

https://dspace.org/

Investigation of attitudes and classroom practices of educators and learners in relation to English as the medium of instruction at four primary schools in Rwanda

Habyarimana, Hilaire

2015-08-13
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/18233

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

INVESTIGATION OF ATTITUDES AND CLASSROOM PRACTICES OF EDUCATORS AND LEARNERS IN RELATION TO ENGLISH AS THE MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION AT FOUR PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN RWANDA

by

HILAIRE HABYARIMANA

THESIS

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Applied English Language Studies, Faculty of Humanities,

School of Education, University of the Witwatersrand,

Johannesburg, South Africa

Supervisors: Dr Visvaganthie Moodley

Dr Ana Ferreira

May, 2015

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted in the context of the 2009 language in education policy in Rwanda. It has a three-fold focus. Firstly, it investigates the attitudes of educators and learners towards English as medium of instruction (MoI) in four Grade Six primary schools in Rwanda. Secondly, it explores challenges posed by using a foreign instructional language in the classroom, and finally it investigates the strategies undertaken to address the identified challenges.

The data was collected and analysed using the mixed method approach, and the study utilised triangulation as a research design. Data collection was done by means of questionnaires, audio-recordings, and observations of lessons and interviews. A total of 185 learners, 24 teachers, four principals, and two deputy principals participated in the study.

The findings revealed that educators and learners have positive attitudes towards English as MoI underpinned by integrative and instrumental motivation. The role of government propaganda for English and the participants' beliefs in investment in a foreign language were the main motivators. However, it was found that unreserved enthusiasm for English is not enough to make it the effective instructional language in Rwanda. This was evident in the challenges posed by the fact that English is simultaneously being learnt and being used as MoI. The study revealed many challenges in comprehension, speaking, reading, writing, and language structure. Using Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory as a theoretical framework, it was found that insufficient expertise in English inhibits the types of classroom interactions that are key to learning. Finally, the study identified different strategies used for learning in English in the four primary schools of Rwanda. The main strategy was switching between English, the instructional language, and Kinyarwanda, the participants' mother tongue (MT). It was found that the use of Kinyarwanda plays an important meditational role for content learning and knowledge building.

The study concludes by providing a number of recommendations that could be useful to Rwandan education stakeholders regarding what is happening in the English medium classrooms. The study positions itself among many others of the same nature and finds its value in sensitising the policy planners on the implications of learning a language while using it as the MoI.

DECLARATION

The researcher, Hilaire Habyarimana, student number 0311394E, declare that this thesis entitled **'Investigation of attitudes and classroom practices of educators and learners in relation to English as the medium of instruction at four primary schools in Rwanda'** is my own work. All the sources the researcher has used or quoted have been duly acknowledged in the references. This thesis has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in any other university.

Signature Date: 29th May, 2015



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this thesis is a result of the combined efforts of various institutions, groups, and individuals whose contribution I wish to acknowledge.

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisors, Dr Visvaganthie Moodley and Dr Ana Ferreira, for having kindly agreed to supervise this work. Their insightful remarks and various suggestions, their patience and encouragement at times when I seemed to falter and stumble are really appreciated. I am also indebted to Dr Kabera Gaetan, Prof. Yvonne Reed, and Prof. Leketi Makalela for having read and provided constructive suggestions for the work improvement.

Special gratitude is due to the Government of Rwanda for financially supporting my studies in the University of Witwatersrand, South Africa, and fieldwork in Rwanda.

My deep thanks go to the principals, deputy principals, teachers, and learners who participated in this study. This thesis could not have come to fruition without their contribution during the data collection process.

I owe so much to my wife Christine and our children Patrick, Larissa, Melissa, Chris, and Anisa for their exceptional understanding and patience during my absence from home. Their love and encouragement have been the source of my strength, inspiration, and success.

I would like to thank all Master's and PhD students from Rwanda, and colleagues and staff members at the Humanities Graduate Centre, for your moral support and exciting discussions on academic work. Many thanks are also due to Dr Laura Dison and colleagues at the Wits School of Education Writing Centre for their contribution to the growth of my writing skills.

To all of you who contributed to the completion of this thesis in one way or another, the researcher says 'thank you'.

Hilaire Habyarimana
University of the Witwatersrand, May 2015

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Practical steps in the scaffolding process…..……21
Table 2.2: A comparison of the educational taxonomies ……..……..……23
Table 2.3: Barret's and Bloom's taxonomies combined……..24
Table 3.1: Description of schools…….……65
Table 3.2: Sample population for questionnaires…….74
Table 3.3: Sample population for interviews……..……78
Table 4.1: Data on attitudes of educators towards English as the MoI…..……..93
Table 4.2: Comparison of functions of English and Kinyarwanda in Rwandan context…...106
Table 4.3: Data on attitudes of learners towards English as the MoI…….113
Table 5.1: Data on teaching and learning challenges caused by English as the MoI at four primary schools in Rwanda……...…….……128
Table 5.2: The average presentation of time distribution in various parts of the lessons…..132
Table 5.3: Teacher and learner turns in the classroom interactions……...…142
Table 5.4: A sample of the learners' reading of English words……...…..149
Table 5.5: Types and examples of the questions asked by teachers in the lessons……164
Table5.6: Types and examples of the questions asked by learners in the lessons…….…165
Table 5.7: Working model of lower order, middle order and higher order questions for analysing the classroom questions……...…….…….167
Table 6.1: Results from the questionnaires about the strategies teachers employed to address classroom challenges...…….……174
Table 6.2: Strategies used by learners to address the classroom challenges posed by English as the MoI……..……204

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1: Map of Rwanda showing the location of selected schools……..……..60
Figure 3.2: General process of Inductive Data Analysis…….……85
Figure 3.3: Visual representation of the mixed methods design used in this study…….87
Figure 5.1: Illustration of classroom teacher-learner interaction in English…….…….141
Figure 5.2: Example of incomplete sentences in the learners' writing……..153
Figure 5.3: Example of enumerated sentences…….……..154
Figure 5.4: Learner CS in writing ……155

CONTENTS

Abstract……..……ii
Declaration……..…..iii
Acknowledgements…….……..iv
List of Tables…….…….v
List of figures……vi
Contents……...vii
Transcription conventions……..….xiii
Acronyms and abbreviations…….……..….xii

Chapter One: General introduction.....1
1.1 Introduction……..…..…..…1
1.2 The Rwandan linguistic situation and language-in-education landscape …..…….. …….3
1.3 Statement of the problem ……..……..…..….7
1.4 Aims and research questions ……..…….……8
1.4.1 Aims of the study …….…….…..……..8
1.4.2 Research questions …….…….……..9
1.5 Rationale of the study ……..……..……..…….……9
1.6 Structure of the thesis …….....…….....……...…..…..……11
1.7 Conclusion ……..……..…..…….……12

Chapter Two: Theoretical framework and related literature ……..13
2.1 Introduction……...…….……13
2.2 Theoretical framework ……..13
2.2.1 Sociocultural perspective on learning ……..……13
Mediation……..……..……..……14
Interaction ……...…….15
The Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)…….……..…..17
More Knowledgeable Other (MKO)……19
Scaffolding…….…….……....…20
2.2.2 Educational taxonomies ……..…….……22
2.3 Literature review …….……..26
2.3.1 Attitudes……..…….……...……..26

2.3.1.1 Conceptualization of attitudes ……..…….26
2.3.1.2 Attitudes and motivation…….……...……..……28
2.3.1.3 Language preference ……..…….……30
2.3.1.4 Attitudes towards language policy decisions ……..……31
2.3.2 Medium of instruction (MoI) ……...……34
2.3.2.1 English as MoI…….……...……..34
2.3.2.2 The spread of English ……..……37
2.3.2.3 Challenges posed by English as the MoI…….……..……...…...…41
2.3.2.4 Debates on the use of English as the MoI……....…….…..42
Arguments for English ……44
Arguments against English……...…….……...45
Language education policy and practices in African countries……47
Language proficiency ……..……..…….……...……..48
2.3.2.5 Teaching strategies in the English-medium African classroom ……..……49
2.4 Conclusion …….……54

Chapter Three: Research design and procedures for collecting and analysing data.....55
3.1 Introduction ……...…55
3.2 Research design …….55
3.2.1Mixed methods approach …….……...…55
3.2.2 Rationale for mixed methods approach ……..59
3.3 Research setting and participants ……..59
3.3.1 Research setting ……..…59
3.3.2 Research participants ……..66
3.3.3 Choice of the content subject ……70
3.4 Data collection procedures ……....71
3.4.1 Data collection instruments ……71
3.4.1.1Quantitative phase …...……..…...……..71
3.4.1.2 Qualitative phase …….……74
3.5 Data analysis methods ……...….81
3.5.1 Quantitative data analysis method ……..…81
3.5.2 Qualitative data analysis methods ……..85
3.5.3 Mixed method for analysis of data ……87
3.6 Ethical considerations …….…..88

3.6.1 Permission to carry out the study ……..….88
3.6.2 Ethical procedures at the data collection site ……88
3.7 Conclusion ……...…..89

Chapter four: Attitudes of educators and learners towards English as the medium of instruction in Rwanda ……...…90
4.1 Introduction ……...…90
4.2 Attitudes of educators towards English as the MoI at four primary schools in Rwanda ..91
4.2.1 Need for English in communication with the outside world ……..94
4.2.2 Attitudes towards English as the language for economic development, unity and reconciliation ……..……96
4.2.3 Desire for access to English as a global language of education……..……..100
4.2.4 Attitudes on the impact of English on MT and cultural identity ……..103
4.2.5 Attitudes towards English as a mark of education ……...107
4.2.6 Attitudes towards English as a challenge to teaching and learning ……110
4.3 Attitudes of learners towards English as the MoI at four primary schools in Rwanda....113
4.3.1Need for English to communicate with the outside world …….……...114
4.3.2 Attitudes towards English as the language for social success and economic development…….……..115
4.3.3 Desire for access to English as a global language ……....116
4.3.4 Preference of English as the MoI…….……..……...118
4.3.5 Affective factors due to lack of confidence in English ……....120
4.4 Conclusion…….……...122

Chapter Five: Challenges in using English as the MoI for teaching and learning….……125
5.1 Introduction ……125
5.2 Teaching and learning challenges ……...126
5.2.1 Comprehension challenges ……...……....129
5.2.2 Speaking challenges ……...…….….139
5.2.3 Reading challenges ……...……....148
5.2.4 Writing challenges ……...……152
5.2.5 Language structure challenges ……...……..157
5.2.6 Affective factors ……...158

5.3 Implications of using English to learn Social Studies ……161
5.3.1 Teaching English ……...……..…..161
5.3.2 Teaching in English ……..…..163
5.3.2.1 Use of questions ……..……..……..163
5.3.2.2 Group work ……..……169
5.4 Conclusion ……...170

Chapter Six: Strategies employed in addressing classroom challenges ……..……174
6.1 Introduction ……..……174
6.2 Strategies used by teachers ……..……174
6.2.1 Code-switching ……...……175
6.2.1.1 English-Kinyarwanda alternations ……..…….176
6.2.1.2 Types of CS and reasons of CS ……..……...….178
6.2.2 Use of non-verbal communication aids ……..……193
6.2.2.1 Use of teaching aids ……..……..…….194
6.2.2.2 Use of body language, miming and gestures ……..……195
6.2.2.3 Use of visual aids ……..……..…….198
6.2.2.4 Other strategies ……...……..……..……200
6.3 Strategies used by learners ……..……..……..….204
6.3.1 Code-switching ……..……205
6.3.2 Peer consultations ……..……..……..……207
6.3.3 Perseverance in learning in English ……..……...……..209
6.4 Conclusion ……...……211

Chapter Seven: Conclusions and recommendations ……213
7.1 Introduction ……213
7.2 Main findings of the study……. ……..……...213
7.2.1 Attitudes towards English as the MoI ……...213
7.2.2 Challenges posed by English as the MoI ……..……217
7.2.3 Strategies used in teaching through English…….……...……..221
7.2.4 Significance of the findings……...……..……..222
7.3 Recommendations ……...……224
7.4 The limitations of the study…..……227
7.5 Future research…….228

References ……..……..230
APPENDICES……..253
APPENDIX A1: Questionnaire for principals……...253
Results……...258
Appendix A1a: Principals' personal information……..….258
Appendix A1b: Principals' language background……...……..259
Appendix A1c: Attitudes of principals towards English as the MoI……..263
Appendix A1d: Perceptions of principals about the challenges that English poses to teachers and learners in the classroom…….……...…….266
Appendix A1e: Strategies used by principals to address classroom challenges posed by English as the MoI……..……..…….……..269

APPENDIX A2: Questionnaire for teachers……...……..271
Results……...276
Appendix A2a: Teachers'personal information…….276
Appendix A2b: Teachers' language background…….…..…278
Appendix A2c: Attitudes of teachers towards English as the MoI……..……..285
Appendix A2d: Perceptions of teachers towards the classroom challenges posed by English as the MoI……...…...……...……..…..288
Appendix A2e: Strategies used by teachers to address classroom challenges posed by English as the MoI…….……...291

APPENDIX 3: Questionnaire for learners…….…293
Results…….……..299
Appendix A3a: Learners' personal information…….…299
Appendix A3b: Learners' language background……...……300
Appendix A3c: Attitudes of learners towards English as the MoI…….303
Appendix A3d: Perceptions of learners towards classroom challenges posed by English as the MoI…...……....306
Appendix A3e: Strategies used by learners to address the classroom challenges posed by English as the MoI……308

APPENDIX A4: Comparison of rural versus urban schools (quantitative data)……..310
Appendix A4a: Results from principals…….310

Appendix A4a1: Comparison of attitudes of principals towards English as the MoI……..…….310
Appendix A4a2: Comparison of principals' views about challenges posed by English as the MoI……..……...……...…313
Appendix A4a3: Comparison of principals' views about strategies employed to address classroom challenges……..…..……...…315
Appendix A4b: Results from teachers……317
Appendix A4b1: Comparison of attitudes of teachers towards English as the MoI..317
Appendix A4b2: Comparison of teachers' views about the challenges posed by English as the MoI…….……..320
Appendix A4b3: Comparison of teachers' strategies employed to address the classroom challenges……..……..323
Appendix A4c: Results from learners……325
Appendix A4c1: Comparison of attitudes of learners towards English as the MoI...325
Appendix A4c2: Comparison of learners' views about challenges posed by English as the MoI……...328
Appendix A4c3: Comparison of learners' strategies employed to address the classroom challenges…….……...……..…330

APPENDIX B: Samples of audio-recorded lessons……...332
Appendix B1: Sample transcripts from RS1……..332
Appendix B2: Sample transcripts from RS2……..336
Appendix B3: Sample transcripts from US1……..340
Appendix B4: Sample transcripts from US2……..344

APPENDIX C: Interview protocol……...…..348
Appendix C1: Interview questions for principals……...……...348
Appendix C2: Interview questions for teachers…….348
Appendix C3: Focus group questions for learners…….349

APPENDIX D: Other documents……...350
Appendix D1: Ethics clearance letter…….350
Appendix D2: Letters granting permission to conduct research……351

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

Highlights in bold: Writing in bold indicates switching to Kinyarwanda.

Normal font: Utterances in English are written in normal font.

(Italics): Italicised text enclosed in parentheses is a translation into English.

[Text]: A text in normal font enclosed in square brackets indicates the observer's descriptions and comments.

(Text): Words and abbreviations in normal font enclosed in parentheses indicate references.

… Three dots refer to an ellipsis, i.e, one or more words left out intentionally.

(-) A hyphen in parentheses indicates silence.

(.) A dot between parentheses indicates a short pause.

↑ An arrow pointing upwards means a rising intonation.

[…] Three dots in square brackets indicate hesitation and doubt.

T: Teacher.

Lr: Learner; Lr1: Learner 1; Lr2: Learner 2; Lr3: Learner 3, etc.

Ls: Learners.

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

BICS: Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills
CALP: Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency
CS: Code-Switching
EAC: East African Community
EFL: English as a Foreign Language
ESL: English as a Second Language
HOQs: Higher order questions
LOQs: Lower order questions
MKO: More Knowledgeable Other
MoI: Medium of instruction
MOQs: Middle order questions
MINECOFIN: Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
MINEDUC: Ministry of Education
MINICAAF: Ministry of Cabinet Affairs
MT: Mother Tongue
NUR: National University of Rwanda
SS: Social Studies
ZPD: Zone of Proximal Development

CHAPTER ONE

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Teaching and learning in English continues to be the subject of various research studies showing that the English proficiency among many African learners is not sufficient to enable them to use it as the medium of instruction (Rubagumya, 1997; Mwinsheikhe, 2002; Webb, 2002; Kyeyune, 2003; Webb, 2004; Brock-Utne, Desai & Qorro, 2004; Rugemalira, 2005; Alidou & Brock-Utne, 2011). Due to globalisation, English has increasingly gained power in economic, social, political, and educational grounds. English has dominated as the language of instruction worldwide, particularly in education. With particular focus to the African context, most countries that have been under British colonial rule adopted English as the educational MoI. It seems clear that current globalisation trends attracted many other African countries to use English as an instructional language. A recent case is Rwanda which officially declared English as the sole medium of instruction at all levels of education in 2009. Due to various challenges that are discussed in this study, in March 2011 there was a change of the instructional language, i.e. a shift from English to Kinyarwanda for the nursery and first three years of primary school (MINICAAF, 2011). This policy shift ordered Kinyarwanda as the MoI from nursery to Grade 3 of primary education, which is in line with UNESCO's recommendation in relation to the child's education in their MT as the MoI (MINEDUC, 2003). However, this change is part of the evidence for the rationale and argument of this study.

In the development framework of its education system, Rwanda has chosen English to be the language of instruction in schools and official language of administration after 80 years of using French as the medium of instruction (République du Rwanda, 2005). This choice was made because English as a language of global interaction is rapidly spreading in science and technology, news and information media, entertainment, international aid and administration, business and marketing (McGreal, 2008). French, the colonial and former second language (L2) in Rwanda, was used widely by the majority of educated Rwandans, which made

Rwandans consider themselves 'Francophones'. As for English, at school it was used in a limited way, taught as a subject, and then used as a language of instruction in a few schools after 1994 alongside French and Kinyarwanda until it was instituted as the sole medium of instruction in 2009. The motive behind this language policy shift was attributed mainly to political, economic, and social reasons (Samuelson & Freedman, 2010; Pearson, 2013) since Rwanda sought integration with regional and global communities.

One of the major challenges identified by Levin, Shohamy and Spolsky (2003) is the MoI in schools. Researchers such as Brock-Utne and Alidou (2011), Wolff (2011), Baker (2006), and Webb (2004) agree on the crucial role of the MoI for the learners' understanding and acquisition of knowledge in academic subjects. They argue that learners need sufficient proficiency in the MoI in order to be able to learn effectively and manage the classroom tasks and examinations. As Baker (2006, p. 170) states 'the language the child is using in the classroom needs to be sufficiently well developed to be able to process the cognitive challenges of the classroom'.

Acquiring proficiency in the MoI for second and foreign language speakers is a process that takes time. As Shohamy (2006) shows, if students are required to learn a L2 in order to use it as a language of instruction at school, this negatively affects the learners' academic performance because it takes them a long time (7-11 years) to reach the level of language proficiency that enables them to achieve similar scores to those of native users of that language.

In 1996, the post-conflict Rwandan language policy prioritised the learning and teaching of French and English with the aim of leading Rwandans to the bilingualism that was conceived of as the equal use of both French and English (Niyomugabo, 2008; Maniraho, 2013). Although the 1996 post-conflict language policy proposed that all subjects be taught in English or French, it did not offer clear criteria to guide teachers on the modalities of selecting either French or English, therefore the majority of teachers chose French because they could not speak English. Worth noting is that this language policy had formulated a profile of language education whereby a pupil was expected to have acquired basic knowledge and skills which would enable him/her to speak, read, and write French and English at the end of primary school (Republic of Rwanda, 1996). However, this language policy did not succeed, because in 2009, it was replaced by the English-only policy. The shift

from the French and English policy, which was still in its infancy, to English only entailed teaching and learning challenges mainly attributed to the 'abrupt' adoption of English as the MoI (Samuelson & Freedman, 2010; Pearson, 2013). The challenges mentioned by Levin et al. (2003), Baker (2006) and Shohamy (2006) are clear concerns of the Rwandan primary school education system whereby children are required to learn in English, the language they are also being taught. Similarly, another challenging issue relates to the teachers who are required to teach in English while they are also learning it. The use of English as the MoI in Rwanda under the above-mentioned circumstances needs a study in order to solve the question on how the English in education policy is perceived and implemented at primary school level. In this thesis, the researcher argues that the use of English (a foreign language) as the language of instruction in Rwanda is a challenge to primary school education because of the lack of exposure to this language for both teachers and learners. In addition, the option to replace French with English as the MoI in Rwanda is not only a political move in the interests of certain stakeholders, but also a decision based on power relations and the hegemony of English in the world.

1.2 The Rwandan linguistic situation and language-in-education policy landscape

Rwanda is an East-central African landlocked country surrounded by Anglophone countries, namely Uganda in the north and Tanzania in the east, and Francophone countries, namely the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) in the west and Burundi in the south. This is linguistically significant, because it places Rwanda in a medial position between Francophone and Anglophone influences (McGreal, 2008). Geographically, Rwanda is a mountainous country labelled 'A land of a thousand hills'. It is small, occupying an area of 26.338 km^2, and has a population of over 10 million people. Kigali is the capital city populated by more than one million people. The majority of Rwandans live in rural villages (Republic of Rwanda, 2005).

Linguistically, Rwanda is a multilingual society whose language diversity is limited to four main languages, namely Kinyarwanda (the native Bantu language spoken by all Rwandans), French (the colonial language that has been the official language from the colonial period to 2008, and spoken fluently by educated Rwandans), English (the language introduced in Rwanda after independence, and which gained support after the 1994 repatriation of the Rwandan refugees from Anglophone countries, and the sole official language of Rwanda in

2009), and Swahili (an African language spoken mostly by Muslim communities and other Rwandans repatriated from Tanzania and some areas of Uganda and the DRC). According to the most recent census, almost all Rwandans (99.4%) speak Kinyarwanda (République du Rwanda, 2005), and it is estimated that 90% of the Rwandan population use Kinyarwanda as the only language of communication (LeClerc, 2008; Munyankesha, 2004). Kinyarwanda has been used as the MoI in the lower levels of primary education and is taught as a subject at the upper levels of primary schools, at secondary education and tertiary level in the University of Rwanda, department of African Languages and Literature (Kagwesage, 2013). The use of French and English are limited. The 3rd General Census of Population and Housing's report indicates that French is spoken by 3.9% and English by 1.9% of the population (République du Rwanda, 2005).

The language diversity currently found in Rwanda is a reflection of a long language history that the country has undergone since the beginning of the colonial period. Unlike many other African nations, Rwanda is a country where all people within its territory were speaking a single language, Kinyarwanda, prior to colonisation. This resulted in Rwanda being a Kinyarwanda-dominated speech community. The language variations in Rwanda can be traced to the arrival of European missionaries and colonists who introduced foreign languages to the country and taught such languages in Rwandan schools.

History shows that French was the first foreign language introduced to Rwanda by Belgian missionaries and colonisers in 1916. French was given the status of official language used in administration, education, and international relations in 1929 (République du Rwanda, 2005). It is also assumed that the first missionaries and colonisers were guided by Kiswahili speakers, which means that this language may have initially been used in Rwanda around 1916, but no references were made to its status. After independence[1] in 1963, English was introduced as a subject in the Rwandan secondary schools and was assigned a relatively low status in comparison to French (Maniraho, 2013). This resulted in little interest and motivation to learn English for students whose school options were not language-oriented until the post-1994 genocide period that opened the way to more complex language diversity

[1] It is worth mentioning that after the independence of Rwanda in 1962 there were many political refugees who went into exile in neighbouring countries such as Uganda, former Zaïre (now DRC), Tanzania, and Burundi. It took them more than 30 years to regain their rights in the country by means of armed struggle.

in Rwanda, and marked the promotion of English to the third official language alongside Kinyarwanda and French. As can be read from Article 25 of the Arusha Peace Agreement on repatriation of Rwandan refugees (Republic of Rwanda, 1993), it is stipulated that returnees had the right to use the languages they were familiar with (English and Kiswahili),[2] even though they also had to learn French and Kinyarwanda. It is recognised that the post-1994 influx of returnees created a complex linguistic mix in Rwanda (Habyarimana, 2006; Mbori, 2008).

Despite the introduction of foreign languages (French and English) into the country between 1963 and 1994, Kinyarwanda, generally used by the masses of the Rwandan population, was used as a national and official language, and the MoI at primary school level. For a long time before and after independence, pupils at the primary school level were taught most of their courses in Kinyarwanda[3], while French was only taught as a subject in the last three years. It was only at secondary school level that students were taught in French (Mutwarasibo, 2003, Habyarimana, 2006). Before 1994, English was not taught at primary school level. It was only at the secondary school level that students, depending on their area of study (language studies, sciences, teacher training, etc.), were taught English as a subject for a varied number of hours per week[4] (Republic of Rwanda, 1996). A student could continue to study English at university level in the Department of English Language and Literature (Mutwarasibo, 2003), and after graduation, he/she could be employed as an English teacher or French-English/English-French translator.

After the 1994 genocide, there was a general revision of the Rwandan system of education because of the complex post-genocide linguistic mix caused by the repatriation of people who had undergone different systems of education in different languages. This entailed a shift in the medium of instruction, and English started playing a prominent role in the post-genocide Rwanda's educational system, and in social and political settings.

[2] There were many Rwandan refugees in Tanzania, Uganda, and Kenya, countries that were using English and Kiswahili. These refugees were fluent in these languages.

[3] The MoI in primary public schools was Kinyarwanda, but there were private primary schools that were teaching in French only, with Kinyarwanda as a subject, because of immigrant pupils or because of the aims of the school, especially based on prestige.

[4] Students who were learning languages were taught more hours of English than those in other academic streams, and this had implications for the latter students because they neglected this language.

Prior to 1994, French was used as the MoI at secondary and tertiary institutions. English became an official language alongside Kinyarwanda and French in 1995 (Rosendal, 2009). English was necessary in Rwanda because of the new demographic composition of Rwandans repatriated from English-speaking countries who did not speak French (Samuelson & Freedman, 2010). After 1996, the Rwandan government had created a 'trilingual' society, in which French, English, and Kinyarwanda were used as official languages and the media of instruction. Until 2008, French and English were used as instructional languages at the upper primary schools, but most teachers were French-speakers teaching subjects in English.

The primary school education, with which this study is concerned, has encountered changes in the MoI. According to the 1996 education policy (Republic of Rwanda, 1996), the language of instruction for the first three years of primary school education is Kinyarwanda, and the pupils additionally have to be taught French, English, and Kinyarwanda. For the last three years of primary school, the MoI is French or English depending on whether the school's teachers are French or English speakers. For this reason, primary schools were labelled either English schools or French schools because of the teachers' and parents' L2 background. The choice of school depends on the parents' will and the school's accessibility. Most English schools were established in urban areas and other places inhabited by English-speaking parents. The majority of French schools are located in rural areas where teachers and learners have insufficient access to English. Although the 1996 education policy proposes the teaching of English in French schools, there were no trained teachers for that purpose, and this influenced the policy's objective that formulated a profile of language education whereby a pupil was expected to have acquired basic knowledge and skills that would enable him/her to speak, read, and write Kinyarwanda, French, and English by the end of primary school (Republic of Rwanda, 1996).

Drawing on the above statements, in its plan of language(s) of instruction, the 1996 education policy mainly targeted bilingualism, which was perceived as the capacity to use at least two world dominant languages which, in the case of Rwanda, are French and English in order to prevent double programmes (i.e., French-speaking and English-speaking programmes) in one institution[5]. The implementation was to be rooted in primary and secondary schools, but there

[5] Double programmes also required a double budget for rooms and salaries of both French-speaking and English-speaking lecturers.

was a lack of teachers and materials and students were unable to use both languages at university. To remedy the problem at university level, during a student's first university year they were required to learn either French or English, depending on their linguistic background (Mutwarasibo, 2003). However, the effort made in planning and implementing bilingualism (use of French and English) as a solution to double programmes in education may have led to the choice of monolingualism (use of English only) in 2009.

Since the beginning of 2009, the entire Rwandan education system has shifted from French to English; French is taught as a subject and Kinyarwanda is only used for Kinyarwanda language courses (McCrummen, 2008; MINEDUC, 2008). Before the beginning of the implementation programme, the government launched an accelerated English training programme for primary school teachers and hired teachers from English-speaking countries to facilitate training and offer assistance and advice to schools. Regular English teacher training during weekends and holidays were compulsory (MINEDUC, 2008). In this plan, not only were teachers required to learn English, but so were government employees, taxi drivers, business people, and students (McCrummen, 2008) because officially, 'English is the language that holds the promise for young Rwandans' (NPR, 2009).

1.3 Statement of the problem

The 2009 shift from French to English as the MoI at all levels of education in Rwanda was implemented when the majority of teachers had studied and/or were teaching in French. From 1994 when English acquired the official language status until 2008 only 5% of schools could teach through the medium of English, while only 1.9% of the people of Rwanda could speak English (République du Rwanda 2005). These numbers obviously show that the Rwandan use of English was minimal, which implies that neither teachers nor learners, particularly in primary schools, had been exposed to much English while they were required to implement English as the MoI, exacerbating their task. Teachers have to teach in English while learning it; and pupils have to be taught in English while learning this language. There is a need to investigate the attitudes of teachers and learners regarding English as MoI, to explore the classroom practices in English as MoI, and to determine how this might affect the Rwandan primary school education system. According to the literature, the language of the teacher and that of the learner should be developed in order to process efficient teaching and learning (Baker, 2006). The present study investigates attitudes of educators and learners towards

English as the MoI in the Rwandan primary school education system and explores the classroom practices in English when teaching and learning content subjects.

1.4. Aims and research questions

1.4.1 Aims of the study

This research aims to understand and describe how teachers and learners view English as the MoI at four Rwandan primary schools. It strives to discover how teachers, the major implementers of the policy, and their pupils perceive English as the MoI in Rwanda because, as Le Dû (2003) states, attitudes are very important for language planners because they assist in the understanding of the implementers' wishes and needs, which informs the directions that language policy makers have to follow. The other focus of this study is to explore the classroom practices in English as the MoI and to determine its effect on Rwandan primary school education. This investigation aims at translating the findings of the intended empirical study into guidelines for the improvement of the observed practices. In relation to the problem mentioned above, this study intends to reveal the practices and implications of English as the MoI for teaching and learning at four Rwandan primary schools. By undertaking this study, the researcher seeks to:

(1) investigate the attitudes of educators and learners towards English as the MoI at four Rwandan primary schools, and to explore how these attitudes influence the classroom practices;
(2) identify the challenges that English as the MoI presents to teachers and learners in the classroom; and
(3) investigate the strategies that teachers and learners use in order to cope with English as the MoI in the Rwandan context.
Based on these objectives, the researcher formulated the following research questions.

1.4.2 Research questions

This thesis was guided by the following research questions:

Overarching question

How do the attitudes of educators and learners towards English as the MoI influence practices in the teaching and learning of social studies (SS) at Grade Six in Rwandan primary schools?

Other questions

1. What are the attitudes of educators and learners towards English as the MoI at four Rwandan primary schools?
2. What are the challenges to teaching and learning that using English as the MoI in Rwandan primary schools presents?
3. What strategies do teachers and learners employ to address these challenges?

1.5 Rationale of the study

The idea to undertake this study arose out of a discussion the researcher had with his first year students in an English class at the National University of Rwanda (NUR). These students had started intensive English courses to prepare them to follow their faculty studies in English. The discussion concerned 'The role of NUR in enhancing the knowledge of English among Rwandans'. During the course of the discussion, the 2009 countrywide language policy change was tackled, and to the researcher's surprise, the conclusions were summed up in an agreement by the students that 'a better implementation of the language policy change should be a systematic process rooted in primary school education'. Similarly, one teacher said 'Sinigeze nigisha mu Cyongereza! Uru rurimi ruratangaje yewe! Ibyo dusoma n'ibyo twandika biratandukanye pe! Ngaho mbwira uko tuzarumenya tukarwigishamo!' ('I have never taught in English! This language! It is very strange! What we read is far different from what we write! Tell me now how we will know this language and teach in it!'). During this conversation, the researcher realised that this teacher feared the new language policy because she could not speak English, which suggested a negative

attitude towards English as the MoI. This made the researcher think about language education in Rwandan primary schools, especially during this time of language policy change in which most primary school teachers are struggling to learn and teach in English, a language they are not familiar with.

This study is also worth conducting for the following reasons:

Firstly, inspired by scholars such as Baker (2006), Ricento (2006a), Spolsky (2004), who mainly focused their attention on political and ideological forces behind language policy, the role of language in a nation, and the practices that should be made in language planning, English as an MoI in Rwanda is a feature of language policy worth exploring because of its context based on complex language in education policies as explained previously (see 1.2). In other words, this study aims to contribute to existing knowledge regarding language policy, policy implementation, and language practice in general, particularly in the Rwandan context.

Secondly, the complexity of the shift from French to English piqued the researcher's curiosity in an attempt to understand the practice and implications of English as the MoI in Rwanda. The fact that French had been used to the extent of labelling Rwandans Francophones offered very little opportunity to practise English in the country despite its introduction to schools in the 1960s. In this regard, it is imperative to investigate the attitudes and practices regarding English as the MoI in a context where the majority of teachers and learners are first and second language speakers of Kinyarwanda and French respectively, and have limited access to English.

Thirdly, much work has been done on language policy worldwide. Shohamy (2006) shows and examines mechanisms that are used to create language policy and reveals that there are often hidden agendas behind language policy that result in negative, undemocratic, and implicit approaches to language policy and practice in most societies, such as Israel, the United States of America (USA), and the United Kingdom (UK). Spolsky (2004), in his discussions about language education policy and his views on language practices, beliefs, and management of social groups inspires the researcher. Spolsky (2004) shows how language policy is controlled by forces (political, economic, social, etc.) such as demands for national identity, English as a global language, and concerns regarding efficient communication issues that are presumed to be the main factors influencing language change in Rwanda. Baker

(2006) raises the researcher's interest with his approaches to learning through a L2. According to Baker (2006), the language that the child is using in the classroom needs to be sufficiently developed for his/her efficient cognitive functioning and academic performance. Ricento's (2006b) contribution emanates from his demonstration on how theories in language policy influence practice and vice versa. For instance, he shows how the Civil Rights movement, the women's movement, and the advent of computers and internet influenced changes in language use and attitudes in the USA. Obviously, to a greater or lesser extent, these studies have all addressed a number of issues or questions related to language policy, language attitudes, and language practices from various polities, but according to the researcher, there is little research on language policy and practices in the Rwandan context, and the existing research (Kagwesage, 2013; Maniraho, 2013) focused on higher education. The present study, which is the first one to investigate attitudes towards English as MoI and classroom practices at Rwandan primary schools, is a contribution to the field of language in education policy.

Finally, the present study focuses on attitudes towards the language of instruction, classroom practices, and their implications on the language in education policy implementation. There are other studies similar to the current one that investigated language attitudes, language use, and development (Mbori, 2008), teachers' attitudes in the African context (Pudi, 2002; Mchazime, 2001), and language attitudes in the Western and Asian context (Karahan, 2007; Alenezi, 2010), just to mention a few. They all examine the importance of attitudes and language use in the success or failure of a target policy such as sustainable development and conflict resolution. The present research shows that attitudes are not the only factors to be considered in the success of language in an education policy.

1.6. Structure of the thesis

The present thesis comprises seven chapters. The first three chapters (Chapters One, Two, and Three) present a general introduction, conceptualisation, theoretical foundation of the study, and methodology used to conduct the research. The remaining chapters are devoted to presentation, analysis, interpretation of data, and conclusions. The content for each chapter follows:

Chapter One is the general introduction. It places the study in context by presenting the Rwandan linguistic landscape. It specifies the main problem and discusses the rationale, aim, and research questions, and presents an outline of the content of the entire thesis. Chapter Two is a review of the theories related to the topic. It focuses on the theoretical framework, which is the lens of analysis focusing on concepts such as interaction, mediation, scaffolding, zone of proximal development (ZPD) and the more knowledgeable 'other'. The relevant literature focused on attitudes, medium of instruction, and teaching strategies when a foreign language is used as an instructional language. Chapter Three is concerned with the methodology used to investigate the educators' and learners' attitudes toward English as the MoI, the classroom challenges, and strategies of teaching in a foreign language. The chapter discusses the mixed method approach selected for this study, and particularly elaborates on the methods used to collect, analyse, and interpret the data.

Chapter Four discusses the attitudes of participants towards English as the MoI while Chapter Five is the analysis of the challenges that English presents in classroom practices. Chapter Six presents and discusses the strategies used in the classroom to cope with English as the instructional language, and Chapter Seven is the general conclusion and recommendations.

1.7 Conclusion

This introductory chapter was intended to set the scene for the study. It provides the reader with information about Rwanda, and other contextual information that is useful in understanding the study.

This chapter introduced the study by presenting the context in which it has been undertaken. It discussed the linguistic landscape of Rwanda, specified the problem of the study, and presented the key questions to be answered. It formulated the aims of the study and presented the rationale and structure of the entire study. The next chapter is a review of the literature related to the key issues of this study, including discussions on attitudes, the MoI, and a sociocultural perspective on learning.

CHAPTER TWO

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents theories that inform this study and provides an overview of literature on attitudes towards English as a language of teaching and learning in the context of second and foreign language use, and attitudes towards language policy practices in post-colonial African classrooms. The reviewed literature also focuses on the use of English as the MoI, and challenges and strategies used in the classroom to overcome language problems. It also provides some ideas about the debate on ideologies and language-in-education practices.

2.2 Theoretical framework

This section discusses theories that inform and guide the analysis of data, i.e. the sociocultural perspective on learning (Vygotsky, 1978) and the educational taxonomies of Barrett (1968), Bloom (1956), and Anderson and Krathwohl (2001). It is a theoretical conceptualisation used to understand how learning takes place and how teachers and learners cope with content learning in the Rwandan English medium classes. A sociocultural perspective on learning addresses the critical importance of social and cultural contexts in human learning practices, and highlights how those contexts influence what is learnt. The discussion of this theory focuses on language tools and interaction to mediate learning in a collaborative environment. The educational taxonomies are used to understand the assessment processes used in the classroom, particularly assessment for learning in the context of teaching through English as a foreign language in Rwanda.

2.2.1 Sociocultural perspective on learning

A sociocultural perspective on learning is used to understand learning in English as a foreign language in primary school education in Rwanda. The discussion starts by presenting a general understanding of the key concepts of the sociocultural theory of learning relevant to this study, and proceeds by showing how these concepts help to understand learning in

English at primary schools in Rwanda. The sociocultural theory is used in correlation with the social constructivist worldview.

The sociocultural theory of learning draws on the work of Vygotsky (Wang, 2007). According to Vygotsky (1978), learning and cognitive development are embedded within social events and occur when learners interact with other people, objects, and events in a collaborative environment. Vygotsky believes that society, culture, peers, and adults influence the child's cognitive development (Vygotsky, 1986; Wertsch, 1991; Tharp & Gallimore, 1998) through interaction. Interpreting Vygotsky, Kozulin, Gindis, Ageyev, and Miller (2003) assert that human cognition and learning are the end products of social and cultural phenomena rather than the result of individual phenomena. This has also been emphasised by Lantolf and Thorne (2006) who demonstrate that culture is the prime determinant of individual development, that is, what children learn is the product of their cultural milieu. As Vygotsky (1978, p. 57) states, 'Every function in the child's cultural development appears twice: first, on the social level, and later, on the individual level; first, between people (interpsychological), and then inside the child (intrapsychological). This applies equally to voluntary attention, to logical memory, and to the formation of concepts. All the higher functions originate as actual relationships between individuals'.

In accordance with the importance of society and culture as shown above, this study draws on the learners' social and cultural contexts in place, i.e., the teachers, school location, and historical context in order to understand the learning processes and knowledge development of the primary school pupils learning in English as a foreign language in Rwanda. Since the focus of the study is learning at school, the concepts such as mediation, interaction, the ZPD, the more knowledgeable other (MKO), and scaffolding are worth explaining to facilitate the understanding of what happens in the classroom.

Mediation

Mediation has been regarded as a central concept of sociocultural theory (Lantolf, 2000). It refers to 'the means through which teachers, parents, peers, and other mentors help students to gradually acquire knowledge' (Donald, Lazarus & Lolwana, 2006, p. 87), and Vygotsky (1978) views it as the 'engine' which moves the learner's development. He also characterises it as the teaching process through which educators help their students learn how to think, and

as the tool that teaches learners how to learn (Kao, 2010). This process referred to as 'mediation' is monitored by the teacher, also known as the 'mediator', because of his/her role of assisting the pupils by filtering the information and guiding them through exercises, or showing them specific methods for interpreting information and problem-solving (Feuerstein, 1990).

In the course of learning and cognitive development, the social and cultural engagement of the learner is mediated by what Vygotsky (1978) calls 'cultural tools', which can either be physical such as books, notebooks, pens, library, video and audio sets, pencils, maps, and posters, or symbolic/psychological tools such as language (Lantolf, 2000; Kozulin et al. 2003; Kao, 2010), and which he sees as playing a fundamental role in the creation of knowledge (Lantolf & Appel, 1994; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Kao, 2010). In the present study, language plays an important part of mediation, which needs to be analysed as a cultural tool in the social interaction between learners and other people with different levels of knowledge. In the course of the analysis, it is assumed that language as a mediator contributes to enabling learners to move from one level to the next levels of understanding and knowledge. In addition, it should be borne in mind that the role of mediators or teachers at school should be to empower pupils with skills and knowledge that enable them to become self-directed learners. This mediated empowerment takes place through interaction and is discussed below.

Interaction

Interaction is another key concept in the sociocultural theory of learning because of its importance in knowledge acquisition and appropriation. As Kao (2010, p. 117) states, 'interaction with people, usually parents, teachers or peers, with different levels of skills or knowledge often leads to effective learning, which then encourages learners to move on to the next stage of learning or understanding'. According to Vygotsky (1978), children acquire knowledge because they engage with people, objects, and events at a social level, i.e., in a collaborative environment. Then later, what has been acquired through collaboration becomes assimilated and internalised at an individual level, i.e., learners transform what has been learnt with help through interaction and become able to use that knowledge on their own. At school, the sociocultural perspective on learning leads teachers to mediate learning by interacting with learners and helping them transform what they teach. Interaction is

relevant for this study because of its learning facility role in the processes of knowledge acquisition and appropriation.

