses on the teaching of writing. My choice of this section was motivated by the fact that writing has received less emphasis in the literature on language teaching than reading, speaking and listening (Hedge, 1993; Ralfe, 2009; Ciobanu, 2011), remains an overlooked area of investigation in relation to PCK (Hlas & Hildebrandt, 2010) and instruction in writing pedagogy for pre-service teachers is often limited (Norman & Spencer, 2005). This situation is a cause for concern in the Rwandan context, where writing is one of the priority areas for high school teachers of English as extended writing carries 25% of the Rwandan O'Level English national examination marks.

In addition, the textual analysis suggested that Module 7 does not adequately address teacher-learners' needs in regard to language pedagogy in general and to writing pedagogy in particular (see section 5.2.2.1). Therefore, in redesigning the section, I drew on the principles of DE materials design and on findings from recent research on writing pedagogy (Ralfe, 2009; Clarence-Fincham et al., 2002, Peterson, 2012), in order to offer what I argue are improvements to these sections in terms of both content selection and mediation of content on the page. In order to achieve

[17] These materials are (i) *Theory and Practice of English Language Teaching*, (ii) *Language, Literacy and Communication* and (iii) *Language in Learning and Teaching (LILT)*. All these materials have won awards in recognition of their high quality and effectiveness as distance teacher education materials. In 2000, *Theory and Practice of English Language Teaching* won the inaugural NADEOSA (National Association of Distance Education Organisations of South Africa) award for excellence. The *Language, Literacy and Communication* won the 2004 NADEOSA award for excellence while materials from the University of KwaZulu-Natal's B Ed Honours programme (including *Language in Learning and Teaching*) have been highly commended by the NADEOSA awards committee.

these improvements, the redesigned section took the teacher-learners through a scaffolded process of both writing (all stages from pre-writing to publication) and teaching learners how to write a coherent, cohesive and logical argumentative essay of the kind included in the Rwandan O'level examination. It also required teacher-learners to do practical activities at each stage in the process of writing an essay and built on feedback on each activity to present subsequent content. Lastly, in taking the teacher-learners through an essay writing process, the section produced a model of an argumentative essay and provided teacher-learners with a model of a lesson plan on writing pedagogy so as to further their reflection on what writing pedagogy entails.

When DE materials are redesigned, it is recommended that such redesigning should be informed by feedback from students who have used the materials (e.g. Evans, 1995; Woodley, 1998). However, with informants being in Rwanda and the researcher based in South Africa, it was not possible to meet the teacher-learners twice on separate occasions to firstly interview them about their responses to KIE DE materials and subsequently to a redesigned section. As four of the five designers of Module 1 for Subject English and all of the designers of Module 7 for Education Studies were no longer at KIE, it was not possible to ascertain their views on the strengths and limitations of these modules.

4.3 Collection and analysis of participants' responses to the materials

One of the three most commonly used approaches to studying DE courses and materials, in order to inform new designs, is elicitation of responses from users of these materials (Evans, 1995; Reed, 2010) and a number of researchers (for example, Pierrakeas, Xenos and Pintelas, 2003; Fung, 2005; Reed, 2005) have attempted to use this approach. I also chose to use it to collect the responses of selected teacher-learners to KIE DE materials for English and to the redesigned materials with regard to their perceived (in)effectiveness in extending these teacher-learners' knowledge

of English and related teaching skills. Teacher-learners' responses were collected through interviews and were triangulated[18] (Bryman, 2004) with the data from the textual analysis to draw conclusions. In this phase of the study, I aimed to understand the situation under investigation from the participants' perspective (Hancock and Algozzine, 2006).

4.3.1 The selection of participants

The number of KIE DE teacher-learners who were studying English in the 2010 cohort is 599; these attend contact sessions at four regional centres as follows:

Regional Centre	Number of teacher-learners	Number of teacher-learners selected for interviews
Butare	130	3[19]
Kabgayi	226	3
Nyundo	120	2
Rwamagana	123	2
Total	599	10

Table 3: The numbers of all teacher-learners and of those who participated in the study, per regional centre

Given that the number of teacher-learners registered in the programme is far too high for it to be feasible to interview them all, a small number of teacher-learners were selected using a combination of purposive and random sampling. According to Tongco (2007, p. 147), "the purposive sampling technique, also called judgment sampling, is the deliberate choice of an informant due to the qualities the informant possesses." For Maxwell (1997, p. 87), purposive sampling is a type of sampling in which, ''particular settings, persons, or events are deliberately selected for the important information they can provide that cannot be gotten as well from other

[18] Bryman (2004) defines triangulation as the use of more than one approach to the investigation of a research question in order to enhance confidence in the ensuing findings. In the case of my study, the different approaches are textual analysis, textual redesign and interviews.
[19] One of the three participants selected from Butare was not available for interview.

choices''. In short, a decision to use purposive sampling is mainly based on the nature of information that the researcher wants and who he or she thinks has it.

The nature of the information that was sought for this research was mainly teacher-learners' experiences with the KIE DE materials and their responses to the redesigned sections. Given that different learners experience learning in different ways, the information that they can offer about their study programmes and learning materials may also be different. I suggest that students' performance in assignments and examinations is one indication of the kind of experiences that they have with their studies. In fact, learners with a low level of performance are likely to be experiencing more problems than those who perform well. Therefore, it is possible that teacher-learners' responses to KIE DE materials might vary according to their academic performance. For instance, learners with a low performance may blame DE materials for their underperformance and state that these are ineffective, in spite of them being of good quality. On the other hand, high levels of performance can discourage learners from being critical of the poor quality of learning materials. Thus, I took performance on assignment as a basis for selecting teacher-learners who should take part in this study and was guided by the tutors who work with the teacher-learners in the choice of informants from both high and low achieving categories. Learner performance, coupled with the need for countrywide representativeness led to the selection of two teacher-learners from each centre: one teacher-learner was randomly selected from those with a relatively high level performance and another one from those with relatively poor performance in their course work. This means that I intended to involve eight teacher-learners in this study.

Though I had decided to interview eight teacher-learners, I gave copies of the redesigned sections to ten (as indicated in Table 3) in anticipation that some of them might not be available for interviews for various reasons. Eventually, one of these did not take part in the interviews because, as he explained, he had not managed to

work with the redesigned section. This meant that nine teacher-learners[20] participated in this study. This number seems very small compared to 599 teachers-learners studying English. However, given that the information that was sought was extensive, it would have been difficult to work with a larger number without compromising the quality of the analysis.

4.3.2 Interviews

Denzin and Lincoln (2000, p. 645) note that "interviewing is one of the most common and powerful ways in which we try to understand our fellow human beings." It allows the researcher "to attain rich, personalized information" (Mason, 2002 in Hancock and Algozzine, 2006, p. 39). This richness may be a result of respondents having enough time to express themselves and to ask questions about what they do not understand and of the researcher being able to probe respondents' answers.

The interviews were semi-structured; such interviews are non-standardized and are frequently used in a qualitative study such as this one, where the interviewer does not do the research to test a specific hypothesis (Kajornboon, 2005). The researcher has a list of key themes, issues, and questions to be covered. In this type of interview the order of the questions can be changed depending on the direction of the interview. An interview guide is also used, but additional questions can be asked, which questions may not have been anticipated in the beginning (Kajornboon, 2005). Corbetta (2003, p. 270) explains semi-structured interviews as follows:

> the order in which the various topics are dealt with and the wording of the questions are left to the interviewer's discretion. Within each topic, the interviewer is free to conduct the conversation as he [*sic*] thinks fit, to ask the questions he deems appropriate in the words he considers best, to give explanation and ask for clarification if the answer is not clear, to prompt the

[20] Gender was not among the characteristics I considered in choosing my participants. Since these were chosen randomly (usng their student numbers) from within the high and low level achieving groups, only one of them happened to be a woman. This is not surprising because there are far more males than females (423 against 177) enrolled in the programme.

> respondent to elucidate further if necessary, and to establish his own style of conversation.

Therefore, semi-structured interviews allow flexibility for both the interviewer and the interviewees regarding the questions to ask and the answers to provide respectively. In fact, in addition to posing some predetermined questions, researchers using such interviews can "ask follow-up questions designed to probe more deeply issues of interest to interviewees" (Hancock and Algozzine, 2006, p. 40).

The advantages mentioned in the above paragraphs cannot be provided by structured interviews which, according to Corbetta (2003), introduce some rigidity to the interview. For example, probing may be a problem. Respondents may be unable to answer the question not because they do not have answers but because they do not understand it or because they have not received sufficient information about it (Corbetta, 2003). Neither could unstructured interviews provide the above advantages because they do not follow any specific interview guide (Kajornboon, 2005) and, therefore, may collect information that is not relevant to the study instead of what is relevant. Using semi-structured interviews enabled me to rephrase questions for the respondents, especially those who chose to be interviewed in English as they sometimes could not fully understand some of the questions.

These interviews were conducted in each respondent's language of choice among the three official languages in Rwanda (Kinyarwanda, French and English). One respondent chose to be interviewed in French, three chose Kinyarwanda while the other five chose English. Apart from the respondent who was interviewed in French, all others code-switched between English and Kinyarwanda: the interviews with the second category were dominated by Kinyarwanda while those with the third category were dominated by English. The teacher-learners' use of and/or preference for Kinyarwanda and French was mainly due to their limited proficiency in English. While I understand the problems that may result from interviewing the informants in a language that is different from the one used in the materials, I also needed to offer

the informants options that would make them comfortable and to respect their choices.

The respondents were given the redesigned section of materials two weeks before the interviews. This was done in order to give them time to work with and reflect on the section in relation to the corresponding one in KIE Module 7, which they were already studying. The interviews took the form of one on one discussions with these teacher-learners of their experiences with the two sections, namely: the one designed by KIE DE materials designers and the one I redesigned. However, the discussion was extended to all the modules and, where necessary, the whole programme in general. Thereafter, the interviews were transcribed and translated, where necessary, into English for analysis and interpretation. The copies of the redesigned section which the respondents used were also collected and were used as another source of data for this study. This is because the respondents were told that they could make notes and comments on the section. In addition, there were activities which they were supposed to do and write their answers in the space provided. Thus, they all wrote on their copy of the redesigned section and I took it back. Given that they were appreciative of this redesigned section, I gave them a clean copy as they indicated that it would be useful for them during a Teaching Practice that they were about to start.

It should be noted that while systematic textual analysis focused on Modules 1 and 7, the interviews included questions about all the KIE DE modules because I was interested in understanding the teacher-learners' perceptions of the overall programme of study.

4.4 Data analysis and interpretation

The analysis and interpretation of the learning materials and of the interview data were informed by key concepts identified in the theoretical framework of the study, discussed in Chapter Two, and by the themes identified in the review of literature in

the fields of subject content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge for language teachers and of DE materials design.

Data from interviews with KIE DE teacher-learners was analysed using thematic analysis. This method of analysis is defined by Braun and Clarke (2006, p. 79) as "a method for identifying, analysing and reporting patterns (themes) within data." These scholars consider a theme as an emerging finding or a pre-set category that captures something important about the data in relation to the research question, and represents some level of patterned response or meaning within the data set. The themes under which the interview data for this study were analysed were derived from the interview questions which aimed to find answers to the following research question: How do teacher-learners respond to KIE DE materials and to redesigned versions of sections of these materials? More specifically, interview questions addressed KIE DE teacher-learners' responses to these materials in relation to (i) content selections, (ii) pedagogy *of* the materials or mediation, (iii), pedagogy *in* the materials (indicating to teacher-learners how to teach), and (iv) the KIE DE programme in general. These are the four themes under which the data from interviews was analysed.

Finally, I made use of triangulation of the data generated by both textual analysis and teacher-learners' responses to KIE DE materials and the redesigned section in order to draw conclusions. Triangulation, as defined by Hussein (2009), is a combination of two or more methodological approaches, theoretical perspectives, data sources, investigators and analysis methods to study the same phenomenon. This use of multiple approaches increases the efficacy of the research because it can help to address weaknesses and/or biases that can result from the use of a single method. In the case of this study, teacher-learners responses to the materials were analyzed to complement the textual analysis.

4.5 Ethical considerations

According to McMillan and Schumacher (2006, p. 142), "ethics generally are considered to deal with beliefs about what is right or wrong, proper or improper, good or bad." Even though there is some degree of disagreement about how to define what is ethically correct in research (McMillan and Schumacher, 2006), a number of principles generally need to be adhered to by researchers working with people as subjects. These principles/requirements have been described by McMillan and Schumacher (2006), and include the following:

- informing the subjects of all aspects of the research that might influence willingness to participate;
- being as open and honest with the subjects as possible;
- subjects must be protected from physical and mental discomfort, harm and danger and informed if any of these risks is possible;
- to secure informed consent from the subjects before they participate in the research;
- information obtained about the subjects must be kept confidential.

Given that my study involved people as participants, I needed to adhere to the above ethical requirements. Before asking teacher-learners whether they were willing to take part in the interviews, I made them aware of all the aspects of my research. These include its objectives, the questions for which I hoped to find answers and what I would do with the information that participants would provide. Concerning the confidentiality of the information provided by the interviewees, I assured them and made sure that nobody other than myself and my research supervisor would have access to it, and that it would be used solely for the purposes of this research. Moreover, no participant would be named in the research report; pseudonyms have been used in reporting on the data generated from the interviews.

All this was be done in order to secure participants' informed consent which "is achieved by providing subjects with an explanation of the research, an opportunity to terminate their participation at any time with no penalty and full disclosure of any

risk associated with the study" (McMillan and Schumacher, 2006, p. 143). My study did not involve any risk but still participants were free to withdraw from the study at any time without any consequence. After giving them all this information, I asked them whether they were willing to participate in the research and, if so, to sign a consent form as evidence for their understanding of the research and consent to participate (McMillan and Schumacher, 2006). Participation was voluntary and no advantages or disadvantages were associated therewith.

Since the interview setting and questioning techniques are likely to impact on the quality of the information provided by the interviewee (Ricci and Beal, 1998), I did my best to put interviewees at ease in answering my questions by permitting them not to answer some questions if they wished and by asking questions and allowing for answers in a language of their choice, among the four that are used in Rwanda (Kinyarwanda, French, English and Kiswahili). I also made sure that the interviews were conducted in sufficient privacy and in a quiet atmosphere.

It would be unethical to use KIE DE materials and teacher-learners as sources of information without consent from the institution. Thus, I applied for and obtained permission from KIE to do a textual analysis of KIE DE materials and to conduct interviews with KIE DE teacher-learners as sources of data for my research project. I also applied for and obtained an ethics clearance from the Ethics Committee of the Wits School of Education.

Chapter Five: Analysis of the content of KIE distance education materials for English and of their alignment with the Rwandan O'Level curriculum and examinations

5.1 Introduction
5.2 Overview of the content of KIE DE materials
5.2.1 Subject English content
5.2.1.1 Linguistics
5.2.1.2 Grammar
5.2.1.3 Literature
5.2.1.4 Content to extend teachers' language proficiency
5.2.2 Content to extend teacher-learners' pedagogic content knowledge
5.2.2.1 Methods of teaching speaking, listening, writing, grammar and vocabulary
5.2.2.2 Methods of teaching literature
5.3 The national O'Level curriculum and examinations for English
5.3.1 The national O'Level curriculum for English
5.3.2 The national O'Level English Examinations
5.3.3 The alignment of KIE DE materials for English with the O'Level national curriculum and examinations
5.4 Conclusion

5.1 Introduction

The KIE DE programme aims to offer professional development opportunities for unqualified high school teachers, including those who teach English, in order for them to teach at the lower level of high school (O'Level) more effectively. One implication of this aim is that the content selected for inclusion in the KIE DE programme should be externally aligned (Biggs, 2003) to the national curriculum and examinations at this level. This chapter analyses the content of KIE DE materials for English in terms of what the designers of these materials believe teachers of English need to know and be able to do (English subject content knowledge and pedagogic content knowledge), gives an overview of the O'Level national curriculum and examinations for English and establishes the extent to which the content in the materials is aligned with these. I acknowledge that teachers need to know more than what is in the curriculum and this was also considered in the analysis. It should be noted that the focus on subject English content, pedagogic content knowledge,

O'Level curriculum and examination and the alignment of the latter KIE DE materials has resulted in this chapter being of considerable length.

5.2 Overview of the content of KIE DE materials

This section focuses on two types of content: (i) subject English content and (ii) content to extend teacher-learners' pedagogic content knowledge (Shulman, 1987) and skills. The two types of content have been identified and analysed in all four content modules and in one pedagogy module respectively, with a focus on what is present and absent and what is foregrounded and backgrounded.

5.2.1 Subject English Content

Based on the area of knowledge that it focuses on, the content in the four English subject content modules can be divided into four categories: linguistics, grammar, literature and communication skills. Their respective weighting in terms of numbers of pages is indicated in the following table:

Modules	**Content areas and respective number of pages per module**				
	Linguistics	**Grammar**	**Literature**	**Communication skills**[21]	**Pages**
Module 1	94	86	63	106	349
Module 2	20	58	76	88	242
Module 3	0	112	102	152	366
Module 4	0	197	105	100	402
%	8.3	33.3	25.4	32.8	100

Table 4: The weighting of content areas in KIE 'English as subject' modules

[21] In this thesis, content on communication skills is referred to as content aimed at extending teacher-learners language proficiency

The data presented in Table 4 above indicates that linguistics is allocated the smallest 'space' (8.3%) while grammar occupies the biggest 'space' (33.3%), followed by communication skills (32.8%) and literature (25.4%). Another important point to note is that the modules are very long (around 350 pages and above), except for Module 2 (242 pages). In spite of this length, the content analysis offered in the next sections suggests that the content selected for KIE DE programme for English does not necessarily address language teachers' needs regarding subject English knowledge.

5.2.1.1 Linguistics

Linguistics content in KIE DE materials for English is found only in a block entitled *Introduction to language and linguistics* (Module 1) and in a section entitled *An overview of the English language development* (Module 2) and in both cases is about general linguistics. As the analysis will show, this is not the type of linguistics knowledge that teachers need most (see Johnson, 2006 and Banegas, 2009 in Chapter Two).

The block on *Introduction to language and linguistics* is divided into seven sections: Definitions of language and linguistics; Theories of the origin and development of language; Properties of human language; Components of language; Linguistics and other disciplines; Spoken and written language; Writing systems. From these titles, it can be assumed that some of the topics addressed are important for teachers of English because the content may make a difference to the way one teaches (Fillmore & Snow, 2000; Faez, 2011). These include the properties of language, development of language (language acquisition), how writing differs from speech, etc. However, the way in which the content under these headings is addressed appears both too general and too superficial to equip teacher-learners with the knowledge of linguistics that could be useful to them. For instance, while applied linguistics is the branch of linguistics that is most relevant to language teachers (Barnard, 2011), the only reference to it in the module is as follows:

> Applied linguistics, on the other hand, deals with a macro-analysis of language. Macrolinguistics refers to a much broader view of the scope of linguistics. It embraces the social function of language, how languages are acquired and the communicative function of language. Applied linguistics thus deals with the application of the concepts and findings of theoretical linguistics to a variety of practical tasks, including language teaching, speech therapy, translation, speech pathology, computer programming, etc. … So, the different branches of linguistics that arise as an interaction of linguistics and other disciplines fall under applied linguistics. (Module 1, p. 20-21, 69).

It is unlikely that this explanation will enable the teacher to understand what applied linguistics really is and how relevant it is to language teaching. This is mainly because the module does not show how the knowledge of linguistic theories can be applied to the solution of practical problems of language teaching (Barnard, 2011).

Some other important issues are just mentioned in passing as can be seen in the following quote: "[I]t [macrolinguistics] embraces *the social function of language, how languages are acquired,* and *the communicative function of language*" (Module 1, p. 20, italics added). The three areas in italics are so important in language teaching (Day, 1993; Faez, 2011; Murray and Christison, 2011) that they should be explained more deeply and more extensively. For instance, one would expect at least some content to be devoted to how languages are acquired; it is hard to imagine an effective language teacher who does not have some knowledge of how languages are learned, the factors that are likely to affect this learning (Finch, 2002; Peacock, 2009; Murray & Christison, 2011) and which factors require particular responses from teachers (Lightbown and Spada, 2006). In addition, the definitions of language are also listed without mentioning the functions of language in society. These functions, I suggest, are part of what language teachers need to know because their primary task is to help learners to become good users of language in various contexts and for various purposes and functions. The lack of content on functions of language, language acquisition and sociocultural variables affecting acquisition of additional/foreign languages is a cause for concern.

Another area that is not given due attention is sociolinguistics, which is allocated just one page with nothing else being presented except its definition while what language teachers need is “an understanding of the relationship between language and society” in order for them to teach while respecting linguistic diversity in their classrooms (McKay and Hornberger, 1996, p. ix). In addition, teachers should be aware of social and political phenomena and decisions which have a strong impact on language use and teaching (Fillmore and Snow, 2000). For instance, several changes have recently and consecutively taken place in language teaching and in language-in-education policy in Rwanda. Therefore, teachers need to understand the effects of these changes on the use and the teaching of English in Rwanda. These are some of the issues that content on sociolinguistics should address.

With regard to the section on ‘Spoken and written language’, it seems that the most important issues in relation to language teaching were omitted and/or understated. These two concepts are explained and the differences between them presented in a table (p. 82) without any further explanation or comments. The table is copied on the next page:

6.4. Differences between speech and writing

There are quite a number of differences between speech and writing which we sum up in the table below:

	Speech	Writing
1	Time-bound	Space-bound
2	Spontaneous and speedy	Allows repeated reading
3	Face to face interaction with an audience	Lack of face to face contact with audience
4	Speaker has access to feedback from an audience	No access to feedback from audience
5	Little freedom for correction	Freedom for correction can rub and rewrite a new
6	Opportunity to think about what to say is hard	Plenty of time to think and rethink what one wants to say
7	Use of such features as intonation, loudness, rhythm, stress, tone, length	No opportunity for the expression of intonation, loudness, rhythm, stress, tone, length, etc.
8	Long sentences and use of hollophrases and filler expressions	Balanced sentences, selected vocabulary, no hollophrases and filler expressions.
9	Suited for casual discourse	Suited for recording facts

Figure 3: Differences between speech and writing according to Module 1 Designers

I suggest that these differences and their implications are very important for language teachers because they may influence the way one teaches speaking and writing. Therefore, these should be discussed in more detail.

The section on the development of the English language briefly explains the Indo-European language family, to which English belongs, and presents a linguistic history of English. It explains and gives examples of the changes (lexical, phonological and morphological) that this language has undergone to be what it is now together with the events that led to these changes and the dates when they occurred. The content is presented in a general way, and no reference is made to what these changes mean for the teaching of English and/or for the future of this language, which could have paved a way, for example, for a discussion of the concept of 'world Englishes'.

The analysis offered in this section indicates that KIE DE materials provide learners with (limited) theoretical and historical knowledge about linguistics but does little to provide them with knowledge that could directly inform their teaching of English. As has been explained in section 3.2.3.1, such knowledge could be addressed through such topics as language and learning, language use in educational settings, language and cultural diversity, sociolinguistics for educators, language development, and first and second or additional language teaching and learning (Fillmore and Snow, 2000). None of these is addressed in KIE DE modules for English.

Interestingly, some areas that appear to be less directly relevant to the teacher-learners' professional needs occupy considerable space. For example, while five pages are allocated to the 'spoken and written language' section (which appears more relevant to language teachers), theories of the origin and development of language (divine, anthropological, linguistic and language diversity theories), writing systems (logographic, syllabic, alphabetic, pictorial, pictographic and phonetic) and directionality in writing systems (left-right, right-left, etc.) occupy 12 pages each. I consider these less important for teachers because, for example, knowing that logographic writing uses a single written character to represent a complete grammatical word or that, according to the divine theory, language originates from God does not necessarily contribute to language teacher effectiveness. Another example is the section on the development of English, which includes content that is only of limited relevance to teachers but which is also very difficult for them to understand. One example of such content is the explanation of 'rule loss', which reads as follows:

> There existed in the history of English a rule called i-Mutation (or i-Umlaut). This rule turned back vowels into front vowels before a /i/ or /j/ in the next syllable. For example, the plural of certain classes in Old English was formed by adding /-i/ and not /-s/. So, the plural of gōs "goose" was /gōsi/ "geese". The i-mutation, then, caused the back vowel /ō/ to become the front vowel /oe/, which is a phoneme resulting from the combination of the /o/ and the /e/ phonemes. Thus, the plural word became /goesi/. Later on, the lip rounding that was producing the sound /o/ was lost and the plural became /gēs(e)/. It is obvious then that at that time the i-

> mutation rule was lost and hence the pronunciations of the word,/gus/ and /gis/ (Module 2, p. 21).

I suggest that even mother tongue speakers of English are likely to find this concept of 'rule loss' as explained above difficult to understand. One can imagine, therefore, how much more difficult it is likely to be for the KIE DE teacher-learners for whom English is a foreign language. Therefore, it can be argued that the content on linguistics in KIE DE materials for English falls short of its main purpose: to provide teacher-learners with the linguistic knowledge that they need for their language classrooms (Fillmore and Snow, 2000).

5.2.1.2 Grammar

Grammar is addressed in all four content modules (see Table 4 on page 115) in four blocks: The grammar of English (Module 1), The structure of modern English (Module 2), Aspects of grammatical analysis (Module 3) and Syntax (Module 4).

The grammar of English block in Module 1 is about word classes (nouns, pronouns, determiners, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions and interjections) only. The teacher-learners are expected to classify, state, describe, explain, distinguish etc. but not use the different word classes in English. *The structure of modern English* in Module 2 "aims at analyzing modern English *from a descriptive linguistic point of view* and thus bringing about new insights into the understanding of the workings of the English language" (p. 13, italics added). It covers issues such as the development of the English language (discussed in the linguistics section), varieties and styles of English, the structure, functions and patterning of English sounds, the structure of English words and the structure of English sentences and semantics. The above learning objectives (with the exception of 'analysing modern English') appear not to encourage a deep approach and a constructive approach to learning, which, however, are the approaches suggested by KIE to its DE materials designers (KIE, 2009). In addition, the presentation of related content itself is no different as will be shown in section 6.2.3.

In contrast to the introduction to the two blocks mentioned in the above paragraphs, the introductions to the grammar blocks in Modules 3 and 4 make reference to teaching. The block on *Aspects of grammatical analysis* (Module 3) is supposedly meant to enable teacher-learners to explain to their learners "the changes of the form of English words and their combination into sentences" (p. 15). It covers grammatical roles and classification of words and the classification and the structure of phrases in English. The *Syntax* block (Module 4) is, according to the designers, a discussion of syntax and its applications to the teaching and learning of English texts in high schools. It covers sentence patterns and verb types, distribution of constituents, syntactic transformations and the application of syntax to the study of texts and discourse. However, the content in these two blocks does not make any reference to the learning and/or teaching of English. The relevance of the grammar content to KIE DE teacher-learners' professional needs will be discussed in the section 5.3.3 of this chapter, which section is about the alignment of KIE DE modules with the Rwandan national curriculum and examinations for English.

5.2.1.3 Literature

Literature is addressed in all KIE DE modules for English (see Table 4 on page 115). The first block, *Introduction to literary genres* (Module 1), covers oral literature, poetry and prose fiction. It aims to help teacher-learners to "acquire knowledge and skills to read, analyze and understand the different literary genres and their specific distinguishing features" (Module 1, p. 301). The second block, *Prose fiction from Africa* (Module 2), aims to "enable the student/reader to study the novel and short story" (Module 2, p. 179). It covers African fiction, the novel and the short story.

In Module 3, two blocks are devoted to literature: *Creative writing* and *Drama*. The block on creative writing aims "to develop and refine [teacher-learners'] writing craft in genres commonly studied in Literature in English within contemporary and modern benchmarks" (Module 3, p. 193). This suggests that the focus of this block is not on literature per se, but on the development of teacher-learners' writing

knowledge and skills for some literary genres through practical activities. However, all the learning objectives for this block expect teacher-learners just to define or describe different issues and strategies involved in creative writing. The presentation of content itself equips teacher-learners mainly with theoretical knowledge about writing (i.e knowing about rather than knowing and practising how to write).

While some of the activities in the two blocks include tasks which ask teacher-learners to write their own poems, plays, and so on, the designers' feedback and answers to the activity questions neither encourage them to reflect on what they have written nor indicate to them what they could have done to write more effectively. For instance, one activity asks teacher-learners to "[W]rite a poem of not less than 10 lines about Africa's problems - ignorance, poverty and diseases" (p. 214). The accompanying feedback states: "This is an important activity in that it gives you room to explore your human experience. After writing your poem, endeavor to discuss it with your colleagues" (p. 214). The designers' suggested answer to this activity question is "personal discretion" (p. 272). While it is difficult achieve more effective feedback in DE materials, I suggest that teacher-learners should have been provided with, at least, the basis on which to discuss their poems such as the elements of poetry that their poems could or should include.

The objectives for the block on *Drama* (Module 3) indicate that teacher-learners are expected to understand what drama is, be able to analyze plays and identify the role and relevance of drama in their communities. However, this suggested connection between the block content and teacher-learners' communities, which has the potential to make the block more contextually relevant and easier for teacher-learners to understand, is consistently missing in the presentation of content and activities. The block just explains the origin of drama, its aspects, its forms, etc. The last block, addressing literature, is about *Poetry* (Module 4) and shows teacher-learners how to analyze poems, focusing on both their forms and content, linking the latter to their own experiences.

This brief overview suggests that, with the possible exception of the Block on *Poetry*, the content in the literature blocks does not provide teacher-learners with a critical

understanding of the literary genres addressed therein. Moreover, literature seems to occupy considerable space (25%) in a programme meant for teachers who are not expected to explicitly teach literature[22]. While no explanation (either in the modules or in any other KIE DE programme document) is given for this allocation, it is possible that literature study is aimed at improving learners' (in this case, teachers') knowledge of the language, including language proficiency (Smita & Mujumdar, 2010) and communicative and cultural competence (Banegas, 2009) and at contributing to their personal development (cognitive, moral, social, cultural, etc.). For example, Smita and Mujumdar (2010, p. 215) argue that

> in this world of mixed cultures, attitudes and ideologies, only teaching language skills at practical and commercial level are [*sic*] not sufficient. In order to create and promote human qualities, philosophical models of thinking, ethical and moral literary outlook and holistic view of life, [*sic*] teaching of literature is must [*sic*].

If literature content was included in the KIE DE materials for English in order to facilitate the acquisition of communicative and cultural competence, the way it is addressed should change. In fact, the way this content in presented does not foster the teachers-learners' (critical) thinking/reflection. For example, all 12 objectives in block 3 (Prose fiction from Africa) of Module 2 expect teacher-learners to define (rather than reflect on and show critical understanding of) the different genres of fiction and their features. The presentation of the content itself does not make a difference because it defines these works, briefly explains their characteristics and historical background and mentions some authors of African fiction and themes commonly treated in it without explaining their relevance to the current daily life of the community.

Four African novels were recommended for teacher-learners to read and a series of activities in the block are based on these. However, most of these activity questions are comprehension questions such as What's the role of Black characters in Mine Boy? (p. 220), Why does Waiyaki decide to visit the sacred grove? (p. 211), Muthoni

[22] As will be explained in section 5.3.1, the O'Level curriculum suggests that teacher-learners refer to literary texts only as teaching resources.

gives reasons for her wanting to be circumcised. What reasons does she give? (p. 206). There are very few questions that encourage critical thinking and these are mainly about the lessons to be drawn from the novels and the impression that the novels have left teacher-learners with. Therefore, I suggest that instead of (or in addition to) presenting the different literary genres as a body of knowledge to be mastered as is generally the case, modules designers should provide teacher-learners with opportunities to engage with literary texts in a critical way based on their communicative needs (Guemide, 2012) and to move away from "parrot-like types of learning" (Turuk, 2008, p. 256). Otherwise, these activities encourage a banking approach to learning (Freire, 2007), which does not encourage learners to move beyond memorization and reproduction of what is learned.

5.2.1.4 Content to extend-teachers' language proficiency

All the content in KIE DE modules for English can and does potentially extend teacher-learners' proficiency in different ways as it involves the use of language. However, some content in three blocks appears to be specifically intended for this purpose. These blocks are (i) *Oral communication and effective writing I* (Module 1), (ii) *Oral communication and effective writing II* (Module 2) and (i) *Paper presentation and debate on topics of interest* (Module 3).

The block on *Oral communication and effective writing I* addresses issues such as effective speaking, effective listening, the syntax of English sentences, the writing process, types of essays and options for their organization and forms of writing. The speaking and listening sections in this block present techniques and strategies for speaking and listening effectively. The activities related to speaking include questions that ask teacher-learners to reproduce the content of the materials (for example, state the two basic speaking skills, state and explain the four main qualities you need to aim for while speaking, etc. (Module 1, p. 201) and those that ask them to use the acquired techniques to take part in speaking exercises such as presentations, debates and group discussions. The engagement in these exercises is

not always possible for DE students, who study mostly in isolation from one another (Croft, Dalton & Grant, 2010) and this may hamper the transfer of theoretical knowledge about how to speak effectively to everyday communication.

The listening activities ask teacher-learners to listen to tapes and answer questions. These tapes are kept and can be used only at the study/learning centres, mostly during face-to-face sessions. Given the busy schedule during these sessions, the informants interviewed pointed out that they never had time to use these. Some of them pointed out that they had never seen them, let alone used them. In addition, these tapes are not interactive and, therefore, do not provide teacher-learners with immediate feedback. This lack of immediate feedback and the difficulties related to the use of these tapes are likely to limit their contribution to teacher-learners' development of oral proficiency.

The rest of the block focuses on the development of teacher-learners' writing skills. It explains writing processes, types of essays and options for their organization together with note taking, summarizing, paraphrasing, synthesizing and evaluation strategies. While the development of these skills requires practice, the presentation of content and related activity questions seems not to involve teacher-learners in practical tasks for them to internalize the content. For instance, out of 32 activity questions, 16 require a reproduction of what is written on the pages of the module. They include questions such as 'what is the meaning of a topic? Why is it important to specify the scope of your writing? State the properties of a paragraph', etc. However, even the remaining 16 questions that seem to encourage thinking and the development of practical skills do not address the entire process of writing a text. Some of these ask teacher-learners to write summaries, evaluative notes and paragraphs, to paraphrase, to identify logical connectors in given paragraphs, etc. Only one question asks teacher-learners to write a text in full on the following topic: *"The money spent on post-secondary education is wasted; discuss"* (Module 1, p. 271). While this topic implies that the teacher-learners are expected to write an argumentative essay, the section to which it is related does not practically indicate how an argumentative essay is written. It only explains the properties of an effective

argument and the types of evidence in an argument but does not explain and/or illustrate how to achieve this in one's own writing. What is more, the designers do not provide an answer to this question in order to practically exemplify how an argumentative essay is written.

The analysis presented in the above paragraph suggests that the block focuses on learning *about* types of writing rather than *doing* the actual writing. It goes against Reid's (2009, p. 197) suggestion that "writing teachers should be [taught and] asked to write as part of their professional development." In fact, writing teachers need to go through the process of writing and experience the difficulties thereof so that they can "connect emotionally to their students" and "gain clarity about how students learn to write" (Reid, 2009, p. 201). It can be concluded, therefore, that this block may equip teacher-learners in the programme with theoretical knowledge on writing, speaking and listening effectively, but fail to help them transfer this knowledge to their daily communication through writing.

The *Oral communication and effective writing II* block is almost entirely on writing[23] (with some content on writing pedagogy[24]) in spite of its designers' claim that it helps teacher-learners "to practice speaking in a profitable way" (Module 2, p. 93). This is an example of the lack of coherence and organization within and across KIE DE modules for English. Again, the section provides teacher-learners just with theoretical knowledge, which is unlikely to help them become skilful writers. For instance, after explaining the drafting and revision stages (in a textbook style), the module designers give the following activity to teacher-learners:

> 1.a What are the different steps involved in creating or preparing the first draft in the writing process?
>
> 1.b. What activities are involved in each step?
>
> 2. How does a scratch outline differ from a descriptive outline?

[23] Reference to speaking is only made in a one page long explanation between speech and writing.
[24] This content will be analyzed in more detail in the section 5.2.2 focusing on the pedagogy module.

3. In revising for the final draft, give some of the questions you might ask yourself in relation to the three basic elements of composition, namely, subject, audience and purpose.

4. Although as a whole the process approach to composition proves to be useful for writers and for all students of English, it however presents some disadvantages for most students of English as a foreign language and some students of English as a second language. What are those disadvantages and what do you suggest as remedies for them? (Module 2, p. 125)

It is unlikely that the ability to get answers to these questions "right" will translate into the ability to draft and revise one's own text effectively and, more importantly to teach learners to do the same as indicated by Mukamana, one of the nine informants that I interviewed. She noted:

> while all our examinations contain composition writing, we do not really take time to teach writing to prepare our learners for this task. The modules also do the same: in all the exams we write we have to write compositions while we have not been taught how to.

These remarks are a confirmation that KIE DE modules for English have not effectively addressed teachers' own writing skills and knowledge and the pedagogic knowledge that they need in order to teach writing, as will be indicated in the section 5.2.2. This is one of the reasons why I decided to redesign a section on writing pedagogy with the aim of simultaneously supporting teacher-learners in the development of their own writing and of writing pedagogy knowledge and skills in a more practical way.

The block on *Paper presentation and debate on topics of interest* (Module 3) addresses three aspects: writing a term paper, presenting a term paper and debating. The content of the section on 'writing a term paper' is actually similar to the process and techniques of writing an essay that were addressed in Module 1 and, more extensively, in Module 2. Again, these repetitions point to lack of coherence in the organization of content in KIE DE modules for English. It can be argued that some repetition is useful but there should be cross-referencing and

progressive development between these, which could help the teacher-learners to understand why certain things have been repeated. The sections on paper presentation and debate equip teacher-learners with theoretical knowledge and tips for successful paper presentations and debates. Interestingly, no activity asks teacher-learners to write 'papers' and present them in class or to hold a debate. This is in spite of some of the learning objectives for the block being to enable teacher-learners "to present and defend a paper" and "to argue coherently and logically in debate sessions" (Module 3, p. 129). This theoretical knowledge may not be helpful in this regard because presentation and debating require practical knowledge and skills. Teacher-learners could have been asked to prepare to debate a topic at a contact session and to present it and receive feedback from tutors/lecturers.

While communication involves all the four language areas (writing, reading, speaking and listening), KIE DE modules for English do not contain any content on reading knowledge and skills development. This total absence of content and mediation (Vygotsky, 1978) regarding reading knowledge and skills seems inappropriate for DE learners, who study mainly from printed learning materials and, therefore, rely heavily on reading. In fact, given the importance of mediation in assisting learners to solve problems that they cannot solved on their own (see Turuk, 2008 in Chapter Two), this absence is likely to make it difficult for teacher-learners to perform reading tasks successfully. Such lack of support for the development of proficiency in reading is likely to affect their learning because the ability to read and school or academic achievement are strongly correlated (Zarei, 2008). Moreover, though this cannot be established with certainty, the lack of content on reading for academic purposes may be one of the reasons why reading and understanding the modules was a challenge as indicated by seven of the nine informants in this study. While this situation can be largely attributed to difficult language used in the materials, poor reading skills may also have played a role (Zarei, 2008).

From this overview, it can be concluded that the KIE DE programme for English may make only a limited contribution to the extension of teacher-learners' language proficiency.

5.2.2 Content to extend teacher-learners' pedagogic content knowledge

The designers of the KIE DE pedagogy module (Module 7) make a very important observation in relation to PCK (Shulman, 1986, 1987): "one may be equipped with a large body of theories and methods of language teaching, which is a good and laudable thing. However, what one does with this body of knowledge in the actual classroom matters" (Module 7, p. 85). The extent to which KIE DE materials enable teacher-learners to use the acquired knowledge to mediate learning in their classes is the focus of this section.

Given that one of the main aims of language teaching is to enable communication (see Andrewes, 2011 in Chapter Three), it can be argued that language teachers (especially in EFL/ESL contexts) should emphasize the use of language in context or, in other words, adopt communicative approaches. Thus, selections from the extensive literature on Communicative Language Teaching (see Chapter Three) are used to inform the analysis of Module 7 materials. The focus of this analysis is on the extent to which the designers enable teacher-learners to adopt communicative approaches in their classes[25]. It should be noted that teacher-learners' PCK applied to ELT is addressed only in one separate module (Module 7). Olphen (2008) notes that such relegation of PCK to methods courses/modules is common in teacher education programmes and argues that it hampers the integration of theory and practice. This is why he suggests that PCK should be incorporated in all teacher preparation courses/modules.

Moreover, KIE DE teacher-learners receive Module 7 towards the end of the programme, which means that they study how to teach English long after they have learnt a great deal of subject English content. Addressing teacher-learners' PCK at the end of the programme may limit the opportunities and time for them to develop as teachers by applying and reflecting on what they learn and making required adjustments progressively and increase the divide between the programme's theory

[25] This is in spite of the arguments for post-communicative English learning discussed on pages 73-73.

and practice, which divide has been identified as a limitation in many teacher education programmes (Johnson and Arshavskaya, 2011). This approach seems to go against the concept of sequencing (Bernstein, 1996) suggesting that different aspects of content need to be presented in a certain sequence in order for learners to understand these optimally. Furthermore, the 2010 cohort of teacher-learners had very limited time (more or less five months) to engage with what KIE offered them in this module: they received the module in mid-2012, attended a contact session on its content in August 2012, did their Teaching Practice under the supervision/guidance of KIE lecturers (usually the module designers) in the last term of the 2012 school year (September and October) and graduated in December 2012.

With reference to its content, Module 7 is made up of three blocks: (i) Methods for teaching English language, (ii) Teaching methods for teaching Literature in English and (iii) Didactique du Français (Didactics for French[26]). Table 5 (on the next page) summarises the blocks and respective sections in Module 7.

[26] The module addresses the teaching of both English and French because, as has been explained in Chapter One, all the teacher-learners who are studying English in the KIE DE programme are also studying French. Since this research is about the professional development of English teachers, the analysis has focused on the first two blocks of the Module.

Blocks	Sections
1. Specific Teaching Methods, English Language	1.Issues and procedures in English language teaching and learning 2.Basic notions and principles of language teaching 3.English language curriculum, content, teaching techniques, resources, assessment and instructional planning
2. Techniques and methods for teaching literature in English	1. Teaching literature: a general approach 2. Teaching oral literature 3. Teaching poetry 4. Teaching drama 5. Teaching the novel 6. Teaching the short story
3. Didactique du français	1. Objectifs généraux et organisation de la classes de français 2. Démarche méthodologique des activités de compréhension 3. Démarche méthodologique des activités de l'exploitation des mécanismes linguistiques 4. Démarche méthodologique des activités de production

Table 5: Module 7 blocks and sections

The designers of this module explain that the aim of teaching language is to "enable learners to receive and pass on information in a verbal and written form" (Module 7, p. 21). They also suggest that communication should not just be an end, but a means as well. Therefore, they recommend the use of communicative activities (group discussions, debates, roles plays, research activities, etc.) in language teaching and extol learner-centred approaches. For example, they suggest that literature teaching should "give priority to students' responses to the texts they read. It is not the teacher's responses to the text that they have to memorize. They have to be taught how to react properly to texts and find out their own responses for their own lives" (Module 7, p. 1). The following sections analyze the extent to which (if any) the content of the English language and literature pedagogy module enables the teacher-learners to adopt these communicative and learner-centred principles in their classes.

5.2.2.1 Methods of teaching speaking, listening, writing, grammar and vocabulary

This block is made up of three sections (see Table 5 above); the first two of these are purely theoretical while the third mixes both theoretical and practical content. It is in this third section that teacher-learners are 'shown how to teach' the four language skills and related knowledge. A careful analysis of this block indicates that the designers of Module 7 list and/or explain the importance of certain theories, principles and issues related to language teaching and mention good ideas and approaches to teaching different areas of language (grammar, vocabulary, writing, etc.). However, they neither provide teacher-learners with guidance nor give them examples of how to use this knowledge to teach these different areas, which suggests that the theoretical knowledge presented in this module is more principled (pure theory) than proceduralized (applied theory) (Shay, Oosthuizen, Paxton & Van der Merwe, under review). I will substantiate this claim through the analysis of the theories and methods of and approaches to language teaching presented in Module 7.

Section 1: Issues and procedures in English language teaching and learning

This section discusses particular theories of language teaching/learning (behaviorist, innatist or mentalist and cognitive), in order to "look at some positive points of these theories, how we would devise activities in relation to them and how some activities could be inspired by ideas from a number of these theories" (Module 7, p. 17). This apparently relevant aim is in line with Bernard's argument that "methodological suggestion needs to be considered in the light of specific teaching/learning contexts" (2011, p. 6). However, in the module these theories are 'discussed' independently of any context. Additionally, teacher-learners are not offered practical guidance on when (in which circumstances) and/or how they should use ideas from particular theories to design and conduct their teaching activities.

While there is a note that comes after a 'discussion' of every theory which seems to be aimed at informing teacher-learners of the implications the theories could have for their teaching and/or what to do when drawing from these, this is very short and generally tells teacher-learners what to do (which they may already know), but not how. For example, the following are the notes on the mentalist and cognitive theories respectively:

> From what has been said regarding the mentalist theory, you as a teacher need to provide a lot of opportunities for the learners of the L2 to hear a lot of good English as well as to use it to communicate with other children at school and outside the school, if their interests are taken into account in what is taught" (Module 7, p. 19).

> Issues raised in this theory should help you as an English language teacher to select, produce and adapt materials for language to exploit. Such materials could stimulate learners' interest and make them want to talk in the target language (p. 20).

The activity related to this section asks teacher-learners to explain how the theories discussed in this section can feed ideas and techniques into a language learning classroom. This question is very important: it is only when teacher-learners can see the link between these theories and the language classroom practice that these theories become relevant to them (Olphen, 2008). However, the Module 7 designers did not link these theories to any classroom context in eith their presentation of content or in the suggested answer to the question. The answer is just a reproduction of what the different theories are about, with no reference being made to language teaching activities.

The concerns raised in the above paragraph also apply to linguistic theories, which are 'discussed' in a way that makes them difficult for the teacher-learners to grasp. This is notably because, in addition to not explaining how these theories can be ushered into the language class, the module designers use many technical terms that are not glossed or defined, sometimes referring to further theories and concepts which teacher-learners may not know. For instance, this is how transformational grammar is described:

> Transformational grammar with its emphasis on language as rule-governed and as being the phenomenon of human mind gave birth to mentalism or thinking as a rule governed activity. Although the behaviorist theory does not derive from structural linguistics, it has focused most of its practice on structuralism. Again, although transformational grammar has not created the cognitive theory, it at least has contributed, with its rule-governed philosophy, to the creation of the cognitive theory (Module 7, p. 21).

In addition to the language being very formal and abstract, it is also lexically very dense, with many words in one clause and the sentences are highly nominalized (Halliday, 1986). Such language contributes to the content of the materials being very difficult for the teacher-learners to understand. In other words, the designers have failed to mediate complex content in ways that facilitate what Shay (2013) terms 'epistemic access'.

While the module designers sometimes relate the theories to language teaching, the relationship is too general to be helpful for the teacher-learners. For instance, the module designers indicate that

> no one language teaching method can account for the complex phenomenon of language learning. The tendency today is to go for an eclectic method that derives insights from all existing theories and methods and different descriptions of languages, while at the same time taking into account learners' needs and abilities, and the factors of the environment in which language teaching takes place (p. 22).

These remarks may be useful to language teachers, but the designers do not indicate to teacher-learners how they can proceed to use eclectic methods.

In this section the designers also discuss a few issues that are directly linked to the language classroom. These include the variety of English that should be taught, lack of adequate teaching resources, the Rwandan sociolinguistic environment which may lead to lack of motivation to learn and use English for communication, large classes, the mother tongue influence on intonation, and the provision of resources for teaching English. Again, there is no indication of *how* these challenges can be addressed in the classroom. For instance, concerning large classes, the module designers state: "you may need to devise ways and means of getting to as many

learners as possible, by using group work methods" (p. 26) without giving any guidelines for how to use group work effectively. Regarding motivation, they suggest: "you must find a way of making English appear relevant and useful to your learners" (p. 26). With reference to the provision of resources for teaching English, the designers present different types of resources that can be used in the teaching of English without indicating to teacher-learners how these can be used and why they should be used. For instance, after explaining what newspapers and magazines are and what they commonly contain, the module designers write:

> A teacher can exploit materials used in different classified advertisements from newspapers to help students discuss the items contained in these advertisements. They can discuss the following, for instance, the qualification needed for a given advertised vacant position and the advantages of renting given houses or apartments advertised according to their facilities (Module 7, p. 31).

While there is some guidance for how to use newspaper texts, it is quite general and more importantly, there is no information about what learners could learn from participating in such discussions.

With regard to the use of reference works such as dictionaries and encyclopaedias, the materials designers write:

> Students should be initiated into a fruitful use of grammar books. They need to identify different classes of words in sentences, the main constituents and sub-constituents of sentences and phrases (…) All these kinds of knowledge and much more are described in different school grammars. Students should therefore regularly consult them in order to facilitate a good understanding of texts (Module 7, p. 32-33)

While learners may have textbooks that include grammar they are unlikely to have grammar books so this directive is not useful to teachers. In addition, the decontextualized grammar teaching implied in these instructions has been widely critiqued (Feng, 2013).

With regard to which variety should be taught, the designers give priority to "the variety which is spoken by native speakers of English" (Module 7, p. 154). This reference to the native variety as a norm has been challenged by the concept of

'World Englishes'[27] and by post-communicative approaches to English language learning (Andrewes, 2011). The concept of 'World Englishes' recognizes the varieties of English not as deviations and contests the ownership of English by 'native' speakers of English (Spencer, 2012). Indeed, having become an international language, English is now shared and shaped by all its speakers, both native and non-native users (Seidhofer, 2005) as Chinua Achebe[28] suggested. Therefore, as Andrewes (2011, p. 11) argues, "native-speaker competence no longer has the exclusively high priority it once did." The module designers themselves point out that the aim of studying English is to understand and make oneself understood in the variety that one uses. Therefore, the teaching of non native varieties (by non native teachers) should not be considered as second best and/or less effective/important. Instead, teachers, who share linguistic and cultural experiences with their learners can be a good model for them since they can anticipate their problems (Crandall, 2000).

The section of Module 7 also discusses the 'basic principles which inform language teaching': the principles of mastery of the subject, motivation, selection, gradation and learner-centredness. Though these principles are related to general pedagogic content and are more extensively addressed in Education Studies modules, the module designers discussed them in relation to ELT, which is likely to make them more relevant to KIE DE teacher-learners who are being educated to teach English.

Section 2: Basic notions and principles of language teaching


This section of Module 7 appears to be aimed at equipping the teacher-learners with theoretical procedural knowledge (Fantl, 2012) or, as discussed in section 3.2.1, the knowledge of how learners learn and of how to teach effectively. It defines concepts

[27] The term 'World Englishes' was coined by Kachru in 1985 to refer to the varieties of English which are spoken in countries where English has been indigenized such as India, Singapore, Nigeria, South Africa, etc (Kilickaya, 2009).

[28] Chinua Achebe [quoted in Bhatt (2001: 537)] challenged the dominance of the English native variety in the following terms: "I feel the English language will be able to carry the weight of my African experience. But it will have to be a new English, still in communion with its ancestral home but altered to suit its new African surroundings."

such as an approach, a method, techniques, aims and objectives of language teaching, explains communicative competence, principles of language learning and language teaching methods and the importance of language teaching methods. While the above concepts are relevant to language teaching, they are superficially addressed. For instance, the module explains what aims and objectives are, their importance and the differences between the two but does not practically show teacher-learners how to set effective objectives for their lessons and use these to guide their teaching. The module designers also point out that "communicative competence is an important concept that is being applied in most language teaching methods" and that it is "useful to understand how different language teaching methods handle communication and why they are important and what principles underlie their manipulation" (Module 7, p. 41). However, they do not indicate to the teacher-learners how the different methods can be used to teach English for communication as will be discussed later. Thus, the lack of guidance on *how* certain teaching principles inform approaches to classroom teaching that was identified in section 1 of Module 7 is also evident in section 2 of the same Module.

The language teaching methods presented in this section of Module 7 are classified under four approaches: teacher-based, learner-based, affective humanistic and whole language. None of these approaches is discussed in terms of its underlying principles. Only the derived methods are discussed in the module immediately after the 'approach heading' without even an introductory word, except in the case of the learner-based approach. The page copied on the next page illustrates this point.



Module 7: English/French teaching methods

c. Affective humanistic approaches

i. Desuggestopedia

Formerly called Suggestopedia, the method changed its name to Desuggestopedia (cfr Larsen-Freeman, 2001:73). Lozanov, the initiator of this method, changed this name because of "*the importance placed on desuggesting limitations on learning*". The idea here is that language learning can take place very quickly in the learner. If it does not, it is because we all are responsible for psychological barriers we set to learning. More concretely, we entertain permanent fear that we are unable to learn, that we will fail if we try. Proponents of this method claim that we may probably be using only ten percent of our mental capacity in our attempts to learn a language. Indeed, this may be true for any mental and intellectual activity, and not only language. Have you ever thought about this possibility? Write your ideas in the space below.

If we could believe that we use only five to ten percent of our mental capacities, the problem then is: how can we use the rest of our capacities satisfactorily? The answer given by Lozanov is: we need to be 'dessuggested'.

Desuggestion, in this regard, consists in applying positive suggestions to pedagogy. We should help students eliminate negative feelings of incapacity towards studying. In this way, we can overcome "the barriers to learning".

One way of stimulating "the students' mental reserve is through integration of the fine arts" in language learning. Lozanov's colleague, Evelyn Gateva, developed a method of including music in language lessons.

The main principle of this method is to enable learners to achieve a state of psychic relaxation in which learners individually or in group utilise the full extent of their inner resources. Lozanov claims that a learner can master 1800 words and speak, using essential grammar and read any text in 24 days. The teacher acts as a facilitator or a guide, encouraging learners to examine their own resources in coping with the learning tasks.

The strong point of this method is that learners assimilate language unconsciously and almost effortlessly within a pleasant atmosphere in which they are involved in games, plays, group discussions and in other active and interesting sessions.

Features of the method

1. The room in which the method takes place is described as being bright, colourful with posters and grammar notes on the wall.
2. While doing language activities, music will be put on. Reading can follow the rhythm of the music. Students take notes during the session.
3. First reading of the dialogue without music but with illustrated paintings.
4. Second reading with music not adapted to the rhythm of music. Students could read the dialogue before they go to bed, and when they get up in the morning. Other activities: translation, repetitions, playing ball while asking one another questions, new dialogues during other sessions; use of toys, stories; study of related words, etc.