In educational contexts, interaction contributes to learning. This means that a relationship exists between interaction and knowledge acquisition. The research on the classroom interactions by Sawyer and Berson (2004), Merill and Gilbert (2008), Shaw, Carey and Mair (2008), Hulan (2010), Hlatshwayo (2011), show that interactions occurring in groups of peers can effectively foster the learners' active participation and result in effective learning if they are well managed. For instance, in their study on instructional strategies on problem-centred instruction, Merill and Gilbert (2008) reveal that peer interaction, i.e., the learners' discussion led by a structured problem, is more effective in problem-solving than peer-telling, which is concerned with gathering information from the readings and presenting them to the class. As a part of the learner-centred instruction, peer interaction was found to be more effective than other approaches of learning because it requires active engagement by the learners (Merill & Gilbert, 2008).

In the classroom context, teacher-learner interaction is mediated by language. Language, in all its forms of use (oral use, reading, and writing), is a tremendously important tool to mediate and facilitate learning (Bruner, 1977; Vygotsky, 1978; Mercer, 1995, 2000; Moate, 2011). It is the main means of communication through which people interact in order to convey information, transmit knowledge, and nurture cognitive development (Vygotsky, 1978). Research on African contexts (Alidou & Brock-Utne, 2011; Brock-Utne & Alidou, 2011) has shown that primary and secondary school students should be helped to develop and refine their language in order to facilitate their learning processes. This is often made possible through the formal teaching of the language whereby learners are encouraged to interact by means of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. This means that the choice of the language of instruction should take into account the learners' abilities to use that language. In addition, in the classroom where language is used as a tool of teaching and learning, teachers and learners should be engaged in discussions, debates, reflections, and interactional problem-solving. In other words, learners' interactions with the teacher and/or between themselves are vital to develop learning success. In this study, the sociocultural perspective on learning serves as a lens to demonstrate the effectiveness of mediation through English, given the participants' low levels of familiarity with the language.

Closely linked to mediation and interaction is the ZPD, which the researcher explores in the next section.

The Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)

The ZPD is a concept that Vygotsky created to refer to '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' (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86). Other scholars such as Mitchell and Myles (2004, p. 196) define the ZPD as 'the domain of knowledge or skills where the learner is not yet capable of independent functioning, but can achieve the desired outcome given relevant scaffolded help'. Likewise, Harvard (1997, p. 40) defines the ZPD as 'the distance between the child's independent capacity and the capacity to perform with assistance'. All the above definitions of the ZPD represent it as an area or a space in which learners need help or assistance from more skilled people in order to perform tasks before they reach the level of skills to do those tasks on their own.

Interpreting Vygotsky (1978), Chaiklin (2003) illustrates the idea of the ZPD with an example of how a child first follows adults' examples to develop skills to perform tasks (interpsychological processes), and gradually increase their capabilities to perform certain tasks without help or assistance (intrapsychological processes). In real life such as at home, and at school, children interact with other children, peers, teachers, parents, and other adults and develop the abilities to communicate, express their feelings, and explain certain scientific concepts. Goodman and Goodman (1990) believe that this social interaction is the basis of knowledge building, and, as Kenrose (2009, p. 1) states, 'ZPD is a tool for understanding how a learner learns.'

Tharp and Gallimore (1988) present a four-stage model of the ZPD that shows the processes through which children develop speech and language. The first two stages (see Figure 2.1) are the ZPD, and they inform the present study on the processes of learning a new language and other school subjects as well, because it is possible to create the ZPD for any domain of skill development (Tharp & Gallimore, 1998).



Figure 2.1

Source: Tharp and Gallimore (1988, p. 35).

Referring to the diagram, the first stage is the area where the child or learner needs assistance from parents, teachers, peers, or other mentors in order to be able to perform a task. This area has been compared to a transit through which a child or learner is enabled 'to transit from other regulation to self-regulation' (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988, p. 35). During this stage, learners are not passive participants, because they start asking questions leading to strategies to use in order to reach the goals assigned by the adult assistant, or they ask for directions to reach the next step of the task. Stage one ends when the adult assistant's responsibility to tailor the task to the child's or other learner's needs has been effectively carried out to the level whereby it becomes the learner's responsibility (Bruner, 1983; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988; Wertsch, 2008).

The second stage represents the learners' self-directed performance of tasks. Wertsch (2008) maintains that at this stage of the ZPD the learner has taken over the rules and responsibilities of both participants in the language-game. This means that the activities that were formerly shared by both the adult and the learner become the complete responsibilities of the learner. According to psychologists (Wertsch, 2008; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988), at this stage the learner has completed the transition in the ZPD and has reached the phase that allows him/her to assume the responsibility of tasks that are now self-directed or self-guided. Thus, the role

of the adult assistant, teacher, peer, or expert converts into a self-directed activity controlled by the learner. Although the ZPD ends with stage two, the learner has not fully developed or automatised his/her performance. This is fully internalised in stage three where the child or learner no longer needs the adult's or mentor's assistance (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). Since learning is a process, the learner evolving in the self-control at stage three is likely to be in a need of help. Whenever the child or learner encounters difficulties due to a new skill or problem at stage four, s/he has recourse to the previous stages whereby a new ZPD is created (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988; Wells, 1999).

In the course of analysis, the approach used in this study is in line with the ZPD in the context of interaction between the learner and mentors (teachers, peers, and more competent other). The analysis seeks to show that learning achievement takes place if there has been adequate assistance based on skilled guidance by the mentor to the learner. In fact, implementing the ZPD requires the teacher to encourage learners to perform learning activities with their own experiences or talk to each other or to their teacher or any other peer. As Kenrose (2009, p. 4) states, 'implementing ZPD in the classroom requires a move from a lecture-style format to one which includes adult guidance and peer collaboration'. This suggests that, after the teacher's guidance, learners have to work collaboratively in pairs or groups, which is a learning strategy that often leads learners to the stage of taking personal responsibility for their education. As seen above, the role of the teacher for the learner's self-regulation is important, since they have to mediate new knowledge by leading learners to becoming independent in their ZPD.

More Knowledgeable Other (MKO)

The MKO refers to 'an agent of learning' (Moodley, 2013, p. 88). Previously in this chapter, the agent of learning was referred to as a 'mediator of learning', and this can be a person (e.g. teacher, tutor, coach, peer, parent, any adult), or thing (e.g. computer, TV, internet, book). In the context of school, the MKO is a more advanced 'expert' in relation to a less experienced learner, novice, student, or apprentice. This person is supposed to have a better understanding or higher level of skills in doing a particular task, operating things, or comprehending concepts than the learner does. The MKO mediates new knowledge by helping the less experienced learners to replicate that knowledge alone at some point in the future.

Echoing Moodley (2013), for different situations and contexts of learning, there are also different MKOs. In the classroom for instance, the teacher is the MKO in front of the learners. During a group discussion or peer tutoring, one learner (or more learners depending on the task) plays the role of the MKO in the group. In brief, the MKO plays a prominent role in learning.

The sociocultural perspective on learning serves as a lens to see how the teacher sets the classroom activities, and which processes s/he goes through in order to promote the learners' cognitive development. For this purpose, teachers need 'an organizing framework that increases precision and, most importantly, promotes understanding' (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001, p. 4). This framework is provided by educational taxonomies that are discussed in Section 2.2.2.

Scaffolding

Scaffolding is a term coined by Jerome Bruner and colleagues to refer to 'any type of adult-child (expert-novice) assisted performance' (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 209). This concept works in conjunction with the ZPD, and it is a way through which teachers or other more competent adults or mentors assist learners to reach their level of independent performance (Kenrose, 2009). When teaching, instructors metaphorically scaffold their learners' knowledge structures and learning strategies. According to Donald et al. (2006), as builders scaffold a building to support it temporarily until it is strong enough to stand on its own, assistance or scaffolding from adults, mentors, and peers in the learners' environment temporarily helps support the learners to develop their learning structures and strategies until they are capable of independent performance. Hence, this metaphor contributes to the understanding of how learning is built by the adult or teacher, and supported by teaching strategies and tools in order to reach the boundary of the learner's ZPD, i.e. the learner's independent performance. According to Balaban (1995, p. 52), 'Scaffolding refers to the way the adult guides the child's learning via focused questions and positive interactions'.

Scaffolding is a process. To scaffold knowledge in the classroom, there must be a mediator (teacher) who initially acts as a model for the learners regarding what they need to learn. In the process of scaffolding, the mediator's assistance reduces as the learners develop their understanding of the study matter. Then, scaffolding ends with the mediator's role decreasing

at the expense of the learner's self-mediation increasing. In other words, 'scaffolding is initially directed 'from the outside in' but the student gradually begins constructing by himself 'from inside out'' (Donald et al., 2006, p. 87), that is, the teacher guides the learner's task performance, and later the learner guides him/herself to produce what was being performed with the second party's help. Table 2.1 illustrates the practical steps that can be followed in the scaffolding process.

Table 2.1: Practical steps in the scaffolding process

Steps	**Process**
1. Identify key structures and forms	Identify key knowledge structures and/or learning strategies to be scaffolded (the teacher must select the knowledge structures and forms of thinking that are central to the learning area).
2. Connect	Translate understanding of the key structures, forms, and strategies into versions that are appropriate to the level of learners being taught.
3. Scaffold–first stage	Depending on the topic and purpose of the lesson, explain, model, demonstrate, question, probe, or ask students to reflect on the topic.
4. Scaffold–second stage	Set up a variety of activities to help students practice, adapt, and refine their understandings and strategies. Also continue supporting, guiding, and directing them to encourage further grasp of the topic.
5. Scaffold–third stage	Reduce input and support as practice begins to take effect in order to allow students to be able to work independently.

Adapted from Donald et al. (2006, pp. 93-94)

This table highlights the mediator's or teacher's structuring of the classroom interaction based on what the learners can manage. It shows how the teacher should set up the supportive activities in a social interaction in order to help the learner in the ZPD extend his/her skills to a higher level of self-regulation. From the table, it is evident that when the teacher actively guides the learners' participation in knowledge-making, scaffolding becomes most relevant at the early stages of learning where the teacher progressively helps learners become familiar with the practices. In this process, it is worth noting that the teacher's support is expected to

diminish as learners progress to the stage where the acquired knowledge and skills enable them to operate independently.

With the advancement of information and communication technology (ICT), scaffolding is not only performed by a person, since technology, especially a computer or other 'digital cultural tools' such as internet, videos, TV, online books, just to mention a few, can be used to assist learners to further their intellectual capacities (Mukama, 2009).

The Vygotskian key concepts explained above are interconnected features that facilitate the learning of a language. In the classroom, teachers are needed to scaffold and mediate learning, and this is performed in the ZPD, which provides learners with the capacity to work on their own after guidance.

2.2.2 Educational taxonomies

A taxonomy is a system for organising things, 'a special kind of framework' (Anderson and Krathwohl, 2001, p. 4), or 'a classification of principles in an ordered system' (Moodley, 2013, p. 90). The main purpose of educational taxonomies is to provide teachers with a framework enabling them to address a curriculum, and help them define objectives for their lessons. The educational taxonomies used in this study are Barrett's Taxonomy of Reading Comprehension, Bloom's Taxonomy of Cognitive Development (Bloom's Original Taxonomy), and Bloom's Revised Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. Although each of these three taxonomies has its own characteristics based on the objectives of the authors or caused by the criticisms which attracted revision, more overlapping characteristics than differences exist, as can be seen in Table 2.2:

Table 2.2: A comparison of the educational taxonomies



Adapted from Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) and Moodley (2013).

These educational taxonomies present a bottom-up hierarchy of cognitive domains which are relevant to the present study. It appears that all these educational taxonomies present cognitive processes, from the lowest (literal, knowledge, remembering) to the highest (appreciative, evaluation, creating), which are meant to help the teacher increase precision in the lesson objectives and promote the learners' learning. As will be seen later in this section, these cognitive processes determine the lower, middle, and higher thinking skills that learners are expected to have developed by the end of the lessons. In other words, the educational taxonomies enable teachers to structure classroom activities from lower order to middle order and higher order thinking skills. The researcher uses these educational taxonomies in conjunction with the principles of *assessment for learning*, a concept, which, in this study is used to refer to all those activities that the teachers and learners undertake for interactive teaching and learning for a greater learner achievement (Chappuis & Stiggins, 2002; Moodley, 2013).

Assessment for learning is 'an instructional tool that promotes learning rather than an event designed solely for the purpose of evaluation and assigning grades' (Chappuis & Stiggins, 2002, p. 40). As research shows, assessment for learning becomes productive in a context where the teacher masters the content of the lesson and pedagogy (Shulman, 1987) and asks questions that foster effective learning processes (Chappuis & Stiggins, 2002). With regard to questions as the main tools for assessment for learning, Moodley's (2013) working model of lower order questions (LOQs), middle order questions (MOQs), and higher order questions (HOQs) combines Barrett's and Bloom's taxonomies for analysing classroom questions and is used in this study to investigate how questions are used to promote learning in English as a foreign language in Rwandan primary schools. The model is illustrated as follows:

Table 2.3: Barrett's and Bloom's taxonomies combined

Cognitive Levels	**Barrett's Taxonomy of Reading Comprehension**	**Bloom's Original Model of Educational Taxonomy**	**Bloom's Revised Taxonomy of Educational Objectives**
Lower Order Questions	Literal Reorganisational	Knowledge Comprehension	Remembering
Middle Order Questions	Inferential	Analysis Application	Understanding Applying Analysing
Higher Order Questions	Evaluative Appreciative	Synthesis Evaluation	Evaluating Creating

Source: Moodley (2013, p. 103)

This model is meant to help teachers and researchers to determine to what extent learners have been assisted to develop cognitively. Researchers (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Black, Harrison, Lee, Marshall, and Wiliam, D., 2004; Moodley, 2010, 2013) have shown that most teachers' questions in the classroom are generally limited to the LOQs, and that asking questions in the middle order and higher order levels to promote the learners' thinking is challenging for teachers, especially when the language of instruction is a second or additional language. In the context where English is a foreign language, the above model is particularly

important for the examination of classroom questions in order to show whether the teachers' questions in English as the MoI in Rwanda promotes learning among learners.

This study is mainly constructed upon the sociocultural perspective on learning and is supported by educational taxonomies. Indeed, both perspectives address the critical importance of language and the way in which it might be used to promote the learners' thinking for effective learning. The educational taxonomies have been used to assist in understanding the effectiveness of the classroom practices. The sociocultural perspective of learning has been used in order to provide a wider framework that includes other theoretical constructs developed in the literature review that follows.

2.3 Literature review

The key scholarly literature that informs the present research concerns the contribution made by the body of research on attitudes towards language in education in general, and, in particular, towards English as the language of teaching in a context where it is a second or foreign language. It also focuses on the use of language as the MoI, with particular focus on English as the MoI in post-colonial African nations. With regard to the MoI, the discussion stresses the role of globalisation and English linguistic imperialism to the current patterns of language-in-education policies in developing and under-developed countries, especially post-colonial African nations. It argues that the spread of English is more a result of globalisation than a result of it being promoted by the power of English-speaking countries. It also reviews some issues in relation to ideologies and attitudes towards language policies and language practices.

2.3.1 Attitudes

The concept of attitudes is not simple and straightforward. Attitudes are controversial since they refer to different realities in different contexts. In this study, the researcher provides key understandings of attitudes in social sciences in order to show the implications of attitudes for practices in education. The researcher particularly discusses how attitudes can positively or negatively affect the implementation of the language-in-education policy, since attitudes can match or differ from classroom practices. The researcher also presents the relationship between attitudes and motivation, and concludes the chapter with an exploration of attitudes towards language policy decisions.

2.3.1.1 Conceptualisation of attitudes

In social psychological research, the concept attitude has been defined as ‘a disposition to respond favourably or unfavourably to an object, person, institution, or event’ (Ajzen, 2005, p. 3). This definition highlights the evaluative characteristic which, before Ajzen (2005), social psychologists such as Fazio (1986) and Eagly and Chaiken (1993) had reported. For instance, attitude had been referred to as ‘an association between a given object and a given evaluation’ (Fazio, 1986, p. 214), and as ‘a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favour or disfavour’ (Eagly & Chaiken,

1993, p. 1). In alignment with this, educational psychologists have also defined the concept attitude. Allport (1954, p. 45 quoted in Gardner, 1985, p 8) posits that 'an attitude is a mental and neural state of readiness, organised through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related.' This definition refers to the tendency to do something or a tendency for something to happen. To be more explicit, with reference to Baker (1992), knowing someone's attitudes may predict how s/he will behave over a period of time. In other words, attitudes may help understand what people will choose to do and may predict the outcomes, whether positive or negative. For instance, 'a favourable attitude to maths or to language learning may be a vital input in maths or language achievement' (Baker, 1992, p. 12). According to Baker (1992), an attitude in this example can be a factor predisposing the maths or language learning outcome in two ways: first, a favourable attitude after the lesson can make the teacher hope for the learners' favourable attitude towards maths or language, and second, because of a favourable attitude, learners can become good at maths or language. In this case, attitude becomes both a 'predisposer' and an 'outcome' (Baker, 1992, p. 12).

The evaluative nature of attitude provides a working definition considered in this study because the educators' and learners' positions on learning and using English as the MoI are regarded as crucial factors for the success or failure of the implementation of English in primary education in Rwanda.

The evaluation of attitude objects has been approached with a multi-componential aspect of attitude definition. According to researchers such as Gardner (1985), Baker (1992), Edwards (1994) and Ajzen (2005), attitudes comprise three componential elements, i.e. cognitive, affective, and conative or behavioural. The cognitive element refers to the person's *belief* or *thought;* the affective element has to do with *feelings* or *emotional reactions*; and the conative element refers to the *predisposition* to act in a certain way. As Edwards (1994, p. 97) states, an individual who 'knows or believes something, has some emotional reaction to it and, therefore, may be assumed to act on this basis.' For instance, someone with a positive attitude towards learning English may be affected by the *thought* that English is a useful language and *feeling* that it is a prestigious language and that it promotes an individual's potential economic development, and can therefore be influenced to learn and speak it fluently. In daily life, 'people form attitudes experientially based on direct or indirect cognitive, affective, or behavioral responding to the attitudes object' (Eagly & Chaiken,

2007, p. 596). This observation, which reflects the multi-componential view, is relevant to this study because the three components' elements are used to guide the investigation on the educators' and learners' attitudes towards English as the MoI in Rwandan primary schools. In effect, the cognitive aspect leads the study to knowing how respondents perceive English as the MoI, i.e. what they believe and think about English as the language of teaching and learning, the affective aspect serves to reveal the respondents' feelings about English and their evaluations of its potential, and the conative aspect reveals the respondents' practices in English as the MoI.

One of the challenges that the concept of attitude has posed among researchers is its latent aspect, i.e. the status that makes it directly unobservable. Moodley (2003) raises a problem of measuring attitudes by positing that they cannot be directly or accurately measured because people's thoughts and feelings are hidden components that cannot be directly observed. Similarly, Ajzen (2005) who presents attitudes and personality traits as similar concepts, asserts that both attitudes and traits cannot be observed because they are not part of the person's physical characteristics. He further asserts that it is not possible to have direct access to the person's thoughts and feelings. These views were reiterated and further promoted by Eagly and Chaiken (2007, p. 584) who state, 'an attitude is inside the person, not directly observable, and is manifested by covert or overt responses'. This reveals the challenge of investigating attitudes. To remedy this problem in the present study, the researcher adopts Baker's (1992, p. 18) proposal to use attitudes as research variables measured on a satisfactory basis because, as he explains, 'the measurement of an individual's attitudes is unlikely to reveal their attitudes perfectly'. In addition, to minimise the risks of obtaining unreliable results due to difficulties of measuring attitudes, the researcher also measured attitudes through multiple sources using a questionnaire, interviews, observations, and recordings of lessons in the classroom, since, as Ajzen (2005) notes, unobservable realities can be inferred from external or observable cues. The latency aspect of attitudes justifies the rationale for the approach used to investigate the educators' and learners' attitudes towards English as the MoI in Rwandan primary schools through multiple sources.

2.3.1.2 Attitudes and motivation

Whoever talks about attitudes talks about motivation. Attitudes are closely related to motivation since attitudes are determinants of motivation (Maniraho, 2013). In the context of

L2 learning, motivation refers to 'the combination of effort plus desire to achieve the goal of learning the language plus favourable attitudes toward learning the language' (Gardner, 1985, p. 10). This definition comprises three components, namely the intensity of the language learning, the desire or wish to learn a language, and the attitudes towards the act of learning the language. According to Gardner (1985), effort to perform an activity, desire to achieve a goal, and favourable attitudes towards that goal constitute motivation. According to Gardner's theory, motivation does not only target the goal of learning an L2; it also aims at other reasons or goals, whose main goals are integrative and instrumental. Integrative motivation refers to 'the social-emotional aims of learning the language in order to use it to communicate with the other community' (Gardner, 1985, p. 12) while instrumental motivation 'is characterized by a desire to gain social recognition or economic advantages through learning the L2' (Ghazvini & Khajehpour, 2011, p. 1210). For Gardner (1985) and Johnson (2001), instrumental motivation focuses on the utilitarian benefits of learning an L2 such as earning a good salary, and accessing power or job promotion. Similarly, many people in Rwanda prefer English because it is a global language with much prestige value (Kagwesage, 2013; Maniraho, 2013). In addition, the instrumental motivation has subsequently been reiterated by Norton (2013) as language investment (see details in 2.3.1.3). The attitudes to learn English as an L2 have often been integratively and instrumentally motivated under the force of globalisation. This provides a lens to observe what motivates educators and learners at Rwandan primary schools to learn and use English as the MoI.

Studies on language attitudes have been conducted in order to discover people's motivation toward learning or using a second or foreign language (Shaw, 1983; Gardner, 1985), and many of them sought to reveal the influences of the people's language choice or preference (Baker, 2001). There has been an increasing interest in understanding the value of language attitudes in the field of language planning and policy (Henriksen, 2010). Research has increasingly shown that people's attitudes towards a language policy play a crucial role in the outcome of that policy implementation (Le Dû, 2003; Baker, 1992, 2001, 2006; Kamwendo, 2006). This shows how important it is to be familiar with the beliefs, feelings, and perceptions of the recipients or implementers of language policies, no matter how well they may have been designed.

2.3.1.3 Language preference

Language preferences in the context of second or foreign language learning are affected by a number of factors, such as learners' attitudes towards the target language and teaching approaches used in the classroom. In the next paragraphs, the researcher discusses the notion of investment in L2 learning, the role of linguistic environment, and teaching strategies for the learners' motivation to learn a target language.

Research shows that learners prefer to learn a language because of future benefits occasioned by the use of that language. Norton's (2013) notion of investment refers to 'the socially and historically constructed relationship of learners to the target language and their sometimes ambivalent desire to learn and practice it' (Norton, 2013, p. 86). According to Norton (2013), the notion of investment in second or foreign language learning draws on Bourdieu's notion of 'cultural capital' in the sense that 'if learners 'invest' in a second language, they do so with the understanding that they will acquire a wider range of symbolic and material resources, which will in turn increase the value of their cultural capital' (Norton, 2013, p. 87). This shows that learners are motivated to learn a language because of future symbolic and material benefits. Among these benefits, learners may be motivated to learn an L2, English for instance, because they have an ideal association with the language, such as becoming a rich person, a politician, or a famous singer, actor, or player who is a member of the English-speaking community.

The linguistic environment plays an important role for the learners' preference of a language and motivation to learn it. As Ho (2003) shows, interest in a foreign language and motivation to learn it on the part of learners is often increased because this language is used in their area. For instance, Ho (2003) points out that learners in rural areas may not be motivated to learn English because they do not have foreign contacts with whom they can practise the language. This situation differs from the one in the urban areas where, in addition to foreigners who speak English, there are many other language learning attractions such as books, newspapers, TV, posters, advertisements, etc., which facilitate language learning and promote the learners' preference of a target language.

Language preference can also be promoted by the teaching strategies for second or foreign language learning. Researchers such as Garton, Copland, and Burns (2011) and Cameron

(2001) found out that the best way to motivate learners to like English and learn it effectively is by teaching it through stories, songs, visuals, and games, strategies that young learners enjoy. These researchers point out that strategies that learners enjoy attract their attention, control their discipline, enable them to remember what they learnt with the teacher, and therefore, encourage their enthusiastic participation, which results in effective language learning.

2.3.1.4 Attitudes towards language policy decisions

Attitudes towards language policies may be positive or negative, and they have been taken as important determinants of success or failure of language policy implementation. It has been argued that when attitudes towards a language policy are positive, the implementation is likely to be successful (Baker, 1992; Adegbija, 1994; Spolsky, 2004; Ricento, 2006b); and when attitudes are negative or counter to the prevailing community's perceptions, the implementation is doomed to failure (Paulston, 1986). This means that before implementing any language policy, positive attitudes of implementers and anyone that is concerned by this policy are necessary. As Adegbija (1994) notes, attitudes have great implications in education, and not recognising this may result into the failure of the policy, which can mean the failure of the education system. For Baker (1992), it is worth investigating the attitudes of the implementers of a concerned policy because they are indicators of the thoughts, beliefs, preferences, and desires of the community.

> Attempting language shift by language planning, language policy making and the provision of human and material resources can all come to nothing if attitudes are not favourable to change. Language engineering can flourish or fail according to the attitudes of the community. Having a favourable attitude to the subject of language attitudes becomes important in bilingual policy and practice (Baker 1992, p. 21).

This quotation suggests that attitudes are predictors of the success or failure of a chosen language-in-education policy for a particular community of implementers and recipients of that policy. This means that people who have good or positive attitudes towards a language of instruction, are likely to perform better in that language, while those who have bad or negative attitudes are likely to perform poorly. In fact, in response to Baker's (1992) views, the researcher understands that attitudes provide an indication of the chances of success in

policy implementation, but there are also other factors such as language proficiency (Cummins, 1999), communicative competence, and learning environment (Brown, 1994) that may contribute to the success or failure of learning through a given language. The researcher will return to these factors in Chapter Four.

According to Chick and Seneque (1987, p.123), 'language policy decisions tend to be motivated by ideological rather than educational considerations, and are designed primarily to serve the interests of those in political power'. Other sources perceive language policy decisions as undemocratic because they are imposed by political administrators (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2009, 2000; Shohamy, 2006; Baldauf & Kaplan, 2004). In many nations, decisions on language education policies have not often involved citizens and the public at large (students, teachers, immigrants and other residents) (Bamgbose, 2000, Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). In addition to this, there is often a lack of negotiation, research, needs analysis, or discussion before launching the implementation of the new language policy (Shohamy, 2006), and this can result in 'drastic' or 'sudden' policies (Pearson, 2013).

Attitude studies have indicated that language policy implementation is a process that has to be handled progressively. According to Herbert (1992) for instance, English progressively became the MoI in Namibian schools. Initially, parents requested that their children be educated in English, which resulted in a language policy change from Afrikaans to English as the MoI in Ovambo schools in 1981. Next, in 1988, the University of Namibia also switched to English as the language of instruction. Later, in 1990, the independent Namibia opted for English as the language of liberation, the language of political and social integration, and the MoI. In terms of planning a language-in-education policy, Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) indicate that policy planners need to ensure that they have sufficient qualified teachers and necessary materials. They need the local community views about the policy and establishment of assessment systems to monitor progress, and since all of these have financial implications, they also have to determine financial costs. Considering the above processes of policy planning and implementation, it can be seen that a successful language policy requires careful exploration before enacting it, because 'policies that are too drastic, sudden, or theoretical may fail in actual practice, and unintended realities may ensue' (Pearson, 2013, p. 16).

Rwanda has held varied language policies which were informed by political ideologies and that therefore did not give any role to the recipients of the language policy in making policy decisions (Obura, 2003; Pearson, 2013). This was done during the colonial period when the 'education of elite' was only favoured for the chiefs' and leaders' children. Similarly, after independence of 1962 and until 1994, the Rwandan education system was unfortunately marked by gross ethnic and regional discrimination: in secondary schools and universities, enrolment was not based on merit but specifically on one's ethnic or geographical origin, according to the whims and interests of the political authorities in power (Obura, 2003). The attitudes towards these two policies were negative because they were regarded as oppressive and segregational.

After 1994 the Rwandan government of national unity embarked on an education policy for all Rwandans based on a number of major language policy initiatives, namely bilingualism (1994-2008) and institutionalisation of English as the sole MoI through the education system (2009). The aim of bilingualism was to promote both French and English as the media of instruction at school because of a repatriated mixed population from both French-speaking and English-speaking countries. Education was to be held either in French or in English, depending on the language of the teacher and learner. The policy also stipulated that all learners were required to attend intensive courses of a different language from that of their linguistic background, i.e. English for Francophones and French for Anglophones. The attitudes towards the progress of the policy were positive (Mutwarasibo, 2003; Mbori, 2008) because for most educated Rwandans, 'to be bilingual is a benefit' (Green, Fagging, Cochrane, Dayson & Paun, 2012, p.2).

With the institutionalisation of English as the MoI, the cabinet resolution states that English become the MoI from primary to tertiary education (MINICAAF, 2008). Unlike language policies in other African countries such as Tanzania, Namibia, and Botswana, the 2009 language policy for primary education in Rwanda does not make provision for a transitional period (first three years) for pupils to learn English that they can use in the rest of their school education. However, non-compulsory subjects can be taught in a language other than English (either French or Kinyarwanda). It also provides that the policy has to apply to all schools, both public and private. The attitudes towards this policy, which qualified as drastic and sudden, were negative within the first three years, and this led to a policy revision, which

designated Kinyarwanda as the MoI from Grade One to Grade Three of primary school since March 2011 (Pearson, 2013).

2.3.2 Medium of instruction

The MoI is generally understood as 'the language used when delivering the content of lessons in subjects other than language learning' (Lo & Macaro, 2012, p. 29). This language is often the one that is used as an official language in many countries of the world, but it may be another language different from the official language. The MoI plays a crucial role for the learning process, since the teacher needs to interact via verbal exchanges with the learners. It is also important for the learner-learner interactions in the classroom. In other words, the MoI is a tool that enables teachers to convey and learners to acquire the content subjects (Webb, 2004; Kyeyune, 2010).

In most post-colonial countries in Africa and Asia, the use of MoI in schools emanates from the colonial legacy (Ferguson, 2006). Among the colonial languages (e.g. French, Portuguese, English, and German), English is dominant in the world since, among people who can speak more than one language, one of the two is generally English (Cook, 2013) which is used as second or foreign language. In this study, the researcher focused on the use of English as the MoI in different contexts around the world in order to enable the reader to understand the attitudes and classroom practices that educators and learners at Grade 6 in primary school in Rwanda reveal.

2.3.2.1 English as the MoI

The use of English as the MoI has increased in most world countries. In the context of Africa, some countries use English as a second language (ESL), and others use English as a foreign language (EFL). ESL and EFL are related but different concepts. It is worth exploring both concepts for the reader's understanding of the impact of English as the MoI in Rwanda, which is the concern of this study.

ESL is a term used to refer to English language learning in countries that have taken English as their official language where the learners' first language (L1) is not English. As Richards, Platt & Weber (1992, p. 143) state, an L2 is 'a language that is not a native language in a

country but which is widely used as a medium of communication alongside another language or languages'. Similarly, an L2 refers to 'any language learned after one's first language, no matter how many others have been learned' (Fasold & Connor-Linton, 2006, p. 434). In the context of South Africa, this is referred to as an 'additional language' because of the complexity of language use in which someone's second learnt language can be another language other than English (Kamwangamalu, 2000; Moodley, 2010).

In the school context, English is an L2 in many African countries such as Ghana, Nigeria, South Africa, Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Botswana, Malawi, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Swaziland, and Liberia, and these countries have all been English colonies. As the researcher shows later in this section, these ESL countries correspond to Kachru's (1992) outer circle of his three concentric circles of English, or Phillipson's (1992) periphery-English countries, 1st type. In these countries, English is not a native language, it is learnt and 'used widely as a medium of communication in domains such as education and government' (Phillipson, 1992, p. 24), and it serves as a lingua franca among different multilingual ethnic groups (Tollefson, 2000).

EFL is used to mean that English is used in countries where it is not an official first language. By definition, a foreign language is 'a language which is not a native language in a country […] usually studied either for communication with foreigners who speak the language, or for reading printed materials in the language' (Richards et al., 1992, p.192). From this definition, in EFL English serves as a link to foreign countries, and this means that English is not necessarily a language of communication within the country.

There are similarities and differences between ESL and EFL. Both concepts refer to the fact that English is not a native language, i.e. it is accommodated in the existing speech communities from outside, and learnt within the country. Even if second language and foreign language have been used interchangeably in the American context, there is a distinction between ESL and EFL. According to Richards et al. (1992), a foreign language is taught as a subject at school but it is not the MoI. In addition to this, in EFL, English is not primarily learnt for the purpose of the people's communication within a country, and it is not used as an official language. On the contrary, as seen above, in ESL, an L2 is taught and used as the MoI in schools, and it is used as an official language of the country and is intended to serve for the people's communication in certain domains, as needed.

This study is informed by theories of English as an L2, but it mainly focuses on the use of English as a foreign language and its impact when it is used as the MoI. Drawing on the definitions provided above, in Rwanda English is used as a foreign language for the following reasons: Firstly, in Rwanda before 1994, English was taught as a school subject and it was not the language of government. It was learnt only to be used to communicate with English speakers, read texts in that language, or used for translation purpose (Mutwarasibo, 2003). The L2 was French, and people's exposure to English outside school was minimal.

Secondly, since 1994, the use of English in Rwanda, despite its choice as an official language and MoI, is still limited (Pearson, 2013). The infrequent use of this language implies that English is still a foreign language because, although it is the MoI and the language of government, it is not Rwanda's main language of communication. Literature shows that the majority of Rwandans (99.7%) communicate in their MT Kinyarwanda, while a small proportion (1.8% - 5%) can use English (Munyankesha, 2004; LeClerc, 2008; Samuelson & Freedman, 2010; Sinclair, 2012). In addition, although there is a small number of Rwandans who learnt English as their L2, English is still not widely used in the country, and much evidence from the recent research on the use of English in education in Rwanda, (e.g. Sinclair, 2012; Pearson, 2013; Kagwesage, 2013; Maniraho, 2013), indicates that Rwanda is in an EFL situation, and that it requires more time to reach an ESL situation. In fact, these studies demonstrate that English in Rwanda does not function as an L2, but rather as a foreign language or third language, and in education, teachers and learners have limited proficiency in English as the MoI. This is relevant to this study that investigates the classroom practices, because as literature shows, if teachers and learners do not have a good command of the language of instruction, they are likely to have problems teaching and learning, and the learners' cognitive development will be hampered (Heugh, 2000; Webb, 2004; Brock-Utne & Alidou, 2011; Wolff, 2011). The context of EFL appears to provide little exposure to the majority population in using the language of instruction, and this is likely to result in insufficient proficiency in English as the MoI, thus entailing several learning problems.

In any learning context, it is a problem if learners are insufficiently proficient in the language of teaching. Researchers, in the context of learning in English in Africa (Rubagumya, 1997; Heugh, 2000; Webb, 2002, 2004; Brock-Utne, Desai & Qorro, 2004; Bamgbose, 2005; Rugemalira, 2005; Kyeyune, 2010; Alidou & Brock-Utne, 2011; Brock-Utne & Alidou,

2011; Wolff, 2011), and in other parts of the world, mainly Asia, (Airey & Linder, 2006; Miller, 2009; Evans & Morrison, 2011; Zacaria & Abd Aziz, 2011; Lo & Macaro, 2012), have shown that learners encounter many problems due to the lack of exposure to English or insufficient proficiency in English as the MoI.

The problem of insufficient proficiency in English as the MoI and its consequences to learning is not new to the African continent. There have been a number of MoI shifts in educational systems in sub-Saharan Africa where some countries moved away from using the former colonial language as the sole MoI after independence and combined it with the local languages for successful education. This was the case in Tanzania where English was combined with Kiswahili (Alidou, 2004; Brock-Utne, 2005), in Malawi where English was combined with Chichewa (Mchazime, 2001), and in Botswana where English was combined with Setswana (Nkosana, 2011). Countries such as Burkina Faso, Mali, and Niger, which had maintained the colonial language of French as the sole MoI, experienced serious educational problems due to the lack of the mastery of the MoI (Alidou, 2004). This means that the switch away from the colonial language was positive because it had always posed a problem for learners.

Although the problem of insufficient proficiency in English among learners in most African and some Asian countries remains, there has been an increase in the adoption of English as the MoI. The recent case of Rwanda has attracted research curiosity to discover why English is spreading as the MoI despite educational challenges it presents.

2.3.2.2 The spread of English

The spread of English has been a controversial issue for researchers. Phillipson's (1999) theory of linguistic imperialism suggests that the spread of English is due to the intentional and conscious policy perpetrated by the British and American powers in order to promote their language together with 'Capitalism, Transnationalisation, Americanization and Homogenisation of World culture, Linguistic, Cultural and Media Imperialism' (Phillipson, 1999, p.29). Another theory that refers to the spread of English as linguistic imperialism is 'linguicism' or 'linguistic genocide' (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000, 2001). According to her, English is a 'killer language' in the sense that the more it is used in most domains of life and various places, the more it reduces and limits the use of other languages, and therefore

contributes to a progressive slow demise of other languages. According to this theory, the spread of English triggered by the English powers results in the extinction of powerless languages previously used in a community.

Spolsky (2004) has a different view which shows how English has become a threat to French and many other national languages in the world since the late 20th century because of new developments in the global movements. For Spolsky, English has spread because of the 'economic, political, military, communicative, cultural and social imperialisms' (Spolsky, 2004, p. 79). In this vein, Spolsky (2004, p. 87) emphasises the spread of English on the basis of socio-economic evolution stating that 'the socio-economic forces encouraging the spread of English are now indigenous in most countries of the world, and do not depend on outside encouragement or formal-language diffusion policy.' This opinion has also been shared by researchers such as Tollefson (2006, 2009), Kramsch (2012), and Cook (2013) who show that the diffusion of English is attributable to the causes or effects of globalisation.

Globalisation is a concept that became a buzzword in information technology, education, economics, media, politics, commerce, etc. It is used to refer to 'a complex, interconnected but partly autonomous set of processes affecting many dimensions of social life (economic, political, social, cultural, environmental, military and so forth) which constitute changes in spatial organization of social activity and interaction, social relations and relations of power, producing ever more intensive, extensive and rapid interconnections, interdependencies and flows on a global scale and between the global scale and other (macro-regional, national, local, etc.) scales' (Fairclough, 2006, p. 163). Like Fairclough, the researcher maintains that globalisation relates to an interconnected and interdependent world in which the geographical borders of nations are dissolved by the increase of world cooperation between political, economic, social, cultural, educational, and technological agents, and many more. The researcher also understands that in globalisation there is an increase of the migration levels, which demands a convergence of multilingualism and multiculturalism to a lingua franca for communication. In education, globalisation implies an increasing demand of a common MoI worldwide, which is currently English.

Another explanation of the spread of English is in Kachru's (1990) three concentric circles alluding to globalisation. Kachru's (1990) argument for globalisation is based on the consideration of varieties of English as natural phenomena to be institutionalised, versus

Standard English. In his views, many varieties of English exist, which he refers to as 'World Englishes'. Kachru (1990) contends that the spread of English is classified in three concentric circles, namely, the inner circle, the outer circle, and the expanded circle. The inner circle refers to countries in which English is used as the L1, and which represents the traditional, cultural, and linguistic base of English. This circle includes the UK, the USA, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada. The World Englishes start in the inner circle with movements of native speakers from the UK, USA, Australia, Canada, and New Zealand providing varieties named British English, American English, Australian English, Canadian English, and New Zealand English. These countries are also referred to as the 'core English-speaking countries' by Phillipson (1992, p.17).

The outer circle includes countries that have been colonised by the UK and which use English as an L2. Kachru's (1990) outer circle corresponds to Phillipson's (1992) 1st type 'periphery-English countries'. These countries are for instance South Africa, Nigeria, Kenya, Ghana, India, Pakistan, Uganda, Tanzania, Bangladesh, Zambia, Philippines, Malaysia and Sri Lanka. These countries indigenised their English and their varieties are spoken in different ways from the native speakers.

The expanded circle refers to the countries that use English as a foreign language. These are countries such as China, Russia, Egypt, Japan, Burundi, Brazil, Columbia, and Nepal that use English to facilitate economic interaction with the English world. Phillipson (1992) calls these countries 2nd type 'periphery-English countries'. Considering the reasons provided above, Rwanda is a part of the expanded circle in which exposure and fluency in English are limited. Kachru's (1990) three concentric circles explain the spread of English by showing how this happened through the change from the UK Standard English to many Englishes, and this contributes to explaining why Rwanda and other countries in similar contexts would choose English as the MoI despite unfavourable language conditions.

Further explanation for the spread of English related to Kachru's concentric circles, especially the expanded circle, is based on multilingualism and multicultural issues that have raised English to the lingua franca and being a vehicle for communication. Recent studies on teaching English as a foreign language, such as those of Kramsch (2012) and Cook (2013), argue that EFL teachers should cope with the advent of globalisation (media and global communication) and the mobility of humans and goods that reflect the use of different codes,

modes, culture, and styles. According to these studies, EFL teaching has contributed significantly to the development of global and multilingual competence, which makes English dominate world communication. According to Cook (2013), the aim of English language teaching in the new methodologies is not to produce a native-speaker or the shadow of a native speaker, but to produce a successful L2 user. This flexibility in teaching English as a foreign language has, in the researcher's view, contributed to the spread of English worldwide, and particularly for Rwanda, EFL teaching is one of the methods that facilitates English learning for many Rwandans.

To account for the effects of globalisation on the spread of English, one can say that language policy issues cannot only be considered in terms of language as such, they have to be dealt with in a much wider context including the causes or effects of globalisation. Recent evidence of this is evident in Rwanda which chose English, not because of the imposition of the super powers (colonisers for instance), but because of its unification with other countries for economic, political, military, communicative growth, and its integration into a global society for social and cultural modernisation. In 2007, Rwanda joined the East African Community (EAC) (EAC, 2007), and in 2010, it became a member of the Commonwealth (VOA News, 8 March 2010), and both organisations use English as their official communication language.

As Kachru's concentric circles demonstrate, the beginning of World Englishes is located in the inner circle with the people's movements. Spolsky (2004) also argues for immigration factors as the obvious reason why English managed to spread in the colonies. He shows that the English-speaking immigrants' settlement in the colonies contributed to the continued spread of English, the language that gained the colonised people's interests because of the power they needed from being proficient in English. This is explained in Spolsky's (2004) and Phillipson's (1992) accounts of the spread of English.

According to Conrad (1996, cited in Spolsky, 2004), the learning of another language increases the power of the learner, which is contrary to Phillipson (1992) who assumes that the learning of another language puts the learner under that language's domination. Instead of looking at the diffusion of English as a result of the English-speaking authorities' efforts, Conrad (1996) and Spolsky (2004) note that the power that the learner gets from a new language, such as English, is the one that attracts the burgeoning population who seek to be

proficient in English. In other words, English spreads not because of its 'linguicism' (Phillipson, 1992), the term used to qualify 'the intentional destruction of a powerless language by a dominant one' (Spolsky 2004, p. 79), but because of its 'imperialism', a concept that Conrad (1996) and Spolsky (2004) use to refer to the global forces that contribute to the continued spread of English.

There are many studies confirming Spolsky's (2004) point of view that cite examples of many African countries that adopted English as their official language and MoI for social, economic, and political reasons (Probyn, 2005; Lin & Martin, 2005). Cases from empirical studies (Brock-Utne et al., 2004; Brock-Utne, 2005) demonstrate that the demand resulting in the spread of English does not necessarily originate from the imposition of the powerful English-speaking countries such as the UK and the USA, but rather emanates from the need to keep pace with the globalisation trend. For instance, countries such as Rwanda (Samuelson & Freedman, 2010), Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam (Bray & Koo, 2004) chose to use English while they were French colonies.

Much evidence from literature shows that the spread of English is the result of economic, political, military, technological, and other influences, rather than the result of the control of language managers. Echoing Spolsky (2004), 'the major factors now affecting the spread of English are associated not with empires or with major campaigns for language diffusion such as those still being conducted by the French, the Spanish and the Portuguese, but come from the changing nature of the world and of its reflected language system' (Spolsky, 2004, p.88). Indeed, English has been losing its association with particular Anglophone cultures to the point that currently it is identified as a lingua mundi (Lamb, 2004).

2.3.2.3 Challenges posed by English as the MoI

Extensive debates on the language of teaching or the MoI, especially in the context of second or foreign language, have revealed that globalisation has influenced many countries to adopt English as the language of instruction (Tamtam, Gallagher, Naher & Olabi, 2010). A number of empirical studies have found that the use of English second or foreign language as the MoI reduces classroom teacher-learner interactions (Airey & Linder, 2006; Evans & Morrisson, 2011), negatively affects the learners' negotiation of meaning and the teachers' scaffolding of knowledge acquisition (Lo & Macaro, 2012), and results in poor performance on the part of

learners (Zakaria & Abd Aziz, 2011). In their study, Evans and Morrisson (2011) found that students learning in English in Hong Kong had difficulties understanding technical concepts and lectures. Due to the lack of learner-teacher interaction in the classroom, learners had to combine many strategies such as peer mentoring, hard work in both English and MT, and consultations with the lecturer outside of the lecture time. Similarly, Lo and Macaro (2012) found that when Grade 9 students in Hong Kong switched from their MT to English as the MoI in Grade 10, lessons became more teacher-centred because the students' participation through teacher-learner interaction was reduced, and learning in English became difficult.

It is worth noting that the challenges faced by most education systems emanate mainly from learning through a language other than one's own, or a language that learners have only previously encountered as a subject for a short time before its use as MoI. Research in language policy and practice has shown that academic success, i.e. acquisition and dissemination of knowledge, depends on the ability to use the language of instruction proficiently (Evans & Green, 2007). English has been chosen as the MoI in many schools, and the way it has been handled in different societies has provoked substantial discussions that are reviewed below.

2.3.2.4 Debates on the use of English as the MoI

The global spread of English has pushed many post-colonial nations to opt for English as MoI. The use of English as MoI in post-colonial Africa has been highly controversial. Research studies indicate the tensions between the post-colonial language policies for English as MoI and the role of the local languages for cognitive development of children at school (Macdonald & Burroughs, 1991; Rubagumya 2003, 1990; Canvin, 2007; Brock-Utne, 2005; Bunyi, 2005; Probyn, 2005, 2006; Heugh, 2007). These studies addressed the problem of whether the use of English as the MoI results in better academic performance, or whether the use of English as the MoI increases the learners' participation in their learning process. The findings indicate that learners, especially primary school children, are not linguistically prepared for instruction through the medium of English. For instance in Malawian (Mchazime, 2001), Tanzanian (Rubagumya, 1990; Brock-Utne, 2005), Kenyan (Bunyi, 2005), and South African schools, in which most, if not all, of the learners are native speakers of African languages (Macdonald & Burroughs, 1991; Brock-Utne, 2005), learners cannot

adequately cope with learning content subjects in English because of their limited mastery of the language of instruction.

Rassool (2007) notes that colonisation imposed colonial languages, (e.g. English, French, and Portuguese) on the colonised people as the official languages and as MoI in order to help colonised nations to develop their human resources for the global labour market. The competitive global labour demands triggered intense learning of the former colonial languages in order to gain access to jobs and services. This resulted in the predominance of colonial languages, particularly English (Phillipson, 1992; Pennycook, 1994; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000), and the regression of local languages.

The worldwide use of English has triggered the widespread desire for English as the MoI. The radically increased role of English in the world made substantial changes of language use in the sense that local languages are no longer useful beyond the specific territory of the nation-states. This is evident in the trend of nations demanding that their citizens learn English for international and global functions and for economic and academic purposes (Shohamy, 2006; Rassool, 2007; Phillipson, 2009). During the colonial period, English supplanted indigenous languages in the formal context to the extent that the latter languages were limited to primary school education in order to curtail opportunities of the colonised within the society and in the labour market (Rassool, 2007). To be competitive in the labour market, colonial language policies demanded instruction in the language of power (English). This colonial language-in-education policy entailed social disparities characterised by promoting the minority elites through formal English education, and leaving the rest of the population outside formal education. According to Shohamy (2006), the use of one particular language over others often serves to establish and maintain the social and economic superiority of members of a dominant central group in relation to those outside the group (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000; Tollefson, 2006). For Rassool (2007), the imposition of languages of power led to the marginalisation of indigenous languages and became an instrument of maintaining colonial language hegemony. However, although the colonial language policies affected the contemporary African post-colonial educational practices, there have been polemic arguments by the local communities and governments on the post-colonial language policies' choice of language.

With regard to English as MoI, the above-mentioned arguments are twofold. On the one hand, Lin and Martin (2005) show that most local African communities and governments are in favour of English for socioeconomic advancement, technological modernisation, and globalisation reasons. In their research, Lin and Martin (2005) provide examples of countries such as India, Malaysia, Singapore, Hong Kong, Iran, and Turkey, where English gained new force because the local communities and governments strongly desired English for the MoI in both basic and higher education for further benefits such as socioeconomic advancement, higher professional education, globalised job market, and the prestige or the value of mastering English under the new forces of globalisation. On the other hand, there are other views against the use of English as MoI, which are based on the ability of learners to use English in the classroom, because learning through the medium of unfamiliar language 'contributes to poor pass rates in African schools and is a major source of inequality and a block to equitable access to the curriculum' (Probyn, 2005, p. 168). Each of the two arguments is explored below, as is the issue of language proficiency with the focus on English in Rwanda.

Arguments for English

Economic needs, technological modernisation, and globalisation have pushed African nations to maintain English as an official language and the MoI. As Pennycook (1994, p.13) states, 'it has become the language of power and prestige in many countries, thus acting as a crucial gatekeeper to social and economic progress'. This shows how English has become a key to facilitating access to social, educational, political, and economic mobility. With regard to the economy, although colonial language policies were initially regarded as oppressive, post-colonisation they contributed to facilitating access to the labour market. People who were literate and could speak the colonial languages of power were able to access life opportunities because they could get jobs as opposed to those who had not been to school could not access these opportunities (Rassool, 2007).

Besides the economic role of English in the post-colonial African societies, English as the MoI was also supported by many parents who sent their children to school to acquire more globally marketable communicative competence in English. Governments also valued the role of English in education and expressed the need to acquire this language, as Pennycook (1994, p. 261) notes:

> As English spread into Africa through trade, missionary work and education, it developed close ties with religion, intellectual work and politics. As the definition of what it meant to be 'educated' came to be seen increasingly in terms of Western education, and, therefore, in terms of ability in English (or other European languages), speaking English and being an intellectual came to be almost synonymous.

Like Pennycook (1994), the researcher understands that many of the world's inhabitants regard English as the language that assigns a mark of education to its speakers because of its power and worldwide reach. For instance some African countries such as Mozambique, Namibia and Rwanda changed their official language and the MoI from another European language, namely Portuguese, German and French respectively, to English (Rassool, 2007). This indicates the move of nations towards English for prestige under the forces of globalisation.

Although it is still difficult for most African children to learn in English because they do not know or understand this language well, many parents and educational stakeholders support the idea of maintaining English as the MoI because it is a global language that people need to access good jobs, and to travel anywhere in the world. However, research has also shown ideas that oppose English as the MoI.

Arguments against English

There have been arguments against English in some of the research on the post-colonial language-in-education policies in Africa. For instance, as Brock-Utne (2005) puts it, in South Africa and Tanzania, English-medium education has significantly been costly for parents and has yet yielded very few benefits because, due to language difficulties, their children repeat classes year after year. Another disadvantage of English as the MoI as found by Bunyi (2005) in Kenya, and Mchazime (2001) in Malawi, is that English as the MoI in primary schools presents enormous challenges to teachers and learners, especially those in rural and poor urban communities, because they have little access to English outside the school environment. Particularly in Tanzania, Brock-Utne (2005) found that teachers did not have a good command of English and learners did not understand the language of instruction. Brock-Utne (2005) argues against the assumption that using English as the MoI means that

students master it. In research carried out in the secondary schools in Tanzania, Qorro (2002, p. 3) discovered that 'the use of English as medium of instruction actually defeats the whole purpose of teaching English language'. She argues that the best way to master English is to teach English as a subject instead of attempting to teach it as the MoI.

The main problem that Qorro (2002) identified in English-medium classes was that teachers who have not mastered English, teach in imperfect English, which affects the learners' knowledge of subjects other than English. Her suggestion is to start learning through the medium of the MT while the learner is being taught English as a subject until they achieve appropriate competence, where English can be used as the MoI. This is an argument adopted by many other scholars, such as Cummins (2000), Spolsky (2004), and Baker (2006), and what they refer to as 'additive bilingualism'. In Rwanda, the 2011 revision of the language-in-education policy reinstated Kinyarwanda as the MoI in lower primary grades, i.e. from Grade 1 to Grade 3, in order to enable the teaching of the English as a subject before using it as the MoI in Grade 4.

Advocates of mother-tongue instruction show that children learn better in their MT, the language that they understand well. For instance Brock-Utne (2005) supports the argument that students do better at school if they are learning in the language they know well, and she illustrates her argument with studies (Prophet & Dow, 1994; Mwinsheikhe, 2002) that indicate that learning in one's own language enhances the students' understanding of subject content. For example, in Botswana, students taught in Setswana proved to have a significantly better understanding of scientific concepts than those taught in English, and in Tanzania, students taught in Kiswahili performed better than those taught in English did. Cummins (2000) provides evidence of the academic success of students who experienced extended use of MT as the MoI along with systematic teaching of English as a subject, in what he calls 'positive effects of additive bilingualism' (Cummins, 2000, p. 37). Drawing from these examples, it is worth noting that although African home languages have been undermined for their academic efficiency, studies show better performance by children in their MT medium schools (Brock-Utne, 2005).

The choice of African home languages for the MoI has been limited by a number of reasons. Firstly, as Heugh (2009) shows, there have been critiques of African languages' ability to convey high-level cognitive processes. Heugh (2009) claims that the belief that African

languages are not capable of expressing mathematical and scientific concepts is incorrect because such a belief is based on the assumption that African languages do not have many written materials (textbooks for learners, reference materials for teachers, newspapers, journals, magazines, etc.). Secondly, parents who have adopted the attitude that African languages are not as useful as English is in terms of economic viability (Kamwangamalu, 2000) want their children to be educated in English. Thirdly, the large number of African languages is another problem that limits the choice of home languages, and opens doors to English as the MoI. It is recognised that in most African countries it is very difficult to support the home languages of all the learners in schools, especially those in multilingual societies such as South Africa (Bamgbose, 2000, 2004; Brock-Utne, 2005; Quane & Glanz, 2010). All of these reasons converge in a language problem which requires the use of African languages as the MoI, while English is being taught as a subject in preparation to using it as instructional language when the child has acquired a good command of it (Brock-Utne, 2005; Baker, 2006; Shohamy, 2006; Cummins, 2009; Skutnubb-Kangas, 2009).

Identifying the stage when the child has attained command of the language of instruction is also significant to this study. The context of using English as a foreign language requires time to learn this language. In her research, Shohamy (2006) found that it takes seven to twelve years to achieve native speaker language proficiency. Cummins (1999, 2000) maintains that it takes a minimum of about five years to achieve the level of language command required to cope with complex content subjects. Both Shohamy and Cummins show that it is not easy for learners to attain appropriate levels of both conversational and academic language skills that enables them to handle complex subjects in class because of the time it takes them to learn the language of instruction at school.

Language education policy and practices in African countries

Languages of instruction in most African countries come from Europe. The variety and the use of those languages depend very much on the colonialist legacy (Skutnabb-Kangas and Heugh, 2012). Languages of instruction in African schools include English, French, Spanish, Portuguese, and Afrikaans (Bamgbose, 2004). African languages are used as the language of instruction but only at the elementary school level. In some African countries such as Botswana, Ghana, Nigeria, Kenya, Uganda, etc, under British influence, and Burundi, Rwanda and DRC under Belgian influence, MT education was favoured for the first three to

four years of primary education (Bamgbose, 2004). In some other countries such as Benin, Burkina Faso, Central African Republic and Niger, under French influence, Angola and Cape Verde, under Portuguese influence, and Equatorial Guinea under Spanish influence, MT education was non-existent in the colonial period. Other African countries such as Cameroon, Ethiopia, Liberia, Madagascar, and Seychells were under a dual language policy in which two languages of colonizing powers were used. In most African countries, foreign languages are valued in education more than the local languages (Bamgbose, 2004).

The idea about the use of indigenous languages or mother tongue (MT) as MoI in Africa is not new. By the end of the 1960s and through the 1970s, the debate attained its highest point (Bamgbose, 2000). The major obstacle to using MT as MoI was that most of the countries in Africa (except a few such as Rwanda, Burundi and Somalia, where all people speak one language throughout the country) have many languages. The norm in most African countries seems to be the use of MT as MoI in lower primary phase, i.e., first three years. However, there are some other countries which extended MT education up to p 4 even p 6 (Bamgbose, 2004).

Language proficiency

In the process of knowledge acquisition, the communicative role of language is very important. As previously seen, learners construct knowledge collaboratively with teachers, peers, or any MKO. Drawing on Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory, Mitchell and Myles (2004) claim that the key to constructing knowledge is the use of language. This means that the crucial role of language in teaching and learning demands proficiency in the language used as the MoI. According to Cummins (1999, p. 2), language proficiency refers to two constructs, namely the 'Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills' (BICS), which is the kind of language proficiency that is necessary for ordinary conversation in social life, and the 'Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency' (CALP), which is the kind of language proficiency that is necessary for dealing with academic tasks.

A critique by Romaine (1989) that BICS and CALP are separate, i.e., they are language dimensions that are autonomous or independent of their contexts of acquisition, seems to missinterprete Cummins' views. In effect, BICS and CALP differ 'in acquisition and developmental patterns' (Cummins, 1999, p.2), i.e., BICS is acquired through everyday life

communication, while CALP is learnt through schooling processes. In terms of developmental patterns, high levels of BICS can be achieved without having opportunities of developing CALP, and as Cummins (1999, p. 3) goes on to show, 'high levels of L2 CALP can precede attainment of fluent L2 BICS in certain situations.' For instance, an adult learner of L2 can develop CALP throughout their schooling and be able to read and write words and concepts correctly before s/he will be able to use those words for joke-telling in that language. For Cummins (2000), however, the sequential nature of BICS and CALP acquisition should not be taken as an absolute order that applies in every, or even the majority of situations. For instance Cummins provides a case of a scientist who can read a language for research purposes but who can't speak that language.

In the school context, the learners' construction of knowledge through dialogues with teachers and peers requires both BICS and CALP. Acquisition and development of BICS and CALP are significantly relevant to the context of English language learning and use in Rwanda, since the Rwandan linguistic landscape locates both acquisition and development of BICS and CALP at school. The opportunities to use English out of the classroom for the development of BICS are rare, and the development of the learners' CALP is likely to be hampered by the teachers' limited proficiency in English.

2.3.2.5 Teaching strategies in the English-medium African classrooms

Most teachers feel confident when they are teaching in the language they know well. In the context where the teacher and learners do not have a good command of the language of instruction, there needs to be other strategies to supplement language in order to mediate learning. Researchers (Rubagumya, 1990; Macdonald & Burroughs, 1991; Mchazime, 2001; Bunyi, 2005; Shohamy, 2006) have shown that poor classroom atmosphere, expressed in the pupils' pervasive silence and poor classroom performance in most African rural schools, can be due to the lack of the language on the part of learners and lack of teaching strategies by the educators. Examples of the prevailing teaching strategies used to remedy the classroom challenges due to the limited proficiency in English are 'safe-talk', 'label quests', and 'code-switching (CS)'. Each of them is briefly discussed below.

Safe talk

Safe talk is a term coined by Keith Chick at the University of Natal in 1980s. It was defined as 'classroom talk that allows participation without any risk of loss of face for the teacher and the learners and maintains an appearance of 'doing the lesson', while in fact little learning is actually taking place' (Heller and Martin, 2001, p.13). This means that safe talk is a classroom practice in which the teacher and learners attempt to preserve their dignity by hiding the fact that little or no learning is taking place. Teachers who often have problems of the language of instruction or content knowledge use safe talk as a strategy to hide their lack of fluency in the language of teaching, or their failure to explain, or when they want to cover the syllabus.

The main practice in safe talk is to encourage learners to repeat what the teacher has said, and copy what s/he writes on the chalkboard. This teaching strategy does not develop learners' abilities to express their ideas or ask questions freely. In most instances where the pupils repeat the right answer in chorus, the teacher proceeds without checking whether every pupil understands what they repeated in chorus (Brock-Utne, 2005).

Label quests

Label quests, originally coined by Heath (1986), are interactional sequences in which teachers elicit vocabulary learning by asking learners to name something, and if they fail to do so, the teachers provide the answer and make learners repeat it. According to Bonacina-Pugh (2013), label quests are practiced by showing, naming, and repeating. Consider the following example:

> Teacher: what is this?
> Learner: a pen
> Teacher: a pen (Bonacina-Pugh, 2013, p. 143)

This is a typical example of label quests used to teach vocabulary items. In a bilingual or multilingual context, label quests provide learners with opportunities to juxtapose the MT and the MoI in order to understand the meaning in the language of instruction. The following extract illustrates bilingual label quests:

Teacher: ça s' appelle comment/[6]

what is it called/

Alexia: ah! (.) **es una historieta**! <Spanish>

ah! (.) it's a cartoon!

Micaela: que (.) comme (.) il parle-

that (.) like (.) that speaks-

Brianna : en anglais on dit **comics**<English>

in English we say comics

Teacher : Voilà (.) exactement (.) exactement (.) en anglais on dit/

There you go (.) exactly (.) exactly (.) in English you say/

Brianna: **comics**<English>

comics

Teacher: **comics**<English> (.) et en japonais/ Sheido/ (.) en japonais/

comics (.) and in Japanese/ (.) Sheido/ (.) in Japanese/

Sheido: **manga**<Japanese>

cartoon (Bonacina, 2009, p.18).

From the above example, and as shown by a number of researchers (Ndayipfukamiye, 1993; Arthur, 1996; Martin, 1999 in Bonacina-Pugh, 2013), label quests are common practices in teaching and learning vocabulary in primary school classrooms. They are used to check the pupils' comprehension, and help them to negotiate meaning.

Code-switching

CS is generally understood as the alternation of two or more languages in a speaker's speech at the word, phrase or clause, sentence, and discourse (or paragraph) level (Myers-Scotton, 1993; Kamwangamalu, 1994; Moodley & Kamwangamalu, 2004; Moodley, 2013). It is a practice commonly used by almost all bilinguals and multilinguals in various communication settings, including written CS through digital technologies (e.g. telephone short messages, chats on Facebook or Twitter), and oral CS in the language classroom (Moodley, 2013), or in the bilinguals' every day communication.

[6] Transcription conventions are presented in the preliminary pages of the thesis.

In the context of education, CS plays an important role for content learning. CS is a strategy that teachers use in the classrooms when they switch to another language that learners know well in order to help them understand what has been said in the language of instruction that learners do not understand well. For instance, if the language of teaching and learning is English, when the pupils do not understand the teacher's sentence, s/he switches to the pupils' MT (e.g. Kiswahili, isiZulu, Kinyarwanda) conveying the same information. CS can be intrasentential and intersentential (Myers-Scotton, 1993; Moodley, 2003). Intrasentential CS refers to alternating different languages within the same sentence, phrase, or sentence fragment as in '**Umwami yayoboraga** Kingdom, **ubu dufite** Republic' *(The King was leading the Kingdoom, but now we have a Republic)* (Extract 7). Intersentential CS refers to alternating languages in a way that the nodes under the same sentence are made of morphemes from the same language, as in 'It is the same as damaged goods. **Ibicuruzwa bishobora kwangirika vuba'***(Goods which can be damaged quickly*) (Extract 1). This study deals with both intrasentential and intersentential CS.

Research (Lin, 2013; Moodley, 2013; Moodley & Kamwangamalu, 2002; Kamwangamalu, 1994; Myers-Scotton, 1993) presents language alternation in various ways. Historically, intrasentential switching has been referred to as *code-mixing*, i.e. the use of two or more languages within a meaning unit, for instance a word or sentence. The switch from one language to another between sentences has been called *CS*. This type of language alternation has also been referred to as *code translation* when similar meaning unit is repeated in another language. Another kind of language alternation is *code borrowing*, which means a borrowing of vocabulary from one language to another.

CS studies have shown that in contexts where two languages are being used, one can surpass the other in terms of quantity of words. Myers-Scotton (1993) developed the Matrix Language Frame Model (MLFM), demonstrating that it is language competition that occurs in bilingual or multilingual speakers. In this model, on one hand, the less the quantity of a language, the more likely it is to be the weaker language, and this is referred to as *Embedded Language* (EL). On the other hand, the greater the quantity of language forms used, the more likely it is to be the speaker's dominant language or the *Matrix Language* (ML). In order to examine the impact of CS in learning in English as the MoI in primary school in Rwanda, the present study uses the MLFM to identify the ML and the EL from the corpus of data.

Previous studies such as Moodley (2003) and Moodley and Kamwangamalu (2004) have identified the different functions of CS as follows: (1) *CS as reiterative*, i.e. when the speaker repeats an utterance literally, or in a modified form using another code from the previous; (2) *CS for explanation purposes*, i.e. when a speaker switches to another language to provide explanations of a term, an idea, concept, or content information; (3) *CS to provide content information or new information*, i.e. when the speaker uses a different code to provide information given in another language; (4) *CS for elaboration* when switching to another language aims at embellishing or expanding what has been said in another code; (5) *CS for classroom management and influencing learner behaviour*, i.e. when the teacher switches to another language in order to maintain the learners' discipline and elicit some behavioural responses from them; (6) *CS as a phatic function*, i.e. language alternation accompanied by para-verbal expressions such as pitch of the voice in order to maintain order in the classroom or achieve any other effect. These functions of CS are relevant to the present study in examining the strategies that teachers and learners use in Rwandan primary schools.

CS has been found to be a normal and natural phenomenon when teaching in multilingual settings, a resource that teachers use to explain, elaborate, and manage the classroom (Moore, 2002; Moodley & Kamwangamalu, 2004; Abad, 2005; Moodley, 2003, 2007, 2010;) instead of being a hindrance to learning, as some researchers such as Canale and Swain (1980) and Tarone and Swain (1995) reported. CS is regarded as a resource when it is used strategically, i.e. when the use of the MT does not impede the learning process or prevent learners from getting familiar with the language of instruction. This means that, if the teacher uses the learners' MT frequently in the lessons, learners will become dependent on the native language and fail to practise English in their lessons. In this case, the MLFM plays a crucial role to determine the strategic use of CS.

The above teaching strategies that teachers adopt as a solution to language problems (safe talk, label quests, and CS) inform the present study in the context where most teachers used to French or Kinyarwanda teach in English, the language they have been less exposed to.

2.4 Conclusion

This chapter has dealt with the theories and literature underpinning this study. The Vygotskian sociocultural perspective on learning and educational taxonomies were selected to guide this study. The sociocultural theory focused on the language as a primary tool of mediation and scaffolding of knowledge. Other emphasis was placed on the social nature of learning, and issues related to interaction, collaboration, the ZPD, and MKO were discussed. The educational taxonomies were chosen as a lens used to understand the teachers' pedagogic practices utilised in the context of teaching through English as a foreign language in Rwanda. A body of literature on attitudes was selected to help understand the concept and show how attitudes influence behaviour and play a crucial role in the language-in-education policies and practices. An exploration of the MoI focused on the increasing use of English in education, and showed how the spread of English due to globalisation influences the choice of English as the MoI around the world, particularly in the post-colonial nations. The challenges posed by English as the MoI and strategies prevailing in the English-medium classes in Africa, mainly CS, were discussed, and it was shown that the basis of the classroom challenges and CS as a classroom strategy when English is used as MoI is lack of language proficiency. It was suggested that both BICS and CALP are necessary for efficient use of English as the MoI in Rwanda. This theoretical discussion was done to enable the reader to understand the analysis of the data on attitudes of educators and learners towards English, the challenges encountered in the classroom, and strategies used to cope with English as the MoI at four primary schools in Rwanda. The methodology used to deal with the present study follows.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTING AND ANALYSING DATA

3.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses how the research was conducted. Firstly, it begins with an explanation of the research design, i.e., the mixed methods approach of inquiry used to find answers to the research questions of this study, and provides justification of the choice of this research design. Secondly, it describes the research setting, participants, and the choice of SS as the content subject for the study. Thirdly, it discusses the data collection process and tools for each phase, i.e. the quantitative phase by means of a questionnaire, and qualitative phase by means of classroom observations, audio-recording of lessons, and interviews. Fourthly, the chapter describes various methods employed to analyse data obtained from both the quantitative and qualitative phases, and shows how both types of data were integrated. Finally, a discussion of ethical considerations is presented.

3.2 Research design

This section indicates how this study is set up, by specifying the approach and methods employed to collect data in an effort to find answers to the research questions. It starts by discussing mixed methods approaches and explaining the one used and provides reasons of choosing it for this study.

3.2.1 Mixed methods approach

This is an approach of inquiry that combines both quantitative and qualitative forms. It emerged as a distinct research methodology that evolved as a way of ‘converging and triangulating different quantitative and qualitative data sources’ (Creswell, 2009, p. 204). According to Creswell (2010), the mixed methods approach should be understood through

the methodology and methods that it uses. The term 'methodology' refers to the philosophical assumptions or worldviews that guide the research, while 'methods' refer to procedures involved in conducting the research.

The methodology that this research uses draws on a framework of ideas and beliefs, i.e. philosophical positions (Johnson, Onwuegbuzie & Turner, 2007) also known as philosophical assumptions or worldviews (Creswell, 2009). These are ideas through which researchers, thinkers, related groups of people, and cultures interpret the world and interact with their surroundings. In the methodology of conducting a mixed methods research as suggested by Creswell and Plano Clark (2007) and Creswell (2009), the mixed methods researcher has to be explicit on the worldviews involved in a study, since the mixed methods approach welcomes a variation of those philosophical assumptions such as postpositivism, constructivism, pragmatism, postmodernism, structuralism, and advocacy/participatory worldview. In this regard, the present study was conceived under a constructivist worldview. This philosophical assumption correlates with the sociocultural perspective on learning as explained in Chapter Two of this study.

The social constructivist worldview assumes that people always try to make their own meanings of the world where they live or work, and since those meanings are socially constructed, the researcher should take into account the views from a variety of people who are concerned with the situation being researched (Creswell, 2009) in order to be able to interpret the phenomenon under study. This study adopts this perspective in two ways. Firstly, the interest of the present study is to hear what participants think and how they feel about their involvement in the current teaching and learning practices through English as the MoI in Rwanda. Secondly, the study seeks to know what participants do to make meanings of the situation they live in after consideration of their historical, educational, political, and social settings. The correlation of the social constructivist worldview and the sociocultural theory, which is the interpretative lens of teaching and learning in this study, enables the researcher to describe and interpret the participants' attitudes and practices towards English as the MoI in Rwanda.

Researchers who define the mixed methods research also draw on the procedures focusing on three main features that characterise mixed methods research namely: (1) the *type* or *nature* of data collection, i.e. data can be collected *concurrently* or *sequentially*; (2) the *priority* that

each form (quantitative or qualitative) is given in the research, that is, forms can have *equal* or *unequal* priority; (3) the *place*, i.e. stage in the research process, either in data collection, data analysis, or discussion, at which the researcher mixes the data from different sources or integrates the results from both quantitative and qualitative phases[7] (Creswell et al., 2003). All the above characteristics of a mixed methods research provide a single definition as follows:

> A mixed methods study involves the collection or analysis of both quantitative and/or qualitative data in a single study in which the data are collected concurrently or sequentially, are given a priority, and involve the integration of the data at one or more stages in the process of research (Creswell et al., 2003, p. 212).

Inspired by Green, Caracelli, and Graham (1989), Morgan (1998), and Creswell et al. (2003), in order to find answers to the research questions using the mixed methods approach, the researcher starts with *implementation,* which is the term they use to refer to the order of succession through which either the quantitative phase of the study takes place before the qualitative one, or vice versa, or both are done concurrently. According to Creswell (2009), on the one hand, if the researcher conducts the first phase of data collection and analysis, and, after a period of time, undertakes the second phase of the study drawing on the results of the first phase, that is a *sequential mixed methods approach*. On the other hand, if the researcher collects both quantitative and qualitative data at the same time, that is a *concurrent mixed methods approach*. The present study uses the sequential mixed methods approach. The reason for choosing this approach emanates from the nature of the research questions that require an exploratory quantitative study to elicit an in-depth qualitative analysis of data. As will be detailed later in this section, the inquiry starts with a quantitative collection and analysis of data, and proceeds with a qualitative study based on the quantitative results.

The next step after deciding on the succession of quantitative and qualitative approaches in this study relates to assigning *priority*. This concept refers to the weight, emphasis, attention, or space that the researcher attributes to either the quantitative or qualitative phase, or both, in the process of data collection or analysis (Morgan 1998; Creswell, 2003; Creswell et al., 2003; Creswell, Plano Clerk & Garrett, 2008). According to Morgan (1998), priority is

[7] These features are thoroughly discussed later in this chapter.

determined from what the researcher needs to emphasise in a given phase of the study, taking into account the objectives of the study, the scope or nature of the research questions, and/or even the interests of the audience. In this study, due to the objectives set in the research questions, priority has been given to the qualitative phase, because, as is discussed thoroughly later in this chapter, it explains the statistical results from the quantitative phase, interprets them, and provides reasons and evidence from multiple sources of data collection. Furthermore, while the quantitative phase uses one data collection source, i.e. questionnaire and one type of data analysis, i.e. descriptive statistics, the qualitative phase uses three sources of data collection and utilises a thematic analysis at two levels, i.e. at the individual case level and across cases level[8] (Yin, 2003). Details on these types of analyses are presented later in this chapter.

The last step of the procedures used in the mixed methods design of this study is *integration*. This is a concept used to indicate the stage or stages at which the researcher mixes the quantitative and qualitative components in the process of the study (Green et al., 1989; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998; Creswell et al., 2003). Examination of the mixed methods research has shown that integration can occur at four different stages in the process of a study, i.e. at the research questions stage, at the data collection phase, at the data analysis stage, and at the interpretation phase (Creswell et al., 2003). This study first integrates the quantitative and qualitative methods at the qualitative data collection stage, since the research questions require a type of data collection protocol connected to the quantitative phase results in order to provide an in-depth explanation of the phenomena that were revealed by the results of the quantitative phase. Another case of integration in this study occurs at the interpretation and discussion of both quantitative and qualitative results. This is a convergence and triangulation of results from multiple data sources mixed from quantitative and qualitative phases of the study in order to determine what the consistencies or contradictions are apparent among the respondents' views in the questionnaires, interviews, and their classroom practices. Another reason for converging and triangulating data in this study is the search for validity of conclusions. If for instance the survey results for a certain

[8] In this study, the individual case level refers to the case of rural schools and the case of urban schools. Each of the two categories was analysed individually. Across cases level refers to the comparative analysis of both individual cases.

type of attitudes matches the observation and interview results, this helps the researcher draw a conclusion that the results are valid and reliable, and therefore, such attitudes exist.

3.2.2 Rationale for the mixed methods approach

In this study, the mixed methods approach, as a whole, presents more advantages than conducting a research using a distinct quantitative or qualitative approach. According to Denzin (1978,p. 14), the advantage of using mixed methods lies in the fact that 'the bias inherent in any particular data source, investigators, and particularly method will be cancelled out when used in conjunction with other data sources, investigators, and methods'. He also adds that by utilising mixed methods, 'the result will be a convergence upon the truth about some social phenomenon' (Denzin, 1978, p. 14). Furthermore, with regard to this advantage, the mixed methods strategies of inquiry provide the researcher with ways of using the results from quantitative data to probe questions and select participants for qualitative data (Creswell, 2009), or vice versa. As McMillan and Schumacher (2006, p.28) state, the 'advantage of mixed-method studies is that they can show the result (quantitative) and explain why it was obtained (qualitative).' The use of mixed methods in this study, especially the sequential type of data collection, provides this research with much strength to sustain the validity and reliability of the results.

3.3 Research setting and participants

Firstly, this section discusses the research sites, i.e. it describes different schools in which the study was conducted. Secondly, it presents the participants and sampling techniques utilised to obtain the samples and sample sizes for this study. Thirdly, it explains the choice of SS as a content subject for this study.

3.3.1 Research setting

The research setting of this study comprises four primary schools in Rwanda, two urban (inner city) schools and two rural schools. The urban schools were selected from the capital city of Kigali, which is the main administrative and commercial Rwandan town. The two urban schools selected for this study represent well-resourced schools with good infrastructure, such as school buildings, play grounds, study facilities such as classroom

equipment, libraries, and ICT rooms, and they are schools where teaching staff receive better incentives than other teachers in various other schools. Rural schools represent schools located in rural areas far from the capital city of Kigali. These schools differ from the schools in urban areas in terms of environment, staff, and infrastructure. The rural schools selected for this study share a common characteristic of being situated in poor environments where the majority of the people are either illiterate or have very low levels of literacy and numeracy. It has been reported in the media that in most of these schools the teachers are not satisfied with what they earn, and this makes other teachers, national or international, reluctant to work there (Agutamba, 2012). Regarding the equipment, school infrastructure, and financial means, the welfare of the teachers and learners are poor in comparison to those in urban schools. Most importantly, the rural and urban divide is relevant to this study because it reflects different linguistic circumstances that could be assumed to be relevant to a study on attitudes and classroom practices. More details are provided below in the map illustration in Figure 3.1.

Figure 3.1: Map of Rwanda showing the location of selected schools



Source: Map from www.MINALOC.gov.rw (accessed 10 October 2011).

Figure 3.1 shows the different locations of the selected schools for this study. School 1 and School 2, are situated in rural areas and are located in different linguistic milieus. School 1 was selected as a school surrounded by French-speaking foreign communities from Burundi and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), while School 2 is situated in an English-speaking milieu, influenced by the English-speaking countries of Uganda and Tanzania. School 3 and School 4 were selected from an urban area. They are schools located in Kigali, the capital city of Rwanda. In the areas surrounding these schools, people mainly speak Kinyarwanda, but English, French, Kiswahili are spoken by immigrants, tourists, business people, and other foreigners in various religious communities. These two schools are found in the centre of the city of Kigali, and they have been known for the quality education they have offered since the 1994 genocide in Rwanda (The World Bank, 2011).

The rural-urban divide is worth investigating because of the schools' varied settings and contexts that may be among the main factors influencing the quality of teaching and learning. For instance, almost all the schools offering college preparatory programmes and pre-university qualifications with international accreditation are private schools located in the capital city, Kigali. These are schools that instruct pupils from pre-primary level to Grade 12 which is the end of secondary schooling in English or French (Commonwealth Network Rwanda, 2012). These schools employ qualified national and international teachers. They are either religious-based schools, parents associations' schools, or individual business-oriented schools. On the other hand, most primary schools in rural areas are public or state schools. Instruction in these schools is offered from pre-primary to Grade 6, and these schools have added a three-year lower secondary cycle (The World Bank, 2011). The language of instruction used for the first three years of primary school is Kinyarwanda. The second three years and the three post-primary years are taught in English as the MoI. Teachers in those schools need training in English. As has been reported in the Rwandan media, education in English in rural primary schools in Rwanda is at risk because of the refusal[9] of the teachers of English appointed to rural primary schools to go to the rural areas to mentor their colleagues in the use of English as the language of instruction (Agutamba, 2012). This rural-urban divide is likely to reflect differences in the language practices.

[9] Mentors for primary school teachers in English were appointed by the Rwanda Education Board to rural schools, but they rejected the job offers because of the low pay and the rural environment, which they did not like. Instead they preferred to retain their jobs in towns near their relatives and friends since there was no difference in salaries.

Despite the school-based mentoring programme in the language of instruction, which is a problem in rural areas but not in urban areas, there is a budget or finance related difference between rural and urban schools. As research has shown, children in low-income or impoverished families are exposed to few literacy practices (Abadzi, 2006). This requires educators to provide more teaching effort and methodological care to those disadvantaged children than is required by their counterparts from well-off families (Abadzi, 2006). This is another factor motivating the interest of this study to investigate on the rural/urban distinction.

In compliance with ethical principles, the four schools were assigned pseudonyms as follows. Schools located in rural area will be identified as Rural School 1 (RS1) and Rural School 2 (RS2), and those located in urban area will be Urban School 1 (US1) and Urban School 2 (US2). The selection of these schools focused on whether or not the school has had much contact with English. The school's geographical location was also considered important as this would, in one way or another, influence the educators' and learners' attitudes and their classroom practices. The status[10] of the public, government subsidised, and private schools was also considered in the school selection process because of the impact that finances have on the outcome of education. Therefore, two schools are public, one is government subsidised, and the other one is private. Each category of schools is discussed below.

Rural schools

Two rural schools, RS1 and RS2, were selected for this study. RS1 is a public school located in the South-West part of Rwanda, District of Rusizi in the Western Province. It has 15 classrooms, approximately 1350 students, 24 teachers and one principal. It is situated in an area neighboured by French-speaking countries, i.e. Burundi on the southern border and the DRC on the western border. The school is surrounded by farming fields and woods, and has a view of small aligned houses. The area, in general, is populated by people living in poor

[10] The status of school refers to whether it is totally government financed, i.e., public school, or an independent school that is financially assisted by the government, i.e., subsidised school, or a school that is totally under the founder's finances, i.e., private school.

conditions. The school has a daily feeding scheme sponsored by the World Food Program (WFP), and children are fed at lunch time.

Before 2009, this school used Kinyarwanda as the MoI in the lower primary phase and French as the MoI in the upper primary phase. Since 2009 teachers have been trained and were required to start teaching in English. There was no period of transition to shift from French to English. People resident around this school area speak Kinyarwanda. At a local small market situated in 800 metres from that school, most people speak Kinyarwanda and a few of them could be heard interacting in Kiswahili and French discussing prices of goods. Teachers speak Kinyarwanda to each other. Outside the classroom situation, teachers reprimand, ask questions, or give instructions in Kinyarwanda. During the absence of the teacher in the classroom and outside, pupils speak Kinyarwanda.

RS2 is a government subsidised school founded by the Catholic Church. It comprises 18 classrooms, approximately 1400 pupils, 26 teachers, one principal, and one deputy principal. It is located in the north-eastern part of the country, the area neighbouring English-speaking countries (Uganda and Tanzania) and settled by the population repatriated from English-speaking countries since 1994. This school is located in an area dominated by a Catholic Church and a health centre. The population of that area lives in poor conditions. Many families in that region earn their living through manual agriculture and livestock breeding.

This school used both French and English as the media of instruction between 1994 and 2009[11], and this created a parallel teaching system, i.e. the same school had a portion of pupils taught in English and another portion taught in French which also implies that there were English-speaking teachers and French-speaking teachers. Kinyarwanda was also used as MoI at the lower primary phase. Since 2009 French has no longer been used as the MoI in this school. RS2 has an English-speaking principal and a French-speaking deputy principal. In the staff room, teachers interact in Kinyarwanda and then switch to English when they receive a visitor who speaks English. Pupils use Kinyarwanda to speak to each other and their

[11] After the 1994 Genocide of Tutsis in Rwanda, many Rwandan refugees were repatriated. Many people from English-speaking countries (Uganda, Kenya, and Tanzania) were settled by the government in the north-eastern part of Rwanda where they joined French-speaking citizens. This linguistic phenomenon entailed the foundation of mixed-language schools whereby children from English and French backgrounds were taught in English and French respectively. This became a new language policy at school, and it was implemented wherever it was needed until it was replaced by the English-only language policy in 2009.

teachers. In the general neighbourhood, people speak Kinyarwanda, Luganda, and Kiswahili. At school, public posters and noticeboards are written in English or Kinyarwanda.

Urban schools

US1 is a private former French-only school that comprises 20 classrooms, 1300 pupils, 26 teachers and one principal. It is located in the centre of Kigali. It is a modern well-built school surrounded by administrative and commercial buildings. The main language used in the neighbourhood is Kinyarwanda, but people also speak English and French in offices, and Kiswahili and Kinyarwanda in shops. School labels, notes on noticeboards, and posters are either written in English or French.

Before 2009, this school had French as the MoI from the nursery phase to Grade 6 of primary education. Kinyarwanda and English were only taught as subjects. Since 2009 the MoI is English, and Kinyarwanda and French are taught as subjects from Grade 1 to Grade 6. In the staff room, teachers often talk to each other in Kinyarwanda. When you listen to them for a certain time you hear them code-switch from Kinyarwanda to English, Kinyarwanda to French, and rarely from English to French. In the classrooms, pupils use Kinyarwanda to communicate among themselves but talk to the teacher or principal in English or French. The principal of the school can speak both French and English.

US2 is a public city school built among a number of administrative and residential buildings. It has 30 classrooms, 1600 pupils, 32 teachers, one principal, and one deputy principal. In the school environment the use of languages varies, depending on the people's language backgrounds and their contact with immigrants or other foreigners during business or work. This is a melting pot area in which Kinyarwanda, English, French, and Kiswahili are spoken. On the streets, the prevailing language is Kinyarwanda. Notices, posters, and directions at school are all written in English.

Between 1994 and 2009, in the lower primary phase US2 used Kinyarwanda as the MoI and in the upper primary phase taught in both French and English as media of instruction. This school has been among the schools that successfully managed to implement the teaching of French and English in a parallel system, i.e. there were pupils learning in French as the MoI and pupils learning in English as the MoI. The school had teachers for the French primary

section and teachers for the English primary section. When the English-only policy was launched in 2009, this school kept English as the MoI, and provided French-speaking teachers with intensive training in English. The school no longer teaches French, and Kinyarwanda is taught as a subject from Grade 1 to Grade 6.