Page 64

Figure 4: The presentation of teaching approaches in Module 7

As can be seen on Figure 4, the title 'Affective humanistic approach' is not mediated[29]: what it stands for has not been explained and, therefore, teacher-learners may not know what using the approach entails. Given that the module

[29] The mediation of content on this page has a number of limitations is be analysed in Chapter Six (page 256).

designers' indication that "an approach is a guiding principle which informs a particular method in the teaching of a language" while "a method is an implementation of the approach in a classroom situation" (Module 7, p. 22), teacher-learners would need to understand a given approach, its underlying principles, the difference(s) between different approaches, etc. in order for them to select and use different method(s) and/or approach(es) effectively. Failing to provide teacher-learners with this knowledge is likely to make the choice/use of particular methods/approaches an even more complicated task.

All the methods in this section are discussed in the same way and allocated the same space irrespective of their relevance to the Rwandan high school context and their connection (or lack thereof) with the aims of the Rwandan O'Level curriculum for English. For instance, the module designers believe that CLT is a potentially helpful approach in teaching language for communication and refer to communication several times (pages 1, 2, 14, 22, 23, 102, 107), emphasizing its primacy both as a means and an end of language teaching/learning. However, a 'discussion' of CLT is allocated no more space than methods such as the Audio-Lingual and the Grammar Translation that the same designers consider to be respectively less communicative and inappropriate to the Rwandan high school context. This finding gives the impression that presenting these approaches and methods is just meant to inform teacher-learners of their existence or even to display that the module designers know about them.

It is also of concern that the strategies for using these methods in the classroom, which should be at the core of a pedagogy module, are just listed without any explanation and/or examples of how they can be used in a given classroom situation for given learning objectives. The following are "the main techniques used in a communicative language teaching approach" (p. 71):

1. Authentic materials (eg newspapers, listening to radio or television broadcasts, menus, timetable, realia, plays, games, role-plays…

2. Scrambled sentences. Passages with sentences in a scrambled order. The point is to restore these sentences to their original order. The learners would then learn about cohesion and coherence properties.
3. Language games
4. Picture strip stories to predict the order in which the pictures could follow one another. This is an example of a problem-solving task.
5. Problem-solving task. They usually include the 3 features of communication (see above features of the teaching/learning process).
6. Role-play (cfr also desuggestopedia above 1)
7. Role-play is important in communicative language teaching as it offers practice in different social roles (Module 7, p. 71).

The above list does not make it clear how these techniques can be adopted to teach each of the 'four language skills' and related knowledge together with grammar and vocabulary for communication. Thus, despite designers identifying CLT as the most effective 'method' to teach English for communication, reading this list of what are termed 'techniques' is not likely to enable teacher-learners to effectively adopt this approach in their classrooms. What is more, these 'techniques' have not been linked to the context where the teaching will take place as recommended by the sociocultural theorists of language learning (see Johnson, 2006 in Chapter Two). This situation is likely to lead to teacher-learners failing to adapt these methods to the realities of their classrooms (Crandall, 2000; Johnson and Golombek, 2011).

While it must be acknowledged that a short comment that comes at the end of a 'discussion' of some methods sometimes briefly makes reference to the Rwandan context in a generalized way, in three of the eight 'short comments' where the Rwandan context is mentioned, only general remarks on methods are provided. For instance, a comment on *Methodological practices* is as follows:

> At lower levels as learners' oral as well as written abilities have not yet sufficiently developed, the teacher could prefer to use methods such as the total physical response, audio lingual method, the natural approach, and so on. At higher levels depending on the objectives of language programmes and the availability of teaching materials and technical equipment, almost all methods could be used and in different combinations …

> teachers could borrow principles and techniques from any other methods and incorporate them into the current methods that they use (Module 7, p. 84).

This comment lacks specificity. For instance, it is not clear what is meant by lower and higher levels (e.g. different years of study or different levels of proficiency in the same year) are referred to. Similarly, it is not clear which teaching materials and technical equipment are needed in order for a given method to be used. Thus there is little chance that the information provided in such a comment will help teacher-learners to select and/or use selected teaching methods effectively. I suggest the following rephrasing of the comment for more focus and effectiveness:

> At the O'Level … you as a teacher should use methods such as … in order to achieve learning objectives such as … Your method selection and use will also depend on the kind of teaching materials at your disposal. If you have … [the materials] you may use … [methods] because …

This section also contains some notes on 'methodological practices' based on the premise that teachers should let "the learner assume his/her responsibilities for building his/her own communicative competence" (Module 7, p. 81). These notes present three 'methodological innovations' which, according to the designers, were developed to complement content based-instruction. These are learning strategy training, cooperative learning and working with learners with 'multiple intelligences'. As a conclusion to these innovations, the module designers challenge teacher-learners as follows:

> We should accommodate our students' learning styles or multiple intelligences while at the same time asking them to work cooperatively in activities of all sorts. While thinking on any methodological choices, we should take into account the unique qualities of each of our students and their learning strategies (Module 7, p. 83).

Again, the module designers do not indicate how the individual learner's needs and learning strategies and styles can be identified and responded to, which is likely to be a limitation to teacher-learners' fruitful 'take up' of these seemingly useful suggestions.

Another important finding about the first two sections of block 1 is that the number of activity questions has decreased compared to the version that was used by the first KIE DE intake of teacher-learners (2001). For instance, while there were 7 questions on Grammar Translation method, there are only 3 questions in the 'new' version (2012). Also, only the first two of the twelve questions on the Audio-Lingual Method remain in the new version (with exactly the same wording) and ten questions, some of which required reflective responses, are entirely left out. Therefore, the reduction of the number of questions may negatively affect the value of the activities. The space reserved for teacher-learners' answers has also decreased, sometimes with no space being left at all (see for example, pages 47, 71, 97, 104, 197 and 199 in the module). The pedagogical implications of this change will be discussed in Chapter Six.

Section 3: English language curriculum, content, teaching techniques, resources, assessment and instructional planning

This section is presented by the designers as the heart of the English language pedagogy material because it claims to discuss "in some details the main procedures, activities and techniques for teaching and learning the basic language skills" (Module 7, p. 85).

The section starts by differentiating a curriculum from a syllabus, explaining curriculum objectives. It also explains the elements that are taken into consideration in developing curricula and syllabi and in setting curriculum objectives. These elements, however, appear to be common to all subjects and are, therefore, related to (general) pedagogic knowledge (Shulman, 1987) addressed more deeply in some Education Studies modules. These elements include contemporary life outside the school, manpower employment patterns, and the needs of the learner. After discussing these issues, the module designers present four major types of [language] syllabuses: formal, functional, task-based and process-based.

These types of syllabuses are not adequately and completely explained; only their key characteristics are summarized in a table. Their implications for language teaching are not addressed, which implications, I suggest, constitute the main reason for learning about these syllabuses. The module designers themselves state that each of these syllabuses attempt to organize materials to be taught in a certain way and urge teacher-learners to examine the table presenting the characteristics of these syllabuses "from two angles: *what is to be learned and how the learning is done*" (p. 89, italics in the original). However, they do not unpack how these syllabuses influence what is to be learned, when and for which aims to use which type of syllabus. The designers just make the following brief comment after presenting these syllabuses:

> A structural syllabus would be arranged according to different structures distributed in different language units according to certain principles: easy to difficult, regular to irregular, simple to complex and so on. A situational syllabus would present structural items grouped in different situations such as "The family", "At the market". A notional-functional syllabus would present lists of linguistic structures and formulate phrases according to the notions and functions they play in everyday communication. A phonological syllabus would probably present sounds according to their increasing ordered difficulty (Module 7, p. 88).

As can be seen, this comment does not refer directly to the four aforementioned 'major types of syllabuses' (formal, functional, task-based and process-based). Indeed, none of them is referred to in this comment. Instead, a different set of syllabuses (structural, situational, notional-functional and phonological) is introduced.

In answering the activity question that asks teacher-learners to identify the main types of syllabuses that have been used in Rwanda, the module designers come up with another list of types of syllabuses (cyclical, structural, lexical, situational, skill-based). These, according to them, are "normally used in language classes in many places in the world" (p. 163). The large number of 'types' and the way they are referred to is likely to confuse teacher-learners. For instance, it is not clear how the 'major types of syllabuses' are similar to or different from those that are 'normally

used in many places in the world'. Moreover, little explanation has been provided for the latter and none of them has been explained in relation to their impact on language teaching in the Rwandan context. This further evidences the lack of guidance on the *how* (Bernstein, 1996) in this pedagogy module and of the lack of connection to teaching context. I suggest that the types of syllabuses that are/have been used in Rwanda should be the main ones to be discussed and teacher-learners should be encouraged to reflect on these in relation to how they teach. However, the other types could also be discussed especially if they are good alternatives to those used in Rwanda and/or elsewhere and, in that case, their discussion should draw on the Rwandan context. In fact, as Clarke and Winch (2004), in Shay (2013), argue, "the learner has got to be able to recognize contexts to which the theory applies and those to which it does not. This requires both knowledge of the theory and the ability to recognize the contexts in which it does apply." I suggest that one way to do this is to explain theories in relation to various contexts.

After these general remarks on language teaching, the Module 7 designers move to the pedagogy of the different knowledge types and skills areas. Again, in spite of listing theories, approaches and methods related to the teaching of these knowledge and skills, the designers do not give guidance on, and examples of, how to teach these as will be demonstrated in the analysis presented in sections that follow.

The teaching of listening and speaking skills

According to Clarence-Fincham et al. (2002, p. 72), "speaking cannot be separated from listening because the two are interdependent." This is true in the sense that if someone can pronounce words and sounds (which make up phrases and sentences) correctly and naturally, they are likely to understand these more easily when they are uttered or pronounced by others and vice versa. As the Module 7 designers note, "the process of speaking is incomplete without listening" and "listening and speaking are language skills that should be taught together in the actual classroom situation" (p. 91). Indeed, the designers have addressed the two aspects under the same heading.

According to Richards (2008, p. 1), "courses in listening and speaking have a prominent place in language programmes around the world today." As this scholar notes, the value accorded to listening has increased in recent years with university and other types of examinations often including a listening component. This is a proof that listening skills are a core component of second language proficiency (Richards, 2008). Listening facilitates communication between the learner and the teacher and helps in the processing of input, which is an important factor in second language acquisition (Krashen, 1985).

Speaking also needs particular attention in the language curriculum, especially in EFL/ESL contexts because,

> the mastery of speaking skills in English is a priority for many second-language or foreign-language learners. Consequently, learners often evaluate their success in language learning as well as the effectiveness of their English course on the basis of how much they feel they have improved in their spoken language proficiency (Richards, 2008, p. 19).

For DETYA[30], "good grounding in basic pronunciation is a valuable gift that *any* ESL teacher can give to any learner" (2001, p. 51, italics in the original) because, regarding comprehensibility, a fairly good pronunciation with grammatical errors is better than good grammar with bad pronunciation.

Regarding the teaching of listening skills, Richards points out that traditional approaches emphasized repetition after the teacher, memorizing a dialogue, or responding to drills, which "reflect the sentence-based view of proficiency" (2008, p. 2). These are unlikely to foster listening for understanding in natural conversations which involve structures that have never been heard and/or pronounced. Thus, advocates of CLT have shifted the teaching of listening from repetitions and drills towards the teaching/learning of listening through learners' involvement in communicative and functional tasks (Richards, 2008).

[30] New South Wales Department of Education Training and Youth Affairs.

In addition to serving as a tool for communication between Rwandans and the outside world, English is expected to enable learners "to develop the spirit of dialogue, promote tolerance and a culture of peace" (NCDC, 1998, p. 2). This is more likely to be achieved through interaction and, therefore, the approach to teaching listening and speaking should focus on talk as interaction (Richards, 2008). However, talk as interaction, may be the most difficult skill to teach because "interactional talk is a very complex and subtle phenomenon that takes place under the control of unspoken [and unteachable] rules" (Richards, 2008, p. 29). Thus, learners should be involved in naturalistic/natural conversations on topics of interest as part of activities to learn speaking and/or listening. The Module 7 designers agree with this approach when they state that

> instead of teaching the learner only the rules of formation, we should teach him/her the pragmatic use of language that mainly involves making decisions about what language to use, where and how (p. 91).

The learning objectives of teaching listening and speaking skills in Module 7 seem to be in line with the above approach and cover all the listening and speaking levels of proficiency: from the articulation of English vowels and consonants, through listening and responding simultaneously and fluently to conversational prompts, to adapting one mode of conversation to suit the context or situation (p. 92). In spite of these implied seemingly relevant approaches and objectives however, the designers do not provide teacher-learners with guidance on how to adopt the approaches in order to teach to these objectives. They suggest ten "strategies for teaching listening and speaking skills" (p. 95). Five of these focus on teaching pronunciation through imitation and are actually suggestions for how to attend to learners' pronunciation problems, which suggests that the problems faced by learners are a starting point. This is problematic because teachers need guidance on how to teach pronunciation, even before any problem is identified. After all, problems are most likely to arise after teaching/learning has started.

The other five 'strategies' are actually activities (dictation, drama and role plays, group work, debates, communication games, etc.) in which learners can be involved

to develop their listening and speaking skills. The module designers explain the importance of these but do not explain the steps to take in using them in classrooms. For instance, the following is all that is written about dictation:

> A dictation can also help learners in improving the listening skills, identifying the uttered words, and the writing skills. Taking dictations does not only improve the listening skills and writing skills, but also spelling and punctuation (p. 95).

In other cases, what seem to be instructions for how to implement a teaching strategy provide general information as illustrated by the following instructions on the use of group work:

> Small groups should be used to discuss a topic of learners' own choice or one given by the teacher. After the task is completed, the students should be asked to present their discussions to the rest of the class. Other students should react to the presentation in a class discussion (p. 96).

Some of the issues that the above instructions do not address include the role of the teacher in these group discussions, how to make them fruitful, how to make sure that everybody participates (including those who are shy), etc.

While most of these 'strategies' or activities (drama, role-plays, group work, debates and communication games) can be used to teach both speaking and listening, the module designers do not indicate how they can be used to teach each of these two areas. After all, one strategy may be used differently depending on whether it is used to teach listening or speaking. Moreover, some strategies that are important in teaching listening and speaking are not mentioned in the module. These include the use of tape recordings and radio and television broadcasts, which could expose learners to different varieties of English and to different speakers and accents (Scheckle, 2009), and debates, which could help alleviate the high affective filter (Krashen, 1985) and shyness that often characterize ESL/EFL learners (Lee, 2003). Debates may also increase interactions between learners, which interactions are central to language learning (Johnson and Golombek, 2011).

Analysis of this section suggests that it may not enable teacher-learners to teach listening and speaking skills in such a way that the learners in their classes can take part in conversations using English; they are not given guidance on how to conduct a lesson on listening and speaking. Moreover, they are not briefed on how to create opportunities for learners to speak and listen to English extensively in the classroom, which opportunities constitute an important factor in teaching these skills (Dornbrack, 2009).

The teaching of reading skills

Reading is "one of the most important acts in school learning" (Gultig, 2001, p. 113) and poor reading abilities lead to poor school performance in all areas of curriculum (Sloat et al., 2007) because reading is used as a main resource for acquiring knowledge. Therefore, teachers of reading should "enable students to learn to read and read to learn" (Pang et al., 2003, p. 21) in all subjects and lessons and in and out of school. This may be why AD-Heisat et al. (2009) suggest that teachers should teach reading strategies that develop learners' reading competency so that they can cope with texts in an unfamiliar language.

The Module 7 designers emphasize the importance of reading for both learning and language and communication skills development as follows:

> reading is a vital skill as access to most of the information is through this skill […] The ability to comprehend what is read is also one of the most important skills, not only in learning English but also in other subjects […] Reading widely helps learners to develop a word bank, and exposes them to new ideas and sentence structures that are used later to communicate both verbally and in the written form" (Module 7, p. 97).

For these designers, "reading is not only a vital skill for academic purposes but also for life", and is, therefore, "part of education for life" (Module 7, p. 98). Thus, they suggest an approach to teaching reading that embraces a critical examination and application of what is read. This is evident in some of what they state as objectives of teaching reading: to read for details and critically, infer meanings from written texts,

apply what is read to other situations and synthesize information from different sources (p. 98). Unfortunately, there is little evidence of this approach in the subsequent content on reading pedagogy as will be illustrated.

The module designers present what they call "theoretical procedures used in reading" (p. 99): bottom up (emphasis on the recognition of words rather than their meanings), top-down (beyond the word or reading between the lines[31]) and interactive (interaction between the reader and the text). While it is important for teachers to know about these, the designers do not show teacher-learners how to help their learners to adopt each of these approaches while reading. The designers present examples of "various reading processes that involve learners either individually or interactively" (Module 7, p. 99). These are reading aloud, shared reading, guided reading, paired reading, independent reading and language exploration. The explanations provided on how to use these 'processes' seem incomplete. For instance, concerning guided reading, the designers state that

> learners are aware of the purposes for reading and the teacher monitors the process. They respond to the materials and the teacher evaluates their progress pointing out the weaknesses. This is better done as homework but not during the reading lesson as it can be time-consuming and learners need to read without pressure" (p. 99).

The above instructions do not indicate the 'purpose(s)' of the guided reading process, how it/they can be achieved and the indicators of progress or the aspects of reading that the teacher should consider.

A subsequent heading entitled 'developing reading skills' introduces the 'different forms' that reading can take in the classroom: intensive and extensive reading, fast reading, reading for detail, inferencing, silent reading, expressive reading, critical reading and reading aloud. These are defined and/or explained briefly, mostly without any indication of how teacher-learners can use them in their reading

[31] While the module designers state that the top-down reading model refers to reading between lines, which implies critical reading, the model actually encourages readers to focus more on understanding the meaning of the whole text than understanding every word (http://everydaylife.globalpost.com/topdown-reading-model-theory-13028.html, accessed on 14 October 2013).

lessons. In the few cases where such an indication is provided, it lacks specificity. With reference to expressive reading, for example, teacher-learners are told:

> In teaching expressive reading skills, you teach learners *various ways* of expressing overall meanings. In reading, you should ask learners *to note areas of language* like paragraphing, tone which may not be explicit, diction, stress, intonation and use of punctuation. These skills enable learners to read meaningfully (p. 101, italics added).

In order for teacher-learners to teach expressive reading skills, they may need further information about some issues raised in these instructions. Some of this information includes what the various ways of expressing overall meaning are, how these can be taught/learned, what learners will do with the areas of language they will have noted, how 'these skills' enable learners to read meaningfully, etc.

A 'simplified' version of the SQ3R (Survey, Question, Read, Recite/recall and Revise/Review) reading strategy is also presented as one of the strategies to develop reading skills. I consider this version simplified because it just explains very briefly (usually in one sentence) what each of its components is about. Moreover, the module designers do not provide practical examples to illustrate how the strategy works; neither do they provide the steps to be followed by teacher-learners, should they decide to use this strategy with their learners.

Teacher-learners are also briefed about "developing reading skills through reading comprehension", which the module designers consider to be "the commonest way to improve reading skills" (Module 7, p. 103). For them, when taking part in a reading comprehension lesson, learners are expected to:

- Comprehend a passage by following its content, arguments and narrative sequence.
- Infer information, meanings, attitudes and intention from what is read.
- Present such information in a variety of ways (p. 103).

These expectations show that reading comprehension goes beyond mere decoding and encourages learners to think and use their prior knowledge to make sense of what they read in Module 7. The teaching of reading comprehension appears to be

addressed more effectively than that of other aspects of reading or other language areas in Module 7: all the stages of a lesson (from preparation to post-reading) are presented one after the other and the designers suggest, briefly explain and provide examples of nine types of questions that can be used "to assess what is read" (p. 105). These questions assess different levels of understanding from knowledge (factual information) to synthesis. While it is not clear why this was done only for this strategy, one can speculate that it is because the designers consider reading comprehension the commonest way to improve reading skills.

In spite of its abovementioned merits, however, the presentation of this strategy is not without shortcomings. For instance, no text comprehension model has been provided in order to illustrate, contextualize and make the strategy and the suggested questions more practical. The examples that are suggested for the different types of questions (factual, comprehension, etc.) are not supported by any text and, therefore, teacher-learners may find it difficult to understand these questions because language study is best done in context (Wessels, 2010). In fact, depending on the context, the same question can belong to different categories. For example, the question, "Why did the policeman arrest the old man?" (p. 105), which the module designers term a factual question, could also be a comprehension question. Similarly, some questions suggested for comprehension questions (e.g. From what you have read, give a title to this passage, p. 105) could also be evaluative questions.

In addition, the information that is provided for some teaching stages is incomplete. For instance, the designers suggest that in the pre-reading stage teacher-learners can ask questions or tell stories to arouse learners' curiosity and interest. However, the principle behind these questions, which, apparently, is activating or building on learners' prior knowledge to understand the new text (Donald, Lazarus & Lolwana, 2010), that would have enabled teacher-learners to understand the pedagogical implications/importance of the questions is omitted. Furthermore, the activity that accompanies this section asks teacher-learners to do exactly what the module designers did: "formulate nine questions of your own, each testing a different skill"

(Module 7, p. 106). The suggested answer to the activity presents a question for each type, which is actually a duplication of what has been done in the content presentation. Interestingly, the activity in the first version of the module had a text on the basis of which teacher-learners had to formulate their questions. Given that DE materials need to be reviewed, improved and updated regularly so that they remain useful to the learners (Mishru, Ahnlad and Rui, 2001), the above situation raises questions about the value of the 'revision' of this module.

This analysis of this section on reading pedagogy points to lack of practical guidance on how to conduct a reading lesson from the beginning (pre-reading) to the end (assessment). In addition, the section offers extremely limited opportunities and encouragement for teacher-learners to experiment with and reflect on what they have acquired from the section and its implications for their reading classes. Moreover, it does not indicate to teacher-learners how to encourage their learners to engage in out of school reading, leading to a culture of reading for life. Therefore, it can be argued that this section does not equip teacher-learners with the knowledge and skills that they need to teach reading optimally.

The teaching of writing

According to Tangpermpoon (2008) writing is the most difficult skill for EFL/ESL learners to develop: it requires a certain amount of L2 background knowledge, can be an anxiety-generating activity and learners may not enjoy it (Tsui, 1996). These are some of the factors that make writing difficult to teach especially in ESL and EFL classrooms (Tangpermpoon, 2008), and which may have contributed to teachers shunning writing teaching, making it the 'Cinderella' of the four language skills (Ciobanu, 2011).

It should be noted that teachers of writing have long focused on the final product of learners' writing activity, at the expense of what learners do to produce it - the process (Tsui, 1996). However, there has been a shift of focus to writing as a process of developing organization as well as meaning (Tsui, 1996; Andrews & Smit, 2011) or

"the making of meaning out of chaos" (Zamel, 1982, p. 199). Instead of emphasizing the qualities of the final product, the process approach emphasizes the skills that learners can develop at the different writing stages, which may help them to write better next time. After all, "if the piece of writing gets better but the writer has learned nothing that will help him on another day on another piece, then the conference (or the exercise, or the corrections) was a waste of everyone's time" (McCormick, 1986, in Antoniazzi, 2005, p. 36). Besides, the feedback and input received at the different stages of the writing process are likely to improve learners' abilities to communicate (Scheckle, 2009) and the quality of the product of writing itself (Zamel, 1982).

Another approach, the genre approach, had its origins in a critique of the process approach which has been accused of not sufficiently dealing with the linguistic knowledge (Kim, 2006). The proponents of the genre approach argue that in the process even though the final stage of editing addresses some mechanical features of language, it is mainly concerned with the skills of processing ideas involved in the planning and drafting stages. Furthermore, they suggest that the process approach has a very restricted view of writing as it presumes that writing proficiency takes place only through the repetition of the same writing procedures irrespective of the nature of text (the genre) being written (Kim, 2006). Thus, the genre approach to writing is based on the premise that the form of a text will be determined by its social function. This gives rise to different genres which we need to be able to write in order to communicate and operate in society successfully (Ralfe, 2009).

While the above three approaches (product, process and genre) are sometimes considered different and separate, the truth is that "a good piece of writing which achieves its purpose is the successful product of a process, and part of that process will have been an introduction to the appropriate genre, so the reality is that all three approaches should be taken into consideration" (Ralfe, 2009, p. 156). Consequently, current writing pedagogy advocates an integrated approach in which the strengths of each of the three writing approaches complement each other (Tangpermpoon, 2008).

With reference to writing pedagogy in Module 7, its designers stress that "each particular piece of writing should be planned and organized, as well as written clearly and coherently" (p. 108). This quote suggests a process approach and gives the impression that the module designers will indicate to teacher-learners how to help their learners to write according to this approach. This, however, seems not to be the case as indicated below.

One example is that of a section on 'the teaching of writing' (p. 107) which mainly provides teacher-learners with general information about writing (what writing is, the types of writing and difficulties in writing) while making limited and general reference to writing pedagogy. For example, in connection with difficulties in writing, the module designers point out to teacher-learners that

> Some learners experience difficulties in understanding what is expected in continuous writing. Hence, they need help with the choice, planning and arrangement of content, which we refer to as **content organization**. Let the learners know that a good writer plans and organizes before they start writing. Learners may have ideas, but if those ideas are presented in a jumbled way, thereby causing incoherency, they may pose difficulties of comprehension to the reader (Module7 p. 110, emphasis in the original).

These remarks suggest that the designers assume that teacher-learners know *how* and, therefore, need the knowledge of *what* to do. For instance, teacher-learners are asked to "let the learners know that a good writer plans and organizes before they begin writing" (p. 110) but are not shown how to help their learners plan and organize. As has been noted earlier, this lack of guidance on *how* is very common throughout Module 7 in general, and in this section in particular.

In order to assess what teacher-learners have learned from the section on writing pedagogy, one activity asks them to identify the problems that their learners face when writing, explain why the problems happen and how they could help overcome these. The related feedback is as follows: "use your experiences with your students to answer this question: if you do not have enough experience of learners' writing problems, discuss with your classmates (colleagues) or contact your tutor" (Module

7, p. 110). This feedback is unlikely to be helpful because it does not show teacher-learners what ought to be done from an expert's point of view. As for the answer to the question, it repeats the problems that learners often encounter (poor content organization, use of inappropriate words, lack of logical order, inappropriate use of connectors, etc.) and suggests 'how' these can be addressed:

> Learners can be helped in these problems [*sic*] by training them sufficiently in the organization of ideas in paragraphs, in reading extensively with an eye fixed on collocations, sentence structures and appropriate words; by organizing enough essays for practice (p. 167).

These suggestions are likely to leave teacher-learners with more questions than answers. These include how to teach learners to organize paragraphs, how to involve them in extensive reading that will help them in their writing, how to exploit collocations (a term with which teacher-learners may be unfamiliar) in developing learners writing, how to help them to write essays, etc. These questions are not addressed anywhere in the pedagogy or content modules and this seems to be a serious limitation.

Towards the end of the section on writing pedagogy there is a text (a third of a page) entitled 'Techniques for teaching the writing skills'. The text is reproduced in its entirety on the next page:

When teaching writing, you should encourage integration of the basic language skills. The four language skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing should not be treated in total isolation of each other, even where the writing skill is the primary focus. You can involve learners in the following activities: (cf Raimes, 1986).

1. Composing: this is essay writing and it can be in the form of narrative, argument, discussion, description and exposition.
2. Functional writing: examples of these are letters (formal and informal), minutes, reports, recipes, dialogues and memoranda.
3. Presenting information in different forms or from different angles.
4. Dictation to improve spelling, use of punctuation marks and capitalization and also to sharpen the listening skills.
5. Rewriting a given text using one's own words (paraphrasing).
6. Taking and making notes from spoken and written sources.
7. Summary writing.
8. Writing dialogue.
9. Using short narrative to write a similar story (Module 7, p. 112-113).

Figure 5: A section on 'Techniques for teaching the writing skills' in Module 7

In spite of its suggestive title, the above text does not provide any techniques for teaching writing; it only lists activities in which learners can be involved for the development of their writing without any indication on how to use these. In a self-assessment activity related to this section, teacher-learners are asked to "make an investigation into the types of writing activities organized in one school to check whether each of the 9 activities … is practiced" (p. 113) and to suggest ways of having all the activities practised in their classes. The answer provided by the module designers lists the activities that are likely to be most practised and those that are likely to be least practiced. Then a conclusion is drawn: "activities that demand a lot of time for marking are less preferred by teachers than those that can be marked in less than no time" (Module 7, p. 168). No discussion is made of pedagogic implications of such a situation, which could have prompted teacher-learners to reflect on it in relation to their own writing lessons and to consider how to alleviate

it. Moreover, no suggestions are made on how to practice these activities in one's class, which further limits their usefulness.

It should be noted that Module 2 contains some content on teaching writing as has been pointed out in section 5.2.1.4. This content, according to the module designers, constitutes "an overview of different approaches to composition writing from the perspectives of product and process approaches" (p. 122). The approaches are grouped according to whether the learners are first, second or foreign language speakers of English. The content briefly explains these approaches without linking them to any specific level or teaching situation/context and without exemplifying them. This makes some issues around these approaches unclear. For instance, it is not clear why KIE teacher-learners, who teach EFL/ESL classes, should also be briefed about methods that are used to teach first language speakers of English. Moreover, the differentiation between the three categories of learners itself seems problematic because some approaches can be used across these classes. For example, the genre approach which the module designers relate exclusively to EFL classes can also be used in English first language classes.

Furthermore, so many approaches are listed that they are likely to confuse teacher-learners: the process, the prose model, the experiential model, the rhetorical, the epistemic and the linguistic approaches (for English first language speakers); the controlled-to-free, the pattern-paragraph, the grammar syntax organization and the communicative (for ESL learners); the structural approach, the product approach, the communicative/humanistic approach, the genre approach and any other approach suggested for English first language speakers and ESL/EFL classes (Module 7, pp. 110-129). Furthermore, there is no explanation of why some approaches are appropriate for certain categories of learners and/or which approaches relate to the development of particular writing knowledge and skills. So, teacher-learners do not have information on which to decide which approach to use. Again, this lack of explanation of why it is a good idea for teacher-learners to do things in particular ways is common in Module 7, especially in block 1.

Nevertheless, the section does offer some helpful suggestions for *what* to do in a writing class. For instance, it urges teacher-learners to make sure that their learners are motivated to write, notably by making their learners "feel that they have something worthwhile to write about", giving them a chance "to choose their own topic of interest" and making them aware that "there is someone interested in reading what they write" (Module 7, p. 111). An important strategy is also suggested to help learners to value their writing: displaying "the best learners' written work on the wall or notice board, have the learner present it to the class or include it in the school magazine" (Module 7, p. 111). Ralfe (2009) terms this display "publication" and considers it important in keeping learners motivated and increasing the opportunities for them to write.

Overall, bearing in mind that many of these teacher-learners do not have a pedagogic background, this section on writing pedagogy is likely to be of very little help to them. This is mainly because there is no guidance on *how* to do things. This issue will be discussed in Chapter Seven from the view point of the teacher-learners who were interviewed.

The teaching of grammar

Research on the teaching of grammar suggests that grammar structures should not be taught independently of the contexts in which they are (supposed to be) used. Indeed, it is not enough for learners to understand grammatical structures; they must also be able to use them appropriately in context (Murray, 2009) or else, their understanding of grammar will be incomplete. Thus, according to Murray (2009, p. 199), "a combination of CLT and explicit attention to grammar is more effective than either CLT or grammar teaching on their own." This may be why in many language classrooms the traditional (rule-focused) teaching of grammar has given way to "a more communicative approach to teaching how to use grammar meaningfully in context" (Gardner, 2008, p. 39).

In introducing the section on grammar pedagogy, the Module 7 designers state that "the ultimate aim [of grammar teaching] should be to develop the ability to use them [grammatical structures and rules] in meaningful sentences, not as single words or to rote-learn them as an end in itself" (Module 7, p. 115-116). Therefore, according to the designers, grammar items should be taught/learned contextually alongside all other language skills and "not in isolation but in a sentence using a meaningful activity" (p. 115). For instance, they suggest that reading comprehension questions should be "framed in such a way that, in answering them, learners should practice some grammatical structures in their answers" (Module 7, p. 117) and grammatical structures should be "included in meaningful utterances and taught to learners before any rule of use could be presented" (p. 117). However, the module designers seem not to value this laudable approach in presenting the content on grammar pedagogy as will be indicated in the analysis that follows.

Module 7 designers suggest the following techniques for teaching grammar: the object-centred technique, the silent way, the verb-centred approach, the situation-centred approach, conversion and transformational activities and identification exercises. The first four techniques seem too elementary to be used to teach high school learners since they are about basic grammar though they could still be useful for revision. According to the designers, all the above mentioned techniques involve questions asked of learners (and their answers) in such a way that they come up with specific structures. Some examples include 'what's this? It's a … (object-centred) and 'I wake up at … Do you wake up at …? No I don't wake up at…; what am I doing? (verb-centred), orders such as walk to the door, sit down, etc. (verb-centred), listening to dialogues to assimilate basic grammatical structures (silent way), etc.

Conversion and transformation exercises are about transforming sentences (affirmative into negatives, affirmatives into questions, actives into passives, and so on) and combining sentences and reducing some parts of the sentences to phrases. Concerning the identification activities 'technique', the designers suggest that learners can be asked to identify given structures (adverbial structures, prepositional phrases used as adjectives, etc.), to identify structures that are identical in different

sentences, “but more importantly, they could be asked to build their own sentences, incorporating given structures as used in model sentences” (Module 7, p. 120). No single example has been provided to illustrate these types of exercises, which leads to an important point being missed: these different grammatical structures are used to express different meanings and, therefore, transformation is not an end in itself, but a means of expressing things differently, making explicit the relationship between form and function (Nunan, 1998).

While the module designers recommend the use of context to teach grammar, no contextualizing example has been provided for the teacher-learners. However, two sentences about the use of reading to teach grammar seem to allude to this. These are as follows: “the selected passage should contain the structures you want to put emphasis on. They should also be at the level of learners’ linguistic ability” (Module 7, p. 121). This is a good suggestion but does not explain how the structures could be taught based on the passage.

My suggestion is that a passage should have been used to illustrate how the grammatical structures and/or rules could be taught. This could indicate to teacher-learners that presenting structures and/or rules in context is far more effective in promoting grammatical fluency than doing this out of the context (Krashen, 1993). Furthermore, given Gardner’s (2008) suggestion that grammar use is practical, grammar teaching knowledge and skills are better acquired when learners are involved in practical activities which stimulate their reflection. This echoes the old Chinese proverb: “Tell me and I forget; show me and I may remember; involve me and I understand”. KIE DE modules seem to ‘tell’ teacher-learners, which is not effective as a strategy to teach them how to *do* things. Moreover, there is no indication of how specific grammar structures (nouns, pronouns, etc.) and rules (tense formation, voices, direct/indirect speeches, etc) should be taught. This lack of illustrative examples for making the suggested approach/es more concrete is another common limitation in Module 7, especially in block 1.

The teaching of vocabulary

Vocabulary plays an important role in ESL learners' ability to communicate effectively in the target language because "lexical items carry the basic information load of the meanings they wish to comprehend and express" (Reid, 2004, p. 146). Thus vocabulary teaching/learning is a very important element of ESL/EFL teaching programmes, though learners certainly acquire word knowledge incidentally while engaged in various language learning activities (Reid, 2004). For vocabulary to be retained and used spontaneously in new and different contexts, there is need for opportunities to practice it frequently (Reid, 2004). The designers of module 7 urge teacher-learners to encourage their learners to use the acquired vocabulary quite often because the "vocabulary that is not often heard or read in its normal context will either be forgotten or be misused" (Module 7, p. 124). The designers identify three aspects that need to be mastered in the learning of lexical items: (i) the phonological aspect (pronunciation), (ii) the morphological aspect (form and spelling), and (iii) the semantic aspect (meaning). This advice is very important because, the ability to recognize and use a given word effectively entails knowledge of the three aspects.

Under the heading 'techniques for teaching vocabulary', the module designers present what they call 'the normal procedure' for teaching vocabulary: pronounce the "word" clearly, have learners repeat the word after the teacher, write the word on the chalkboard and have learners pronounce it again, explain its meaning by putting it in a suitable context, and ask learners to give the meaning of the word in their local language if they fail to explain it in English. This seems to imply a teacher-centred and less communicative approach, in spite of the module designers recommending a learner-centred approach, "where learners make efforts to get the meaning by themselves through the use of contextual clues" (Module 7, p. 126). In addition, the designers do not provide a starting point which, I suggest, should be the context where the word is used; that is a text. Thus, instead of explaining the word by 'putting it in a suitable context', the context in which the word is found should be used to explain it first. Learners could then be asked to use the word in (a)

new context(s) for practice and/or evaluation. Otherwise, learners may know the meaning of the words but fail to use them to communicate especially because the same word can have different meanings in different contexts.

After this 'normal procedure', the module designers list and briefly explain examples of "other specific techniques for teaching vocabulary" (p. 127). Some of these are contextualization, using words in sentences, use of visual aids, dramatization, reference to what learners already know, using a dictionary, using synonyms, etc. These are not actually 'techniques of *teaching* vocabulary' but techniques of *explaining* vocabulary likely to take place within a lesson, which lesson teacher-learners were not shown how conduct (from the introduction to the conclusion).

Concerning evaluation in a vocabulary lesson, the Module designers list different methods that can be used to test whether learners have acquired the vocabulary and whether they are able to use new words appropriately (p. 128). These include the use of multiple choice questions, use of an item or picture to elicit vocabulary, use of phrasal verbs in sentences, use of affixes and compound words to form new words, use of cloze tests and other gap filling exercises, etc. Again, apart from listing these 'methods', the module designers neither explain them nor give examples of *how* teachers can use them. Unless these are unpacked by means of examples, the teacher-learners may not understand how and what to use these for.

The lack of guidance on *how* is extended to the activity that is supposedly designed to assess what teacher-learners have learnt from the section on techniques of teaching vocabulary. It asks them to "select a passage, identify vocabulary and try to get the meaning from the context" (p. 129). This activity does not actually assess teacher-learners' ability to teach vocabulary, but their own knowledge of vocabulary items. Since the knowledge of certain topics (vocabulary in this case) does not necessarily translate into the ability to teach them (Shulman, 1987; Hlas & Hildebrandt, 2010), this activity seems not very helpful regarding vocabulary teaching.

After these notes on the teaching of different aspects of language knowledge and skills, the module designers devote considerable space (25 pages) to sections entitled 'assessment in English language teaching' (12 pages) and 'instructional planning for English language instruction' (13 pages). In spite of these suggestive titles, however, the content under these is discussed in general terms, without being related to ELT, except for one and half pages devoted to the essay test. This approach to content presentation makes it applicable to all subjects and, therefore, part of (general) pedagogic knowledge (Shulman, 1987) addressed in Education Studies Modules. While it is debatable whether this content should or should not be included in a PCK module for ELT, the lack of focus on English is a cause for concern in a module for English teachers.

Conclusion

While Block 1 of Module 7 claims to equip teacher-learners with the 'procedural' knowledge that they need in order to teach English effectively, analysis of its content suggests that it does not do this optimally. It falls short of addressing both Winch's (2013) 'know how' and 'knowledge by acquaintance' or theoretical procedural knowledge and practical procedural knowledge respectively. While the section allocates more pages to theoretical procedural knowledge about language teaching than to practical procedural knowledge, neither are addressed in ways that Rwandan teachers of English are likely to find informative for their classroom work.

Furthermore, while the analysis of the situations in which teachers' work is one source of PCK for teacher-learners (Richards, 1991), the module designers rarely draw from such situations. This lack of links between the knowledge and the contexts and situations where it is to be applied is inappropriate in a pedagogy module which aims to develop teacher-learners' knowledge and skills for teaching in a specific context. In fact, context knowledge itself is an integral part of teachers' PCK (see Olphen, 2008 in Chapter Two) and, according to sociocultural theory (see Johnson and Golombek, 2011 in Chapter Two), linking teaching methods and approaches to the contexts where they will be used is a sine qua non for effective

teacher education programmes. The limited use of practical examples and instruction on how theories can inform teaching may negatively affect teacher-learners' development of PCK and their ability to teach because, as pointed out by the Module 7 designers, "it is what one does with this body of knowledge in the actual classroom matters" (Module 7, p. 85). As Eraut (2002) and Fantl (2012) suggest, knowing how something is done does not necessarily translate into the ability to do it.

In addition, while the designers identify CLT as "a new way and a new method of teaching language and linguistic structures from a functional perspective" so that learners are "able to use them for a communicative purpose" (Module 7, p. 71), they have not indicated sufficiently to teacher-learners how the different aspects of language can be taught communicatively. This suggests that they have espoused a principle (that "we do not study language simply in order to understand it but mainly in order to communicate in it" (Module 7, p. 1) that they have not enacted in their practice (the materials).

5.2.2.2 Methods of teaching literature

It can be argued that in a high school language classroom Literature should occupy an important place in language classrooms because it has the potential to further learners' knowledge of language. Indeed,

> if students are exposed systematically to works of literature, they will develop their language competence too … Students will enrich and develop their language input since literary texts offer contact with some of the more subtle and varied creative uses of language (Guemide, 2012, p. 74).

In addition, literature teaching can encompass all aspects of a language curriculum – listening, speaking, reading and writing and understanding language structure and use (Davis, Dixon & Kerr, 2009). Thus, literature can provide authentic material for studying language and opportunities to use the target language (Clarence-Fincham et al., 2002). In order for the learners to capitalize on such opportunities, they need to actively engage with literary texts individually by drawing from their world (Davis,

Dixon & Kerr, 2009) and expressing their own understanding of and 'emotional response' (Clarence-Fincham et al., 2002) to the texts. Indeed, "the pedagogical interface of literature and language teaching should become the students' responses to the text" (Guemide, 2012, p. 73). This encouragement of learners' personal responses to the text may be the reason why the teaching of literature is believed to support the development of critical thinking (Turuk, 2008).

In the literature pedagogy block (block 2), the Module 7 designers emphasize that each learner "should respond to the literary text as an individual so that he or she experiences the emotional sense that the text creates" (Module 7, p. 177). What the designers consider being the objectives of teaching literature seem to be aligned with the recommendations in the previous paragraphs. These objectives include imparting language skills and knowledge, personal and character development, cultural socialization and entertainment (Module 7, p. 175-176). However, an analysis of the content of this block suggests that the module designers have good ideas about teaching but seem not to work with these optimally in order to demonstrate how to teach. In other words, the issue of how teacher-learners should teach is not consistently addressed throughout the block. Nevertheless, this block appears to be more effectively designed than block 1 mainly because its designers show understanding of the context where teacher-learners work: the classroom. As will be illustrated, the designers sometimes use classroom situations to help teacher-learners to understand pedagogic content. This seems an effective approach because procedural knowledge, which the block aims to develop, is bounded by the context in which it is (supposed to be) used (Carr, 1995), hence Fenstermacher's (1994) reference to it as local knowledge.

The literature pedagogy block comprises of six sections. The first section addresses 'a general approach to teaching literature' while the other five address the teaching of one of each of the following literary genres: oral literature, poetry, drama, a novel, and a short story. It should be noted that the first version of the module (2001) included a pre-test aimed to assess the teacher-learners' prior knowledge of the content of the block. This is not the case in this second version (2012). Moreover, in

the first version each of the abovementioned six sections had its own separate set of objectives, which, I suggest, was more helpful because it enabled teacher-learners to evaluate their progress after each section instead of waiting until the end of the block (85 pages) as is the case in the new module. Issues around objectives will be discussed more extensively in Chapter Six. In the next sections, I analyze each of the six sections separately.

Teaching literature: a general approach

This section elaborates on the designers' stated objectives of teaching literature (see page 166), the teacher's role and learners' responsibilities in a literature class. The module designers emphasize that the teacher's role should be "that of a facilitator rather than a professional know-it-all interpreter … that of guiding the learner to realize what he or she can decipher from the literary text" (Module 7, p. 177). Adopting this suggestion may encourage the individual learner's response to the text or any other literary work and such an approach is learner-centred. In this regard, the designers advise teacher-learners to help learners contextualize what the (literary) text is about and to whet their appetite before starting the actual reading. For instance, for the teaching of Langston Hughes' poem "*I too*", which is about racial segregation in America, the module designers suggest that teacher-learners could start by asking learners to give as much information as possible about the United States. They could also play a pop song like Bob Marley's "*Buffalo Soldier*" (which is about slavery and the racial situation in America) to establish the context in which the poem was written. More importantly, the section encourages teacher-learners to improvise their own materials in case there are no ready-made ones. This is helpful advice especially in contexts like Rwanda where English literature learning/teaching resources are limited. The problem with it is that no guidance is provided in the module on how teacher-learners can develop these materials.

Concerning the actual teaching of literary texts, the section encourages the teacher-learners to involve learners in group discussions, synthesize learners' ideas and add their input to handout notes. Such an approach is likely to encourage learners to

become active and critical readers and not passive consumers of texts (Clarence-Fincham et al., 2002). It can also help in achieving the aim of teaching literature which, for Clarence-Fincham et al. (2002, p. 159), is to "encourage learners to actively engage their imaginations in responding to a text, working out things for themselves and relating their own experience to the experiences they encounter in the texts."

Module 7 designers also make an interesting point regarding what to do after reading and studying the text:

> The teaching of literature does not end with the analysis of the text. Just as there are activities that help the student to contextualize the text before beginning to read it, there are other activities that can help him/her to internalize better the text after reading and studying it (p. 186).

This is very important because learners are likely to understand the text better if they think about and/or work with/on it in their out of school life, with peers and/or any other person(s). If they are well set, the after-reading activities can enable learners to relate what they learn in the classroom to their everyday life. Another merit of this section is that it encourages teacher-learners to go beyond module designers' instructions, be creative and experiment with their own ideas in class. The section also presents teacher-learners with a lesson plan on 'definition of literature', which is copied below in its entirety on the next two pages.

Example of a lesson plan

Name of teacher: Rubebe Chantal

Name of the school: Kimironko High School

Number of students: 25

Form: SIV

Time: 14 hrs – 14.40

Topic: Definition of Literature


Date: 01/01/2002

Objectives of the lesson:

By the end of the lesson the learners should be able to:

a. Define literature
b. Identify the two categories of literature
c. List various genres of literature

Material development	**Time**	**Teacher's activities**	**Learner's activities**	**Resources and reference material**
Introduction	15 min	Teacher asks students to cite and briefly recount stories of any novels, short stories, plays, poems, or folk narratives they have ever read, watched or listened to being performed	Students respond to the question.	Teacher's own experience of literature from his/her community and/students' community
Lesson development - Definition of literature - Difference between oral and written literature - List genres of oral literature - List genres of written literature	20min	Teacher guides students on arriving at an acceptable definition of literature Teacher guides students in identifying the differences between orature and written literature	Students attempt a definition of literature before the teacher gives one. Students attempt listing differences between oral literature and written literature	Taylor, R. (1981) *Understanding the Elements of Literature* Graphic drawing on manila paper, of the various genres of both oral and written literature
Conclusion				



Block 2: Techniques and methods for teaching literature in English

	15 min	Teacher recaps on the main points regarding definition of literature, differences between oral and written literature	Students are given a suitable text to read in preparation for the next lesson
Self- evaluation		(to come after the lesson has been taught)	

Figure 6: An example of a lesson plan in Module 7

While one can be critical of aspects of its content, this lesson appears to be learner-centred and communicative because learners are the ones that provide some of the content of the lesson by answering the teacher's questions, which questions are apparently aimed at guiding them through the learning process. In the process of answering the questions, learners are involved in communication to some extent. Nevertheless, the lesson could have been more communicative if learners had been encouraged to discuss the questions in groups. The next sections focus on the teaching of different literary genres as addressed in this block.

The teaching of oral literature

The forms of oral literature addressed in Module 7 are oral narratives, proverbs, riddles, tongue twisters, songs and dances. In order to teach these, the designers suggest an integrated approach that merges language-learning skills with those of orature, taking "a practical student-centred approach to learning language" (Module 7, p. 188). However, they do not provide any particular methodology for teaching these forms; they just define and briefly explain each one.

The assessment activities in the materials, however, address pedagogic content knowledge and skills related to these forms. For instance, the three questions on the teaching of oral narratives ask teacher-learners to explain how they would help their learners (i) to identify literary devices, (ii) themes and (ii) moral lessons and other meanings emanating from the story "*Wagachiairi and the Monster*" (p. 192). While one would expect related 'feedback' to guide teacher-learners through the process of achieving the above, what is given only outlines the features of style (repetition, symbolism, etc.) and challenges teacher-learners as follows:

> identify sentences or statements that contain the literary devices you have noted. Use them to make your learners understand them. Discuss with your colleagues and your Subject Tutor so as to agree on your methodology and its appropriacy, then compare with the answers we have given (Module 7, p. 193).

The answers referred to in the above quotation do not refer to any methodology; they just list the literary devices used in the story without any indication of how they have been identified. Thus, the 'knowledge how' (Bernstein, 1996; Richards, 2008) is also missing in this section. Moreover, there is no reference to the themes and, more importantly, to the moral lesson(s) drawn from the story or to how to identify these. Discussion of the moral lesson, I suggest, could help develop learners' critical thinking, encouraging them to link what they learn to what happens in their communities or, in other words, to read not only the word but also the world around them as these two are intertwined (Freire & Macedo, 1987). The link between oral literature and everyday life seems to be addressed by the activity question on the teaching of proverbs: it asks teacher-learners to prepare a lesson plan to teach proverbs, encouraging learners to identify the importance of these in society. However, the designers' suggested lesson plan focuses on translating certain Kinyarwanda proverbs into English, with their importance in society being confined to the lesson's conclusion which is allocated 5 of the lesson's 40 minutes. This brief analysis suggests that the section is unlikely to enable the teacher-learners to teach oral literature in a way that develops their learners' critical thinking and communication skills.

The teaching of poetry, drama, novels and short stories

The teaching of poetry, drama, novels and short stories is addressed in the same way for each genre, divided into three phases: before the reading, during the reading and after the reading of the text. For each of these genres, the designers take teacher-learners through these phases by asking them to explain how they would tackle certain aspects of the teaching, before suggesting their (the designers') own perspectives/answers. In the feedback to these activities, the designers indicate that their answers are not the only correct ones and encourage the teacher-learners to come up with their own. Such a suggestion is in line with a constructivist approach to learning (see Chapter Two) and may encourage teacher-learners to think critically when comparing the two sets of answers, and to make thoughtful and informed decisions in their own teaching. This shows a degree of recognition by the designers that these materials are intended for practicing teachers, something that is not found in block 1.

The nature of activities in the 'before-reading' phase suggests that the phase refers to a teacher's preparations for teaching and the activities he or she should take learners through to prepare them for the subject and/or the topic. For Clarence-Fincham et al. (2002), activities in this phase should help learners to make links between their own experience and the text to be studied and provide them with the information they need in order to understand the text. As can be inferred from its title, the 'during reading phase' consists of activities that take place during the actual reading of the text. One of the aims of such activities is to enable learners to have a deep understanding of the text. Clarence-Fincham et al. (2002) suggest that these activities should maintain learners' interest, encourage them to respond to the text and develop empathy, imagination, and language skills. For all the four genres (poetry, drama, novel and short story), the designers use a text to illustrate this phase.

The after reading phase is aimed at helping learners to "internalize better the text after reading and studying it" (Module 7, p. 186). The activities in this phase,

according to Clarence-Fincham et al. (2002), should consolidate what has been learned and extend learners' understanding by encouraging them to use new skills and knowledge in new contexts. This seems in line with the Rwandan O'Level curriculum statement that learners should be taught to "relate literature to their everyday experience" (NCDC, 1998, p. 3). Activities, which indicate of how to teach the various literary genres will be analysed for each of the three phases in the next sections.

Teaching poetry

The Module 7 designers claim to "provide some strategies and techniques which can be adopted in teaching poetry to either students who are new to the subject or the more advanced" (p. 204). Firstly, they challenge teacher-learners to address a preconceived attitude that learners and some teachers have about poetry: poetry is difficult and "can only be taught and enjoyed by the very clever" (Module 7, p. 204). The module designers write that poetry "permeates our day-to-day life" (Module 7, p. 204) and everyone can read, recite, enjoy and, eventually, create poetry, though to different extents. They attempt to position teachers to respond positively to the teaching of poetry.

The Module designers suggest that teachers can address the misconception that poetry is difficult by starting with poems that are interesting and easily accessible for learners. These include songs, hymns, anthems, pop songs, etc. The reason for this is that if teachers start with very difficult abstract poetry, learners "will confirm their unfounded fear that poetry is difficult to understand" (Module 7, p. 250). After singing or listening to and/or reading these songs or poems, the designers suggest, teachers should ask learners to reflect on the songs, drawing learners' attention to the characteristics of these songs and their functions in the community. This seems effective guidance for showing learners that they deal with poetry on a daily basis.

For the 'during-reading phase', the designers chose John Ciardi's poem "*Men Marry What They Need. I Marry You*" to model the teaching of poetry. The related activity

includes the following questions: (i) what elements of poetry would you like your students to be introduced to? List them, (ii) how many of these elements can you identify in Ciardi's poem? Show them by annotation on the poem, (iii) discuss them briefly and describe the way you would explain them to your students (p. 206). It is of concern to find (from the designers' answers to these questions[32]) that the focus of these questions is only on the form and not on content/meaning. This absence of focus on meaning may be a hindrance to effective teaching of poetry (Clarence-Fincham et al., 2002) because the meaning of a poem is important in learners/readers' taking poetry into their daily life as recommended in the Curriculum for English (NCDC, 1998).

The feedback to this activity suggests that a simpler poem that deals with "a similar or same theme" (p. 251) should be used as an ice-breaker for the teaching of a poem of the level of difficulty of Ciardi's. The module designers suggest Everret M. Standa's "*Wedding Eve*" so that learners "have something to compare the current poem [Ciardi's] with" (Module 7, p. 252). While this is a good suggestion, it may not work for all complex poems because teachers may not always find poems on the same theme that are simpler than the ones they want to teach. Moreover, the simplicity of a poem may vary from person to person and the teacher-learners need to know how to teach 'simple' poems as well. Therefore, the designers should have spelled out what needs to be done (the principles) in order to help learners understand the poem, before illustrating this with one of several possible ways of doing it (using Standa's poem). This could help teacher-learners to devise their own ways of achieving the same outcomes when teaching different poems.