Although the school is public, it developed its own financing policy based on the parents' financial support and management in collaboration with the school administration. For instance, parents pay fees for teachers' incentives and schooling equipment, and organise a feeding scheme that funds pupils' and teachers' school lunches so that they can continue with the afternoon school activities.

In the staff room, teachers communicate in Kinyarwanda, but talk to their pupils in English first and then code-switch to Kinyarwanda when there is some misunderstanding or comprehension problem. Students speak Kinyarwanda to each other and address teachers, administrative staff, or the principal in Kinyarwanda. The information provided above for each school is summarised in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1: Description of schools

Location			**Status of schools**	**Population**				**Language profile**		
Schools	**District**	**Province**	**Status**	**Principal**	**Deputy principal**	**Teachers**	**Learners**	**MoI before 2009**	**MoI after 2009**	**Language use in the neighbourhood**
RS1	Rusizi	Western	Public	1	0	24	±1350	Kinyarwanda/ French	English	Kinyarwanda French Kiswahili
RS2	Nyagatare	Eastern	Government subsidised	1	1	26	±1400	Kinyarwanda/ French and English	English	Kinyarwanda Luganda Kiswahili
US1	Nyarugenge	Kigali city	Private	1	0	26	1300	French	English	Kinyarwanda French English Kiswahili
US2	Nyarugenge	Kigali city	Public	1	1	32	±1600	Kinyarwanda/ French and English	English	Kinyarwanda French English Kiswahili

As can be garnered from the table, these schools differ in terms of geographical location and school status but they do have some common characteristics, such as population of school that indicates almost the same numbers of teachers and learners, and the language profile that

illustrates how the language MoI has been used in these schools, and how languages are used in the schools' neighbourhood. Participants who were selected from these schools are described below.

3.3.2 Research participants

This section presents participants for this study. It describes procedures followed to select these participants, the types of participants, and reasons for selection. It also describes the sampling techniques; sample sizes are provided when the methods of data collection are presented.

Selection of participants

In order to obtain reliable data that would help to answer the research questions, the researcher selected participants who were able to provide information about themselves in a written form by answering a questionnaire on their attitudes and practices for vivid descriptions of the phenomena under study. As Darlington and Scott (2002, p. 52) state, research participants must have 'the capacity to provide full and sensitive descriptions of the experience under investigation' and the ability to 'develop some significant relationship with the phenomenon under study'. In addition to this, a purposeful sampling technique was used to select categories of participants.

Purposeful sampling is an effective sampling technique that helps the researcher study a phenomenon using knowledgeable informants within it (Bernard, 2002). As Bernard (2002) explains, the researcher using the purposeful sampling technique chooses participants on the basis of the qualities they possess. In other words, after clarifying what needs to be known, the researcher sets out to find participants who are able and willing to provide the information by virtue of knowledge or experience. These are key informants who are chosen on the basis of information-rich cases because they know much about the phenomenon under study (Patton, 2002; McMillan & Schumacher, 2006). On this basis, the researcher set two common criteria for selecting participants: (1) to have at least two years' experience of the pre-2009 language policy and two years' (or more) experience of the post-2009 language policy at the same school, and (2) to be in the highest category of information-rich cases in the same school. The examination of these criteria resulted in the choice of the primary school learners

at Grade 6 of 2011 academic year, with their teachers and principals as the main participants in this study. These were selected because they were deemed to be more knowledgeable and informative than other members of their groups about the subject under investigation (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006). Each type of participant and reasons for selecting them are discussed below.

Educators

As the title of this study shows, educators are the first participants that this study is concerned with and comprised principals and teachers.

School principals

The principals of the schools selected for this study were invited to fill in a questionnaire and participate in an individual semi-structured interview. The reason for including them in the sample of participants is due to their roles as the top agents at school, and as people who, directly or indirectly, influence the efficacy of the school and the achievement of the students (Leithwood, Jantzi & Steinbach, 2002). Each school that was visited had one principal. However, two schools in the sample had a deputy principal. Since they assume closer duties to the principals, or replace them in their absence, they were included in the principals' sample and were asked to fill in the questionnaire.

The principals' personal information (Appendix A1a) shows that they are aged between 40 and 50, and are all Rwandans. They all have more than 10 years of experience as leaders of schools. The most senior principal is the leader of US1 and she has more than 20 years of experience. In terms of their area of expertise, all the principals completed their teacher training. The US1 and US2 principals have a diploma in teacher training, while others have a secondary school certificate. This information about participants in the school leadership positions is of particular importance to this study because their personality, leadership, and experience may influence the teachers' and learners' attitudes and behaviour at school.

With regard to the principals' language background (Appendix A1b), all of them are Kinyarwanda L1 speakers. Four of the six principals are French L2 speakers, while two of them are English L2 speakers. Kinyarwanda is the language they always use at home with

family members. At school, they often use Kinyarwanda to communicate with teachers and learners, and sometimes use it in their official communication. Apart from two principals who grew up in English-speaking countries, the rest did not have much exposure to English.

Teachers

Teachers are important participants in this research because they are the main implementers of the policy. Having acquired much experience from varied previous education reforms based on language policy in Rwanda, teachers are assumed to have gained insight into the classroom practices that would help answer the research questions in this study.

The choice of teachers who participated in this study was done using the following criteria: (1) Teachers of Grade 6 SS at the selected schools were the most suitable participants because SS is the subject content selected for this study, as explained later in this section (see 3.3.3). Across the four sample schools, these teachers were the ones whose lessons were observed and audio-recorded. They also filled in a questionnaire and participated in an individual semi-structured interview. (2) Teachers who teach Grade 6 English. These teachers were asked to fill in a questionnaire because they know their own attitudes towards English usage and are aware of their classroom practices during the English lessons they teach.

The teachers' personal information (Appendix A2a) reveals that the majority of teachers, 67% (n=24), are young adults between 23 and 40 years old, and 25% are above 50. This information is significant to this study since the age may influence the acquisition and use of the language positively or negatively (Mackey, 2006). The overwhelming majority, 95.8%, are Rwandan; 54.2% are males, and 45.8% females. The majority of teachers, 62.5%, live in urban areas.

Regarding qualification, the majority of teachers, 87.5%, completed teacher-training and have a secondary school certificate. Most of them, 65%, have between five and 15 years of teaching experience. Such information is relevant to this study because the teachers' expertise and qualifications are likely to influence the quality of work they produce (Shulman, 1987).

As for their language backgrounds (Appendix A2b), 95.8% of teachers speak Kinyarwanda as their MT, 66.7% of them use French as their L2 while 33.3% speak English as their L2. It

appears that all teachers learnt either English or French, or both as school subjects. Kinyarwanda is the teachers' language of communication at home (95.8%). It is also used as the teachers' language of communication with colleagues at school (50%), and sometimes, teachers use Kinyarwanda in their official communication (20%). Before the English-only policy, French had been used as the language of teaching by the majority (58%) of teachers. It is clear that these teachers have had little exposure to English.

Learners

Learners in Grade 6 were selected for the following reasons:
(1) Experience of the old and new language policy: at the time of the data collection, these learners had three years of experience of the previous language policy through which they had either French or English as the MoI, and possibly Kinyarwanda as the MoI, depending on the school. From 2009 until the time when they participated in this study they had already had three years' experience in English-only as the MoI. These learners were assumed to have richer information for this study than their counterparts in lower classes.

(2) The complexity of the language Grade 6 learners are taught in: The language in which the programme for Grade 6 are written is likely to be very difficult for children who had not had much exposure to English, and especially those who do not have parents or relatives who can help them understand the content they learn at school. In the same vein, research shows that 'deficiencies in the second language may not be apparent in lower grades, but they increase after Grade 4-5, when the concepts become more challenging' (Abadzi, 2006, p. 54)

(3) Transition from primary school phase to secondary school phase: Grade 6 marks a very important transition of learners to a new educational phase. These learners at the threshold of their secondary studies are supposed to be well prepared in terms of the MoI for them to be able to handle more difficult programmes. Although the study does not intend to investigate the impact of the transition on the learners' school performance at the next phase of their education, it is worth investigating these learners' use of the language of the MoI because the results may predict interesting features for research and provide hints to programme designers on how they can develop a coherent flow of the MoI between the two learning phases.

The learners' personal information (Appendix A3a) reveals that the majority of learners, 81% (n=185), are between 11 and 13 years old. They are all Rwandan. 54.6% are females and 45.4% are males. The learners' sample does not comprise any immigrants whose ideas and language proficiency may influence the classroom practices.

The learners' language background (Appendix A3b) clearly indicates that these respondents use Kinyarwanda in most of their home and school activities. Almost all learners, 96.2%, have Kinyarwanda as their MT. It can be observed that learners use different languages depending on the interlocutors. For instance, in informal communication with peers the majority of learners, 57.3%, state that they communicate in Kinyarwanda, while in formal situations, 71.4% claim that they write in English to teachers and principals. Out of the school environment, 57.8% prefer to watch TV programmes in Kinyarwanda, and 90.7% listen to radio stations in Kinyarwanda.

3.3.3 Choice of the content subject

This research was conducted in the subject of SS. This comprises History, Geography and Civics. The choice of SS for this research was determined by two main reasons: (1) SS is a subject that many teachers consider difficult for learners because lessons are designed in a highly technical language. This assumption attracted the researcher's curiosity to investigate attitudes that educators and learners have towards English as the MoI, and to explore the classroom practices that teachers and learners utilise to cope with teaching and learning in English. (2) The course content (History, Geography, and Civics) requires language skills to explain concepts, complex phenomena, and events. In SS, meaning is mainly conveyed through language. In other subjects, such as mathematics, students can be taught by demonstrating formulas, and learners who may not be familiar with the language of instruction may still understand and feel comfortable with that. However, it is assumed that SS demands more teacher-learner interactions for better understanding of the lesson than may be required in mathematics. Thus, since the research investigates language practices, this subject best suits the investigation through language interactions that the study warrants.

3.4 Data collection procedures

This section explains how data for this study was collected in two sequential phases. It starts by presenting the quantitative phase conducted by means of a questionnaire, then, discusses the qualitative phase whereby data was collected by means of audio-recording of lessons, classroom observations, and interviews.

3.4.1 Data collection instruments

3.4.1.1 Quantitative phase

Quantitative data collection instruments used for this study included questionnaires which were largely comprised of closed-ended questions, including Likert Scale items, and a few open-ended ones. Three types of questionnaires were used, one for the school principals (Appendix A1) another for the teachers (Appendix A2), and one for the learners (Appendix A3).

Questionnaires were selected as appropriate tools for gathering information that would help in the process of finding answers to the research questions. Influenced by Milroy and Gordon (2003) and McMillan and Schumacher (2006), questionnaires were used in order to gather large amounts of data as an exploratory survey for a further in-depth study. The use of a questionnaire in this phase helped the researcher obtain answers in a short time because most questions given to the respondents were in a Likert's scaling format that was easy to answer, requiring ticking of one's choice of the answer. The survey was conducted using a 5-point Likert Scale ranging from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*. The scale was reduced to four alternatives (1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = disagree, 4 = strongly disagree) eliminating the 'neutral' option in order to avoid the central tendency from the respondents who may avoid using extreme response categories and choose the neutral midpoint (Pennington & Yue, 1994; Moodley, 2003). A few open-ended questions that required the respondents' personal written comments were also provided after the closed-ended questions, and the respondent was free to answer such questions if there was important additional information s/he wanted to add.

The closed-ended questions used in the quantitative study were questions that provided the respondents with two or more possible choices of answers from which they had to select. These types of questions gave the respondents the choice among 'predetermined responses' (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006, p.197). The open-ended questions were questions that allowed the respondents a choice of how to answer and what to answer. These were questions that allowed respondents to decide and write any answer they wanted (Oskamp, 1991). The choice of this questionnaire design was influenced firstly by Baker (1992, p. 17) who recommends the Likert Scale to measure attitudes because this method 'usually enhances internal reliability', and secondly by Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2011, p. 254) who advise to add an open-ended question after each series of questions for a certain attitude because, by using the Likert's scaling, 'we [researchers] have no way of knowing if the respondent might have wished to add any other comments about the issue under investigation'.

According to Cohen et al. (2011), a questionnaire should be designed in a way that does not intimidate the respondents. They emphasise that the order of questions should encourage respondents to answer a questionnaire. Following this recommendation, the researcher designed a layout that starts with questions that may not threaten the respondents or make them lose interest in answering the questionnaire, then moves to closed-ended questions, and finally ends with open-ended questions. The questionnaire for this study comprises five sections (section A to section E) and the questions were designed as follows: section A intends to seek the biographical information of the respondents. It focuses on the respondents' personal information. Section B is about the participants' language background. Section C comprises a series of questions to investigate the respondents' attitudes towards English as the MoI. Section D contains questions on challenges that English as the MoI presents to teachers and learners, and section E investigates the practices or strategies that teachers and learners use to address the classroom challenges.

Considering Messick's (1996a, 1996b) views in relation to the construct validity of the questionnaires, questions were designed on the basis of the 'Pierson's factor model' of evaluating attitudes (Pierson et al.,1980). It is worth noting that factors in this study are likely to be identified by the reader as themes because the questionnaires do not provide a wide range of possibilities from which factors would be elicited. However, the researcher preferred to maintain factors in line with Pierson et al.'s (1980) theoretical model of evaluating attitude

as a predisposer and as an outcome. With regard to the structure of the questionnaire, the questions were designed and ordered with the aim of seeking responses to the thesis research questions.

Regarding substantive aspect of validity, the questions were designed in the Likert Scale model. To avoid the researcher's influence on the participants' responses, questions were given four options from which the respondent had to choose and an open-ended space for more ideas. To minimise the adverse consequences of score interpretation, the researcher designed the interview protocol and observation guide after obtaining the questionnaire results. This permitted triangulation of the data from various sources. Triangulation was intended to contribute to increase the validity and reliability of the research. By collecting information from different people using different instruments, and by comparing the results from the information generated by these different instruments, the study's findings became more credible than would have been the case if only one group of participants had been used or if only one instrument had been used to collect data.

In order to refine the questions and ensure that they were understood in the same way by all participants, they were piloted before being used in the actual study. This is because piloting research instruments offers the researcher a chance to detect potential problems and errors in the instruments and therefore enables him/her to correct them. In this way, a researcher ensures that the instruments help him/her to get the required information (Dawson, 2007).

The questionnaires were answered in the presence of the researcher since the majority of respondents were young learners who needed guidance on procedures of answering questions. A total of 215 questionnaires were administered to participants and all were returned. This sample is presented in the next section.

Sample size

The strategies used to find the sample size for the quantitative phase of this study followed different aspects of the research problem and methods used to seek answers for the research questions. While investigating attitudes, classroom challenges, and practices by means of questionnaires, every participant's opinion was needed, and therefore, the total number of

learners in Grade 6, their teachers, and principals was taken. The sample population for this preliminary phase of data collection was equal to 215 participants, as illustrated in table 3.2:

Table 3.2: Sample population for questionnaires

	RURAL SCHOOLS		**URBAN SCHOOLS**		**TOTAL**
Participants	RS1	RS2	US1	US2	
Teachers	6	6	6	6	**24**
Pupils	56	52	29	48	**185**
Principals	1	1	1	1	**4**
Deputy principals		1		1	**2**
TOTAL					**215**

Table 3.2 shows the number of respondents who participated in the study. Six teachers per school i.e. 24 in four schools were approached, and they agreed to answer a questionnaire. 185 learners were invited to answer the questionnaires, which they actively did. As can be seen in the table, RS1 had 56 Grade 6 pupils, RS2 had 52, US1 had 29, and US2 had 48. What can be observed from these numbers is that the lowest number of pupils (29) was found in an urban private school and the highest (56) in a rural public school. The researcher observed that urban schools are more advantaged in terms of teachers and classrooms and therefore have smaller class sizes. The table also shows that four school principals and two deputy principals were also part of the sample for questionnaires. They all agreed to participate in this study and answered the questions.

3.4.1.2 Qualitative phase

The second phase of data collection used in this research was qualitative. It was undertaken after the quantitative exploratory phase that provided factors that influence attitudes and classroom practices identified in the study. In this phase, data was collected to supplement the quantitative results. This was done in order to provide the richness and depth of information on this research using multiple sources for collecting data, namely audio-recordings of lessons, classroom observations, semi-structured interviews, and focus group

interviews. The following sections provide details of each of the instruments that were selected for the qualitative data collection.

Audio-recordings of lessons

The researcher used audio-recordings of lessons as the first qualitative data source for this study. This choice was mainly influenced by Swann (1994, p. 36) who states that audio-recordings allow researchers 'to make a permanent record of spoken language', and 'provide excellent evidence for discussion with colleagues or pupils'. In this study, the researcher audio-recorded interactions between teachers and learners from four SS lessons in each of the four selected schools. The choice to audio-record the four lessons was mainly due to the analysis purpose, i.e. the examination of the frequency of the recurring phenomena relevant to the questions of the researcher's investigation throughout the four lessons helped the researcher to ascertain the accuracy and reliability of data.

Another reason that motivated the audio-recording of lessons is Swann's (1994) argument that audio-recordings allow researchers to check the information as many times as needed because recordings can be played and replayed, and this helps to check the accuracy and reliability of observations if both methods have been used in the same research. In this regard, the lessons that were audio-recorded were also observed. The main objective of audio-recording these lessons was to catch every oral detail of what happens between the teacher and learners during the lesson. Since audio-recordings were done while the researcher was observing the same lessons, the possibility of losing information existed because what could be lost by using audio-recordings only, for instance non-verbal information such as gestures or any other body expressions, however this was captured in the researcher's field notes. Similarly, the data from the audio-recordings was used to supplement or fill the gaps which emerged from observations, and that served to reinforce the accuracy of field notes. The audio-recording of each SS' lesson took 40 minutes, which is the normal duration of a lesson session.

Classroom Observations

Observations were used in this study as a technique to collect data as they occur at the research site. According to Milroy and Gordon (2003, p.71), this technique 'produces a tremendous supply of high-quality data and crucial insight into community dynamics'.

Although observations have been associated with extreme demands of time, tact, energy, and emotions, they best suit empirical studies by providing full, accurate, and clear information based on what exists in real life or what the observer can record as it occurs naturally (Milroy & Gordon, 2003; McMillan & Schumacher, 2006). In this study, the aim of observation was to observe the classroom interactions, the English language practices used to convey knowledge, other methodological practices used to support language use, classroom management, and teachers' ways of assessing the learners' understanding of the lesson. These aims were meant to help the researcher generate a picture of the overall practices of English as the MoI in each of the four selected schools.

In generating the focal points to guide the observation process, the researcher focused on the following:

- the language teachers and learners use to discuss matters in the lesson;
- the strategies teachers use to explain new words and complex concepts in the lesson;
- the role of books and visual aids to help teachers and learners during the lesson;
- how teachers guide learners to answer their questions;
- how learners answer their teachers' questions;
- how learners ask their questions during the lesson;
- how teachers manage the classroom;
- how teachers encourage or discourage the learners' initiatives;
- how teachers intervene towards learners' language problems;
- how teachers motivate the use of the language MoI in the classroom; and
- how teachers assess the learners' understanding of the lesson

In addition to these points, there were other details in the learners' classroom behaviour such as silence, murmuring, absent-mindedness, laughter, and exclamations, which were also recorded as field notes.

Field notes report what actually happened in the classroom and the researcher's reflections on the classroom activities being observed. The teachers' and learners' verbatim utterances were not written down because they were audio-recorded. However, it was sometimes necessary to write down some learners' verbatim responses or questions when, for instance, the voice of

the learner was too soft[12] to be picked up by the tape recorder, or when the researcher was moving about the classroom to observe the group activities.

During the lesson and observation process, the researcher did not engage with the learners and teacher. After greetings and short presentations, teachers gave the researcher a seat at their own desks either at the back of the classroom or somewhere in the front, on the right or left side. From there, the researcher wrote the field notes and carried out the audio-recording. Children could turn back to see what the researcher was doing, but they did not ask the researcher anything or call upon him for help. The researcher noted that during group discussions when the researcher was turning around to see the learners' activities and hear their discussions, they were aware of being observed and focused on their duties.

Four SS lessons in each Grade 6 class across four schools were observed in two phases. The first phase of observation, i.e. two lessons per class, was done prior to interviews and the second phase of observation was carried out after interviews. This was done as means of determining the consistencies and contradictions between the respondents' views in interviews and what is done in the classroom. The first phase of observations helped the researcher to enrich the interview protocol, and after interviews, the second phase was performed mainly to cross-check, confirm, or disprove the data obtained from the varied previous sources. Before observing, the researcher did a preliminary visit to each class with the aim of becoming acquainted with the learners and teachers, and planning a practical way of observing and audio-recording.

Interviews

This study used face-to-face, one-on-one, in-depth interviews with four teachers and four principals, and focus-group interviews with 20 Grade 6 pupils. As the purpose of inquiry is to take the data further, probe and better understand it, it was not necessary to include the whole sample size of the inquiry through interviews. Only a sample survey, i.e. a sub-set of the whole population selected for the entire study was taken and deemed to provide opinions that

[12] During an audio-recording test, the majority of the learners' sounds were inaudible on the tapes mainly because of the distance between the recording device and speakers, and sometimes because of the learners' shyness. To avoid losing information from those utterances, they were written down in the field notes.

would accurately represent the opinions of the overall population. According to research, the quality, validity and truth of the results are to be obtained from the information richness of the case under investigation, rather than from the size of the sample (Patton, 2002; McMillan & Schumacher, 2006; Mouton, 2009). For interviews, seven respondents from each selected school were chosen, i.e. five Grade 6 pupils, a teacher and a principal from each group from those who completed the questionnaire. Therefore, the initial sample of 185 learners who completed the questionnaire was purposefully narrowed down to a sample of 20 learners who engaged in focus-group interviews, four teachers out of 24 who answered questionnaires were selected for a semi-structured interview, and four principals were invited for a semi-structured interview. The whole sample for interviews was limited to 28 respondents as illustrated in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3: Sample population for interviews

Participants	**RURAL SCHOOLS**		**URBAN SCHOOLS**		**TOTAL**
	RS1	RS2	US1	US2	
Teachers	1	1	1	1	**4**
Pupils	5	5	5	5	**20**
Principals	1	1	1	1	**4**
TOTAL	7	7	7	7	**28**

A total of 28 people were interviewed. Five pupils per class were asked to sit for a focus group interview. The choice of five learners per class was due to the requirements of the study to get in-depth data from a small manageable number of respondents on the basis of information rich principles (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006). On the basis of voluntary participation, learners who were interviewed were selected by drawing lots. All learners had the same chance to be selected. The researcher took the numbers of the learners from the teachers' list and wrote them on pieces of paper and put them into a basket. The numbers were mixed up and a volunteer was asked to draw five numbers of the learners who took part in the focus-group interviews after obtaining their consent.

As literature shows, interviews serve ‘to gather information regarding an individual’s experiences and knowledge; his/her opinions, beliefs, and demographic data’ (Best & Kahn, 1998, p. 255). In this study, interview questions were semi-structured. They were selected for this study because they allow the researcher to hear the informants’ personal views about what they have experienced without being cued or influenced by the interviewer (Neuman, 2006). The questions the researcher asked were fairly specific in their intents, e.g. ‘what are the benefits of teaching Rwandan children in English?’ As researchers (e.g. McMillan & Schumacher, 2006; Neuman, 2006; Bernard, 2002) advise, when unclear or incomplete answers are given, the interviewer is free to formulate other questions (probe) as judged appropriate for a given situation. In this regard, whenever the researcher needed clarification or elaboration on the initial question the researcher probed it by adding sub-questions that could not affect or influence the respondent’s answer, e.g. ‘What are those schooling benefits you are referring to?’, ‘What do you mean by regional integration?’ or ‘Could you tell me more about that?’.

It is worth emphasising that, while observing, the researcher had a list of the identified factors contributing to the participants’ attitudes and practices in the classroom in order to help pay attention on the focal points that triggered questions for interviews. At the time of interviewing, teachers and principals were invited for individual or face-to-face in-depth interviews and learners for a focus group interview. Each of these is described below.

Face-to-face in-depth interviews

Face-to-face in-depth individual interviews were conducted with teachers and principals. They were asked questions meant to elicit more information about their attitudes towards English as the MoI and practices, and whenever it was necessary, probing questions sought to elicit clarification. Before asking questions, there was an informal talk with the aim of establishing a comfortable rapport between the researcher and the interviewees. In the process of interviewing, participants were approached during their free time when they could be asked as many questions relevant to the phenomenon under study as possible. With their permission, responses were tape-recorded because, as has been proven, a tape recorder collects information more completely and objectively than note-taking if the interview was organised in a way that the recorder does not disturb the interviewee or affect responses (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006).

Focus group interviews

Focus group interviews were used with learners. This is the type of interview that offers 'a social environment in which group members are stimulated by one another's perceptions and ideas', and in which 'the researcher can increase the quality and richness of data through a more efficient strategy than one-on-one interviewing' (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006, p.360).

In this study the focus group with learners was chosen to enhance discussions and responses from children, and to allow the researcher to probe certain claims and obtain additional data because focus group interviewing has often been used 'as a confirmation technique' (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006, p. 360). Focus group interviewing was chosen in order to create a sense of trust and confidence for the learners who otherwise may feel shy to face an interviewer on their own. The time-saving element of the focus group interview was another advantage. Twenty learners were interviewed in four groups, which saved the time of interviewing one by one.

Questions in the focus group interviews were meant to elicit more information about the learners' attitudes towards English, the challenges they encounter in expressing themselves and learning through this language, strategies they use to interact with their teacher in the classroom, what they do to overcome the classroom language challenges, and how they feel about their teachers' ways of helping them to learn in English. These interviews with learners were held in Kinyarwanda because it was the language interviewees felt comfortable with. For the sake of the protection of information, after transcription, original Kinyarwanda versions were translated by a professional translator skilled in Kinyarwanda and in English in collaboration with the researcher.

To summarise, this section detailed the different methods that were used to collect data for this study. It explained the reasons for choosing each of them, and how they were utilised in tandem in a mixed methods approach. The analysis of the collected data was undertaken and done as described in the following section.

3.5 Data analysis methods

This section describes how data was analysed in a mixed methods design. It starts with the analysis of quantitative data using the lens of factor analysis, and then discusses the methods used to analyse qualitative data. It finally shows how data was synthesised in order to seek answers to the research questions.

3.5.1 Quantitative data analysis method

The analysis of quantitative data from questionnaires was done using the framework of the Factor Analysis Theory (Pierson, Fu & Lee, 1980), which was used as an interpretative lens for the quantitative phase of this study. This theory provides a deductive analysis through which sets of items are classified into factors that are influenced by responses that hang together in a questionnaire (DeCoster, 1998). For instance, in the present study, direct attitudes questionnaire items were classified into factors that contribute to the educators' and learners' positive or negative attitudes towards English as the MoI in Rwanda. Similarly, two key points of the research question were also examined with the factor analysis, namely (1) challenges that English as the MoI presents to teachers and learners, and (2) strategies that teachers and learners use to address the classroom challenges.

With regard to attitudes and classroom challenges (section C and D of the questionnaire), respondents were asked to state what they feel or think about the statements given in the Likert Scale by ticking in the box of their choice corresponding to *strongly agree*, *agree*, *disagree* or *strongly disagree*. For the last section of the questionnaire (section E) inquiring the strategies that educators and learners use to address the classroom challenges, respondents were asked to indicate the frequency of the practice in the statement by marking their choice corresponding to *I always do this*, *I sometimes do this*, *I hardly ever do this* or *I never do this*. The questionnaires were analysed and the findings were presented in the appendices (see for example Appendices A1a, A2a, A3a). With descriptive statistics, data was presented in the form of tables displaying the frequencies or the mean ($\overline{X}$) and standard deviation (S) (see for example Appendices A1c, A2c, A3c).

The mean was calculated by multiplying the scores assigned to the responses by their respective frequencies and dividing by the number of responses. It is accompanied by the standard deviation that measures the average variability around the mean, i.e., the average amount that each of the individual scores varies from the mean of the set of scores (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006). The standard deviation is calculated as follows:

$$S = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{f_i\left(x_i - \overline{X}\right)^2}{n-1}} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n-1}\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i\left(x_i - \overline{X}\right)^2}$$

In the formula, the sum of squares is divided by *n*-1, and not by *n*, to satisfy the property that the expected value of the sample variance S^2 must be equal to the population variance σ^2. In other words, S^2 is an unbiased estimate of σ^2 (Zar, 2010).

The choice of $\overline{X}$ and S for the presentation of the survey results best facilitates the interpretation of quantitative data. In fact, $\overline{X}$ shows the average score of the total number of respondents per each statement. In interpretation, for instance, the mean 1.29 (see Appendix A2c) indicates the respondents' agreement with the statement, *English is necessary to obtain good jobs elsewhere in the world*, while the mean 3.30 (Appendix A2c) is in disagreement with the statement, *Learning in English only makes children lose their cultural identity*. In this study, it is worth noting that a score less than 2.50 indicates the respondents' agreement with the statement, while the score greater or equal to 2.50 indicates a disagreement. The score 2.50 is chosen as a cut-off for agree and disagree since it is the median of 1, 2, 3, and 4, which are the points of the Likert Scale used in this study.

The interpretation of the mean score is done in the sense of *agree* or *disagree*, thus combining values *strongly agree* and *agree*, and values *disagree* and *strongly disagree*, respectively. Such an interpretation method was mainly influenced by the idea that, in the Likert's rating scales, one respondent's *strongly agree* may be another's *agree* (Moodley, 2003; Cohen et al., 2011).

The standard deviation shows how responses vary in terms of the closeness or disparity. The statistics $\overline{X}$ and S may be used to test whether or not a population mean (μ) is equal to a hypothetical value (μ_0); here $\mu_0 = 2.50$. To test the equality between (μ) and (μ_0), the test statistic is:

$$t^* = \frac{\overline{X} - \mu_0}{S / \sqrt{n}}$$

The formula follows a t-distribution with *n*-1 degrees of freedom where *n* is the sample size (Zar, 2010, p. 99). In this context, the null hypothesis (H_0) and alternative hypothesis (H_1) are as follows:

$H_0 : \mu = \mu_0$ versus $H_1 : \mu \neq \mu_0$, or $H_1 : \mu > \mu_0$, or $H_1 : \mu < \mu_0$ depending on the research question. To conclude H_0 or H_1, the test statistic t^* is compared to a critical value denoted t_c. Tables of the t-distributions exist, from which t_c can be read when a significance level α and the degrees of freedom $v = n - 1$ are given (see for example Zar, 2010, p. 678). The decision rule is as follows:

If the absolute value of t^* denoted $|t^*|$ is greater than t_c, then conclude H_1, otherwise conclude H_0. Alternatively, p-value may be used to conclude H_0 or H_1. A p-value (p) is "the probability of obtaining a test statistic at least as extreme as the one that was actually observed, assuming that the null hypothesis is true" (Salkind, 2012, p. 83). In the present context, p = prob ($t \geq |t^*|$). It is compared to a predetermined significance level α, often taken as 0.05. Specifically, if $p \geq \alpha$, then H_0 is not rejected; if $p < \alpha$, then H_0 is rejected in favour of H_1.

In some circumstances, there is a need to compare two means instead of comparing a mean with a hypothetical value. In this case, the test statistic is:

$$t^* = \frac{\overline{X_1} - \overline{X_2}}{S_e\left(\overline{X_1} - \overline{X_2}\right)}$$

In this formula, $\overline{X_1}$ and $\overline{X_2}$ are sample means and $S_e(\overline{X_1} - \overline{X_2})$ is the standard error of the difference between $\overline{X_1}$ and $\overline{X_2}$. In these comparisons, the null and alternative hypotheses are as follows:

$H_0 : \mu_1 = \mu_2$ versus $H_1 : \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$, or $\mu_1 > \mu_2$, or $\mu_1 < \mu_2$. To conclude H_0 or H_1, p is used in a similar way as described above.

Another comparison done in this study is between two proportions. The test statistic for this is:

$$t^* = \frac{\hat{p}_1 - \hat{p}_2}{S_e(\hat{p}_1 - \hat{p}_2)}$$

In the formula, $\hat{p}_1$ and $\hat{p}_2$ are sample proportions, and $S_e(\hat{p}_1 - \hat{p}_2)$ is the standard error of the difference between $\hat{p}_1$ and $\hat{p}_2$. The null and alternative hypotheses are: $H_0 : p_1 = p_2$ versus $H_1 : p_1 \neq p_2$, or $p_1 > p_2$, or $p_1 < p_2$ where p_1 and p_2 are population proportions. To conclude H_0 or H_1, p is used in the usual fashion as described previously.

The preliminary presentation of data was put in appendices because of the volume of the data. This presentation was done according to the categories of respondents, i.e. data from the questionnaire for principals (Appendices A1a, A1b, A1c, A1d, A1e), data from the questionnaire for teachers (Appendices A2a, A2b, A2c, A2d, A2e), and data from the questionnaire for learners (Appendices A3a, A3b, A3c, A3d, A3e). In the chapter discussion, the data was synthesised and discussed with reference to the appendices. For instance, the data for principals and teachers are presented in the same table but in separate columns. This was done because principals and teachers have different educational duties. Principals are involved in the school management duties, i.e. they are in charge of following up the implementation of policies established by policy makers at the Ministry of Education, while teachers are implementers of those policies. For this reason, it is assumed that, there might be differences between principals' and teachers' responses based on duties, experiences, and attributions. In addition, as decision makers at school, the principals' attitudes are likely to influence the teachers' and learners' attitudes and practices (Moodley, 2011). Therefore, it was deemed necessary to analyse data starting with principals who are school managers, then teachers who are the implementers of policies, and finally learners who are the ultimate goal of the policy. The choice of this procedure was because the hierarchy in daily life influences people's attitudes, behaviour, and practices. It is likely that the teachers' attitudes and practices are influenced by their principals and deputy principals, and the learners in general inherit what the teachers provide (Moodley, 2011).

Exploratory data analysis was performed using *descriptive statistics* and the test statistic was used to make inference. Statistical analyses were conducted using STATA, version 12, and the results were tabulated according to the factors identified by the investigator in the light of the Pierson et al.'s (1980) factor analysis. It is worth noting that throughout all the analytical chapters, the quantitative findings are supplemented by extended qualitative analyses in order to be able to draw final conclusions.

3.5.2 Qualitative data analysis methods

The analysis of the qualitative data in this study was an inductive process of organising data into categories and identifying patterns (i.e. relationships) among the categories, while seeking for plausible explanations. The researcher used a thematic analysis procedure, i.e. after reading and making sense of the qualitative data obtained from audio-recordings of lessons, classroom observations, and interviews, the researcher organised them into categories in order to generate recurring ideas, gave them descriptive names, compared the coded data, and grouped them to avoid overlapping descriptions. This procedure provided major themes and their sub-themes, which were discussed as narratives.

This procedure followed the general process of inductive data analysis proposed by MacMillan & Schumacher (2006) as illustrated in figure 3.2:



Figure 3.2: General process of Inductive Data Analysis

Source: Adapted from McMillan & Schumacher (2006, P. 365)

As figure 3.2 shows, qualitative analysis is ‘a relatively systematic process of coding, categorising, and interpreting data to provide explanations of a single phenomenon of interest’ (MacMillan & Schumacher, 2006, p. 364). In this study, three types of data sources, i.e. audio-recordings of lessons, observations, and interviews, were processed and analysed in this model. Each type of data has been described in the section below.

Data from audio-recordings and observations of lessons

Sixteen audio-recorded lessons, i.e. four lessons per school, were entirely transcribed. Transcripts were put on paper and were compared, coded, and categorised in order to obtain patterns (themes) that were discussed. Field notes from classroom observations were also processed in the same way as audio-recorded transcripts. These two types of data (audio-recorded transcripts and field notes) were compared and contrasted to find out similarities or inconsistencies. It was necessary to combine these two types of data because they were collected at the same time and, in practice, they complete each other, i.e. the information missing in the field notes can be found in the audio-recording or vice versa.

Although data from audio-recordings and observations of lessons were entirely transcribed, only some relevant extracts were illustrated under each theme, and there was always a summary of the recurring ideas. Samples of transcripts are presented in Appendix B.

Data from interviews

The role of interview data in this study was to complement, reinforce, confirm, or contradict data identified from questionnaires, audio-recordings, and observations of lessons. Since most participants preferred to be interviewed in Kinyarwanda, tapes were listened to, transcribed and translated. The interview transcripts were translated from Kinyarwanda into English by the researcher in collaboration with a professional translator. Before translating, the researcher verified transcripts, checking whether all the recorded details such as silence, hesitations, CS, murmuring, emotions, and any other affective feature had been recorded in the transcripts. Those features were highlighted to enable the translator to know what could be changed and what had to remain unchanged because of their significance in the study. The processing and analysis of interviews were performed in the same way as those for audio-recordings and observations. Samples of interview transcripts are presented in Appendix C.

The obtained quantitative and qualitative data needed to be integrated in order to create coherent and convincing ideas in response to the research questions. This was done in another phase of the study discussed in the next section.

3.5.3 Mixed method for analysis of data

During the discussion and interpretation phase, both quantitative and qualitative data was integrated. The purpose of this integration was to compare data from different sources that were used in this study in order to find consistencies and discrepancies in the data. This is what most mixed methods researchers refer to as 'triangulation' or 'convergence', which emanates from the idea that looking at a phenomenon under study from multiple perspectives improves accuracy (Green et al., 1989; Morse, 1991; Morgan, 1998; Creswell et al., 2003; Creswell et al., 2008; Creswell, 2009). The mixed method used in this study can be visually represented as follows:



Figure 3.3: Visual representation of the mixed methods design used in this study

This figure illustrates how the mixed methods approach was used in this study. The left side component of the chart is a quantitative phase of data collection and analysis, while the right side is the qualitative representation of the data collection and analysis. The middle component is an overlap of both quantitative and qualitative data. The uppercase represents the dominant phase.

3.6 Ethical considerations

Since this study involved human subjects, the researcher was required to apply for an ethics clearance, which was granted by the University of Witwatersrand. The procedures and other ethics issues on field work are discussed below.

3.6.1 Permission to carry out the study

Permission was sought from and given by the authorities of three districts of the Republic of Rwanda, namely Nyarugenge District, Nyagatare District, and Rusizi District. The researcher wrote letters to the Mayors of the selected districts to obtain permission. After permissions to conduct the study at four selected schools had been granted by the districts, the researcher approached the principals of each of the schools and provided them with the district's letters of permission. Permission to administer questionnaires, do classroom observations, audio-record and interview educators and learners were obtained from the school principals. Educators and their learners were then formally invited to participate in the study through an information sheet accompanied by consent forms for each aspect of the data collection instruments, and all of them agreed to participate. Since the learners were children under the age of 18 years, before interviewing them, the researcher obtained the written informed consent from their parents or guardians.

3.6.2 Ethical procedures at the data collection site

Before each step of collecting data, the researcher reminded respondents what the research was about, and the aims and procedures to be followed. The researcher also reiterated his guarantee of confidentiality and anonymity, and reminded participants that participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw at any time if they so wished.

When data collection started, questionnaires and the interview format were given to participants prior to the step of responding and recording them. This was done in order to create a relationship of trust between the researcher and participants, and it helped the informants to respond confidently because they had already been prepared.

Interviews were conducted at a venue that was suitable to the participants. Interviews were held naturally in a mood that permitted the researcher to listen to participants carefully and ask them further questions to acquire more information. Participants were allowed to answer in the language they felt comfortable with, either English or Kinyarwanda, in order to ensure that they answered after having understood the questions well. This was done with the purpose of helping them to provide clear and complete information.

3.7 Conclusion

This chapter has discussed how this research was conducted. It has described the research design of this study, the mixed methods approach, and presented the research site and participants. It has also discussed methods and procedures used to collect and analyse data by showing how the use of a mixed methods approach in this study served to strengthen the findings of quantitative data with qualitative data. The intention of this sequencing of information gathering was first to explore the variables or themes with a large sample during the quantitative phase, and then to explore those themes in more depth with a smaller sample during the qualitative phase. Although the findings of this study speak of issues that are general, they are not meant to be generalisable to the whole country. This research was approached as a pilot study for further research that can provide general results from much wider samples.

CHAPTER FOUR

ATTITUDES OF EDUCATORS AND LEARNERS TOWARDS ENGLISH AS THE MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION IN RWANDA

4.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to examine the attitudes of educators and learners towards English as the MoI at four Rwandan primary schools. In this chapter as well as the two subsequent chapters, both quantitative and qualitative data were used simultaneously. Statistical data is backed up by qualitative data from interviews with principals and teachers. Interview quotations were coded. For instance a quotation coded PUS1 means that the quotation was picked from the interview with the principal (P) from Urban School 1 (US1) while TRS2 reffers to the quotation by a teacher from Rural School 2 (RS2).

Due to the volume of the data and restrictions on the length of a PhD thesis, the researcher has presented the data in appendices. The data collected by means of questionnaires administered to principals appears in appendices A1c, A1d and A1e. The data from teachers' questionnaire is presented in appendices A2c, A2d and A2e while data from learners' questionnaires is displayed in appendices A3c, A3d and A3e. Samples of the data from audio-recorded lessons are presented in appendix B while interview questions are in appendix C. The discussion and interpretation were done in the chapters.

This chapter consists of a descriptive presentation of synthesised quantitative data followed by qualitative data and interpretation. This sequence of data analysis has been explained in Chapter Three of this study. The quantitative data was categorised into factors contributing to the respondents' attitudes towards English as the MoI, and the findings for each factor (a combination of similar statements from the questionnaire) are tabulated and discussed. The qualitative data for this chapter was obtained from a thematic analysis of the responses to the interview questions (see interview schedules in Appendix C). The term 'educators' is used as a generic name for principals and teachers. A discussion of educators' attitudes towards English as the MoI in Rwanda follows.

4.2 Attitudes of educators towards English as the MoI at four Rwandan primary schools

Considering the crucial role of attitudes for the effectiveness of policy implementation as noted in Chapter Two of this study, it is postulated in this section that negative and positive attitudes of educators will affect their classroom practices (Baker, 1992). This leads to an examination of the educators' responses to the survey questions.