For the after reading phase, the designers suggest activities such as recitation, learners writing their own poems, pieces in place (reordering jumbled verses or stanzas of poems) and activities related to comparing and contrasting poems with similar themes and/or forms, among others. These activities are important for

[32] The answer to question 3, which includes an element of pedagogy, is no different. It just explains the different elements of poetry. For instance, the following is all that is written about 'Tone': "tone is the attitude of the poet or speaker towards the subject being addressed or treated. In Ciardi's poem, the tone is affectionate. It is a serious tone that is giving a vow of commitment" (p. 255). Concerning the way these can be explained to the learners, it suggests: "use your discretion here" (p. 254).

reinforcing learners' understanding of the poem they have studied but they seem ineffective for encouraging them to take poetry into their daily lives. The latter could be achieved by setting activities that ask them to reflect and express their feelings and opinions on some of the themes in the poem in relation to their community life. This is one way providing the individual response to a literary text that the Module 7 designers recommend.

Teaching drama

The module designers start this section by defining drama and explaining its elements (plot, character, theme, language style and setting). Thereafter, they ask teacher-learners to read John Ruganda's "*The Burdens*" and devise some steps and activities they would take their learners through while teaching it and to compare their suggested process with the one suggested in the module. For the before reading phase, the module designers suggest a newspaper article, "*Kabila fires five ministers*" to provide a context which will assist learners to understand the play. The questions suggested to help learners in this regard include 'How do you think the ministers' families reacted to their sacking?', 'What do you think will happen to the sacked ministers?' The article seems to be an effective ice-breaker in helping learners to understand Wamala's (the main character in *The Burdens*) current life as depicted in the play: that of a former minister who, after being fired, now lives in abject poverty.

The during-reading phase consists of questions and answers (in a bulleted form) about different acts of the play focusing on what happens in the play and on its elements (plot and structure, setting, themes, language and style, and character and characterization). These are the questions that the module designers suggest teachers should ask their learners. Some of these questions include 'Who are the first characters to appear in Act 1?' 'What can you say of the description of Kaija's clothes?' 'Give a suitable title to Act 1', etc. No information is provided on how to help learners to understand the play. In other words, the section does not actually

teach teacher-learners *how* to teach the play but focuses, in some way, on developing their understanding of its content.

The after-reading activities suggested to enable learners to "internalize well the aspects of the play" (Module 7, p. 219) include role-play, dramatization, tape recording, and debates. Some of these seem effective when used appropriately. For instance, "role-play provides learners with real, concrete experience, and allows them to connect with and express their own responses and ideas" (Clarence-Fincham et al., 2002, p. 167). The problem with the way these activities are presented is that the designers have not specified which activity can be used to internalize which aspect of the play and, more importantly, how. Moreover, there are no activities that encourage learners to reflect on and relate the play to their everyday lives.

Teaching a novel

The section on the teaching of a novel starts with a warning note to teacher-learners: audio-visual electronic media can decrease learners' interest in reading printed materials such as novels which are usually long and, therefore, require much time and effort to read. Thus, the Module designers challenge teacher-learners to establish a reading culture in their classrooms because "reading literature encourages intellectual or mental development of the student much more than what is directly presented to the sense of say hearing or sight" (Module 7, p. 221). In addition, as the designers argue, an established reading culture means that learners are likely to read with minimum supervision from the teacher. The problem is that the Module does not indicate to teacher-learners how to achieve this.

The novel chosen to illustrate the process of teaching a novel is Chinua Achebe's *Things Fall Apart*. The following is a pre-reading phase activity given to teacher-learners:

> Suppose you were required to teach Chinua Achebe's *Things Fall Apart* to a class of Senior 3 [Grade 9] students who have never had the experience of studying literature before. Describe how you would help create a learning context for the class (Module 7, p. 221).

A feedback note follows pointing out that there is no definite answer to this question. Instead, it provides the main question that should guide teacher-learners in determining what to do: "What can I do to help my students to relate the events in Achebe's novel to their own experience?" (p. 221). This question is very important given that effective learning builds on what one already knows (Donald, Lazarus & Lolwana, 2010) and one of the aims of teaching literature is to help learners link literary texts to their own experience (Clarence-Ficham et al., 2002). As an answer to the above guiding question, the designers explain that teacher-learners' decision will depend on the theme they want to focus on. For instance, if they choose to focus on colonialism, which resulted in Okonkwo's death, the questions to learners could focus on their knowledge of how colonialism started in their country and what the initial response of the people was. From such questions, teachers can "talk to students about Okonkwo and give them a synopsis of the novel" (p. 222). I suggest that this model is effective in the teaching of this novel and those with similar themes, provided that learners are encouraged to provide their individual response to it.

The 'during reading' phase for teaching a novel is divided into two types of reading: (i) reading for comprehension and (ii) 'analytical' reading. The 'reading for comprehension' focuses on the content of the novel and the designers suggest a 'reading log' to help learners understand it. For each chapter that the learners have read, they should be asked to fill in different blocks with a title (as there are no chapter titles in the novel), the characters involved and a summary of what happens in the chapter. The following is an example of a 'reading log' completed by the designers (Module 7, p. 222):

Reading log for *Things Fall Apart*

Chapter	Title	**List of characters involved**	Summary of what happens
One Pp 3 - 6	"Okonkwo the great wrestler"	Okonkwo, Unoka, Okoye – a neighbour	Okonkwo's background is given. Unoka's character is decribed. Okoye demands his debt from Unoka who does not pay.
Two Pp 7 - 11	"Udo's wife is murdered in Mbaino" or "Ikemefuna is brought to Umuofia"	Okonkwo, elders of Umuofia, Ikemefuna, Nwoye	Udo's wife is killed in Mbaino. People are summoned to meet. Okonkwo is sent with a message of war to Mbaino and brings Ikemefuna. Okonkwo is described as iron handed.

Figure 7: A 'reading log' copied from Module 7

While this log appears to be useful, it lacks one important element of the during-reading phase: the encouragement of learners to express what they think about what happens in the chapter and what it means to them personally or, in other words, to express their own responses to the text (Clarence-Fincham et al., 2002; Module 7) in thoughtful and creative ways (Davis, Dixon & Kerr, 2009). That is why I suggest an addition of a fifth column to the log to bring about this personal response element. In this column, learners could write what they think about what happens in the chapter and what it means to them personally.

The 'analytical' reading focuses on elements of a novel (form): setting, plot and structure, themes, characterization, and language use and style. Instead of taking teacher-learners through the process of teaching these elements, Module 7 designers explain these, one after the other and ask teacher-learners to identify them in *Things Fall Apart*. Being able to identify these elements in this novel is important for teachers, but what they need most from a pedagogy module is guidance on *how* to help learners to do the same.

Nevertheless, the section contains three questions relevant to literature pedagogy: (i) how would you draw your learners' attention to the elements of the setting in the

novel? (p. 224), (ii) mention the activity you would take learners through to make them realize the plot of the novel (p. 225) and (iii) what can you do to help learners identify and describe the characters intelligibly? (p. 228). The feedback to the first question suggests that teacher-learners could ask learners to reflect on these elements in relation to their culture, identifying similarities and differences. For the second question, feedback suggests that learners can be put in groups to explore the events in the novel and the changes Okonkwo goes through. For the third question, the module designers suggest that learners could be asked to "list down major characters in the novel" (p. 257) and read certain sections and write a summary on what is said about characters in the section. They also suggest group work to discuss the characteristics of one character and report to the whole class, with the outcomes of these discussions being used to write common handout notes.

Taking learners' responses into consideration when making notes for them may make them feel empowered and may, therefore, increase their self-confidence as their contribution to the course is valued. Similarly, group work may promote collaborative/cooperative learning and understanding amongst learners and develop their communication skills. The question that one may ask is why this was not done for other literary genres as well. Again, this more systematic guidance on how to teach, drawing from classroom situations evidences the difference between the block on literature pedagogy and that on language pedagogy (block 1).

For the after reading activities, the designers suggest a dramatization of some acts in the novel, debates and research, among other activities. Debates and research are likely to help learners link the content of the novel to their everyday life and apply the acquired skills in new contexts. In 'debates', the module designers suggest, learners can give their views on some controversial elements of the novel or discuss certain themes relating them to their society by, for example, putting themselves in the shoes of some of these characters and saying what they would have done and why (Module 7). These suggestions are in line with Clarence-Fincham and colleagues' (2002) 'what if?' activities in which learners make predictions and speculations about what could happen, had the main or any other character made a different decision. For instance, learners could be asked to say what could have happened if Okonkwo

had not committed suicide. Such questions (though they are not appropriate for debates) are likely to be effective in stimulating learners' thinking and creative skills.

With reference to research (by the learners), the module designers indicate that it is aimed at encouraging learners "to read what other people have said about the same text, with the main aim of disputing or agreeing with the ideas raised" (Module 7, p. 230). This may enable learners to acquire more knowledge on the novel, reflect on it outside classroom settings and draw lessons from this research for their everyday life. However, the level of the knowledge of language required by this strategy seems to be too high for the Year 3 EFL high school learner. Moreover, it is hard for teachers and learners to find such texts given that most of them do not have access to the internet. Finally, the designers suggest group work in which each group is allocated "a task based on topics covered in the novel for further study" (Module 7, p. 230). However, the nature of the task and/or the study to be conducted is neither explained nor exemplified for teachers whose research knowledge and skills (if any) may be extremely limited.

Teaching a short story

For the before reading phase of short story teaching, the module designers ask teacher-learners to indicate what they would do with their learners before giving them (learners) a short story entitled *Uncle Ben's Choice* to read. The feedback to this question refers teacher-learners to what has been suggested for introducing a novel, which suggests that the two genres are/can be introduced in the same way. I agree with this suggestion because a short story looks like a shorter version of a novel.

For the 'during reading' phase, the module designers ask teacher-learners to explain how they would go about teaching the elements of *Uncle Ben's Choice*. As an answer to this question, a list of 'WH' questions[33] and their answers about these elements is provided, with no reference to *how* these questions could be approached with

[33] They include questions such as: which country do you think the story is set in? Who is the narrator telling the story? Who is the main character in the story? Who or what is the story about?

learners. The list plays a limited pedagogic role in spite of it being the main activity aimed at indicating how to teach a short story.

For the 'after reading' activities, the designers suggest that learners should internalize the story and retell it to the rest of the class, and reorder paragraphs of the story after these have been mixed up. They also suggest encouraging learners to read stories that have the same thematic, stylistic and structural features to compare and contrast them with the one they have studied. However, they do not indicate the aspects to be taken into consideration while making this comparison, depending on the nature of the story. The teaching of a short story as explained/described in this section does not provide opportunities for learners to relate the story to their daily life or to express their personal response to it. These are some of the factors that are likely to limit the effectiveness of this section in helping teacher-learners to teach short stories.

As was noted previously in this section, with the exception of literature pedagogy, Module 7 does not include examples from the teacher-learners' teaching contexts to help them link what they learn to what, how and where they teach. However, DE or self-instructional materials for teachers which have been found to be of high quality encourage teacher-learners to think about what they learn in relation to the classrooms in which they teach. The following examples from three sets of DE materials designed in South Africa illustrate this point:

Example 1: from *Theory and Practice of English Language Teaching*

Arguments for and against code-switching

In many countries, including South Africa, there is a great deal of debate about whether or not learners should be permitted or encouraged to use their main language(s) in classes where the focus is on learning/acquiring an additional language (i.e. a target language). There is similar debate about whether teachers should use the languages of the learners in situations where they are able to do so.

Activity


In the list below, arguments in support of using only the additional (target) language in the language lesson and arguments in support of learners and teachers using their main languages and the target languages (i.e. codeswitching) have been mixed up. Make a list under these headings: (1) Benefits of target language only, (2) Benefits of Codeswitching.

Compare your list with your partner's.

Write down any comments you would like to make or questions you would like to ask about these statements so that these can be discussed in the second residential session (pp. 36-37).


Figure 8: Connecting teacher education programmes and teachers' teaching context: Theory and Practice of English Language Teaching

Example 2: ***Language, Literacy and Communication, Umthamo[34] 4, pp. 22-23***






- How shall we start?
  What shall we write first? (set the scene)
- What is the first thing that happens in our story? (event 1)
- What happens next? (event 2)






- Is that the best way we can say that?
- Can we think of a better word?





Page 22

[34] This is a Xhosa (one of South African language) word that means a mouthful





- Have we left something out here? (logic/cohesion)
- Is that what somebody would really do? (sense/coherence)
- How shall we finish our story?
- Let's check that we are happy with our story. (edit)





Reflection

When the Activity has been completed, make time to open your Journal and write a description of what happened when you carried out this Activity with your learners.

Then reflect on what occurred. What surprised you? Why do you think you were surprised? Who did most of the talking, you or your learners? Why was this? Write down some of the interesting things that they said. Think about why they said these things, and write down your explanations. How well did you listen to them? What do you feel you have learned or gained from this Activity? How could you improve this Activity?

Page 23

Figure 9: Connecting teacher education programmes and teachers' teaching context: Umthamo 4

Example 3: from Language in Learning and Teaching

Thulani's writing experiences

The following is a transcript of a conversation between a language teacher (Q) and Thulani (T), a matric learner in South African urban high school. In this conversation, Thulani talks about his school writing experiences. As you read the transcript (an exact copy of the conversation), look for answers to the following question: 'To what extent did Thulani's school learning experiences help him to find his "voice" as a writer?'

[**TRANSCRIPT FOLLOWS**]

If we look at Thulani's experiences of writing in school, we see that these did not give him confidence or a sense of 'voice'. His remarks constantly refer to a disempowering experience: 'we were not encouraged to write … not taught how to be independent … create things for ourselves … we usually depend on the books, depend on the teacher'

He also experienced very *minimal* writing – all his writing was 'one-off' events with little or no comment from the teacher. What little comment there was focused on 'form' – the address of the letter and the spaces between paragraphs – not content or *meaning*. Thulani's experience is a common one (p. 94).

Figure 10: Connecting teacher education programmes and teachers' teaching context: Language in Learning and Teaching

In the first extract (Figure 8), the designers encourage active learning by asking teacher-learners to reflect on and express their views about a practice that is common in many South African classrooms: code-switching. The photographs in Figure 9 model how a teacher can actively involve learners in the process of teaching writing, in which both the teacher and the learners jointly write the model text. After this process, learners are more likely to be able to write their own text with minimal assistance. The teaching and learning context displayed in the photographs is similar to that of many of the teacher-learners and the photographs are all medium shots so

that the viewer looks at the learners (and the teacher) from what Van der Mescht (2004) calls “a teacher distance.” The third extract (Figure 10) also encourages reflection using the case of a learner whom the teacher-learners may identify with. Also, it speaks indirectly to teachers whose learning experiences were probably similar to Thulani’s and who, possibly, teach in the same way and invites them to reflect on the implications of such an approach. Moreover, by defining the term ‘transcript’, designers of the material in the third example indicate that they understand that teacher-learners are reading the materials in an additional language and may be unfamiliar with technical terms in English. Thus, it can be argued that the designers of these three sets of materials understand the teacher-learners’ contexts and draw on these to help them to learn. This is a very important strategy for assisting teacher-learners to develop PCK (Shulman, 1987) and failure to do this by the KIE DE materials designers may be an impediment to the effectiveness of the KIE DE programme.

After analysing the content selected for KIE DE materials for O’Level teachers of English to extend both their subject English knowledge and PCK, I now turn to the analysis of the curriculum that these teachers are expected to teach and the examination that they are expected to help their learners to pass.

5.3 The national O’Level curriculum and examinations for English

There is often a close relationship between the curriculum and examinations because the curriculum is expected to serve as a basis for the development of the examination questions. The curriculum that was in use when the KIE DE programme and materials were designed was developed by the former National Curriculum Development Centre (NCDC) in 1998, before this Centre was merged with other government services pertaining to education under the Rwanda Education Board (REB). These services include the former Rwanda National Examinations Centre (RNEC), whose main task was to set primary and secondary school leaving national

examinations. The RNEC is the body that set the examination papers which have been analyzed in this study.

5.3.1 The national O'Level curriculum for English

This curriculum document begins by presenting the general aim of teaching English in Rwanda: "to facilitate national world [*sic*] communication for sharing experience and for personal development" (NCDC, 1998, p. 2). That communication is the overarching aim of teaching English in Rwanda is further confirmed in the statement of the English teacher's main role, which is "to help the students acquire communicative competence" (NCDC, 1998, p. 2), and in what is expected of learners after the completion of the first three years of secondary school:

- Listen with understanding and speak fluently in English in a variety of contexts;
- Have developed the skills of reading intensively and extensively;
- Write clearly and correctly;
- Use effectively the main structures of English by writing logically and coherently on a given topic;
- Understanding a passage by following its content, arguments and narrative sequence and be able to infer meaning attitudes (*sic*);
- Use correctly and effectively a wide range of vocabulary mastered during the course;
- Demonstrate habits both in spoken and written communication;
- Relate literature to their everyday experience;
- Make effective use of English in the study of other subjects in the curriculum and in the development of further learning;
- Appreciate the importance of English as a tool of fostering understanding among people (NCDC, 1998, p. 3).

In order to achieve the above, several content areas have been selected by the curriculum designers to be addressed during these three years. These include aspects of grammar and content related to the four language skills: reading, writing, listening and speaking. While the curriculum document contains some notes on the

teaching of vocabulary, it does not specify the nature of the vocabulary which needs to be acquired by O'Level learners.

The aspects of grammar are presented per year of study. In the first year, teachers are expected to teach parts of speech (nouns, pronouns, articles, verbs, adverbs, adjectives, conjunctions, prepositions, interjections), punctuation, sentence usage, tenses (present perfect, present continuous, future), direct and indirect speech, conditional tenses type 1 and 2, and comparative forms. In the second year, the aspects to be taught are tenses (past: negatives, interrogatives, passive, etc), prepositions, the use of relatives, the use of a result clause, active/passive voice, the use of comparatives, modal verbs, conditionals type 1 and 3, direct/indirect speech, adverbs of frequency, manner and degree, the use of coordinators and linking words, and the use of concession clauses and phrases. In the third year, learners are supposed to study tenses (past perfect continuous), punctuation, advanced uses of clauses and phrases (relative and participle clauses), word formation, advanced use of countables/uncountables, and inversion of sentences (no sooner had … than…, hardly had … than…).

Regarding the four language skills, the following is a summary of what is aimed at: regarding listening and speaking skills, learners are expected to be able to take part in conversations, listen and respond to live speech, make presentations such as book reports and summaries using the correct grammar, narrate stories sustaining plots and tense sequence, etc. In the writing area, learners are supposed to be able to write descriptive, narrative, discussion/argument texts, summaries and reports. As for reading, they should be able to read for understanding, inferring the meanings of unfamiliar words and expressions from the context, to perceive deeper meaning and the effect of punctuation on meaning, recognize the register, etc. In addition, learners are expected to be able to apply critical thinking to what they read by distinguishing fact from opinion and judging the opinion (NCDC, 1998).

The curriculum also recommends that at least three books selected from novels, plays and poetry should be read per year. In addition to these literary texts, the

curriculum lists very few literature related aspects and texts to be used as teaching/learning resources (not as content to be taught) in the third year. These are easy novels, writing exercises on drama, riddles, proverbs, tongue twisters and creative writing. While the curriculum aims to enable learners "to relate literature to their everyday experience" (NCDC, 1998, p. 3), it does not recommend the teaching of any literary genre. Thus, it is not clear how learners can be helped to relate literature to their experience while it is not taught to them explicitly. Another important thing to note in relation to this curriculum is that there is no indication of the time allocated to different content areas within it, which could give an idea of what teachers should foreground and/or back-ground (see Singh and Harris, 2010, in Chapter Two). However, based on the details that are provided for different content areas in this document, it can be argued that grammar occupies a major part. For instance, while for other types of content only objectives and learning activities are mentioned, topics and subtopics (sometimes accompanied by examples) are provided for every aspect of grammar to be taught.

Having briefly outlined the O'Level curriculum for English, I now turn to the analysis of the O'Level national examination for English before establishing the extent to which the two documents are aligned with the KIE materials for English teachers.

5.3.2 The national O'Level English Examinations

As stated in Chapter Three, the 2009, 2010, 2011 examination papers were analyzed in this research. The three hour long O'Level examination for English carries 100 marks and is made up of four sections: Comprehension and Vocabulary (30 marks), Grammar and Phonology (45 marks), Summary writing (10 marks) and Composition (15 marks).

The first section generally consists of a one and a half to two page text and multiple choice comprehension questions with four answer options each. It also has a limited number of questions requiring either answers in own words (for 2009 and 2011) or those requiring true or false types of answers (2010). In the vocabulary sections, a

list of words is provided from which learners have to choose the correct word to fill in the gaps left in passages (2009 and 2010) or in sentences (2011). The vocabulary section seems to be relatively more communicative and to expect learners to think as it requires the use of the terms in a context. For instance, the following is the vocabulary question in the 2009 examination paper:

Choose from the list below an appropriate word or phrase to complete the following paragraph: *Meet, clubs, similar, deal, shy, imagine, a few, devoted, among, least*.

> Britain is a land of **…..** and societies and a large number of people belong to at **…..** one society. These organizations hold regular meetings, which take up a good **…..** of time; they make it very simple to **…..** others with **…..** interests. The British, being rather **…..** , feel more at ease when they are **…..** people with whom they have something in common. There are so many different societies that it is difficult to **…..** a person who could not find one single one to interest him. There are societies **…..** to music, art, discussion, photography, amateur drama, bridge, chess and bowling to name only **…..**

In order for learners to answer this question effectively, they need to think not only about the provided words but also about the context in which they are used; That is the meanings of other words, the way sentences are constructed, the meaning of the whole passage, etc.

The grammar section also includes a large number of multiple choice questions, asking learners to choose a correct structure that fits in the gap left in sentences. For instance, out of 35 marks allocated to grammar in 2009, 25 are allocated to multiple choice questions, and such questions account for 20 of the 40 marks in 2010 and 15 out of 35 marks in 2011. The following are examples of such questions:

1. Mary wouldn't let him ….

a) to dance with her b) dance with her c) dancing with her d) dance her (2010).

2. Our house … ten years ago.

a) was built b) built c) would be built d) had been built (2009).

In the phonology section, learners are provided with four words for each question, with one word having a different sound or stress (e.g. bear, fear, wear, dare - 2010; necessary, knowledge, police, benefit - 2011), and are asked to identify the word. For summary writing, learners are asked to summarize a short text that is provided (2010 and 2011), or a passage from the reading comprehension text (2009). With reference to composition, learners are given three topics from which they have to choose one and write an approximately 200 word descriptive or argumentative essay. The following are some of the topics: *'Life in the countryside is better than in the city'. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?* (2009); *Write an account of your favourite personality in sport and state why you admire him/her* (2010); *A friend of yours who lives in England wants to come to visit Rwanda. Describe to him/her your country, its beauty and places he/she should visit while in Rwanda* (2011).

This brief overview indicates that comprehension and grammar constitute a major part of these examinations. These two parts of the examination evaluate learners' ability to communicate in English to only a very small extent in spite of communication being the overall aim of teaching English in Rwanda (NCDC, 1998). In fact, the questions do not encourage learners to formulate answers in their own words and/or to think from different perspectives. The following multiple choice reading comprehension question in the 2010 examination illustrates this point:

Why was the UN established?

a) To help prevent wars between nations
b) To rule the world
c) Because representatives from rich countries approved the charter
d) To end all the wars

To a certain extent, this question evaluates learners' understanding of the text, but it could have done more, notably by allowing them to answer the question in their own words. This could have given them more options and freedom to show their ability to use the language. Given that learners are provided with clues in the form of alternative answers, ticking the right answer does not necessarily guarantee that

learners understand the text and can justify their responses to it. Concerning grammar, such an approach does not necessarily guarantee learners' ability to use the examined aspects and/or rules in context or to formulate the suggested phrases themselves.

Nevertheless, there is a limited number of questions that test learners' ability to use grammar in context. These include using correct tenses (e.g. *He said that if he had money he (buy) me a drink* -2011; *Mary (be) sick in hospital for a month* -2010); correcting sentences (*How Mary did travel to Kigali?* -2011); rewriting sentences according to given instructions (It's a pity there is no secondary school in my village: rewrite using *I wish …….* -2009), etc. If the entire grammar section was made up of such questions, especially in a continuous text (as in the 2010 exam paper) instead of discrete sentences, these could indicate learners' abilities to use grammar in meaningful contexts.

It should be noted that Rwandan schools are ranked and teachers' teaching competence evaluated based on learners' performance in national examinations. Thus, teachers are likely to teach to exams, focusing on grammatical form rather than grammatical functions. Moreover, the curriculum document itself does not make any reference to using the various grammatical structures to express different meanings in different contexts as an end aim but identifies good performance in the examination as one of the objectives of teaching English (NCDC, 1998). Consequently, the areas which are not examined (for example speaking and listening) may receive limited or no attention from teachers. Some of the KIE teacher-learners who participated in this study also pointed out that they focus on grammar rules in their teaching of English. This exam-focused teaching may lead to learners' communication skills being hampered, making them knowledgeable about grammar but with limited competence in using grammar generatively.

5.3.3 The alignment of KIE DE materials for English to the O'Level national curriculum and examinations

In his constructive alignment model, Biggs (2003b) suggests that the goals of teaching, the content to teach, the teaching activities/methods and assessment should be aligned if teaching programmes are to achieve their aims. Here, Biggs refers to the internal alignment which, Phillips (2007) argues, is an important feature of self-instructional materials. In this section, the focus is on external alignment, which refers to a situation whereby "the measurable learner objectives reflect the demands of the Show-Me Performance and Knowledge Standards or Curriculum Frameworks at the appropriate learning level" (Washer and Wright, 2004, p. 157). In other words, the teaching content, objectives, activities and practices should be carried out in relation to what the programme developers want learners to become or be able to do after completing the programme. In the words of Drake and Burns (2004), the written and taught curricula should reflect the concepts and skills required in the standards. Therefore, it can be argued that the KIE DE programme designed for teachers of English should be in line with (the standards of) what teachers of English in Rwanda need to know and be able to do, which, I suggest, correspond to what Muller (2009, p. 217) terms "the demands of the workplace."

Therefore, I suggest that one way of looking at the effectiveness of a given teacher education programme is through its alignment to the curriculum at the level of education that these teachers are supposed to teach and the examinations that they are supposed to help their learners to pass. Applying the concept of alignment to the KIE DE programme, it can be argued that the content of the KIE DE materials for English should be externally aligned to the O'Level national curriculum and examinations for English. However, I acknowledge that the KIE DE programme needs to help the teacher-learners to acquire knowledge which extends beyond what they have to teach (Twiselton, 2002), especially because after getting diplomas from this programme they can register to study for degrees.

Generally, the content that is commonly addressed by the O'Level national curriculum and examinations for English includes reading for understanding, vocabulary, basic communicative (rule-based) grammar, descriptive and/or 'argumentative' texts and summary writing. It can be argued that a teacher education programme for the teachers of this level of schooling should focus on the above content areas, in addition to extending teachers-learners' general subject knowledge, pedagogic knowledge and PCK (Shulman, 1987) pertaining to ELT.

From the above description of the O'Level national curriculum and examinations for English, it can be argued that these are generally in alignment with to other. In fact, apart from speaking and listening areas, all other content in the curriculum is covered by national examinations. Nevertheless, there is some content which the national examination does not address as deeply as required by the curriculum. For instance, while learners are expected to apply judgmental/critical thinking to what they read, the examinations hardly examine these skills. In the three examination papers that were analyzed only two comprehension questions (in 2011) seem to encourage learners to think critically and express their opinion: (i) How do you think the bride felt as she was waiting for the groom to arrive?" and (ii) "Do you think the women were fair to the two men?" However, I acknowledge the difficulty of setting questions that require or encourage the expression of own opinions especially when the marking has to be standardized.

The content of the KIE DE materials for English which is most directly related to the content in the O'Level curriculum and examinations is mainly found in two areas: grammar and communication skills. The two areas constitute a major part of these materials: 66.1% of all the content (33.3% for grammar and 32.8% for communication skills) (see Table 4 on page 115). It should be noted, however, that several content aspects in these two areas are not directly related to the abovementioned curriculum and examinations. This suggests that the module designers may not have considered the latter as one of the resources for selecting content for KIE DE materials for English as will be further illustrated in the next sections.

Firstly, KIE DE materials for English address a small portion of the content that is covered in the national O'Level curriculum and examinations for English. In fact, of the grammar content in the O'Level curriculum and examinations, KIE DE modules seem to include parts of speech only: nouns, pronouns, determiners (articles, demonstrative adjectives and pronouns), verbs, adjectives, adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, and interjections. Aspects such as sentence usage, tenses, direct and indirect speech, conditionals, the use of relative, participle, result and concession clauses, active/passive voice, punctuation and inversion of sentences is not addressed in the modules, despite the extent of grammar functions. This constitutes further evidence that content related to how parts of speech and structures are put together to make meaning is not the focus of the modules. This is a serious limitation regarding the training of teachers who are meant to teach English for communication.

Moreover, the presentation of grammar in KIE DE modules is purely form or rule-focused and reference is very rarely made to how grammatical structures are used to express particular meanings in particular contexts. Indeed, there is no learning objective that expects teacher-learners to use the structures presented; instead, they are expected to identify characteristics, list word classes and different phrases in English, identify headwords in phrases (Module 3), differentiate the different forms of verbs, distinguish the different types of adjectives and adverbs, state the different types of conjunctions (Module 1), etc. To illustrate the designers' approach, I will use two examples from two modules.

Example 1: In Module 1, 'voice' is presented as follows:

> There are two voices in English, the active voice and the passive voice:
>
> (1) Paul congratulated David. (2) David was congratulated by Paul.
>
> Passive constructions are formed using the **passive auxiliary** *be*, and the main verb has an *-ed* inflection. In active constructions, there is no passive auxiliary, though other auxiliaries may occur (e.g. Paul *will* congratulate David).

In the passive construction in (2), we refer to Paul as the **agent**. This is the one who performs the action of congratulating David. Sometimes no agent is specified (David was congratulated). We refer to this as an **agentless passive** (Module 1, p. 143, emphasis in the original).

Example 2: In Module 3, the following is how the special use of a preposition is presented:

b. Special use of prepositions in certain verbs:

e.g. climb (up) flee (from)
jump (over) pass (by)

With such verbs it is often possible to omit the preposition; the verb then becomes transitive and the preposition complement becomes a direct object.

e.g. They jumped (over) 2 fences before reaching the house.
We passed (by) a church (Module 3, p. 63).

In the first example, the semantic implications of the change from active to passive voice and to agentless passive have not been made clear. So, readers are not made aware of why voice changes. This also applies to the second example: adding to or omitting the prepositions from the above verbs modifies their meanings, which the module does not consider. Such an approach is likely to limit teacher-learners' ability to use their grammatical knowledge for communicative purposes, and, more importantly, to explain to their learners the reason(s) for these changes.

Secondly, the grammatical content which is covered in the modules is presented in a manner that seems not to respond to the teacher-learners' professional needs and to their level of knowledge of English. For instance, content that appears to be of interest and value primarily to linguistic specialists occupies a large space in the modules and is likely to be too difficult for teacher-learners to understand. The following are some examples from Module 3:

1. Instead of focusing on the use of adjectives in context, much attention is given to categorizing them into *central and peripheral, inherent and non-inherent, stative and dynamic adjectives, emphasizers, amplifiers, downtoners*, etc.

2. *Additives, exclusives* and *particularizers* as types of adverbs are likely to sound unfamiliar to teacher-learners. Furthermore, the concepts of *adjuncts, subjuncts, disjuncts, and conjuncts* which are associated with the functions of adverbs and which are identified on a purely structural basis may not make much sense to them or indeed to many people for whom English is a home language. What is likely to make matters worse is subcategories of these, such as *wide-orientation subjuncts, narrow-orientation subjuncts, contrastive conjuncts (reformatory & replacive and anthithetic), appositive conjuct,* etc.

Instead of helping teacher-learners to understand and use the 'parts of speech' concerned, these concepts and related terminology are likely to confuse them. I suggest that all teacher-learners need is what adverbs generally are, the generic types of adverbs (manner, time, place …) and adjectives and, more importantly, how they are used to express the user's intended meaning.

Further, some of grammar content recommended in the O'Level curriculum seems not to receive the required attention by the module designers. For instance, while tenses, conditionals, clauses and direct/indirect speech are supposed to be taught to learners so that they can use them, these aspects are under-addressed because they are just mentioned in passing (or are not mentioned at all) and/or used as resources for the presentation of some other content. For instance, the following is what has been included about tense in Module 1:

> Tense refers to the absolute location of an event or action in time, either the present or the past. It is marked by an inflection of the verb:
> David *walks* to school (present tense) David *walked* to school (past tense)
>
> Reference to other times – the future, for instance – can be made in a number of ways, by using the modal auxiliary *will*, or the semi-auxiliary *be going to*:
> David *will walk* to school tomorrow David *is going to walk* to school tomorrow.
>
> Since the expression of future time does not involve any inflection of the verb, we do not refer to a "future tense". Strictly speaking, there are only two tenses in English: present and past (Module 1, p. 142, italics in the original).

In other modules tense is also briefly approached from a structural perspective by, for example, distinguishing it from time (Modules 3 and 4). The different tenses have

not been explained in terms of how they are formed and used to express meaning. Conditionals are also mentioned alongside imperative, declarative, etc. sentences, when explaining sentence types. As for relative clauses, they are not addressed on their own; they are only referred to alongside prepositional phrases and non-finite clauses, when explaining modification (Module 3). Given that relative clauses and conditionals are important topics in grammar (and in the Rwandan O'Level curriculum for English), some content should be devoted to them.

With reference to phonetics and phonology, what the modules do is to classify English sounds and explain their features and how they are produced. While the phonology section in the national examination for English is always about stress and word pronunciation, the modules only describe individual sounds and provide general information on what stress is and how it can affect word meaning. Instead of providing information on *how* to use stress accurately, the designers warn teacher-learners that "when the wrong syllable is stressed in English words, this makes the word very difficult to understand and … changes the meaning and type of the word" (Module 1, p. 60). Telling teacher-learners what stress is and what it does may not help them to use stress appropriately and/or teach their learners how to use stress. Some of the KIE DE teacher-learners interviewed were also critical of this section of the materials. For instance, Mutabazi explained:

> The stress ... the intonation, it is a problem. Even if we have those Oxford, those dictionaries and other things, but when we don't have a clear way, when we don't have a clear help of how to read those words, it is not clear. That one [content on how to use stress] when it is integrated in our modules, it will be better[35] (Interview, 12 August, 2012).

KIE DE modules also contain grammar content which is not part of the O'Level curriculum, but which, as suggested by the titles, appears to be a necessary part of teachers' general knowledge. This seems obvious because teachers need knowledge which goes beyond what is contained in the curricula that they have to teach. Such topics are mainly found in Module 2 and include, for example, the structure of

[35] Quoted verbatim

English sentences, semantics, structural diversity of modern English (varieties), the structure of English words, etc. However, in addressing these topics, the modules present unnecessary and very difficult details such as analytic and synthetic models of sentence structure, the use of tree diagrams to represent hierarchical syntactic structures, componential analysis, semantic classification of phraseological units, etc. The following is an example from the 'Semantic classification of phraseological units' section:

> Phraseological units can be classified according to the degree of motivation of their meaning. There are three types of phraseological units:
>
> 1. **Fusions** – when the degree of motivation is very low. We cannot guess the meaning of the whole from the meanings of its components. They are highly idiomatic and cannot be translated word for word into other languages, e.g. "at sixes and sevens"(means in a mess). (Module 2, p. 79, emphasis in the original).

There are other sections of the modules whose titles give the impression that they are relevant to the O'Level national curriculum. Most of these are found in the block on syntax in Module 4 and include 'sentence patterns and verb types', 'auxiliaries', 'combining and reducing transformations', and 'criteria for the existence and distribution of constituents'. However, the approach taken to the 'presentation' of these, the level of the text from which information has been selected and the terminology which is used may not enable teacher-learner to identify with and, possibly, understand these. For example, in their discussion of the phenomenon of intrusion which requires "the postulation of an abstract constituent structure associated with sentences" (Module 4, p. 56, italics in the original), the designers give the following example:

> This tall girl will visit this short boy → *Almost certainly*, this tall girl will visit this short boy→ This tall girl will, *almost certainly,* visit this short boy.

The designers term the constituent in italics the intrusion which, from a functional and more easily understood perspective, is an adverb of degree of certainty which can change its place in a sentence depending on the user's choices and intended meaning. Another example of content that may be difficult to understand is that of x-bar syntax, left-handed, right-handed, self-embedded, left-branching and right

branching sentences and “the flip/ flip-flop/ affix hopping rule” (Module 4, p. 68), among many others. These examples suggest that the module designers have not taken heed of Bernstein’s (1996) argument that in order for specialised knowledge to be accessible and appropriate for the context of schooling, it has to be interpreted and turned into pedagogic knowledge, that is, recontextualised. What KIE DE materials designers may have done is to take the specialised knowledge and present it to the teacher-learners with little (if any) conversion to suit a new institutional setting (Bourne, 2008).

With reference to writing, it cannot be concluded that the content in the KIE DE programme for English is aligned with the O’Level national curriculum and examination for English. As has been pointed out in section 5.2.2.1, KIE DE materials for English do not assist teacher-learners to write effectively. For instance, while the O’Level curriculum and examination expect high school learners to be able to write argumentative and descriptive texts, teacher-learners have not been empowered to become effective writers of such texts or to teach learners how to write them (see section 5.2.2.1).

As has been noted in section 5.2.1.4, KIE DE materials for English do not contain content aimed at developing teacher-learners’ reading knowledge and skills. This may negatively affect not only teacher-learners’ learning, but also their teaching. In fact, in addition to the need for language teachers to be good readers, they have to teach learners how to read effectively. Indeed, reading constitutes an important element of the O’Level curriculum for English and plays an important role in the Rwandan O’Level examinations and in general learning (Wessels, 2010).

5.4 Conclusion

From the analysis of the content in KIE DE modules designed for teacher-learners who are studying and teaching English, a number of findings emerge. With reference to subject English content, one important finding is that these modules do not meet

the teacher-learners needs adequately; the content selected is arguably not what the teacher-learners need most. For example, the materials provide the teacher-learners with theoretical knowledge about general linguistics but do not include topics from applied linguistics such as language and learning, language use in educational settings, language and cultural diversity, sociolinguistics for educators, language development, and first and second or additional language teaching and learning which, according to Fillmore and Snow (2000), are important for language teaching. Regarding literature content, the materials do not provide teacher-learners with a critical understanding of the literary genres addressed: they generally explain the different literary genres and ask teacher-learners to reproduce the explanations for assessment. This kind of assessment which encourages rote learning may be an obstacle to the achievement of Bernstein's right to individual enhancement (see Chapter Two) which, according to Bernstein (2000), is the right to the means of critical understanding and to new possibilities and, therefore, "the condition for confidence" (p. xx).

With reference to content aimed at extending the teacher-learners' proficiency, KIE DE materials play a very limited role. Again, they provide teacher-learners with theoretical knowledge about effective communication (strategies for effective speaking and listening, writing strategies for and characteristics of different forms of writing) but do very little to help them develop practical skills and knowledge to take part in effective communication. In addition, while DE learners rely a great deal on reading in their studies, the materials designers did not include any content aimed at developing teacher-learners reading skills and knowledge.

Another finding is that the content is not always coherently organized because some overlaps can be identified between different blocks across the modules. For instance, while the block on '*The grammar of English*' in Module 1 covers word classes, almost half (53 of 112 pages) of *The aspects of grammatical analysis* block (Module 3) does exactly the same, and *Syntax* in Module 4 covers the category of verbs. The content of a section on 'the structure of English sentences' in the block on *The structure of modern English* (Module 3) is addressed (to a certain extent) in the

Syntax block (Module 4) which, I suggest, is where it fits better. Furthermore, the content on 'sentence syntax' seems inappropriate in a block focusing on *Oral communication and effective writing I* (Module 1) as it is more related to grammar and is actually addressed in the grammar part as has been pointed out in section 5.2.1.2.

Similarly, some of the topics addressed in the block on *Oral communication and effective writing I* are also addressed in *Oral communication and effective writing II* to varying degrees. These topics are the main approaches to effective writing and techniques for summarizing, paraphrasing and synthesizing. Given that the designers point out that the second block is a continuation of the first, the wisdom of these repetitions is questionable. It has also been noted previously that the section on 'writing a term paper' (Block 2, Module 3) focuses on the process and techniques of writing an essay which are also addressed in Modules 1 and 2. Further evidence of the lack of coherent organization of content in KIE DE modules is that teacher-learners are asked to hold debates in Module 1, while they are introduced to strategies of conducting a debate only in Module 3. Furthermore, there is no cross-referencing between the blocks in the same module and/or in the same areas (such as grammar, communication skills, etc.) and some useful elements of mediation are present in some modules and/or blocks while they are absent in others. Such elements include thorough introductions, additional learning resources, glossaries, etc. This point is addressed more extensively in Chapter Six (section 6.2.1).

This poor organization of content and the high degree of insulation (Bernstein, 1996) between different blocks and modules suggests that each of these blocks/modules was designed independently of the others, implying that content in the KIE DE programme for English teachers is strongly classified (Bernstein, 1996 & 2000). In fact, content selection for each block appears to have been done independently. In other words, the degree of insulation (Bernstain, 1996) between the blocks is high. On this note, Bernstein (2000) suggests that when we analyze curriculum we need to ask in whose interest is the apartness or and in whose interest is the togetherness of the things. I suggest that the 'apartness' in KIE DE programme for English is not in the

teacher-learners' interest because they may struggle in trying to make sense of and to work with these different ways of presenting content in the same programme. However, this apartness may be in the module designers' interest because, according to Abedi and Badragheh (2011), it may less demanding in terms of time and energy to write in isolation than to work consultatively as a team.

As an alternative, I suggest that content in the same area should be divided into consecutive and logically linked blocks. For instance, the content on writing could be divided into two or three blocks/units entitled, *Effective writing I, Effective writing II, Effective writing III*, etc. This could enable teacher-learners to see the links between these blocks/units more clearly. In addition to making the programme content more coherent and integrated, doing this could have freed some space for important topics that were not addressed. These topics include assessment in a language classroom, the development of English classroom resources, first and second/additional language acquisition, and sociolinguistics and language education. The lack of content on language assessment is particularly a serious weakness because assessment is a very important element in a teaching/learning process (Agrawal, 2004) in all areas and subjects.

With regard to the content aimed at developing teacher-learners' PCK for ELT generally, it is unlikely that a teacher-learner who has studied Module 7 has been equipped to teach English effectively and confidently. This is mainly because, as has been demonstrated, with the exception of some content on forms and stages of teaching literature, the Module generally tells teacher-learners what to do without demonstrating how. This lack of 'knowledge how' (Bernstein, 1996; Richards, 2008) echoes the assumption by some teacher educators that "by providing teachers with information about language, language learning and methodology, teachers themselves will be able to apply such information to their own classroom practices" (Richards, 1991, p. 85), which is not always the case. The KIE DE programme seems to espouse what Carr (1995) calls 'a faculty-based conception of teacher education and training that emerged in 1960s and which "viewed professional preparation as largely a matter of initiation into a range of theoretical disciplines of educational

philosophy, psychology, sociology, history and so on" (p. 313). I suggest that this missing practical guidance (the how in the words of Bernstein, 1996 and Richards, 2008), which could further procedural knowledge (Carr, 1995), is what KIE DE teacher-learners need most as many of them have not had any training in pedagogy (KIE, 2009).

In addition, Module 7 (especially block 1) does not involve teacher-learners in practical pedagogic activities, in order for them to reflect on the implications of different approaches, methods and techniques of teaching English and on how to improve on these. What is more, KIE DE teacher-learners have not been encouraged to test the new ideas and approaches introduced in the module in their classes as part of learning. This approach may be detrimental to their development as teachers because "knowledge that informs an activity is not just abstracted from theory, codified in textbooks … but also emerges out of a dialogic and transformative process of reconsidering and reorganizing lived experiences" (Johnson, 2006, p. 241). Moreover, teaching expertise is acquired through teachers' reflection on their own practice, and that of others (Barnard, 2011).

The encouragement to reflect on and/or apply what they study to their work in the classroom context could encourage teacher-learners' critical reflection. It could also lead them to questioning the way they teach, which Richards (1991) considers a primary goal of in-service teacher education programmes. Indeed, in-service teachers' classrooms are important resources because they are places where "theories can be tested and new ideas put into practice" (Howard and McGrath, 1995, p. 5). The strongly classified nature of the KIE DE programme for English, paired with strong framing (as will be explained in Chapter Six), may not be beneficial to teacher-learners' professional development: they may not clearly see the contribution of the programme (as a whole) to their becoming better teachers and how the different blocks/modules work together to achieve this aim.

The analysis has also indicated that, while teachers are expected to encourage active learning (Donald, Lazarus & Lolwana, 2010), Block 1 of Module 7 accords KIE DE

teacher-learners a very limited and mostly passive role. They are seldom involved in active and practical tasks aimed at helping them to learn and they are not encouraged to give their own opinions or perspectives on what and how they are taught. In short, the block generally adopts a "transmission mode of teaching with its emphasis on the authority of the teacher and passivity of learners" (Balfour, 2000, p. 48). This mode is likely to limit teacher-learners' engagement with the block content. Therefore, it can be argued that the pedagogy *of* this block is an example of the performance model, strongly framed (Bernstein, 1996) and contrary to the principles of constructivism (See Donald, Lazarus & Lolwana, 2010 in Chapter Two). In fact, the teachers (the KIE designers), rather than the learners (the teacher-learners), are in control of the teaching/learning process. Given that teachers tend to replicate the approaches that were used to train them (Lortie, 1975; Murdoch, 1994; Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Valencia, 2009; Singh & Harris, 2010), KIE DE teacher learners themselves are likely to adopt the same (transmission) approach. As a result, the learner-centred and communicative language teaching approaches recommended by the Module 7 designers and numerous experts in language education as the most effective for language teaching may not find their way into the lessons of KIE DE graduates.

However, in Module 7, the block on the teaching of literature (block 2), appears to be relatively more effective than block 1, in spite of some limitations. This is the case for two main reasons. Firstly, block 2 frequently asks teacher-learners questions which require their opinions on the teaching of different literary genres, builds on their possible answers to present new content and encourages them to add their own input and suggestions on how/what else they can do in addition to what is suggested by the designers. Secondly, the designers use classroom situations to illustrate the way different literary genres are taught, notably through the questions they ask and the challenges they give teacher-learners. This approach echoes the experientially based approaches which, according to Richards (1991) are important in teacher education. It is also in line with the weak framing of knowledge and skills associated with the competence model of pedagogy, which Bernstein (1996) claims, fosters teacher autonomy.

The designers of this block also argue that teaching a literature text requires moving learners "from comprehension to interpretation" (Module 7, p. 180) and, for some genres, they attempt to demonstrate how this can be done. In this regard, they suggest that after reading any literary text, learners could be asked questions such as the following:

a. After reading the text give it another title.
b. Where is the action in the text taking place?
c. Who are involved in the action or events of the text?
d. What are they doing?
e. Why are they doing what they are doing?
f. What do you feel about what these characters are doing?
g. How do the events end?
h. How do you feel about this ending? (p. 180)

Some of these questions require learners to think 'critically' using not only the information in the text, but also their prior and everyday knowledge and to make judgments on what they have read. This is in line with the constructivist approach, which KIE DE materials designers are requested to encourage (KIE, 2009). Moreover, this block shows teacher-learners how to address all the four language skills in a literature classroom: learners can read and/or perform the text, can be read to or listen to people performing the literature work or to recordings, can write their responses and/or summaries of the text, and they can take part in debates on the issues covered in the literary text (Module 7).

It is interesting to note that the literature pedagogy block is likely to address the needs of teachers more effectively than the language (listening, speaking, writing, reading, grammar and vocabulary) pedagogy block. This raises questions regarding the effectiveness of the KIE DE programme for English. In fact, KIE DE teacher-learners are trained to teach the O'Level of high school and literature is not explicitly taught at this level (see section 5.3.1). Thus, it seems illogical for the content that the teacher-learners are not expected to teach to be mediated more effectively than the one that constitutes the focus of their teaching.

The analysis offered in this chapter also suggests that O'Level national curriculum and examinations for English may not have been referred to by the designers of KIE DE materials for English. The content and the pedagogy in KIE DE materials are not often externally aligned (Washer and Wright, 2004) to what is expected of the teacher-learners after their studies. With reference to grammar, apart from the parts of speech which were explained (from the perspective of an expert in linguistics), no other content that is included in the O'Level curriculum and examinations is systematically addressed in KIE DE materials. Conversely, the major part of these modules is devoted to content which is not only not directly linked to the O'Level curriculum for English but is very difficult for anyone without a sophisticated knowledge of linguistics to understand. This content has its own value because all knowledge is important. However, it should be added to the core content: that which is directly related to what teacher-learners are expected to teach or, in other words, the content recommended in and examined by the national O'Level curriculum and examinations respectively. Such additional knowledge should extend teacher-learners' general knowledge of English and should use an approach, style and language which teacher-learners can easily understand and identify with.

This lack of constructive alignment referred to in the above paragraph may be one of the reasons why some KIE DE teachers-learners who were interviewed for this study pointed out that after getting degrees from KIE they will have to find a way of studying what KIE has not provided or has not managed to help them to understand as Karangwa explained: "Ugasanga n'ubundi nta … n'ubwo watsinda utavuga ko ibyo bintu wabyumvise ku buryo bizasaba ko umuntu ashaka ubundi bumenyi ku ruhande kugira ngo azashobore kubyigisha neza." (So... even if you pass the exams, you cannot say that you have really understood what you were examined about. It will necessarily require us to get knowledge and skills from elsewhere to be able to teach these things effectively – Interview, 8 August 2012). Thus, it can be argued that the content of the modules is not entirely 'fit for the purpose' (Essel, Owusu-Boateng & Saah, 2008). Consequently, teacher-learners are unlikely to be able to teach English communicatively and confidently and to help their learners to pass optimally the O'Level national examinations for English as a result of studying the KIE DE Modules.

Chapter Six: Analysis of mediation strategies adopted in the KIE distance education materials for English

6.1 Introduction
6.2 Mediation in KIE DE materials for English
6.2.1 Module access devices/elements
6.2.2 Teaching/learning objectives
6.2.3 Teaching/learning activities
6.2.4 Feedback to teacher-learners
6.2.5 Visual elements
6.2.6 Layout
6.2.7 A conversational/interactional style
6.2.8 The approach/es to mediation of knowledge foregrounded or backgrounded in KIE DE materials
6.2.8.1 Active learning
6.2.8.2 Drawing on teacher-learners' contexts
6.3 Conclusion

6.1 Introduction

As explained in Chapter Two, mediation involves helping a person to form connecting links in the process of understanding something (Donald, Lazarus & Lolwana, 2002). In the construction of DE materials, the role of a materials developer is to facilitate (mediate) the learning of the knowledge and skills presented on the page or screen. With acknowledgment to Vygotsky, Kuzulin et al. (2003), state that central to mediation is the role of human and symbolic intermediaries placed between the individual learner and the material to be learned.

The selection of content for DE materials is in itself a form of mediation, given that the materials designers choose, from the extensive body of knowledge in a particular field, content that they consider important for a particular constituency of learners. Analysis of content selections in the KIE DE materials for English teachers was the focus of Chapter Five. In this chapter, several other elements of mediation, some of them specific to DE, are introduced and used in an analysis of mediation strategies evident in or absent from the KIE DE materials.

6.2 Mediation in KIE DE materials for English

The mediation strategies/elements that were analysed in KIE DE materials for English include access devices/elements, teaching/learning objectives and activities, feedback to teacher-learners, use of visual elements, layout and use of a conversational/interactional style. As has been explained in Chapter Four (Methodology), the materials selected for systematic textual analysis are Module 1 for English (*Introduction to Language & Literature*) and Module 7 for Education Studies (*French and English Teaching Methods*), with some examples being taken from other modules as well. Table 6 below presents the blocks and sections of Module 1[36].

Blocks	Sections
1. Introduction to Languages and Linguistics	1. Definitions of languages and Linguistics 2. Theories of the origin and development of language 3. Properties of human language 4. Components of language 5. Linguistics and other disciplines 6. Spoken and written language 7. Writing systems
2. The Grammar of English	1. Criteria for word classes 2. Nouns, pronouns and determiners 3. Verbs 4. Adjectives 5. Adverbs 6. Prepositions 7. Conjunctions 8. interjections
3. Oral Communication and Effective Writing 1	1. Effective speaking 2. Effective Listening 3. The English Sentence 4. The writing process 5. Types of essays – options for organization 6. Forms of writing
4. Introduction to Literary Genres	1. Oral literature 2. Poetry 3. Prose fiction

Table 6: Module 1 blocks and sections

[36] The blocks and sections of Module 7 are presented in Table 5

6.2.1 Module access devices/elements

In DE materials access devices include the index, symbols, tests, titles, contents list, overview or introduction, objectives and guidance on using the materials, headings, numbering systems, summaries, verbal signposts, graphic signals such as white space, reader stoppers, icons, bulleted lists and boxes (Rowntree, 1990). In short, an access device refers to any aspect of DE materials that is aimed at helping learners to navigate the materials. These devices have two functions: (i) to enable the reader to find what he or she needs in the material and (ii) to make the structure of the materials more apparent to the reader and so help him or her to learn (Rowntree, 1990, p. 179). Though these devices are aspects of good design for all print materials, their mediating role is particularly important in distance education where there is no teacher present to draw learners' attention to key topics and ideas, argument summaries, explanations of technical terms, etc. The analysis offered in this section focuses on tables of contents, introductions and glossaries and suggests that these access devices in KIE DE materials for English do not play their role in mediating learning in optimal ways as will be illustrated below.

Marland et al. (1990) indicate that tables of contents make an important contribution to access because they outline what the material contains. With reference to this, the table of contents in KIE DE Module 1 gives limited information. It presents block and section titles only, leaving out the sub-headings which introduce particular aspects of the content. For instance, section 3 (*Properties of human language*) of the first block has seven headings/subsections under it (arbitrariness, displacement, creativity, cultural transmission, duality, discreteness and dynamicity and redundancy) but these are not mentioned in the table of contents. Thus, in order for the teacher-learners to have a comprehensive overview of the module, they need to turn all its pages. A full and detailed content list at the beginning of each block could be a better option (Rowntree, 1990).