Two sets of 23 direct attitudes questions were designed for the questionnaire; one was administered to six principals, and another to 24 teachers. The questions were related to the educational status of English, enquiring about the respondents' perceptions and feelings regarding English as the MoI. The analysis was done according to the factors identified by the researcher drawing on Pierson, et al.'s (1980) model of factor analysis (see Chapter Three, section 3.5.1). The results are assimilated into a table that presents the results of the whole group of participants, i.e. results from the group of six principals and group of 24 teachers. The table also compares the results from the same participants with regard to the rural and urban divide for the reasons stated in Chapter Three. It is worth noting that the table is a summary of what has been detailed in Appendices A1c and A2c. The questions posed to principals and teachers are the same, and the same broad factors emerged from their responses. The instruments used for this study were analysed in a way that reveals the respondents' disposition to respond favourably or unfavourably to the object under study, i.e., English as the MoI. In this way, the analysis of quantitative data revealed six factors contributing to the educators' attitudes towards English as the MoI in Rwanda as follows:

(i) Factor 1: Need of English for communication with the outside world.
(ii) Factor 2: Attitudes towards English as the language for economic development, unity, and reconciliation.
(iii) Factor 3: Desire for access to English as a global language of education.
(iv) Factor 4: Attitudes on the impact of English on MT and cultural identity.
(v) Factor 5: Attitudes towards English as a mark of education.
(vi) Factor 6: Attitudes towards English as a challenge to teaching and learning.

For these factors, corresponding statements were made in order to enable the researcher to deduce the participants' attitudes from their responses in terms of the Likert scaling values

Agree and *Disagree*. In the tables throughout the chapters, *F* refers to Factor, *A* means Agree, *D* is Disagree and p equals p-value, and the numbers in the columns of *A* and *D* are percentages (%) while those in the column of *p* are the indicators of the significance level from test statistics (see Chapter Three, section 3.5.1). Table 4.1 illustrates the results as follows:

Table 4.1: Data on attitudes of educators towards English as the MoI

		All the schools						**Comparison of the Rural and Urban schools**									
		Principals			**Teachers**			**Principals**					**Teachers**				
								Rural schools		**Urban schools**			**Rural schools**		**Urban schools**		
F	***Statements***	***A***	***D***	*p*	***A***	***D***	*p*	***A***	***D***	***A***	***D***	*p*	***A***	***D***	***A***	***D***	*p*
(i)	English is needed for communication with the outside world.	**100**	0	< 0.0001	**92**	8	< 0.0001	**100**	0	**100**	0	-	**92**	8	**92**	8	1
(ii)	English is the language for economic development, unity, and reconciliation.	**100**	0	< 0.0001	**92**	8	< 0.0001	**100**	0	**100**	0	-	**92**	8	**92**	0	1
(iii)	English is a global language of education.	**94**	6	< 0.0001	**89**	11	< 0.0001	**93**	7	**96**	4	0.2762	**88**	12	**85**	15	0.2600
(iv)	English impacts on the learners' MT, culture, and identity.	33	**67**	0.0412	19	**81**	< 0.0001	0	**100**	**66**	34	0.0072	22	**78**	9	**91**	0.1210
(v)	English is a mark of education.	**92**	8	< 0.0001	**71**	29	< 0.0001	**100**	0	**83**	17	0.1481	**79**	21	**63**	37	0.1020
(vi)	English is a challenge to teaching and learning.	**90**	10	< 0.0001	**82**	18	< 0.0001	**100**	0	**86**	14	0.0361	**88**	12	**73**	27	0.0082

Note: The shaded bold numbers indicate the highest results that are considered in the discussion.

4.2.1 Need for English in communication with the outside world

According to Gardner (1985), the motive to learn a language in order to use it for communication with other communities indicates positive attitudes towards that language and predicts better learning results. In this study, the data in Table 4.1 reveals that all principals (100%, p = 0.0003) and most teachers (92%, p < 0.0001) strongly agree that English is necessary to communicate with the outside world. These results were also obtained from a comparison of the rural and urban settings, which shows that there is no difference (p = 1) in ideas between rural and urban school educators regarding the overwhelming positive attitude towards English as the language needed for the global communication.

In interviews, educators reveal that communicating in English has evolved significantly in business, education, politics, science, and ICT, and this has become the attraction for the world to adopt English as a means of communication. Principals perceive English as a powerful language that dominates in global communication. This awareness of the world's continued move towards English is one of the key factors contributing to the principals' desire to communicate in English as a global language.

(i) *...without language, nothing can be done in education, politics, business and media. English is nowadays doing all of that!* (PUS2).

(ii) *The future is for English speakers!...if you can speak English, you can go everywhere you want in the world* (PRS1).

(iii) *It* [English] *is even very important since English is dominating the world communication* (PRS2).

These quotations affirm the principals' choice of English that resulted from the potential that English has in connecting people globally. Similarly, teachers show that the preference for English as the MoI emanates from its dominance over other world languages, and from the fact that speaking English gives pride, confidence, and hope for success in life, as stated below:

(i) *English is nowadays spoken all over the world! Most countries of the world including ours no longer need other languages; they all want English* (TRS1).

(ii) *…it is a good language…it is an important language because when you know it you feel great and you expect success in many ways because you can communicate and be understood everywhere in the world* (TUS2).

(iii) *If you are skilled in any domain and can speak English, you are welcome in any country; you can work and have good life!* (TUS1).

As the above interview extracts indicate, teachers perceive English as a global language of communication. These perceptions reflect the preference of English for communication triggered by positive expectations that educators have for themselves and their pupils after successful use of English at school. It is clear from the data that teachers support the learning of English because of future benefits that the spread of English is presenting to the world.

The above data shows that English is seen as an enabling language for communication with the world. This finding can be attributed to the effect of globalisation, which requires people of the world to exchange information, skills, and knowledge through ICT in English. As research shows, English has become the international lingua franca (Spolsky, 2004; Tollefson, 2006, 2009) and many people and nations of the world, including Rwanda, want to learn it for communication purposes. For instance in Rwanda, the long term plan of the government is to make the country a globally connected nation, a global player through ICT. According to the Rwandan Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy 2013-2018 named EDPRS 2, the use of ICT solutions is considered to be the milestone in developing a knowledge-based economy (MINECOFIN, 2013). In this strategy, English remains the language of business to facilitate investments from English-speaking countries in Rwanda's education, commerce, and rural development projects, and the gateway to a range of exchange with the rest of the globe. According to the Euromonitor International's (2010) report, Rwanda has significantly facilitated business interaction with English-speaking countries by permitting access to the business licence online in 30 minutes, and it has increased its investment in English-led education by allocating 21% of its GDP to education, while developed countries, such as the UK, spend between 10 and 12% on education. Considering these examples, it seems that the high level of positive attitude towards English as the language of global communication is rooted in the people's adherence to the government's vision and plans for the newly integrated country in the EAC and the Commonwealth.

4.2.2 Attitudes towards English as the language for economic development, unity, and reconciliation

Statistics in Table 4.1 indicate that all principals (100%, $p < 0.0001$) and most teachers (92%, $p < 0.0001$) perceive English as the language for economic development, societal success, and prosperity. This perception was mostly expressed in the respondents' strong agreements with statements such as *English is necessary to obtain good jobs in Rwanda* and *Children should be taught in English in order to be able to compete at the World job market when they grow up*. The results of the analysis of the questionnaire are a clear indication of the educators' overwhelming positive appraisal of English as the language of economic prosperity. A comparison of the rural and urban settings in the same table shows no difference in responses ($p = 1$). The discussion of the previous factor also showed that both rural and urban settings have the same attitudes towards English as the language of global communication. Among the reasons for communicating in English, economic targets are desired by educators from both rural and urban schools. Following this logic, the results are likely to be the same.

From the interview data, principals believe that Rwanda will benefit from using English as official language and the MoI. They all feel that English is the language that can boost Rwanda's economic situation. For instance, they contend that the integration of Rwanda into the EAC and the Commonwealth has contributed to the development of Rwanda in different areas of life, such as education, politics, trade, and communication, and they acknowledge the use of English for prestige since they state that English has helped Rwandans join international organisations, which is seen as contributing to the Rwandan dignity.

(i) *...our country has joined EAC and now Rwandans are able to do business with EAC countries without any problem: no visas, travelling has become easier...English has become a part of Rwandan dignity; we are now represented in many international organisations* (PRS1).

(ii) *In the English world, there are many schooling benefits that Rwanda cannot miss* (PRS2).

In addition to prestige, teachers believe that English is the language that provides many opportunities for employment, and which will lead the country to better education and leadership as two participants claim in the following extracts:

(i) *English has become the language of wider employment in the world. People who can speak fluent English get jobs in NGOs and UN*[13] *organisations and earn much money* (TUS1).

(ii) *Anglophone countries offer scholarships, and eh, do not segregate, say, who goes to schools, who doesn't as French school leaders used to do! ...to have access to the knowledge that the world has produced in English, we need education in English* (TRS1).

According to Samuelson and Freedman (2010, p. 203), English has been taken as 'a valuable commodity in the regional East African market and also in the global market.' In addition to the regional and international integration that teachers believe can boost the economy of the country through business and employment because of the use of English, interviews reveal the additional benefits of education and leadership. In education, English is a desired tool that enhances educational development. Teachers find lots of benefits emanating from the use of English, because Anglophone countries offer scholarships and allow everyone to go to school, while the French system is perceived as 'segregationist', i.e. a system that, on the ethnic and regional basis, has prevented a section of Rwanda's population from pursuing secondary or tertiary education since Rwanda's independence until 1994 (Obura, 2003), when English started overtaking French, creating a new Rwandan image (Steflja, 2012). According to sources such as Obura (2003) and Niyomugabo (2008), there was a policy called 'Iringaniza in education' (education equilibrium), which was an educational system whose objective was to provide education on the basis of the ethnic quotas in which admissions to secondary and tertiary education were done in direct link with the ethnic group's quota of the whole population. This resulted in a distribution of admissions in a way that Hutu (90% of the population) were getting 90% admissions, while of the Tutsi's (9%), only 9% or less were admitted to school, and Twa (1%), were allowed 1% or less admissions to school. This education policy affected many Rwandans and led them to experience negative attitudes towards French. From the data it is evident that respondents perceive

[13] NGOs and UN = Non-Government Organisations and United Nations

English as a more trustworthy language than French because Rwandans were disappointed by the French leadership that led the country to genocide. This observation leads to an examination of the relationship between English and French in order to understand the positive level of attitudes towards English.

Interview data reveals that the current power of English over French is the result of public perceptions associating French with the genocide of Tutsis in Rwanda in 1994 and regarding English as the language of national reconciliation (Steflaja, 2012). In the following extracts, principals and teachers express similar attitudes, contrasting French and English in political terms:

(i) *...in the Rwandan society, politically and socially, French language has lost already because of what is in the minds of Rwandans!! The role of French in genocide of Tutsi in Rwanda has already discredited French* (TUS1).

(ii) *We have learnt much from English-speaking countries' leadership, which I believe is different from French who led us to genocide because of bad leadership!* (PUS1)

(iii) *In leadership, English model is better than the French one which led us to genocide!* (TUS2).

The data shows that respondents associate the language (French) and the political regime that led Rwanda to genocide with the political ties that the French government had with the Rwandan leadership that followed independence up to the 1994 Genocide of Tutsis. With regard to political leadership, it is believed that English has enhanced national reconciliation since the 1994 Genocide of Tutsis, while French has been discredited because of the role the French government actively played in supporting the regime that perpetrated the killings. After the wars and killings, it was clearly noted that the 'widespread bitterness over these wrongs has resulted in French being regarded as the language of the 1994 killers' (Samuelson & Freedman, 2010, p. 194), while most Rwandans, especially the survivors and repatriated citizens, regarded 'Anglophone countries as more reliable sources of development aid and knowledge transfer than France, Belgium or their African allies' (Samuelson & Freedman, 2010, p. 194). Similar findings can be found in the context of post-apartheid South Africa where people's choice of English was mostly motivated by their negative attitudes towards Afrikaans as the language of Apartheid (Moodley, 2003). In the context of Rwanda, even if

participants had to abide by the government order to change the language of instruction from French to English, the interview data reveals that, in the hearts of some Rwandans, especially victims of the genocide, it would be better to suffer with English than to allow French to re-enter their lives. As one teacher stated:

> *It was good to get rid of French to show its masters that what they did to us was inhuman!!...their support to 'genociders' was very unfair to us!* (TRS1).

One principal also declared that he observed the traumatic experience of a victim who heard a testimony in French during the 16th commemoration of genocide in 2010 as follows:

> *...it was time for French to go...a young lady was traumatised during a testimony about the French 'operation turquoise[14]' when she heard a victim imitating the French militaries' words in French during Murambi Killings…* (PUS2).

The statements indicate the break away from French because of the role France played in the genocide of Tutsis in Rwanda. This means that the participants' positive attitude towards English occurs as a consequence of their negative perception towards French.

As interviews indicate, educators have strong feelings that teaching in English is a way to enable Rwanda progress economically, politically, and socially. It is clear that educators emphasise that English has played a great role to rouse Rwandans and make them participate actively to improve their economy, education, and leadership. These examples contribute to their perceptions of English as the promoter language for the people's economic, social, and political development.

This perception has some roots in the Rwanda's Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy named EDPRS 1 by the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MINECOFIN, 2007) and in the Education Sector Strategic Plan 2010-2015 named ESSP (MINEDUC, 2010), which aims to establish Rwanda as a strong economy by improving its

[14]This was the French military operation meant to protect civilians and stop the mass killings of Tutsis, but it failed in its mission because the killings continued to occur under their control in the western part of the country that was called Zone Turquoise.

education sector via teaching English as the MoI. From this logic, it is likely that most educators were influenced by both strategic plans to adopt new perceptions and attitudes towards English as the language that they can use to raise their economic status through national or international jobs. This observation is also evident from the fact that most educators feel that English will contribute to the fast and sustainable development of Rwanda. As research shows, many countries of the world, including Rwanda, took English as an official language because they saw it as an important tool of education for their social, economic, and political advancement (Spolsky, 2004; Pennycook, 2008; Tollefson, 2009).

4.2.3 Desire for access to English as a global language of education

English has become a global language or international language, i.e. a language that has transcended national boundaries and has become a global tool of education. Like many other countries of the world, Rwanda seems to be influenced by the internationalisation of English, and this emerges from the way educators appraise English. Table 4.1 indicates that the majority of principals (94%, $p < 0.0001$) and teachers (89%, $p < 0.0001$) have high regard for English. Referring to the results of the statements constituting this factor (Appendix A1c), educators support the use of English as the MoI in Rwanda because they feel that globally, English is the most desired language in education, and they believe that access to English proficiency can be reached by teaching it. This belief is confirmed in the principals' and teachers' disagreement (67%, $p = 0.0228$, and 82%, $p < 0.0001$, respectively) of the statement, *At primary school level, pupils should learn English as a subject only* (see Appendix A1c).

The data from four principals who were interviewed indicates that they believe that teaching in English would help Rwanda promote the learning of English.

(i) *We need to be up to date in our education by using the most important language in the world* (PUS1).

(ii) *Education in English is a main factor to integrate our country into the world society; we need to teach our people English…it is an international language!* (PRS2).

These statements appraise English as a global language and reflect the necessity of using it in education in order to curb isolation. Similarly, two teachers contend that Rwanda needs to educate in English in order to cope with globalisation processes and to dissolve the national boundaries through education. This means that education in English is seen as integrating Rwanda into a global community because of the perception that most teaching resources and learning facilities are found in the Anglophone world. Interviews reveal that the teachers' awareness of the dominance of English in print industries and information technology enhances their desire for English in education in Rwanda, as stated in the following quotations:

(i) *Many countries use English in communication, administration, education and business. For quick dissemination of English among its people, Rwanda needs English as MoI, I mean, eh, to learn it and teach in it. If we do not do that, we will be left behind because we won't be able to communicate with the world.* (TUS2)

(ii) *...most books are written in English, internet and all ICT is in English, UN uses English, many universities in the world are Anglophone, so we need to educate in English!* (TRS2).

The interviews with teachers regarding language in Rwandan education manifest their desire for English as the MoI. In fact, teachers acknowledge the role of English for global communication and information for advancement of knowledge since they feel that Rwandans need to become fully-fledged members of the English users' global community, which reflects their integrative motivation and desire to reach their 'ultimate goals' (Gardner, 1985) through education in English. Teachers are also motivated by other benefits such as further studies and advantages linked with the use of English as an international language in the UN. According to Lamb (2004) and Yashima (2002), the power and spread of English have led to benefits that people can access if they are users of English.

Interviews reveal that most principals and teachers tend to conflate the idea of learning English as a language with that of learning in English. For instance TUS2 in the statement number *(i)* above believes that English can spread among Rwandans if it is used at school where it is learnt and utilised as the MoI: '...Rwanda needs English as MoI, I mean, eh, to

learn it and teach in it'. Similarly, PRS2 in statement *(ii)* illustrated above uses 'Education in English…' and 'we need to teach our people English' in a way that does not seem to distinguish teaching English and teaching in English. More evidence from observations and classroom practices indicates that learning English is simultaneous with learning in English. The researcher illustrates more examples in Chapter Five.

The conflation of learning English and learning in English can be explained by the respondents' perception that the only means of acquiring an international language such as English or French in the context of Rwanda and practice for language proficiency is through school. The data from the questionnaires provides two cases of evidence in support of this explanation. The first is the respondents' language background (Appendices A1b and A2b), which indicates that the principals and teachers acquired English or French when they were at school where they were also using the languages as media of instruction. The data does not show any response for the use of English or French away from the school environment; instead, all the respondents mention that they use Kinyarwanda at home and outside the home. It is worth noting that, before the use of English as the MoI, French was learnt as a subject in the lower primary (P1-P3) before using it as the MoI (see Chapter One). The second case of evidence is in the questionnaire responses to the statement, *At primary school level, pupils should learn English as a subject only*, in which more than 80% of the respondents disagree with the idea of choosing to teach primary school learners English as a subject only (Appendices A1c and A2c). The high disagreement percentage for this statement confirms the previous case of evidence that learning an international language in the context of Rwanda takes place at school where learning English takes place simultaneously with English as theMoI. In addition to the evidence obtained from the data, studies conducted on language use in the context of Rwanda show that a linguistic situation in which Kinyarwanda dominates inhibits the mastery of foreign international languages (Ntakirutimana, 2005; Niyomugabo, 2008), and school is the place for learning foreign languages. For instance Niyomugabo (2008, p. 33) notes that '...l' apprentissage des langues étrangères passe essentiellement par la voie de la scolarisation' (...the learning of foreign languages is essentially done through school education), and that the degree of fluency among many speakers of foreign languages is minimal because of the frequent use of Kinyarwanda. The findings of this study confirm the reasons why the use of English as the MoI is conflated with the teaching of English.

The educators' conflation of learning English and learning in English makes them think that learning in English helps learners master the language of instruction. However, researchers (Macdonald & Burroughs, 1991; Qorro, 2002; Rubagumya, 2003 and Brock-Utne, 2005) suggest that the best way to master English and to use it effectively to access knowledge in other subjects is to learn it as a subject before using it as the MoI. In light of this research finding and examples of empirical studies by Brock-Utne & Alidou (2011) and Rugemalira (2005), it seems that the educators' belief that teaching and learning in English leads to mastering it is linked to political ideology or propaganda (the researcher explains this in Section 4.4), which accompanied the government resolution for subject teaching via English from Grade 1 to higher education. Therefore, educators are likely to think differently from the research because there were not sufficient opportunities to teach and learn English as a subject before using it as the MoI.

A comparison of the results across rural and urban contexts in Table 4.1 reveals that there is no difference between the rural and urban principals' responses (p = 0.2762), and the same comparison shows no difference between the rural and urban teachers' responses (p = 0.2600). This means that rural school educators share similar attitudes to urban school educators in terms of their desire for access to English as a global language of education. This, according to Lamb (2004), would indicate people's strong desire for access to English because of its integrative motivation. However, as the researcher mentioned above, these attitudes in both rural and urban areas are likely to be motivated by political propaganda to which both rural and urban educators may have equally succumbed.

4.2.4 Attitudes on the impact of English on MT and cultural identity

It is argued that languages of power negatively affect or even destroy the minority languages (Skutnabb-Kangas (2000, 2009), and impact on the learners' culture and identity (Nieto, 2010). In this study, the results from the questionnaire reveal that educators do not feel that English has a negative impact on the learners' MT, culture, and identity. As Table 4.1 shows, the majority of principals (67%, p = 0.0412) and most teachers (81%, p < 0.0001) think that English does not affect the learners' MT, culture, or identity. A comparison of rural schools and urban schools in Table 4.1 indicates that the majority of teachers from both rural and urban settings express similar perceptions (p = 0.1210) that English does not impact

negatively on the learners' MT, culture, or identity. For principals, the results indicate different ideas ($p = 0.0072$). The principals' responses to the questionnaire indicate that 100% of the rural school principals disagree with the statement, *English impacts on the learners' MT, culture, and identity*, while 66% of the urban school principals agree with the statement. Some reasons for this difference were provided in interviews as in the following quotation:

> *I remember having a child whose parent was a Rwandan Diplomat; that child could not speak Kinyarwanda at nursery level, but could understand some words! She was speaking fluent French and had difficulties in Kinyarwanda lessons until the end of primary 6!* (PUS1)

This quotation reflects the speaker's perception of the relationship between exposure to a language and the speaker's abilities to use it and negotiate identity (Norton, 2013). In fact, the learner in the quotation was raised in a French-speaking environment where there was probably no significant Kinyarwanda-speaking community since the parents were diplomats in a French-speaking country. She could speak French fluently because of the environment she grew up in. The principal shows that the learner had more French background than Kinyarwanda, which caused her to have problems in Kinyarwanda because she had not been exposed to it at home. For him, a foreign language can have a negative impact on Kinyarwanda.

Similarly, one of the urban teachers reveals that, depending on the children's ages, a foreign language can affect the learners' culture and identity. From the experience at his school, he states that it is possible that a foreign language can affect young learners' culture and identity, as shown in the following example:

> *At lower age yes…I may say, eh…at nursery school, yes, because kids are very young, and are even still learning their home language, but at other levels of primary school from the age of 7, children are not easily affected by a foreign language influence* (TUS1).

As seen earlier with PUS1, this teacher has also had the same experience as the principal and feels that English can affect learners. However, their perceptions differ because the teacher

puts the language influence at the early age of the child while the principal does not attribute the language influence to any specific age.

The data shows that the perception of English as a language that does not impact on Kinyarwanda, the learners' culture, and identity is also based on the amount of exposure to the language. Most educators agree that they use the MT Kinyarwanda at home, and therefore, they think that the language children use at school cannot impact negatively on Kinyarwanda and their cultural identity because of the belief that there is too little exposure to it. For instance one principal explains:

> *...when we are home in our families we all speak Kinyarwanda with our children and other relatives. ...our children cannot lose their culture or Kinyarwanda identity because of English they use at school. All may depend on which language and cultural practices are used at home (*PUS2).

In addition to the above principal's view, three teachers emphasise that the English used at school in Rwanda cannot affect the culture and identity of learners. For instance TRS2 states:

> *How much of English culture that can interfere with the Kinyarwanda culture do they have? English can't affect our children's culture and identity* (TRS2).

Both statements above suggest that the language someone speaks may have an influence on her/his culture and identity, depending on the level of exposure and use of that language. There is evidence in literature to support that language is deeply implicated in culture and identity (Nieto, 2010), and that language's influence on people depends on its power in the community (Crystal, 2003). In the context of this study, the responses to questionnaires show that Kinyarwanda is used in everyday activities at home, in the workplace and at school while there is less exposure to English language and culture. It may be noted that Rwanda, a country in which Kinyarwanda is spoken by 99.7% (République du Rwanda, 2005), is likely to be less influenced by the use of English as a foreign language in relation to the MT, culture, and identity. Without resorting to the relationship between language, culture, and identity, this phenomenon has a sociolinguistic explanation. Considering Baker's (2006, p. 69) definition of sociolinguistics as 'the study of language in relation to social groups, social class, ethnicity and other interpersonal factors in communication', it is evident that the

educators'dperception that English cannot impact negatively on the MT, culture, and identity emanates from the power that Kinyarwanda has over English in terms of the functions of these languages in Rwanda. Drawing on Baker's (2006) classification of the language functions, it is clear that the functions of Kinyarwanda make it more socially powerful locally than English, and this explains why educators do not consider English as a threat to the children's MT, identity, and culture. The analysis of the use of Kinyarwanda and English in Rwanda, where Kinyarwanda is spoken by 99.7% and English by 1.9%, shows that children's exposure to English is slight if we compare English and Kinyarwanda and their functions in Rwanda as Table 4.2 illustrates:

Table 4.2: Comparison of functions of English and Kinyarwanda in the Rwandan context

Context		**English**	**Kinyarwanda**
1.	The home and family		✓
2.	Schooling	✓	✓
3.	Media and www	✓	✓
4.	Business and commerce	✓	✓
5.	Social and cultural activity in the community		✓
6.	Correspondence with relatives and friends		✓
7.	Correspondence with government and departments	✓	✓
8.	Religious activity		✓

Source: Adapted from Baker (2006, p. 69).

Table 4.2 clearly indicates that both English and Kinyarwanda share a number of functions, and Kinyarwanda occupies all the functions. It is worth noting that among the four functions of English as illustrated in Table 4.2, only two of them, i.e. English for schooling and English for media[15], are relevant for children, whereas almost all the eight functions of Kinyarwanda are applicable to the children's activities with this language. Another factor that makes Kinyarwanda more socially powerful than English in Rwanda, is its official status in the country. According to the Constitution of the Republic of Rwanda (2003, Article 5),

[15] Depending on their age and exposure to English, children may be reading newspapers in English, watching TV or listening to radio programmes and using the internet in English.

Kinyarwanda is the national language and it is the official language alongside French[16] and English. It is therefore used in almost all the official and non-official activities.

Table 4.2 indicates that a few people who are also speakers of Kinyarwanda can use English and both English and Kinyarwanda share a number of functions. In terms of language exposure and functions, it appears that Kinyarwanda has more power than English in terms of social and cultural use, and therefore weakens the influence of English on culture and identity, thus, making educators feel that the English used at school cannot affect learners' culture and identity.

Considering the above discussion, the language context of Rwanda provides a perception that foreign languages do not affect the learners' Kinyarwanda, their culture, and identity because of a unique management of this language that all the citizens speak at home and in the public domain. The fact that there is a lack of exposure to English as opposed to a full use of Kinyarwanda by all citizens makes people believe that English cannot interfere with the children's MT, culture, and identity, and this seems to be one of the important factors contributing to the people's positive attitudes towards English as the MoI in Rwanda. The corollary to this is that the use of Kinyarwanda in almost all informal and formal contexts in Rwanda inhibits the mastery of English and reduces its influence on the learners' culture and identity because children do not have sufficient exposure to English outside the school environment (Maniraho, 2013).

4.2.5 Attitudes towards English as a mark of education

The data reflects the respondents' thoughts, feelings, and beliefs about English as a mark of education. The results from the questionnaire (92%, $p = 0.0001$ and 71%, $p < 0.0001$) indicate that the majority of principals and teachers perceive English as a mark of education. The responses to the questions in the survey indicate that the majority of educators agree with the statement, *English is a mark of education*. A comparison between the educators' perceptions about English as a mark of education indicates no significant difference among

[16] Even if French is no longer recognised as the instructional language in Rwanda and banned from various uses, it is surprisingly still kept in the National Constitution as an official language alongside Kinyarwanda and English.

rural and urban principals (p = 0.1481) and rural and urban teachers (p = 0.1020), which means that the majority of educators in both rural and urban schools have the same perception of English as a mark of education. There are varied reasons for these perceptions. In interviews, educators highlight that being able to speak English in Rwanda is an asset that grants a person social and academic respect and confers on him/her the mark of an educated person. This idea was repeated by participants in interviews and was best expressed in one principal's statement, as follows:

> *… today in Rwanda, English is the mark of education! I am sorry to take you* [researcher] *as an example, but you are very lucky to be fluent in English and French, but I think people respect you now because you speak English* (PUS1).

This principal clearly regards English as an empowering language. The speaker attributes the power of English to its prestige *(…today in Rwanda, English is the mark of education!*), which promote people's attitudes towards English *(…but…people respect you now because you speak English*). The speaker suggests that English empowers its users by providing them access to respect in the Rwandan community. In addition, the results for the statements, *English is important for an educated person* and *Educators who teach in English are the most respected* clearly indicate that the great majority of educators believe that English can change one's social and intellectual standing. This perception, adopted by most French-speaking teachers after the shift of the MoI from French to English, may be attributed to the reduction of the use of French because of government decisions regarding as the removal of French from the instructional languages in 2008, its replacement as the MoI, taking Radio France Internationale (RFI) off the Rwandan air, and the closing the French Cultural Centre in Rwanda (Steflja, 2012).

Furthermore, the interviews reveal that English is a requirement for access to employment in education. For instance, four teachers who were interviewed believe that they will not keep their job if they cannot teach in English as one of them puts it:

> *Rwandans believe in being educated in English and I also do. For instance if you are teaching here, and you can't teach in English, you lose your job!* (TRS2).

This example reveals teachers' lack of job security, because if they cannot teach in English they may lose their job. However, this instability is not only limited to their careers in education because teachers show that, even if they leave the education sector, they do not have any hope of securing a job in another sector if they cannot use English. One teacher states:

> *...it is not easy in Rwanda to get a new job if you can't speak English. I always see in job publicities saying, 'fluency in speaking and writing English is an asset' as if fluency in English is qualification!* (TRS1).

As expressed in the participants' statements, their perceptions of English as a mark of education may be attributed to political propaganda under the influence of globalisation. In its Education Sector Strategic Plan 2010-2015, the Rwandan Ministry of Education states that, in order to achieve the government's goal of developing a knowledge-based and technology-led economy, there must be a consistent implementation plan for the use of English as the MoI (MINEDUC, 2010). This plan was introduced after Rwanda had joined political and economic international organisations such as the EAC and the Commonwealth. In order to motivate the people of Rwanda in general and teachers in particular to learn and use English, there were training plans and sensitisation regarding the benefits of using English and making it a mark of education (Samuelson & Freedman, 2010). It seems that educators in this study may have succumbed to the government propaganda regarding the value of English for Rwanda.

Another possible explanation of the educators' attitudes towards English as a mark of education is that, after the 1994 Genocide of Tutsi in Rwanda, any English-speaking Rwandan had improved chances of securing a job in private companies and government, as opposed to those Rwandans who were French-speaking. This may have been influenced by the government's policy that adopted English as the language of facilitation for the national reconciliation, and for economic incentives (Steflja, 2012). Having a command of English is regarded by private companies and certain public institutions as being a step towards career promotion and higher pay (Euromonitor International, 2010). According to the Euromonitor International (2010) report, there has been a 20% salary gap between professionals with and without English skills. In education, many investors created English-speaking schools because of the demand from repatriated English-speaking parents. These schools employed

foreign and Rwandan English-speaking teachers, and they were well remunerated (Jemimah, 2011). Teachers who remained in public French-speaking schools did not get the same advantages as their counterparts in private English-speaking schools, and thereafter some French-speaking teachers may have regarded English as more valuable than French and regard an English education as more empowering than a French one.

However, even if educators value English as a mark of education in Rwanda, the majority of principals (67%, p = 0.0482) and teachers (63%, p = 0.0416) feel that English is not a sine qua non of pursuing one's studies at further level because they disagree with the statement, *If a person cannot speak English, s/he cannot pursue her/his studies after school.* In other words, educators regard English as the language of scientific, social, academic, and intellectual integration but do not take it as the only language for successful learning. From another perspective, after the shift of the MoI, not all teachers, lecturers, and students were happy with the shift, because there were some who felt that it was abrupt and Rwanda needed a transition that started with both French and English as media of instruction (Jemimah, 2011; Steflja, 2012). This feeling emanated from the fact that after the shift, many available teaching and learning materials were still in French and most teachers were unable to translate them into English (Jemimah, 2011). In addition to this explanation, due to various language backgrounds and language preferences, educators are likely to have different beliefs on the language that can favour their personal scientific growth, and most of the time, their preferences may be based on personal feelings about the language they understand and speak better.

4.2.6 Attitudes towards English as a challenge to teaching and learning

Although the results from the previous factors indicate the educators' overwhelmingly favourable attitudes towards English as the language of education, global communication, social integration, and economic development, the remaining results reflect their perceptions of English as a challenge. Table 4.1 indicates that the majority of principals (90%, p < 0.0001) and most teachers (82%, p < 0.0001) perceive English as a challenge to teaching and learning in Rwandan primary schools. For instance, the majority of educators strongly agree with statements such as *Teaching in English is a very hard task for teachers in primary*

schools in Rwanda and *Learning in English is very difficult for pupils in primary schools of Rwanda*. A comparison of the results in Table 4.1, (p = 0.0361) for principals and (p = 0.0082) for teachers, indicates differences between perceptions. The data reflects higher percentages in rural schools than in urban schools, which seems to suggest that educators in rural schools believe that they are faced with more challenges regarding English than those in urban schools do.

The majority of educators in this study report blame the teachers and learners difficulties in the classroom on their lack of English proficiency. Two interviewees indicated that learners are unresponsive because they are unconfident when speaking in English.

> *They* [learners] *understand what you ask them in English, but they are unable to reply. If you speak to them in Kinyarwanda they reply, but if you speak in English they are shy and keep quiet* (PRS1).

Lack of proficiency in speaking in English is not only a learner problem. The data also shows that teachers process and understand English when reading or listening to English, but lack proficiency in speaking the language fluently.

(i) *My problem is not vocabulary or grammar, but to produce a correct and coherent sentence in English because I first have to think in French and translate!* (TRS1)

(ii) *...when I doubt about how a word is pronounced in English, I feel I am teaching my pupils incorrect language that the native speaker will laugh at!* (TUS2)

The lack of confidence in English can also be traced to how teachers regard their training and what they request or suggest to the government about the support they need.

(i) *...they* [Education stakeholders] *have to sit and plan well those trainings, because teachers don't get much from there. It has so far been taken as if teachers are good at English, that's maybe why most trainings are about 'how to teach in English!'* (TUS1).

(ii) *... I was expecting to learn more English from trainers but we didn't get much from there. It has so far been taken as if teachers are good at English, that's maybe why most trainings are about 'how to teach in English'* (TRS1).

The interviewees in this section indicate that speaking in English in the classroom is a problem common to both teachers and learners. Educators' attitudes related to challenges in

the classroom are expressed in their perspective that neither teachers nor learners have been sufficiently trained in English to use it as the MoI. The language difficulties discussed in Chapter Five form part of the evidence for the educators' attitudes regarding English as a teaching and learning challenge. Examples from audio-recorded lessons (see Chapter Five) demonstrate what educators claim in interviews in relation to the lack of English proficiency. As PRS1 states, learners do not respond in English because they lack the necessary vocabulary, grammar, and language skills to enable them to communicate efficiently and effectively. Teachers also experience problems of communicative competence in English. As TRS1 indicated in the interviews, he thinks in French, the language he knows well, before constructing his sentences in English. This is a transfer of strategies from the language a speaker is familiar with to the new tasks in the additional language being learnt (Chamot, 2004), which is an indication that the perceptions of English as a challenge in the classroom are closely linked to the use of English as a foreign language in Rwanda. Additional evidence from the data is that teachers call upon the government to intervene by helping them increase their spoken and written English through well planned and focused training sessions, because they feel that they do not get what they need from the training sessions since they are taught the methodology of teaching in English while they also require English as a language. This is explored further in Chapter Five.

Summary

The quantitative data in Table 4.1 reveals that the majority of educators view English positively, i.e. they express feelings supporting their desire for English as the language of education. Most educators feel that using English as the MoI will provide both teachers and learners with opportunities of mastering it for further benefits, such as developing themselves economically and elevating their social standing. This study shows that educators do not consider English a threat to Kinyarwanda and to the learners' culture and identity. However, the study reveals that the majority of educators acknowledge difficulties due to lack of proficiency in English among both teachers and learners. While English appears to be a challenge in the classroom, educators' attitudes towards English as the MoI in Rwanda are positive, because they are mostly influenced by the socio-political context of the country, and by the global position of English. This point will be returned to later in this chapter. The researcher now turns to the learners' attitudes.

4.3 Attitudes of learners towards English as the MoI at four primary schools in Rwanda

This section presents and discusses attitudes of learners towards English as the MoI in Rwanda. It draws on data gathered from questionnaires and focus group interviews. The questionnaire responses are classified according to factors contributing to the learners' attitudes, and the focus group responses discuss the attitudes identified in the questionnaires.

With regard to the questionnaire, 23 direct attitudes statements were administered to 185 learners to investigate their attitudes towards English as the MoI. Five factors emerged from their responses as follows:

(i) Factor 1: Need for English to communicate with the outside world.
(ii) Factor 2: Attitudes towards English as the language for social success and economic development.
(iii) Factor 3: Desire to access English as a global language.
(iv) Factor 4: Preference of English as the MoI.
(v) Factor 5: Affective factors due to lack of confidence in English.

These factors and their results are presented in Table 4.3 similar to the presentation of Table 4.1.

Table 4.3: Data on learners' attitudes towards English as the MoI

		All the schools			**Comparison of rural and urban schools**				
					Rural schools		**Urban schools**		
F	**Statements**	**A**	**D**	*p*	**A**	**D**	**A**	**D**	*p*
(i)	English is needed for communication with the outside world.	**84**	16	< 0.0001	**88**	12	**79**	21	0.0575
(ii)	English is the language for social success and economic development.	**82**	18	< 0.0001	**85**	15	**78**	22	0.0602
(iii)	English is the global language of education.	**91**	9	< 0.0001	**91**	9	**90**	10	0.2207
(iv)	French is preferred as the MoI rather than English.	26	**74**	< 0.0001	28	**72**	24	**76**	0.0849
(v)	There is lack of confidence in English.	**80**	20	< 0.0001	**84**	16	**65**	35	< 0.0001

The statistical data in Table 4.3 is discussed and supported with qualitative data from the focus group interviews conducted with a total of 20 Grade 6 learners. Out of four schools, four focus groups were conducted, i.e. five learners per school were interviewed in a focus group. For reference purposes regarding interview quotations, learners are referred to as Lr1 (learner one), Lr2 (learner two), Lr3 (learner three), and so on. Each of these codes is preceded by the code of a school such as RS1 or US2, and, for instance Lr4 from US1 is coded US1/Lr4. During the analysis, the four focus groups were compared in order to select quotations containing recurring ideas. The selected statements are used as illustrations in the interpretation of data. The following is the detailed analysis of data in factors.

4.3.1 Need for English to communicate with the outside world

The analysis of the learners' responses to the questionnaire reflects favourable attitudes towards English. One of the main reasons for these attitudes is the need to communicate in English. The results in Table 4.3 (84%, $p < 0.0001$) highlight that the majority of learners express enthusiastic desire for English in their communication. This is evident in the learners' strong agreements with the statement, *If I can speak English, I can travel all over the world without any communication problems* (Appendix A3c). A comparison of the results from rural schools and urban schools indicates no significant difference ($p = 0.0575$) of attitudes in terms of the learners' need of English for communication. As shown in the focus groups, learners from both rural and urban schools believe that English is an important communication tool, i.e. the language that learners aspire to speak to communicate with the world. They believe that knowing how to speak English enables the speaker to communicate with other people around the world, a task that local languages cannot accomplish. The data indicates the enormous enthusiasm that inspires learners to be proficient in English, as expressed in the following examples:

(i) *I like English because when you know it you can speak it with foreigners from Europe or America and when you travel you can communicate without any problem* (US1/Lr1).

(ii) *English is used in many countries. So when you go abroad, you can use English because there you cannot use your local language. That is what we like about English* (US2/Lr2).

(iii) *Because when you speak it you can go in Europe and America and talk to the people you meet there, and you can do a lot that another person who does not know English can't do* (RS1/Lr2).

These quotations support the learners' integrative motivation (Gardner, 1985), as they ambitiously seek to acquire English for communication. This motivation is indicative of the learners' positive attitudes towards English emanating from their communication aspirations.

The desire to learn English as the global language for communication links to another factor, which is that learners feel that by speaking English they can achieve a certain economic and social status, as discussed below.

4.3.2 Attitudes towards English as the language for social success and economic development

The results in Table 4.3 (84%, $p < 0.0001$) indicate that most learners are motivated to learn English because of the elevated status that English speakers are accorded in the Rwandan society and because of the job opportunities that are available to Rwandan English speakers. For instance most learners strongly agree with the statement, *People who speak English have more chances to get better jobs than those who speak Kinyarwanda or French* (Appendix A3c). In terms of the rural and urban divide, it appears from the same table that there is no significant difference ($P = 0.0602$) between the rural and urban results, which implies the same perceptions of English as the language of prosperity and progress.

The four focus groups reveal that most learners feel that speaking English will boost their social mobility and economic development. For instance, they think that knowing English will promote their social and economic standing by providing them with power and opportunities to enrich themselves because they have access to good jobs and money.

(i) *The reason why I learn English is because I want to be an engineer or doctor, so I must be able to speak good English, and I may go to study in other countries, or if I am a doctor I can work in NGOs, I like Doctors without borders, or I can go and teach in America!* (US1/Lr2)

(ii) *It* [English] *can also help you to get a job. Many countries speak English, so when you go there without speaking English, you can't get a job!* (US2/Lr3)

(iii) *When I know English I will be admitted to study in the British universities or American universities and I will be very intelligent* (RS1/Lr5).

(iv) *If I know English I will study in Europe and will get a job in the UN and be rich because I will be paid in dollars* (RS2/Lr2).

These views reveal the learners' aspirations to gain English proficiency to boost their economic and educational advancement. From the data, it appears that learners believe that English proficiency enables people to access higher education, which in turn leads to a higher economic standard. This is what Gardner (1985) calls instrumental motivation to learning a language, and it is a feature of favourable attitudes towards that language, because learners agree that English is the key to Rwandans' economic potential and a mark of value in the society. As seen in Factor 1 of this section, learners regard English as the language of social and economic power, and their favourable attitudes towards English are linked to seeking this power through becoming proficient English users. The learners' positive attitudes towards English can also be seen in their statements referring to their preference of English as the MoI. A discussion of this issue follows.

4.3.3 Desire for access to English as a global language

Table 4.3 indicates that learners have favourable attitudes towards English. The results (98%, $p < 0.0001$) reveal that almost all learner participants strongly agree with statements such as *English is the most important language in the world* and *English is a very beautiful language*, which are statements praising English as the globally desired language (Appendix A3c). Another indication of the learners' strong desire for English is their disagreement (69% ($p < 0.0001$) with the statement, *I hate English and speakers of English* (Appendix A3c). A comparison of the rural and urban settings in Table 4.3 indicates no difference ($p = 0.2207$) of attitudes, which means that the rural and urban groups of learners have the same perceptions of English as a global language. Responses from the focus group interviews indicate that learners love English and desire to learn and use it at school and in their future lives. It is clear from the interview results that learners are attracted to English because they feel it is an important language that is liked and used by many people in the world.

(i) *English is a beautiful language, it is not difficult, and many people like it because it is important* (US1/Lr3)
(ii) *English is a very beautiful and important language in the whole world!* (US1/Lr1)
(iii) *For me English is a very nice language because of how it is spoken* (RS1/Lr4)
(iv) *It's easy, exciting and easy to learn and speak!* (US2/Lr4)
(v) *English is better than French, and easier than French* (US1/Lr5)

The above interview statements converge with the praise of English as a language to which most learners are attracted. In effect, learners regard English as 'beautiful', 'good', 'nice', 'easy to learn', 'lovely to hear', 'exciting' and 'important language'. These adjectives used to qualify English positively, indicate how learners value it and desire to learn it because it is globally desired. The fact of regarding English as a global language indicates that learners are aware of the status of English in Rwanda and have been apprised of the importance of English for the country and the world. According to Crystal (2003), a language becomes a 'global language' if it is spoken as a second or foreign language by certain people and given a 'special place within their communities' (Crystal, 2003, p.4). This special place of the language, as Crystal states, can be its use as official language and the MoI or, if it is not used as an official language, it must be 'a priority in a country's foreign-language teaching' (Crystal, 2003, p.4). The learners' high level of positive attitudes towards English as a global language can be said to be triggered by the label that has been politically assigned to it in Rwanda since 1996 when it was officially declared an official language (Samuelson & Freedman, 2010; LeClerc, 2008) and made the only MoI in 2008 (MINICAAF, 2008).

The reputation that English has acquired nationally and internationally has engendered a sense of pride in this study's learners because of the respect and honour that the society they live in confers on English speakers. Consider the following examples:

(i) *English is smart; when you speak it you are a gentleman!* (US1/Lr1)
(ii) *I like it because when you speak English people respect you.* (US2/Lr2)
(iii) *When you speak English you are like a European!* (RS2/Lr4)
(iv) *Because it is the language of Europeans and many white people speak it.* (RS1/Lr2)

In these statements, English is regarded as smart, the language of gentlemen, the language of Europeans or 'white people', and the language of respect, which reflects the linguistic and cultural superiority of English. The way learners describe English indicates their keen motivation to learn and use it because they want to be like those speakers of English to which they are referring. The above quotations reveal that speaking English in the context of Rwanda is associated with being in a position of power. In Rwanda, as in many other African communities, the concept 'white' does not only refer to the racial distinction, it also implies social class in which 'umuzungu' in Kinyarwanda, 'mzungu' in Kiswahili, 'mlungu' in Isizulu, to mention but a few, means 'rich' and 'powerful'. In the context of the present study, it appears that learners associate English or speaking English with economic power (richness) and social power (prestige, respect and high standing) by matching terms *English* with *white people* or *European*, *speaking English* with *respect* and *English* with *gentleman*. Echoing Pennycook (1994, p. 13), the role of English as a 'gatekeeper to social and economic progress' influences the learners' positive attitudes.

In the context of learning English as a foreign language, the above learners' statements reflect the notion of investment in language learning as promoted by Pierce (1995) and Norton (2013). Drawing on the literature on investment in an L2 (see Chapter Two), the learners' attitudes towards English are positive because of their perception that by learning English, 'they will acquire a wider range of symbolic and material resources' (Norton, 2013, p. 87), i.e. they will be able to access their ideal identity. As can be seen from the data, it is clear that the learners' aim in learning English is to establish a relationship between learning English and becoming a powerful person who is rich and respected like 'white people' or 'Europeans' are.

The interview extracts from the focus groups indicate an overwhelmingly positive feeling that the learners at the four primary schools in Rwanda have towards English. It is a language that they love and which they consider to be highly ranked in the world because of its associations with power and prestige.

4.3.4 Preference of English as the MoI

Favourable attitudes towards English as the language of instruction, language of communication, and language for individual economic growth and social value or prestige

was also emphasised by disagreements with the statements indicating a rejection of other languages in favour of English as the MoI. Table 4.3 indicates that the majority of learners (74%, p = 0.0001) disagree with the statements suggesting the use of French or Kinyarwanda as the MoI. This disagreement with the statements such as *I am happy when the teacher explains the lesson in French* or *I am unhappy when the teacher asks me to do homework in English; I would rather do it in Kinyarwanda* equally emerged in both rural and urban schools as the results 72% and 76% (p = 0.0849) indicate.

It appears from the four focus groups that the majority of learners are not content to be taught in another language other than English. They express some satisfaction with using English for school tasks instead of using Kinyarwanda or French because of the benefits they expect from English as an international language.

(i) *English is the language I can choose because it is better than French and Kinyarwanda* (US1/Lr4).

(ii) *I prefer English because Kinyarwanda cannot help me when I go to study abroad* (US2/Lr2).

(iii) *I can choose English because it is easier than French* (RS2Lr1).

(iv) *It is good to study in English because if we study in Kinyarwanda we will only work in Rwanda, and we will not know many things* (US2/Lr4).

(v) *French is not used in our school; my choice is English because I can use it to write to the ministers or president* (RS1/Lr3).

The focus groups reveal the learners' awareness of the importance of an international language, i.e. to break the national boundaries in order to access international resources in relation to knowledge and economy. The learners' preference for English over French seems to be influenced by the regulations of which the learners are aware. As RS1/Lr3 states, French is not the MoI and she cannot use it for her official communication because it is not the official language. Echoing Crystal's (2003) ideas in relation to how people come to prefer to use a language on the basis of the status assigned to it by political authorities, it might be possible that the learners' choice and preference of English over French is motivated by the

status that English has been given in the Rwandan society as official language and the MoI. In addition, even if it is not explicitly expressed in the learners' statements (For instance US1/Lr4 states, '…it [English] is better than French…'), there might be influences of educators' attitudes towards French political implications, which were discussed previously in this chapter. It is likely that if adults in general have favourable attitudes towards English, then learners pick up on this and replicate the adults' attitudes. Furthermore, English is preferred over Kinyarwanda because learners believe in the linguistic superiority of the Western languages. For example, the learner's belief expressed in 'if we study in Kinyarwanda we will only work in Rwanda' (US2/Lr4) is a sign that learners are aware of the limitations of Kinyarwanda as a local language.

4.3.5 Affective factors due to lack of confidence in English

Even though the four factors discussed above reveal the learners' positive attitudes towards English, some of the data reveals that attitudes differ from practices. In fact, the remaining learners' responses to the statements of the questionnaire (see Appendix A3c), actual practices in the classroom, and learners' statements from focus groups indicate that learners feel that English is difficult to use in the classroom.

Table 4.3 highlights that the majority of learners (80%, $p < 0.0001$) agree with the statements such as *I feel uncomfortable to ask a question in English, I still need more English classes to be able to write and speak it properly* and *I always feel that my classmates speak better English than me,* which all converge in the lack of confidence in English. The other evidence for the learners' discomfort with English in the classroom is highlighted in the disagreement (70%, $p < 0.0001$) with the statements, *I understand my teacher well when s/he speaks in English*, and *I can express my ideas better in English than in Kinyarwanda* (Appendix A3a). A comparison of the rural and urban settings indicates a significant difference ($p < 0.0001$) of perceptions linked to lack of confidence in the classroom. This is explained in Chapter Five.

The focus groups indicate that learners have limited conversation and discussion in the classroom because they lack the confidence and the vocabulary to express their ideas in English. Some fear that their classmates will laugh at them, while others are simply

unresponsive in English because they do not have sufficient English vocabulary to express their ideas.

(i) *It is like when you know the answer but because you are not confident, eh,… it is not the problem of language but you, in yourself you don't have this strength to say it in English because you are not confident* (US1/Lr4).

(ii) *When I am not confident I ask myself 'what is every one going to say about my idea?' because, see, you are standing, everyone is looking at you!* (RS1/Lr3)

(iii) *It's because we don't have vocabulary we can use to speak and give a clear idea in English* (US2/Lr4).

(iv) *For me, I am not shy, but I don't want my friends to laugh at my vocabulary in English!* (RS2/Lr1)

The above quotations illustrate the speaking difficulties occasioned by the learners' awareness of insufficient vocabulary and grammar enabling them to structure sentences in English confidently. The extracts reflect the learners' shyness to speak English, which may be attributed to their limited exposure to English. There is data that indicates that learners who have been exposed to English for a given time claim that they do not have any problem speaking it, as expressed in the following illustrations:

(i) *I started learning English in P1 or P2, don't remember well, I speak and learn SS without any problem. The problem would be if they change the language I cannot understand very well because I learnt English at school since P2 and it is the only language I used for my lessons, so when they change in another language I don't know what they are saying* (US1/Lr4).

(ii) *I have learnt English since P1 and many lessons were in English, so, it is so simple to speak it and learn SS in it* (US2/Lr5).

These interview extracts provide more evidence to suggest that the learners' lack of confidence in speaking English is mainly due to the absence of exposure to this language because, as the learners indicate, the longer they have been exposed to English, the better they claim to be able to use it in the classroom. Referring to research, one can say that the lack of exposure to English delays the development of both the learners' BICS and their CALP (Cummins, 1999), which are discussed in the next chapter.

Summary

The analysis of the data in the above discussion indicates that learners have positive attitudes towards English as a language and English as the MoI. The factors identified from the survey display findings to indicate that learners have positive orientation towards learning English and learning in English. Learners feel that when they have learnt English and are able to speak it, they will be able to communicate with the outside world, get good jobs in and out of the country, and become respected people. It was also shown that the learners' attitudes towards English motivate their preference to have it as the MoI. However, the learners' level of positive attitudes towards English is as high as their level of lack of confidence in this language of instruction. Even if the findings demonstrate the learners' discomfort in using English in the classroom, learners are both integratively and instrumentally motivated to learn and use English at school and in their future lives.

4.4 Conclusion

Evidence from the questionnaires, interviews, and focus group interviews demonstrates that educators and learners have positive attitudes towards English as the MoI, which are underpinned by both integrative and instrumental motivation (Gardner, 1985; Baker, 1992; Ajzen, 2005). In particular, the data presents overwhelming evidence for the educators' and learners' desire for English to be used as the MoI at Rwandan primary schools because they believe that teaching and learning in English as the MoI will be beneficial for their development of proficiency in English. As evident in the educators' responses to items (i) and (iii) in Table 4.1 and learner responses to items (i) and (iii) in Table 4.3, it would appear that globalisation has mostly influenced the respondents' attitudes by establishing English as a *lingua mundi* or *lingua franca*. However, regarding the implementation processes of English as the MoI, both teachers and learners express a lack of confidence in speaking English in the classroom and admit to finding English a challenge for teaching and learning content subjects. These findings are significant for this study because they represent an important paradox to be considered in relation to English as the MoI in the Rwandan context.

The paradox, that respondents have positive attitudes towards English and yet feel that English is a challenge for the teaching and learning of content subjects, is an issue to be considered carefully. It is evident from this study that the positive attitudes towards English

and the limited abilities to teach and learn through this MoI are at odds with each other. One cannot expect positive results from using English as the MoI in Rwanda on the basis of the positive attitudes that educators and learners have towards it. Educators and learners in the Grade 6 classrooms involved in this study are aware of the difficulties of using English in the classroom, and especially report lack of confidence in using the language. This situation is likely to affect teaching and learning across the curriculum.

While there is extensive research on the benefits of learning English as a subject before using it as the MoI (Qorro, 2002; Rubagumya, 2003; Brock-Utne, 2005), the use of English as the MoI in Rwanda came into effect immediately after the government decision in 2008 (Samuelson & Freedman, 2010; MINICAAF, 2008). There were no consultations with the implementers of the policy to gauge their attitudes. Instead, there was an extensive information campaign to inform the Rwandan community about the benefits of using English as the MoI. Subsequently, further actions taken by the government have promoted people's positive attitudes towards English as a vehicle for communication between Rwanda and other countries. For example in 2009 Rwanda joined the Commonwealth despite never having been a British colony (BBC News[17]). It is clear from these factors that the government is a prime influence on the respondents' high level of positive attitudes towards English as the MoI in Rwanda.

According to Baker (1992), Adegbija (1994), Spolsky (2004), and Ricento (2006b), when attitudes towards a language policy are positive, the implementation is likely to be successful, and when attitudes are negative or counter to the prevailing community's perceptions, the implementation is doomed to failure (Paulston, 1986). Following this logic, one would expect the context of Rwanda, which displays educators' and learners' favourable attitudes towards English as the MoI, to result in better performance. However, the findings of this study revealed the respondents' self-awareness of lack of proficiency and confidence in English. On the part of teachers, interviews revealed that they do not consider the knowledge of English that they acquired from the training that the Ministry of Education organised for them before and during the English-in-education policy implementation, to be sufficient. They believe that effective well-planned training sessions for teaching English are needed to help them be more confident in the classroom, and to successfully implement the new policy.

[17] BBC news on 29/11/2009 available at http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/8384930.stm

Likewise, despite positive attitudes, learners expressed self-awareness of lack of confidence in English in the classroom. Considering this paradoxical situation, it is worth mentioning that the positive attitudes that teachers express towards English are not enough for them to use it as the MoI successfully because, as will be seen in Chapter Five, teachers need to be proficient and confident enough in English to be able to convey knowledge in this language (Webb, 2004; Kyeyune, 2010). As for learners, the lack of confidence, which was qualified as the 'killer factor' of positive attitudes in this study, hinders their effective learning because it prevents them from interacting with their teachers or peers.

To summarise, this chapter has demonstrated that educators and learners have positive attitudes underpinned by political influence from government propaganda for English in Rwanda; integrative and instrumental reasons motivated by the people's need to invest in learning a foreign language; and social ideology placing French, the former language of instruction, to the negative side, connected as it is, with the perpetration of the genocide of Tutsis in 1994, and regarding English as the language of the post-conflict national reconciliation. It has also shown that these attitudes coexist with the perceptions that English presents a challenge to teaching and learning in primary schools. The findings of this chapter suggest that, although the participants' attitudes towards English are positive because they regard it as the language of opportunity and progress, there is more that has to be considered for the move to English as the MoI in Rwanda to be successful for learning in schools. The next chapter explores the factors that contribute to the participants' concerns regarding the use of English as the MoI.

CHAPTER FIVE

CHALLENGES IN USING ENGLISH AS THE MoI FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING

5.1 Introduction

This chapter examines teaching and learning challenges posed by the use of English as the MoI in four Grade 6 primary schools in Rwanda. The chapter analyses the data obtained from questionnaires administered to educators and learners (Appendices A1d, A2d, and A3d); transcript data from audio-recordings of lessons and observation field notes (Appendix B); and transcript data from interviews with principals (Appendix C1) and teachers (Appendix C2), and from focus group interviews with learners (Appendix C3). The discussion is organised according to the factors identified from the analysis of the questionnaires. The relevant questions in the questionnaires were designed according to the four language skills namely listening, speaking, reading, and writing in an attempt to investigate the challenges that learning in English presents in the classroom. This design was adopted in accordance with the 2010 English language curriculum for primary school in Rwanda, which was established by the National Curriculum Development Centre (NCDC, 2010).

In the course of analysis, the researcher examined the degree of correlation between challenges reported through questionnaires and interviews, and observable evidence from the classroom observations and audio-recordings. Since the core evidence regarding teaching and learning challenges is found in the classroom practices where the main actors are the teacher and learners, the analysis of the classroom recordings cannot be performed by separating the data from teachers and the data from learners, as was done in the previous chapter. For this reason, the researcher also presents the questionnaire data from principals, teachers, and learners in the same table, in order to discuss them together with the classroom recordings and interview data. The researcher first presents and discusses the data according to the factors identified from the questionnaires and classroom recordings. Next, the researcher

proceeds to the implications of using English to learn SS and then interprets and concludes the chapter.

5.2 Teaching and learning challenges

English as the MoI in Rwanda poses a variety of challenges influenced by various factors. The points the researcher discusses in this section are obtained from a combination of the factors contributing to language difficulties in the classroom as they have been identified from questionnaires and classroom recordings. They are supported with the data from interviews and observation field notes. The analysis of the findings from the questionnaires identified four factors obtained from combining related statements from the questionnaires according to the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) recommended in the English teaching curriculum for primary schools by NCDC (NCDC, 2010). It is worth noting that for listening skills, curriculum 2010 puts emphasis on comprehension of what is heard as the main objective to be achieved when the teacher talks to learners or plays a recording in the lesson. Even if *comprehension* is involved in all skills, for example comprehension of a reading or comprehension of a spoken word or sentence, the researcher uses it instead of listening because it includes 'language production' and 'language receptiveness', which are the main features of information exchange for learning (MacDonald, 2013). Since the focus of the study is on language and classroom interactions in a content subject, examination of challenges requires analysis that looks at both receptive and productive skills in English when used for content learning.

The findings of the analysis of the questionnaires are illustrated in Table 5.1 as:

(i) Factor 1: Comprehension challenges.
(ii) Factor 2: Speaking challenges.
(iii) Factor 3: Reading challenges.
(iv) Factor 4: Writing challenges.

In addition to these factors from the questionnaires, the classroom recordings revealed another factor related to the use of grammar:

(v) Factor 5: Language structure challenges.

The researcher discusses each of these factors, focussing on how English as the MoI contributes to the classroom challenges that hinder effective learning of SS in Grade 6

Rwandan primary schools. The following table presents the results of the analysis of the questionnaire.

Table 5.1: Data on teaching and learning challenges caused by English as the MoI at four Rwandan primary schools

		All the schools									**Comparisons of the Rural and Urban schools**														
		Principals			**Teachers**			**Learners**			**Principals**					**Teachers**					**Learners**				
											Rural schools		**Urban schools**			**Rural schools**		**Urban schools**			**Rural schools**		**Urban schools**		
F	**Statement**	***A***	***D***	*p*	***A***	***D***	*p*	***A***	***D***	*p*	***A***	***D***	***A***	***D***	*p*	***A***	***D***	***A***	***D***	*p*	***A***	***D***	***A***	***D***	*p*
(i)	**Compre-hension** is a challenge for learners.	**72**	28	0.0038	**64**	36	0.0006	**72**	28	< 0.0001	**100**	0	45	**55**	0.0043	**80**	20	49	**51**	0.0030	**90**	10	48	**52**	< 0.0001
(ii)	**Speaking** is a challenge for learners.	**83**	17	0.0001	**83**	17	0.0001	**58**	42	< 0.0001	**100**	0	**66**	34	0.0607	**83**	17	**83**	17	1	**68**	32	44	**56**	< 0.0001
(iii)	**Reading** is a challenge for learners.	**67**	33	0.0412	**64**	36	0.0053	**55**	45	0.0044	**100**	0	34	**66**	0.0073	**86**	14	41	**59**	0.0009	**70**	30	33	**67**	< 0.0001
(iv)	**Writing** is a challenge for learners.	**83**	17	0.0001	**71**	29	0.0019	**54**	46	0.0171	**100**	0	**66**	34	0.1367	**75**	15	**67**	33	0.3267	**68**	32	35	**65**	< 0.0001

5.2.1 Comprehension challenges

The findings presented in Table 5.1 indicate that the majority of principals (72%, $p = 0.0038$) and teachers (64%, $p = 0.0006$) agree that learners have comprehension challenges, i.e. difficulties in understanding the language and the content of what they are taught through the medium of English. This finding is confirmed by the results from the learners' questionnaire, which shows that the majority of learners (72%, $p < 0.0001$) agree that comprehension of new concepts in English is difficult for them. In effect, the educators' perception of English as a challenge in terms of understanding what the teacher is saying in English appears in their responses to statements, such as, *Lessons in English complicate my pupils' understanding of scientific concepts*, and *When I ask a question in English, my pupils do not understand it* (Appendices A1d and A2d). Most educators agreed with these and other similar statements. In addition, the responses that principals and teachers provided to the open-ended questions of the questionnaire indicate that learners have difficulties in understanding lessons in English. For instance two responses from the teachers' open-ended questionnaires state,

(i) *The English used in the SS book is very high; my pupils can rarely understand it when I read or explain concepts to them* (TRS2, Appendix A2d)

(ii) *Different pronunciation styles of some words in English from different teachers confuse learners* (PRS2, Appendix A1d).

(iii) *I understand the content of the lesson but when I explain it in English the vocabulary I know does not help me clearly tell what I need to say to my pupils* (TRS1, Appendix A2d).

These statements indicate that educators are aware of the learners' difficulties in understanding the teacher's communication in English, and they acknowledge their own English limitations. TRS2 attributes the learners' comprehension challenges to English that the learners find difficult understand. PRS2 believes that teachers play a part in the learners' comprehension challenges because the teachers' inconsistent pronunciation makes understanding difficult. For TRS1, another factor contributing to the learners' difficulties comprehending an English discussion is the teacher's weak English vocabulary. It seems that TRS1 knows the content of the lesson, probably because he learnt it or taught it in another language, but has difficulties in expressing ideas in English. This may be one of the reasons

why learners may not understand what the teacher is saying. The same statement suggests that this teacher might have difficulties in the comprehension of English since he is not confident in his vocabulary. Additional evidence for the educators' perception of comprehension challenges among learners is that most teachers (63%, p = 0.0416) disagree with the statement, *When I use English, my pupils do not experience any problems understanding me*.

Difficulties of understanding language and content were identified in the lessons' audio-recordings. The following example illustrates these difficulties and how they are handled by the teacher.

Extract 5.1 [US1, L9: Transport and communication]

1. T: Another disadvantage?
2. L: Unreliable.
3. T: Unreliable. Yes, the road transport can sometimes be dangerous, there can be highway robberies. When for example you are driving on the road, through the forest, the robbers can attack you; they can attack vehicles, motorcycles, and that makes the road unreliable. Do you understand? (-) **Bivuga ko umutekano wo mu muhanda utizewe** *(It means that the road transport is unreliable).* Okay?
4. L: What is highway robberies?
5. T: Okay, a highway is a road; you know a road! Yes? This road is normally bigger than these roads you know near our school, and it connects two or more areas, you see here, for a highway, the distance from A to B or B to C is long. So, robbers, robbers are thieves who steal with guns! Do you understand this? (-) **Abajura bibisha intwaro** *(Thieves who steal using guns)*. Those are robbers![...] Highways robbers, who can tell me who they are?
6. L: The thieves.
7. T: Yes, thieves, but what kind of thieves? Where do they go to steal? At home? At the market? (-) Where?
8. L: At highways
9. T: Clap for him!…Highway robberies, **ni ubujura bwo ku mihanda mikuru ijya kure** *(it is robbery committed on major roads to long distance)*…

In a lesson on ‘Transport and communication’, the teacher is presenting advantages and disadvantages of road transport. He is explaining the concepts *unreliable* and *highway robberies*. The extract indicates that the problems of understanding the language affect the understanding of concepts, and thus content knowledge in general. For instance the adjective *unreliable* in the extract had to be explained in order to show learners that road transport could be dangerous. Among the words the teacher used to explain the meaning of unreliable, were *highway robberies,* which also needed explanation. To explain the concept *highway robberies*, the teacher was required to explain *highway* and *robber* separately, and then *highway robbers*, which he translated in Kinyarwanda, before learners could understand what *highway robberies* was. It can be seen from the extract that other words such as *thieves* and *guns* require translation into Kinyarwanda, the learners’ MT.

Further evidence for comprehension challenges that require teachers to explain vocabulary a number of times in the lesson is presented in Table 5.2. The data in the table was obtained by listening to the recording of lessons and capturing the time (amount of minutes) used to introduce the lesson, the actual lesson, assessment, and conclusion. The number of minutes (m) and percentage (e.g. 5 m (11%) in the column of RS1) are calculations of the average amount of time used for different parts of a lesson in four audio-recorded lessons per school. There were a total of 16 lessons across the four schools, RS1, RS2, US1, and US2. The focus of this section is the amount of time that teachers use to explain new vocabulary (see shaded row) in comparison to times used in other parts of the lesson plan. The focus on vocabulary was triggered by the teachers’ common practice of explaining as many words as needed. As could be observed from audio-recorded lessons, teachers seemed to spend an inordinate amount of time coping with absence of basic linguistic comprehension. Table 5.2 provides the average amount of time used for each part of the lesson plan as it was presented by the teachers. Details of the analysis are presented in Appendix 5.

Table 5.2: The average presentation of time distribution in various parts of the lessons

Teaching procedure	**Description**	**Timeline**				
		RS1	**RS2**	**US1**	**US2**	**Total average**
Introduction	-Recalling the previous lesson. -Brainstorming the new lesson.	5m (11%)	3m (7%)	3m (7%)	4m (9%)	3m (7%)
Core of the lesson	**-Explanation of new vocabulary.**	**22m (49%)**	**19m (42%)**	**16m (36%)**	**19m (42%)**	**19m (42%)**
	-Focus on the key content of the lesson: Development of new concepts; discuss main ideas; compare and contrast; ask questions (teacher-learner interactions); provide examples, etc.	16m (36%)	17m (38%)	19m (42%)	18m (40%)	18m (40%)
Assessment	-Teachers' questions -Learners' responses -Exercises, group work	1m (2%)	5m (11%)	6m (13%)	3m (7%)	4m (9%)
Conclusion	Summarise all objectives	1m (2%)	1m (2%)	1m (2%)	1m (2%)	1m (2%)
Total		45m	45m	45m	45m	45m

The data in Table 5.2 reinforces the point made in relation to the data from extract 5.1. The total averages indicate that most of the time (42%) is allotted to explaining vocabulary (English words) that learners do not understand. It can be observed from the data that almost all the teachers use between 42% and 49% of the whole lesson time to explain vocabulary. It is normal for any teacher, regardless of his/her familiarity with the language of instruction, to spend a significant amount of time explaining key words to learners. However, in the present study, the data shows that more than a half of the time used for the core of the lesson is spent on vocabulary teaching, which appears inordinate for a content subject. This disadvantages other parts of the lesson because, as can be seen from the table, informal assessment of learners' understanding during the course of the lesson is sometimes not done, or it is given insufficient time to assess whether or not the lesson has been understood. It was observed

that, in the inadequate time allotted to informal assessment, teachers focus on whether or not learners have understood the language before checking the learners' understanding of the content. In addition, recordings reflect lessons that were not concluded.

More data from interviews with educators indicate that they attribute comprehension challenges to the teachers' and learners' limited vocabulary, limited grammatical knowledge, and general unfamiliarity with the language of instruction. They insist that English should be taught thoroughly to learners and teachers to increase their level of language proficiency in order to eliminate comprehension challenges in the classroom. For instance, two principals believe that teachers have problems making themselves understood in the classroom because of limited English proficiency:

(i) *…teachers have not yet mastered English, and our pupils don't understand when teachers talk to them in English only, they need more and more classes of English language* (PRS1).

(ii) *Especially teachers need more speaking skills in English; they are not fluent in English...when pupils do not understand they use Kinyarwanda* (PRS2).

These statements reveal that educators perceive English as the reason for comprehension challenges in the classroom because teachers and learners are not proficient in this language of instruction, and this helps to understand why teachers resort to Kinyarwanda when there are comprehension problems. As was shown in Extract 5.1, and as will be seen in Chapter Six, teachers code-switch as a way of helping learners to understand the content in English. In addition to CS, teachers resort to many other strategies, such as the use of body language or visual materials to facilitate the learners' understanding of English. The researcher will also return to this issue in the next chapter.

In the focus groups, learners highlighted that they often do not 'catch' the new words the teacher pronounces, and the learners do not understand the content of what is explained because of the teacher's speed and pronunciation.

(i) *When our teacher doesn't write on the black board, it is difficult for me to catch his pronunciation of new words in English* (RS1/Lr2).

(ii) *When she says things in English I don't understand them, but when she puts them in Kinyarwanda I understand what they mean* (RS2/Lr3).

(iii) *We don't understand our teacher when he speaks very quickly in English, but when he goes slowly, we hear him well and understand* (US1/Lr4).

From the above examples, one can see that pronunciation and speaking speed are reported as the basis of the learners' problems in understanding the teachers. It appears that these comprehension difficulties are due to the lack of exposure to English in conversation, since the learners mention that they can recognise the words when they are written on the board or when they are pronounced slowly. The lack of exposure to a language, according to Yao (2012), is a problem that hinders comprehension, and which is remedied through using the words many times in different contexts. This requires developing communicative competence (Canale & Swain, 2002) in order to curb comprehension challenges due to speed and pronunciation.

With regard to speed and pronunciation, the present findings are in line with Miller's (2009) results showing that the speed and variety in pronunciation of English words by lecturers was found to be the main factor affecting the engineering students' comprehension in English in Hong Kong. In the present study, some teachers' pronunciation of words confused learners. For instance, one teacher in a lesson on civics was pronouncing the word 'law' as /laʊ/ while learners, with their teacher of English, had learnt to pronounce it as /lɔ:/. After the lesson, one learner told the researcher: 'I had not understood what he was saying, I only learnt he was meaning /lɔ:/ when he wrote it on the blackboard!'

Much discussion has thus far focused on challenges of understanding the language, but the data also reflects difficulties of understanding the content. The data in extract 5.1 shows a good example of the difficulty of understanding *highway robberies*. When asked what they think could be the cause of the challenges of understanding the content, three teachers had similar responses to the one expressed in the following example:

> *...the examples are given in realities that do not exist in the Rwandan context and they are difficult to understand. For instance you saw how difficult it was to explain the term 'highway robbery'* (TUS2).

This example reveals that one of the factors contributing to the learners' failure to understand the content of the SS curriculum is the mismatch between the content and the learners' cultural frame of reference. In fact, as could be observed, when the teacher was explaining words *highway*, *robber*, *robbery*, etc., one could see that learners did not have a clear idea of what the teacher was talking about, and the teacher was required to elaborate and translate in Kinyarwanda. In fact, understanding the concepts was complicated because Kinyarwanda does not have exact words referring to *highway* and *robber*. Therefore, the teacher was required to paraphrase in Kinyarwanda in order to make the English concepts understood.

Teachers also added that the content of much of the SS curriculum has been translated from French to English, and that there was no consideration of the pupils' age and their level of thinking in English before approving the syllabus:

> *(i) ...the chapters we teach were designed by Belgians - we call the design 'Belgian system' which is a French system of teaching - in the 1980s. That time a pupil was starting Grade 6 at 16 or 17 years old, but now a child is starting Grade 6 at 11 or 12 years old. You understand pretty well that the levels of thinking of an 11 years old and 16 years old are not the same* (TUS1).
>
> *(ii) For me there are some concepts they could only understand if they were at secondary schools* (TRS1).

These teachers attribute difficulties of understanding the content in English to the mismatch of the French, Geography, History, and Civics curriculum that was transferred and translated into English in order to produce the 2010 English curriculum of SS. As TUS1 states in the above interview extract, there is subject matter that was taught in Grade 8, the last year of the primary school education in 1980s when learners were between 15 and 17 years old, which is still a part of the current curriculum. This subject matter has been found to be difficult for learners in Grade 6, who currently end their primary school education when they are between 11 and 14 years old. Even if the analysis of the curriculum is beyond the scope of this study, it was observed that the textbooks' inappropriate conceptual level in relation to the age of the learners exacerbates the content problem. The problem of textbooks used in Grade 6 SS also reflects the above teachers' statements as far as content is concerned.

The classroom recordings and observations clearly indicate that none of the 16 lessons that were observed were taught in English only. Teachers reveal that they find SS difficult because it is written in difficult English that requires them to check meanings of words in the dictionary constantly. As one teacher states:

> *It* [SS] *is even difficult for us teachers because there are many concepts we have to look for from the dictionary or ask colleagues or principal for explanations* (TRS2).

A clear example supporting TRS2's statement comes from one teacher's lesson on the political organisation of the kingdom in which the teacher was unable to read and explain the terms 'hierarchical' and 'enthrone' in English. The teacher tried to hide his inability to pronounce the words, wrote them on the board with their meanings in Kinyarwanda (*hierarchical = isumbana ry' inzego; enthrone* = kwimika), and asked pupils to write them in their note books. After writing, the teacher did not want to practice the words in drills and repetitions as he did with other words; instead, he promised learners to come back to the words after break during the next SS lesson, and went on with another activity. After the lesson, the teacher went to meet the principal and English mentor in the principal's office. Through a shadowing observation, the researcher managed to hear them reading the phonemic transcriptions of the terms from a dictionary and repeating together until the teacher was familiar with the terms. This example supports the teachers' awareness of the difficulties in using the language and understanding the concepts in English and their commitment to trying to overcome them.

From the interviews and the examples of the challenges in understanding English concepts, it appears that comprehension problems are shared by both learners and teachers as a result of the lack of English proficiency. It must be noted that the relationship between understanding the language of instruction and understanding the content is significant, particularly because English is a foreign language in Rwanda. This supports Shohamy's (2006) findings that learners whose MoI is different from their MT are likely to have comprehension problems when they learn scientific concepts or hear new ideas in the new language in which they have not developed sufficient proficiency.

A comparison between the two rural schools and the two urban schools in terms of classroom comprehension challenges reveals that participants in rural schools perceive more challenges than participants in urban schools do. As Table 5.1 illustrates, while respondents in rural schools agree with the statement, *comprehension is a challenge for learners*, their counterparts in urban schools disagree with the statement. The findings show that while 100% of principals, 80% of teachers and 90% of learners in rural schools agree that learners are faced with comprehension challenges, 55% of principals, 51% of teachers and 52% of learners in urban schools disagree. The difference in results (principals: $p = 0.0043$, teachers: $p = 0.0030$, and learners: $p < 0.0001$) clearly indicates that the rural schools face more comprehension challenges than the urban schools do. One of the reasons for this difference appears in the following statements made by principals from the urban schools:

(i) *The school organised teachers' training in English, we paid trainers from abroad and parents contributed to the training* (PUS2).

(ii) *We recruit teachers who are professionals, we do not take any teacher, this is a private institution, we have norms we follow to recruit teachers, and this recruitment helped us start teaching in English without many problems* (PUS1).

The above statements indicate that teachers in the two urban schools in this study had more opportunities to improve their knowledge of English than their counterparts in rural schools had. In fact, after the shift of the MoI from French to English, urban schools had greater financial means and a willingness to train their teaching staff in English, which rural schools did not do. In the focus group interviews, learners at rural schools revealed the following:

(i) *No one at home can help me for my homework because they don't know English* (RS1/Lr 2).

(ii) *I live to my Grandmother's; she doesn't know any word of English* (RS2/Lr 3).

It appears from both examples that one of the reasons for the difference between rural schools and urban schools is the lack of both school and home support in learning English. Most rural school learners state that their parents or siblings do not speak English. This indicates the importance of home support for school in developing the learner's skills and knowledge of English. According to the socio-cultural perspective of learning, the home environment, i.e.

people and objects, contributes to the development of the learners' language abilities. As shown in the focus group with the learners of US1, the learners in urban house holds have literacy practices that their counterparts in rural schools do not experience, as one of them states:

(i) *My older sister brings novels; we read them together at night and watch films on Sundays* (US1/Lr4).

(ii) *The New Times, Imvaho Nshya*[18]*, my Dad buy them every week…Yes, I read and understand* (US1/Lr5).

These statements and many others indicate different sources of home literacy activities. A comparison of the extracts from RS1 and US1 shows that learners from urban schools receive home support that helps them understand English as opposed to the rural learners who do not have access to any literacy sources at home. The two examples clearly show that learners in urban households are more exposed to reading materials such as books, newspapers, and audio-visuals such as TV or DVD players. This could be the reason that learners in urban schools feel more confident in English, as the findings in Table 5.1 and data in Section 4.3.5 of Chapter Four indicate.

According to the socio-cultural theory, learning is a process that starts with understanding of what is being taught and progresses towards equipping learners with abilities to use the learnt materials later on their own. This is the ZPD in which learners develop abilities to perform a task with the help of the MKO until the time they can do it on their own. This means that if learners have not understood what the MKO is saying, or when they have not been given relevant scaffolded help, it is impossible for them to acquire new knowledge. In the present study, it appears that the majority of Grade 6 learners are likely to miss out on the content development they need from the SS lessons because the English language is an obstacle to effective learning.

[18] *The New Times* and *Imvaho Nshya* are newspapers published in English and Kinyarwanda, respectively.

5.2.2 Speaking challenges

The findings presented in Table 5.1 highlight that the majority of principals (83.4%, $p <$ 0.0001), teachers (83.4%, $p < 0.0001$), and learners (58%, $p < 0.0001$) agree that there are difficulties in speaking English in the classrooms. Participants' agreements with statements such as, *It is difficult for teachers to explain new concepts in English to their pupils* and *English prevents pupils from participating in class discussion* (Appendix A1d) indicate that teachers struggle to explain new concepts in English, and that the lack of English prevents learners from participating in the classroom discussions. Principals' and teachers' responses to the open-ended questions state:

(i) *Speaking English for many pupils and teachers in Rwanda is still a problem; they have not yet mastered the language* (PRS2).

(ii) *Words for 40 minutes speaking English in the classroom are not easily handled by every teacher* (PRS1).

(iii) *I do not know much vocabulary in English; it is not easy to speak as fluently as I do in French!* (TRS1).

(iv) *Big challenge for many colleagues in this school is pronunciation of words in English* (TRS2).

(v) *My pupils fear to speak to me in English because they do not have enough vocabulary* (TRS2).

The above examples indicate that the challenges of speaking are consequences of a lack of English vocabulary and failure to pronounce some English words accurately. Even if it was not explicitly said, two statements by PRS2 'they have not yet mastered the language' and TRS1 'it [English] is not easy to speak as fluently as I do in French' imply difficulties in making grammatically correct sentences. It appears that pronunciation, fluency, and confidence are reported as a part of the factors hindering speaking.

Regarding learners, most of them strongly agree with the statements, *It is difficult for me to make sentences when I speak in English* and m*any times, I have something to say but feel I cannot find words to say it in English.* These statements also allude to grammar difficulties and lack of vocabulary as the causes of speaking challenges. Additionally, most principals

(67%, p = 0.0412) and majority of teachers (74%, p = 0.0006) disagree that learners discuss in English in the classroom.

The data from audio recordings of lessons provides explicit examples of learners' speaking difficulties. A replay of the audio recorded lessons reveals frequent instances of the learners' silence and limited participation in classroom interactions with the teacher.

RS1/L1: Arrival and influence of foreigners (Appendix B1). T: Okay, **noneho dushyireho** century; **uracyumva** century **icyo aricyo?** *(Let's now add the* century; *do you understand what century is?)* **Nimumbwire icyo ari cyo** (Tell me what it is). **Ls: (-)** **T: Ninde watubwira** century **icyo aricyo?**(*Who can tell us what* century *means?*) Ls: (-) T: Century? Ls: [Murmuring] 21 century. T: Eh? Twenty-one century uhh! We are in twenty-one century.	***RS2/L5: Our national flag (Appendix B2)*** T: Now, the other colour is green. What does it mean? Ls: (-) T: Green represents our agriculture which is our main economic activity, our prosperity and productivity. Prosperity is living well, do you understand this? Ls: Yes. T: What does prosperity mean? Ls: (-) T: **Kubaho neza. Kugira ngo umuntu abeho neza rero agomba kuba afite ubushobozi bwo kongera umusaruro,** productivity. To live well. (*In order to live well, one must have capacities to increase productivity).*
US1/L11: Government of Rwanda (Appendix B3) T: What is the function of the Executive? Ls: (-). T: Do you know the importance of Executive in our government? L: The function is to rule the country. T: To rule, to govern the country. Yes, the function of the Executive is to implement the national policies. What do you understand by national policy? Ls: (-). T: A policy is a plan of the government.	***US2/L15: Our national flag (Appendix B4)*** T: Yes, the sun warms the earth. Good idea! How does the sun dry things or warm the earth? Ls: (-). T: Okay! It dries because it is hot, and of course it emits light on the earth. You know sun rays? What are they? Ls: (-). T: Sun rays are called **imirasire y' izuba** *(sun rays)*! Now, to know a good and bad day we look at how the sun rises in the morning. When we look at the horizon and see it is dark, there is fog, it means what? Ls: Rain. T: And, eh...when there is sun it means what? Ls: (-). T: It means good day, it means there will be no rain. **Haba haza kubaho umunsi mwiza** *(That means there will be a good day).* **Murabyumva?** *(do you understand?)* Ls: **Yego** *(yes).*

Figure 5.1: Illustration of classroom teacher-learner interaction in English

The extracts in Figure 5.1 are samples from classroom recordings illustrating features of the learners' difficulties in speaking English in the classroom. These features are instances of silences (-) that occur often when the teacher asks a question in English that requires a response to explain an idea or meaning of a term in English. Most examples of the teacher's question and learners' silence indicate that either the learners do not know the answer, or they know it, but are unable to say it in English. The example showing that learners do not know the answer is evident in the extract from RS1/L1 where the teacher asks the question in Kinyarwanda but the learners do not answer. They could have answered in Kinyarwanda if they knew the answer, but they did not. For cases where questions are asked in English, both ignorance of the answer and inability to answer in English are possible. However, the most probable reason is that it is difficult for learners to answer in English. One of the reasons for this claim is that when they are given opportunities to answer in Kinyarwanda they provide answers more frequently than they are able to in English. Consider the following example:

Extract 5.2 [US2/L13: Arrival and influence of foreigners]

10. T: Yes, they will call you a foreigner. (.) Now, foreign influence means anything from outside coming to change the way people or things were living before. **Iyo uhuye n'ikintu cyangwa umuntu mushya hari icyo biguhinduraho cyangwa bikumarira?**

(Does meeting a foreigner or something new change anything in you?)

11. Ls: **Yego** (*yes*).
12. T: **Mumpe urugero** *(Give me an example).*
13. L: **Nkiyo uhuye n'Umunyamerika akakuvugisha mu Cyongereza umenya uko** AmericanEnglish **ivugwa** (*When you meet an American and talk to him in English, you learn how*American English *is spoken*).
14. T: Good.
15. L: **Iyo bakubwiye indege utarayibona ntabwo wumva ko yatwara abantu benshi, arikoiyo uyibonye urabyemera** (*When people tell you about an airplane before seeing it, you don't believe that it can carry many people, but after seeing it you do*).
16. T: Good! Let's now see how Rwanda was influenced by foreigners.

In this extract, two learners expressed themselves fluently and provided answers to the teacher's question because they were using the language they know well. This claim has much evidence from classroom recordings showing that when learners are given

opportunities to speak in English, there is a silence or one word responses are given, as Figure 5.1 reveals.

An examination of turn-taking during classroom interaction helps to understand the problem that learners face when speaking in English. With the 16 transcripts of audio recorded lessons, the researcher was able to examine the number of turns taken by the teacher and number of turns taken by the learners during teacher-learner interactions in the classroom. The numbers of turns in Table 5.2 were counted from the transcripts of the 40-45 minute lessons. In this study, a turn is an occasion of speaking taken by an interlocutor, irrespective of the number of words or length of the talk he/she uses on that occasion, before another person involved in the conversation can speak.