With regard to an introduction to a module, Shabani and Okebukola (2001, p. 86-87) suggest that it "should give a general overview of the module, study skills necessary,

any equipment and textbook required, assessment procedures and when they will take place, support media and how they are integrated with the entire module." As for the introduction to a unit (or block in the case of KIE modules), these scholars suggest that it "should contain a general statement of purposes, overview of the main concepts and learning materials required for the unit, learning outcomes or expectations and any special learning skills for that particular unit" (2001, p. 87). The one page introduction to Module 1 focuses on defining language and explaining the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing). This 'introduction' does not do justice to the whole module as its content seems related to block 1 (*Introduction to language and linguistics*) only, while the module contains four blocks (see Table 6 on page 209). Furthermore, Modules 1 and 7 (and all others) do not contain any information on how to approach the content therein and on the learning skills required for studying the module as a whole and particular blocks and/or sections. The lack of such information is a serious limitation in terms of mediation and is in contrast with what is consistently found in effective self-instructional materials, which indicate to teacher-learners what to do in order to study effectively. For instance, Gultig and Butler address teacher-learners as follows:

> we rely strongly on your **participation in the activities** we set which often require you to practise the ideas introduced in this module in your own school. We believe that our teaching style works best if you also try new ways of learning, rather than only concentrating on increasing what you know (2010, p. 4, emphasis in the original).

The KIE DE Modules do not inform teacher-learners of the importance of the mediation elements used in the Module (including activities and feedback) and of how they should approach these. Again, this is in spite of the fact that materials that have been found to be effective have such information in their introductions. For example, Gultig (2001, p. 6-7) warns the users of "*Learners and Learning*"[37] of the danger of ignoring learning activities as follows:

[37] In his review of *Learners and Learning* the director of the Centre for Research and Development at the Open University (UK) described the module as "an invaluable resource for those designing pre-service and professional courses for teachers" (Moon, 2002, p. 27).

> Of course you could complete this module in a couple of days if you ignore all the activities and simply read it from cover to cover. But this isn't studying and you will probably forget everything within days ... you will miss the most important part of the learning pathway we have developed for you.

Such a warning aims to position the user to take learning activities seriously and to increase the likelihood that he or she will attempt them. The lack of such information in KIE DE materials may result in teachers 'simply reading' the activities, which may affect their understanding of the content of these materials.

With reference to how teacher-learners' learning will be assessed, Module 7 does not mention any type of assessment other than the pre-test. Module 1, however, outlines the number and the types of assessment tasks. These are self-assessment activities, which the designers consider to be part of assessment, one Tutor-Marked Assignment (TMA), one test[38] and one final examination. The suggested assessment pattern seems not to give teacher-learners any feedback on these tests as they work through the module. With the exception of self-assessment activities, all other types of assessment are summative, taking place at the completion of the module. Consequently, teacher-learners do not have an opportunity to use feedback on these assessment tasks to monitor their progress. Moreover, this kind of assessment does not provide the module designers with information on the teacher-learners' progress, which could help them improve the way they teach (through the materials and/or in face-to-face sessions). It can be argued that information on learners' evolving ZPDs is important for identifying their constantly changing needs and for tailoring subsequent teaching to these needs. One way to get this information is to use formative assessment and to provide constant feedback (Lui, 2012). The lack of such information may affect the quality of the teacher-learners' learning and performance (see Duron, Limbach and Waugh, 2006 in Chapter Two). One good thing about the presentation of activities in the KIE DE modules is that activities are put in a box and are signalled by a writing hand icon, which is an important access device.

[38] The module designers suggest that the test is part of continuous assessment, but do not provide further explanations.

Towards the end of the 'introduction' to Module 1 there is an 'overview' of the module, which is a repetition of the block titles in prose:

> In this module we are going to focus on four main areas. The first block will deal with the general introduction to language and linguistics. The second block will focus on the grammar, in this case of the English language. The third block will concentrate on oral communication and effective writing skills. The fourth block will introduce you to different literary genres (Module 1, p. 1).

Just after this paragraph, an additional overview of the sections in block 4 (Introduction to Literary Genres) is provided, which is not done for other blocks. After the introduction there is a heading "*What is in this module?*" (for both Modules 1 and 7) which, again, is a list of the blocks in the modules. The value of these repetitions is questionable and points to problems with the organizational design. It should be noted that no overall aims were given for any of KIE DE modules for English, in spite of the instruction to KIE DE materials designers stating that module aims should be part of the introduction (KIE, 2009). Given that the statement of expected learning outcomes is considered to be an important mediation strategy (Rowntree, 1994; Mishra, 2004; McKimm & Swanwick, 2009), the lack of these in KIE DE modules may be detrimental to teacher-learners' engagement with the content of the modules.

With reference to additional resources which, according to Shabani and Okebukola (2001), should also be part of the introduction, Module 1 and Module 7 provide a list of additional books that teacher-learners need to use without specifying the block(s) these books relate to. It seems, they are all literary texts, related to the literature blocks (Introduction to Literary Genres in Module 1 and Techniques and methods for teaching literature in English in Module 7). In Module 2, however, designers have specified which resources are related to which blocks while Module 4 does not provide teacher-learners with any additional resources. Moreover, Modules 3 and 7, give an overview of each block, which other modules do not do. These inconsistencies constitute another indication of lack of coherence and organization within and across KIE DE modules for English, as was noted in Chapter Five.

From the above analysis, it can be argued that the introduction to KIE DE modules does not adequately inform teacher-learners of either the content or how to approach their studies. This situation may be due to the lack of specificity in the instructions to KIE DE materials designers which suggest that the module introduction "describes the aims of the module and what will be covered" (KIE, 2009, p. 27). The extent to which what will be covered should be 'described' is not indicated, which leaves room for several interpretations by the designers, one of which may be that a list of blocks and sections is enough. Indeed, Module 2, "*The structure of English and prose fiction*", which is designed by a team that is different from others (see Chapter One), has a thorough introduction which states its aims and the relevance of its blocks to the learners' everyday use of English, gives an overview of each block and shows the link between the blocks.

Glossaries, which constitute another type of access device, are included only in two of the seven modules: Modules 1 and 4. The terms included in the glossaries in the two modules are literature-related technical terms. As all modules and blocks also contain technical or other 'difficult' terms that could have been glossed, it is not clear why this has not been done for all of them. Even in modules that contain these glossaries, there is neither a reference to these in the introduction, nor an indication (in the text) of which words are glossed nor page numbers (in the glossary) where the glossed words are used in the text. As a result, it is difficult to know which words are glossed, which suggests that signposting (Rowntree, 1990) is not well done in these materials.

This brief analysis suggests a lack of organization and coherence within and across KIE DE modules and inconsistencies in the way different blocks and modules introduce teacher-learners to the content. It appears that the designers have designed different blocks/modules independently in ways that are likely to increase the degree of insulation (Bernstein, 1996) or the strength of boundary (Bourne, 2008) between these. Such a situation suggests that content in the KIE DE programme for English teachers is strongly classified (Bernstein, 1996). It can also be argued that the KIE DE programme lacks systematicity in content presentation and

organization. With reference to systematicity, Wheelahan (2010b) argues that the methods of inquiry and knowledge creation within any particular discipline are systematic, though the type of systematicity may differ from discipline to discipline. As Winch (2013, p. 128) notes,

> a key feature of good curriculum design is the ability to manage the different types of knowledge in a sequence that matches not just the needs to the subject, but also that of the student, so that the different kinds of disciplinary knowledge are introduced in such a way that the development of expertise is not compromised.

Therefore, the lack of systematicity or appropriate sequence in the KIE DE programme is a cause for concern especially because, in addition to developing teacher-learners' subject content knowledge, the programme should help them to present knowledge to their learners in a systematic way (Morrow, 2007).

6.2.2 Teaching/learning objectives

As has been discussed in Chapter Three, learning objectives constitute an essential component of self-instructional materials (Mishra, 2004) because they indicate to learners what is expected of them and help them to check their progress (C.O.L, 2005). An analysis of learning objectives in the KIE DE materials indicates that these do not play their role effectively: they are far away from where they are needed, they are too broad and/or too few to cover related content, do not encourage active learning, critical thinking and/or deep learning, etc. Evidence in support of these claims is provided in the following sections.

In KIE DE modules, objectives are indicated only for blocks and placed at the beginning of these, without an indication of which section within a block they relate to[39]. Given that the blocks are large (96, 86, 105 and 71 pages in Module 1 and 159, 87 pages in Module 7), these objectives are far away from where they are needed. For instance, Section 5 (Types of essays – options for organisation) of Block 3

[39] A close look at the objectives and the content in the different sections of the blocks reveals the sections to which the different objectives relate. However, this gives teacher-learners an additional task which they may not always do well.

(Module 1) is 70 pages away from where the objectives are stated[40]. Therefore, in order for the teacher-learners to use the objectives from time to time to check how well they are doing, they need to turn 70 (and more) pages back. This is an additional task that could be avoided by placing the objectives at the beginning of the section to which they are related.

Another finding in relation to learning objectives in the KIE DE modules for English is that these appear to be too few compared to the content that they supposedly cover. Block 1 in Module 1 is an illustration of this point. This block is made up of seven sections: (1) definitions of language and linguistics, (2) theories of the origin and development of language, (3) properties of human language, (4) components of language, (5) linguistics and other disciplines, (6) spoken and written language and (7) writing systems. The module designers estimate the time which learners should spend on this block to be 30 to 35 hours, which implies an average of 4 to 5 hours for each section. Twelve objectives are set for this block (seven sections), which means a maximum of two objectives for each section on average, with some sections having one or no objective. One possible implication of this situation is that some content may not relate to any objective, which is the case for the sections on 'Emergence of Grammar' (block 1), 'Coordinators', 'Interjections and other minor word classes' (block 2). Consequently, teacher-learners are likely to study some content without a clear understanding of what is expected of them and what would constitute successful learning. This may make it difficult for them to check their progress.

Alternatively, if these 'objectives' cover this very broad content, then they may not be specific about what a learner should be able to do (or do better) as a result of learning (Rowntree, 1994). An illustrative example is that of 'learning objectives' for Block 1 in Module 7. This block aims to enable teacher-learners to teach all areas of English (other than literature). The objectives are as follows: (i) *demonstrate your understanding* of the various theories in language teaching, (ii) *explain* the general trends and nature of language education methodology, (iii) *state the problems and issues* connected with English language teaching, and (iv) *identify basic principles and*

[40] Block 3 starts at page 195 while Section 5 starts at page 265.

describe teacher characteristics in English language teaching (pp. 15-16, italics added). These objectives are too broad and too general to enable the teacher-learners to identify the focus of the content they are learning. For instance, the module designers do not make it clear what 'demonstrating one's understanding of the various theories in language teaching' (objective (i)) actually means and how they can assess whether they have achieved the objective.

Other examples of objectives that are very broad include 'account for the diversity in language', 'describe the scope and aims of linguistics' (Module 1, p. 14), 'synthesize and integrate text materials' (p. 196), and 'analyse poems using different approaches' (p. 302). Given that a specific indication to teacher-learners of what is expected of them is one main function of objectives (McKimm & Swanwick, 2009, The Florida State University, 2010), it can be argued that the above objectives do not play their role effectively. This situation is likely to be an impediment to teacher-learners' monitoring of their own progress.

Furthermore, such broad learning objectives in KIE DE materials do not encourage deep learning (Biggs, 1987). For instance, the objective in the "theories of the origin and development of language" section states that teacher-learners should be able to "explain the different theories on the origin of language" (Module 1, p. 14). Here, I suggest that being able to explain the theories should not be all that teacher-learners should be able to do as a result of learning about these theories. For instance, teacher-learners could be expected to analyze, compare, evaluate and express their views on these theories. Thus, I suggest that the following objectives could be set for the content under the 'linguistic theory' heading, in order to encourage critical thinking: (i) explain the linguistic theory of language origin, (ii) explain different hypotheses related to this theory, (iii) identify and analyze the weaknesses and strengths of these hypotheses, and (iv) suggest their contribution to and/or implications for the study of language. Being able to explain this theory is unlikely to cover all the knowledge and skills referred to in the above five objectives. Given that objectives indicate the depth to which content will be studied (C.O.L, 2005), KIE DE teacher-learners may take the ability to reproduce the explanations

given by the module designers as an indication of learning, which encourages a surface approach to learning (Biggs, 1987). Such an approach neither enhances the transference of learning into new situations nor increases the capacity of the learner to scaffold and mediate their own learning in future (see Robertson, Fluck and Webb, 2003 in Chapter Two).

It should be noted that many students who are studying self-instructional texts read slowly and do not have much time to spend on reading at any one time (Rowntree, 1990; Juneby, 2008). Therefore, the content in such materials should be divided into manageable chunks that can be dealt with in a fairly short time (Holmberg, 1995; Swales, 2000; KIE, 2009) and learning objectives should be set for each chunk. This, however, is not the case in the KIE DE materials for English. As a result, KIE DE teacher-learners are compelled to read the whole section (4 to 5 hours for Module 1), which they are unlikely to do at one time, before they know whether they have or have not achieved any of the stated 'objectives'.

As has been explained in Chapter Two, KIE instructs its DE materials designers to adopt a constructivist and/or a deep approach to learning. Holmberg (1995) suggests that this can be achieved, notably by encouraging students to try out new ideas, reflect, compare and apply a critical judgment to what is studied. I suggest that learning objectives are one way to make learners aware of these expectations. With reference to supporting a deep approach to learning, as indicated above, the objectives in Module 1 generally do not encourage this but rather encourage the reproduction of what teacher-learners have read. For example, the objectives include the following: explain the different theories on the origin of language, distinguish between human and non-human systems of communication, state the characteristics of nouns (p. 14), describe different types of nouns, pronouns and determiners (p. 110), identify major characteristics of drama, and define poetry (p. 302). This 'surface learning' approach is likely to play a limited role in addressing teacher-learners professional development needs because, as Bertram (2011) puts it, a deep understanding of the fundamental concepts in a subject is what matters rather than having a huge collection of facts about the subject.

Additionally, none of the learning objectives for the block on "Specific Teaching Methods, English language" (Module 7), expects teacher-learners to be able to *practically teach* the different areas of language, which is the essence of what the block is about. Rather, the statement of these objectives suggests that the block is meant to equip teacher-learners with knowledge about language teaching theories and methods as findings of the textual analysis have indicated (see section 5.2.2.1). In the block on literature pedagogy, however, teacher-learners are expected to devise learning activities for their learners, choose suitable teaching approaches and choose or create resource materials for their literature classes. Again, this points to the aforementioned difference between the design of English language blocks and those on literature.

Indeed, very few of the objectives in the English language blocks are tied to Bloom's three higher levels of cognitive ability (synthesis, analysis and evaluation) that are associated with critical thinking (see Duron, Limbach and Waugh, 2006 in section 2.7). In Module 1, out of 51 objectives there are only seven high level objectives. However, the teaching of the content related to these does not provide learners with an opportunity to analyze, evaluate or question the information presented to them. For instance, the lesson on poetry which, according to the related objective, is aimed at indicating to teacher-learners how to analyze a poem (Module 1, p. 331), just defines poetry and presents the types and aspects of poetry; no sample poem analysis is provided to illustrate how poems are analyzed. Thus it can be argued that the Modules do not help teacher-learners to develop higher order thinking skills. This situation is likely to limit their creativity, improvisation and adaptation to changes in their teaching activities and contexts, which, according to some scholars (for example Dirks, 1998; Tsai, 2001; Lunenburg, 2011), are important qualities of an effective teacher. This point will be developed more extensively in the next section in which teaching/learning activities are analysed.

6.2.3 Teaching/learning activities

Lockwood (1995) suggests that in order for the objectives stated in DE materials to be achieved, they should be translated into tasks or activities. As has been stated in section 3.3.2, learning activities (should) involve learners in active learning, engage them with the content of DE materials and show them what to do in order to learn (Phillips, 2007). Therefore, they should be integral to the teaching/learning process (Rowntree, 1992). However, activities in KIE DE modules are meant for the teacher-learners' self-assessment: the teacher-learners are supposed to use them to check whether they have understood what they have read. Therefore, these activities seem not to play a 'teaching role' (Vrasidas, 2000) as can be seen in the information given to KIE DE teacher-learners regarding activities in the modules. For instance the information given in Module 1[41] is as follows:

> In every block, there are activities meant to test how much you have learnt from each section. Attempt them after each section before moving on to the next block. If you find the activity difficult, read the section again and attempt it a second time. If the second attempt doesn't yield much, consult your colleagues or Subject Tutor. The answers to each activity are provided at the end of each block. In order to assess yourself effectively, exercise some degree of discipline by not looking at the answers before attempting the activity (p. 5).

In addition to not suggesting to teacher-learners a good reason to attempt the activities, this extract suggests that activities have been designed for assessment rather than for learning purposes. Indeed, KIE DE materials designers are instructed that activities should enable teacher-learners "to assess their understanding of the block content" (KIE, 2009, p. 15). Such an approach to activities is likely to limit the role of these for learning. Furthermore, it can be argued that some activities are set just to comply with the requirement of "at least one activity in each section" (KIE, 2009, p. 15). Indeed, there is just one (not more) activity for each section in the modules irrespective of their length. For instance, there is one activity (5 questions) for a ten page section on "*Components of language*" (Module 1, p. 53), one activity

[41] The information on activities in Module 7 refers only to the pre-test.

(1 question) for a five page section on “Issues and Procedures in English Language Teaching” (Module 7, p. 20) and one activity (4 questions) for a half page section on “*Writing system on the computer*” (Module 1, p. 96). One implication of this situation is that the activities may not address all the content that they are supposed to address.

While the teacher-learners are frequently instructed to read and understand the content of one section (which understanding is evidenced by answering the activity questions correctly) before moving to the following one, the presentation of content in subsequent sections does not refer to the previous sections. Thus the knowledge that the teacher-learners acquire progressively seems not to be built on in helping the teacher-learners to understand subsequent content. In other words, teacher-learners are not made aware of how the content of (a) section(s) can help in the learning of a subsequent one(s). What is presented in the KIE DE modules can be compared to a series of unrelated lessons in a face-to-face context. Such an approach is not in line with Vygotsky’s concept of mediation, which, according to Rogoff (1990), cited in Donato (1994), emphasizes the teacher’s active continual revisions of earlier scaffolding in response to the emerging capabilities of the learner. Additionally, in the KIE materials there is no cross-referencing between different sections and blocks and, therefore, there seem to be no links between these. This feature of the design of the materials suggests that the curriculum presented to teacher-learners is an example of a strongly classified one in which, according to Bernstein (2000), the rule is: things must be kept apart.

One type of activity present in all KIE DE modules for all subjects is a diagnostic test entitled ‘*How much do I know?*”. Its aim is to test the prior subject knowledge of the teacher-learners (prerequisites) and to help in orienting them to the content which is to follow (KIE, 2009). The teacher-learners are asked to attempt the test in order to see how much they “know so far about language generally” (Module 1, p. 6) and “to make you [them] aware of the orientation of the module and of how much you [they] already know and where you [they] are starting from” (Module 3, p. 4). However, teacher-learners are not made aware of the implications of their

performance on this test for their subsequent studies and the prerequisite knowledge which the test is meant to identify does not inform instructional activities in the modules. Thus it seems not to make a difference whether one does it (successfully) or not, as can be seen in the feedback on the pre-test in Module 1:

> How did you find the above questions? Were you able to answer all of them? If you did, it is good. But if you encountered some problems do not worry [*sic*] this is a diagnosis activity to test how much you already know (Module 1, p. 9).

I suggest that this feedback lacks an important element: some explanation of the implications of passing and/or of failing the test. For instance, teacher-learners who would find the test difficult should be told what to do (such as reading about or studying certain concepts that they have found difficult to understand) before tackling the module content. Without such information, the role of this test in the KIE DE teaching/learning process may be limited. The lack of such information may suggest that the module designers do not understand the importance of this test which, I suggest, is to help identify teacher-learners' ZPD so that the teaching can be tailored to it when teacher-learners and KIE tutors meet for face-to-face sessions.

As has been mentioned earlier, activities are supposed to help learners to engage with content "rather than merely reading about it" (Rowntree, 1990, p. 83). As with learning objectives, learning activities should encourage active and deep learning, notably by engaging learners in problem-solving strategies (Lockwood, 1997). Such an approach may enable them to construct knowledge so as to be able to be creative and to improvise in their classrooms. Given the importance of instructional activities in students' assessment (Brooks & Brooks, 1993; Lusunzi, 1999; Schwartz et al., 2009), I suggest DE materials designers (including KIE's) should design such activities so that they foster learners' creative abilities to construct knowledge. Crucial to creativity and improvisation by teachers is their capacity to think critically, which, according to several authors (e.g. Dirks, 1998; Tsai, 2001; Lunenburg, 2011), goes hand in hand with constructivism. While the KIE DE materials designers are requested to design activities which "challenge students to think more deeply, and to put concepts into context" (KIE, 2009, p. 11), the activities in KIE DE materials for

English predominantly consist of questions for which answers can be taken directly from the materials. I analyse some activities to illustrate this claim.

The section on 'Sociolinguistics' (Module 1, p. 69) includes the following questions under the heading 'Activity': (i) What is a dialect? (ii) What is a sociolect? (iii) What do you understand by the term dialectology? and (iv) Differentiate between sociolinguistics and the sociology of language. All the above activity questions ask teacher-learners to provide definitions of sociolinguistics-related terms which have been provided in the preceding pages. Consequently, answering these questions correctly may not necessarily imply an understanding of what sociolinguistics is and of the effects of society on language use (and vice versa), which is the essence of sociolinguistics (Module 1, p. 69). For instance, the answer provided by the module designers to the fourth question is that "sociolinguistics focuses o*n the effect of the society on the language, while sociology of the language focuses on the effects of language on society*" (Module 1, p. 70). This answer does not help teacher-learners to understand the 'effects' and how they happen and, more importantly, to identify these in their linguistic community/ies. The same applies to the questions about a dialect and a sociolect. With reference to question 3, knowing that dialectology is the study of dialects does not contribute much to an understanding of sociolinguistics, while some teacher-learners may not even understand what a dialect is. Therefore, this activity just requires them to operate as decoders (Freebody and Luke, 1990) and encourages them to adopt a surface approach to learning (Biggs, 1987). Biggs (1999) suggests that this approach should be discouraged in education because, as argued by Kember (1996), a student may use it not to seek understanding but for the satisfaction of immediate needs such as passing an exam.

If activities in KIE DE materials are supposed to encourage teacher-learners to think deeply (KIE, 2009), and the end aim of mediation is to enable learners to use acquired information to develop their independent thinking and problem-solving skills (see Williams and Burden, 1997 in Chapter Two), I suggest that the activity questions should be improved. For instance, in addition to defining a dialect, teacher-learners could be asked to identify some Kinyarwanda dialects and, possibly,

compare them to the standard dialect. This could be easily done because Kinyarwanda has several dialects (Ikirera, Igikiga, Ikigoyi, etc.). The concept of 'world Englishes' could also be used to exemplify how the same language can be used (and owned) differently by different societies.

Teacher-learners could also be asked to identify and explain some of the effects that society, its values, norms and changes therein have had on the use of Kinyarwanda since there have been many of these recently. For instance, the militia that committed the 1994 genocide in Rwanda used to call itself '*Interahamwe'* (people working together for a common purpose). In English, the same person can be referred to as a freedom fighter or a terrorist, depending on the context (Seligmann, 2011). The association of the word 'Interahamwe' with the 1994 genocide has changed its meaning to that of a 'killer' though it used to mean something good. Another possible example could be the effect that issues such as age and gender have on language use in society. In Rwanda, for instance, a daughter-in-law cannot utter the name of her father/mother-in-law even when talking to another person about her father/mother-in-law or about (an)other person(s) with the same name(s). Young people are also required to use the second personal plural pronoun when talking to one older person. Such examples could provide a better understanding of the content in the section on Sociolinguistics by encouraging teacher-learners to relate its content to their own personal world (Turuk, 2008).

A second example of an activity which promotes a surface approach to learning comes from block 2 (The Grammar of English) of Module 1, which focuses on pronouns. Given that language teaching specialists (for example Gardner, 2008; Wang, 2010) suggest that grammar should be taught in context, the ultimate goal of the designers of the lesson on pronouns should be to ensure that teacher-learners are able to use these correctly. However, the module designers state that the section aims to enable teacher-learners "to explain the functions of pronouns" (p. 110). The following is one activity on pronouns:

Question 1

In each of the following sentences a pronoun has been highlighted. What type of pronoun is it?

a. Let's contact ***one another*** once we have made some progress.
b. She wants to do it ***herself***.
c. I can't find ***them***.
d. I can't believe it's finally ***ours***.
e. The girl ***who*** usually cuts her hair has won the lottery.
f. ***He*** wants to go to Scarborough.
g. Why are ***you*** shouting at me?
h. Jim gave ***me*** the last copy.
i. ***Nobody*** said a word all night.

Question 2

Give the objective forms of the following pronouns

a. I
b. We
c. He
d. She
e. They
f. Who

It should be noted that a table of the different types of pronouns was provided in the teaching text. For question 1, therefore, learners can find the pronouns and their types in the table without necessarily thinking about their use. Sub-question '*g'* gives the impression that by answering it, teacher-learners will have shown the ability to distinguish between pronouns as subjects and pronouns as objects. The designers' answers to the activity, however, indicate that all that is expected from learners is to indicate that it is a personal pronoun, without distinguishing between the subject and the object forms (p. 188). Question 2 is even more problematic because the pronouns are not put in sentences. What teacher-learners need to do is to go back to the table and copy the corresponding objective forms. Thus, teacher-learners are unlikely to be able to explain the functions of the pronouns (which is the aim of the

section) or, more importantly, to use them in new contexts as a result of attempting the activity. This approach, which appears to be based on a 'banking' conception of education (Freire, 2007), is unlikely to encourage critical thinking and a deep understanding of the content that teacher-learners are learning.

Given that the types of pronouns and the pronouns that fall under each type were provided, teacher-learners could have been asked to use these pronouns in their own sentences for question 1. In fact, as Christie (1991) argues, grammar should be presented to teachers and learners as a set of tools they can use rather than a set of rules about what to do. Another alternative question could be to provide sentences or a text containing nouns and ask learners to replace them with pronouns and, if necessary, to name the type of pronouns they have chosen. For question 2, the designers could have provided a text containing the same nouns (or names) used both subjectively and objectively in different sentences. Teacher-learners could then be asked to replace the nouns/names with personal pronouns, which could show whether or not they understand the difference between the two uses of pronouns. Based on Lusunzi's (1999) definition of an effective instructional activity as one which takes learners beyond the knowledge acquisition domain, develops their intellectual acumen and results in behavioural change (attitude), it can be argued that the KIE DE instructional approach is not effective. In fact, the activities which have been analysed above seem to encourage 'regurgitation' of what the teacher-learners have read in the materials, rather than to foster understanding.

The encouragement of surface rather than deep learning can also be identified in Module 7 (the pedagogy module) especially in block 1. The activities in this block do not generally take teacher-learners beyond mere reading and reproduction of content in the module; they just require learners to identify or even copy answers directly from the materials. Some examples include 'what are the main objectives of the Direct Method?' (p. 54), 'how does the Direct Method differ from the GT Method?' (p. 54), 'what are the main criticisms levelled against the cognitive code method?' (p. 63), 'give the name of the methods that are based on the

Comprehension Approach' (p. 76), 'what are the advantages of teaching your learners how to read with understanding' (p. 98).

Moreover, even when questions seem to ask teacher-learners to think critically and give their opinion, the related feedback does not usually reflect a response to such thinking. For instance, Activity 2 in block 1 (Module 7, p. 47) is as follows: *Elaborate on any two of the following basic principles of language learning, making any critical comments based on your personal opinions.* These principles (according to the module designers) are habit formation, accuracy, concreteness, proportion of different aspects of a course, etc. No answer is provided for this question as it is "open-ended" (p. 158). Instead, teacher-learners are referred to related 'feedback', which reads as follows: "this is an open-ended activity. You may summarize the ideas given for each principle from the above sections. But you are free to give your personal opinions on the issues involved" (p. 47). This feedback implies that teacher-learners' opinion is optional, contrary to what is indicated by the question. Given that providing learners with the opportunity to form their own opinions on critical issues is one of the factors determining learners' control over the learning process (Wessels, 2001) and contributes to them being able to construct knowledge (Zarei, 2008), it is of concern that the KIE DE materials do not encourage this.

There are a few instances where questions do encourage critical thinking and feedback (through answers to activities questions) links up with, and responds to, the requirements of the questions. These include the following question: "[M]ention some of the barriers that students bring with them and show ways in which the teacher can overcome them other than ensuring a complete control of his/her classroom" (Module 7, p. 67). The answer to the question mentions some barriers (fear, hatred of the target language culture, anxiety, etc.) and suggests that teachers should make their lessons interesting by being friendly and using teaching aids that are interesting for learners in order to overcome these barriers. However, such instances are extremely few. In block 2 (literature pedagogy), however, there are activities which encourage critical reflection on what and how the teacher-learners have to teach as has been explained in section 5.4.

Another strategy that can be used to help learners to develop their critical thinking abilities is to encourage cooperative learning. Cooperative learning or peer collaboration is a very important aspect of a constructivist approach to learning (Jonassen, 1999) because it incorporates mediation at the peer level and encourages active learning (Donald, Lazarus & Lolwana, 2007). With reference to KIE DE materials, teacher-learners are not encouraged to work together, notably because there are very few reflective (learning) activities in the materials. Nevertheless, the feedback in the materials sometimes invites teacher-learners to 'compare' their answers to (assessment) activity questions with those of their peers. However, it cannot be concluded that collaboration is fostered here since learners are not challenged to engage in discussions of either the content or activity questions and answers, or more importantly, the process of arriving at the answers. In short, KIE DE materials do not initiate peer support sessions (Roberts, 2004) and, therefore, do not elicit active participation from learners and the sharing of their experiences, which are at the heart of cooperative learning and student-centredness (Lusunzi, 1999). This may be a limitation to effective learning because, according to sociocultural theory, learning arises from interactions with others (Vygotsky, 1978; Turuk, 2008). Whilst KIE DE teacher-learners (like any other DE learners) mostly study on their own, I suggest that the module designers should encourage those who stay and/or teach in the same areas to work together as much as they can.

With reference to the model that designers use in presenting activities, KIE (2009) recommends a tutorial-in-print model (see Chapter Three). An analysis of activities in KIE DE materials, however, reveals that these are not tutorial-in-print based. The typical elements of this model (frequent questions, an indication of how to approach the learning matter, the skills needed to do so, the time that should be spent on different sections and what is expected of teacher-learners after completing different sections) are absent. In addition, while this model is expected to simulate the conversation between the tutor and the learner (Rowntree, 1994), the tutor's voice is absent from these materials. Such a situation may silence the teacher-learners' voice as there is no one to converse with. Furthermore, apart from often

very general self-assessment questions at the end of each section, no other opportunity is provided for learners to sum up, recap or revise what they have learned (Race, 1992) as there are no summaries at the end of sections.

The KIE DE materials appear to be examples of a tell-and-test model which provides "many pages of unbroken reading followed by a self-test with answers provided" (Rowntree, 1994, p. 14). Rowntree suggests that the approach is based on the lecture-questionnaire format or that of a textbook chapter with comprehension questions at the end. KIE DE Module 1 and Module 7 (especially block 1) conform to this format: the blocks and sections look like textbook chapters with questions at the end. No section or heading is introduced and/or concluded as a teacher would do for a lesson and no link is established between these questions and the learning of subsequent sections. Again, this further indicates that the content in KIE DE modules for English is strongly classified (Bernstein, 1996), in spite of KIE (2009) making it clear to its DE materials designers that DE materials are not textbooks but lessons. In such lessons, according to Essel, Owusu-Boateng and Saah (2008, p. 2), "the instructor and the instructional strategies/methods are subsumed." This finding suggests that KIE DE designers did not take the differences between textbooks and self-study materials into consideration (see Lockwood, 1997 in Chapter Three), possibly because they may not be aware of these differences.

To return to the tell-and-test model, Rowntree (1994, p. 14) states that its effectiveness "depends on the quality of the telling and the helpfulness of the testing". At its best, this model can be lively and stimulating, and, at its worst, "little more than an information pack which learners are left to manage as best as they can" (Rowntree, 1994, p. 14). The tell-and-test model in KIE DE materials for English seems often to be an example of tell and test at its worst because teacher-learners are presented with insufficiently mediated content which they may find difficult to study on their own. Indeed, even with the 'assistance' from local tutors and lecturers, there is evidence that KIE DE teacher-learners still find it difficult to understand the modules as is illustrated in the following paragraph.

When interviewed by a journalist for The New Times, one teacher-learner indicated: "KIE only furnishes us with modules and we end up spending too much time learning the course by ourselves. The facilitators [tutors] want us to tell them what we didn't understand instead of teaching" (Mbonyinshuti, 2012). Another observed that "the problem arises when the whole module is incomprehensible" (Mbonyinshuti, 2012), which may make it difficult for teacher-learners to ask any question. Such remarks suggest that the materials are unlikely to be self-instructional or, in other words, designed in such a way that the learners do not feel the absence of the teacher during their study (Mishra, Ahmad & Rai, 2001) and cannot escape without learning what they are intended to learn (Biggs, 2007). The remarks may also be an indication of the limited nature of the 'scaffolded support' (Shay, 2013) offered in face-to-face sessions to help teacher-learners to understand the modules.

Another possibility is that KIE DE module designers' 'mediation' of content does not facilitate learners' access to the content as a result of failing to identify their ZPD (Vygotsky, 1978) or, in other words, what teacher-learners can achieve alone and what they need assistance to achieve (Turuk, 2008). In fact, working with the ZPD implies that the teacher is aware of learners' development stages and can plan for qualitative changes in the teaching in order to achieve a certain goal (Hedegaard, 2005). Failure to do this may lead to teacher-learners' frustration and disappointment (Turuk, 2008) because what is required from them is beyond their capabilities (Wessels, 2010). Alternatively, it can lead to their overreliance on the tutors' role in the learning process (Pierrakeas, Xenos and Pintelas, 2003), which is what the above-quoted teacher-learners' remarks suggest. However, I acknowledge that identifying learners' ZPD and how it evolves is more difficult in DE because of limited contact between learners' and teachers (materials designers in this case). Therefore, instead of working reactively DE materials designers work proactively, predicting what is likely, based on the information available to them (see Moll, 2002; Reed, 2010 in Chapter Two). In designing their materials, KIE DE materials designers seem not to have responded to the information which was made available to them by KIE. This information indicates that the teacher-learners are generally of average intelligence, have basic knowledge of the subjects they will study, "have no previous

experience of distance learning, and cannot be assumed to have the study skills required for successful distance learning" (KIE, 2009, p. 4).

6.2.4 Feedback to teacher-learners

While some scholars (for example, Rowntree, 1990, 1992) consider answers to be part of feedback as learners can use them to monitor their progress, KIE DE materials designers distinguish between 'feedback' and answers to the activities. In these materials, 'feedback' comes immediately after activities, while answers to activity questions in a block come at the end of this. In this thesis, the feedback in KIE DE materials refers to both of these categories.

The designers of Module 1 seem to have an unusual understanding of what feedback is. While feedback is generally a comment on a range of answers that could be given to activity questions (Rowntree, 1992), 'feedback' in Module 1 mostly works as a transitional note between sections. The common message from almost all these examples of feedback is that learners should move to the following section after having understood the content of the previous one, or, in other words, after answering the questions satisfactorily[42]. In case they do not understand the section content, the 'feedback' invites them to read the section again without indicating to them what to do differently so as to achieve what they have not managed to do in the first reading. Here is an example:

> We hope you are now able to distinguish between a logographic writing system and the syllabic writing system and give the advantages and disadvantages of one over the other. We also hope that the activity was tackled without much difficulty. If yes, then move to sub-section 7.3., if not, go through sub-section 7.2. again (Module 1, p. 88).

This instruction seems to imply that learners fail to understand because of not reading a sufficient number of times. Further evidence to support this assumption is a response by the Head of KIE's CODEL to KIE DE teacher-learners' complaints about

[42] As has been indicated in section 6.2.3, however, the presentation of content in subsequent sections does not build on or make any reference to the content or activities in the preceding ones. This calls the usefulness of the activities and/or the accompanying feedback into question.

lack of facilitation from KIE. He said: “if students sit down and read instead of waiting for the tutors or facilitators, they can obtain good results” (Mbonyinshuti, 2012). This educator’s remarks seem to downplay the role played by tutors and of contact sessions in DE by assuming that teacher-learners will understand the content by merely reading it.

Apart from these aspects that are common to all the examples of ‘feedback’ in Module 1, some other aspects are occasionally evident. They include what seem to be summaries or main points of the sections. These come in the form of questions or statements addressed to teacher-learners, in which the pronoun *you* is used, indicating attempts to write in a conversational style. Here are some examples:

> At this point you now know one of the properties of human language that is arbitrariness and you are able to tell whether your language or the languages you know are arbitrary or not (p. 36).

> Does your language have the property of displacement? We hope your answer to this rhetorical question is yes since at this particular point in your studies you know what displacement is as a property of language (Module 1, p. 37).

Some aspects of the two examples of feedback seem irrelevant. For instance, it was mentioned in the text that all human languages have the properties of arbitrariness and displacement. Therefore, asking teacher-learners whether their languages have these properties seems redundant. In addition, apart from mentioning the two language properties, these remarks neither contain any reference to what these properties mean nor encourage teacher-learners to identify examples of these in their language(s).

In other cases, ‘feedback’ refers (very briefly) to the key point in the section but does not make any reference to the activity questions for which it supposedly constitutes feedback. The following two questions and related ‘feedback’ illustrate this point:

> 1. In chapter 2, of this novel, what is the significance of the two boys’ fighting?

> 2. In chapter 3, the author tries to make Waiyaki a special boy. Notice the ritual of Waiyaki's 2nd (*sic*) birth. It is what may be called a symbolic birth. In your own words, describe what happens during this birth (one paragraph) (Module 2, p. 203).

The feedback reads as follows:

> *Now you should be able to notice that Ngugi wa Thiong'o applies symbolism in his novels to make the reader visualize the deeper meaning in his work* (Module 2, p. 203).

In addition to not playing the actual role of feedback, the above sentence appears not to be related to the questions in any way though it refers to one key point in the section (use of symbolism).

The 'feedback' in Module 7 (and also in some examples in Module 1) consists of instructions concerning the way teacher-learners should answer the activity questions, which is not actually the aim of feedback. Here are some examples:

> *You need to go through appropriate sections to do the above activity (Module 7, p. 58).*

> *You will certainly find a large number of elements that would help you to answer the questions of this activity in the above two sections. But do not forget that for some questions, you should exploit your personal experience of language teaching situations in Rwanda and your overall knowledge derived from other languages teaching/learning courses (Module 7, p. 71).*

> *The question in this activity sounds mechanical. Others require of you some thinking effort. So go through the examples and explanation given in the section while doing the activity. The rule of word grouping will be very helpful in answering question 3 (Module 1, p. 36).*

As can be seen in these examples, feedback in KIE DE materials does not help teacher-learners to monitor their progress. Moreover, some of the module designers' remarks sometimes suggest that they themselves may not understand what the role of feedback is. For instance, after giving an extract from a play and asking teacher-learners how they "can use it to enhance the students' understanding of the play" (Module 7, p. 220), the designers stated: "there is no feedback for this

activity as each individual may use it to teach several aspects of the play including discussing plot, themes, characterization and style" (p. 220). This seems to imply that the designers understand feedback to mean necessarily (an) answer(s) to (an) activity question(s) and that it should be given only when there is one correct answer. These examples suggest that there is no particular pattern followed in providing 'feedback' in KIE DE materials for English, which may make it difficult for module users to understand its role in these materials.

However, there are a few examples of feedback which have the potential to play a role in mediating learning, especially in the literature pedagogy block (Module 7). The following extract from feedback on a question about designing a lesson plan on the importance of proverbs is illustrative of this finding:

> Proverbs are the beacons which show the level of folk-wisdom in any given, orate society. You have already learnt that that composition of proverbs relies heavily on drawing from the local environment. In this light, proverbs reflect the social, political, religious, spiritual and economic lives of people. In a formal society, proverbs also reflect the relationship between the past and present in terms of the utilisation of indigenous knowledge (Module 7, p. 197).

In this example, teacher-learners are given an indication of what the lesson plan should focus on. The feedback also links the activity to another section. The paragraph summarises the importance of proverbs in society and, therefore, the teacher-learners can relate their answers to this summary to check their understanding and/or progress. Again, the fact that such feedback is found almost only in the literature pedagogy block further illustrates the difference between this block and the language teaching block as pointed out in section 5.4.

The second category of feedback is made up of answers to the activities in a block. As has been mentioned previously, most of these are answers that can be taken directly from the materials and, in some cases, teacher-learners are referred to particular sections in the block for answers to the questions. For instance, teacher-

learners are told "*As in the block*" (Module 1, p. 106) as the answer to the following question: "*List some of the differences between speech and writing*" (p. 83). Such an approach does not encourage teacher-learners to develop their critical and constructive reflection-related skills. In addition, module designers usually provide one answer (usually without any other comments) to each activity question, which may send an indirect message to teacher-learners that the suggested answers are the only right ones and discourage teacher-learners from thinking from various and different perspectives. Furthermore, indicating right answers without explaining why it is the right answer and, possibly, why certain answers are wrong or 'less right' may not necessarily help teacher-learners to monitor their progress, which is one of the key purposes of feedback (Rowntree, 1990; Holmberg, 1995). In addition, this approach does not encourage deep learning.

It should be noted that apart from being informed that these activity questions and their answers are there in the modules, and that teacher-learners should not look at them before attempting the activity, teacher-learners are not briefed on how to use them in order to enhance their understanding. In a previous version of the pedagogy module (2001), however, there was an important note with regard to this:

> The answers provided at the end of each block should not be memorized. They are simply given as guide to your own answers. But they should not limit your freedom to express your originality in the expression of your ideas" (English Subject Teaching Methods Module, 2001, p. 8).

This note is important because it may encourage teacher-learners to think critically and express their ideas rather than relying passively on designers' opinions. It is not clear why it was omitted in the more recent and 'improved' version of this module.

This analysis suggests that feedback in KIE DE materials is extremely limited compared to that in high quality DE materials. For instance, the extract on the next page is an example of an activity and related feedback from Gultig's (2001, p. 170) *Learners and Learning*:

Activity 50

1. Read through Harlen's questions for developing process skills in the science classroom on page 169 again.
2. Use your knowledge about questions from Section Two to identify the relative power of each question used by the teacher to encourage the six key process skills. In other words, consider:
    a. Which questions are relational? Which are explanatory? Which are evaluative?
    b. Which questions set up gaps and challenges?
    c. Which questions allow for mistakes and encourage learners to take risks?
    d. Which questions encourage the use of imagination or analogy?
    e. Which questions encourage the learners to make links between everyday knowledge and school knowledge?
    f. Which questions focus the attention of the learners on specific features of the task?

What did we think? [Feedback]

You should have noticed in the above activity how different questions encourage different qualities of thinking.

Questions by their very nature set up *gaps* between the known elements of the question and the yet unknown answer. They also establish a *learning relationship* between the one who asks and the one who answers. The developmental potential of this learning relationship depends on two things:

- the nature of the questions asked;
- the quality of the feedback the teacher gives to the replies.

Teachers who only ask questions to get correct answers will tend to use unproductive, closed, and subject-centred questions. These kinds of questions will give them very little insight into the thinking behind the learners' responses, thus limiting the constructive feedback they can give when learners make mistakes.

By contrast, productive, open, and person-centred questions all have a relational or explanatory focus and so encourage the teacher and learners to pay attention to the learning process rather than the content of the question. That is why they are better tools for teaching.

Although Harlen's examples concentrate on teacher questions that help learning, we have illustrated with earlier activities that learner questions are equally powerful tools for learning. Both teacher and learner questions have their place and can be an effective strategy for promoting learning, provided they contain elements of challenge and support for the learning process. As teachers we cannot control learning, but we can increase the probability that learning will occur through our use of well-designed questions.

Figure 11: An example of feedback from 'Learners and Learning'

The above feedback is very thorough; it starts by indicating to the teacher-learners what the activity was intended to achieve: to show them that 'different questions encourage different qualities of thinking'. Thus, they know whether they have

understood the content or not (checking their progress). It then explains the importance of questions in learning before elaborating on the implications or outcomes of each type of question, which is likely to help the teacher-learners to set effective questions based on what they want to achieve.

Another mediation strategy that is underutilized in the KIE DE materials is frequent summaries, in spite of them being one of the distinguishing aspects of DE materials (Lockwood, 1997). Summaries are provided only at the end of the blocks, which, as has been indicated earlier, are very long. Therefore, these summaries may not do justice to the content within the blocks. For instance, two of the four 'summaries' in Module 1 are just lists of different items in the block sections. Some examples are as follows:

Section 2 looked at theories on the origin and development of language. We saw such theories as the divine theory, the anthropological theory, the linguistic theories and the language diversity theory. In section three we discussed … (p. 97).

In this block we discussed 5 sections as follows
Section 1 dealt with the following:

- *Basic speaking skills*
- *Speaking for academic purpose*
- *Giving a talk*

Section 2 discussed the following points:

- *Reasons for listening*
- *Etc. (p. 286)*

However, the summaries in the fourth block of Module 1 (Introduction to Literary Genres) and those in Module 7 make a difference: they give an overview of what has been covered in the respective blocks (not just a list) and sometimes offer teaching advice to the teacher-learners, and therefore, are likely to help teacher-learners recall what they have studied. But they still do not do justice to the wide content they cover. Two paragraphs from these summaries are as follows:

> Fifth, you were introduced to the way in which you might go about analysing a character in a work of prose fiction (novels and short stories). You were also briefly introduced to the fact that while a short story may explore one or two themes, a novel usually explores several themes. Finally, it was stated that the manner in which a novel or a short story writer passes on his/her message to the reader is his/her style of writing. Different authors use different styles to communicate to their readers. (Module 1, p. 355).

> In the section on 'Poetry', we have explored some activities that can be employed in teaching poetry. We have looked at activities that can be used before, during and after studying a poem. However, these are not the only prescribed activities that can be used. As a teacher you have to be innovative enough to come up with interesting activities that can facilitate teaching and learning – stand on your head if you must ensure that you engage your students in the literature learning and teaching process (Module 7, p. 241).

In the first extract, the module designers summarize different issues addressed in the block but do not make any reference to *how* a character in a work of prose fiction can be analysed, which is one of the key issues in the block. In the second extract, the nature and aims of activities in the three phases suggested for teaching poetry are not indicated. Therefore, the reader is unlikely to have a complete overview of what is included in the block or section for which the 'summary' is provided.

6.2.5 Visual elements

The analysis of visual elements in the KIE DE materials for English begins with an analysis of the front covers. This is because the cover is the very first page that the teacher-learners read and, therefore, should be attractive and appealing so that learners feel motivated to read the content therein (Kumar, 2000). On the next two pages are the front covers of Modules 1 and 7:




Figure 12: Front cover of Module 1




Figure 13: Front cover of Module 7

As can be seen on these two covers, apart from the module title, no other visuals (such as drawings or photographs) are used to refer to the content of the modules and/or to arouse teacher-learners' interest (Mishra, Ahmad and Rai, 2001). The

module titles are very broad and do not give the teacher-learners a clear idea of what the module is about. Moreover, except for the title, the module number and code, all covers of KIE DE modules for English look the same, which is likely to make them fall short of the attractive and appealing nature, expected of self-instructional materials covers (Kumar, 2000). By contrast, the following cover from the materials designed by the University of Fort Hare is an example of an interesting cover page because it gives glimpses of what the material contains and shows a teacher and learners at work:




Figure 14: Front cover: Umthamo 4

The use of visuals in KIE DE materials is very limited. Only six icons, (four of which are common to all KIE DE materials) and occasional tables are included. The following are the icons[43] used in KIE DE modules for English (Module 1, p. 5):




Figure 15: Icons used in KIE DE modules

These icons play the role of signposts to alert learners to different things in the modules. Interestingly, the first icon has not been used in Modules 1, 2 and 3 despite the introductions to these indicating that the icon is used in the modules. The use of the second icon is very limited as it signals the questions that teacher-learners are supposed to answer 'in order for them to learn'. As has been discussed in section 6.2.8.1, these questions are very few. The use of the next two icons depends on the presence of what they signal (activities and related answers); there are as many icons as there are activities and related answers in the modules. As for the last icon, it is only used in grammar blocks and is not specific to DE materials. It can be argued, therefore, that icons play a limited pedagogic role in KIE DE materials for English.

Very few tables and diagrams are used in Module 1. Tables are mainly used in grammar, phonetics and phonology sections to illustrate the categories of different

[43] The first four icons are common to all modules irrespective of the subject; they are part of the module structure given to module designers to follow.

parts of speech and English language sounds respectively. A speech organs diagram and a few tree diagrams are also used. It cannot be argued that these tables were included specifically for self-instructional purposes because these are found in many linguistics textbooks and other reference books. Moreover, visuals are used only in the first three blocks of Module 1 (to a very limited extent), while they are totally absent in the fourth. It should be noted that no visuals are used in the first two Blocks of Module 7, except two comparative tables and two lesson plan formats. This limited use visual elements raises questions on the effectiveness of KIE DE materials in a time of a growing use of visual elements in learning and other contexts (Lowe, 1995; Kress and van Leeuwen, 2001; Stokes, 2001).

Given that some subjects require or encourage the use of visuals more than others (Seligmann, 2011), it can be argued that some of the content in KIE DE modules for English does not necessarily require and/or encourage the use of visuals. This cannot be a valid explanation because some of the functions of visuals are generic and, therefore, independent of the nature of subjects. Some of these functions include breaking the monotony of the print, making the materials more attractive, increasing attention, making learning more real, etc. (Gachuhi and Matiru, 1989). For instance, the extracts from the Fort Hare materials (pages 183, 184 and 241 of this thesis) play the above roles effectively. The pictures of children in class can remind teacher-learners of who their own learners are; they seem to be focused, active and interested in what they are learning, some are wearing uniform, others are not, etc. Additionally, the way the teacher is modelling the writing process can bring teacher-learners to think about how they teach writing. All these may contribute to teacher-learners feeling that the materials were specifically designed for them as practising teachers. Therefore, the limited use of visuals in KIE DE modules may be an impediment to teacher-learners' motivation (Gardner, 1985), investment (Norton, 2000) and understanding as it may negatively affect their interest in these materials.

6.2.6 Layout

The layout of DE materials should facilitate learners' engagement with these materials. Designers of KIE DE materials are expected to "use attractive visual presentation with enough white space in the margin to allow learners to add their own comments" (KIE, 2009, p. 3). These [wide] margins are the first thing that catches the reader's eyes as he or she opens KIE DE modules. On each page, such a margin is left on the side nearest to the spine of the book. Silverman (2004) calls this an inside margin. This margin seems sufficient for the teacher-learners to write their short notes, comments, observations, questions, etc. However, the fact that it is close to the spine of the book is likely to make it awkward to write in, which may suggest that it was meant not for pedagogic purposes but for leaving space for the binding (Silverman, 2004). In this regard, I suggest that 'wider outside margins' (Silverman, 2004) are better than inside ones. Moreover, these inside margins are sometimes used by module designers to write key words especially at the beginning of sections and most activity questions also encroach upon them, which reduces their width. If this margin was designed "to allow learners to add their own comments" (KIE 2009, p. 3), I suggest that using it for something else by the module designers would limit the likelihood that the teacher-learners will make and/or write these comments.

With reference to the space reserved for teacher-learners' answers to activity questions, it is unevenly distributed, extending from too wide (for example Module 1 pages 79, 350) through wide (for example Module 1, pages 17, 277; Module 2, pages 226), small (for example Module 1, pages 201, 283; Module 2, pages 71, 223, 153; Module 3, pages 150, 228, 285, 314) to no space at all (for example, Module 2, p. 36, 125; Module 7, p. 71, 192, 199, 267). In some cases, questions which require answers as short as one word or phrase are given more space than those which require relatively long answers as evident in the three activities copied from Modules 1 (the first activity) and 7 (pages 206 and 199) on the next two pages.

Activity 25

You must have read at least one or several short stories. Choose one of the short stories and answer the following questions about the short story:

1. What is the title of the short story?

2. Who is the author of the short story?

3. How long did you take to complete reading through the short story?




Figure 16: Space left for activity answers in Modules 1 and 7

Given that the size of the space serves as an indication of the length of the answer expected (Lockwood, 1992), the space left for answers to activities 25, 3 and 7 above suggest that this principle was not taken into consideration. Furthermore, the lack of or insufficient space for answers to some questions is likely to decrease the likelihood that teacher-learners will attempt the activities as indicated by Gashumba (one of the informants) in Chapter Seven.

Another aspect of layout is how the text is placed on the page, with regard to whether it is flush left or justified. Silverman (2004) argues that the space between

words in a justified text is likely to distract the reader because it can appear large or uneven. Therefore, as this author suggests, a flush left approach is preferable particularly when the writer writes in one column, as is the case for KIE DE materials. Another merit of this approach is that it keeps lines short, which may help them to read faster. This is the approach that KIE DE materials designers have adopted.

Font size is also an aspect of layout. In KIE DE modules for English the block and the section titles are in font size 24, subsections in 18, headings (under subsections) in 14, while the text is in 10.5 font size with single line spacing. All the titles are in bold while the text is not. This situation helps to distinguish different layers of titles from the text, which is a good aspect. However, I suggest that block titles should be in a larger font size than that of sections in order for teacher-learners to tell them apart more easily. Moreover, a 10.5 letter size and single line spacing seem too small especially for additional/foreign language learners (such as KIE DE teacher-learners) to read the materials easily. I suggest that the font size and line spacing should be 12 and 1.5 respectively. I understand that increasing the font size and line spacing would result in modules (which are already very large) becoming even larger. This implies that the module designers should select the content that teacher-learners really need and find ways of presenting it in such a way that the materials are user-friendly.

Concerning the density of module pages, some of these are extremely dense (for example pages 1, 23, 28, 29, 84, 197-205, 214-219 of Module 1 and 16-47, 129-151 of Module 7) while others appear to be sparse. The sparse pages are generally those that contain tables and activities (leaving space for answers as one would expect). The following are examples of pages that appear to be very densely written.

Section 7: Writing systems

Speech and writing are the two basic manifestations of language and each has its own functions as we saw in Section 6. In some areas there is a one-to-one correspondence between speech and writing while in other areas there isn't. To actualise written language, writing systems had to be developed.

A writing system is a type of symbolic system used to represent elements or statements expressible in language.

Writing systems can be distinguished from other possible symbolic systems by the fact that one must usually understand something about the associated language in order to successfully read and comprehend the text. The extraction of meaning in other possible symbolic systems such as information signs, painting, maps, mathematics, etc, does not necessarily depend upon prior knowledge of a given language.

Every human community possesses language, a feature regarded by many as an innate and a defining condition of humankind. However, the development and adoption of writing systems has occurred slowly. Once established, writing systems are on the whole modified more slowly than their spoken counterparts and often preserve features and expressions which are no longer current in the discourse of the speech community.

The great benefit of writing systems is their ability to maintain a persistent record of information expressed in a language, which can be retrieved independently of the initial act of formulation.

All writing systems require the following:

1. A set of defined base elements or symbols, individually termed as characters or graphemes and collectively called a script.
2. A set of rules and conventions understood and shared by a community, which arbitrarily assign meaning to the base elements, their ordering, and relations to one another.
3. A language, generally a spoken language, whose constructions are represented and able to be recalled by the interpretation of these elements and rules.
4. Some physical means of distinctly representing the symbols by application to a permanent or semi-permanent medium so that they may be interpreted visually.

Writing systems are conceptual systems, as are the languages to which they refer. Writing systems may be regarded as complete according to the extent to which they are able to represent all that may be expressed in the spoken language.

Graphology is the study of all the conventions used in representing speech in writing. A **grapheme** is a technical term used to refer to an atomic unit of a given writing system: An individual grapheme may be represented in a wide variety of ways, where each variation is visually distinct in some regard but all are interpreted as representing the same grapheme.

These individual variations are known as allographs of a grapheme, e.g., the grapheme 'a' can be represented as a, **a,** A, *a,* etc. The selection between different allographs may be influenced by the medium used, the writing instrument, the stylistic choice of the writer, and the largely unconscious features of an individual's hand writing.

Figure 17: Page density in Module 1

Gardner has even added another type:

The naturalist: someone knowledgeable and comfortable in the natural world.

Teachers could create language activities of all sorts that could be classified in each of these multiple intelligence types. Since learners do not have all these different types or have them at different degrees, diversified activities in all these types could help individual learners to develop their language abilities in a coherent and balanced way. In addition, by being aware of the types of intelligences language activities belong to, the teacher could know which activities to insist on in accordance with the different intelligences of his /her individual learners. We should accommodate our students' learning styles or multiple intelligences while at the same time asking them to work cooperatively in activities of all sorts. While thinking about any methodological choice, we should take into account the unique qualities of each of our students and their learning strategies.

Comments:

Discussions have now gone full circle. We have moved from teaching methods being the sole propriety of the teacher to the teacher being only a simple instigator of learning strategies in the learner. In fact, language teaching methods can be viewed as shuttling back and forth between these two poles of the initiation of learning activities: the teacher and the learner. The last section of this block has actually concentrated on the kinds of abilities the learner can bring into the process of his/her own development to language mastery.

The above survey of language teaching methods and approaches shows that language teaching methodology today has a large data base from which we can select appropriate methods, principles and techniques in our current teaching activities. In reality, there is no unique language teaching method that is perfect and that can be used in all circumstances and situations. The teacher is indeed free to select those methods, principles and techniques that would suit particular situations and purposes. Each method has positive and negative aspects, depending on the objectives of language learning. That is why you are the main deciders of your course of actions and activities. Obviously, you are free to combine methods, principles, techniques and activities which you think could enable you to achieve particular expected outcomes. This approach is what is generally called *ecclecticism.*

With regard to an eclectic approach, Rivers (1984: 55) writes: "*Ecclecticists try then to absorb the best techniques of the entire well - known language -teaching methods into their classroom procedures, using them for the purposes for which they are most appropriate*".

Along the same lines, Harmer (1991: 42) advocates for a '*balanced activities approach which has the role of ensuring that students get a variety of activities, which foster acquisition and learning*'.

Teachers should in fact vary their methods. No matter which methods are in vogue or are officially recommended, teachers who are professionally alert will adopt techniques and principles from other methods, in accordance with their objectives, personalities and the particular classes they are teaching; the ages, levels and educational needs of their students; and finally, the situations in which they find themselves.

Figure 18: Page density in Module 7

This very dense layout might have been a deliberate choice aimed at reducing the thickness of the modules as they are already very long (372 pages for Module 1 and 290 for Module 7) and the margin is wide as pointed out above. This can be a strategy for making learning materials not "irritating to read" (Silverman, 2004, p. 97) because teacher-learners do not have to turn pages frequently. However, turning pages frequently is less challenging than reading a very dense and long text without a break, especially when the font size and line spacing are very small as is the case in KIE DE materials for English. It should be noted that in the first cohort of KIE DE teacher-learners also indicated that density in KIE DE materials made content difficult to understand (Rumble, 2003).

6.2.7 A conversational/interactional style

KIE DE materials designers are expected to design materials that are interactive, and to use a conversational style of writing (KIE, 2009). An analysis of KIE DE Modules 1 and 7, however, reveals very little evidence of a conversational style. For instance, the use of the pronoun '*you'* referring to the teacher-learners (not the generic *you*) is confined almost entirely to the introductory sections of different blocks and to feedback[44]; it is usually absent in the presentation of the content. Moreover, the use of this sole second personal pronoun '*you'* does not necessarily imply a conversation because the pronouns that refer to the 'interlocutor(s)' are absent. Its use seems to imply orders or instructions given to teacher-learners by someone with a higher status as can be noted in the following extract:

> Apart from the course texts and the course packets which will be provided to *you*, *you* need to be resourceful as an individual. There is a lot of information in *your* community, particularly on oral literature … *You* may either purchase them [books] or borrow… *You* should also make a habit of making notes… ask *your* Subject Tutor to identify relevant websites for *you* (Module 1, p. 5, italics added).

As evident in this quote, the designers seem to distance themselves from both the teacher-learner and the learning process. It is as if a third person wrote the

[44] The pronoun you is consistently used in 'feedback' in KIE DE modules in order to give the teacher-learners instructions, mainly on how to answer activity questions. Thus, this use hardly implies a conversational style.

materials. The use of the passive form (*will be provided to you [by whom?]*) and the reference to the Subject Tutor as a teaching guide, support this claim. A style like this in a teaching/learning relationship may intimidate learners and limit their engagement with the materials. In fact, this may make them think that all that their learning requires is to abide by the instructions from the designers and study what has been provided without questioning it. My suggestion is that the style could be made more interactional/conversational by introducing pronouns referring to the designers. Moreover, instead of referring teacher-learners to tutors for relevant websites, the latter should have been included in the materials. Otherwise, the materials may be considered not self-contained/sufficient and self-explanatory (Kumar, 2000) contrary to the instructions to KIE DE materials designers (KIE, 2009).

Some other uses of the pronouns 'we' and 'you' in Module 1 are confusing as to who they refer to as can be seen in the example below:

> "In this module *we* are going to focus on four main areas… The fourth block introduces *you* to different… In oral literature *you* will deal with definitions… The drama section introduces *you* to major…In the Poetry section *we* will deal with…" (Module 1, p. 1-2)

In the first sentence, the pronoun '*we'* seems to be inclusive, referring to both the designers and the teacher-learners. However, the subsequent uses of the exclusive '*you*' and the last likely inclusive '*we*' raise questions about this alternate use of these pronouns. Such questions would include whether there are sections that the designers and the teacher-learners are supposed to work on together and others which the teacher-learners will work on alone. This can also be noted in the introductions to a section on 'Effective listening' (Module 1) and to block 2 of Module 7 where the use of 'we' switches between inclusion and exclusion without any relevant reason:

> In the previous block *we* [possibly inclusive] looked at effective speaking. In this block *we* are going to discuss…In this block *we* [likely exclusive] are going to give you some tips on… (Module 1, p. 214, italics added).

> This block focuses on the techniques or strategies that *you* can use ... it will require *you* to revisit all past modules of *your* study ... In this block, *we* will first look at ... and then *we* will consider ... (Module 7, p. 173, italics added).

There are very few examples of an unambiguous use of the pronouns *you* and *we* in Block 3 of Module 1. One of these reads as follows:

> … *you* need to take an active role and work hard on *your* own. In relation to this skill, what counts most is more practice on *your* part as the learner. In this block *we* are going to give *you* some tips on what *you* are required to do in order to develop speaking skills (Module 1, p. 197).

In Module 7, however, there are several examples of attempts to write in a conversational style. This is especially the case for the literature pedagogy block which, as has been indicated in Chapter Five, is different in many respects from the English language pedagogy block. Some examples include the following:

> You have already studied what oral literature is ... Now we are going to focus on how to teach oral literature. As such, you need to revise the content that you have already covered so that it can enable you to help your students to understand and enjoy oral literature. You know that to teach well involves good planning of your work. To achieve this, you need to use integrative, student centred, communicative and heuristic approaches. You will learn how to use these terms in this block (Module 7, p. 187).

> In the section on 'Poetry', we have explored some activities that can be employed in teaching poetry. We have looked at activities that can be used before, during and after studying a poem. However, these are not the only prescribed activities that can be used. As a teacher you have to be innovative enough to come up with interesting activities that can facilitate teaching and learning – stand on your head if you must to ensure that you engage your students in the literature learning and teaching process (Module7, p. 241).

In these paragraphs, it is clear who is referred to by the pronouns 'we' and 'you': they are clearly inclusive and exclusive respectively. The use of the inclusive pronoun 'we' suggests that the teacher/designer and the learners are exploring the new content together. The use of the exclusive 'you', however, signals those tasks that the learner has done or has to do alone such as revising previous materials (first

paragraph) and using the newly acquired knowledge and skills to teach their own learners (second paragraph).

It should be noted that none of the other three features of a conversational style (an informal style of writing, contractions and rhetorical questions – Richards, 1995; Essel, Owusu-Boateng & Saah, 2008) is used in KIE DE Modules 1 and 7. This gives the modules a formal style in spite of KIE recommending an "informal friendly tone and style" (KIE, 2009, p. 2). Therefore, the tone of an "enthusiastic teacher enjoying a discussion of the subject with a responsive learner" (Rowntree, 1990, p. 207) and the interaction between the designers and the teacher-learners (Dzakira and Idrus, 2003, Turuk, 2008) in which lies one of the secrets of effective learning (Vygotsky, 1978) are almost entirely absent. In fact, there are very few places where learners are invited to reflect on or respond to writer's questions, comments, or observations. As has been indicated earlier (section 6.2.3), the learner's engagement with and input on the subject matter is limited by the lack of such features.

As mentioned in the above paragraph, KIE DE Modules 1 and 7 for English use a formal academic language and style instead of an informal and friendly style of writing. They contain technical and/or unfamiliar terms which teacher-learners are likely to find difficult to understand, especially because English is a foreign language for them. Moreover, these terms are not glossed. Below are two examples of paragraphs from Module 1, in which the language is very formal and technical:

> Steven Pinker, following Chomsky and Emmanuel Kant, believes that humans are born with a language instinct, that is, a neural processing network that contains a universal grammar that has developed specifically for encoding and decoding human languages (p. 26).

> Derek Bickerton suggested that the language faculty evolved in two major steps. The first is a protolanguage of symbolic representation, verbal or gesture signs, and the second is formal syntax. Symbolic representation allows modelling of reality and constructional learning and, together with some communicative ability, permits

> shared learning. Syntax, on the other hand, permits significantly improved precision and clarity in thought and communication (p. 26).

The designers seem to take for granted that terms such as instinct, a neural processing network, universal grammar, encoding and decoding, protolanguage, constructional learning, etc. will be known by the teacher-learners whereas the reality is that most of these terms are likely to be new for them. Such specialist terms are also used in Module 7; they include terms such as versatile, leeway, axiomatic, structural linguistic/syllabus, functional notional grammar. Thus, it can be argued that the module designers have done limited work to mediate learning effectively because the specialist vocabulary is not explained in ways that make it accessible to teacher-learners (Leach, 1995; Richards, 1995). In fact, while it is true that academic courses require an academic discourse, Morais (2002, p. 561) suggests that "a close relation of communication between academic and non-academic discourses has the potential to make knowledge more meaningful, more understandable and applicable." If the language used in the materials is not accessible, KIE DE teacher-learners will have to 'fight two enemies' (Brock-Utne, 2000) at the same time (the language and the subject matter).

This lack of a conversational style coupled with abstract technical and academic language in KIE DE materials for English is likely to reduce the teacher-learners' control of their learning. This situation suggests that the KIE DE programme are strongly framed and an example of a performance model of pedagogy (see Bernstein, 1996; Hoadley and Jansen, 200945 in Chapter Two). As has been discussed in Chapter Two, a strongly framed curriculum is less likely to foster active learning and a learner-centred approach, both of which, according to Daniels (2001), are at the heart of effective mediation and which are more likely to lead to teacher-learner autonomy. However, this finding does not necessarily imply that weak classification and a competence model will promote active learning and teacher-learner agency because, as has been pointed out in Chapter Two, what matters is not

[45] According to Hoadley and Jansen (2009), a curriculum which uses many special terms or specialist language that one needs to understand in order to access the subject can be described as strongly classified while a weakly classified curriculum makes greater use of everyday language.

whether a particular classification and model is adopted but how appropriate it is to context.

One other important thing to note about KIE DE materials for English in relation to learner autonomy is that while it is evident that the designers draw extensively from academic texts, they have not included any such texts or extracts from these texts in the materials. I suggest that they should have included and mediated such texts/extracts in their materials in order to initiate teacher-learners into academic literacy. Failure to do this is likely to limit the professional development of those teachers who wish to continue their studies at degree level after completing their diploma studies with KIE. While I understand the difficulty of achieving learner autonomy in DE materials (see section 2.2.2.3), I suggest that such autonomy is assisted by the use of language that learners can understand easily and by explanations of specialist terms.

6.2.8 The approach/es to mediation of knowledge foregrounded or backgrounded in KIE DE materials

One aim of this study has been to establish whether, how and to what extent the designers of the KIE DE materials for language teacher education take the constructivist approach to learning advocated by the institution (KIE, 2009). This approach emphasizes knowledge construction rather than knowledge transmission (Zarei, 2008). As has been discussed in Chapter Two, constructivism is associated with a number of learning approaches which I use in this section to analyze KIE DE materials for English. These include critical thinking[46] (Duron, Limbach and Waugh, 2006), active learning (Donald, Lazarus and Lolwana, 2007), learner-centred approach (Singh and Harris, 2010), peer collaboration or cooperative learning (Donald, Lazarus and Lolwana, 2007), and considering and/or drawing on the context in which learning takes place (Vrasidas, 2000; Crandall, 2000).

[46] Critical thinking has been discussed in the section analyzing learning activities and objectives in KIE DE materials. Thus, I will not return to it in this section.

6.2.8.1 Active learning

> The concept of constructivism emphasizes the student as being the active learner, playing a central role in mediating and controlling learning (Jonassen, 1999).

One of the central premises in constructivist thinking is that people actively and continuously construct their world (Donald, Lazarus and Lolwana, 2007). Research indicates that learners learn more and retain knowledge longer if they acquire it in an active rather than passive manner (Fink, 2003, in Duron, Limbach and Waugh, 2006). In the teacher education area, Crandal (2000) indicates that a constructivist perspective that considers teacher-trainees to be a primary source of knowledge about teaching has largely replaced one that considers them as passive recipients of knowledge.

The analysis offered in this chapter has identified limitations in KIE DE materials for English teaching resulting from the lack of tasks for learners to do in order to learn as ITQs are almost absent in these materials. For instance, only eight such questions are included in Module 1. This contradicts the recommendation in the handbook for KIE DE module designers to use ITQs as one of the "devices to make learning easier for the students" (KIE, 2009, p. 2) replacing "the questions any classroom teacher constantly asks of their [sic] students" (p. 11). The lack of ITQs is a serious deficiency because such questions help learners to think from a variety of perspectives, to relate theory to practice and to engage in deep learning (Fung, 2005). In a Sub-Saharan multi-country assessment of the use of DE and ICT in education undertaken in 2003, the first intake of KIE DE teacher-learners themselves decried the insufficiency of ITQs in the materials (Rumble, 2003). The persistence of this shortcoming in the revised version of these materials can call the validity of the revision into question.

In the very few instances where learners are asked questions in the teaching/learning process, little feedback (or follow-up) is given on their answers

(see for example, Module 7, pp. 38, 122). In the section on '*Definitions of Languages and Linguistics'* (Module 1) for example, learners are asked to write their definition of language in the provided space. Immediately after the space, the text continues:

> *There is no comprehensive definition of language. In section 1 of this block we will look at some of the commonly quoted definitions*" (p. 15).

One can wonder why learners are asked to give their own definition of language, if nothing is going to be done with it. Instead of, for example, asking teacher-learners to reflect on their definitions and compare them with those given in the module (which could bring them to think critically), they are informed that '*there is no comprehensive definition of language*'. There is a risk that teacher-learners will interpret this as '*what you have done is useless because no one can comprehensively define language*'. This seems ineffective as a question designed to help teacher-learners understand what it means to know a language.

In other cases, the follow-up consists of answers that are given without any reference to the question that has been asked. For example after learners are asked to list the parts of speech they know in the space provided (Module 1, p. 109), the designers list the different of parts of speech in English immediately below the space. In such cases, teacher-learners may wonder why they should list these parts of speech (some of which they may not know) while a comprehensive list is provided. The provision of answers without any reference to the related questions also appears on pages 306, 308, 313, 341, 348, and 352 of Module 1. I suggest that some rationale (direct or indirect) needs to be given to learners as part of the designers' response to teacher-learners' answers. The only instance of follow-up that seems 'relevant' to the answers is when learners are asked to list the languages they speak. This feedback is as follows: *"[I]f you speak Kinyarwanda, French and English or any other language you listed above, then you can be said to know these languages*" (p. 13). To a certain (limited) extent, this feedback at least implies part of what to know a language means: to be able to speak it. The block on literature pedagogy (Module 7) however, contains a few questions that are set to help the teacher-learners to learn, and for which the module designers provide feedback and on which they build subsequent content presentation as has been explained in section

5.2.2.2. One example of an attempt to teach through activities in Module 7 (p. 226) is as follows:

Question

From your reading of *Things Fall Apart*, list down some themes that you could identify in the novel. Write your answer in the space below.

Space

Feedback

There is no definite answer to this question. Your answer will depend on your insight into reading the novel. However, there are some recurrent or obvious ideas that almost every reader is bound to get after reading *Things Fall Apart*. For instance, the struggle for preservation of the traditional culture that is spearheaded by Okwonkwo, the encroachment of Christianity on traditional African practices, and the eminent (*sic*) change that is gradually sweeping through Umuofia. These would form the basis of description and discussion of some of the themes in the novel.

Subsequent question

Describe how you would make your students become aware of these themes through an appropriate activity. Write your answer in the space provided.

Figure 19: An example of good feedback in Module 7

This section illustrates how teaching through questioning (Duron, Limbach and Waugh, 2006) should be done: the teacher asks learners (a) question(s), learners give their answers, and the designer of the material gives feedback and builds on learners' likely answers and on his or her own feedback to introduce new teaching.

An analysis of the activities in the Modules 1 and 7 indicates that the teacher-learners are asked very few questions which focus on learning rather than on assessment. Given Duron, Limbach and Waugh's (2006) suggestion that active learning can be achieved by teaching through questioning (see Chapter Two), it can be argued that KIE DE materials do not really promote active learning, and that their teaching approach is not learner-centred and may not foster critical thinking. The

approach just expects the teacher-learners to read the materials, answer the assessment activity questions mostly by reproducing what they have read and, if their score on these activities is not satisfactory, re-read the materials. All these factors point to an approach that foregrounds knowledge transmission rather than knowledge construction. This approach may turn the KIE DE teacher-learners into "passive receivers of knowledge who did not question the authority of their teachers" (Reed, 2005, p. 271), and the KIE DE module designers into know-it-all specialists and the only source of knowledge without whom learning is hardly possible. This approach may not result in much learning because as Shuell (1986), cited in Biggs (2003a, p. 1), argues, "what the student does is actually more important in determining what is learned than what the teacher does".

6.2.8.2 Drawing on teacher-learners' contexts

As mentioned in section 2.3.3, in-service teachers have the advantage of being able to apply and reflect on what they learn when they teach. This affords them an opportunity to link theory to practice in specific contexts and to make decisions about which methodology works best for them (Crandall, 2000). Consequently, materials for in-service teacher education should capitalize on this opportunity in order to connect to teacher-learners' own experiences and reality (Wessels, 2001), to encourage them to put what they have learned into practice (Norman & Spencer, 2005) and to make informed decisions when choosing and applying teaching approaches and methods. One way of doing this is to include classroom scenarios in activities (Fung, 2005) because "the classrooms where teachers spend the majority of their time represent legitimate sites for teacher learning" (Johnson, 2006, p. 244). The extract from *Language, Literacy and Communication, Umthamo 4* (pages 183, 184 and 241 of this thesis) is an example of an effective inclusion of classroom scenarios in learning materials.

With reference to the inclusion of classroom scenarios it could be concluded from reading the KIE DE English Modules 1 and 7 that they were not written for in-service teachers. In Module 1, there is not one instance where teacher-learners are asked to

reflect upon something being learned from the module in relation to their teaching context. In addition, extremely few examples are drawn from Rwandan English classrooms and wider Rwandan contexts to facilitate teacher-learners' understanding. The literature pedagogy block in Module 7 is the only exception as it uses some classroom situations to present content. According to Johnson (2006), the lack of links between teacher education programmes and teachers' classroom contexts may limit the professional development of English teachers as transformative intellectuals.

The lack of connection to teacher-learners' contexts of practice together with the very technical language used in KIE DE materials for English suggest that KIE DE materials use a more vertical discourse than a horizontal discourse (see Bernstein, 1999 in Chapter Two). The former tends to be context free (and more conceptual) while the latter tends to be context bound (Muller, 2009). While horizontal discourses may "reduce student access to important forms of knowledge by which they can challenges tradition and the status quo" and vertical discourses may provide students with "mechanisms for generating new knowledge beyond specific and isolated contexts and content" (Player-Koro, 2009, p. 5), vertical discourses need to be very carefully mediated. For example, technical terms should be glossed in order to facilitate learners' understanding. There is no glossary of technical terms in KIE DE modules, which mostly use a vertical discourse, making it difficult for the teacher-learners to access the content. The only exception is some literature blocks, although these also have limitations, as has been explained in section 6.2.1.

With reference to language teaching, Johnson (2006) and Johnson and Golombek (2011) argue that the connection between teacher-learners' acquired skills and knowledge and the sociocultural context where they are going to use these is a sine qua non for successful language teaching. This connection between teachers' acquired knowledge and skills and the context(s) where the teachers will apply these is characteristic of a competence pedagogic model and a horizontal discourse (Bernstein, 1999), which make strong links between school learning and real life (Hoadley and Jansen, 2009). The fact that this connection is consistently missing in

KIE DE materials for English suggests that the designers may not be aware of its importance. Therefore, it may be difficult for teacher-learners to make connections between the content included in the modules and what, how, where and why they teach. The lack of connection between the KIE DE programme and teacher-learners' contexts of practice may also position them to consider their teaching and their studies as two separate programmes and address them as such, instead of using them interactively for the improvement of each as implied in Mukamana's remarks[47] that follow:

> We have generally wondered whether the writers actually sat and wrote the modules or copied things from somewhere else and pasted them in the modules. And I think I share the same question with many other KIE DE teacher-learners. But the language in here [the redesigned section] shows that it is a composition written by someone who took into consideration … someone who knows Rwanda, who knows the current situation in Rwanda, who knows the people he is writing for. That is my impression [Interview, 16 August 2012].

Mukamana's remarks suggest that she found KIE DE materials not relevant to her, notably because their writing style suggests designers' lack of understanding of the context in which Rwandan teachers work. A different opinion was expressed by the same informant on the redesigned section because, she indicated, it was designed by "someone who knows Rwanda, who knows the current situation in Rwanda, who knows the people he is writing for" (Interview, 16 August 2012). In other words, she suggests that there is a link between the redesigned section and the Rwandan teachers' context. This lack of connection between teacher-learners' school and everyday (professional) life suggests that the KIE DE programme is an example of a performance model (See Bernstein, 1996 and Hoadley & Jansen, 2009 in Chapter Two), and may inhibit teachers' professional development and adaptation to ever-changing and diverse teaching contexts. It may also negatively affect their ability to continue to learn and actively transform their world as recommended by sociocultural theorists (see Donato, 1994; Williams and Burden, 1997 in Chapter Two).

[47] These remarks are also used in Chapter Seven (section 7.2) while discussing language use in KIE DE materials

In their evaluation of the first set of KIE DE materials, Pennells and Coldevin (2003) pointed out that these materials were not sufficiently focused on what teachers do in the classroom. In a brief review of the KIE DE programme undertaken by SAIDE in 2006, it was also noticed that "to adapt the curriculum to speak more to the actual experience of the learner and the teacher in the classroom" was one of the main challenges (Mays, 2006, p. 4). The fact that this situation persists in the second and newer version of the materials may point to the designers of KIE DE materials not having the necessary knowledge and skills or sufficient time to design and revise the materials in order to improve their quality. Furthermore, the effectiveness of the KIE DE programme in preparing teachers for the realities of the classroom (Crandall, 2000) and in responding to their actual needs can also be called into question. An analysis of the following page copied from Module 7 further illustrates this claim.




Figure 20: An illustration of lack of contextual knowledge development in KIE DE materials for English

This page gives a general picture of what KIE DE materials for English look like and the points of critique offered indicate that the aim of the KIE DE programme (to upgrade teacher-learners' qualifications and improve their teaching) may not be fully achieved. In particular, the lack of reference to the teacher-learners' teaching contexts in the learning materials may limit their abilities to thoughtfully apply new content knowledge about English and pedagogic knowledge about English teaching to their own classroom contexts.

6.3 Conclusion

The analysis offered in this chapter suggests that the designers of KIE DE materials seem to take a banking approach (Freire, 2007), which takes the reproduction of the learned matter as an indication of successful learning. This approach, according to Chen (2003), foregrounds learner's final performance (see Bernstein's (1996) performance model of pedagogy in Chapter Two) rather than the process that leads to it, or competence in Bernstein's (1996) words. Chen (2003) observes that educators who use a behaviourist approach transmit knowledge to learners mostly by direct instruction such as lectures or reading assignments. As has been explained in this chapter, the content in KIE DE materials is, for the most part, presented in the form of (written) lectures (rather than interactive lessons), which may limit learners' active involvement in the learning process.

Furthermore, it can be argued that KIE DE materials for English are strongly framed (Bernstein, 1996): they do not offer teacher-learners the opportunity to play an active role in and take charge of their learning, notably by expressing their own views on and, possibly, challenging what and how they learn from these materials. In effect, teacher-learners' views on content and related pedagogy are seldom sought and/or encouraged in KIE DE materials for English while effective teaching needs to give learners opportunities "to try things out, to experiment and discover things, to question and discuss, and to reflect and solve problems for themselves" (Donald, Lazarus & Lolwana, 2010, p. 53). Indeed, as Wheelahan (2010b, p. 199) argues, while

discussing the 'induction into knowledge', such indication involves "introducing students to the debates and controversies within disciplines and for (sic) creating the conditions for active agency so students can participate in these debates and controversies." Thus the approach adopted by the designers of the KIE DE materials can be questioned particularly in a pedagogy module (Module 7), the content of which is meant to be applied by teacher-learners in new contexts.

The approach to the mediation of content has implications for learners' identities as both learners and teachers because, as Bernstein's argues, "different ways of putting curricular knowledge together produce different identities and relations in pedagogic contexts" (Singh, 1997, p. 2). One of these implications is that teacher-learners are likely to passively depend on materials designers' decisions instead of thinking for themselves autonomously (Illés, 2012). In such a case, the rules of social order or the regulative discourse may position them as conscientious, attentive, industrious, careful and receptive rather than critical, creative, active, interactive, etc. (see Bernstein, 1996 in Chapter Two). Such a situation may reduce the teacher-learners' control over the learning process and negatively affect their development and their own construction of knowledge as teachers (Wessels, 2010) and their attainment of Bernstein's (2000) right to be included, which right entails the ability to be autonomous and separate (if necessary) as opposed to adhering blindly to society's principles and values.

However, as has been noted in Chapter Two, strong framing of curriculum can, in some cases, be a better option than weak framing. This is especially so when learners do not have the knowledge base needed for them to fully take control of the learning process. This might be one reason why KIE DE materials designers have taken this option especially because KIE DE teacher-learners may not necessarily have a solid knowledge base (KIE, 2006). However, the way the content is mediated contradicts this point: the mediation in the materials is not suitable for teacher-learners with a weak knowledge base and for their gradual development towards independent thinking. Analysis of the approaches to mediation evident in the materials indicates that the transformation of specialist expert knowledge into

pedagogic forms that could make it accessible to the teacher-learners (see Singh, 2002 in Chapter Two) is not often appropriately done.

With regard to how assessment is carried out in KIE DE materials for English, it can be argued that the materials are an example of a performance model of pedagogy which, according to Bernstein (1996), emphasizes "a specific output of the acquirer". The module designers have provided only one right and specific answer to most of assessment activity questions, which suggests that they expect the same from teacher-learners. Moreover, this approach suggests that the focus of these activities is not on the process that teacher-learners go through in answering the questions (as in the competence model) but on the final answer (product) to the questions. In fact, apart from listing the answers to the questions as part of the feedback, the module designers rarely provide any indication of how answers could have been arrived at. Such an approach implies that successful learning means getting the same answers as those suggested by module designers. As has been explicated, such feedback limits the possibilities of teacher-learners thinking critically or of transferring the acquired knowledge and skills to new (teaching) situations and, eventually, of using those for continuous learning, independent thinking and problem solving (Wessels, 2001). This is an impediment to the achievement of learner autonomy, the overarching aim of education (Vygotsky, 1978; Bernstein, 1996).

The analysis summarized in this chapter has identified limitations in relation to content selections and how this content is mediated in KIE DE materials for English. In this regard, a question arises as to what factors may have contributed to this situation. The following extract[48] addressed to KIE DE materials designers makes reference to some of these factors:

> You all have postgraduate qualifications and are subject specialists but you don't necessarily have teaching or communication skills in Distance Education (KIE 2009).

This extract suggests that the materials designers may not have relevant or sufficient knowledge and skills in the design of quality DE materials. In addition, it may position

[48] The extract is from the handbook designed for KIE DE materials designers.

them to expect little of themselves regarding effective designing of the materials, and thus limit the efforts that they make.

Moreover, time constraints may constitute a further challenge for the 'unskilled' designers, as is illustrated in the following quote:

> You are full time KIE lecturers with full workloads: 8-12 hours lecturing, plus research. In addition to your workload you give maximum support to DTP by writing modules, assessing learners' performance, conducting residential trainings etc. (KIE, 2009).

This statement implies that the design of KIE DE materials and the provision of learner support to KIE DE teacher-learners by KIE lecturers has been an 'add-on' to their already heavy workloads. These time constraints paired with the abovementioned lack of knowledge and skills in designing DE materials might have contributed to the limitations identified in the KIE DE modules for English. Moreover, designers were unable to visit teachers/schools to contextualise materials and to find out about teachers' and learners' proficiency in English before designing the materials. It seems likely that these factors (among others) have had effects on the quality of the materials produced for the KIE DE programme.

Chapter Seven: Teacher-learners' responses to KIE distance education materials for English and to the redesigned section of these

7.1 Introduction
7.2 Teacher-learners' views on the content chosen for inclusion in KIE DE modules for English
7.3 Teacher-learners' views on the content selected and on mediation in KIE DE modules for English and in the redesigned section
7.3.1 Teacher-learners' views on activities
7.3.2 Teacher-learners' views on feedback
7.3.3 Teacher-learners' views on layout
7.3.4 Teacher-learners' views on language use
7.3.5 Teacher-learners' views on content that addresses writing pedagogy and of the mediation of this content in the KIE DE materials and in the redesigned section
7.4 Teacher-learners' general comments on KIE DE programme

7.1 Introduction

The data analysed and interpreted in this chapter were collected from nine informants who were selected across the four KIE DE regional centres (See Chapter Three). Two teacher-learners (one low achiever and one high achiever) were selected from each centre, with the exception of Nyundo, where three teacher-learners (one low achiever and two high achievers) were selected for the reasons explained in Chapter Three. The data were collected through interviews that took place in the centres in August 2012 during the final face-to-face session for the 2010 KIE DE cohort. The informants were met in the four centres: Butare, Kabgayi, Rwamagana and Nyundo. The following table (Table 7) indicates informants' names (pseudonyms) and their respective centres:

Regional Centre	**Informants' names**[49]
Butare	Kalisa and Gashumba
Kabgayi	Mugabo and Karangwa
Rwamagana	Mutabazi and Rukundo
Nyundo	Ndahayo, Mukamana and Ngarambe

Table 7: Informants' pseudonyms and their respective centres

[49] The first student in each Centre is a low achiever while the second (and third for Nyundo) are high achievers.

The aim of this chapter is to present and analyse informants' views on the KIE DE materials for English and on a redesigned section of Module 7. The redesigned section is appended to this thesis as Appendix 4 and the principles that shaped its redesigning were explained in Chapter Four (see section 4.2.2). The analysis focuses on teacher-learners perceptions of the extent to which these two types of materials meet their professional needs as Rwandan high school teachers of English. The chapter is comprised of two main sections: teacher-learners' views on (i) content selections in KIE DE modules for English and (ii) teacher-learners' views on mediation strategies in KIE DE modules for English and (iii) teacher-learners' views on content and mediation in the redesigned section. It should be noted that a number of factors might have negatively or positively affected the information that was provided by the informants on both KIE DE materials and the redesigned section. These factors are discussed in section 7.3.5.

7.2 Teacher-learners' views on the content chosen for inclusion in KIE DE modules for English

As discussed in Chapter Five, several types of content are addressed in the KIE DE materials for English to differing extents. In the interviews, KIE DE teacher-learners expressed their views on both the content that was included in the modules and on the content that they expected to find that was not included. These views are summarized Table 8 on the next page.

Parts / Informants	Most useful parts (question 1)	Least useful parts (Question 2)	Parts expected but not found (Question 3)	Parts that should not be included (Question 4)
Kalisa	Grammar (Tree diagrams) Communication related parts	Activities without answers (open-ended questions)	The methodology (how to teach different contents).	There are unnecessary things which pose challenges to us. E.g. Rhyme and meter
Mugabo	All the parts	All the contents are useful, some parts are difficult to understand (linguistics, literature, grammar -tree diagramming).	- We do not know what is supposed to be included in the modules. - Literature	Many unnecessary details (e.g. Instead of giving ten definitions of one concept, they should provide one comprehensive definition).
Mutabazi	Grammar and pedagogy	Tree diagrams and too many and unnecessary details	- Critical thinking development content - How to use stress (intonation)	There are unnecessary and irrelevant contents but I cannot remember them.
Ndahayo	Grammar, and the teaching of writing	All the parts in modules are useful	- All things are there, but no details and examples - Grammar and linguistics are enough.	All the contents are relevant
Gashumba	Grammar, literature and Linguistics	Everything that has been included in the module is important.	- Syntax and how sentence structures correspond to their meanings	- Poems which we found difficult to analyse - The information in the modules is insufficient.
Karangwa	Creative and academic writing and grammar	The origin of language and the history of English	- All things are there but not clearly explained - Related activities are without answers - Oral skills development	Several issues copied from the books which are not even available in KIE's library.
Mukamana	Grammar and literature	Syntax and Linguistics and language analysis in Module 2	- The modules are more theoretical than practical	Syntax
Rukundo	All the parts in the modules are useful, phonology, stylistics and English literature impressed me the most	Grammar	- English oral skills development: we expected to interact with native speakers of English	The grammar parts contain too many and somehow unnecessary details.
Ngarambe	Pedagogic knowledge	- Questions without answers (open-ended questions). - Content presented as if we already know it.	- Communication skills development, especially regarding listening to a native accent.	Modules are very big when something is big it means that it also contains many [important] things.

Table 8: Teacher-learners' views on content selected for KIE DE modules for English

An analysis of informants' answers suggests that, in spite of identifying some useful content in KIE DE materials (generally grammar), the informants were generally critical of the content in these materials. This is because (i) some of the content that they need is not included, (ii) content that is not very useful for teachers occupies a

large space and (iii) the content in the materials is addressed in a manner that does not facilitate understanding, among other reasons. These responses will be discussed in detail in this chapter.

The first of my interview questions[50] asked the informants which parts of KIE DE modules they found most useful and why. As can be seen in Table 8 above, most of their answers were quite general. They spoke about grammar (six informants), pedagogy (two informants), communication skills (one informant), literature (three informants) and linguistics (one informant) without going into detail. One informant did not mention any specific area, claiming that all the content in the modules was equally useful. As can be seen, grammar was the area identified by the largest number of the informants as the most useful part. Some of the reasons the informants gave for this were that the focus of high school English teaching is on grammar (the seemingly overarching reason), that grammar enabled them to understand the function of words in different teaching situations, that grammar was addressed more deeply in KIE DE modules (hence clearing up some misconceptions they had), and that the knowledge of grammar helps them to write well. Mutabazi and Ngarambe, who mentioned pedagogy, said that the materials showed them how to prepare and conduct lessons in a manner that acknowledges and promotes learners' central role in learning. It is possible that these informants were referring to Shulman's (1987) general pedagogic knowledge that is addressed in Studies in Education Modules because, as the analysis offered in this thesis has indicated, KIE DE modules for English hardly address this kind of knowledge.

The second question in my interview asked the informants which parts in the modules for English they found least useful (question 2). The parts which they pointed out include activities which do not have answers (Kalisa and Ngarambe), analysing sentences using tree diagrams (Mugabo), the origin of language and the history of English (Karangwa and Mukamana), syntax, and structure of modern English (Mukamana) and grammar (Rukundo). Mugabo, who previously pointed out

[50] The interview questions are listed in Appendix 1.

that all content was useful, reiterated this answer when answering this question but added that some content (linguistics, literature and tree diagramming) is difficult to understand.

The main reason given for why the informants listed some content as least useful is that it is difficult to understand, notably because it is couched in difficult language and, therefore, does not help them much. Other reasons given were that the content is not taught at high school or does not (at least) provide examples which teacher-learners can adapt and use in their teaching. The teacher-learners responses echo the lack of external alignment (Biggs, 2003) between KIE DE module content and the O'Level curriculum discussed in Chapter Five. Another reason given by some informants is that they already had knowledge of some of the content (the case of grammar as mentioned by Rukundo) or that specific content can be read about and/or learned elsewhere, not necessarily from a study programme like this. Karangwa felt the latter to be the case for the origin of language and the history of English.

The research was also interested in finding out about the content which informants expected to find in the modules, but which was not actually included (question 3). The informants were critical of the lack of the following content: methodology to teach different aspects of language - PCK (Kalisa), content to develop critical thinking skills and appropriate use of stress in pronunciation (Mutabazi), content to explain how to link sentence structures to meanings (Gashumba), and content to develop (oral) communication skills (Karangwa, Rukundo and Ngarambe). The informants did not only mention the content but also the aspects of mediation that they expected to find (the pedagogy *of* the materials). For instance, Ndahayo and Karangwa said that all the necessary content was included but, together with Mukamana, criticized the lack of detail, practical explanations and examples and answers to certain activity questions. Most of these answers accord with the findings of the textual analysis presented in Chapter Five: grammar is addressed without linking it to meaning in context, KIE DE modules encourage a surface approach to learning (lack of criticality),

appear ineffective in extending teacher-learners' oral proficiency[51] and lack examples to illustrate and/or clarify different issues.

In connection with question 3, I asked the informants to describe the content which they thought should not have been included in the modules (question 4). Seven informants were of the view that some of the content is unnecessary while two (Ngarambe and Ndahayo) said that all the content included is relevant. To further elaborate on this, Ngarambe (Interview, 16 August 2012) explained: "Byo modules ni volumineux, gusa ... ni uko ... bigaragare ko iyo ikintu ari volumieux, kiba kirimo ibintu byinshi. Ariko nta bintu birimo umuntu yanenga cyane ngo ntabwo ari ngombwa." (It is true that the modules are voluminous but … in fact … when something is big it means that it also contains many things. But I don't think that there are issues that one can deem to be unnecessary). Ndahayo shares the same view as he pointed out that

> Modules in general, seem to be big, as big as possible. But to be big in that sense ... it is not exactly the problem because as teachers, we need … of course, more documentation. So, if we get the big module, as well we acquire or we have more documentation and it is necessary[52] (Interview, 16 August, 2012).

The above comments suggest that the informants may not have focused on the quality of what is included, possibly because they believe that every type of content provides them with knowledge, and all knowledge is important. The comments also suggest inability by the informants to identify what content they need in relation to what they teach because of the learning paradox (Glasersfeld, 2001), among other factors. This issue will be discussed in the sections to come.

The parts which were deemed to increase the size of the modules unnecessarily include 'unspecified' unnecessary details and things which are entirely copied from some books and "are not even related to the content we [teacher-learners] need" (Kalisa). Such 'unnecessary details' were pointed out by four informants, including Rukundo, who identified these in grammar. However, they did not specify what

[51] While I understand that oral proficiency is difficult to achieve in DE, the analysis suggests that content aimed at developing listening and speaking skills falls short of its aim.
[52] Quoted verbatim

exactly these are mainly because, as they indicated, they had used some of the modules almost two years earlier and they could not remember the details. Other content mentioned as unnecessary included syntax (Mukamana) and literature (Mugabo) because they are not taught anywhere at high school[53].

While it is not clear why some of the teacher-learners think that module designers copy and paste content from books, it seems that they based this idea on the difficult, technical and academic language used in the modules. This can be inferred from Mukamana's comment on the language used in the modules and in the redesigned section respectively:

> Icyo twaje kwibaza muri rusange ni uko dutekereza ngo izi modules ni composition of a writer cyangwa ni ibintu baterura bapastinga baterura bapastinga. Icyo cyo ntekereza ko hari abantu benshi babyibazaho kimwe nanjye. Ariko ahangaha ururimi ruri umungumu ni composition; mbese ni umuntu ubwe uba yabyiyandikiye agereranije … umuntu uba mu Rwanda, uzi u Rwanda aho rugeze azi n'abo ari kwandikira abo ari bo. Ni yo impression. (We have generally wondered whether the writers actually sat and wrote the modules or copied things from somewhere else and pasted them in the modules. And I think I share the same question with many other KIE DE teacher-learners. But the language in here [the redesigned section] shows that it is a composition written by someone who took into consideration … someone who knows Rwanda, who knows the current situation in Rwanda, who knows the people he is writing for. That is my impression [Interview, 16 August 2012].

This informant seems to imply that since the language was not appropriate to the level of the teacher-learners in the programme, then the designers had not written the content themselves. While this claim cannot be definitely confirmed, it suggests that module designers did little to simplify the language of the resources which they used to write the modules or, in other words, to mediate the content (Vygotsky, 1978) so that it is accessible to the teacher-learners. Such inadequate mediation is detrimental to teacher-learners' understanding of the module content, as some of them indicated. In fact, when the language of tuition is not the learners' home language (which is the case for KIE DE teacher-learners), special attention needs to be paid to the comprehensibility of the language in the study materials (Wessels,

[53] Though syntax is grammar, much of syntax found in KIE DE modules for English is not taught in Rwandan secondary schools.

2001; Phillips, 2007). However, this is not always easy to achieve, especially for the lecturers who are accustomed to writing academic texts (Phillips, 2007).

The responses of some of the informants also suggest that the teacher-learners appreciate learning materials which show understanding of and draw on the context in which they work, as recommended by sociocultural theorists (see Johnson and Golombek, 2011 in Chapter Two) constructivists (see Vrasidas, 2000 and Crandall, 2000 in Chapter Six) and other supporters of learner-centred approaches to teaching (Singh and Harris, 2010 in Chapter Two). This appreciation can further be evidenced by the fact that for some informants (such as Ngarambe and Kalisa), the redesigned section offered examples that they could easily identify with, because they were based on their immediate context. Indeed, Lusunzi (1999) and Holmberg (1986) argue that instructional activities that are illustrated with examples from learners' immediate environment are likely to support student motivation and promote learning pleasure and effectiveness.

It should be noted that some content which was considered most useful by some informants was considered least useful or irrelevant by others. For instance, Kalisa pointed out that tree diagrams were among the most useful parts because they enabled him to understand the function of words in sentences. However, Mutabazi considered that while they increase teacher-learners' general knowledge of language, tree diagrams are least useful because he cannot use them in the teaching of English; not even for an example. In similar vein, while grammar was considered as most useful by six of the nine informants, Rukundo classified it as least useful. He shares Mukamana's view that grammar related content includes too many unnecessary and/or irrelevant details. Also, Gashumba identified linguistics to be one of the most useful parts while Karangwa considers it to be among the least useful. These differences suggest that there is a wide variation among KIE DE teacher-learners regarding their educational backgrounds and interests. as is the case for many DE learners (Mishra, Ahmad & Rai, 2001). Catering for this variation poses a challenge for DE materials designers.

In connection with the above, the reasons given by some informants for their preference for some content seem related not to its relevance to their professional needs, but to whether the content is easy or difficult to understand. This is the case for phonology and sentence structures for Gashumba, syntax for Mukamana, some aspects of poetry (rhyme and meter) for Kalisa and some poems for Gashumba. Again, this suggests that the teacher-learners' ability to understand their professional needs as teachers may be quite limited. After all, not all content that is difficult to understand is necessarily irrelevant and/or not useful and not all that is easy to understand is relevant and/or useful to their teaching. Among other possibilities, this may suggest that teacher-learners are interested in the content that they can understand easily in order to pass their exams and get degrees. This claim is supported by Mugabo's response below:

> We find the module challenging to study because they put unimportant things, unnecessary things. This can be proved by the fact that when we are going to prepare an exam, when they bring an exam, you can see that some of them are not necessary[54] (Interview, 8 August, 2012).

In this response, Mugabo seems to imply that the content that is 'necessary' is the content that helps him to pass the examinations.

What the teacher-learners find relevant or useful may also depend on their previous learning experiences, hence varying from person to person. Thus, the basis for these 'poor' judgments may not necessarily be the content per se, but the teacher-learners' (in)ability to understand it. However, this cannot serve as a reason for KIE DE materials designers not to fulfil their responsibility to mediate 'difficult' content clearly and well. On the contrary, it should serve as a reminder to thoughtfully consider their writing so that their materials are "specially designed and carefully prepared to suit all the learners, meet all their educational requirements and help them learn on their own without much assistance from others" (Mishra, Ahmad & Rai, 2001, p. 52). I suggest that this is what distinguishes self-instructional materials from reference/textbooks.

[54] Quoted verbatim

The three informants who decried the lack of content on speaking and listening and lack of opportunities for improving oral proficiency said that they expected to interact with native speakers of English in order to develop this proficiency. These views suggest that, for the informants, proficiency in English means speaking the English of a 'native speaker', which, for Ngarambe, is spoken by "people from England and from America" (Interview, 16 August 2012) and that it cannot be attained, unless one interacts with 'these people'. This belief may actually be an obstacle to the attainment of proficiency because it can prevent teacher-learners from taking advantage of the opportunities of using English with people who are not necessarily 'the native speakers'. After all, globally most verbal exchanges in English do not involve any of its native speakers at all (Seidlhofer, 2005; Andrewes, 2011). Thus, what the teacher-learners need is language exposure (Banegas, 2009) irrespective of who uses it. So, it might have been a good idea for KIE DE materials designers to include some language awareness content in the modules, to enable teacher-learners to understand the functions of a language in local and global contexts, the notion of world Englishes, etc. which are some of the topics that content on sociolinguistics could address. As pointed out in Chapter Five (section 5.2.1.1), the content of the KIE DE modules is limited in this regard.

Some other reasons given by teacher-learners in their evaluation of content are linked to their interest in new knowledge. For instance, Gashumba considers linguistics content as most useful because this topic helped him to find how the languages he studied at high school (Kinyarwanda, French, English and Kiswahili) are linked or share certain similarities. This informant's interest in linguistics seems not linked to what he is doing now (teaching English) but to his school background and to the need to know more. Another example is that of Rukundo who found grammar to be least useful because "à l'école secondaire nous étudiions beaucoup de grammaire; alors, ici dans le module, la grammaire ne m'a pas beaucoup intéressé parce que j'avais une certaine connaissance là-dessus" (at high school we studied a lot of grammar. Therefore, the grammar parts in the module did not impress me that much because I already had some knowledge of it. Interview, 13 August 2012).

For Rukundo, the most useful parts in the materials are those which teach him new things irrespective (perhaps) of whether they are related to his current job or not. Indeed, he identified phonology, stylistics and English literature in general and African literature in particular as most useful because "à l'école secondaire nous n'avons pas beaucoup étudié ces parties là. Et elles m'ont impressionné puisque j'y ai trouvé des connaissances que je n'avais pas" (I did not study these parts at high school. They impressed me because they provided me with the knowledge that I did not have. Interview, 13 August 2012). These remarks suggest that some of the informants (Gashumba and Rukundo) are integratively rather than instrumentally motivated (Gardner, 1985) to study English in general, and the parts which they identified as most useful in particular. The latter parts might have responded to their need to know about a language towards which they have positive attitudes for various reasons.

However, Norton (2000) suggests that motivation alone is not enough for engagement and success in language learning. This is why this scholar developed the construct of 'investment' in order to complement the constructs of motivation in the field of SLA. According to Norton (2000, p. 10), learners invest in a second language "with an understanding that they will acquire a wider range of symbolic and material resources, which will, in turn, increase the value of their cultural capital." This construct is an economic metaphor in that learners expect a return on their investment (Pittaway, 2004), which return is a precondition for the investment. Pittaway (2004) suggests that "in the case of language learning, the return can be the acceptance into an L2-medium community of practice", which community can be imaginary (Norton & Toohey, 2011).

In addition to the interest in return, the level of investment is likely to be related to a number of factors in the actual teaching. These include, for example, teaching practices and how they position learners, learners' expectations, etc. Thus, for instance, language learners may have little investment in the language practices of a given classroom or those of certain parts of the curriculum because they may consider these to be racist, sexist, anti-immigrant or because learners' conception of

good teaching is not consistent with that of the teacher (Norton and Toohey, 2011). This can happen in spite of learners being motivated to learn the language and may lead some learners to invest more in certain language classroom practices and areas than in others. For instance, in a study conducted by Duff (2002) in a multilingual secondary school in Canada, and reported in Norton and Toohey (2011), some learners with limited command of English chose to remain silent and invest heavily in written activities of the classroom because they were afraid of being criticized or laughed at by native English speaking peers.

Cases of learners' investment in some parts of the modules rather than others can also be identified in the data I collected from the informants. For instance, Ngarambe pointed out that none of his classmates read what KIE DE module designers call 'feedback'[55] because it does not enhance their understanding of the content. When asked whether there are issues that he thought should not be included in the modules, Karangwa said:

> there is things they put there inside which are not necessary. For example, they can just come and write some pages, okay … from books that we haven't even in the library they haven't … So when you read you just notice this cannot help you… when even I am reading the modules I jump [these things] because I see they are not useful. So they cannot make me lose my time[56] (Interview, 8 August 2012).

These remarks suggest that in spite of the informants being motivated to study English through the KIE DE programme, they do not invest in all parts of the modules in the same way. From Ngarambe's and Karangwa's remarks above, one can deduce that there is little or no investment in the parts identified as not useful perhaps because of poor mediation by the designers. This, I suggest, directly affects what teacher-learners take from these parts and, indirectly, what and how they teach.

[55] As has been discussed in Chapter Six, this is mistakenly termed feedback; it falls short of its role.
[56] Quoted verbatim; not edited.

7.3 Teacher-learners' views on the content selected and on mediation in KIE DE modules for English and in the redesigned section

As has been explained in Chapter Six (section 3.3), mediation of content in DE materials can be done in a number of different and often interrelated ways. I decided to focus my interviews on the elements of mediation which teacher-learners could easily identify and comment on. These include activities, feedback, layout and language use (Kumar, 2000). However, the other aspects which were commented on by the informants will occasionally be referred to as well. It should be noted that most of the answers provided by the informants relate to the section on the teaching of writing, in Module 7. This was the case even for some questions related to other sections and/or modules. As has been explained in the methodology chapter, I redesigned the writing pedagogy section and some interview questions asked the informants to reflect on the redesigned version in relation to the one in the module. This may have influenced them to relate (consciously and/or unconsciously) all the interview questions to this section. In addition, working with the KIE DE modules and the redesigned section involved comparison, which may have altered the way teacher-learners came to see the KIE modules. This can be seen in the following remarks made by Rukundo:

> Les modules nous les étudiions comme ils sont …mais après avoir lu votre section je souhaiterais que les modules soient préparés ou soient constitués de la façon dont vous avez constitué votre section, parce que c'est celle que je vois utile pour un apprenant ou un élève qui étudie de la manière dont nous étudions. (we were using the modules the way they are… but after reading your section, I wish the modules were prepared or designed the way you have designed it. It is the one that suits a learner or a student who studies the way we do. Interview, 13 August 2012)

This suggests that some teacher-learners used the redesigned section as a 'measuring stick' with which to evaluate KIE DE materials. Indeed, all informants considered the redesigned section to be effective in almost all aspects that, in their view, KIE DE modules did not address effectively.

Overall, the informants indicated that the mediation is inappropriate in KIE DE materials generally and in the original version of the section that was redesigned in particular. Some of the reasons for this include that (i) the materials do not encourage learner-centred and active learning, (ii) they do not encourage deep/critical thinking, (iii) feedback does not help them to monitor their progress, (iv) the language used in the materials is very complicated and (v) the materials are boring to read because of a dense layout and limited use of visuals. Conversely, the informants were positive about mediation and content in the redesigned section and found it to be the opposite of the section in Module 7 in almost every respect. These claims will be illustrated in the following sections focusing on the analysis of each of the abovementioned teacher-learners' claims.

7.3.1 Teacher-learners' views on activities

As can be seen in Table 9 on the next page, teacher-learners views on activities in both KIE DE modules and the redesigned section (question 7) can be classified into two main categories: (i) the absence/presence of answers to questions and (ii) the superficial/deep nature of the activities. Generally, the absence of answers and the superficial nature of activities are associated with the KIE DE materials. In fact, lack of answers to some questions (mostly open-ended) was one of the most common criticisms (made by 6 of the 9 informants) while the superficial nature of the activities was also identified by five informants as a problem.