Table 5.3: Teacher and learner turns in the classroom interactions

Schools	**Lessons**	**Numbers and percentages**	**Teacher turns**	**Learner turns**		**Total**
				Talk	Silence	
RS1	L1	N	60	36	24	120
		%	**50**	**30**	**20**	
	L2	N	66	30	18	114
		%	**58**	**26**	**16**	
	L3	N	90	72	12	174
		%	**52**	**41**	**7**	
	L4	N	96	60	30	186
		%	**52**	**32**	**16**	
RS2	L5	N	78	54	24	156
		%	**50**	**35**	**15**	
	L6	N	76	44	18	138
		%	**55**	**32**	**13**	
	L7	N	72	66	6	144
		%	**50**	**46**	**4**	
	L8	N	54	36	18	108
		%	**50**	**33**	**17**	100
US1	L9	N	66	42	24	132

		%	**50**	**32**	**18**	
	L10	N	72	54	18	144
		%	**50**	**38**	**12**	
	L11	N	66	36	24	126
		%	**52**	**29**	**19**	100
	L12	N	84	60	24	168
		%	**50**	**36**	**14**	
US2	L13	N	102	60	36	198
		%	**52**	**30**	**18**	
	L14	N	78	48	32	150
		%	**52**	**32**	**21**	
	L15	N	90	66	24	180
		%	**50**	**37**	**13**	
	L16	N	84	72	6	162
		%	**52**	**44**	**4**	
Total		**N**	**1142**	**836**	**338**	**2316**
		%	**50**	**36**	**14**	

The table shows teacher turns and learner turns, which implies interaction. The percentages for the 16 lessons indicate that teachers take between 50% and 58% of the total turns, which means that the remaining turns are learners'. In each school, four lessons were taught by the same teacher. The significant differences in interaction patterns among the four lessons per school were often due to the length of the lesson or whether the lesson was familiar or unfamiliar to learners. With regard to the learner turns, percentages indicate that when learners are given opportunities to speak, they do not take advantage of them because, as the total numbers for the learner turns indicate, 72% of the opportunities learners were given to speak were taken, while 28% of speaking opportunities were not taken up. These learners' silences throughout all the 16 lessons are part of the evidence for speaking challenges that learners face in the English medium classes in Rwanda.

In interviews, educators provide ideas that help understand the reasons for the learners' speaking challenges in the classroom. For instance two principals state:

(i) *They* [learners] *understand a few questions in English, but they are unable to reply. If you speak to them in Kinyarwanda they reply, but if you speak in English they are shy and keep quiet* (PRS1).

(ii) *...the main shortcoming with the majority of them* [learners] *is speaking. They do not have enough vocabulary* (PRS2).

Teachers also affirm that pupils in the classroom remain unresponsive or use their MT because they do not have the English vocabulary to respond.

(i) *They are shy to speak English…they don't know vocabulary! In Kinyarwanda they can speak, but in English it is a problem!* (TRS1).

(ii) *Children are learning in English with difficulties, they listen but can't speak!...I know, it's vocabulary problem* (TUS2).

The above interview extracts indicate that principals and teachers attribute the learners' speaking challenges in English to weak vocabulary and grammar. This has evidence in literature. According to the ESL/EFL theorists (Krashen, 2006; Selinker, 1972), the learners' difficulty in speaking English originates from insufficient proficiency and lack of confidence in classroom participation because of insufficient vocabulary and grammar. In addition to weak vocabulary and grammar, the learners' failure to speak English is due to the lack of what Krashen (1982) calls 'language experiences'. Learners are prevented from speaking because of their lack of exposure to English. The extracts show that learners can understand some questions in English but are unable to reply in English, while they can reply in Kinyarwanda because it is the language they are familiar with. This shows how the learners' lack of participation in the classroom results from a lack of English proficiency because the less they speak, the less exposure they are giving themselves, and the less likely they are to develop the skills needed to speak more.

Similar reasons for speaking challenges in the classroom emerged from the focus groups with learners. Some of them fear being laughed at by classmates or simply remain unresponsive because they do not have the English vocabulary to express an idea they have in mind.

(i) *It is like when you know the answer but because you are not confident, eh,… it is not the problem of language but you, in yourself you don't have this strength to say it in English because you are not confident* (US1/Lr4).

(ii) *When I am not confident I ask myself 'what is every one going to say about my idea?' because, see, you are standing, everyone is looking at you!* (RS1/Lr3).

(iii) *It's because we don't have vocabulary we can use to speak and give a clear idea in English* (US2/Lr4).

(iv) *For me, I am not shy, but I don't want my friends to laugh at my vocabulary in English!* (RS2/Lr1).

The above illustrations of speaking difficulties indicate that speaking is inhibited by the lack of exposure to English, which does not enable learners to develop their BICS and CALP. It can be noted from the learners' statements that it is hard for them to speak up in the classroom or with peers because of an insufficient vocabulary. With reference to the theory of how BICS and CALP develop (Cummins, 1999), exposure to a target language is likely to be one of the solutions to the learners' speaking difficulties. By the same logic, the data indicates that learners who have been exposed to English for a considerable period of time claim that they do not have any problem in speaking, as expressed in the following extracts:

(i) *I started learning English in P1 or P2, don't remember well, I speak and learn SS without any problem. The problem would be if they changed the language I cannot understand very well because I learnt English at school since P2 and it is the only language I used for my lessons, so when they change in another language I don't know what they are saying* (US2/Lr4).

(ii) *I have learnt English since P1 and many lessons were in English, so, it is so simple to speak it and learn SS in it* (RS2/Lr5).

From the above statements, it can be deduced that the learners' difficulties in speaking English is mainly due to the lack of exposure to this language because, as these two learners indicate, the longer they have been exposed to English, the better they claim to be able to use it in the classroom. However, this early exposure to English is unusual since the claim was made by only two pupils out of a full set of participants.

The lack of familiarity with English is one of the factors that makes learners experience

speaking challenges characterised by the use of short answers and phrases. This has implications for learning. As was observed from the lessons, the words learners used could not confirm their understanding of the content. In other words, the learners' limited words in English do not enable them to demonstrate whether or not they had acquired the necessary knowledge. An example from the audio-recorded data indicates that the use of short answers does not show whether or not learners have understood explanations.

Extract 5.3[US2/L13: Arrival and influence of foreigners]

17. T: Good. Now, how long have Rwandans known Christianity?
18. L: In the 19th century.
19. T: No, **ndababaza ngo, Abanyarwanda bamaze igihe kingana iki bamenye Ubukristu?** *(I am asking you, how long have Rwandans known Christianity?)* How long have Rwandans known Christianity? Different from, **Abanyarwanda bamenye Ubukristu ryari?** *(When did Rwandans know Christianity?)* When did Rwandans know Christianity? [Learners seem confused, teacher elaborates further] Look, for this last question, Sandra, look here, the answer is Rwandans knew Christianity in the 19th century. Do you understand?
20. Ls: Yes.
21. T: Now, for the question 'How long have Rwandans known Christianity?' I want to know the duration from the 19th century to now. **Abanyarwanda bamaze igihe kingana iki bamenye Ubukristu?***(How long have Rwandans known Christianity?)*
22. L: **Ibinyejana bibiri n'imyaka cumi n'ibiri**. *(Two centuries and twelve years).*
23. T: How do you say that in English?
24. L: Two century and twelve years.
25. T: Have you understood?
26. Ls: Yes.

In Extract 5.3, the teacher is teaching History and English grammar and vocabulary at the same time. CS is also evident in this extract but the researcher will elaborate on this in Chapter 6. For History, the teacher wants learners to give the length of time that Christianity has lasted in Rwanda by using the present perfect tense. To teach grammar, the teacher explains in Kinyarwanda and English showing how the present perfect functions, by contrasting it with the simple past tense. The answers in English with a 'yes'eand the phrase 'Two century and twelve years' do not show whether learners have understood the use of the

present perfect tense and its distinction from the simple past tense. In terms of teaching SS, one can observe that the teacher is providing language skills to help learners understand the history of Christianity in Rwanda. It was clearly found that all the teachers in the 16 observed lessons had to teach language skills. In addition, on the part of learners, the lack of English to express themselves prevents them from showing whether or not they understand, as exemplified in Extract 5.3.

A comparison between the rural and urban schools indicates that there was no difference between the speaking challenges that educators from rural schools and urban schools reported. As Table 5.2 illustrates, all the principals from rural schools and the majority of principals from urban schools (67%) expressed the same feelings (p = 0.0607), i.e. that speaking is a challenge to learners. Similarly, 83% of teachers from both rural and urban schools agreed that their learners are faced with speaking challenges. As for learners, the results indicate a significant difference (p = 0.0001). While 68% of the rural school learners agree that they experience speaking challenges, 56% of the urban schools disagree and deny having problems in speaking English. This difference of perception regarding English as a challenge shows the confidence that learners in urban schools feel towards English usage at schools. As seen in the previous section, these learners also expressed different feelings from their rural counterparts.

With reference to Table 5.2, one would have expected the findings to indicate that the urban school teachers would have shown different perceptions from the rural school teachers because of the training factors mentioned in Section 5.2.1. The findings highlight the same results because, after the shift from French to English, even if there had been the Government's establishment of the Rwanda English Action Program (REAP) and the Teacher Service Commission (TSC) for the training of teachers, it was impossible to transform the overwhelming percentage of French-speaking teachers (over 90%) into competent and confident speakers of English in a short time (Jemimah, 2011). Referring to Jemimah (2011), over 60% of the learners who were concerned with the shift of the MoI were more fluent in French and uncomfortable in English because they could not speak it. Irrespective of whether teachers and learners were in rural or urban settings, the probable reason for the same perceptions could be the lack of confidence in English because the majority of them were not used to it and the short period of training did not foster the competence and confidence required to handle the school tasks in English.

Drawing on Vygotsky's (1978) socio-cultural theory, keeping quiet, giving one word answers and lacking confidence to use English in the classroom are likely to hinder effective learning of SS in Grade 6 of the four Rwandan primary schools because each of these issues hamper the teacher-learner interactions that are crucial for learning. Without teacher-learner interaction, pupils cannot negotiate meaning in content subjects and teachers cannot mediate and scaffold learning. As research shows, in their study in Hong Kong, Lo and Macaro (2012) demonstrate that the shortage of teacher-learner interaction caused by the change of the MoI from the learners' L1 to English as L2 made classes more teacher-centred, and, thus, provided learners and teachers fewer opportunities of negotiating meaning and scaffolding, respectively.

5.2.3 Reading challenges

Table 5.1 highlights that the majority of principals (67%, p = 0.0412), teachers (64%, (p = 0.0053), and learners (55%, p = 0.0004) agree that reading English is a challenge to learners in Grade 6 of the four Rwandan primary schools. There are various reasons supporting this perception. The findings from the analysis of the questionnaire indicate that 48% of teachers agree that English motivates their pupils' reading in the classroom (see Appendix A2d). This shows that slightly more than half of the teachers believe that learners are not motivated to read English. The analysis of the focus group interviews reveals the following:

(i) *English words are complicated in the way they are written. The spelling is very different from how we read in Kinyarwanda. I don't know how they are pronounced. I sometimes read for reading only!* (US1/Lr4).

(ii) *My problem is how words are pronounced in English. If the teacher has not taught us how to read the words, it is difficult to know how they are pronounced* (US2/Lr4).

(iii) *The pronunciation of words of English is more difficult than Kinyarwanda words, that's why reading English is difficult for me* (RS1/Lr2).

These quotations highlight spelling and pronunciation as some of the key challenges that inhibit the learners' ability to read. Another important observation is that learners read what

they have memorised since they say that it is difficult to read what the teacher has not taught them. In addition, the lack of vocabulary and grammatical knowledge that has been referred to earlier makes it difficult for learners to make sense of what they read. In Grade 6 SS, the learners' independent reading for their conceptual knowledge growth is missing. The four schools do not have libraries or any other means of helping learners access books other than those used for the content subjects. There is no Kinyarwanda-English dictionary that would help pupils read on their own and learn new words. The lack of Grade 6 learners' independent reading prevents them from increasing their vocabulary because, as research found, there is a correlation between reading ability and an increase in vocabulary (Leseman & De Jong, 2011). Drawing on these ideas, the learners' lack of motivation to read English can be regarded as indicative of insufficient English knowledge, which in turn hinders the learners' reading skills.

In order to investigate reading challenges through classroom practices, the researcher listened to the learners' reading of sentences or words from classroom recordings many times. The data from the audio recordings did not reflect many instances in which the teacher asked learners to read a text or a sentence under study, and because of the learners' shyness in the classroom, only a few extracts were audible. Therefore, the researcher selected words that were audible from the extracts and extended the list with other words that were read by the learners from the blackboard. The researcher used those words to illustrate phonological difficulties due to English proficiency. The following table illustrates the reading challenges as follows:

Table 5.4: A sample of the learners' reading of English words

	IPA reading	Learner 1	Learner 2	Learner 3	Learner 4
hill	/hɪl/	/hɪl/	/hɪl/	/hɪl/	/hɪl/
environmental	/ɪn'vaɪrən'mentəl/	/envɪrɒn'mentɒ/	/envɪrɒn'mentɒl/	/envɪrən'mentɒ/	/ɪnvɪrɒn'mentl/
solid	/'sɒlɪd/	/'sɒlɪd/	/'sɒlɪd/	/'sɒlɪd/	/'sɒlɪd/
temperatures	/'temprɪtʃəz/	/'temperatʃz/	/'temperaturez/	/'temperæt.../	/'tempɪrɪtʃæz/
land	/lænd/	/lænd/	/lænd/	/lænd/	/lænd/
volcano	/vɒl'keɪnəʊ/	/vɒl'kænɒ/	/vɒl'kænɒ/	/vɒl'kænɒ/	/vɒl'kænɒ/
civilian	/sɪ'vɪliən/	/sɪ'vɪlijæn/	/'sɪvɪlijæn/	/sɪvɪlijæn/	/sɪ'vɪlijæn/
enthroning	/ɪn'θrəʊnɪŋ/	/entrɒnɪŋ/	/entrɒnɪŋ/	/ɪn'trɒnɪŋ/	/ɪn'trɒnɪŋ/
custodians	/kʌs'təʊdiənz/	/kʌs'tɒdijænz/	/kus'tɒdijænz/	/kus'tɒdijæz/	/kʌs'tɒdijænz/
neighbourhoods	/'neɪbəhʊdz/	/'neɪgbʊrhʊdz/	/'negbæhʊdz/	/'nɪgbæhʊdz/	/'neɪgbæhdz/
heights	/haɪts/	/heɪts/	/hejts/	/heɪts/	/haɪts/
cabinet	/'kæbɪnet/	/'kæbɪnet/	/'kæbɪnet/	/'kæbɪnet/	/'kæbɪnet/

The phonemic transcriptions illustrated in Table 5.3 are the learners' readings captured from the audio recorded lessons. They were transcribed phonemically with reference to the IPA reading from the Cambridge English Dictionary, which most teachers were using in the classroom. The aim of transcribing is not to identify the best or worst reader, but to help identify difficulties in reading the English words that might complicate comprehension. The highlighted words are the ones that were read without complication.

The analysis of the words in phonemic transcription shows that it was easy for most learners to read words made of simple syllables, which, in one way or another, would sound like the syllables they are familiar with in their MT (Kinyarwanda). Reading words such as 'hill', 'land', 'civilian', 'solid', 'volcano', and 'cabinet' was easy and enjoyable because the sounds of the vowels and consonants are similar to those they know in Kinyarwanda. It was very complicated and frustrating to read complex, multisyllabic words such as 'enthroning', 'custodians', 'environmental', 'neighbourhoods', 'heights', and 'temperatures' because of the unfamiliar sounds. At the time of teaching such complex words, teachers made learners repeat those words many times in order to help them become used to their pronunciation and reading. Sometimes they were learning incorrect pronunciation depending on whether or not the teacher knew the correct pronunciation of the word.

Interviews with educators reveal that the reading difficulties learners have derive from the language problem of unfamiliarity with English words. As shown in Table 5.3, there are difficulties in pronouncing words, especially problems of pronouncing unfamiliar English sounds such as /θ/, /əʊ/, which do not exist in Kinyarwanda. In the following examples from interviews, the teachers use 'alphabet' when referring to phonemes.

(i) *The English alphabet is not easy for the children especially when they read SS; the texts in these books are difficult for them* (TRS2).

(ii) *No problem to read Kinyarwanda! ...they read English words as if they were spelt like Kinyarwanda* (TRS1).

These quotations suggest that the reasons for reading difficulties at Grade 6 in SS in the Rwandan schools relate to the insufficient English vocabulary and unfamiliarity with the spelling and pronunciation of English words. Audio-recordings of the lessons illustrate many

instances of drills used to help learners assimilate concepts and English vocabulary in the SS lessons. This is discussed in Chapter Six.

The learners' difficulties in reading unfamiliar English words are self-evident in this study, and one of the factors contributing to this challenge is the difficulty in understanding and speaking, as discussed in the two previous sections. In his study, Ntakirutimana (2005) assessed the reading proficiency of Rwandan learners in English, French, and Kinyarwanda at primary and secondary schools and found that the learners' reading proficiency in foreign languages (English and French) was generally very poor while their ability to read in Kinyarwanda was very high. The main reason for this was the linguistic situation in which Kinyarwanda dominates and is easily used by almost all Rwandans who can speak, read, and write it correctly (Niyomugabo, 2008). This finding is consistent with Donald et al. (2006) whose research finding highlights that, if learners cannot speak and understand the language used in teaching and learning, reading becomes difficult and meaningless for them because reading skills improve as the learners develop their language knowledge. It can be noted that Grade 6 learners in the four Rwandan schools experience reading difficulties because of their limited use of English. As research shows, the knowledge of a language and the ability to draw meaning from orthographic words are necessary prerequisites for reading (Hoover & Tunmer, 1993). Thus, the challenges of reading English in Grade 6 can be reduced by the learning of English as a subject before it is used as the MoI.

A comparison of the findings in Table 5.2 shows that there is a difference between the rural and urban schools in terms of reading challenges. The table illustrates that where principals and teachers in rural schools agree that reading is a challenge for learners, their counterparts in urban schools disagree. These results suggest that rural schools have greater reading challenges than urban schools. The explanation of this difference of perception may be attributed to the level of home support for literacy practices. In a study on the home literacy practices among Rwandan families, Ruterana (2011) shows that the poor home literacy environment prevalent in rural settings hinders the development of a reading culture of school children. He found that the availability of resources and activities fostering literacy development differs in rural and urban settings, and this affects the learners' subsequent development of reading ability. In the present study, regardless of the rural-urban divide, the focus group discussions reveal a lack of parent-child interaction in respect of homework and other literacy practices at home. However, there were statements showing that a few learners

in urban households are engaged in reading newspapers and stories in Kinyarwanda with their siblings. Considering early home literacy practice as a milestone to later reading achievement (Leseman & De Jong, 2011; Ruterana, 2011), reading English in rural schools is more challenging than in urban schools because of the lack of foundations for reading (Hoover & Tanmer, 1993) that start early at home. Therefore, the less exposure that rural schools have to English, the weaker their literacy practices will be.

5.2.4 Writing challenges

An investigation into the educators' and learners' perceptions of the writing skills among Grade 6 learners indicates that the majority of principals (83%, p = 0.0001), teachers (71%, p = 0.0019), and learners (54%, p = 0.0171) agree with the statements that writing in English is a challenge to learners. Additional evidence from the questionnaire for these perceptions is that the majority of principals (67%, p = 0.0412) and more than half of teachers (58.4%, p = 0.1241) disagree with the statement, *English motivates my pupils' writing*. In order to investigate the pupils' writing challenges and understand the kinds of writing difficulties learners face, the researcher examined 56 samples of the learners' scripts that the researcher collected from a class during the observation processes. These scripts are not primary data, they were collected because they were a part of the lesson that the researcher was observing and because the teacher used this activity to evaluate the lesson. With the teacher's permission the researcher examined the copies in the classroom and was allowed to photocopy a sample of the scripts that the researcher needed. The activity was performed individually and learners were instructed to write as much as they could on the following topics:

1. As a future leader, explain how you can encourage the community to reduce poverty.
2. Suppose your parents live in the highland region. Explain how you can help them to survive in that area.
3. Explain the importance of lakes for the people.
4. Name four physical features in Rwanda.

On analysis of the scripts, the researcher was interested in the structure of the responses and language used to respond. Most scripts comprised incomplete sentences and phrases. The next script is an example:



Figure 5.2: Example of incomplete sentences in the learners' writing

Apart from the last topic, all the other topics required explanations in full sentences but the responses in the example are half sentences or phrases. The enumerated responses reveal that learners mention the key concepts that they can remember, but are unable to put them in full sentences. For instance, in trying to answer the second question, the learner writes 'to plant the trees' and 'to giging a terraces' [learner wanted to say 'digging terraces'], which shows that the learner knows key words for the answer, i.e., *plant trees* and *dig terraces*, but there is an inability to write those key words in a grammatically correct English sentence. Similar difficulties occur in responses to topic three.

In general, the above example illustrates avoidance of writing a full sentence with a subject, verb, and object in English on the one hand, but, on the other hand, the scripts also show that there are some learners who can make sentences with subject, verb, and object, but fail to write them in paragraph form, or enumerate. Consider the next example:


P.6

Quiz

1) As a future leader, explain how you can encourage the community to reduce poverty.
- As a future leader, I will tell people to have peace in their region
- You tell people to be in cooperatives, to work community work every the end of the month.
- I must to tell them to put the children in schools to study and to tell them to love your country and your president

2) Explain how you can help them to survive that cover
- I can tell that parent to move away of that highland because when rainfall is raining they can die
- You can also tell them to dig water irriga tion ways and to plant the trees.

3) Explain so importances of lakes for the peop
- it gives fish
- it gives water
- it gives electricity
- it gives rain
- it gives water of washing clothes
- build houses
- metan gas

4) Name 4 physical features in Rwanda
- lakes
- rivers
- mountains
- forests

Figure 5.3: Example of enumerated sentences

This learner can write more complete sentences in English than the one in the previous example. The learner writes words correctly and can make long sentences as in 'You tell people to be in cooperatives, to work community work every the end of the month'; 'I must to tell them to put the children in schools to study and to tell them to love your country and your president'; and 'I can tell that parent to move away of that highland because when rainfall is raining they can die'. The sentences the learner provides for each topic indicates that she has all the necessary information to respond to the topic. This is an unusually good script that the researcher found different from all the others. However, the learner does not seem to be able to organise sentences into paragraphs while writing a paragraph is taught in the subject of English (NCDC, 2010b). The data shows writing problems emanating from both language and lack of writing skills.

In terms of language, most learners' scripts comprised one or more words of Kinyarwanda or French as the next example illustrates:



Figure 5.4: Learner CS in writing

The above example highlights how the lack of an English vocabulary compels learners to CS to compensate for the missing word or phrase in another language. The above example comprises four instances of CS namely: 'To provide **centre de santé'** (French for *Health centre*); '**Guhinga amaterasi'** (*to build terraces*); '**Tugaca imirwanyasuri kugira ngo imvura idatwara ubutaka'** (*We dig waterholes to avoid soil erosion*), and 'Help **abasare kubona akazi'** (*Help sailors to obtain jobs*). This finding is significant to this study mainly because, while educators use CS in class talk, they do not support CS in writing, as will be shown in Chapter Six.

Except for figure 5.3, the examples in the scripts indicate that a lack of lexico-grammatical knowledge is likely to be one of the factors contributing to the learners' difficulties in writing in English. This is also stated in interviews with principals and teachers as follows:

(i) *Many pupils fail their written tests because they cannot write proper English...if they don't know words in English, they leave blanks or write Kinyarwanda words for the missing English vocabulary!...we don't accept that though!* (PRS1).

(ii) *… eh...the time of writing notes, learners copy from the blackboard. When you give them a dictation that's when you see that they don't know how words are written. They need practice* (TRS2).

(iii) *They can't write what they don't know to speak! They can't speak, they can't write! They need vocabulary!* (TRS1).

These examples show that most learners at primary school cannot write correct English sentences. For the principal, even if switching between languages when writing tests is not permitted, there are learners who write Kinyarwanda because of their weak English vocabulary. As for teachers, learners' writing difficulties are due to the lack of practice and shortage of vocabulary.

Research shows that writing is a continuous practice that requires the learner to have basic knowledge of the language that enables him/her to match the pronunciation and spelling during the writing process (Colorado, 2008). Observations of lessons indicate that learners at primary schools face problems of writing in English, and one of the causes is their inability to associate pronunciation and spelling of English words when the teacher dictates them or asks them to write words they have heard before but have not learnt to write well. For instance, in one of the lessons, learners always waited for the teacher to write on the black board before they wrote in their note books. Another important observation referred to in Section 5.2.1 was that learners could understand the words if the teacher had written them on the blackboard. This confirms the learners' difficulties to match the spelling and pronunciation, and this seems to be the reason why writing English words is a challenge for them.

The focus group interviews reveal the learners' reliance on the teacher's notes on the blackboard.

(i) *Dictations are very difficult because we don't know the words the teacher is telling us* (US1/Lr4).

(ii) *What the teacher reads and what we write are different; in a dictation quiz I get the spelling wrong* (RS1/Lr2).

(iii) *The spelling and pronunciation of words in English confuse me many times. For example when the teacher gives us a dictation I don't catch the words, but when he writes them on the black board or spells them I find that I know them* (US1/Lr4).

(iv) *When the teacher doesn't write on the blackboard, I don't know how the words are spelt* (RS2/Lr5).

These interviews indicate that the writing challenges that learners face result from the lack of exposure to English. As the statements reveal, it is difficult for learners to write English without the teacher's support. It seems that learners are not able to link the pronunciation of words and their spelling and, therefore, need the teacher to write them on the board so that they can copy them. This is an indication that learners need more exposure to vocabulary and grammar to be confident in writing English correctly.

A comparison of the findings from rural and urban schools indicates no difference (p = 0.1367) between the perceptions that educators have towards the writing challenges that English causes learners in the classroom. However, the results from learners indicate a significant difference ($p < 0.0001$) between rural and urban schools where rural school learners seem to be faced with more writing challenges than urban school learners. Drawing on literature, writing English as a foreign language requires knowledge and skills that develop as learners progress in the language (Donald et al., 1992; Cummins, 1999; Krashen, 2006). The fact that learners at Grade 6 level have not developed their comprehension, speaking, and reading skills, as seen in the previous sections, is an indication that they are likely to struggle when writing English words and sentences.

5.2.5 Language structure challenges

As previously seen, some learners are faced with the problem of sentence structuring (see Figure 5.2) and the use of tenses in English, for instance the distinction of the present perfect and simple past tenses (see Extract 5.3). Another challenge that has been observed is the interference of Kinyarwanda when constructing sentences in English. In the recorded data, there were instances such as 'It is a volcano vomiting' (see Extract 6.12) in which the learner was influenced by the Kinyarwanda word 'kuruka' (vomit). In fact, the learner could not distinguish between the Kinyarwanda context and the English context because both the act of emptying the contents of the stomach through the mouth and the volcano eruption are

expressed by one word ‘kuruka’ in Kinyarwanda. Similar cases occurred often in the learners’ sentences as in: ‘I have thirteen years old’ instead of ‘I am thirteen years old’. This grammatical error is likely to be influenced by the Kinyarwanda ‘Mfite imyaka cumi n’itatu’ because Kinyarwanda uses ‘have’ instead of ‘be’ to talk about someone’s age. This example can also be influenced by the French structure that also uses ‘to talinstead of ‘nsteas in ‘J’ai treize ans’ (I have thirteen years). The recordings of lessons indicate that interference from the Kinyarwanda and French structures contribute to the English language structure challenges.

5.2.6 Affective factors

The prevailing affective factors identified in this study are lack of confidence and shyness when speaking English. As noted in the previous chapter, the use of English as the MoI is perceived as a challenge because it inhibits confidence in the classroom. In practice, lack of confidence among learners is expressed through being unwilling to say what they think, uncertainty in explaining or commenting on something, and fear of making mistakes in English. Consider the following extracts:

Extract 5.4 [RS1/L1: Arrival and influence of foreigners]

27. T: Traders is plural of trader. What does trader mean?
28. Ls: (-)
29. T: What does trader mean? Trader, […] **umucuruzi** *(trader)*. **Twari twavuze yuko mbere yuko abazungu baza, abantu bacuruzaga gute?** *(How were people trading before Europeans came?)* Tell me how people were buying and selling goods.
30. Ls: (-)
31. T: **Byagendaga gute?** *(How was it done?)*
32. L: **Uwabaga afite ibishyimbo ashaka kugura umwenda yaraguranishaga***(Someone who had beans and wanted clothes was exchanging with the one who had clothes).*
33. T: Yes, we called that goods exchange! Goods exchange. That means if Karaveri has meat and you have sorghum, you give him a basket of sorghum and he give you two kilos of meat.

Extract 5.5 [US1/L11: The government of Rwanda]

34. T: What is the function of the Executive?
35. Ls: (-).
36. T: Do you know the importance of Executive in our government?
37. L: The function is […] to […] to […] rule, to rule the country.
38. T: Yes, you are right! Speak loud, you are right! The function is to do what?
39. L: To rule the country.
40. T: Very good! To rule, to govern the country.

In Extract 5.4, the lack of response to the teacher's question in English can be identified from the learners' silence (-) when the question is in English (turns 28 and 30). The silence may mean that learners have not understood the question, or they know the answer but are unable to or fear expressing it in English. The answer one of the learners provides when they are given an opportunity to respond in Kinyarwanda (turn 32) indicates that there was no problem in understanding the question, but learners were not sufficiently confident to respond in English. Extract 5.5 illustrates that the learner was uncertain of the verb she was going to use. This can be seen in her hesitations […] before saying the verb. Another sign of uncertainty is in the teacher's encouragement to speak loud because the learner had spoken in a low, unconfident voice.

With regard to shyness, learners spoke inaudibly and the teacher made them to repeat their answers, asking them to speak louder, as is evident in the following example:

Extract 5.6[US2/L16: Important places in Rwanda]

41. T: Why people go to the museum?
42. L: [inaudible]
43. T: We don't hear you! Speak louder!
44. L: (-) [murmuring]
45. T: Again, and you speak louder!
46. L: They go to see old things.
47. T. Okay**, ikindi?** *(what else?)*
48. L: **Habayo ibintu ndangamuco** *(There are cultural objects)***.**
49. T: Very important!

Although the teacher tried to ask her to speak louder, while the learner in turn 42 and 44 had shown the willingness to respond, she could not be heard. In turn 44, she spoke to herself as if she was exercising what she intended to say, and when the teacher insisted on telling her to speak louder she did it in turn 46 and provided a good answer. It seems that learners become shy to speak, possibly because they lack faith in their English knowledge. This can be supported by interview data that reveals that teachers believe that the lack of confidence among Grade 6 learners emanates from a weak ability to use English. For instance two teachers state:

(i) *Learners are not confident to speak in the classroom because they fear to make mistakes. I often tell them that we all learn from the mistakes we make!* (TUS 2).

(ii) *They are quiet because they don't have confidence in their English* (TRS2).

These interview extracts reflect silence as the consequence of the lack of confidence in the classroom. As indicated previously, the audio-recordings of lessons show very little contribution of learners in the classroom interactions, and observations reveal the learners' shyness and unwillingness to answer the teachers' questions, pose their own questions to the teacher or classmates, and provide their own points of view in the classroom discussion.

During an informal talk with teachers during a break, one teacher said: 'For me, speaking becomes harder during the principal's inspections; I feel like he is taking notes of my English mistakes'. This statement also indicates an affective factor to the English challenges. The lack of confidence in English makes this teacher think about her language difficulties and she feels that her inspector's interest is English mistakes.

The teachers' and learners' lack of confidence in the classroom can be attributed to the unfamiliarity with English caused by the lack of practice. In other words, the lack of exposure to English makes teachers and learners lose their confidence in the classroom because they are not sure of the correct language for what they want to express in English.

The lack of confidence in the classroom practices has major implications for the learning process because it makes teachers and learners 'self-critical and doubtful of their own abilities; anxious, nervous, tense, uncomfortable and insecure' (Norman & Hyland, 2003, p. 9). In their study on the role of confidence in lifelong learning, Norman and Hyland (2003) found that lack of confidence hinders communication, prevents interactions, and impedes undertaking new tasks and adaptation to new situations. In the context of Rwanda, the lack of confidence in English is likely to prevent teachers and learners from engaging fully in the teaching and learning processes and meaningful interactions, because the majority of them do not feel relaxed and sufficiently comfortable to use English in the classroom. As research has shown, teaching requires the teachers' and learners' ability to handle the language of instruction in order to create confidence in the classroom activities (Donald et al., 2006).

In the overall analysis of this section, the data reveals that when a foreign language is the language of teaching and learning, many difficulties are experienced and there are obstacles to the teachers' scaffolding of learning and learners' effective acquisition of knowledge. The challenges posed by English as the MoI in Grade 6 in Rwandan primary schools are evident in listening comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing, which are four interconnected language skills that are crucial for classroom activities. Lack of grammatical knowledge and affective factors such as lack of confidence and shyness are part of the challenges that English poses in the classroom. In this study it is postulated that any difficulty in the language of instruction affects the achievement of the goals of the curriculum taught in that language, in one way or another. The following section discusses the implications of English as the MoI for SS lessons.

5.3 Implications of using English to learn Social Studies

The analysis of quantitative and qualitative data (Section 5.2) shows that there are difficulties in using English as the MoI. As shown in Chapter Four, teachers conflate the process of learning English within the process of learning in English. A further analysis of the audio-recorded lessons reveals the teachers' conflation of both ideas, and this is discussed and illustrated in order to show the implications that language difficulties have for the effective learning of SS in Grade 6. The analysis first presents how the teaching of English is carried out and affects the learning of SS, and then turns to how Grade 6 SS is taught in English.

5.3.1 Teaching English

Throughout 16 audio recorded and observed lessons, the teachers' practices show that most often learners are first exposed to the language by learning pronunciation through drills and repetition, then meaning, and after that, they are taught the content of the subject. This practice suggests the dual role of the teacher as both the language teacher and the content teacher. For instance, in a history lesson about the arrival and influence of foreigners in Rwanda, before tackling the core lesson, the teacher first taught vocabulary as in the following extract:

Extract 5.7 [RS1/L1: Arrival and influence of foreigners]

50. T: In the 19th century, foreigners came in Rwanda. Repeat the word 'foreigner'.
51. Ls: Foreigner
52. T: Foreigners
53. Ls: Foreigners
54. T: Foreigner
55. Ls: Foreigner
56. T: What? ↑
57. Ls: Foreigner.
58. Ls: Again ↑
59. Ls: Foreigner
60 T: Good. A foreigner is an outsider, a person from another country. When a Ugandan comes to our country we call him a foreigner; when a person from Europe or America, Asia and any other area of the world comes to our country we call him a foreigner. You too if you go to another country, they will call you a foreigner. Now, foreign influence means anything from outside coming to change the way people or things were living before.

According to the teacher's guide (Habineza, Kabanda & Kamali, 2009), the aim of the lesson was to help learners identify and name different foreign groups (explorers, missionaries, and colonists) and their influence during colonial rule. However, the illustration shows the teaching of vocabulary for much of the time before teaching the core content of the lesson. In the extract, the last sentence, 'Now, foreign influence means anything from outside coming to change the way people or things were living before' (turn 60), indicates that the teacher's intention was to explain the concept *foreign influence* in order to help learners understand how different foreign groups came to Rwanda with the mission of changing people's lives in the 'civilisation' or 'modernisation' plan for Africa. To reach his aim, the teacher teaches language skills, i.e. pronunciation of the word *foreigner*, its singular and plural forms, and its meaning to help learners understand what *foreign influence* means. It was observed from most lessons that teachers spend a significant amount of time on language teaching, instead of focusing on the content planned in the objectives of the lesson because they know that the learners do not understand the words used in the lesson. This practice was found to be time-consuming in favour of language teaching, thus preventing sufficient mediation of the content.

Teaching vocabulary and grammar in SS encouraged the researcher to investigate whether it impacts on the learning of the content. The analysis was done investigating how SS is taught in English.

5.3.2 Teaching in English

The lack of English knowledge and skills has various consequences for teaching, such as a lack of teacher-learner interactions, problems of time management, and teacher's energy spent on trying to help learners understand the content of the lesson. In order to determine the implications of teaching SS in English, this study examines the use of questions and group work, drawing on audio recording of lessons and observations. Questions and group work were selected for this examination because of their crucial role in effective learning (Napell, 2001; Laughlin, Carey & Kerr, 2008). According to Moodley (2013), it is important that teachers ask questions that promote learning, i.e. questions that can help learners make sense of their own thoughts and enable them to provide reasons for their own thinking. She also argues that group work facilitates thinking and enables learners to achieve the lesson outcomes.

5.3.2.1 Use of questions

The questions identified from the audio-recorded lessons can be classified in different categories, i.e. questions for lead-in, questions for checking comprehension, questions for corrections, and questions for practicing drills. Table 5.5 is an illustration of these categories of questions and examples drawn from the sample of questions presented in Appendix B.

Table 5.5: Types and examples of the questions asked by teachers in the lessons

Question type	**Meaning**	**Example**
Questions for lead-in.	Questions that teachers use to lead learners to discover or guess what is going to be taught (Atkinson, 1993).	-What is this picture showing you? - Can everyone see here? - On what does a train move? - What is this type of transport?
Questions for checking comprehension.	They are 'concept questions' (Atkinson, 1993, p. 30), i.e. questions that indicate whether learners can identify or recall the answer, or name something.	The identified questions of this type required one-word or Yes/No answers -What's the English for **ijana** (*one hundred*) ? -Do you remember this? -When did Europeans come in Rwanda?
Questions for corrections.	Questions asked to help the learner correct the wrong answer that has just been provided.	L: It is transport of air. T: Transport of air? ↑ Is it transport of air? ↑ What is it? L: It is air transport.
Questions for practising drills.	Questions aimed at leading learners to intensive and controlled practice through repetition.	T: ...the function of the legislature is to do what? ↑ Ls: To make laws. T: To do what? ↑ [Teacher increases the pitch] Ls: To make laws.

The table shows that the types of questions asked in the SS lessons require direct short answers. The analysis of the samples of questions in Appendix B indicates that there were no questions that encouraged learners to express their own ideas regarding something in the lesson. On the part of learners, their questions were limited to asking for new information and checking the correctness of their answers. Consider Table 5.6.

Table 5.6: Types and examples of the questions asked by learners in the lesson

Question type	**Meaning**	**Example**
Questions for new information.	Questions aimed at getting information on how something works, is made, or understood.	-What is the cause of earthquake? -How are mountains formed?
Questions for new vocabulary in English.	These were questions targeting the equivalences of Kinyarwanda terms in English.	-How can we say **ukwemera** (*faith*) in English? -What is **urufunzo** (*papyrus*) in English, teacher?
Questions for checking correctness.	These are questions that learners asked to make certain that their answers were correct.	-Is it correct to say, 'the Mwami expanded the Kingdom'? -Weren't the first missionaries White Fathers?

Learners did not ask many questions in the classroom (Appendix B). A few questions identified from audio recordings of lessons are questions for new general information, questions for new vocabulary in English, and questions for checking correctness, as exemplified in Table 5.5.

After analysing the types and reasons for the questions that teachers and learners asked in the classroom, the researcher proceeded with testing a sample of those questions with a question rating model adapted from the revised Bloom's Taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001) and Moodley's working model for analysing questions (2013) in order to see whether the questions asked help effective teaching and learning. Taken from samples of questions for each lesson (Appendix B), some questions were placed in the table of the taxonomy model (Table 5.6) on the basis of the characteristics defined for each level of questions. **A lower order model question** is the one aimed at remembering, i.e. recognising or recalling from previous knowledge in order to compare it with what is being presented to the learners, or when they are given prompts to recall (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). These include yes/no and true/false type of questions, and questions to promote retention such as:

(i) When did the first missionaries get in Rwanda?

(ii) Who is the first white explorer to reach Rwanda?

(iii) What happened to the Tutsis in 1994?

A middle order model question is that question aimed at showing the learners' understanding, i.e., questions that require learners to interpret, exemplify, classify, summarise, compare, and explain (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001) as in for example:

(i) How would you explain earthquake in your own words?
(ii) What were the main reasons that made Europeans to come in Africa?
(iii) Can you tell us what a volcano eruption is?

This category of questions also includes procedural knowledge questions such as:

(i) Can you demonstrate a century on the time line?
(ii) Can you draw a flag of your own and define the meaning of the colours used?

The category of **higher order model questions** includes questions for analysing, evaluating, and creating. In Bloom's revised taxonomy table, questions for analysing, evaluating, and creating are ranked for higher-order thinking (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). Drawing on the taxonomy, the questions for analysing require the learner to be able to show what is relevant and what is not (differentiating), indicate how ideas or content are organised in a lesson (organising), and determine the underlying purpose of the author of the taught material (attributing) (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001, pp. 79-82). According to Bloom's taxonomy, the questions for evaluating encourage learners to make judgements on criteria such as quality, effectiveness, efficiency, and consistency, and aim at checking and critiquing. The questions for creating encourage learners to reorganise the learnt material in order to make a new product of the learner's thinking through generating, planning, or producing. There were no examples for HOQs in the data as can be seen in Table 5.7.

Table 5.7: Working model of lower order, middle order, and higher order questions for analysing the classroom questions.

Levels of questions (Qs)	**Aim**	**Teachers' questions**[19]			
		TRS1	TRS2	US1	US2
Higher-order model Qs	Creating	0	0	0	0
	Evaluating	0	0	0	0
	Analysing	0	0	0	0
Middle-order model Qs	Applying	0	0	✓	✓
	Understanding	✓	✓	✓	✓
Lower-order model Qs	Remembering	✓	✓	✓	✓

Drawing on Table 5.6, the identified questions from the SS lessons indicate that the large majority of questions (Appendix B6) are the LOQs and MOQs aimed at understanding. A few questions were found in the middle order model aimed at applying. The HOQs are missing in the samples, and this may be attributed to lack of language proficiency since the ability to understand and use the language is a crucial tool for higher order thinking skills (Grosser & Nel, 2013). Drawing on the latter research, in the context of the present study, it appears that, on the one hand, the teachers ask LOQs because their English language proficiency is not sufficiently developed to enable them to stimulate and enhance the learners' thinking abilities. On the other hand, the learners' language proficiency is another problem that prevents teachers from asking HOQs because they are aware of the learners' inabilities to express opinions and ideas clearly in English. Therefore, as observed from the audio recordings, teachers ask LOQs, especially questions that required 'yes/no'eand one-word answers, because of the language problem.

The above findings suggest implications for learning SS, or any content subject, for that matter. As research has shown, poor performance in the language of instruction results in poor critical thinking, which hinders effective learning of the content (Bauer, Holmes & Warren, 2006; Quane & Glanz, 2010; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh 2012) because language, thinking, and learning are intimately tied together (Donald et al. 2006). Literature has demonstrated the interconnection of these three components by showing that from

[19] In this table, 0 means that there were no questions of that type, the tick sign means there were questions of that type.

Vygotsky's socio-cultural theory (McPeck, 1990) language ability has been a prime factor contributing to efficient critical thinking skills for the achievement of learning objectives (Grosser & Nel, 2013). This view shows how the lack of language proficiency in the Grade 6 SS classrooms is likely to result into ineffective content learning.