Respondent	Activities in the KIE module	Activities in the redesigned section
Kalisa		- They help learners in their own learning [he did not explain how]
Mugabo	- Some questions (open-ended) do not have answers - The activities here are theoretical while we know that writing is practical.	- All the questions have answers - The activities are practical
Mutabazi		- They encourage critical thinking - Develop planning skills for a writing process
Ndahayo	- Activities come at the end of a section. - The content of these activities is the same because they all help to revise and remind the reader of the most important issues.	- Activities come before the content they relate to, which is a weakness.
Gashumba	- Sometimes questions are not linked with the content they seem to assess; you check for right answers from the content and you don't find them. - The activities look like an examination; they are very difficult to answer.	- Questions are clear and relevant to the content they relate to - The activities in this section help the learner to understand the content. That's the difference I have found between the two.
Karangwa	- Less activities (only three) [in the section on writing] - No space for writing answers or any other comment - Answers not connected to activities - Answers not provided for some questions (open-ended questions).	- Answers are provided for all activity questions. - Activities help the reader to understand the content of the section.
Mukamana	- Only questions for which answers can be picked from the modules are answered. - Open-ended activity questions are not answered, which limits our thinking.	- All activity questions have answers - Activities help in illustrating the writing process.
Rukundo	- Require copying answers from the module	- Require much thinking: one needs to think carefully and understand the content of the lesson before attempting the activity.
Ngarambe	- Answers not provided for some activities in the module - Questions do not have anything to do with teaching; this is not important for someone training to be a teacher.	- Activities are intended for teachers - They provide the terms that one can use in their teaching - The activities give a central role to the reader (the teacher-learner) in the teaching process.

Table 9: Teacher-learners' views on activities in KIE DE modules for English and in the redesigned section

The fact that the majority of informants referred to answers when asked to comment on activities may suggest that they rely on these too much. In such a case, the provision of answers may limit the likelihood of their attempting the activities. For example, some informants in Fung's (2005) study of teacher-learners' use of

activities found it unnecessary to attempt activities because answers were provided for these in the materials. When commenting further on the lack of answers to some questions, Ngarambe seemed to take negatively the suggestion to teacher-learners to (critically) reflect on the activity questions and come up with their own answers. He said:

> barazibaza, hamwe ntibatange ibisubizo. Bakavuga ngo your own thinking cyangwa critical thinking. Ngo ni wowe bireba. Ahongaho, nk'umunyeshuri baba bagize bate? Baba baguhagaritse. (They set activities but don't provide answers. They tell you to use your own thinking or critical thinking. They say that it's up to you to provide answers. This limits us as learners. Interview 16 August 2012).

Without undermining the value of answers to activity questions as part of feedback, I suggest that this request is not necessarily limiting but may also be liberating: it offers teacher-learners an opportunity to express their own understanding through reflection; such an opportunity is important for teacher-learners (Norman & Spencer, 2005). However, it is a cause for a concern that they are not provided with any "standard" against which to measure this understanding or guidance as to the "scope and depth of preferred responses" (Lockwood, 1998).

As stated previously, some informants indicated that the activities encourage a surface approach to learning (Biggs, 1987), although they did not use these words. They expressed their responses in different ways: for Mugabo, the activities (in the section on writing pedagogy) are 'theoretical' while, for him, writing is practical; for Mutabazi, they do not develop critical thinking skills while for Mukamana and Rukundo, the activities in the modules are not effective because they just require the copying of sentences from the modules as answers to the questions without much thinking. For Ngarambe, the questions do not have anything to do with teaching and, therefore, are not important for someone training to be a teacher. These responses confirm the findings of the textual analysis reported in Chapter Five, indicating that the section on writing pedagogy in Module 7 mainly provides general information about writing, usually without linking it to teaching.

As discussed in Chapter Six, one finding of the textual analysis was that many activities in the KIE modules do not encourage critical thinking or deep learning. For some of the informants, this limitation in the materials was frustrating, which confirms Vygotsky's suggestion (in relation to ZPD) that instruction located at or below learners' current level of understanding are challenging enough to promote further development (Lui, 2012). For example, Mukamana said:

> Niba watanze definition ya writing, kongera kuyibaza hano at the end ukongera ukayikosora, ukongera ukandika bya bindi byanditse hano, mbona ari perte de temps kurusha ko wenda wagerageza gutanga urugero rw'ikibazo umuntu atahita abonera igisubizo muri module. (For me, if you have given a definition of writing, then at the end you ask learners to reproduce it and, for feedback to the question, you reproduce the same definition, it is a waste of time. You should set questions for which answers cannot be copied directly from the modules. Interview … August 2012).

These informants seem to understand that such an approach that encourages rote learning is likely to produce dull and uninspired learners (Simister, 2004, in Turuk, 2008). The informants appear to be interested in activities which encourage/challenge them to move beyond mere reading of the modules (surface approach to learning) and reflect more deeply in order to come up with various perspectives on the issues addressed in the modules (deep approach to learning) (Biggs, 1987). In fact, teaching should not just be about giving information to learners; it should be about challenging and helping them to analyse, construct and reconstruct the information progressively (Jordan & Pillay, 2009; Donald, Lazarus & Lolwana, 2010) and test and make judgments about the acquired knowledge being open to alternative ways of thinking (Wheelahan, 2010b).

Such thoughtful observations can also be identified in some informants' explanations of why they thought activities in the redesigned section were more effective. These activities are more practical while those in the module are more theoretical (Mugabo), they develop critical thinking (Mutabazi and Rukundo) and planning skills for writing (Mutabazi), and give a role to the reader (teacher-learners) in the

teaching/learning process (Ngarambe). In more elaborated terms, Rukundo observed that the redesigned section encourages the reader to reflect carefully and understand the content of the lesson before attempting the activity. For Ngarambe, "muri 'Becoming a teacher of writing', umwarimu afite uruhare ariko aratekereza no ku ngorane umunyeshuri agomba guhura na zo ashaka gutanga ibisubizo." (In 'Becoming a teacher of writing' [the redesigned section], the teacher [the designer] has a role [in the teaching/learning process], but he is also mindful about the learner's role and the difficulties he or she may face in finding answers to the questions –Interview, 16 August 2013). These remarks suggest that the informants understand that "the processes of learning are negotiated with people in what they do, through experiences in the social practices associated with particular activities" (Johnson, 2006, p. 237). In other words, they understand that they, as learners, need to have a central active role in their learning and teachers (in this instance materials designers) are responsible for encouraging this.

Other views expressed by informants about the activities are less insightful and not related to the nature of activities. However, they are also important observations. These are mainly from the teacher-learners perceived by their tutors to be 'weak students'. Some of these views include answers coming at the end of the block, "which may lead people to forget before they get there" (Mugabo), activities coming at the end of a section, which help to revise and remind the learner of what is important in the modules (Ndahayo), activities being too few (especially in the section on writing) with those that are there being set in a difficult language (Gashumba), activities being too difficult with some answers not related to the questions, lack of space to write answers (Karangwa), etc. These responses suggest that these teacher-learners need more support.

While the implications (for learning] of the issues expressed in the above paragraph have been discussed in Chapter Six, I would like to comment on two of these. The first is that Ndahayo thinks that activities remind the learner of the most important issues, which echoes Rowntree's (1990) recommendation that each important idea in teaching material should be made a subject of an activity. This suggests that if

teacher-learners want to know what is important in the section, they can look at the related activities, among other strategies. However, when the activities do not cover all the content as is the case with KIE DE modules for English (see Chapter Six), this strategy may result in teacher-learners overlooking some important issues.

The second issue is Karangwa's point that activities are too difficult and answers are not related to the questions. In his further elaboration on this, he said:

> the activities which we have here [in the module], it is to … it is like an exam in this module. It is like a very difficult exercise. But the activities from this section [the redesigned one] they are there to help a learner to understand the content[57]. (Interview, 8 August 2012).

This answer suggests that teacher-learners are not provided with enough assistance to tackle the activities which, normally, need to be mediated before they are attempted. This observation also confirms a finding of the textual analysis: activities in KIE DE modules are meant for assessment. The difference between using activities for assessment, which is the approach taken by the KIE DE materials designers (see Chapter Six), and using them for teaching/learning, together with the limitations of the former approach were discussed in Chapter Six.

It should be noted that some of the KIE DE teacher-learners' answers to interview questions also indicate that some teacher-learners believe that activities in DE materials are meant just for assessment. For instance, Mukamana and Gashumba pointed out that they read the entire redesigned section without answering the activity questions; they answered these later without re-reading the content in order to see how much they had learnt. These teacher-learners missed a very important point: activities in the redesigned section were designed to help readers to "go beyond memorization, bring their own experience and examples, use the ideas in the materials and apply them in their work or personal life" (Phillips, 2007, p. 6) for their own self-development and actualization (Lusunzi, 1999). Moreover, the presentation of content in this section builds on previous activities and related answers and feedback. Thus, by ignoring activities while reading the section, there are issues

[57] Quoted verbatim

which the teacher-learner could not grasp well. If the informants have not used activities to learn, it may have been due to the lack of guidance on how to use activities that should have been provided at the beginning of the section. The lack of such information is a weakness in both KIE DE materials and in the redesigned section.

7.3.2 Teacher-learners' views on feedback

The informants' views on 'feedback' in the KIE DE materials can be summarized as follows: it seems to be a question as well (Kalisa); it is a guide on how to proceed in answering the questions (Mugabo); answers do not come immediately after activities, which encourages teacher-learners to think; feedback does not encourage deep thinking (Mutabazi); it is used to attract our attention (Ndahayo); it is too short and sometimes not related to the activity (Gashumba); it looks like an activity and does not provide full answers and some questions are not answered (Karangwa); it does not allow the reader to have a clear understanding of the section to which the activity is related; it sometimes says that you need to consult with a colleague or a tutor, who may not always be available (Rukundo); it is difficult to understand and too short to be helpful and many people do not read it (Ngarambe). The table on the next page (Table 10) summarizes the teacher-learners observations about feedback in the KIE DE materials and in the redesigned section.

Respondent	KIE Modules	The redesigned section
Kalisa	Looks like a question also	- It is a summary of what has been discussed; it helps you understand better
Mugabo	It is a guide on how to proceed in answering the question	- It is an answer to the activity that has been given - It helps the reader to understand the content which comes before and that which comes next.
Mutabazi		- It comes immediately after the activity, which can lead to the reader checking answers without attempting the activity. If it is separate from the activity it can enhance critical thinking. - It is informative and encourages the reader to think critically and deeply about what they are reading.
Ndahayo	- The feedback looks like an activity; it seems to be a tautology - It does not provide complete answers and some questions do not have answers	-It is like a summary and helps you to understand better.
Gashumba	- Used to attract our attention - No summary - The feedback in the module and in the section is the same.	- It is a short summary that reminds the reader of important issues
Karangwa	Too short and sometimes not related to the activity question.	- Extensive and gives enough information - Explicit and clear
Mukamana	- The opposite of the redesigned section	- It engages the reader regarding what he or she has read previously. - It prompts the reader to think deeply about what he/she is about to read based on what he or she knows. - It contains answers and comes immediately after the activity, which may bring some readers to skip the activity.
Rukundo	- It does not allow the reader to have a clear understanding of the section to which the activity is related. - It sometimes says that you need to consult with a colleague or a tutor.	- It guides the reader well and helps him (sic) to understand the section he (sic) has just read and the section that follows.
Ngarambe	- It is difficult to make sense of	- It is easy to understand and helps to understand the content. - It provides me with the examples I can use in teaching writing and explains how to use them - It motivates the reader and explains him/her how he/she can motivate his/her learners as well.

Table 10: Comments on feedback in KIE DE modules for English and in the redesigned section

As can be seen in Table 10, the views expressed by the informants do not reveal any particular pattern and very few of these actually reflect what feedback is supposed to do: to help learners "monitor their learning and check on their performance as they progress through the teaching package" (Lockwood, 1998, p. 8). Given that 'feedback' in KIE DE modules does not consistently do the same thing (see Chapter Six), teacher-learners may have been confused about what feedback is meant for, especially because its role has not been explained to them at the beginning of their studies. This point can be illustrated by teacher-learners' views on feedback in the redesigned section as discussed below.

The views expressed by seven informants on feedback in the redesigned section seem to be in line with the purpose of feedback. Some of the informants are of the view that it stimulates their thinking. For instance, Mutabazi observes that it is informative and encourages the reader to think deeply and critically about what he or she is reading. Others indicated that it helps them monitor their progress and correct their errors. For example, Gashumba indicates that "n'iyo waba utagisubije mu buryo bukwiriye, feedback ihita ikorienta uburyo wagombaga gusubiza icyo kibazo cyawe bakubajije hano" (even when you have not got the answer right the feedback provides you with guidance on how you should have answered the question. Interview, 6 August 2012). Mukamana, Mugabo and Rukundo indicated that feedback in the redesigned section serves as a transition between sections. For them, the feedback in the redesigned section engages the reader regarding what he or she had read previously and prompts him or her to think deeply about what he or she is about to read, based on what he or she knows. This is sometimes true in the sense that throughout the redesigned section, the presentation of new content aims to build on previous content and teacher-learners' assumed answers to activities together with those suggested by the designer. This is what Murtagh and Baker (2009) call feed-forward.

For others, feedback in the redesigned section looks like a summary of what has been discussed, which helps the reader to understand better (Kalisa & Karangwa), reminds him or her of the most important issues (Ndahayo) and provides him or her

with guidance on how he or she should answer the question (Gashumba). It should be noted that feedback in the redesigned section mainly consists of possible answers to activities. If these teacher-learners indicated that feedback summarizes the content, it can be argued that the feedback helps them to check their progress by pointing them to the most important things to retain from the content. The difference between the informants' views on the feedback in the two sets of materials confirms the findings of the textual analysis (Chapter Six) indicating that feedback in KIE DE modules falls short of what is generally accepted as the main learning purposes of feedback.

7.3.3 Teacher-learners' views on layout

The informants' views on layout in KIE DE modules and in the redesigned section are presented in Table 11 on the next page.

Respondent	Layout in the KIE DE modules	The redesigned section
Kalisa	- It gives the impression that these are just notes for reading.	- It (implicitly) tells me that I need to write something in these blank spaces; I feel that I also have to contribute.
Mugabo	- Pages are too dense and are likely to get the reader bored.	- Pages are sparse and the reader does not get bored.
Mutabazi	- No free space, no encouragement to write in the module. - It is economic - There is space only in the margin and it is awkward to write in it.	- Many gaps: Encourage me to write something in these gaps - Expensive
Ndahayo	- When you open the pages you immediately get bored because of disorganization and too long paragraphs	- There are icons - Good paragraphs - You understand without even using a dictionary - Pages well presented.
Gashumba	- This one is big and contains more topics - Small letter sizes	- This one is small and needs to be increased - Big letter sizes
Karangwa	- Pages are so dense that they are tiring to read. - Activities do not leave space for us to write answers; so we are compelled to write in the margin which creates a disorder that can lead to confusion.	- There are icons - Letter size and font show important issues which need particular attention. - The diagrams facilitate understanding - the section was carefully thought about and it is helpful to everybody - Enough blank space helps to write extensively.
Mukamana	- Small characters and difficult to read; you fell demotivated at first sight. - Pages are dense and paragraphs are too long - Need to summarize and leave space to make readers interested and not bored.	- Opposite of the module.
Rukundo	- Pages are too dense and no enough space - No space for the reader to make notes because they have used both the front and the back of the papers. - There aren't enough margins that would allow the reader to make notes.	- Used front of pages only; so the reader can use the back to make notes.
Ngarambe		- There are icons which stop the reader who may be in hurry and encourage him/her to think. - The layout makes it easy to read and understand the content of this section. I read it in a very short time.

Table 11: Comments on layout in KIE DE modules for English and in the redesigned section

As indicated in Table 11 above, teacher-learners' views generally suggest that layout in the KIE DE modules for English poses a challenge for them mainly because there is hardly any free white space. Some informants indicated that due to the density of the materials, these look no different from any other reference book (Mukamana, Ndahayo and Kalisa) and are boring and tiring to read (Mugabo, Gashumba and

Karangwa). Emphasizing the inappropriate layout, Karangwa indicated that "when you open this module you get tired immediately" (Interview, 8 August 2013). Some of the factors that were said to contribute to this include the use of extremely long paragraphs, small font and lack of icons to signal important issues. There is no doubt that such a design affects the learning process. Indeed, learning through materials which are difficult to read and, eventually, not interesting, is a challenge for DE teacher-learners who, as has been explained, have many other commitments and relatively little time for their studies. They need materials written in a way that helps them to make effective use of their time (Mishra, 2005). In relation to this, Mukamana said:

> "ubundi igitabo cyose cyanditse, iyo cyanditse mu nyuguti ntoya zegeranye kiravuna kugisoma. Ntabwo ki … déjà ubwabyo interest ihita igenda mu kucyitegereza. Ibi bitabo rero na byo ni muri ubwo buryo byanditsemo... Ubona ari ibintu bicucitse cyane, birebire … (normally, any book that is written in small size characters is difficult to read. It doesn't … you immediately get uninterested at the first sight. KIE DTP modules are written in this way... The pages in the modules are very dense, paragraphs are extremely long, … - Interview, 16 August 2012)

Commenting on the lack of white space, Gashumba notes:

> "Nanone kandi kubera ko umwanya aba ari mutoya kenshi na kenshi nta na wo, kwandika kariya ka icon kagaragaza ngo andika biba bigaragara ngo ntaho uri bwandike. Ubwo ukajumpinga ukagenda. (Moreover, since the space is usually not enough or totally absent, we don't find the importance of including the icon that tells you to write in the modules. In such cases, we just skip the activities and immediately move on – Interview, 6 August 2012).

Such layout may reduce the opportunities for teacher-learners' to reflect on and actively engage with the content in KIE DE materials. It makes the materials difficult to read and reduces the opportunities for teacher-learners to engage actively in learning (make comments, observations, pose questions, etc.), which is an important strategy for promoting effective learning (Lusunzi, 1999). The teacher-learners' aforementioned desire to write in the materials indicated that they understand their

need to interact with them (Rowntree, 1992; KIE, 2009), which may be why they were disappointed by the lack of or insufficient white space in KIE DE modules.

With reference to the redesigned section, the informants were satisfied with its layout because, according to them, it contains more white space, uses short paragraphs, well-spaced pages, diagrams and icons. For them, all these features facilitate reading and learning from the section's content. For instance, Kalisa and Mutabazi stated that the blank space in the section tells them that they have to write something, commenting on what they are learning. This well-spaced layout, according to Ngarambe, makes the redesigned section easy to read.

Visuals such as icons and diagrams in the redesigned section were also commented on positively. For example, all the informants pointed out that each icon drew their attention and encouraged them to stop and do the activity. The following are some of their views:

Ngarambe: When you see this icon you say to yourself: 'I am required to do something here; so I must be careful' … they [icons] stop the reader who may be in hurry and encourage him or her to think before moving forward (Interview, 16 August 2012).

Mugabo: this is helpful because any person who is teaching himself if he finds this icon he can think that this one is very important and he can stop before going on[58] (Interview, 8 August 2012).

Gashumba: When you see that man in that position [stop and think icon], you immediately understand that you also must take time to think … you cannot just pass without doing something. Diagrams are also important because they illustrate things better (Interview, 6 August 2012).

Rukundo: This "stop and think" icon helps me to reflect more deeply in order to understand what I have just read. Thereafter, it guides me in the reading and understanding process of the content of the following page (Interview, 13 August 2012).

[58] Quoted verbatim; not edited.

With reference to other visuals, Mutabazi expressed the usefulness of illustrative diagrams as follows:

> For example, those line drawings, those circles [diagrams] will help. But in the module that give only notes without clearing how can I help the teacher who is going there … down there at the ground … how will he or she use the module?[59] (Interview, 13 August, 2013).

From these views, it can be deduced that teacher-learners believe that visual elements play an important pedagogic role in their learning. Their views suggest that the two icons included in the redesigned section increased their likelihood of attempting activities and of their reflection on the learning matter while the diagrams made things clearer. The limited use of visuals in KIE DE modules may be an obstacle to effective learning and may have contributed to the aforementioned boredom with these materials, because, among other functions, visuals can be used to keep the reader interested (Phillips, 2007).

7.3.4 Teacher-learners' views on language use

DE specialists (e.g. Howard and McGrath, 1995; Kumar, 2000) recommend the use of simple and sometimes informal language for DE materials so that they are easy to read and work with (Essel, Owusu-Boateng & Saah, 2008). The informants were asked to comment on language use in the KIE DE materials and in the redesigned section (question 11). Their comments are summarized in Table 12 on the next page.

[59] Quoted verbatim

Respondent	Language use in the KIE DE modules	Language use in the redesigned section
Kalisa	- The language is difficult; I cannot read one page without using a dictionary due to difficult words and expressions.	- The language is simple and easy to understand and is appropriate to our level; I read the section in one day thanks to simple language used here.
Mugabo	- The language is not easy to understand; they use difficult and unfamiliar terms. We cannot understand it on our own; we need some assistance.	- The opposite of KIE DE modules
Mutabazi	- The language in the two sections is the same. I read both of them and they were understandable; no difference.	
Ndahayo	- At my level, I don't need to consult a dictionary for any word in the module. - The language is the same: simple and easy to understand.	
Gashumba	- The language is difficult; when you don't have a dictionary you are in trouble.	- The language is easy, simple. I read it when I was lying on a bed and I found it easy to answer the activity questions. When I left the bed I sat down and answered all the questions. I never used a dictionary.
Karangwa	- The language is complicated; you cannot understand easily without using a dictionary.	- The language is beautiful and clear, the words used are good. It is not difficult to understand.
Mukamana	- With regard to the use of language in the modules, we have wondered whether the writers actually sat and wrote the modules or copied things from somewhere else and pasted them in the modules. And I think I share the same question with many other KIE DTP students.	- But the language in this section shows that it is a composition written by someone; someone who knows Rwanda, who knows the current situation in Rwanda, who knows the people he is writing for.
Rukundo	- A complicated language that cannot be easily understood by anyone who is not used to English.	- A language that helps anyone who wants to understand the content.
Ngarambe	- The module uses difficult terms that require us to use dictionaries.	- The opposite of the module.

Table 12: Comments on the language use in KIE DE modules for English and in the redesigned section

Most informants (9 out of 11) agree on the fact that the language used in KIE DE materials is too complicated for them to access the content easily, as opposed to the simpler language used in the redesigned section. Only two informants (Mutabazi and Ndahayo) argue that the language in the two sets of materials is the same and equally easy to understand. Interestingly, these are two of the 'weak' students.

In their follow up comments, those who indicated that the language in KIE DE modules is difficult remarked: I cannot read one page without using a dictionary due to difficult words and expressions (Kalisa); they use difficult and unfamiliar terms and we cannot understand them on our own; we need some assistance (Mugabo); the language is difficult; when you don't have a dictionary you are in trouble (Gashumba); there are terms which you cannot find in dictionaries (Karangwa); the language cannot be easily understood by someone who is not used to English (Rukundo). These views generally suggest that the language used in KIE DE materials makes the content difficult to access. Elaborating further on this issue, Mukamana said: "urasoma, ugasoma ukazisinziriramo pe. Ariko at the end uwakubaza ati umaze gusoma iki, ukaba utabona icyo uvuga." (You read them [modules] until you fall asleep. But at the end, if someone had to ask you what you have got from the reading you don't find anything to say" (Interview, 16 August 2012). It appears that for these teacher-learners the materials are not user-friendly and do not enable them to read and understand the content on their own, which is what self-study materials should do (Essel, Owusu-Boateng & Saah, 2008). This corroborates the findings of the textual analysis of the KIE DE materials, indicating that the language of these materials is both very formal and includes many technical terms that are not glossed and, therefore, does not facilitate readers' access to content.

If these responses (many of them unexplained) are to be taken literally, one would assume that teacher-learners think that any text that requires the use of a dictionary is necessarily written in difficult language. However, the following comment by Ngarambe indicates a nuanced understanding of this point:

> Yego ntabwo wamenya byose byo birumvikana. Aho ho umuntu yaba ashatse nko kwirarira. Ariko hari igihe usoma, ukumva bakuzaniye amagambo yo mu Bugereki, amagambo yo mu … bagafata extrait runaka … cyangwa bajya kukubwira ngo andika ibintu runaka, ukabona bakoresheje nk'amagambo mbese asaba byanga byakunda kujya gukonsulta cyangwa se asaba ubumenyi buhanitse cyane. Ari na yo mpamvu nababwiye ko abategura iyi module baba bazi ko ibyo badutegurira tuba tubizi. (It is true that you cannot understand each and every word; saying so would be boastful. But sometimes you read and find that they have used words from Greek, from ... or

> they take an extract from somewhere or … they tell you to write something while using the terms that will necessarily require you to consult a dictionary or which require a higher level of knowledge – Interview, 16 August 2012).

The informants' views on the use of language in the redesigned section, however, reveal the reverse as illustrated by the following few statements:

Kalisa: The language is simple and easy to understand and is appropriate to our level; I read the section in one day thanks to a simple language used here (Interview, 6 August 2012).

Gashumba: The language is easy and simple. I read it when I was lying on a bed and I found it easy to answer the activity questions. When I left the bed I sat down and answered all the questions. I never used a dictionary (Interview, 6 August 2012).

Ngarambe: You can see that the language in this section 'Becoming a teacher of writing' facilitates the understanding of the content. How long do you think it took me to read this section? I received this section yesterday evening, I think. Those who gave it to me briefed me about how we were supposed to use it. We are very busy as you can see, but thanks to the way this section is written, I read it and understood what it is about. How can you read a document like this and fail to understand its content? It is really well prepared (Interview, 16 August 2012).

These comments suggest that the use of language in the section accommodates DE learners' different learning styles (Holmberg, 1995). For instance, they could read it at their own convenience (lying on a bed, for example). This is not easy to do if one has to consult a dictionary frequently; it is not only time consuming but also laborious and breaks the reading flow and may, eventually, hamper understanding.

7.3.5 Teacher-learners' views on content that addresses writing pedagogy and on the mediation of this content in the KIE DE materials and in the redesigned section

I asked the informants to comment on the content (question 5) and on the indication of how to teach (question 10) in both the section on teaching writing in Module 7 and the redesigned section. Their answers are summarized in Tables 13 and 14 on the next two pages:

Respondent	The section in Module 7	The redesigned section
Kalisa	- No methodological steps on teaching writing - Talks about writing in general: types of writing, creative writing, functional writing, and academic writing. - Gives general information about writing	- Clear methodological steps on teaching writing - Strategies or techniques which you can follow to teach writing and the stages you can go through in order that students understand how to write. - Clear and practical examples - Answers to activities are clear
Mugabo	- An activity after each topic and answers provided at the end of the block; there is a possibility to forget because the block covers many things. - No methodology about how to teach writing - No illustrations - More theoretical than practical - No indication of the steps of a writing process - No indication on how the different parts of an essay are written.	- Answers provided immediately after the activity; - There are icons for activities and stop and think; they encourage the reader to think; - Clear methodology and strategies on how to teach writing. - Clear illustrations (e.g. an example of an essay illustrating the process of writing it) - Is practical - Indicates how the different parts of an essay are written.
Mutabazi	- Answers are far from the activity - No big difference	- Feedback comes immediately after the activity; one can be tempted to check the answer immediately without attempting the activity - Richer in terms of the amount of information (step by step indication of how to teach writing).
Ndahayo	- Less activities - there is some tautology	- Answers immediately after the activities help us to understand. - More practical
Gashumba	- The section in the module is a summary - The content is the same	- There are many details and good examples of how to teach writing
Karangwa	- Provides a summary; no details; just talks about the nature of writing; - Less (insufficient) activities - Activity questions not necessarily related to the content.	- Richer: provides more details. - activities enable the reader to understand what he or she wants to do; - Provides answers immediately after the activities - Activity questions are always related to the content covered.
Mukamana	- - Purely theoretical, no example to illustrate what is in the module. - Boring to read and difficult to understand.	- Practical with clear examples that can inspire the teacher. - The language is simple and economical (summarized). - Interesting and understandable.
Rukundo	- No steps to follow in teaching how to write.	-Clear steps that a teacher can follow in teaching writing.
Ngarambe	- Designed for someone who already knows the content (It is like telling someone who knows how to plough to do so) - Only explained the types of texts without explaining how these are written - A lot is missing: shows types of writing but does not show the parts/characteristics of each type.	- Prepares the reader to be a teacher in such a way that even a learner who will be taught by this teacher will say: 'I have learned something'. - Shows how to write introduction, body or conclusion. Any instruction about essay writing which lacks these things [parts of a text] is not effective.

Table 13: Differences between the writing pedagogy section in Module 7 and the redesigned section in terms of content

Respondent	The section in module 7	The redesigned section
Kalisa	- Even if I put everything in this module in my head, I will not be able to teach writing	- I can go to the class with this section and teach writing effectively. - There are techniques, methodology and sample questions that I can ask learners to help them understand how to write.
Mugabo		
Mutabazi	- It does not explain how teachers can proceed to teach writing.	- Detailed examples - Illustrative diagrams help the teacher to understand - An example of a model lesson plan that can be used for any type of text; it can be used by the teacher on the ground.
Ndahayo	- No example of how to write any type of text was given.	- It contains more information and provides examples of topics that can be appropriate to O'Level learners. - It provides terms that are frequently used in the teaching of writing. - It can help the reader to teach any type of text.
Gashumba	- The opposite of the redesigned section.	- It has clear and relevant examples of paragraphs, logical connectors, etc. So it is more helpful for a teacher.
Karangwa	- The opposite of the redesigned section.	- It shows us how to help learners to understand the topic. The module did not address this.
Mukamana	- Reading these modules will not have a considerable change on our teaching habits especially because no practical examples were provided.	- It equips us with the skills we need to teach writing.
Rukundo	- It is too short (4 pages) - No indication of the steps to go through in teaching writing	- It is practical in showing how to teach writing - It is long enough (20 pages) - The steps to follow are explicitly explained.
Ngarambe	- The opposite of the new section	- It provides me with the examples I can use in teaching writing and explains how to use them - It motivates the reader and explains to him/her how he/she can motivate his/her learners as well.

Table 14: Differences between the writing pedagogy section in Module 7 and the redesigned section in showing how to teach writing

Generally, the informants expressed dissatisfaction with the section in Module 7 and satisfaction with the redesigned section as far as the development of their skills to teach writing is concerned. Only two informants (Mutabazi and Ndahayo) consider that the content in the two sections is the same. When asked to express their

preference for one or the other section (question 6), however, both of them preferred the redesigned section for reasons that included that the section in the module does not explain how teachers can proceed to teach writing (Mutabazi, Interview, 13 August, 2013). I will return to some of their views when discussing informants' views on the redesigned section.

The views of those who felt dissatisfied with the content of the section in Module 7 can be divided into two categories: (i) insufficient (and somehow less useful) information on how to write and (ii) lack of methodological guidance for teaching writing. These views suggest that teacher-learners understand their two fold need regarding writing pedagogy: to be both skilful writers who can model writing for their learners' writing and effective teachers of writing. Indeed, it has been argued that teachers need to be good writers so as to teach writing effectively (Reid, 2009; Hlas & Hildebrandt, 2010; Andrews & Smit, 2011) because teachers who do not understand what good writing is or looks like are often ill-equipped to teach it (Tulley, 2013). The informants' views concur with the findings of the textual analysis in Chapter Five: content modules have done little to address teacher-learners' needs regarding their own writing and writing pedagogy-related knowledge and skills.

With reference to the first category, some informants (Mugabo, Rukundo and Mukamana) indicated that the section in Module 7 is purely 'theoretical'; it does not use practical examples to illustrate the steps in a writing process, does not indicate how the different parts of an essay are written and what each part should contain. For others, it provides general information about writing (such as types of texts, etc.) without explaining how writing is done (Kalisa and Ngarambe); it contains very few activities (Gashumba and Karangwa) and activity questions are not necessarily related to the content (Gashumba). Particularly, Ngarambe criticized the lack of indication of 'the how' (see Bernstein, 1996 in Chapter Two) of writing as follows:

> Kuko hariya ... umuntu ari kwigisha umuntu usa n'aho muri we abizi. Nk'uko ushobora kumbwira uti umpingire uyu murima uzi ukuntu ndawuhinga. Ariko ukiyibagiza ko wenda ntazi guhinga. (The section in that module ... seems to be aimed at teaching someone who already knows what they are studying. It's like you telling me to plough your garden, assuming that I am able to do it but forgetting that I may not know how to – Interview, 16 August 2012).

It is evident from the above comments that the informants understand the significance of examples as an important learning tool in DE materials (C.O.L, 2005). These informants' comments also constitute further evidence of the module designers' apparent failure to identify teacher-learners' ZPD, resulting in inappropriate mediation (see Vygotsky in Chapter Two). It should be noted, as explained by Lui (2012) (Chapter Two, page 43 of this thesis), that the ZPD has a limit as there is what a learner cannot do even with assistance and, therefore, "instruction that is beyond what a student can comprehend is ineffective for stimulating learning" (p. 3). One possible reason for this failure to identify the limits of teacher-learners' ZPD and to mediate content accordingly, is that the module designers did not visit teachers in their schools to identify their needs before designing the materials. It should be noted, however, that recognizing the abovementioned limits of the ZPD and being strategic in designing teaching/learning activities accordingly continues to challenge teacher educators in face-to-face contexts (Johnson & Golombek, 2011) and may be even more of a challenge for DE programmes.

Concerning the second category (lack of methodological guidance), the informants expressed disappointment regarding their expectations from the section. All of them indicated that they do not have the necessary knowledge and skills in writing pedagogy, which they expected KIE DE modules to equip them with. Some of them expressed their disappointment as follows:

Kalisa: Even if I put all the notes [in the Module 7 section] in my head I cannot go in the classroom and teach writing … As a teacher-learner, I go to school to study how to teach other people [how to write]. And when I arrive there, the module shows me the type of writing is this, but how to teach writing in the classroom there isn't. That is a very big problem[60]." (Interview, 6 August 2012).

Karangwa: in this module there is nothing you can consider that can help you in teaching writing because here they are telling us in introduction in few words what writing is, only that, and types of writing and objectives only. But they are not telling us how can you start when you want to write an essay, what can you do?[61] (Interview, 8 August 2012)

Mukamana: Ariko ahangaha nta rugero nigeze mbona, nta kantu na kamwe wenda kafasha umuntu kuba yagenderaho. Bivuga ngo n'ubundi urangije izi modules kuvuga ngo hari ibintu birahindura mu buzima bwawe busanzwe bwo kwigisha ni ukwibeshya. (But here I haven't seen any example that can inspire a teacher [in teaching writing]. It implies that expecting changes in our teaching habits as a result of reading these modules is an illusion – Interview, 16 August 2012).

The fact that the informants made these remarks at the end of the programme suggests that KIE may have failed to fully prepare its DE teacher-learners for their role in English language classrooms mainly because the module focused on content in general and general pedagogic content knowledge. These informants' views corroborate one finding of the textual analysis of Module 7: the module fails to indicate to teacher-learners how to teach the different areas of language effectively. Given that changes in the professional knowledge, skills and attitudes, beliefs or actions for teachers are the essence of teachers' professional development (Fraser et al., 2007, in Bertram, 2011), this finding is a cause for concern.

On the other hand, a range of contrasting views was expressed by all the informants about the redesigned section. These informants seem to view it as a better alternative to the section in Module 7 because, for them, it addresses the

[60] Quoted verbatim
[61] Quoted verbatim

weaknesses of the latter. All the informants indicated that the section generally taught them the writing process leading to a well written argumentative text (product) and indicated (through examples) how to teach writing. For them, the section is practical and shows how different parts of an essay are written, how they are linked together and what each part is supposed to contain and it indicates how to teach writing step by step (Mugabo, Ngarambe and Mutabazi); it provides an example of how language features contribute to the meaning of a text (Ngarambe); all its content is relevant; it is briefly and concisely written and in easy and simple language (Karangwa and Mukamana); the section uses clear and practical examples to illustrate the methodological steps, techniques and stages of teaching writing (Kalisa, Rukundo and Mugabo). Ngarambe went even further to argue that the quality of teaching by a teacher who draws from this section will be totally different from that of the one who draws from Module 7. He contends that if the two teachers were to be evaluated, the one who has used Module 7 would definitely fail. This may be the reason why all the informants pointed out that they prefer the redesigned section to the section in Module 7. Three of them explaining this choice as follows:

Mutabazi: It gives enough information. For example, this lesson plan [about writing teaching] is very helpful; it clears out confusions by providing a step by step procedure of conducting a writing lesson ... it also gives detailed examples, uses diagrams and a model of a lesson plan to illustrate the process of teaching writing (Interview, 13 August 2012).

Gashumba: I was really surprised when I saw this section. I thought that if we had seen this section before, we would have been devoting more time to teaching writing … If we were not in school holidays, I would immediately prepare a lesson on writing because I realized that … in fact, I would like to ask you for a copy of this section so that we can use it because we have found the modules not helpful with regard to teaching writing … If it were possible, this section should be incorporated in the modules for future KIE DE intakes (Interview, 6 August 2012).

Ndahayo: The redesigned section gives clear and relevant examples of paragraph development and logical connectors (Interview, 16 August 2012).

In a follow up comment on this, Ndahayo said: "as a teacher, if I get this document, and I go and enter the class with this document, it is enough. I can teach with this document[62]." (Interview, 16 August 2012). These informants' views suggest that the redesigned section addresses the limitations of the section in Module 7.

While the informants pointed out that they needed both content knowledge and PCK (applied to writing), the above responses suggest that what they needed most is PCK or "how the teacher transforms or recontextualises the content knowledge so that it can be understood by the particular learners in her [*sic*] classroom" (Bertram, 2011, p. 6). This is the case not only for writing but also for other language areas. As has been pointed out in Chapter Five, KIE DE modules have not addressed this type of knowledge adequately. Thus, it may be part of what informants will strive to acquire after completing their studies with KIE so as to become better teachers, as was indicated by Karangwa.

It should be noted that the teacher-learners did not only benefit from the pedagogy *in* the redesigned section; they also benefited from the pedagogy *of* it (Reed, 2010). For instance, Mukamana explained that the in-text-question about the importance of writing reminded her that it is good to explain to learners the importance of what we teach them in order for them to be motivated for and to invest much in learning, something she had never done in her 14 year long teaching career.

Given the satisfaction expressed by the informants regarding the redesigned section, I asked them to tell me what they had generally learnt from it. All of them acknowledged that they learnt new things that they could not find in KIE DE modules. For example, Kalisa said that he came to a point where he can teach writing correctly. Among other things, he learnt that writing (in all its stages) can/should not be taught in one period (which is different from what he used to do) and that learners need to have a say in choosing topics to write about. Mutabazi said that he used to focus on grammar in his class at the expense of writing mainly

[62] Quoted verbatim

because of his poor writing pedagogy. But after reading the section, he realized that teaching writing is not as difficult as he imagined. Gashumba learnt how to choose a topic (both for his learners and for himself) and how to proceed in order to understand and/or help in understanding it and how to design a lesson plan for a writing lesson. Ndahayo learnt that good writing needs to be planned and written in stages; he said he was impressed by the five writing stages presented in the section (pre-writing, drafting, revising, proofreading and publishing). It seems that the concept of writing stages was unknown to Ndahayo (and possibly to the others). This may be why he criticized the approach taken by the redesigned section for encouraging teachers and learners to overlook grammar mistakes (during the drafting stage). Such a remark suggests that the informant thinks that the text produced at this stage is the one that will be submitted for assessment and, therefore, there is no other opportunity to attend to language issues.

Karangwa and Mukamana said that they learnt that learners' written texts should not end in dustbins as they used to think. Mukamana further commented on this as follows:

> Ako ka publication déjà ubwo nanjye kahise ka … mbese hari n'ubwo njya ntanga composition sintange feedback ku banyeshuri numva bimbabaje cyane binandiye ahantu ndavuga nti rimwe na rimwe no kuba abanyeshuri bataba interested mu byo twigisha tuba twabigizemo uruhare. (This issue of publication has already … (she sighs) In fact, I used to ask learners to write but did not give them feedback. This has made me feel guilty. I have actually realized that we teachers are sometimes responsible for learners' lack of interest in our lessons. Interview, 16 August 2012)

As these informants indicated, the redesigned section has taught them different ways of making these texts available to a wider readership, which is likely to improve their learners' motivation for writing. In fact, research shows that learners write better when their writing has an authentic and wider audience, a variety of functions, and can make a difference in the world, instead of just serving assessment requirements in school (Andrews and Smit, 2011).

7.4 Teacher-learners' general comments on the KIE DE programme

The informants commented not only on KIE DE modules for English but also on the KIE DE programme in general, with some of them pointing out how the programme had benefited them (question 15) and the changes they would like to see in it (question 16). Generally, pedagogic knowledge (which is addressed in a general way in several Education Studies modules) seems to be the type of knowledge that KIE DE teacher-learners value the most from the KIE DE programme. This is not surprising because many of KIE DE teacher-learners did not study pedagogy in their previous studies (KIE, 2009) while they had some content knowledge of the subjects they teach. Thus, they may have found this 'new' field of knowledge interesting and relevant to their long-standing needs.

Mugabo and Rukundo said that before joining KIE DE they used to teach without following any pattern; now they have learnt how to teach according to 'pedagogic principles'. From the knowledge they got from psychology, Mutabazi, Karangwa and Mukamana can now understand their learners, manage their different behaviours and accommodate their needs in their classes. With reference to the actual teaching/learning process, Karangwa and Ngarambe have learned to give a central role to their learners, as opposed to what they used to do: to talk alone for almost the whole lesson. About this, Ngarambe made an important remark:

> Mbese ni ukuvuga ngo kwigisha ni nkanjye wabaga ndi kwisobanurira. Nta ruhare na rumwe umunyeshuri yabigiragamo. Naravugaga akikiriza, navuga akikiriza; rimwe na rimwe erega umuntu yakubaza ibibazo byinshi ukarakara. (In fact, I used to teach as if I were explaining things to myself. Learners did not have any role in my class; all they had to do was to agree with whatever I said and I sometimes would get angry when they asked me too many questions – Interview, 16 August 2012).

It is interesting to note that all informants referred to what is described by Shulman's (1987) as general pedagogic knowledge with none of them mentioning what he describes as PCK (Shulman, 1987) applied to ELT. This finding concurs with the

answers that they provided for other questions suggesting that, generally, they did not benefit greatly from Module 7 addressing language pedagogy, and corroborates the findings of the textual analysis of this module (See Chapter Five). Their responses are not surprising because the KIE DE programme seems to emphasize content knowledge and (general) pedagogic knowledge over subject specific PCK. In fact, while language pedagogy (PCK) is 'addressed' only in one module (Module7), all the six preceding modules produced by the Faculty of Education are devoted to aspects of general pedagogical knowledge. This type of education that combines general pedagogical knowledge with a focus on content knowledge is insufficient for preparing content (including L2) teachers (Shulman, 1986; Hlas & Hildebrandt, 2010).

Another thing that some of the informants (Kalisa, Mutabazi, Ndahayo) claimed to have got from the programme is proficiency in English. They indicated that the programme provided them with the opportunity to speak English during the biannual face-to-face sessions and the monthly weekend tutorials. However, this proficiency seems relative because, as can be seen in some of informants' answers quoted verbatim (see pages 198, 273, 276, 294, 303 and 311 for example), they still face difficulties in speaking English. Another piece of evidence is the fact that four of the nine informants chose not to be interviewed in English indicating that they were not comfortable with it. The opportunities to speak English during face-to-face sessions themselves seem limited as has been discussed (section 5.2.1.4).

Finally, I asked the informants to comment on the KIE DE programme in general and to suggest any changes that they wish to see in it (question 16). Most of the issues pointed out by the informants point to some limitations of KIE DE materials identified in the textual analysis. All the informants, except Ndahayo, focused on the way KIE DE modules are designed. Mugabo and Ngarambe suggested that the volume of the modules should be reduced because some of them contain unnecessary information. Mukamana and Karangwa recommended that the language used in the modules be simplified to make them more accessible. For Rukundo and Gashumba, KIE DE modules should be written in the same way as the redesigned section. Ndahayo pointed to organizational problems in the KIE DE

programme such as late delivery of the modules, communication, assessment and examination problems, etc. There is no doubt that these organizational problems and their effects on learning are real, as reported in some Rwandan media (e.g. Mbonyinshuti, 2012). However, they are not the focus of this study.

Before concluding this chapter, I would like to highlight a number of factors that might have impacted negatively on the amount and the quality of information that was provided by the informants about both KIE DE materials and to the redesigned section. Such factors include lack of self-confidence in commenting on the materials written by experts and the concept of the 'learning paradox' (Glasersfeld, 2001).

Given that the KIE DE materials designers are expected to be experts in their respective areas, some teacher-learners seem to consider them as infallible. For example, Ngarambe pointed out that he cannot underestimate something that has been written by an expert (referring to KIE DE modules and designers). Such an attitude may have reduced teacher-learners' critical responses and may have made them become passive receivers of the materials, which may reduce their control over the "*what"* (the learning content) and the "*how*" (the learning process) (See Bernstein, 1996 in Chapter Two) and, consequently, make the programme appear strongly framed (Bernstein, 1996). Furthermore, the attitude evidences the amount of trust put in KIE DE materials designers and the weight of responsibilities that rest with them in terms of providing relevant content using effective mediation strategies.

The learning paradox has been defined as "the paradox of how one might know something one does not yet know" (Glasersfeld, 2001, p. 141). It is based on the premise that "you cannot learn something unless you already know it, but the process of learning suggests you don't previously 'know' what you are trying to learn" (Moody, n.d.). In other words, it is difficult for learners to know what they are supposed to gain from a course of study before they start studying. This paradox is implied in some informants' remarks on what content they thought should be part of their programme's curriculum. For instance, when asked whether there are issues

that he expected to find in KIE DE modules that he did not actually find, Mugabo replied:

> But unfortunately, when we started this programme we normally didn't know what we were supposed to see. What they do, they send us the modules and we try to tackle them. We don't know if this is supposed to be seen in this module or not. What we do is to exploit [read extensively] the modules; we don't know what is supposed to be in it or not[63] (Interview, 8 August, 2012).

These remarks are not surprising as teacher-learners did not have an overview of the whole programme when they started. Mugabo further stated that KIE DE modules covered all the content that they (teacher-learners) needed and were "useful because they contained different things" (Interview, 8 August 2012). The learning paradox may have been the reason for this vague statement. In fact, since he did not know what was supposed to be included in the modules, there is no way he could know that all the necessary content had been included. The same may also apply to mediation elements of DE materials because (undergraduate) DE learners are generally more familiar with the textbooks of the traditional high-school education and less "with the 'specific' educational materials used in distance learning" (Pierrakeas, Xenos and Pintelas, 2003, p. 358). Thus, they may not necessarily know what high quality DE materials are supposed to look like and, therefore, may not be able to comment critically on these. The following short conversation with Kalisa illustrates this point:

> **The researcher**: What is your opinion of the activities in the redesigned section?
>
> **Kalisa**: The activities?
>
> **The researcher**: Yeah.
>
> **Kalisa**: The activities help me to understand about the topic… about the lesson … to understand very clearly the lesson. That is what I can say those activities are very helpful.
>
> **The researcher**: Can you explain to me how they help you to understand?
>
> **Kalisa**: Because those activities facilitate me to understand very correctly the lesson. Those activities are prepared to help me to understand the lesson. That is the way I say those activities are very helpful (Interview, 6 August, 2012).

[63] Quoted verbatim.

From these answers, it appears that Kalisa does not know what good/helpful learning activities look like. However, one can infer an answer to this from his remarks on the issues he considered to be less useful in the modules:

> For example when you take activities in the module and you write: 'the answer is, for example, open-ended question'. That is very difficult to ... for me as a student because those activities doesn't give the ... don't give the answer very clearly. For example, those activities are not ... if you try to compare those activities and the notes which are written in the module you can find the answer outside the module by using a personal research and so on[64] (Interview, 6 August 2012).

It seems that, for Kalisa, good (learning) activities may be the ones for which answers have been provided or, at least, can be immediately located in the learning materials, possibly, irrespective of the skills and/or knowledge which the activities should help learners to develop. This may be one of the reasons why he considers the activities in the redesigned section to be more helpful: answers are provided for each of them in the form of feedback.

After analysing the informants' answers, it is important to establish whether their academic performance in the KIE DE programme is pertinent to the nature of answers which they provided. Generally, there seems to be a difference between the answers provided by the two groups of the informants (low achievers and high achievers), which suggests a difference in the depth of their thinking. Taken as a group, low achievers (Kalisa, Mugabo, Mutabazi and Ndahayo) have generally provided less thoughtful answers than those provided by high achievers (Ngarambe, Karangwa, Mukamana, Gashumba and Rukundo). For instance, high achievers seem to have a general idea of the content needed by teachers of English in Rwandan contexts, which seems not to be the case for low achievers. The latter generally think that all parts of the KIE DE modules are equally important and that the bigger the modules are the more (important) information they contain and the more relevant they are.

[64] Quoted verbatim

Another example is that when they were asked to identify a difference between activities in the two sections, the low achievers (Kalisa, Mugabo, Mutabazi and Ndahyo) generally focused on form related aspects of activities (such as their placement and that of related answers) instead of focusing on their nature and function. Further evidence of less thoughtful answers by low achievers is Ndahayo's comments on the activities and feedback in the two sets of materials, indicating that there is no difference whatsoever between the two sections in relation to these mediation strategies. However, the redesigned section was designed to address weaknesses in the modules identified through textual analysis regarding these aspects and other informants (mostly high achievers) have identified major functional differences between the two sections. This may suggest that Ndahayo does not understand the role of activities and feedback in DE materials, which may limit the benefits which this informant could get from these.

Similarly, Mutabazi and Ndahayo (low achievers) indicated that the use of language in the two sections is not different, in spite of the very formal, academic and technical language used in KIE DE modules as has been discussed in Chapter Six. Moreover, in spite of a number of weaknesses in KIE DE modules for English regarding mediation (see Chapter Six), Ndahayo reported that he did not find anything wrong with the way the modules are designed. In similar vein, Mugabo initially indicated that all content in KIE DE materials was useful. However, when talking about his experience of using the modules, he said that the modules contain unimportant and unnecessary things. These 'poor' judgments and contradictory opinions are not found in the high achievers' views and, therefore, they can possibly be attributed to the informants' limited analytical skills.

Overall, an analysis of teacher-learners' responses to the two sets of materials indicates that KIE DE materials do not fully meet their needs in terms of both content knowledge and pedagogic content knowledge that they need as teachers of English, and in terms of how this content is mediated on the pages of these materials. This is detrimental to these teacher-learners playing their role in the pedagogic recontextualisation field (PRF) which involves translating English into a learnable and

more accessible discourse for their high school learners (See Bernstein, 1996 in Chapter Two).

Chapter Eight: Conclusions and Recommendations

8.1 Introduction
8.2 Key findings and conclusions
8.2.1 Findings from the analysis of content
8.2.1.1 Subject content
8.2.1.2 Pedagogic content
8.2.2 Findings from the analysis of mediation strategies
8.2.3 Findings from interviews with teacher-learners
8.3 Recommendations
8.3.1 Content selection
8.3.2 Content mediation
8.3.3 Support for materials designers
8.4 Limitations of the study
8.5 Avenues for further research
8.6 Conclusion

8.1 Introduction

This chapter brings together findings discussed in chapters 5, 6 and 7 of this thesis, draws conclusions and makes recommendations for improvements to the Kigali Institute of Education's (KIE) Distance Education (DE) programme in general, and to the KIE DE materials that are used for the professional development of high school teachers of English in particular. Finally, the limitations of the study are discussed and avenues for further research suggested.

8.2 Key findings and conclusions

Distance Education has been identified as one of the strategies to address the shortage of qualified high school teachers in Rwanda because professional development through distance education enables teachers to study while they continue to work in schools.

This research has (i) analysed the content selected for KIE DE materials for English, (ii) identified the extent to which this content is aligned to the Rwandan high school

O'Level English curriculum and examinations, (iii) analysed how this content is mediated on the page and (iv) redesigned a section of the materials and obtained responses from some of the teacher-learners enrolled in the KIE programme to both the KIE DE materials and the redesigned section.

8.2.1 Findings from the analysis of content

This section summarizes separately findings from the analysis of subject content (Modules 1 to 4) and pedagogic content (Module 7).

8.2.1.1 Subject content

The content of Modules 1 to 4 is divided into blocks which focus separately on grammar, linguistics, literature and communication skills. The content analysis indicated that, generally, the content included in KIE DE materials for English does not effectively address the academic and professional needs of the teacher-learners for whom the materials were designed.

Concerning grammar, it was identified that most of what is included in KIE DE modules is not what the teacher-learners need most. For example, while the O'Level national curriculum and examination focus on the use of aspects of grammar such as parts of speech, tenses, voice, conditionals, etc., only parts of speech are systematically addressed in KIE DE modules. However, these parts of speech themselves are addressed from a structural perspective while teachers of English need a more functional knowledge of grammar in context (Feng, 2013). Furthermore, the way grammar is addressed and the highly technical language used to present it make it very difficult for teacher-learners to understand the content and, subsequently, to draw on it to inform their teaching.

With reference to content on linguistics, the analysis has found that the content is extremely limited and the little that has been included is about general linguistics instead of the applied linguistics needed by language teachers in order to assist them

to teach additional language well (Johnson, 2006; Banegas, 2009). Content in the areas of first and second/additional language acquisition, sociolinguistics, sociolinguistics and language teaching, language development, English in the global context, varieties of English and English as a lingua franca, assessment in a language classroom and the development of English classroom resources is not addressed. Failure to include such content deprives the teacher-learners of linguistic knowledge that could both improve their own communicative competence (Hymes, 1972) and inform their teaching.

Literature is also part of the content included in KIE DE materials for English; it accounts for more than a quarter of the subject content in spite of it not being explicitly taught at the O'Level. In KIE DE modules, literature content is addressed in a way that does not engage teacher-learners with literary texts in order to improve their knowledge of language, language proficiency and communicative and cultural competence (Banegas, 2009; Smita & Mujumdar, 2010) or to encourage enjoyment of literature. The content focuses on theoretical knowledge of different literary genres such as their definitions, their characteristics, etc.

Teachers of language are supposed to be proficient users of the language they teach (Nel & Müller, 2010; Faez, 2011). Thus, language teacher education programmes need to help teacher-trainees to achieve proficiency by including content aimed at developing their reading, writing, listening and speaking proficiency. KIE DE materials for English were found lacking in this regard. For instance, they do not contain any content aimed at developing the reading knowledge and skills that language teachers need to develop (Reid, 2009; Andrews & Smit, 2011). Regarding writing, KIE DE materials for English have been found ineffective in helping teacher-learners to develop as writers. While they provide teacher-learners with limited theoretical knowledge about writing different kinds of texts, the materials do not involve them in writing tasks which would enable them to practice the writing of these texts themselves. It appears that the teacher-learners are getting limited procedural knowledge but not procedural knowledge informed by propositional knowledge (Ryle, 1945; Carr, 1995; Wagner, 2002; Eraut, 2002; Fant, 2012, Meadows, 2012;

Winch, 2013). These omissions are likely to be detrimental to teacher-learners' development as both writers and readers and may limit their ability to teach reading and writing, given that teachers who have limited experience of reading and writing are unlikely to teach these aspects of the curriculum effectively (Reid, 2009; Hlas & Hildebrandt, 2010; Andrews & Smit, 2011).

With reference to developing teacher-learners' listening and speaking knowledge and skills, the KIE DE programme offers only limited assistance to teacher-learners. It provides very few opportunities for them to practice oral language. For instance, in the 'Oral Communication and Effective Writing' blocks, the only opportunity provided for teacher-learners to practice listening is tape recorded conversations/descriptions. Moreover, even these tapes can only be used in study/learning centres during face-to-face sessions and teacher-learners' busy schedule during these sessions limits their use of these tapes. Additionally, the tapes are not interactive, which may further limit their effectiveness. As for speaking, apart from being encouraged to debate on certain issues as part of (self) assessment activities, the teacher-learners are not offered any other opportunities that are purposefully aimed at developing their speaking knowledge and skills. However, I acknowledge that effective development of oral proficiency is difficult to achieve in DE materials.

Another important finding is that English subject content is not coherently organized within and across KIE DE modules: some content is repeated in different blocks and modules and there is no cross-reference between these. This lack of coherence suggests that the content for the overall programme was not decided on before the preparation of individual modules commenced, possibly because of the time and other resource constraints under which the materials were designed and produced.

8.2.1.2 Pedagogic content

The analysis of mediation strategies, which focused on Modules 1 and 7, indicated that in addition to the limitations identified in subject English content, KIE DE

materials for English also appear to be inadequate for developing teacher-learners' PCK for teaching English - knowledge that is essential for language teachers (Shulman, 1987; Carr, 1995; Meadows, 2013). With the exception of the block on literature pedagogy (which has been found to be different from other blocks in several respects), the materials designers have listed useful ideas and approaches regarding the teaching of a second/additional or foreign language, but have consistently failed to indicate to teacher-learners how to implement these to teach the different aspects of language.

In addition, the module designers do not link the content to the contexts in which KIE DE teacher-learners work. In other words, they do not encourage teacher-learners to reflect on the sociocultural contexts of schooling (Freeman and Johnson, 1998). This lack of connection between the teacher education programmes and the teacher-learners' teaching contexts is a serious limitation because teaching contexts (or schools), Carr argues, are responsible for teachers' practical initiation into teaching (Carr, 1995). Moreover, teachers need to understand that "context is a powerful mediator that can shape or be shaped by how they [teachers] conceptualize teaching" (Childs, 2011, p. 85). One way to achieve this understanding, I suggest, is to provide teacher-learners with contextual knowledge (Muller, 2009) through context/classroom-based activities and experientially based approaches (Richards, 1991), which the KIE DE materials for English do not do.

Another important finding is that the KIE DE programme seems to focus more on propositional knowledge or knowledge-that at the expense of procedural knowledge – both theoretical and practical (Ryle, 1945; Carr, 1995; Fantl, 2012; Winch, 2013). For instance, out of eleven modules designed for the English programme (four and seven modules for subject English and Education Studies respectively), only one module addresses (to a limited extent) theoretical and practical procedural knowledge (Eraut, 2002; Fantl, 2012; Winch, 2013). This is the final module which teachers study only at the end of their three-year programme. Thus, subject content knowledge and 'general educational knowledge' constitute the bulk of the KIE DE programme's content, which suggests that 'the relay' receives less attention than

'the relayed' (Bernstein, 1996). Given that both propositional knowledge and procedural knowledge are equally important for teachers (Carr, 1995), this finding is a cause for concern regarding the effectiveness of the KIE DE programme in addressing teacher-learners' professional needs, especially in relation to pedagogy.

8.2.2 Findings from the analysis of mediation strategies

Using the work of various scholars (for example Rowntree, 1990 & 1992; Lockwood, 1997 & 1998; Reinders and Lewis, 2006) on the characteristics of good mediation in self-access teaching materials, the textual analysis offered in this thesis indicates that mediation in the KIE DE materials is not adequate. Reinders and Lewis (2006) suggest that good self-instructional materials should give clear instructions, be visually attractive, give a lot of practice, give feedback (show answers or let learners know how they are doing), make it easy to find what learners want, contain a lot of examples and tell learners how to learn best. However, as has been explained in Chapter Six, KIE DE materials for English have limitations regarding all of the above: they do not give sufficient and clear instructions on how to use them, how to approach different activities and how to use feedback, and do not provide summaries to help teacher-learners revise.

The layout of these materials was also found to be inappropriate for several reasons: the use of visual elements is very limited, most of their pages are very dense, and sometimes there is not enough or any space for activity answers or note making. These are some of the reasons why the materials were described as boring to read by some KIE DE teacher-learners who participated in this study. This finding confirms the observation of Donald, Lazarus and Lolwana (2010) that teachers (or DE materials designers) can often focus on the content too much and neglect the process of learning or, in other words, the mediation of content. This is in spite of Bernstein's argument that "the relayed (message/content) and the relay (the carrier of the message/content) are equally important and without the relay "no message is possible" (Bernstein, 1996, p. 39).

Feedback[65] in KIE DE materials has also been found to be limited in relation to helping the teacher-learners to monitor their progress in the course of their studies. In the materials, the 'feedback' that comes immediately after activity questions generally serves as a transition between sections, telling teacher-learners to move to the next section only after successfully answering activity questions. In spite of this apparent transitional role, however, the teaching of the subsequent section does not build on the activities in the preceding section. In other cases, feedback just makes a short comment on a related activity, indicating to teacher-learners how the questions should be approached, or it is not given at all. This kind of feedback is unlikely to help-teacher-learners 'know how they are doing' (Reinders and Lewis, 2006) and/or how they can do better if their progress is unsatisfactory. Nevertheless, there are some examples of effective feedback especially in the block on literature pedagogy which, again, testifies to the aforementioned distinctive nature of this block.

The answers to activities, which constitute a second category of feedback (Rowntree, 1990, 1992), were also found ineffective in helping teacher-learners to check on their progress. The module designers just mention answers to activity questions without indicating how they were arrived at or helping learners to see how close to or far they are from the 'right' answer. This may not help teacher-learners to monitor their progress because merely telling learners what the (right) answer to the question is does not necessarily guarantee their understanding of how to arrive at it. Given the key role of meditation in learning (Vygotsky, 1978) and the limited nature of mediation in KIE DE materials for English as outlined above, it can be argued that the teacher-learners may not have benefited optimally from KIE DE materials.

With reference to the approach taken to learning, it was found that KIE DE materials for English generally adopt a behaviourist approach (Chen, 2003), encourage a surface approach to learning (Biggs, 1987) and are, therefore, characteristic of a banking approach to education, encouraging rote learning (Freire, 2007). This goes

[65] In the KIE DE materials 'feedback' is separate from answers to activity questions (see section 6.2.4). In this thesis, however, the latter are taken to be part of feedback.

against the constructivist approach to learning which, however, is the approach officially encouraged by KIE (2009) and by many scholars as an approach that fosters learner autonomy and criticality (Gultig, 2001; Zarei, 2008; Kintsch, 2009, Donald, Lazarus & Lolwana, 2010). While KIE DE materials writers are requested to "challenge students to think more deeply, and to put concepts into context" (KIE, 2009, p. 11), activities in KIE DE materials for English predominantly consist of questions for which answers can be directly copied from the materials. This does not encourage teacher-learners to go beyond operating as text decoders (Freebody & Luke, 1990) or to adopt a deep approach to learning (Biggs, 1987). In addition, with the exception of some questions in the literature pedagogy block (Module 7), the questions in the KIE DE modules do not encourage teacher-learners to link what they learn to their teaching contexts. In other words, the design of the materials does not encourage active learning and limits teacher-learners' role in the learning process. Moreover, such activities as there are seem to have been designed for assessment rather than learning purposes, which may have negative implications for KIE DE teacher-learners' learning.

These findings suggest that the KIE DE programme for English adopts a performance model of pedagogy in which knowledge is strongly framed and classified (Bernstein, 1996). Such a model affords few opportunities for learners to give their own opinions on their learning and tends to limit their active role in the teaching/learning process. This is likely to hamper their achievement of the learner autonomy which is one end aim of the mediation and scaffolding process (Vygotsky, 1978), one foundation of Bernstein's (1996) three pedagogic rights and also the broader aim of all education endeavours (Neupane, 2010). This lack of attention to the development of such autonomy suggests that the KIE DE programme may not optimally meet the needs of the Rwandan high school English teachers. Indeed, effective teachers (that KIE is supposedly producing) are those who can try out their own ideas and personal versions of ideas gathered from colleagues, courses and books (Eraut, 2001). It can be argued that the KIE DE programme for English may not offer the teacher-learners epistemic access (Shay, 2013) or access to powerful knowledge (Young, 2010). On the contrary, it seems to provide teacher-learners with access to the knowledge of

the powerful which, as has been pointed out in Chapter Two (see Young, 2010), does not afford the learner an opportunity to challenge it, may undermine learner autonomy and, therefore, is likely to reproduce social inequality (Wheelahan, 2010b). Foregrounding the knowledge of the powerful is likely to impede the achievement of Bernstein's (1996) three pedagogic rights discussed in Chapter Two (see section 2.2).

8.2.3 Findings from interviews with teacher-learners

The analysis of teacher-learners' responses to the KIE DE modules and to the redesigned section of one of these modules indicated that they were generally critical of the former and generally positive about the latter for the reasons discussed in Chapter Seven. At least some of the responses to the two sets of materials suggest that these teachers understand what their needs are and have an idea of what the materials designed to meet these needs should look like. They also suggest that teachers who are working in a foreign/additional language context and who have little experience in writing in English respond positively to materials that offer explicit guidelines for their own writing development and for teaching writing to high school learners (Ralfe, 2009; Tulley, 2013) together with explanations for the guidelines suggested. The responses also suggest that such teachers need materials which show understanding of the context in which they work and the examinations that their learners are being prepared for.

8.3 Recommendations

In view of the findings of this research, a number of recommendations are offered with the aim of contributing to the design of quality DE materials in general and to the improvement of the KIE DE materials and programme in particular.

8.3.1 Content selection

The findings of this study have indicated that the content that was selected for the KIE DE programme does not address the teacher-learners' academic and professional needs adequately. As was discussed in Chapter Five, some content areas that are not directly related to the needs of teachers of English occupy considerable space in KIE DE materials while a number of content areas that are very important for teachers of English as a second/additional or foreign languages are not included. Moreover, those that are included are not addressed in a way that suits the teacher-learners' needs in this regard. For instance, grammar was addressed from a formal rather than a functional perspective, while the limited content on linguistics focused on general rather than applied linguistics. In addition, the content was found not to be aligned (at least externally) with that of the Rwandan O'Level national curriculum and examinations. It was also found that pedagogic content knowledge for English teaching is addressed in a separate module placed at the end of the study programme. The possible negative implications of this placement were discussed in Chapter Five (section 5.2.2). Therefore, I recommend that the content selected for the KIE DE programme be re-examined and that aspects of language pedagogy be incorporated in subject content modules so that propositional and procedural knowledge can be brought together because, as Bertram (2011, p. 9) argues, the two "cannot be understood or learned independently of each other".

8.3.2 Content mediation

A number of limitations have also been identified in the KIE DE modules for English in terms of content mediation on the page. For instance, no overall aims are given for the modules. This makes it difficult for the teacher-learners to understand what is expected of them and what they are likely to learn from the modules. Therefore, in addition to learning aims for the different blocks, there should be learning aims for the whole module. The inclusion of broad aims may help to make the modules and the whole study programme more coherent and relevant to the teacher-learners.

Objectives/aims should also be placed at the beginning of each new section of a module to facilitate easy engagement with the content. Their number should also be included because, as was pointed out, they are too few to cover the content of the sections that they relate to.

The findings of this research also indicate that KIE DE teacher-learners were not provided with enough information on how to study in the DE mode and on how to use DE materials successfully. This may be one reason why some informants indicated that they had found themselves in a 'sink or swim' situation, which, according to them, has negatively affected their learning. The lack of such information may also be one of the reasons why teacher-learners expected tutors to teach them the modules as in the on-campus mode (Mbonyinshuti, 2012). Therefore, more explanations to teacher-learners are needed regarding DE in general and the use of DE materials in particular because, as has been repeatedly indicated in this thesis, DE learners mostly study in isolation from their tutors/lecturers and from one another (Shabani and Okebukola, 2001). The need for such explanations is even more pressing in the Rwandan context where DE is a new endeavour and, therefore, many people are not familiar with it.

Language use has also been identified as a limitation to effective mediation in the KIE DE materials because it is often too technical or specialized and too formal. This suggests that these materials use a vertical discourse (Bernstein, 1999) in which scientific concepts are not related to teacher-learners' everyday concepts (Hedegaard, 2005). The designers' use of specialist discourses contributed to the content in the modules being too difficult for many teacher-learners to understand, given their limited knowledge of English (which is a foreign language for them) and this is a cause of concern given the central role that language plays in learning (Abasi and Graves, 2008). Therefore, the language used in KIE DE materials should be simplified where possible and, where specialized terms are required, these should be glossed in order to enhance the likelihood that the teacher-learners will access and understand the content. On the other hand, given that teacher-learners who successfully complete the KIE Diploma are entitled to enter degree studies, they do

need to be introduced to the kinds of texts that they are likely to encounter when studying at a higher level. One way of doing this is to include extracts from a range of academic texts and to carefully mediate them as is done in the SAIDE Study of Education series, most of which is now available on the OER Africa website (http://www.oerafrica.org).

In relation to mediation, inappropriate layout was another finding and this is likely to negatively affect the self-instructional nature of these materials. Visual elements are limited in these materials while these elements are being increasingly used as a meaning making mode in textbooks (Bezemer and Kress, 2010) as well as in self-instructional materials. Thus, KIE DE materials designers should find ways to include more visuals to make their materials both more appealing and more pedagogically effective. The pages in KIE DE materials are also very dense and hardly leave space for teacher-learners to make notes and to answer questions. Ideally, there should be more white space on most pages and where teacher-learners are expected to answer questions, the space for answers should be proportionate to the length of the expected answer.

The limited provision of summaries in KIE DE modules can also be a drawback: learners need to be helped to recap what they have covered in a section (Lockwood, 1997) and frequent conclusions and/or summaries are one of the main ways to achieve this (Kumar, 2000). Therefore, a summary after each section should be provided in order to support teachers' learning.

8.3.3 Support for materials designers

Findings from this research suggest that the designers of KIE DE materials, who are specialists in subject English, lack knowledge and expertise in the design of DE materials, in general pedagogy and in pedagogic content knowledge (Shulman, 1987). These knowledge and skills gaps have a negative effect on the KIE DE materials in terms of content aimed at assisting teacher-learners to teach various aspects of language and in terms of mediation of content in all modules. Therefore,

these designers should be offered support in these areas, which can be done in two ways: (i) they could be offered professional development opportunities in DE materials and graphic design and in pedagogic knowledge and PCK (Shulman, 1987) applied to ELT or (ii) work hand in hand with experts in these areas. However, either option is likely to require additional government funding for the institution.

While waiting for KIE to obtain the means to offer professional development in DE materials design to its DE materials designers, I recommend that designers could make use of self-instructional materials that are freely available online in order to have an idea of what effective self-instructional materials look like and to learn about designing. Such materials include those designed by Open Education Resource Africa (http://www.oerafrica.org), those designed by TESSA (Teacher Education in Sub-Saharan Africa) and those designed by the Commonwealth of Learning (COL). For instance, TESSA is an international research and development initiative which offers a range of materials to support school based teacher education and training (http://www.tessafrica.net/, accessed on 21 May 2014). Though some of these materials are designed for primary school teachers rather than for high school teachers, KIE DE materials designers may still find these materials useful in illustrating aspects of good self-instructional materials. After all, the main meditational features of DE materials are generally similar, irrespective of the level for which they are designed. It should be noted that in this thesis some OER materials have been used as examples of effective self-instructional materials. These include those edited by Gultig and Butler (2010) and Gultig (2001) (see page 211-212).

KIE DE materials were also found not to reflect the context in which they have been designed to be used. This may be mainly because before designing the materials, the designers did not visit schools and teachers in order to find out their professional needs, language proficiency and teaching contexts. Therefore, visits to schools and interactions with teachers for whom the programme is designed are recommended in order to tailor the materials and the programme as a whole to their needs and

contexts. In similar vein, the materials should be piloted before they are finalized so that the weaknesses therein (if any) can be addressed.

8.4 Limitations of the study

While this study is arguably important because it is the first of its kind to be conducted on Kigali Institute of Education's DE materials, it has some limitations which are outlined below.

The fact that the author of the redesigned section also doubled as the researcher who interviewed the informants about their views on both this section and KIE DE materials might have influenced informants' responses. The informants might have chosen to please the researcher and to have refrained from pointing out some shortcomings in the section. In addition, the nature of the interview questions (see Appendix 3) may also have disposed them to look at the negative side of KIE DE materials. In fact, the informants responded as 'satisfied customers' (Reed, 2005) to the redesigned section in almost all its aspects while painting a largely negative picture of the KIE DE modules. In similar vein, working with the two sets of materials (KIE's and the redesigned section) involved some comparison; thus the perceived improved nature of the redesigned section might have backgrounded some of its shortcomings and, possibly, some of the merits of the KIE DE modules. However, the informants were always asked to justify their answers and the justification generally appeared to be in line with the findings of the textual analysis and with literature and other research findings relating to the questions that were asked.

Furthermore, given that the interviews were conducted towards the end of the programme, the informants indicated that they could not remember everything about the modules they had used almost two years earlier. In addition, some questions were on the KIE DE programme as whole and did not specifically address the objectives of the study. This may have limited the amount and the depth of the information provided by the teacher-learners during interviews. However, working with different sources of data (textual analysis of KIE DE materials for English, the

literature and from studies conducted in the area of DE, informants' responses to these materials and the comments they wrote on the copies of the redesigned section) helped me to comprehensively and critically evaluate the relevance of the materials to the professional needs of Rwandan high school teachers of English.

It has been mentioned that KIE DE teacher-learners who are studying English also study and are expected to teach French (also taught as a foreign language in Rwanda but no longer a medium of instruction). It is possible that knowledge and skills acquired from the modules for French could be useful for teaching English. Therefore, additional data for this study could have been obtained from an analysis of the materials designed to prepare teacher-learners for the teaching of French (Block 3 of Module 7). This was not done due to time and study programme constraints.

8.5 Avenues for further research

The study could not address all the issues pertaining to the KIE DE programme for teachers of English, hence the need for future researchers to explore issues such as those outlined below.

Research in the area of DE suggests that learner support is a very important element of DE programmes because, as Rowntree (1992) argues, few learners can survive on materials alone. Indeed, it is argued that effective learner support is likely to lower the dropout rate and increase the pass rate, which are two of the key issues that DE programmes are faced with (Roberts, 2004). With reference to this, KIE DE teacher-learners have complained about insufficient or ineffective support from their tutors (Mbonyinshuti, 2012). They also pointed to organizational problems in the programme as one of the challenges to their learning. Therefore, the effectiveness of the learner support offered by KIE to its DE teacher-learners and their responses to this support should be investigated. This could provide avenues for improving the quality of this support and that of the KIE DE programme in general, if necessary.

Some DE scholars suggest that women and men have different learning styles which may affect their participation in DE (Kwapong, 2007). For instance, according to some authors, female DE learners are oriented towards creating opportunities for meeting and working with other students while male colleagues are less likely to do this (Kwapong, 2007). Creating opportunities for collaboration is very important for DE learners, who usually study in isolation. Thus, one possible area of investigation could be the experiences of female KIE DE teacher-learners with DE versus those of their male counterparts especially because women were underrepresented in this study (only one of the nine informants) for the reasons explained in Chapter Four.

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) has been identified as an effective approach for teaching second/additional and foreign language for communication (Andrewes, 2011; Chang, 2011), in spite of recent recommendations for a move to a post-CLT era (Andrewes, 2011). However, some scholars argue that this approach works better in a second/additional language rather than a foreign language context because for CLT to be successful, learners need to be exposed to the target language in authentic situations in order to capitalize on what they practice in class (Scheckle, 2009). Given that English is a foreign language in Rwanda and is spoken by very few people (in 2014, 7% of the Rwandan population self-reported being literate in English[66]), such exposure is not widely available. Therefore, there is a need for researchers to investigate how CLT is used (if at all) in Rwanda, the challenges that teachers face in using it, how these can be addressed, and what alternative approaches may be more useful.

Another possible area for further research is teacher educators' understanding of and receptivity to learner-centred education and constructivist approaches to learning, especially as research suggests that the take up of these approaches in the Sub-saharan Africa is very weak (Tabulawa, 1997; Schweisfurth, 2011; this study). According to Schweisfurth (2011), reasons for limited understanding and receptivity

[66] Data from the 4th Population and Housing Census in Rwanda (NISR, 2014)

include lack of personal experience with these approaches in pre- and in-service teacher education. Tabulawa (1997) argues that the understanding of learning as a transmission-based process aimed at passing examinations, resulting in banking styles of teaching is widespread in Africa. Therefore, there is need for research to investigate KIE teacher educators' beliefs about the purpose of education and about what constitutes good learning.

8.6 Conclusion

This chapter has summarized the key findings of this study, formulated some recommendations for the improvement of the quality of the KIE DE materials, outlined the limitations of the study and suggested avenues for further research.

Given Bernstein's suggestion that recontextualization implies adapting the transmitter's information according to perceived learners' need (Bernstein & Solomon, 1999), it can be argued that the recontextualization in KIE DE materials is not adequate: the singulars that were selected together with the knowledge within these singulars do not respond adequately to KIE DE teacher-learners academic and professional needs. In addition, the mediation of these singulars and the knowledge therein was found to be limited in terms of helping the teacher-learners to actively engage with and gain a deep understanding of the content in the materials: they encourage surface learning (Biggs, 1987) and the designers have adopted a behaviourist (Chang, 2011) and a banking approach (Freire, 2007) to teaching/learning. It can be argued, therefore, that the KIE DE programme for English does not facilitate teacher-learners' critical examination of the *what* and the *how* (Bernstein, 1996) of their learning as teacher-learners and of their teaching as practising teachers.

Reference list

Abasi, A. R. and Graves, B. (2008). Academic literacy and Plagiarism: Conversations with International Graduate Students and Disciplinary Professors. *Journal of English for Academic Purpose*, 7(4), 221-233

Abedi, M. & Badragheh, A. (2011). Distance Education in Developing Countries. *Journal of American Science*, 7(4) 295-301.

Adams, A.P. (2009). Empirical evidence and the knowledge-that/knowledge-how distinction. *Synthese*, 170, 97-114.

Adekanmbi, G. (1999). *The transformation of distance education in Africa.* Paper presented at the Celebration of Ten Years of The Commonwealth of Learning, held on 1-5 March, 1999, at the University of Brunei Darussalam.

Aderinoye, R., Siaciwena, R., and Wright, C.R. (2009). Regional Focus Issue Editorial: A Snapshot of Distance Education in Africa. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning,* 10(4), 1-4.

Agrawal, M. (2004). Curricular reform in schools: The importance of evaluation. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 36 (3), 361-379.

Akbari, R. & Tajik, L. (2009). L2 Teachers' Pedagogic Knowledge Base: a Comparison between Experienced and Less Experienced Practitioners. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(6), 52-73

Akyel, A. and Yalçin, E. (1990). Literature in the EFL class: a study of goal-achievement Incongruence. *ELT Journal*, 44(3), 174-180.

Al-Humaidi, M. (2007). *Communicative Language Teaching*. King Saud University. Retrieved on 07 September 2011, from http://faculty.ksu.edu.sa/alhumaidi/Publications/Communicative%20Language%20Teaching.pdf

Anderson, T.D. and Garrison, D.R. (1995). Critical thinking in distance education: Developing critical communities in an audio teleconference context. *Higher Education,* (29), 183-199.

Andrews, R. & Smit, A. (2011). *Developing Writers: Teaching and Learning in the Digital Age*. Berkshire: Open University Press.

Andrewes, S. (2011). Communicative Language Learning: Communicating for What Purpose? *Modern English Teacher*, 20(2), 5-12.

Ascough, R. S. (2002). Designing for Online Distance Education: Putting Pedagogy Before Technology. *Teaching Theology and Religion*, 5(1), 17-29.

Astleitner, H. (2002). Teaching Critical Thinking Online. *Journal of Instructional Psychology,* 29(2), 53-76.

Ball, D.L., Thames, M.H. and Phelps, G. (2008). Content knowledge for teaching: what makes it special? *Journal of Teacher Education,* 59(5), 389-407.

Banegas, D. (2009). Content Knowledge in Teacher Education: Where Professionalisation Lies. *ELTED Journal*, 12, 44-51.

Barnard, R. (2011). Language teachers as applied linguists - past and future. *Modern English Teacher*, 20(1), 5-9.

Bax, S. (2003). The End of CLT: a context approach to language teaching. *ELT Journal*, 577(3), 278-287.

Beattie, V., Collins, B. & McInnes, B. (1997): Deep and surface learning: a simple or simplistic dichotomy? *Accounting Education*, 6(1), 1-12

Belchamber, R. (2010). CLT Re-examined. *Modern Language Teacher,* 19, 60-64.

Beldarrain, Y. (2006). Distance Education Trends: integrating new technologies to foster student interaction and collaboration. *Distance Education,* 27(2), 139-153.

Bernard, R.M. et al. (2004). How Does Distance Education Compare With Classroom Instruction? A Meta-Analysis of the Empirical Literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 74 (3), 379–439.

Bernstein, B. (1975). *Towards a Theory of Educational Transmission (Class, Codes and Control, Vol.3)*. London: Routledge & Kegan and Paul.

Bernstein, B. (1996). *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control, and Identity: Theory, Research, Critique*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Bernstein, B. (1999). Official knowledge and pedagogic identities. In F. Christie (Ed.), *Pedagogy and the Shaping of Consciousness* (pp. 246-261). London & New York: Cassell.

Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity: Theory, Research, Critique (Revised edition).* Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc

Bernstein, B. and Solomon, J. (1999) 'Pedagogy, identity and the construction of a theory of symbolic control': Basil Bernstein Questioned by Joseph Solomon. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 20(2), 265-279.

Bertram, C. (2011). What does research say about teacher learning and teacher knowledge?: Implications for professional development in South Africa. *Journal of Education,* 52, 3-26.

Bezemer, J. and Kress, G. (2008). Writing in Multimodal Texts: A Social Semiotic Account of Designs for Learning. *Written Communication*, 25(2), 166-195

Bezemer, J. and Kress, G. (2010). Changing Text: a social semiotic analysis of textbooks. *Design for Learning*, 3(1-2), 10-29.

Bhatt, R.M. (2001). World Englishes. *Annual Review of Anthropology,* 30, 527-550

Biao, I. (2012). Open and Distance Learning: Achievements and Challenges in a Developing Sub-Educational Sector in Africa. In P. B. Muyinda (Ed), *Distance Education* (pp. 27-62). Rijeka: InTech.

Biggs, J.B. (1987). *Student Approaches to Learning and Studying*. Victoria: Brown Prior Anderson.

Biggs, J.B. (1996). Enhancing Teaching Through Constructive Alignment. *Higher Education*, 32, 347-364.

Biggs, J.B. (1999). *Teaching for quality learning at university*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Biggs, J.B. (2003a). *Aligning Teaching and Assessing to Course Objectives.* Paper Presented at a Conference on Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, University of Aveiro, 13-17 April, 2003.

Biggs, J.B. (2003b). *Aligning Teaching and Assessment to Curriculum Objectives*. Imaginative Curriculum Project, LTSN Generic Centre.

Biggs, J.B. (2007). Aligning teaching for constructing learning. *The Higher Education Academy.* Retrieved from www.heacademy.ac.uk, on 10 May 2014.

Black, P., & William, D. (2003). 'In praise of educational research': Formative Assessment. *British Educational Research Journal,* 29 (5), 623-637.

Bloor, M. and Wood, F. (2006). *Keywords in Qualitative Methods: a Vocabulary of Research Concepts.* London: Sage Publications

Bourdeau, J. and Bates, A. (1996). Instructional Design for Distance Learning. *Journal of Science Education and Technology,* 5(4), 267-283.

Bourne, J. (2008). Official Pedagogic Discourse and the Construction of Learners' Identities. In M. Martin-Jones, A. M. de Mejia and N. H. Hornberger (Eds), *Encyclopaedia of Language and Education*, (2nd Ed), Volume 3: Discourse and Education (pp. 41-52). Springer Science & Business Media LLC.

Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology,* 3(2), 77-101.

Brock-Utne, B. (2000a). Language of Instruction in Tanzania and Namibia. B. Brock-Utne (Ed), *Whose Education for All? The Recolonization of the African Mind* (pp. 173-210). New York and London: Falmer Press.

Brooks, J.G. & M.G. Brooks (1993). *In Search of Understanding: the Case for Constructivist Classrooms.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of Meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bryman A. (2004). *Triangulation and Measurement*. Department of Social Sciences, Loughborough University Loughborough, Leicestershire. Retrieved from www.referenceworld.com/sage/socialscience/triangulation.pdf, on 28 August 2013.

Burnaby, B. & and Sun, Y. (1989). Chinese Teachers' Views of Western Language Teaching: Context Informs Paradigms. *TESOL Quarterly,* 23(2), 219-238.

Burns, M. (2011). *Distance Education for Teacher Training: Modes, Models, and Methods.* Washington: Education Development Centre.

Commonwealth Of Learning and The Asian Development Bank (1999). *Designing Materials for Open and Distance Learning: Training Toolkit*, Vancouver; Manila: The Common Wealth of Learning and The Asian Development Bank

Commonwealth Of Learning (2002). *Distance Education and Open Learning In Sub-Saharan Africa: A Literature Survey On Policy And Practice*. ADEA Final Report.

Commonwealth Of Learning (2005). *Creating Learning Materials for Open and Distance Learning: A Handbook for Authors and Instructional Designers*. Vancouver: The Commonwealth of Learning.

Cadorath, J., Harris, S. & Encinas, F. (2002). Training for Distance Teaching through Distance Learning. *Open Learning, 17(2), 139-152.*

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47

Canale, M., and M. Swain. 1988. "Some Theories of Communicative Competence". In W. Rutherford and M. Sharwood Smith (Eds), *Grammar and Second Language Teaching: A Book of Readings* (pp. 27-38). Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Cannella, G. S., & Reiff, J. C. (1994). Individual constructivist teacher education: Teachers as empowered learners. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 21 (3), 27-38.

Carr, D. (1995). Is Understanding the Professional Knowledge of Teachers a Theory-Practice Problem? *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 29(3), 311-330.

Celce-Murcia, M. & Olshtain, E. (2000). *Discourse and Context in Language Teaching: a guide for language teachers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chaiklin, S. (2003). The zone of proximal development in Vygotsky's analysis of learning and instruction. In A. Kozulin, B. Gindis, V. Ageyev & S. Miller (Eds), *Vygotsky's educational theory and practice in cultural context* (pp. 39–64). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chang, M. (2011). EFL Teachers' Attitudes toward Communicative Language Teaching in Taiwanese College. *Asian EFL Journal*, 53, 17-34.

Chen, C. (2003). A constructivist approach to teaching: Implications in teaching computer networking. *Information Technology, Learning and Performance Journal*, 21(2), 17-27.

Childs, (2011). What are teachers' beliefs (about 2LL & 2LT) and where do they come from? How does 'context' shape how teachers conceptualize teaching? *APLNG 587.* Retrieved from http://sites.psu.edu/aplng587fall2011/, on 03 March 2014.

Christie, F. (1991). What is functional grammar? *Teaching English Literacy*, 106-107.

Ciobanu, I.R. (2011). Developing writing skills for business purposes in mixed-ability classes. *Studii si Cercetari Filologice. Seria Limbi Straine Aplicate*, 10, 112-117.

Clarence-Fincham, J. et al. (2002). *Exploring our Voices: Effective English Teaching in Multilingual Classrooms.* Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Corbetta, P. (2003). *Social Research Theory, Methods and Techniques.* London: SAGE Publications.

Crandall, J. (2000). Language Teacher Education. *Annual Review of applied Linguistics*, 20, 34-55.

Danaher, P. A. and Umar, A. (2010). Contemporary Research on Open and Distance Learning in Teacher Education. In Danaher, P. A. and Umar, A. (Eds), *Teacher Education Through Open and Distance Learning,* (pp. 7-21). Common Wealth of Learning: Vancouver

Daniels, H. (2001). *Vygotsky and Pedagogy*. New York: Routledge

Davis, J.N. (1988). Distance Education and Foreign Language Education: Towards a Coherent Approach. *Foreign Language Annals*, 6(21), 347-350.

Davis, H., Dixon, K. and Kerr, S. (2009). Teaching Literature: Thinking about all the four literary genres: short stories, novels, drama and poetry. In A. Ferreira (Ed), *Teaching Language*, (pp. 177-193). Northlands: Macmillan South Africa.

Davis-Seaver, J. (2000). *Critical Thinking in Young Children*. New York: The Edwin Mellen Press.

Day, R. (1993). Models and the Knowledge Base of Second Language Teacher Education. *ESL,* 11(2), 1–13.

Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (2000). *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd Edition). Sage, USA, UK

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. London: Macmillan

Dirks, A. L. (1998). Constructivist Pedagogy, Critical Thinking, And the Role of Authority.
Available online at http://webhost.bridgew.edu/adirks/ald/papers/constr.htm.

Donald, D., Lazarus, S. & Lolwana, P. (2002). *Educational Psychology in Social Context (3rd Ed)*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Donato, R., 1994. Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J.P. Lantolf (Ed). *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 33-56). London: Ablex Publishing.

Dornbrack, J. Let's talk about it: Teaching Speaking Skills. In A. Ferreira (Ed), *Teaching Language*, (pp. 118-132). Northlands: Macmillan South Africa.

Downing, A. & Locke, P. (2002). *A University Course in English*. London: Routledge.

Drake, S.M. and Burns, R.C. (2004). Meeting Standards Through Integrated Curriculum. Alexandria: ASCD.

Duron, R., Limbach, B. and Waugh, W. (2006). Critical Thinking Framework For Any Discipline. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 17(2), 160-166.

Dzakira, H. & Idrus R. H. (2003). Teacher- learner interaction in distance education: A case of two Malaysian Universities. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education-TODJDE* (4)3: 1-13.

Elder, C. (2001). Assessing the language proficiency of teachers: are there any border controls? *Language Testing*, 18(2), 149-170.

Ellis, R. (1996). SLA and language pedagogy. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 19, 69-92.

Entwistle, N.J. and Entwistle, A.C. (1991). Contrasting forms of understanding for degree examinations: the student experience and its implications. *Higher Education*, 22, 205-227

Eraut, M. (2001). Teachers Learning in the Workplace. In P. Xochellis and Z. Papanaoum (org) *Continuing Teacher Education and School Development* (Symposium Proceedings). Thessalonoki, Department of Education, School of Philosophy AUTH, pp. 54-68

Essel, R. Owusu-Boateng, W. and Saah, A. A. (2008). *Distance Learners' Perception of the use of course materials and its effects. A Case Study of Centre for Continuing Education, University of Cape Coast, Ghana.* The Fifth Commonwealth Forum on Open Learning, Commonwealth of Learning and the University of London, UK.

Evans, T. (1995). The potential of research with students to inform development. In F. Lockwood (Ed.), *Open and Distance Learning Today* (67-75). London: Routledge.

Evans, V. and Green, M. (2006). *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Facione, P. A (2011). *Critical Thinking: What It is and Why it Counts*. Millbrae, CA: Measured Reasons and The California Academic Press.

Faez, F. (2011). Points of Departure: Developing the Knowledge Base of ESL and FSL Teachers for K-12 Programs in Canada. *The Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics,* 14(1), 29-49.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse*. London & New York: Routledge.

Fantl, J. (2012). "Knowledge How". In E.N. Zelta (Ed), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2012 Edition).
Retrieved from http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/knowledge-how/, on 10 April 2014.

Feng, Z. (2013). Functional Grammar and Its Implications for English Teaching and Learning, *English Language Teaching*, 6(10), 86-94.

Fenstermacher, G. D. (1994). The Knower and the Known: The Nature of Knowledge. In Research on Teaching. *Review of Research in Education*, 20, 3-56.

Fillmore, L.W., & Snow, C. (2000). *What teachers need to know about language*. Washington, DC: Delta Systems and Center for Applied Linguistics.

Finch, A. E. (2002). The language clinic: The teacher as an agent of change. *Thai TESOL Bulletin*, *Special Issue*, 35 – 52.

Freebody, P., & Luke, A. (1990). Literacies programs: Debates and demands in cultural context. *Australian Journal of TESOL*, 5(3), 7-16.

Freebody, P., & Luke, A. (1990). Further Notes on the Four Resources Model. Retrieved on 29 September 2011, from
http://www.readingonline.org/research/lukefreebody.html.

Freebody, P. (1992). A socio-cultural approach: Resourcing four roles as a literacylearner. In A. Watson & A. Badenhop (Eds.), *Prevention of reading failure* (pp. 48-60). Sydney: Ashton-Scholastic.

Freeman, D. & Johnson, K. E. (1998). Reconceptualizing the Knowledge-Base of Language Teacher Education. *TESOL Quarterly,* 32(3), 397-417.

Freire, P. (2007) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Freire, P. and Macedo, D. (1987). *Literacy: Reading the Word and the World.* South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin & Garvey Publishers.

Fung, Y.Y.H. (2005). Teachers' views on and use of printed materials in a distance learning teacher education course. *Open Learning*, 20(2), 175–183.

Gachuhi, D. & Matiru, B. (eds.) (1989). *Handbook for Designing and Writing Distance Education Materials.* Bonn: ZED

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social Psychology and Language Learning: The role of Attitudes and Motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.

Gardner, S. (2008). Changing approaches to teaching grammar. *ELTED*, 11, 39-44.

Geyser, J. P. (2008). *Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages. Additional Course Readings.* TEFL Training College.

Ghose, B. (2004). Language and Communication. *India's National Magazine*, 21(15).

Gibbons, J. (1990). Applied Linguistics in Court. *Applied Linguistics*, 11 (3), 229-237.

Glasersfeld, E. (2001). Scheme Theory as a Key to the Learning Paradox. In: A. Tryphon & J. Vonèche (Eds.), *Working with Piaget: Essays in honour of Bärbel Inhelder,* (pp. 139 –147). London: Psychology Press.

Gore, J. M. (1993). *The Struggle for Pedagogies*. New York & London: Routledge.

Gorsky, P. and Caspi, A. (2005). A critical analysis of transactional distance theory. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education,* 6(1), 1-11.

Gray, A. (1997). *Constructivist teaching and learning*. SSTA Research Centre Report, 97-07.

Guemide, B. (2012). Teaching English language and literature in non-native contextsputs the case for teaching literature. *Modern English teacher*, 21(1), 73-77

Gultig, J. and Butler, D. (2010) (Eds). *Creating People-Centred Schools: School Organization and Change in South Africa*. The SAIDE Teacher Education Series.

Gultig, J. (2001) (Ed). *Learners and Learning: Learning Guide*. The SAIDE Teacher Education Series.

Guri-Rosenblit, S. (2009). Distance Education in the Digital Age: Common Misconceptions and Challenging Tasks. *Journal of Distance Education*, 23(2), 105-122.

Hallam, B. (1995). Formation à Distance: Learning Strategies. In Howard, R. and I. McGrath (Eds), *Distance Education for Language Teachers: a UK perspective* (pp. 182-192). Adelaide: Multilingual Matters.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1986*). Spoken and Written Language*. Dezkin University : Victoria

Halpern, D.F. (1998). Teaching critical thinking for transfer across domains. *American Psychologist,* 53(4), 449-455.

Hammond J., & Gibbons, P. (2005). Putting scaffolding to work: The contribution of scaffolding in articulating ESL education. *Prospect Special Issue*, 20 (1), 6-30.

Hancock, R.D. and Algozzine, B. (2006). *Doing Case Study Research: A Practical guide for Beginning Researchers.* New York: Teacher College Press

Hanson, H. & Wennö, e. (2005). Closing the Distance: Compensatory Strategies in Distance Language Education. In B. Holmberg, et al. (Eds), *Distance Education and Languages: Evolution and Change*, (pp. 278-294). Clevedon, New York, Ontario: Multilingual Matters.

Harley, K. (2010). An Outline of Basil Bernstein's Concepts. SAIDE. Retrieved from http://www.SAIDE.org.za; www.oerafrica.org

Haworth, T. & Parker, R. (1995). The Contribution of a Face-to-Face Component in Initial Teacher Training at a Distance. In R. Howard and I. McGrath (Eds), *Distance Education for Language Teachers: a UK perspective* (pp. 78-94). Adelaide: Multilingual Matters.

Hedegaard, M. (2005). The zone of proximal development as basis for instruction. In H. Daniels (Ed), *An Introduction to Vygotsky (2nd Ed)* (pp. 227–252). New York: Routledge

Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and Learning in a Language Classroom.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Hinton, L. and Hale, K. (2001). *The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice.* California: Academic Press.

Hlas, A. & Hildebrandt, S. (2010). Demonstrations of pedagogical content knowledge: Spanish Liberal Arts and Spanish Education majors' writing. *L2 Journal*, 2, 1-22.

Hoadley, U. and Jansen, J. (2009). *Curriculum: Organizing knowledge for the classroom*, 2nd Ed. Oxford University Press Southern Africa.

Holmberg, B. (1986). A Distance of Distance Education. *Journal of Distance Education*, 1(1), 25-40.

Holmberg, B. (1995). *Theory and Practice of Distance Education*. London: Routledge.

Holmberg, B. (2001). *Distance Education in Essence: An Overview of Theory and Practice in the Early twenty-first Century*. Oldenberg: Bis

Holmberg, H. (2005). Teaching Foreign Language Skills by Distance Education Methods: Some Basic Considerations. In Holmberg et al. (Eds). *Distance Education and Languages: Evolution and Change*, (pp. 166-177). Clevedon, New York, Ontario: Multilingual Matters.

Holowchak, M.A. (2009). Education as Training for Life: Stoic teachers as physicians of the soul. *Educational Philosophy and Theory,* 41(2), 166-184.

Howard, R. & McGrath, I. (1995) (Eds), *Distance Education for Language Teachers: a UK perspective*. Adelaide: Multilingual Matters.

Howatt, A.P. R. (1984). *A History of English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hu, G. (2005). 'CLT is best for China': an untenable absolutist claim. *ELT Journal,* 59(1), 65-68.

Huimin, Z. (2010). EFL Teacher Development: a reflective model. *Modern Language Teacher,* 19(2), 60-63.

Hunma, A. & Sibomana, E. (2014). Academic Writing and Research at an Afropolitan University: an International Student Perspective. In T. Lucia and L. Cooper (Eds), *Risk in Academic Writing: Postgraduate Students, Their Teachers and the Making of Knowledge* (pp. 100-128). Ontario: Multilingual Matters.

Hussein, A. (2009). The use of Triangulation in Social Sciences Research: Can qualitative and quantitative methods be combined? *Journal of Comparative Social Work,* (1), 1-12.

Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In Pride, J.B. and Holmes, J. (Eds). *Sociolinguistics. Selected Readings*, (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth: Penguin Books

IGNOU (1989). '*Self-Instructional Course Unit*' (IGNOU Handbook 5), New Delhi: IGNOU.

IGNOU (2000). *Self-Learning Materials Development: Developer's handbook*. New Delhi: IGNOU.

Illés, E. (2012). Learner autonomy revisited. *ELT Journal,* 66 (4), 505-513.

Inglis, M., Thomson, C. and MacDonald, A. (2000). *Language in Learning and Teaching (LILT) Learning Guide.* Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press.

Ipaye, B. (2005). *Study Guides and Learning Strategies in Open and Distance learning (2nd Ed)*. Lagos: Chayoobi Publishers

Ismat, A.H. (1998). Constructivism in Teacher Education: Considerations for Those Who Would Link Practice to Theory. *ERIC Digest*. Retrieved from http://www.monarchcenter.org/pdfs/ericconstructivism.pdf, on 24 February 2014.

Janks, H. (2009). The Language teacher's repertoire: what effective language teachers should know and be able to do. In A. Ferreira (Ed), *Teaching Language* (pp. 59-72). Northlands: MacMillan South Africa

Janks, H. (2010). *Literacy and Power*. New York & London: Routledge.

Jennings, J.C.H. (1995). Virtual Language Schools: Overcoming the Problem of Distance in the Training of Language Teachers. In R. Howard and I. McGrath (Eds), *Distance Education for Language Teachers: a UK perspective* (pp. 104-117). Adelaide: Multilingual Matters.

Jin, L., Singh, M., & Li, L. (2005). *Communicative language teaching in China: misconceptions, applications and perceptions.* Paper presented at the AARE annual conference, Parramatta.

Johnston, B., & Goettsch, K. (2000). In search of the knowledge base of Language teaching: Explanations by experienced teachers. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 56, 437-468.

Johnson, K. E. (2006). The sociocultural turn and its challenges for second language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40, 235-257.

Johnson, K. E. and Arshavskaya, E. (2011). Strategic Mediation in Learning to Teach: Reconceptualizing the Microteaching Simulation in a MA TESL Methodology Course. In K. E. Johnson & P. R. Golombek (Eds). *Research on Second Language Teacher Education: A Sociocultural Perspective on Professional Development* (pp. 169-185). New York: Routledge.

Johnson, K. E. and Golombek, P. R. (2011). A Sociocultural Theoretical Perspective on Teacher Professional Development. In K.E. Johnson & P. R. Golombek (Eds). *Research on Second Language Teacher Education: A Sociocultural Perspective on Professional Development* (pp. 1-12). New York and London: Routledge.

Jonassen, D.H. (1999). Designing constructivist learning environments. In C.M. Reigeluth (Ed.), *Instructional-design theories and models* (2nd Ed) (pp. 215-239). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Jordan, S. and Pillay, R. (2009). Beginning my Journey of Professional Development: The language Teacher and the Teaching profession. In A. Ferreira (Ed), *Teaching Language* (pp. 1-9). Northlands: MacMillan South Africa

June, K. P. (1991). *Upgrading the Target Language Proficiency Levels of Foreign Language Teachers.* ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics Washington DC.

Juneby, H.B. (2008). *Mentoring in Distance Education: Preventing Attrition to Promote Public Health*. Unpublished Master Thesis, University of Gothenburg, Sweden.

Kajornboon, A.B (2005). Using interviews as research instruments. *E-Journal for Researching Teachers*, 2(1). Retrieved from http://www.culi.chula.ac.th/Research/e-Journal/bod/Annabel.pdf,on 20 January 2014

Kamiya, M. (2006). *The Role of Communicative Competence in L2 Learning*. Available online at http://www.jrc.sophia.ac.jp/kiyou/ki26/kamiya.pdf, consulted on 21 February 2011

Kelly, M. et al. (2004). *European Profile for Language Teacher Education - A Frame of Reference.* A Report to the European Commission Directorate General for Education and Culture. Southampton, UK.

Kember, D. (1996). The Intention to both Memorize and Understand: Another Approach to Learning? *Higher Education,* 31, 341-354.

Kember, D. (2000). Misconceptions about the learning approaches, motivation and study practices of Asian students. *Higher Education*, 40, 99-121.

KIE (2009). *A Handbook for Course Writers*. Unpublished Handbook, Kigali Institute of Education.

Kim, M. (2006). Genre-based approach to teaching writing. *HPU TESL Working Paper Series,* 4(2), 33-39.

Kintsch, W. (2009). Learning and Constructivism. In S. Tobias & T.M. Duffy, (Eds). *Constructivist Instruction: Success or Failure?* (pp. 223-241). New York: Routledge.

Koole, T. (2010). Displays of Epistemic Access: Student Responses to Teacher Explanations. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 43(2), 183-209

Kozulin, A., (2002). *Sociocultural theory and the mediated learning experience*. School Psychology International, Sage Publications.

Kozulin, A. et al. (2003). Introduction: Sociocultural Theory and Education: Student, Teachers and Knowledge. In A. Kozulin et al. (Eds), *Vygotsky's Educational Theory in Cultural Context*, (pp. 1-14). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. New York: Longman.

Krashen, S. (1993). The effect of grammar teaching: Still peripheral. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 717-725.

Kress, G. & van Leeuwen, T. (2001). *Multimodal Discourse*, London: Arnold.

Kirschner, P. A., Sweller, J. and Clark, R.E. (2006). Why minimal guidance during instruction does not work: an analysis of the failure of constructivist, discovery, problem-based, experiential, and inquiry-based teaching. *Educational Psychologist*, 41(2), 75 – 86.

Kumar, A. (2000). Development of evaluation criteria for self-instructional materials for distance education. *Journal of Distance Education,* 7(1), 57-68.

Kumi-Yeboah, A. (2010). A Look at the Trend of Distance and Adult Education in Ghana. *International Forum of Teaching and Studies*, 6(1), 19-29.

Kwapong, O.A.T.F. (2007). Providing Quality Teacher Education for Women in Ghana Through Open and Distance Learning. *Indian Journal of Open Learning*, 16 (3), 217-234.

Kwizera, C. (2009, October 21). Education sector records impressive results – Murigande. *The New Times*.

Lantolf, J.P. (2000). Introducing sociocultural theory. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 1-26). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lantolf, J. P. & Thorne, S. L. (2007). Sociocultural Theory and Seconda Language Learning. In B. VanPatten & J. Williams (Eds), *Theories in Second Language Acquisition: An Introduction*, (pp. 201-224). New Jersey: Lawrence Elbaum Associates.

Larochelle, M and Bednarz, N. (1998). Constructivism and Education: Beyond Epistemological correctness. In M. Larochelle et al. (Eds). *Constructivism and Education* (pp. 3-22). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leach, R. (1995). Language Teacher Training by Distance Learning: Models of Delivery. In R. Howard and I. McGrath (Eds), *Distance Education for Teachers: a UK perspective* (pp. 35-48). Adelaide: Multilingual Matters.

Leary, J. & Berge, B. (2007). Successful Distance Education Programmes in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education-TOJDE*, 8(2), 136-145.

Lee, K. (2000). English Teachers' Barriers to the Use of Computer-assisted Language Learning. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 6(12).
Retrieved from http://iteslj.org/Articles/Lee-CALLbarriers.html on 19 January 2014.

Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2010). *Practical research planning and design* (9th Ed). Upper Saddle River: Pearson.

Leki, I. (2001). Material, Educational and Ideological Challenges of Teaching EFL Writing at the Turn of the Century. *International Journal of English Studies*, 1(2), 197-209.

Lightbown, P. M. & Spada, N. (2006) (3rd ed). *How Languages Are Learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lockwood, F. 1992. *Activities in Self-Instructional Text*. London: Kogan Page.

Lockwood, F. (1994). *Activities in Self-Instructional Tests*. London: Kogan Page Limited.

Lockwood, F. (1997). *Developing Self-Instructional Material, For Open, Distance and Flexible Learning.* Pre ICDE Conference Workshop Report, Pennsylvania State University.

Lockwood, F. (1998). *The Design and Production of Self-instructional Materials*. London: Kogan Page

Lortie, D.C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Louw, A. V. & Jensen, U. H. (2013). In Search of Learning Opportunities for All - Exploring Learning Environments in Upper Secondary Schools. *Designs for Learning*, 6 (1–2), 101-125.

Lowe, R. (1995). Using Instructional Illustrations for Distance Education. In F. Lockwood, (Ed), *Open and Distance Learning Today* (pp. 288-300), London: Routledge.

Lui, A. (2012). Teaching in the Zone: An introduction to working within the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) to drive effective early childhood instruction. *Children's progress*. Retrieved from http://www.childrensprogress.com/, on 13 November 2013.

Lunenburg, F.C. (2011). Critical Thinking and Constructivism: Techniques for Improving Student Achievement. *National Forum of Teacher Education Journal,* 21(3), 1-9.

Lusted, D. (1986). Why pedagogy? *Screen*, *27, 2–14*.

Lusunzi, I. S. (1999). *Building instructional Activities in Distance Education Self-Instructional Materials*. A paper presented at the 1st NADEOSA Conference, 11-13 August 1999.

Magnus, J. (1996). Distance Education in Sub-Saharan Africa: the Next Five Years. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International,* 33(1), 50-57.

Marland, P. et al. (1990). Distance learner's interaction with the text while studying. *Distance Education,* 1(1), 71-90.

Marton, F., & Säljö, R. (1997). Approaches to Learning. In F. Marton, D. Hounsell, & N. Entwistle (Eds.), *The Experience of Learning: Implications for Teaching and Studying in Higher Education*, (2nd Ed) (pp. 39-58). Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.

Marzano, R.J. (2007). *The Art and Science of Teaching: A Comprehensive Framework for Effective Instruction*. Alexandria: ASCD.

Maxwell, J. (1997). Designing a qualitative study. In L. Bickman & D. J. Rog (Eds.) *Handbook of applied social research methods* (pp. 69-100). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mays, T. (2006). Qualified Teachers for the Future Through I.YA.KURE, Rwanda. *SAIDE Newsletter:* Open *Learning through Distance Education*, 12(4), 4.

Mays, T. (2014). Harnessing OER to Support Teacher Education at a Distance. *SAIDE Newsleter*, Vol. 20, No 2. Retrieved online from http://www.saide.org.za/resources/newsletters/Vol_20_no.2_2014/Content/ICDE%20course.html, on 01 June 2014.

Mbonyinshuti, J. A. (2012, August 21). Dark cloud hangs over KIE's long distance programme. *The New Times*.

McGrath, I. (1995). Pre-service Training for Language Teachers: Face-to-Face or at a Distance? In R. Howard & I. McGrath (Eds), *Distance Education for Language Teachers: a UK perspective* (pp. 14-20). Adelaide: Multilingual Matters.

McKay, S. and Hornberger, N. (eds) (1996). *Sociolinguistics and language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McKee, A. (2005). *Textual analysis: a beginner's guide*. London, California, New Delhi: Sage Publications Ltd

McKillop, C. (1998). *Improving the quality of the student's learning experience: an agent-based approach to on-line study guides*. Technical Report No. KMI-TR-72, Open University, UK.

McKimm, J. & Swanwic, T. (2009). Setting Learning Objectives. *British Journal of Hospital Medicine, Vol 70, No 7, pp. 406-409.*

McMillan, J. H. and Schumacher, S. (2006). *Research in Education: Evidence-Based Inquiry.* New York: Pearson Education.

Meadows, B. (2013). The Relative Priority of Conceptual and Procedural Knowledge in University Second Language Teacher Education (SLTE) programs: Perspectives of In-Service Language Teachers in New Jersey. *Action in Teacher Education*, 35(3), 186-203.

Mishra, S. and Gaba, A. K. (2001). How do Distance Learners use activities in Self-Instructional Materials? *Indian Journal of Open Learning,* 10(1), 40-51.

Mishra, S. and Panda, S. (2007). Designing Reflective Activities for Distance Learning Materials. *Indian Journal of Open Learning*, 16(1), 7-23.

Mishra, R.R., Ahmad, N. and Rai, N.K. (2001). Print Materials in Distance Learning: learners' view. *Indian Journal of Open Learning*, 10(1), 52-59.

Mishra, S. (2004). *Objectives in Self-Learning Materials: a Critical Analysis of their Expected Roles, Learners' Perception and Usage*. STRIDE Research Report.

Mishra, S. (2005) How Do Distance Learners Perceive the Role of Objectives in Self-Learning Materials? *Malaysia Journal of Distance Education,* 7 (1), 33-47.

Moody, M. (n.d.). *The Learning Paradox: You must know an idea before you can learn it, but you only learn ideas you don't know.* Accessed online at http://www.calldrmatt.com/AskDrMatt1237_Learning_Paradox_Explained.htm, on 10 October 2012.

Moon, B. (2002). Learners and Learning: A Review. *Open Learning Through Distance Education (OLTDE),* Tenth Anniversary Edition, July 2002, p. 27.

Moon, B. (2013). *Teacher education and development in Africa: The need for access, sustainability, quality and relevance within the context of globalisation.* A key Note Address at the DETA Conference, 29 July – 01 August 2013, Nairobi, Kenya.

Moon, B., Leach, J. and Stevens, M. (2005) *Designing Open and Distance Learning for Teacher Education in Sub-Saharan Africa.* Washington DC: The World Bank.

Moore, M.G. (2007). The Theory of Transactional Distance. In M.G. Moore (Ed), *Handbook of Distance Educatio,* (pp. 89-107). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. Publishers.

Morais, A. et al. (Eds) (2001). *Towards a Sociology of Pedagogy: The contribution of Basil Bernstein to research*. New York: Peter Lang.

Morais, A.M. (2002). Basil Bernstein at the Micro Level of the Classroom. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 23(4), 559-569.

Morrow, W. (2007). *Learning to Teach in South Africa*. Pretoria: HSRC Press.

Moyo, S. (2003). Distance Learning and Virtual Education for Higher Education in Africa: Evaluation of Options and Strategies. *African and Asian Studies*, 2(4), 497-521.

Mukamusoni, D. (2006). Distance Learning Program of Teachers' at Kigali Institute of Education: An expository study. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, Vol. 7(2).*

Muller, J. (2009). Forms of knowledge and curriculum coherence. *Journal of Education and Work*, 22(3), 205–226

Mulphin, H. (1995). From Teaching Materials to Teacher Induction. In R. Howard and I. McGrath (Eds), *Distance Education for Language Teachers: a UK perspective* (pp. 174-181). Adelaide: Multilingual Matters.

Murtagh, L. and Baker, N. (2009). Feedback to Feed Forward: student response to tutors' written comments on assignments. *Practitioner Research in Higher Education*, 3 (1), 20-28.

Murdoch, G. (1994). Language development provision in teacher training curricula. *ELT Journal,* 48(3), 253-265.

Murray, D.E. & Christison, M.A. (2011). *What English Language Teachers Need to Know.* New York and London: Routledge.

National Institute of Statistics of Rwanda (2014). *Fourth Population and Housing Census, Rwanda, 2012: Thematic Report, Education characteristics of the population*. Kigali, Rwanda.

Nel, N. & Müller, H. (2010). The impact of teachers' limited English proficiency on English second language learners in South African schools. *South African Journal of Education*, 30, 635-650.

Neupane, M. (2010). Learner Autonomy: Concept and Considerations. *Journal of NELTA*, 15 (1-2), 114-120.

Nonyongo, E. (2009). Collaboration in open and distance learning: The realities of policy implementation in the Africa region. *Africa Education Review,* 6(1), 106-122.

Norris, N. (1999). *Language teacher proficiency or Teacher language proficiency? An environmental scan of information relating to the competencies/qualities/knowledge required to be an effective language teacher.* Retrieved from http://www1.curriculum.edu.au/nalsas/pdf/language.pdf, on 24 February 2014.

Norman, K.A and Spencer, B.H. (2005). Our lives as writers: examining pre-service teachers' experiences and beliefs about the nature of writing and writing instruction. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 32(1), 23-40.

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Harlow, England: Longman/Pearson Education.

Norton, B. and Toohey, K. (2011). Identity, language learning, and social change. *Language Teaching*, 44(4), 412–446.

Nosich, G (1993). Educational Virtue: Becoming a Critical Thinker. In W. P. Richard, (Ed), *Critical Thinking: What Every Person Needs to Survive in a Rapidly Changing World* (pp. 17-36). Rohnert Park, California: Center for Critical Thinking and Moral Critique.

Nunan, D. (1998). *The Learner-Centred Curriculum*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (2002). Teaching MA-TESOL Courses Online: Challenges and Rewards. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(4), 617-621.

Olphen, M. (2008). *World Language Teacher Education and Educational Technology: A look into CK, PCK, and TPCK.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City, March 24-28, 2008.

Shay, S., Oosthuizen, M., Paxton, P. and van der Merwe, R. (under review). Towards a principled basis for curriculum differentiation: Lessons from a comprehensive university. In E. M. Bitzer and M. E. Botha (Eds), *Curriculum Inquiry in South African Higher Education - some scholarly affirmations and challenges*. Stellenbosch: SunMedia.

Paul, R.W., Willsen, J. & Binker, A. (1993). *Critical thinking: How to prepare students for a rapidly changing world.* Santa Rosa, CA: Foundation for Critical thinking.

Paulston, C.B. (1992). *Linguistic and Communicative Competence: Topics in ESL.* Clevedon, Philadlphia, Adlaide: Multilingua Matters

Peacock, M. (2009). The evaluation of foreign-language-teacher education programmes. *Language Teaching Research*, 13(3), 259-78.

Pearson, P. (2013). Policy without a plan: English as a medium of instruction in Rwanda. *Current Issues in Language Planning. DOI: 10.1080/14664208.2013.857286*.

Pennells, J. and Coldevin, G. (2003). *Rwanda: Kigali Institute of Education Distance Teacher Training Project: Mid-Term Review*. DfID Africa, Great Lakes and Horn Department. Draft, March 2003.

Perraton, H. (1995). Distance Education for Teacher Training: International Experience. In R. Howard and I. McGrath (Eds), *Distance Education for Language Teachers: a UK perspective* (pp. 21-34). Adelaide: Multilingual Matters.

Perraton, H. (2010). *Teacher Education: the Role of Open and Distance Learning*. Vancouver: C.O.L.

Peters, O. (2010). *Distance Education in Transition: Developments and Issues (5th Ed.)*. Oldenburg: BIS.

Peterson, S. S. (2012). An Analysis of Discourses of Writing and Writing Instruction in Curricula Across Canada. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 42(2), 260-284.

Phillips, J. K. (1991). Upgrading the Target Language Proficiency Levels of Foreign Language Teachers. *ERIC Digest*.

Phillips, J.A. (2007). *Writing Self-Instructional Materials for Distance Learners: An Introspective Study.* A paper presented at the 21st Asian Association of Open Universities (AAOU) Annual Conference, Kuala Lumpur, 29-31 October 2007.

Pierrakeas, C; Xenos, M. & and Pintelas, P. (2003). Evaluating and Improving Educational Material and Tutoring Aspects of Distance Learning Systems. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 29, 335-349.

Pithers, R. T., & Soden, R. (2000). Critical thinking in education: A review. *Educational Research*, 42(3), 237-249.

Pittaway, D.A. (2004). Investment and second language acquisition. *Critical Enquiry*, 1(4), 203-18.

Player-Koro, C. (2009). *How do different modalities of pedagogical practices within teacher education shape student teachers? An empirical study of secondary mathematics teacher education*. Retrieved from http://bada.hb.se/bitstream/2320/5900/1/Paper_CPK.pdf, on 27 March 2014.

Postle, G. and Tyler, M.A. (2010).Learning and Teaching Strategies and Practices in Teacher Education through Open and Distance Learning. In P. A. Danaher and A. Umar (Eds). *Teacher Education through Open and Distance Learning* (pp. 61-74). Vancouver: Commonwealth of Learning.

Race, P. (1992). *53 Interesting Ways to Write Open Learning Materials*. Bristol: Technical and Educational Services Ltd.

Rahman, M.H. (2006). Developing Course Materials for Open and Distance Learning: BOU Perspective. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education-TOJDE,* 7(4), Article 4.

Ralfe, E. (2009). From the Creative to the Transactional and everything in-between: Teaching Writing. In A. Ferreira (Ed), *Teaching Language*, (pp. 148-176). Northlands: Macmillan South Africa.

Raymond, E. (2000). Cognitive Characteristics. In E. Raymond (Ed), *Learners with Mild Disabilities* (pp. 169-201). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon, A Pearson Education Company.

Reed, Y. (2005). Using students as informants in redesigning distance learning materials: possibilities and constraints. *Open Learning,* 20(3), 265-275.

Reed, Y. (2010). *Mediating Knowledge and Constituting Subjectivities in Distance Education Materials for Language Teachers in South Africa.* Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

Reid, E.S. (2009). Teaching Writing Teachers Writing: Difficulty, Exploration, and Critical Reflection. *College Composition and Communication*, 61(2), 197-221.

Reinders, H. and Lewis, M. (2006). An evaluative checklist for self-access materials. *ELT Journal*, 60(3), 272-278.

Ricci, C.M. & Beal, C. R. (1998). Effect of Questioning Techniques and Interview Setting on Young Children's Eyewitness Memory. *Expert Evidence*, 6, 127-144.

Richard, P. & Elder, L. (2002). *Critical thinking: tools for taking charge of your professional and personal life.* New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.

Richard, W. P. (1993) (Ed). *Critical Thinking: What Every Person Needs to Survive in a Rapidly Changing World*. Rohnert Park, California: Center for Critical Thinking and Moral Critique

Richards, J. C. (1990). The Dilemma of Teacher Education in Second Language Teaching. In J. C . Richards & D. Nunan (Eds). *Second Language Teacher Education* (pp. 3-15). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J.C. (1991). Content Knowledge and instructional practices in second language teacher education. In J. E. Alatis (Ed), *Linguistic and Language Pedagogy: the State of the Art* (pp. 76-99). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Richards, K. (1995). Direction and Debate in Distance materials for Teacher Development. In R. Howardand I. McGrath (Eds), *Distance Education for Language Teachers: a UK perspective* (pp. 35-48). Adelaide: Multilingual Matters

Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. (2008). Second language teacher education today. *RELC Journal,* 39(2), 158-177.

Richards, J. C. & Nunan, D. (Eds) (1990). *Second Language Teacher Education.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. and Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching, Second Edition.* Cambridge University Press

Roberts, D. (2004). *Learner Support In South African Distance Education: A Case For Action.* Paper presented at a Commonwealth of Learning Conference, New Zealand: C.O.L

Robertson, M., Fluck, A. and Webb, I. (2003). Children, on-line learning and authentic teaching skills in primary education. *Australian Association for Research in Education Conference Proceedings*, pp. 1-15.

Robinson, B. and Latchem, C. (2003). Open and Distance Teacher Education: Uses and Models. In B. Robinson and C. Latchem (Eds). *Teacher Education Through Open and Distance Learning* (pp. 28-47). London and New York: Routledge, Falmer.

Rowntree, D. (1986). *Teaching Through Self-Instruction: A practical handbook for course developers*. London: Kogan Page.

Rowntree, D. (1990). *Teaching through Self-Instruction: How to Develop Open Learning Materials.* London: Kogan Page

Rowntree, D. (1992). *Exploring Open and Distance Learning*. London: Kogan Page Limited

Rowntree, D. (1994). *Preparing Materials for Open, Distance and Flexible Learning*. London: Kogan Page Limited.

Rumble, G. (2003). *Sub-Saharan Africa Multi-Country Assessment of the Use of Distance Education and Information and Communication Technologies in Education: Rwanda.* Joint International Council of Distance Education/World Bank.

Rutebuka, J. (n.d). *TESSA and Kigali Institute of Education, Rwanda*. Retrieved from http://www.tessafrica.net/files/tessafrica/TESSA_case_study_5_KIE_final.pdf on 1 July 2013.

Rutherford, W. (1988). "Aspects of Pedagogical Grammar". In W. Rutherford and M. S. Smith (Eds). *Grammar and Second Language Teaching: A Book of Readings* (pp. 171-185). Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Rwanda Ministry of Education (1999). *A survey on the secondary school teachers' profile.* Kigali: MINEDUC.

Rwanda National Curriculum Development Centre (1998). *Ordinary Level English Programme for Anglophone*. Kigali.

Ryle, G. (1945). Knowing How and Knowing That: The Presidential Address. Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society. *New Series*, 46, 1-16.

Moll, I. (2003). *What is a Learning-Centred Learning Centre?* Johannesburg: SAIDE.

Sapir, E. (1921). *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and company

Savignon. S. J. (1983). *Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice: Texts and Contexts in Second Language Learning.* Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Sayer, B. (n.d.). *Designing Distance Education Materials: Workshop materials*. University of London, Centre for Distance Education.

Scheckle, E. (2009). Communicative Language Teaching: Learning Language through meaningful interaction. In A. Ferreira (Ed), *Teaching Language*, (pp. 86-101). Northlands: Macmillan South Africa.

Schwartz, D.L. et al. (2009). Constructivism in an Age of Non Constructivist Assessments. In S. Tobias, and T.M. Duffy (Eds). *Constructivist Instruction: Success or Failure?* (pp. 34-61). New York: Routledge.

Schweisfurth, M (2011). Learner-centred education in developing country contexts: From solution to problem? *International Journal of Educational Development,* 31, 425–432

Seidlhofer, B. **(**2005). 'English as a lingua franca'. *ELT Journal,* 59(4), 339-341.

Seligmann, J. (2011). *Academic Literacy for Education Students*. Oxford University Press: Southern Africa.

Shabani, J. and Okebukola, P. (Eds) (2001). *Guide to the Development of materials for Distance Education.* Ibadan: Olu Akin Printing

Sharma, P. and Williams, S. (1988). Language Acquisition by Distance Education: an Australian Survey. Distance Education, 9(1), 127-146.

Sharma, H.L. (2000). Development of self-instructional materials in educational statistics for M. Ed. Programmes through distance mode. *Journal of Distance Education,* 7(1), 1-29.

Shay, S. (2013). Conceptualizing curriculum differentiation in higher education: a sociology of knowledge point of view. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 34(4), 563-582.

Shulman, L. 1986. Those who understand: knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4-14.

Shulman, L. 1987. 'Knowledge-base and teaching: foundations of the new reform.' *Harvard Educational Review,* 57(1), 1-22.

Sibomana, E. (2010). *Challenges faced by postgraduate French speaking students who are learning in English: a case study of Rwandan students in the School of Education at the University of the Witwatersrand.* Unpublished MA Research Report, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

Silverman, F. (2004). *Self-publishing Textbooks and Instructional Materials: A Practical Guide To Successful and Respectable Self-Publishing*. Gloucester: Atlantic Path Publishing.

Siminyu, S.N. & Kisiki, B.G. (n.d.). *Developing Study Materials for Distance Education: a manual for training distance education writers*. Institute of Adult & Continuing Education, Makerere University. http://www.distance.mak.ac.ug/downloads/writer_note.pdf, accessed on 10 May 2011.

Singh, P. (1997). Review Essay: Basil Bernstein (1996). *Pedagogic, Symbolic Control and Identity*. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 18(1), 119-124.

Singh, P. (2002). Pedagogising Knowledge: Bernstein's theory of the pedagogic device, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 23(4), 571-582.

Singh, P. and Harris, J. (2010). Pedagogic Translations: Dominant Pedagogic Modes and Teacher Professional Identity. In P. Singh, A. Sadovnik and S. Semel, (Eds). *Toolkits, Translation Devices, Conceptual Tyrannies : Essays on Basil Bernstein's Sociology of Knowledge* (pp. 249-266). New York: Peter Lang.

Smita, A. and Mujumdar M.A (2010). Teaching English Language and Literature in Non-Native Contexts. *Language in India*, 6, 210-216.

Soled, S.W. (1995). A*ssessment, Testing and Evaluation in Teacher Education*. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Solis, A. (2009). Pedagogical Content Knowledge: What matters most in the professional learning content teachers in classrooms with diverse student populations. *IDRA Newsletter*.

Spolsky, B. (1998). *Conditions for Second Language Learning: Introduction to a General Theory.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Stokes, S. (2001). Visual Literacy in Teaching and Learning: A Literature Perspective. *Electronic Journal for the Integration of Technology in Education*, 1(1), 10-19.

Swales, C. (2000). *Editing Distance Education Materials*. Vancouver, BC: Commonwealth of Learning.

Tabulawa, R. (1997). Pedagogical Classroom Practice and the Social Context: the Case of Botswana. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 17 (2), 189-204.

Tangpermpoon, T. (2008). Integrated Approaches to Improve Students' Writing Skills for English Major Students. *ABAC Journal*, 28(2), 1-9

Taylor, J.C. (2001). "Fifth *Generation Distance Education*." Keynote address presented at the 20th ICDE World Conference, April 1–5, 2001.

Tenenbaum, G. et al. (2001). Constructivist pedagogy in conventional on- campus and distance learning practice: an exploratory investigation. *Learning and Instruction,* 11, 87–111.

Thompson, G. (1996). Some misconceptions about communicative language teaching. *ELT Journa*l, 50(1), 9-15.

Tongco, M., 2007. 2007. Purposive Sampling as a Tool for Informant Selection, *Ethnobotany Research & Applications*, 5, 147-158.

Tsai, C. (2001). A Review and Discussion of Epistemological Commitments, Metacognition, and Critical Thinking with Suggestions on Their Enhancement in Internet-Assisted Chemistry Classrooms. *Journal of Chemical Education,* 78(7), 970-974.

Tulley, C.E (2013).What are Preservice Teachers Taught About the Teaching of Writing: A Survey of Ohio's Undergraduate Writing Methods Course. *Teaching/Writing: The Journal of Writing Teacher Education Winter/Spring*, 2(1), 38-49.

Turner-Bisset, R. (1999). The Knowledge Bases of the Expert Teacher. *British Educational Research Journal*, 25(1), 39-55.

Turuk, M.C. (2008). The Relevance and Implication of Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory in the Language Classroom. *ARECLS*, 5, 244-262.

Twiselton, S. (2002). *Beyond the curriculum - learning to teach primary literacy: How do the beliefs, values and understandings that student teachers hold impact on their understanding of the National Literacy Strategy and their teaching of English?* Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the British Educational Research Association, University of Exeter, England, 12-14 September 2002

UNESCO (2001). *Teacher Education Through Distance Learning: Technology-Curriculum - Cost – Evaluation.* Summary of Case tudies: Brazil, Burkina Faso, Chile, China, India, Mongolia, Nigeria, South Africa (two studies), United Kingdom.

University of Fort Hare Distance Education Project. (2000). *Language, Literacy and Communication Umthamo 4.* University of Fort Hare.

University of Fort Hare Distance Education Project. (1998). Language*, Literacy and Communication Umthamo 1.* University of Fort Hare.

Valencia, J.A.A. (2009). An exploration of Colombian EFL teachers' knowledge base through teachers' reflection. *Linguagem & Ensino, Pelotas,* 12(1), 73-108.

van der Mescht, C. (2004). Creating a relationship: A discourse analysis focusing on the construction of identities and relationships in distance education materials for a teacher upgrade programme. Unpublished master's research report, Rhodes University, Grahamstown.

Vrasidas, C. (2000). Constructivism versus objectivism: Implications for interaction, course design, and evaluation in distance education. *International Journal of Educational Telecommunications*, 6(4), 339-362.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in Society*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wagner, R.H. (2002). *Knowing, Learning, and Teaching*. Retrieved online from http://hw.webhost.utexas.edu/papers/klt.pdf, on 10 February 2014.

Walsh, M. (2006). The 'textual shift': Examining the reading process with print, visual and multimodal texts. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy,* 29(1), 24–37.

Wang, Y. & Sun, C. (2001). Internet-Based Real Time Language Education: Towards a Fourth Generation Distance Education. *CALICO Journal*, 18(3), 539-561.

Wang, F. (2010). The Necessity of Grammar Teaching. *English Language Teaching,* 3(2), 78-81.

Warren, H. (2004) *Engineering Subject Centre Guide: Learning and Teaching Theory for Engineering Academics. Loughborough*: HEA Engineering Subject Centre.

Washer, B. A. & Wright, M. D. (2004). *Effective curriculum and instruction for career education.* Warrensburg, MO: Central Missouri State University, Missouri Center for Career Education.

Watts, M. (1997). A Case for Critical Constructivism and Critical thinking in Science Education. *Research in Science Education,* 27(2), 309-322.

Welch, T. and Glennie, J. (2005). An Overview of Quality Assurance in Distance Education in South Africa. In T. Welch, and Y. Reed (Eds). *Designing and Delivering Distance Education: Quality Criteria and Case Studies from South Africa* (pp. 5-17). South Africa: NADEOSA.

Wessels, J. S. (2001). Assessing Learning Materials for Distance Education: a case study. *Politeia,* 20(3), 34-60.

Wessels, M. (2010). *Practical Guide to Facilitating Language Learning* (3rd Ed). Cape Town: Oxford University Press Southern Africa.

Wheelahan, L. (2010a). The Structure of Pedagogic Discourse as a Relay for Power: the Case of Competency-based Training. In P. Singh, A. Sadovnik & S. Semel (Eds), *Toolkits, Translation Devices, Conceptual Tyrannies: Essays on Basil Bernstein's Sociology of Knowledge* (pp. 125-137). New York: Peter Lang

Wheelahan, L. (2010b). *Why Knowledge Matters in Curriculum: a Social Realist Argument.* London/New York: Routledge.

White, C. (2003). *Language Learning in Distance Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

White, C. (2004). Independent Language Learning in Distance Education: Current Issues. *Proceedings of the Independent Learning Conference 2003*, Published in 2004.

White, C. (2005). Towards Learner-Based Theory of Distance Language Learning: The Concept of the Learner-Context Interface. In B. Holmberg et al. (Eds). *Distance Education and Languages: Evolution and Change,* (pp. 55-71). Clevedon, New York, Ontario: Multilingual Matters.

Williams, M. and Burden, R. (2007). *Psychology for Language Teachers: A Social Constructivist Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Winch, C. (2013). Curriculum Design and Epistemic Access. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 47(1), 129-146.

Woodley, A. (1998) 'Programme Evaluation at the British Open University'. In H. Rathore & R. Schuemer (Eds.) *Evaluation Concepts and Practices in Selected Distance Education Institutions.* ZIFF Papiere 108.
Retrieved from http://www.fernuniver-hagende/ZIFF/108cont.htm on 01 October 2014.

Wright, W., Jeffs, C. & Wood, J. (1995). *Distance Education: Must it be 'Out of sight, out of mind' education?* ASCILITE Conference, University of Melbourne, Australia.

Yilmaz, I. and Yalcin, N. (2012). The Relationship of Procedural and Declarative Knowledge of Science Teacher Candidates in Newton's Laws of Motion to Understanding. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 2(3), 50-56.

Young, M.F.D. (2010). *Keynote Introductory Lecture to a meeting of the Goethe Project.* University of Tubingen, 29 January.

Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The Process of Discovering Meaning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16(2), 195-209).

Zarei, G.R. (2008). The effect of constructivist language teaching/learning on Students' conceptions of L2 reading. *Iranian Journal of Language Studies (IJLS)*, 2(2), 281-298.

Web sites

http://everydaylife.globalpost.com/topdown-reading-model-theory-13028.html

http://www.oerafrica.org

http://www.primature.gov.rw/

http://www.tessafrica.net/

Appendices

Appendix 1: Information letter to the teacher-learner

Dear DTP student,

My name is Emmanuel Sibomana, and I am a student at the University of the Witwatersrand in Johannesburg. For the completion of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy for which I registered in 2010, I am required to conduct research and write a thesis. My research is about *the role of distance education materials in addressing the professional development needs of high school English teachers in Rwanda.* More specifically, I aim to analyze the materials produced by KIE to investigate teacher-learners' experience in using them and to investigate the extent to which the content of these materials is aligned with the Rwandan high school O'Level curriculum and examinations. I will attempt to answer the following questions:

1. Which content is selected for KIE DE materials for English teachers?
2. To what extent is this content aligned with the Rwandan high school O'Level curriculum and examinations?
3. How is this content mediated on the page?

To achieve this, in addition to textual and content analysis of selected KIE distance education materials for English, I would like to re-design some parts of these materials and have some teacher-learners in the programme use and reflect on these redesigned sections in comparison to the same sections in KIE DTP original materials.

My fourth research question is "How do teacher-learners respond to KIE DE materials and to redesigned versions of sections of these materials?" I hope to have a 30-60 minute interview with you about your experiences with these two 'sets' of materials. Participation is voluntary and no person will be advantaged or disadvantaged in any way for choosing to participate or not participate in the study. No information that could identify you will be included in the research report. Interview materials (tapes and transcripts) will not be seen and/or heard by any person other than my research supervisor and myself. In the interview, you may refuse to answer any questions you would prefer not to, and you may choose to withdraw from the study at any point. Please complete the enclosed consent form if you are willing to assist me with this research:

1. by participating in an individual interview with me at a time that is convenient to you;
2. By allowing the interview to be tape-recorded for later transcription and use in research report with confidentiality assured;

Your participation in this study will be highly appreciated. It is anticipated that this research will inform policy about the improvement of the materials that are used to teach English at a distance in Rwanda, which may contribute to the improvement of the teaching of English and the status of this language in Rwanda.

Yours sincerely,

Emmanuel Sibomana

Appendix 2: Interview consent form (for teacher-learners)

I hereby agree to participate in an interview with Emmanuel Sibomana. I understand that:

- He will be inquiring about the role of distance education materials in addressing the professional development needs of high school English teachers in Rwanda.
- Participation in this interview is voluntary.
- I may refuse to answer any questions I would prefer not to.
- I may withdraw from the study any time.
- No information that may identify me will be included in the research report, and my responses will remain confidential.

Signed: _____ Date: _____

Tape recording consent form (for teacher learners)

I _____ consent to my interview with Emmanuel Sibomana for his study on *The role of distance education materials in addressing the professional development needs of high school English teachers in Rwanda* being recorded. I understand that:

- The tapes and transcripts will not be seen or heard by any person other than his supervisor at any time, and will only be processed by the researcher.
- All tape recordings will be destroyed five years after the research is complete.
- No identifying information will be used in the transcripts or the research report.

Signed: _____ Date _____

Appendix 3: Guide questions for interviews with teacher-learners

1. Which parts of KIE DTP modules have you found most useful? Please give reasons for your answer.

2. Which parts of KIE DTP modules have you found least useful? Please give reasons for your answer.

3. Is there any content/information that you expected to study that was not included in KIE DTP modules for English? If so, briefly describe this content/information and suggest why it should have been included.

4. Is there any content/information that you think should have been left out of your materials? If so, briefly describe this content/information and explain why you think it is not relevant to you as a teacher of English to O'level classes.

5. Have you noticed any difference between the content (information) in the modules designed by KIE lecturers and the section that I have redesigned for you? If you have, could you explain these to me?

6. If you prefer one set of materials, which one do you prefer? Please give reasons for your answer.

7. Which difference have you noted between the activities in the sections from the KIE DTP modules and the section that I have redesigned?

8. Please comment on the design and the presentation of the content on the page (appearance) in the KIE DTP materials in the redesigned section.

9. Have you noticed any difference between the feedback in KIE DTP modules and the section that I have redesigned? If yes, what?

10. Which of the two sets of materials you find more helpful in terms of showing you how to teach writing? Please give reasons for your answer.

11. Could you please comment on the language use in the two sets of materials?

12. What is your opinion on the activities in the section that I have given you?

13. I the section that I have redesigned, you were frequently required to ‘stop and think’ and to do some ‘activities’. Did you do what these were asking you to do? If you did, what is your response to these activities?

14. Could you tell me what you have learnt from the redesigned section?

15. Now that you are about to complete the KIE DE programme, please describe how it has benefited you as a teacher of English.

16. If you have any further comments to make or any questions that you would like to ask me, I would be pleased to hear these.

Thank you for your time and cooperation

Appendix 4: The redesigned section

Becoming a teacher of writing

Before you begin this section, please note the icons which are used in it. These are as follows:



Stop and think

This icon signals something that you need to think about in order to get more insights in the content that you have read and to understand the content that comes next.



Activity

This icon signals an activity that you are required to do before moving to the next section. Like the thinking, the answers that you provide for the activity questions should help you to understand what comes next. Therefore, it is important to attempt all the activities before proceeding to the sections that follow them.

Below the icon and the instructions next to it there is an empty space for you to write your answers or your thoughts. Please make use of this space.

Introduction

This section takes you through a process that you can use to teach writing. It focuses on the writing stages that writers should go through before they produce the final version of their text. Therefore, by the end of this section you should be able to:

- Reflect on the importance of writing in your life and in that of your pupils
- Select topics that pupils are likely to find interesting and relevant
- Help your pupils understand the topic
- Help pupils to find information and ideas (content) for their topics
- Help pupils to plan their essays
- Teach pupils how to organize their content in paragraphs
- Help pupils revise and proofread their essays

1. Why is writing important?

It is likely that you, your students and other members of your community do some kind of writing activities in your daily lives. Most of us write for different purposes and in different situations.



Activity 1

- ***Make a list of all the different kinds of writing that you do and that other people (children and adults) in your community do.***

- ***Now, complete the following sentence***

Writing is important because …

Feedback

Writing is very important in the daily lives of many people. Many kinds of communication are done in writing: notes to family members, teachers' notes on the chalkboard, letters, emails, job applications, reports, announcements, etc. In a school context, it is through writing that pupils demonstrate much of their understanding of the knowledge they acquire. Therefore, pupils who can write well tend to do well in all school subjects (Ralfe, 2009). All teachers have a responsibility to teach pupils to write, but this is particularly the responsibility of language teachers.

In spite of the importance of writing, research on what teachers do in classrooms shows that they spend less time teaching writing than they spend teaching reading, speaking, listening, grammar and vocabulary.



Stop and think

Think about the English lessons that you have taught during the last two weeks. How much time did you give to teaching writing? How much time to listening, speaking, reading, grammar and vocabulary? What does this tell you about the attention that you give to writing?

Stages in the writing process

Writers go through a number of stages in order to produce their final texts. These stages are:

- pre-writing,
- drafting,
- revising,
- proofreading, and
- publishing (Ralfe, 2009).

The argumentative essay will be used to illustrate these stages because it is always one of the options offered to pupils in the section on composition of the O'Level national examinations for English in Rwanda. An argumentative essay is an essay in which the writer argues for or against a topic about which people have differing views.

Imagine that you wish to write an argumentative essay. You should clearly take your stand and write as if you were trying to persuade readers to accept your argument. In other words, your aim as a writer is to bring the reader(s) to see things as you do and you need to do this by supporting your position with reasons, evidence and examples.

On the next page there is an example of an argumentative essay, adapted from Clarence-Fincham et al. (2002). It has been annotated (commented on) to show you how it is structured.

The purpose of the essay:
To state a point of view and to support or justify it.

<u>Stages of the essay (Structure)</u>

Introduction
It gives background information about the topic, followed by a statement of the writer's point of view on the topic. It allows the reader to predict what is going to follow in the essay.

Development of argument
It provides claims, reasons or evidence in support of the point of view in the introduction. Each claim, reason or piece of evidence signals what the paragraph is going to be about.

Conclusion
It sums up (summarizes) the arguments used and links them to the writer's point of view. Sometimes the point of view is repeated.

There are many ideas about what makes a good teacher. Is a good teacher one who controls everything or one who encourages independent thinking? In this essay, I will argue that good teachers are the ones who encourage learners to be independent thinkers.

Firstly, education should prepare learners for certain roles in society, where they will have to make decisions on their own. Therefore, good teachers are those who encourage learners to express and defend their opinions in classrooms through discussions and debates. Such activities are likely to promote active learning and increase learners' self-confidence both in the classroom and in their everyday lives.

Secondly, education should aim to produce self-reliant citizens who can think for themselves. Thus, good teachers are those who promote problem-solving and critical thinking abilities. In fact, they are teachers who encourage learners to reflect on and question everything before deciding on whether it is true or false. This means that they encourage thinking rather than memorizing.

To conclude, a good teacher is one who encourages learners to be critical thinkers by allowing them to be active participants in problem-solving activities.

<u>Language features</u>: Linking words
In this essay, linking words include *'Therefore'*, *'Thus' in fact*, which indicate reasons and *firstly* and *secondly* which indicate the

2. Selecting a topic for or with your pupils



Stop and think

What do you think teachers should consider when they select writing topics for their pupils?

Feedback

The teacher can either choose a topic for pupils, with his or her pupils, or let pupils choose their own. The topic should interest pupils and they should have, or be able to find, enough information about it so that they do not get "stuck" because they lack ideas to write about. Preferably, it should be about something that relates to their lives, experiences, interests and abilities. Otherwise, students may lose motivation and enthusiasm for writing and, consequently, their writing performance is likely to be affected as well.

Here are two examples of topics with a connection to pupils' lives at school:

1. Write a composition arguing for or against the following statement: "*It is better to study in a boarding school than in a day school*";

2. *High school pupils should be allowed to use cell phones at school*. Write an essay in which you agree or disagree with this statement.

The following are examples which may relate to pupils' out of school lives:

1. *The Urunana soap opera has many important lessons for Rwandan youth. Write an essay in which you argue for or against this statement.*

2. *Boys are more responsible for teenage pregnancies than girls. Write an argumentative essay for or against this statement.*



Activity 2

Write the topics for two argumentative essays, one on a topic with a connection to schooling and the other with a connection to teenagers' out of school interests and lives.

3. Helping pupils to understand the topic

**Activity 3**

How would you help your pupils understand the topic about 'studying in a boarding school or in a day school'?

Feedback

One way to help pupils to understand the topic is to show them how to identify two important types of words in an essay topic: ***topic words*** *and* ***task words****.* ***Topic words*** *tell writers what the topic is about or what the content of the essay will be about.* ***Task words****, on the other hand, tell writers what to do with the content. In the topic about 'a boarding and a day school', the topic words are '****boarding school****' and '****day school****'. The task words are '****write****' and '****argue****'. You need to help pupils understand these, by asking them to explain them. If necessary, rephrase, correct or complete their answers.*

Once pupils know what they have to do, they need to think about the topic statement and decide whether they agree or disagree with it. This is how they decide on their opinion. The sentence that expresses this opinion is called a thesis statement; it provides the focus for the essay. It tells the reader what the essay is going to be about and the position taken on the topic by the writer. Remember that it doesn't matter which position pupils take; what matters is how they explain, support and illustrate their position with evidence and examples. After deciding what to do with the topic, the next thing is to help them with the activities in the first step of the writing process: **pre-writing**.

3. finding information and ideas for a topic

Stage 1: Pre-writing

Prewriting is the first stage of the writing process; it includes all the things a writer does before he or she is ready to write out the first version of the text. It is an information gathering stage, in which writers collect ideas for the text that they will write. It is a very important step in the writing process because without ideas, there is nothing to write about.


The following are some of the strategies that teachers can use with pupils to help them to gather ideas and information for an essay:

- **Brainstorming**: Pupils must write down as quickly as possible everything that comes into their head about a particular topic. After the brainstorming they go over the list of points and decide which to use in their writing and in which order.

- **Freewriting**: When using this technique, pupils write for a specific period of time (usually 2 to 5 minutes) without taking their pen or pencil off the page. For pupils for whom English is a second language such as those in Rwandan high schools, this technique works best if you, as a teacher, provide an opening clause or sentence for the students to start with (Kroll, 2009). The advantage of free writing is that because there are no rules and no concern with the correctness of language, pupils have no excuse not to write (Ralfe, 2009).

- **Clustering**: This begins with a key word or central idea placed in the centre of the page (or the blackboard) around which pupils write down all their ideas associated with the topic using individual words or short phrases. This is different from a list because the words or phrases are in a pattern which shows connections between the ideas. Clustering can take the form of a diagram or a mind map.

Here is an example of a cluster on a boarding school:



In this section, we will use brainstorming, which is one of the three strategies suggested on the previous page.



Activity 4

How can you help your pupils brainstorm ideas to argue for or against the following statement: "It is better to study in a boarding school than in a day school"?

Feedback: **Here is one suggestion about how ideas on the above topic can be brainstormed**

Ask pupils to draw a vertical line down the middle of a piece of paper and to write the words 'A boarding school' as a heading for the left hand column and 'A day school' for the column on the right. Ask them to write everything that they can think of about 'A boarding school' and about 'A day school' in the respective columns. They should just write without worrying too much about the relevance of their ideas or the correctness of the language they use. Some of their ideas are likely to include the following:

A boarding school	**A day school**
Eating and sleeping at school, more opportunities and time to study and socialize with other pupils, appropriate learning facilities (computers, electricity, etc.), serious regulations and supervision by school staff, separation from the family, expensive.	Daily walk to and from school, less time to study and socialize with other pupils, more time with one's family, less supervision, doing home chores after school, study on one's own after school.

Now, ask pupils to re-examine the ideas that they have written to check whether they are relevant to the topic. Only relevant ideas should be kept and used in writing the essay. Then they should classify (arrange) the ideas on each type of school into two categories (advantages and disadvantages), putting each idea into the category to which it belongs. This will help them in the drafting phase. Normally, pupils should list more ideas in favour of the position that they wish to support. For instance, if they wish to argue that studying in a boarding school is better than studying in a day school, they should have more advantages and fewer disadvantages for a boarding school than for a day school.

The pupils' classification may look like this:

A boarding school	A day school
Advantages: More opportunities and time to study, eating and sleeping at school, less tiredness, more opportunities and time to socialize with other pupils, appropriate learning facilities (computers, electricity, etc.), serious regulations and supervision by school staff. **Disadvantages**: Separation from the family, it is expensive.	**Advantages**: More time with one's family, studying on one's own after school, it is cheap. **Disadvantages**: Daily travel to and from school, less time to study and socialize with other pupils, less supervision, doing home chores after school, lack of appropriate learning facilities, less motivation to study due to lack of supervision.

4. Planning the essay

Creating an outline

An outline is a general plan of the material that is to be presented in a text. In other words, an outline is a simplified list of the main ideas and sub-ideas, according to the order in which they will appear in the text.



Activity 5

How would you help pupils create an outline for their essays on the ideas brainstormed on the previous pages?

Feedback

Remember that people write an argument when they are trying to persuade other people to agree with their opinion. However, writers do more than just state their opinion. They must give good reasons for their opinion. The reasons are generated from the ideas which writers collect in the pre-writing phase. For example, if pupils were asked to identify reasons for their opinion from the list of disadvantages and advantages of boarding and day schools, they could include the following:

1. *There is more study time at a boarding school.*
2. *There are more opportunities and time to socialize with other pupils.*
3. *There are appropriate learning facilities (computers, electricity, etc.).*

4. *Studying on one's own is taken more seriously in a boarding school than in a day school.*

These four points are an outline for the essay.

5. Organizing content in paragraphs

Writing a first draft

This is the stage where writers put their ideas on paper, expanding on the points which are in the outline. Therefore, they need to keep an eye on their outline when drafting their texts. As you can see, by identifying reasons to support their argument, pupils will have already written an outline of their essays. Now, each of these reasons can be used as **a topic sentence** for a paragraph.

A **topic sentence** is a sentence that contains the main point in a paragraph. It is usually, but not always, the first sentence of the paragraph. An effective topic sentence typically contains only one main idea while the rest of the paragraph develops that idea more fully, offering supporting reasons and examples. It gives the reader an idea of the information in the rest of the paragraph.

During this stage, pupils do not need to worry about language features such as grammar and spelling, sentence structure, length of their text, etc. In fact, the purpose of the first draft is for them to focus on their ideas and get them onto paper without fear of making mistakes in grammar, capitalization, punctuation, or paragraph structure.

Ideally, pupils should write one paragraph about one reason. However, if the number of words is very limited, they can put two or three reasons in one paragraph. After writing the topic sentences, they should expand on them by grouping all their examples and smaller points in the paragraphs where they belong. Teachers should monitor pupils' paragraph writing based on the outline they have created. Pupils have to make sure that the sentences within their paragraphs link together. They should use linking words to do this.

The paragraphs developed from the outline on this page could look like the following:

Studying in a boarding school offers more study time than a day school. This is mainly because pupils eat and sleep at school and do not lose time walking to and from school. In addition, since the school prepares meals for pupils, they do not have to spend their time cooking for themselves or doing numerous home chores.

There are more opportunities and time to socialize with other pupils in a boarding school than in a day school. In fact, pupils spend more time together in a boarding

school than in a day school. They do almost everything together: eating, washing clothes, watching television, listening to radio, playing, and so on. This helps them to make friends and, therefore, pupils in a boarding school are likely to have more friends than those who attend a day school.

Access to appropriate learning facilities is easier than in a day school. For example, pupils can use computers and internet connection, chalkboards, and electricity after the normal class hours. These facilities are absent in many homes in Rwanda. Therefore, if a pupil does not have access to a computer at home, it will be difficult for him or her to develop digital skills.

Self-study at a boarding school is likely to be taken more seriously than at home. In fact, there are serious regulations and a regular and strict supervision of study by school authorities such as wardens or matrons. This can encourage even lazy pupils to study and achieve good grades. Moreover, motivation to learn is likely to be higher in a boarding school than in a day school. This is because seeing other people studying hard may encourage one to study even harder, leading to a better performance.



Stop and think

In each of the paragraphs above, the first sentence is the topic sentence. What do you notice about the relationship between the topic sentences and other sentences in the paragraph?

Feedback

You may have noticed that each sentence in a paragraph is related to and explains or supports the topic sentence of that paragraph. This is how ***coherence*** *within a paragraph is achieved.* ***Coherence*** *is the unifying element in good writing. It refers to the unity created between the ideas, sentences, paragraphs and sections of a piece of writing. It gives the reader a sense of what to expect. Therefore, it makes the reading easier to follow as the ideas appear to be presented in a natural and logical way.*

So far, this is what pupils have done. They have:

- decided on what their opinion/position is;
- written their opinion in the form of a sentence;
- collected ideas and decided on their main reasons for their opinion/position;
- written each reason as a topic sentence for a paragraph;

- grouped all their examples and smaller points in the paragraphs where they belong.

Making the essay coherent

**Stop and think**


Reread the four separate paragraphs you have just read as if they were one essay. Decide whether there are any links between them.

Feedback

The paragraphs have been written separately and there seems to be no link between them. Therefore, they need to be linked together by means of linking words/phrases (sometimes called logical connectors). The ***logical connectors*** *to use should be chosen to show the relationship that the writer wants to establish between paragraphs. For example, the following linking words/phrases would be placed at the beginning of each of the above paragraphs in this order:* ***firstly, in addition, another important advantage of a boarding school is that, finally.***

You will notice that the text is now **coherent** because of the linking words and phrases that have been added. The annotations on the following page illustrate this **coherence**. One paragraph has also been annotated to illustrate coherence within paragraphs.

Coherence between paragraphs **Coherence within paragraphs**



Firstly, studying in a boarding school offers more study time than a day school. This is mainly because pupils eat and sleep at school and do not lose time walking to and from school. In addition, since the school prepares meals for pupils, they do not have to spend their time cooking for themselves or doing numerous home chores.


In addition, there are more opportunities and time to socialize with other pupils in a boarding school than in a day school. In fact, pupils spend more time together in a boarding school than in a day school. They do almost everything together: eating, washing clothes, watching television, listening to radio, playing, and so on. This helps them to make friends and, therefore, pupils in a boarding school are likely to have more friends than those who attend a day school.

Another important advantage of a boarding school is that access to appropriate learning facilities is easier than in a day school. For example, pupils can use computers and internet connection, chalkboards, and electricity after the normal class hours. These facilities are absent in many homes in Rwanda. Therefore, if a pupil does not have access to a computer at home, it will be difficult for him or her to develop digital skills.

Finally, self-study at a boarding school is likely to be taken more seriously than at home. In fact, there are serious regulations and a regular and strict supervision of study by school authorities such as wardens or matrons. This can encourage even lazy pupils to study and achieve good grades. Moreover, motivation to learn is likely to be higher in a boarding school than in a day school. This is because seeing other people studying hard may encourage one to study even harder, leading to a better performance.


Now, pupils have paragraphs consisting of a topic sentence and explanations, details and examples that support what they wrote in the topic sentence. They should then think of and write an introduction and a conclusion that fit their argument. In this case, the introduction should introduce the topic and state the position or opinion while the conclusion should restate the main argument. Thus, the introduction and conclusion for the above paragraphs could look like the following:

Introduction



A boarding school is a school where pupils study and live during the school term. A day school is a school where pupils study during the day and return to their homes after class. In my view, studying in a boarding school is better than studying in a day school and, in this essay, I will provide reasons to support my point of view.

Conclusion



Given all the above reasons, one can conclude that studying in a boarding school is better than studying in a day school, in terms of both school performance and social life.

5. Revision and proofreading

Stage 3: Revision

For effective revision, Ralfe (2009) advises teachers to encourage pupils to write on every second line when they write their draft. This gives them space to add revisions and changes without necessarily re-writing the whole text. In this phase, the writer reads his or her own text, examining it critically, removing and/or adding things, replacing one word with another that says more precisely what he or she means (Ralfe, 2009), changing the order of sentences or paragraphs, eliminating repetitions, etc. In short, this is a phase aimed at improving the draft. The guiding question should be '*does this sentence/paragraph/text say what I want to communicate to the reader?*

Good revision is done with someone else. In fact, it is not easy for someone to notice mistakes in their own writing. Therefore, you could ask pupils to exchange their texts after they have done their own revisions so that they can comment on each other's texts. When writing alone, pupils should be encouraged to read their drafts as many times as possible, trying their best to be as objective as possible.

Stage 4: Proofreading

This stage of writing is also important since it is where language issues are attended to so that the essay communicates the writer's intended message clearly. Therefore, teachers should encourage pupils to re-read their texts in order to check their grammar, punctuation, spelling, etc. When they proofread, pupils need to slow down their reading, allowing their eye to focus on every word, and every phrase of their essay. Reading aloud can help them to do this. A teacher needs to guide pupils because they may not be able to notice and to fix their errors by themselves. Ralfe (2009) suggests that teachers should identify the errors that are widespread and persistent and make them a focus of language lessons as such widespread errors indicate that many pupils have difficulties in these areas.

Stage 5: Publication



Stop and think

After pupils have written their essays and you have assessed them, what do you think pupils should do with them?

Feedback

This question may not be easy to answer, but you, as a teacher, should be aware that writing deserves a wider audience than just the teacher. Pupils may not be motivated to write if, in the end, they have to keep their texts to themselves. This is especially the case when pupils have invested a lot of effort in writing their essays. Making the text available to a wider audience has many benefits: "it affirms and motivates young writers, gives them an authentic [real] reason to write and persuades them to follow the process as they want good quality work circulated and attributed to them" (Ralfe, 2009, p.159).

Publications can take different forms depending on the means available. According to Ralfe (2009), the easiest is to create a writing wall in the classroom on which completed pieces are posted to be read. You can also put the essays together in the form of a booklet or a class magazine. If you have a school magazine, you can choose your pupils' best essays to be published in it. This can motivate pupils to write well as they are likely to want their essays to be published.



Activity 6

What other forms of publication could you use to publish your pupils' essays?

Points of reflection

The steps/stages on these pages have taken you through a process of assisting pupils to write in a particular genre which is part of the O'Level national examination for English. However, it is not possible to take pupils through all these steps in one lesson. These steps need to be covered over several lessons at different intervals. This gives pupils time to think about the activities in the writing process. Some activities can be part of homework so that pupils can do them in their free time. In addition, the process of writing does not move in a straight line, moving from pre-writing to publication. It is a recursive activity (it goes back and forth) in which the writer moves backwards and forwards between drafting and revising, with stages of re-planning in between (Hedge, 1993). For example, writers may return to pre-writing activities after doing some revising or proofreading.


When responding to pupils' writing, your aim should be to develop their understanding. In other words, your feedback should focus on how pupils can improve their writing. You should not simply underline mistakes and award a mark. Rather, you should comment on the text pointing out its strengths and weaknesses in a constructive way, and suggest what pupils should do to address any weaknesses. In addition, you should not wait until the end of the writing process to respond to pupils' writing. Instead you can do this as they write. For instance, you can look at how they have gathered the information, how they have designed outlines, how they are linking their ideas, etc.

The next pages illustrate a simplified series of lesson plans for the teaching of an argumentative essay arguing for the following statement: "*High school pupils should be allowed to use cell phones at school.*"

Aim of the lessons: To teach pupils how to write an argumentative essay

Topics to teach	Time	Teacher's activities	Pupils' activities
Lesson 1: Pre-writing ***Introduction*** ***Understand the topic*** ***Information gathering***	50min 5 min 15min 30min	-Ask learners questions about modern means of communication found in their community. -Ask pupils to identify and define key words. -Ask pupils to explain what is expected from them. -Ask pupils to choose one information gathering strategy among the three described in this material (brainstorming, freewriting and clustering). -Ask pupils to use the chosen strategy to generate as much information as they can in relation to the topic. -Help pupils refine their ideas and stimulate their thinking.	-Identify the modern means of communication found in their community, which include cell phones. -Identify and define cell phones as a key word and describe their importance. -Explain the task that they are expected to accomplish, which is to argue for the statement. -Pupils choose the strategy to use to find information for their essay. -Pupils generate information using their own strategy. Some of this information may include the use of cell phones for communication with parents, caretakers, drivers, etc. for learning purposes (searching the information from internet, for digital literacy development, etc), for safety reasons, for general communication.
Lesson 2: Drafting ***Introduction*** ***Creating an outline*** ***Writing the first draft***	100 min 5min 15min 80min	-Ask pupils to re-read the information gathered on the topic. -Ask pupils to select the strongest and most relevant points from the information gathered. -Ask pupils to express each point in one sentence and to put the sentences in a logical order. -Ask pupils to find reasons and examples to support the	-Re-read the information gathered on the topic. -Go through the gathered information and select the strongest and most relevant points. -Express these points in one complete sentence each and put them in a logical order. - Find reasons and examples to support the points that they have identified.

		points that they have identified. -Ask pupils to expand on the above points using these reasons and examples. -Ask pupils to use linking words between their sentences and between their paragraphs so that their essays are coherent.	-Expand on each of the above points using these reasons and examples. They should write these in the form of paragraphs and should write on every second line. -Use linking words to achieve coherence within and between paragraphs.
Lesson 3: Finalizing writing ***Introduction*** ***Writing introductions and conclusions*** ***Revision and proofreading***	50min 10min 20min 20min	-Ask pupils to restate their main arguments to the class. -Ask learners to re-read their essays and think of how they will introduce and conclude them. -Ask pupils to draft introductions and conclusions for their essays. -Ask learners to read their essays, checking whether the sentences, paragraphs and the whole essay mean what they intended to tell the readers. -Ask pupils to exchange and revise each other's essays. -Ask pupils to look at their colleagues' observations and make changes on their essay if necessary.	-Restate their main arguments to the class. -Read their essays carefully and thoughtfully, thinking about how they will introduce and conclude them. -Draft introductions and conclusions for their essays. -Read the essays to check whether these mean what the pupils intended to say. They should make comments, observations and corrections where necessary. -Revise each other's essays. -Look at their colleagues' observations and revise their essays accordingly.
Teacher's evaluation of the essay			



Activity 7

In this section we have focused on how to write an argumentative essay. Now, using the above example, choose one of the following descriptive essay topics and plan a series of lessons to take your pupils through the writing process as has been illustrated in this material. These topics are from the 2010 and 2011 national examinations for English. You can also choose your own topic as well.

1. *If you inherited one million dollars, how would this change your life?*

2. *A friend of yours who lives in England wants to come and visit Rwanda. Describe to him/her your country, its beauty and places he/she should visit while in Rwanda.*

Reference list

Antoniazzi, M.I.C. (2005). Pre-writing in EFL. *Revista Enfoques Educacionales* 7 (1): 35-49.

Badger, R. and White, G. (2000). A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal*, 54(2), 153-160.

Becky, L. and Spivey, L. (2006). What is the Writing Process? *Super Duper Publications*, No 112. Available online at http://www.superduperinc.com/handouts/pdf/112_writing_process.pdf, accessed on 07 March 2012.

Cretchley, G. & Stacey, J. (1986). *Write Well: Skills for Better English.* Cape Town: Ravan Press Publication.

Ciobanu, I. R. (2011). Developing Writing Skills for Business Purposes in Mixed-Ability Classes. *Studii si Cercetari Filologice. Seria Limbi Straine Aplicate*, 10 (2011), 112-117.

Hedge, T. (1993). *Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Derewianka, B. (1990). *Exploring How Texts Work*. Victoria: Primary English Teaching Association.

Ralfe, E. (2009). From the Creative to the Transactional and Everything In-between: Teaching Writing. In A. Ferreira (Ed). *Teaching Language*, pp. 148-176. Johannesburg: Macmillan.

Samway, K.D. (2006). *When English Language Learners Write Connecting Research to Practice, K–8*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Zamel, V. (1983). Recent Research on Writing Pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21 (4), 697–715.

Websites

http://www.lavc.edu/library/outline.htm
http://www.buowl.boun.edu.tr/students/types/of/essays/ARGUMENTATIVE/ESSAY.htm
http://www2.yk.psu.edu/~mer7/research.htm

Appendix 5: The ethics letter

Wits School of Education

27 St Andrews Road, Parktown, Johannesburg, 2193 • Private Bag 3, Wits 2050, South Africa
Tel: +27 11 717-3064 • Fax: +27 11 717-3100 • E-mail: enquiries@educ.wits.ac.za • Website: www.wits.ac.za

Student number: 322741
2011ECE135**C**

12 September 2011

Mr. Emmanuel Sibomana
48 De Korte Street
BRAAMFONTEIN
2001

Dear Mr. Sibomana

Re: Application for Ethics for PhD

Thank you very much for your ethics application. The Ethics Committee in Education of the Faculty of Humanities, acting on behalf of the Senate has considered your application for ethics clearance for your proposal entitled:

The role of distance education materials in addressing the professional development needs of high school English teachers in Rwanda.

The committee recently met and I am pleased to inform you that clearance was granted. The committee was delighted about the ways in which you have taken care of and given consideration to the ethical dimensions of your research project. Congratulations to you and your supervisor!

Please use the above protocol number in all correspondence to the relevant research parties (schools, parents, learners etc.) and include it in your research report or project on the title page.

The Protocol Number above should be submitted to the Graduate Studies in Education Committee upon submission of your final research report.

All the best with your research project.

Yours sincerely

M Mabeta

Matsie Mabeta
Wits School of Education
(011) 717 3416

CC Supervisor: Dr. Yvonne Reed