With regard to the questions used by teachers in class, it is clear that they do not help learners think at higher levels in order to develop their mental abilities for creative work. It was observed that these questions do not open to learners opportunities to interact with the teacher or talk to each other in the classroom for effective learning. According to Alidou and Brock-Utne (2011, p. 162-3), 'Effective teaching involves teachers' use of quality questions. Effective questioning emphasises higher level (or more complex) thinking and leads to effective learning on the part of the student'. This suggestion is hard to apply to the contexts in which learners have limited knowledge of the language of instruction.

In addition, learners ask very few questions in the class sessions (Appendix B6) and are not motivated to do so because teachers ask them questions that do not encourage their thinking and own questions (see Table 5.4 and 5.5). Furthermore, even the few questions they can ask concern vocabulary, grammar, or direct information, which is indicative of a lack of English proficiency (Bauer et al., 2006). According to Napell (2001, p.192), it is important for learners to be able to ask questions because 'the questions we ask act like a lens clarifying or distorting information relevant and necessary to us.' In addition, 'students whose ideas are being considered seriously, who are asked questions which enhance their learning rather than put them on the spot or rank them, who are given time to formulate their responses, are more willing to think at higher levels, solve problems, and ask their own questions' (Napell, 2001, p. 194). This means that the lack of questions on the part of learners prevents them from engaging in metacognitive activities that enable learners to achieve effective knowledge acquisition (Livingston, 1997). As previously noted, learners do not understand what they do not know in English; metacognitive activities such as *jigsaw*, in which learners can work on a question in a group, and *think, pair, and share* in which learners are given a question to reflect on in pairs and then in larger groups, can help them think about their own questions and ways of developing their own learning processes in English as the MoI.

5.3.2.2 Group work

One of the probable inhibiting factors to language learning is the lack of language practice. Extensive research (Scott & De La Fuente, 2008; Atkinson, 1993) has shown the importance of pair and group work for improvement in learners' confidence in the classroom, especially those learning in a second or foreign language. Of the 16 classroom sessions that were observed for this study, only two sessions had a few minutes of pair and group work. The lack of group or pair work has disadvantages because, as Atkinson (1993) states, learners feel much more comfortable when they speak to a few people than when they address the whole class and the teacher. For example, during the pair work activities that were observed, interactions among learners in their group work were much closer to real-life situations, whether they spoke English or Kinyarwanda. In groups that were trying to interact in English, this practice was likely to contribute to the learners' development of confidence to speak English in the classroom and out of it.

Similarly, observations demonstrated that some teachers do not understand or know the importance of collaborative work to facilitate the teaching task and foster the learners' knowledge. For instance, during observations, it appeared that the lack of pair and group work in the classroom overloads the teacher because s/he always has to speak alone, ask questions to ensure the learners' comprehension, and does not have time to help weaker learners. Other implications of lack of group work include making the lesson more teacher-centred, which, in most cases, bores learners and contributes to the pupils' lack of concentration. But, most importantly, lack of group work or collaborative tasks prevents learners from practising using the target language, which is key to making progress in language learning (Atkinson, 1993; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003; Scott & De La Fuente, 2008).

Studies on the use of collaborative work have extensively been conducted, and their findings reveal important effects on learning, such as problem-solving, creation of confidence in the language of learning, increase in understanding the content, and enjoyment of learning. For instance, the findings from various studies such as Li, Remedios and Clarke (2010), Laughlin, Carey and Kerr (2008); Banda (2007); Johnston and Miles (2004), Olivera and Strauss (2004) showed that learners benefit from group work. In the present study, almost all the observed lessons did not include group work while learners show that they benefit from

peer mentoring. In the context of Rwanda, the fact that learners share the same MT (Kinyarwanda) is an added advantage that can be more productive if teachers can regulate and encourage informal and formal group work. For instance, learners can be encouraged to reflect on topics or questions given by the teacher. Most of the time, the group discussions are held in both languages because of the lack of proficiency in the target language, but learners benefit in understanding the content and learning from each other, and they increase vocabulary in the target language.

In this section, it has been shown that language problems hinder effective learning because teachers and learners ask lower-order model questions that do not encourage learners to demonstrate understanding and higher thinking level. It has also revealed that the lack of group work prevents learners from speaking out and collaborating for problem-solving and knowledge acquisition.

5.4 Conclusion

The main focus of this chapter has been the challenges that teachers and learners encounter in teaching and learning through English as the MoI in Grade 6 in four Rwandan primary schools. The findings revealed that teachers and learners face many challenges due to limited English language knowledge and skills such as listening, speaking, reading, writing, and grammar challenges that are often coupled with lack of confidence. The chapter has shown that difficulties in listening, speaking, reading, and writing hinder the teaching of SS because teachers are forced to devote time and effort to teaching English instead of focusing on mediating effective learning of the SS content. This practice has been explained as a consequence of teaching and learning in a foreign language that is not familiar to either the teachers or learners because, as research has shown, learning in a language requires both the teacher and learners to be conversant with the language of instruction (Webb, 2004; Brock-Utne & Alidou, 2011; Wolff, 2011). The data reveals that learners face language challenges in all basic English skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing, and grammar), especially in rural schools where the school and home learning conditions do not facilitate the learning of English, and where there is an even greater lack of exposure to English. In addition to these challenges, there was a generally low level of literacy due to a predominant lack of reading culture.

Language learning, especially a second or foreign language, is a process that takes time in order to develop both BICS and then CALP. According to Cummins (2000), learners of English as second or foreign language need approximately two years in order to be able to use their BICS competently, while it requires five to seven years to reach the level of CALP that a native speaker needs for school activities (O'Connor & Geiger, 2009; Shohamy, 2006). In this study, Grade 6 learner participants did not have sufficient time to develop BICS and CALP because, since the launch of English as the MoI at all levels in Rwanda, these learners learnt English while learning in it as the MoI. This may also be another reason why their teachers conflate teaching English and teaching in English, as was evident in the previous discussions.

The language difficulties in listening, speaking, writing, and reading indicate limited knowledge of English that is reflected in the learners' difficulties with their BICS and CALP. Drawing on Cummins (2000), this study reveals that Grade 6 learners' BICS have not been developed to the extent of allowing them to communicate competently with educators and peers, and their CALP has not reached the level of using English proficiently for the school activities. It is evident from the study that teachers of SS teach English because learners need to develop their comprehension and speaking skills for school and other social settings (BICS), and acquire the academic register (CALP) that school requires for writing and reading in specific subjects. In this study, it can be seen that teaching English and teaching in English as teachers of SS do is unavoidable, since both BICS and CALP are needed in order to construct knowledge, and mainly because, in the context of Rwanda, the development of BICS and CALP necessary for the classroom can only be attained through school. With regard to BICS, opportunities to use English out of the classroom are rare because all Rwandans use their MT, Kinyarwanda, for ordinary conversation in social life. As for CALP, the language skills necessary for academic subjects are taught at school and are unlikely to be developed at home when BICS has not taken place.

With particular focus on the language of instruction, the sociocultural perspective on learning suggests that effective learning emerges from social interactions between the teacher, or the more knowledgeable person, and the learner (Vygotsky, 1978). In these interactions, the role of language is central because it mediates the acquisition of skills and knowledge. In the classroom, language is the medium through which learners interact with teachers on the one hand, and with one another, on the other hand. This study has shown that learners and

teachers are not conversant with the language of instruction, which increases the teachers' and learners' anxiety in the classroom, and discourages learners' participation in the lesson. In addition, the role of language in joint intellectual activity has also been researched and the outcomes reveal that it is through language that people think and work together in order to transform the information presented to them into new understanding, or to solve given problems as a result of their combined intellectual efforts (Mercer, 2000; Kao, 2010). In this study, it was found that challenges of using English only in the classroom result in the teachers' and learners' inability to exchange information on the subject's content, interpret and develop new skills and knowledge. Consequently, English only in the context of Rwanda was found likely to entail lack of effective learning of the content because of insufficient proficiency in it as the MoI. As research (Mercer, 2000; Kao, 2010; Moate, 2011) shows, language plays a meditational role if it can offer something more valuable than mere information exchange.

Considering the classroom challenges posed by English as the MoI, and the context of conflation of teaching English and teaching in English, the researcher argues that the lack of language proficiency linked to the inability to understand and use the language of instruction negatively affects the learning of SS in the four Rwandan primary schools. As the socio-cultural perspective on learning suggests, learners should be helped to develop and refine their language in order to facilitate their schooling activities and learning processes (Moate, 2011). Drawing on this idea, it is unlikely to teach SS in English successfully if learners do not understand the language that the teacher is using. In addition, if the teacher is not sufficiently proficient and confident in the language of teaching, he or she is unlikely to be able to assist learners to gain new knowledge (Lantolf & Appel, 1994; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Kao, 2010), because the lack of language limits the teacher-learner interaction that is crucial to fostering the learners' active participation in effective learning (Bruner, 1977; Vygotsky, 1978; Mercer, 1995, 2000; Moate, 2011), and scaffolding the learners' higher thinking skills (Donald et al. 2006). This shows how the language of instruction, which Vygotsky calls a 'symbolic tool' (Lantolf, 2000; Kozulin et al. 2003; Kao, 2010), is centrally important.

In the context of the present study where positive attitudes of the learners towards English as the MoI coexist with the lack of confidence in using this language of instruction (see Chapter Four), it is clear that English does not play the necessary meditational role because learners

are not sufficiently proficient in English to participate in sustained interaction with their teachers. As shown in the literature, 'students who are not confident in their ability to use language in an academic context will tend not to speak up or interact' (Donald et al., 2006, p. 96). According to the sociocultural perspective on learning (Vygotsky, 1978) and related theories (Lantolf, 2000; Kozulin et al., 2003; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Kao, 2010), this limited proficiency in English is likely to result in ineffective learning because the language of instruction cannot play a mediational role in the acquisition of knowledge.

Furthermore, the teaching of English during the lessons of content subjects inhibits the learning of the content because teachers choose to teach vocabulary and grammar in a way that is easy for them, in order to fill the learners' language gap and create a learning environment that can enable the teacher to mediate the learning of SS. The way teachers cope with English as the MoI in Grade 6 in Rwandan primary schools is time-consuming because it combines two tasks, i.e. teaching English and teaching in English. Classes in English are difficult to manage because of the language difficulties. Very often, the class sessions become teacher-centred because learners do not have the language to interact with the teacher, thus producing ineffective learning of the subject's content. It is worth noting that the inability to use the language of instruction for both teacher and learners creates lack of confidence in the classroom that forces the teacher to resort to different teaching strategies and CS. These strategies are explored in the next chapter.

The language challenges that teachers and learners encounter vary depending on the location of the school, and it was found that the rural schools are the most affected because of social and school economic conditions that do not favour the learning of English in comparison to conditions in urban areas. It is hoped that the rural and urban divide considered in this study and various practices of teaching through English in rural and urban settings inform education stakeholders about what can help equitable access to learning of SS in Rwanda. The next chapter examines the strategies that teachers and learners use to cope with English as the MoI for effective learning of SS.

CHAPTER SIX

STRATEGIES EMPLOYED IN ADDRESSING CLASSROOM CHALLENGES

6.1 Introduction

While the previous chapter focused on the challenges that English as the MoI in Rwanda poses for teachers and learners in the classroom, the researcher presents the strategies they use to address these challenges. In addressing the strategies, the researcher draws on all modes of data collection, as was done in Chapter Four and Chapter Five. The first section deals with the teachers' strategies, and the second section discusses the learners' strategies.

6.2 Strategies used by teachers

The analysis of the teachers' questionnaires reveals two main strategies:

(i) Strategy 1: Code-switching.

(ii) Strategy 2: Use of non-verbal communication aids.

The findings of the analysis are illustrated in Table 6.1.

Table 6.1: Results from the questionnaires about the strategies teachers employed to address classroom challenges

Strategies		**Overall results**			**Comparison**				
					Rural schools		**Urban schools**		
No	Statement	Agree (A)	Disagree (D)	*p*	A	D	A	D	*p*
(i)	Teachers code-switch in the classroom.	**62**	38	0.0004	**75**	25	**49**	51	0.0044
(ii)	Teachers use non-verbal communication aids in the classroom.	**92**	8	< 0.0001	**88**	12	**96**	4	0.1481

Table 6.1 combines the overall results for the four schools, and a comparison of the results from the two rural schools and results from the two urban schools. A detailed analysis is presented in Appendix A2e. Each of the strategies identified from the questionnaire is presented and discussed in the next sections.

6.2.1 Code-switching

In this study, the researcher uses CS as a case of alternation between English and Kinyarwanda. For example, in analysis, English becomes ML, i.e., the host or base language, if its quantity is greater than the quantity of Kinyarwanda in a CS. In this case, Kinyarwanda becomes the EL, i.e., the guest or donor language. To determine the ML and EL, the researcher refers to Myers-Scotton's (1993, 2006) MLFM (see details in Chapter Two). In the course of the analysis, the 'over-reliance' on Kinyarwanda, i.e., the intense use of Kinyarwanda exceeding the use of English in a CS makes Kinyarwanda become the ML and English the EL. The ML and EL serve to examine the implications of CS for learning. This is done through the lens of the 'strategic' CS, i.e., the 'use of CS in a way that ensures that teachers and learners do not resort to using the mother tongue or guest language to such an extent that it becomes the matrix language' (Moodley, 2013, p. 67).

The analysis of the data from the questionnaire indicates that the majority of teachers (62%, $p = 0.0004$) reveal that they practise CS. This appears in the teachers' responses agreeing with the statements such as *I switch between languages (use more than one language) to help my pupils learn concepts in English and understand the content of the subject*, and, *During group discussions, I allow my pupils to interact in Kinyarwanda or French.* CS is also reflected in the teachers' disagreements with statements, *I strictly enforce the use of English in my classroom*, and, *in the classroom, I punish a pupil who uses any other language apart from English* (Appendix A2e).

A comparison of the rural and urban findings indicates that the rural schools have a higher percentage of CS in the classroom (75% of CS) than the urban schools (49%). This is a significant difference ($p = 0.0044$). To explain the reasons for this difference, the researcher looks at the qualitative data, i.e., audio-recordings and interviews.

The data from classroom audio-recordings of teachers and learners indicates that CS is common to all teachers in this study (Appendix B). According to the observed lessons, all four teachers engage in CS practices. However, the frequencies of CS per teacher differ, depending on various factors such as the objective of the teacher's activity, nature of the content of the lesson (difficult or easy to understand), teachers' and learners' English proficiency, and teachers' assumptions on their learners' English proficiency, as will be shown later in this chapter. In the following sections the researcher presents the frequency of English-Kinyarwanda alternation, then proceeds with different examples of CS as they emerged from the data, explains reasons why such practices occur in the classroom, and draws tentative conclusions on effects of CS in teaching through English in Rwanda.

6.2.1.1 English-Kinyarwanda alternations

The 16 audio-recorded lessons clearly reveal English-Kinyarwanda alternations. The analysis reveals five French words that were used as follows: a word 'donc' *(thus)* (TRS1) was used as a pause filler; teachers did not know the English words for 'relief' *(contour)* (TRS1) and 'marchandises' *(commodities)* (TRS2), and one teacher seemed not to have a Kinyarwanda word for 'raw material' but had 'matière première' *(raw material)* (TUS2) in French, which is a common term that Rwandans regularly use since Kinyarwanda does not have a term for 'raw material'. Although most teachers have a French background, the data from audio-recordings indicates very little use of French. The fact that only a few words of French can be identified in the recordings of French-speaking teachers suggests a significant commitment of their effort to comply with the policy and may also indicate negative attitudes towards French. As seen in Chapter Four, respondents had unfavourable opinions towards French because of its political history in Rwanda.

To examine CS and discuss its implications for learning, it was necessary to look at the occurrences of English-Kinyarwanda (E-K) or Kinyarwanda-English (K-E) alternations. The following are the examples of CS that have been considered in this study.

> *(i)* There is an international court **muri Tanzaniya aho bita Arusha** *(in Tanzanian area called Arusha)*, do you understand? (RS1/L3).
>
> *(ii)* That is the Bible explanation, religion explanation of the existence of the world. **Ibyo ni ibisobanuro bya Bibiliya bijyanye n'ukwemera ku iremwa ry' isi** *(That is the Bible explanation of the faith about the creation of the world)* (US1/L12)**.**

(iii) **Murabyumva** cabinet **icyo aricyo**? *(Do you understand what* cabinet *is?)* (US1/L8).

(iv) **Kuki ahari imisozi hagwa imvura?** *(Why are mountainous places rainy?)* How are mountains source of rainfall? (RS2/L7).

These are examples of intrasentential CS and intersentential CS from English to Kinyarwanda, and Kinyarwanda to English. As stated in Chapter Two, different forms of English and Kinyarwanda alternations are regarded as CS.

From the 16 classroom audio-recordings, it was not possible to measure the frequency of CS in numbers in order to show exact percentages of the use of English and percentages of the use of Kinyarwanda in a sentence or sentences. In terms of Myers-Scotton's (1993) MLFM, the ML and EL are identified on the basis of the quantity of English compared to the quantity of Kinyarwanda used in an instance of CS. Such an analysis of EK alternation or vice-versa serves to determine whether or not CS is strategically used to promote learning (see Chapter Two).

Through the lens of MLFM, the analysis of the audio-recordings indicates that both English as ML and Kinyarwanda as EL, and Kinyarwanda as ML and English as EL occur in the data. The data highlights some differences in language alternation. For instance, it appears that the lessons in RS1 comprise instances of CS in which Kinyarwanda usage is greater than English. Similarly, in RS2, the first two lessons, display more Kinyarwanda than English. The data shows more non-strategic CS in rural schools than in urban schools. Drawing on Moodley (2010; 2013), instances of CS in which Kinyarwanda is used mostly is likely to inhibit the acquisition of English and the learning of the content in English if CS is not used strategically.

The factors of teachers' proficiency and their perceptions on their learners' ability in English are significant in this study. As noted in Chapter Five, it seems that all the lessons were conducted with English difficulties, and all the teachers resort to Kinyarwanda to remedy a number of English problems that they and their learners experience. It was noted that, in one way or another, the use of CS plays a meditational role to make technical and unfamiliar concepts understood. However, the strategic use of CS in the context of this study for effective learning attention must be given to using English more often than Kinyawanda. As

identified in all lessons of RS1 and two lessons of RS2, the extensive K-E alternation is likely to be one of the factors contributing to the learners' test and examination failures where questioning techniques require that answers be given in English and not in Kinyarwanda, which is frequently used by the teacher. It is important that teachers use CS strategically to promote learning in English as the MoI.

The instances of CS by all four teachers in the 16 observed lessons reveal that CS is a strategy often used in the four Grade 6 English-medium Rwandan classrooms. This finding prompts the need to understand the types of CS and reasons for CS, and these are presented in the next section.

6.2.1.2 Types of CS and reasons for CS

This section presents, describes, and illustrates the types of CS used in this study and provides explanations of the language alternations that were observed in the teaching of SS. This is done in an attempt to draw conclusions on the effects of CS practices for teaching and learning. Illustrations are extracts drawn from samples of the lessons' audio-recordings in appendix B.

The types of code-switching explored in this study draw on the existing literature (Moodley, 2003, 2010, 2013; Moodley & Kamwangamalu, 2004) and the recurrent types are CS for explanations, CS for classroom management and influencing learners' behaviour, CS for emphasis, and CS for linguistic solidarity. There are two other types, namely CS for teacher's ease in the classroom, and CS for learners' comprehension in the language of instruction, which emerged from the data and that seem to be typical to the Rwandan context in which the language of instruction is a foreign language that pupils and teachers need to learn. In addition, Kinyarwanda, which is a language that both the teacher and learners use and understand well, makes CS a frequent occurrence in the classroom for the benefit of both teachers and learners.

Since the aim of this study is not to explore CS too deeply, the discussion of the types of CS aims to illustrate what happens in the classroom in order to enable the researcher to draw possible implications of CS practices on learning in English. Each of the identified types of CS is discussed and illustrated in the following sections.

Code-switching for explanations

The data from audio-recordings of lessons and field notes indicates that, most often, teachers code-switch because they want to explain difficult concepts that they believe learners will not grasp in English, as in the following example:

Extract 6.1 [US1/L9: Transport and Communication]

1. T: Do you know what damaged goods mean?
2. Ls: (-)
3. T: Damaged goods?
4. Ls: (-)
5. T: Eh… [...] damaged goods, **Ibicuruzwa byangiritse** *(rotten goods)*. For example look at this picture of damaged goods. These are damaged goods…The disadvantage; it is very slow, the reason why it cannot transport urgent and perishable goods. Do you know what perishable goods mean?
6. Ls: No.
7. T: Perishable goods?
8. Ls: (-)
9. It is the same as damaged goods. **Ibicuruzwa bishobora kwangirika vuba** *(Goods which can bedamaged quickly*).

Extract 6.1 indicates that English is the ML and Kinyarwanda the EL. The teacher chooses what learners do not understand. These are concepts like 'damaged goods' and 'perishable goods'. In turn 5 and turn 9, the teacher is explaining what water transport is, its advantages and disadvantages. He decides to switch to Kinyarwanda when learners keep quiet (learners' silence (-) in turns 2, 4, and 8) or say 'no' in turn 6. The teacher's hesitation and thought […] before switching to Kinyarwanda indicates the likelihood that the teacher was looking for a suitable way to explain the concept. The choice to switch to Kinyarwanda enables the teacher to clarify his own thoughts about the concepts *damaged goods* and *perishable goods*. Another observation to support this analysis is that, even if the teacher has a teaching aid, e.g. a picture showing what damaged goods are, he resorts to CS to ensure that learners understand the concepts clearly. The use of CS in this teacher's talk plays an important role to explain and distinguish the two concepts. When the teacher switches to Kinyarwanda, this provides

more clarity for the concepts that would otherwise be difficult to explain in English; and it saves time the teacher would have lost explaining in English to foster learners' understanding.

In explaining vocabulary or concepts, CS can be used to help low proficiency learners to understand content information in the language of instruction. Extract 6.2 illustrates the case:

Extract 6.2 [US1/L10: Physical features of Rwanda]

10. T: Good! Hills. (.) Now, tell me, what are hills?
11. Ls: (-)
12. T: **Nimumbwire icyo mwumva kuri iri jambo** hills *(Tell me what you understand by this word)*. What do you understand when someone says hills? Hills? Yes, there?
13. L: Small mountains.
14. T: Okay, what? Speak loudly.
15. L: Small mountains.
16. T: Good! Small mountains [Teacher looks around staring at everyone's face]. Do you understand? **Udusozi duto!** *(small mountains)* Small mountains, **udusozi duto!** *(small mountains)* Okay? Have you now understood? **Mwabyumise?** *(Have you understood?)*

In extract 6.2, the lesson was about physical features of Rwanda, and the teacher was explaining the concept 'hills'. The learner's answers in turn 13 and turn 15 indicate that the term was not new to all learners. Even if one learner could provide the answer, the teacher's look at every learner's face (turn 16) indicates his doubt that every learner comprehends, which pushes him to switch to Kinyarwanda. The teacher translates for those he assumes do not understand: 'Small mountains. **Udusozi duto** *(Small mountains)'*; 'Have you understood? **Mwabyumvise?** *(Have you understood?)'*

The English is translated into Kinyarwanda to ensure that all learners understand the teacher's explanations, and more particularly, it is a way of checking whether low proficiency English learners have understood. The purpose of CS in the form of translation was to offer quick and comprehensive understanding of what was being explained, especially for low proficiency English learners. In this study, there are cases of CS carried out via translation,

and this term should be understood as the process of providing meaning of the source language in the target language using equivalences or paraphrases (Wilson, 2009).

Translation has been regarded as 'the clearest way of helping a learner to understand what a word means' and the simplest solution 'for a learner restricted by lack of vocabulary and unfamiliarity with English-speaking cultures' (Atkinson, 1993, p. 95). In the present study, translation serves to negotiate meanings of unfamiliar terms and 'forms an important part of the learning process' (Paxton, 2009, p. 345) because it seems to be one of the strategies that teachers use to overcome teaching problems emanating from unfamiliar language usage in the classroom.

Echoing Moodley and Kamwangamalu (2004), CS can be used by teachers who want to expand on information or embellish what they have already said in a given code. In this study for instance, teachers code-switch because they want to provide much clearer explanations or examples of what they are teaching. The next extract illustrates how a teacher code-switches to elaborate on the concept 'national policies'.

Extract 6.3 [US1/L: The government of Rwanda]

17. T: A policy is a plan of the government (.) **Gahunda y'ibikorwa bya Leta (.)** **Murabyumva?** *(A plan of the government's activities. Do you understand?)* **Nk'urugero Leta yashyizeho** policy **ya** nine years **mu burezi murayizi. Iyo ni** national policy**, ni ukuvuga imyaka icyenda y'uburezi bw'ibanze mu** **Rwanda ni** national policy. (*For example government established a nine year basic education, you know it. That is a national policy; that means nine year basic education is a national policy).* Are we together?
18. Ls: Yes.

Extract 6.3 is a part of a civics lesson in SS. The teacher is presenting the structure of the government of Rwanda, explaining the functions of the Executive. In turn 17, the teacher defines the concept 'policy' and switches to Kinyarwanda to clarify the definition and check the learners' comprehension. The teacher switches to Kinyarwanda, again elaborating on the definition by using an example in Kinyarwanda about the context learners knew well, i.e., that of nine years basic education. The extract shows that the ML is English and Kinyarwanda is the EL. The Kinyarwanda elements embedded in the ML are phrases that

expand the meaning of the term 'policy' that the teacher broadly provided in English. The alternation of English and Kinyarwanda is an elaboration aimed at enabling comprehension, and the teacher code-switches because he wants learners to understand well and quickly.

Code-switching for classroom management and influencing learners' behaviour

CS can be used to manage learners' discipline and behaviour in the classroom. The recordings demonstrate that teachers resort to using Kinyarwanda because they want to elicit specific behavioural responses from learners. This CS often allows learners to receive clear instructions, motivate their willingness to answer questions, or sometimes rouse them when they seem to be tired or lose concentration. In this case, CS is used to attract learners' attention as a means for classroom management. The next extracts illustrate this type of CS:

Extract 6.4 [RS2/L6: Importance of the natural environment in Rwanda]

19. T: Water can be found in a lake such as Lake Kivu. **Ahandi dusanga amazi ni he? (***Where else is water found?)* [Teacher looks at a group of learners on his left] **Kalimba, funga igitabo; mukurikire kuri map! (***Kalimba, close the book! Follow on the map!)* **Ahandi dusanga amazi ni hehe?** *(Where else is water found?)*
20. L: **Mu migezi.** *(In rivers)*
21. T: ... We will also see that other areas we call swamps also contain water. **Mwitegereze hano! Abo inyuma murahabona neza? Murabona ko ari akantu k'akazenga gakikijwe n'ibyatsi! Turumvikana?** *(Look here! You in the back, can you see here well? You can see that it is a kind of stagnant water surrounded by grass! Are we together?)*
22. Ls: **Yego.** *(Yes)*

Extract 6.5 [RS1/L1: Arrival and influence of foreigners]

23. T: …Where is Rwanda on this map? Show our country on the map!
24. Ls: (-)
25. T: **Ko mudatera intoki hejuru se? Ntabwo mubyumva? Erekana igihugu cyacu kuri iriya map! Ni ukuvuga ko ugiye kwerekana igihugu cyacu;** *(Why don't you raise hands up? Don't you understand? Show our country on the map! This means that you are going to show our country on the map)*
26. T: …Show Rwanda on this map. Yes, you!
27. L: Here. [A learner points at Rwanda on the map.]

Extract 6.4 is part of the lesson concerning the physical features of Rwanda and the teacher was focussing on features such as lakes, rivers, and swamps. In turn 19, the teacher switches to Kinyarwanda to call for class participation: **'Ahandi dusanga amazi ni hehe?'** *(Where else is water found?*) Instantly, she finds that Kalimba and his 'deskmates' were concentrating on the book, instead of looking at the map. To draw their attention, she orders them to close the book and follow on the map: '*Where else is water? Kalimba, close the book! Follow on the map! Where else is water?'* (turn 19). Similarly, the teacher switches to Kinyarwanda to make sure her instructions are well understood because she needs everybody's attention before she can introduce new information. Her strategy to attract the learners' attention is successful because one of the pupils answers the question correctly (turn 20). Also, in turn 21, the teacher looks at the back of the classroom and asks pupils at the back if they can see on the map well. After providing information, the teacher checks the pupils' comprehension with a question, '**Turumvikana?'** (*Are we together?).* In this extract, switching to Kinyarwanda serves to help the teacher easily manage the classroom because every learner understands what the teacher is saying in his or her MT.

In extract 6.5, the teacher is teaching the lesson about the arrival and influence of foreigners in Africa, specifically in Rwanda. After the teacher has tried many times to give instructions in English about the activity learners are supposed to do (turn 23), he finally decides to switch to Kinyarwanda, asking them why they are not answering, wondering whether they can understand or not, and repeating what he has just said in English (turn 25). It is clear in this extract that switching to Kinyarwanda rouses the learners' willingness to participate in the activity because they have understood what they are required to do. In addition, one can see that the teacher switches to Kinyarwanda when he gets emotional, which serves to motivate the learners' willingness to raise their hands (turn 26), hence influencing their behaviour (turn 27).

Code-switching for emphasis

The audio-recordings show that teachers repeat what they have said or what pupils have been asked to repeat in order to emphasise the understanding of vocabulary, or verify the accuracy of a point. Learners also repeat what they have been taught in both languages to ensure comprehension. Both teachers and learners repeat in Kinyarwanda what they said in English or vice versa, as illustrated below.

Extract 6.6 [RS2/L5: Our national flag]

28. T: We have seen blue and yellow. Have you understood what they mean?
29. Ls: Yes.
30. T: ↑ **Mwabyumvise? Ni iki mwumvise?** Kamali? *(Have you understood? What have you understood?)* Kamali?
31. L: **Numvise ko ibara ry'umuhondo rivuga** wealth **aribyo ubukungu cyangwa ubukire**, **naho** blue **ni** peace **bivuga amahoro**. *(I understood that yellow means wealth which is richness while blue means peace).*
32. T:… Prosperity is living well, do you understand this? [Teacher changes tone]
    Kubaho neza. Kugira ngo umuntu abeho neza rero agomba kuba afite ubushobozi bwo kongera umusaruro, productivity. *(To live well. For people to live well, they must be able to increase their productivity.)*

In extract 6.6, the lesson concerns the meanings of the colours in the Rwandan flag. The extract shows that after reminding learners what has been seen (turn 28), the teacher switches to Kinyarwanda to ask them whether or not they have understood, and she also asks them to say what they have understood (turn 30). In turn 31, the learner's answer is a CS in which the ML is Kinyarwanda and English the EL. The exchange shows that the learner mentions the target words ('wealth', 'blue', 'peace') in English and uses Kinyarwanda to explain and prove he has understood. However, the teacher explains the concepts of 'prosperity' and 'productivity' in English and switches to Kinyarwanda to emphasise and elaborate on the meanings she has provided in English for better understanding (turn 32). From the audio-recording, the use of CS for emphasis is stressed and backed up by the teacher's change of pitch when she resorts to Kinyarwanda.

Code-switching for linguistic solidarity

This is an instance in which multilingual speakers resort to their native language in order to build closer interpersonal relationships as individuals who share the same cultural and linguistic identity (Sert, 2005). From classroom observations, it was easy to observe that both teachers and learners often had recourse to Kinyarwanda for personal knowledge, i.e., for information they share, and which a third party cannot easily understand. The following extract illustrates CS for linguistic solidarity.

Extract 6.7 [US2/L14: Political organisation of the Kingdom in Rwanda]

33. L: Question teacher. Eh [...] (-) **Ntabwo habagaho Imirenge, Utugari n'Imidugudu?** *(Weren't there Sectors, Cells and villages?)*

34. T: **Ikibazo cyiza Polina! Izo ni inzego z'ubuyobozi ziriho ubungubu. Ariko bifite aho bihuriye.** Look here for example [Teacher draws two columns paralleling the structures of a Kingdom versus a Republic]. **Umwami yayoboraga** Kingdom, **ubu dufite** Republic. **Hariho** Provinces, **nubu dufite** Provinces; **hariho** Districts **nubu dufite** Districts; **mu mwanya wa** Hills, **dufite** Sectors **ariyo Imirenge**; Neighbourhoods **dufite** Cells **cyangwa Utugari**. **Hano hakiyongeraho Imidugudu itarabagaho mu gihe cy'Umwami! Murabibona neza?** *(Good question Polina! Those are current categories of leadership. But there is a relationship. Look here for example. The King was leading a Kingdom, today we have a Republic. There were Provinces and even now we have Provinces; there were Districts and now we have Districts; instead of Hills we have Sectors; for Neighbourhoods we have Cells. Here we have villages which did not exist during the Kingdom period, can you see this clearly?).*

35. Ls: **Yego** *(Yes).*

In extract 6.7 the lesson is about pre-colonial people and the political organisation, and the teacher is talking about the Kingdom and its political structure. The CS is learner-initiated. In turn 33, the learner starts in English and asks her question confidently in Kinyarwanda. The hesitation […] and silence (-) before switching to Kinyarwanda indicates that the learner does not know the terms in English, which is the reason why she asks the question in Kinyarwanda. The teacher's reply (turn 34) is given in Kinyarwanda, and it praises the learner for asking a good question. In this turn, the ML becomes Kinyarwanda and the key English words are embedded. The teacher explains the local knowledge in Kinyarwanda because he knows everyone can follow and understand the important information. It appears that both the teacher and learners share the same information regarding names of the current political organisation of the country in Kinyarwanda. Therefore, the use of Kinyarwanda to talk about their internal matters was favoured above English. Another feature indicating linguistic solidarity throughout the audio-recordings is that whenever the teacher asks a question such as '**Murabibona neza**' *(Can you see this clearly?'* or '**Murabyumva?**' *(Do*

you understand?'), learners reply in Kinyarwanda **'Yego'** *(yes)* (turn 35) instead of replying 'Yes' in English.

Code-switching for teacher's and learners' ease in the classroom

In addition to the linguistic solidarity discussed in the previous type of CS, the data reveals over-reliance on Kinyarwanda for two other reasons, i.e., for the sake of the teacher when s/he switches to Kinyarwanda seeking ease of expression in the classroom, and for the sake of the learners, when switching to Kinyarwanda serves to help learners understand and correctly use concepts in the language of instruction. The data suggests that the teachers' use of CS in which Kinyarwanda is the ML occurs when it becomes difficult for them to express ideas in English clearly. For instance, in extract 6.8, the teacher understands what *landlocked country* and *no coastline* mean, but explaining these concepts in English does not seem to be easy for him because he chooses to do it in Kinyarwanda. Consider the following example in extract 6.8:

Extract 6.8 [RS1/L1: Arrival and influence of foreigners]

36. T: **Twari twavuze ko Rwanda** is a [...] land […] land […] landlocked country. *(We have just said that Rwanda is a landlocked country).*
37. T: Landlocked country **bivuga iki?Ese u Rwanda rurakora ku nyanja?Ese u Rwanda ruri hagati ugereranyije n'Ribibihugu biri hano?***(What does landlocked country mean? Does Rwanda touch the coast of ocean? Is Rwanda surrounded by all of these countries?).* [Teacher points at the map showing how Rwanda does not touch the coasts of any ocean or sea].
38. T: **Iri jambo riravuga** no coast line. No coast line; eh... **murabyumva iyo mvuga** no coastline? [Some pupils nod]. **Ni ukuvuga ntabwo bigera hano ku Nyanja.** *(This word means no coast line. No coast line; eh…do you understand what I mean by no coastline? It means there is no link with the ocean).*

(Appendix B1/Les 1).

In extract 6.8, the teacher was explaining the concept *landlocked country*. In turn 36, the teacher starts explaining in Kinyarwanda and when he switches to English the hesitation marks […] indicate that it was difficult for him to pronounce the word 'landlocked'. In turn 37, the teacher switches to Kinyarwanda and explains the concept of a landlocked country,

and does it well with a demonstration on a map. In turn 38, he explains *no coastline* in both Kinyarwanda and English. It appears that the teacher makes a complete sentence in Kinyarwanda and uses phrases in English. This may mean that providing English explanations only was not possible for him because of a lack of English proficiency. Code-switching in this extract facilitates the teacher's task to explain concepts and enables him to provide content information. In interviews with this teacher, he states that he switches to Kinyarwanda when he finds it difficult to explain in English and when it is difficult for learners to understand in English:

> *…when it is difficult to find words in English I use Kinyarwanda in order to make myself understood and achieve the main objective of the lesson.*
> *…I have to speak in Kinyarwanda because all my pupils understand it well and they can ask what they do not understand* (TRS1).

The statement shows reliance on Kinyarwanda for the benefit of the teacher when explaining in English only is not possible. The example also shows that the teacher believes that learners benefit from CS because when the teacher switches to Kinyarwanda, this facilitates the learners' understanding of the content. In this way, it appears that CS is likely to help the teacher enhance the learners' knowledge, because switching to Kinyarwanda enables learners to grasp difficult ideas and concepts. The data shows that teachers insist on repeating the terms and their equivalences in Kinyarwanda for pupils to learn the English terminology. We can say here that CS serves to help pupils learn how to say in English what they already know in Kinyarwanda. This can be illustrated in extract 6.9:

Extract 6.9 [RS2/L5: Our national flag]

39. T: Wealth is a noun from the adjective wealthy. When you say for example Mugenzi is a wealthy man, we mean that he has money, he has cars, he is rich. Do you understand?
40. Ls: Yes.
41. T: What wealthy means?
42. Ls: (-).
43. T: Look, Mugenzi is a wealthy man. It means he is rich. **Ni umukire. Afite ubutunzi**. Wealth **ni ubukire**. The colour, […], the yellow means that Rwandans must be what?
44. Ls: Wealth, rich, wealthy
45. T: Rwandans must be wealthy. **Mwabyumvise? Abanyarwanda bagomba gukira. Bagomba kugira ubukungu. Mwabyumvise?**
46. Ls: **Yego** *(Yes)*.

In extract 6.9, the lesson concerns the colours of the Rwandan flag and their meanings. In the extract, the teacher is explaining what 'yellow' means. Turn 39 shows that the teacher is explaining the adjective 'wealthy' by providing an example that learners know well in order to help them understand that the yellow in the flag of Rwanda means 'wealth'. In turn 43, the teacher adds explanations, but, in turn 44 learners get confused between wealth and wealthy. To clear the learners' confusion, the teacher switches to Kinyarwanda (turn 45).

Both extracts 6.8 and 6.9 show how teachers rely on the use of Kinyarwanda to ensure the learners' comprehension of concepts in English. One can draw from the above extracts that teachers assume that their learners do not understand what they say in English even when their English explanations are clear. This makes the teacher resort to CS because they are not sure whether or not they have made themselves understood in the language of instruction. Research has shown that teachers with less professional experience and less English proficiency tend to overuse CS (Auerbach, 1993; Cook, 2001; Crawford, 2004; Mouhanna, 2009). For instance in this study's data some teachers resort to using Kinyarwanda and only use English for the lesson's terminology and key words. As stated by Crawford (2004), the more proficient teachers are in the target language, the less they use their native language. In this logic, it has also been shown that teachers who code-switch are most often competent in both the target language and the native language (Brock-Utne, 2005), and the instances of the concerned CS are one-way, i.e., the switching is done from the target language to the native

language and not the other way around. In the context of Rwanda, this literature does not seem to be applicable because, as Table 6.1 and most extracts in the analysis show, the CS in the 16 observed lessons extends beyond the boundaries of most research findings in the above-mentioned literature.

Contrary to many cases in the literature (Crawford, 2004; Moodley & Kamwangamalu, 2004; Mouhanna, 2009; Moodley, 2003, 2007, 2010, 2013) where interests have often been directed to one-way CS among bilingual speakers, often proficient in both languages, the present study shows that the frequent instances of two way CS, i.e., both switching from English to Kinyarwanda and switching from Kinyarwanda to English, is probably the consequence of insufficient English proficiency. This observation can be supported by the fact that the frequency of CS in the context of Rwanda, especially K-E CS, seems to be high in terms of the quantity of Kinyarwanda used if compared to Atkinson' ratio of normal and profitable CS. Even though Atkinson's research was conducted in a different context from that of Rwanda, the findings are useful to the present study. In fact, Atkinson's (1987, 1993) research on second language learning argues for the use of the first language for successful learning of the target language, and limits the use of the native language to 5% and 95% for the target language. In the context of Rwanda where English is learnt as a foreign language, 5% maximum for the MT usage would be too little and too difficult to manage. However, Atkinson's recommendation of using 5% MT as profitable CS correlates with the idea of strategic CS mentioned earlier, and which the researcher uses as an evaluative model of CS in the context of learning English as a foreign language in Rwanda. The estimates of the use of CS by teachers throughout the samples of 16 lessons in Appendix B reveal that, on average, Kinyarwanda was used at approximately 39% and English at approximately 61%. These percentages indicate that the four teachers of SS over-rely on Kinyarwanda, thus overuse CS in the English-medium classes because the percentages, i.e. 39% Kinyarwanda and 61% English, are far higher than Atkinson's acceptable and reasonable CS from the language of teaching to the learners' MT. The researcher is aware that the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of CS cannot be measured by the number of switches or number of words in the native language, but the above-mentioned numbers are significant and support the researcher's position to the over-use of Kinyarwanda in English-medium classrooms.

Although Atkinson (1987) argues for the role of the native language in learning the target language, the over-reliance on the MT while learning the target language may result in problems such as:

1. the teacher and/or the students begin to feel that they have not 'really' understood any item of language until it has been translated;
2. the teacher and/or the students fail to observe distinctions between equivalence of form, semantic equivalence, and pragmatic features, and thus oversimplify to the point of using crude and inaccurate translations;
3. students speak to the teacher in the MT as a matter of course, even when they are quite capable of expressing what they mean; and
4. students fail to realise that during many activities in the classroom it is crucial that they use English only (Atkinson, 1987, p. 246).

Such problems are quite similar to what teachers and learners in the samples of this study experience. As shown in some teachers' lessons, especially TRS1, the ML becomes Kinyarwanda and English the EL, which, according to Atkinson (1987), hinders the learning of English. For instance, the CS used in extract 6.9 reflects the over-reliance on Kinyarwanda for the benefit of the teacher because it enables her to express herself easily in the classroom, but it hinders the learners' progress in English since they do not practice the English words through which they learn the content of SS.

Based on pedagogic principles, the data indicates that CS in the SS lesson is not used strategically. In effect, the higher percentages of the use of Kinyarwanda suggest the use of this language to the extent that it is used as ML, which, according to Moodley (2013) hinders the learning of the target language. However, in terms of content, the data suggests that the learners understand the content more easily when more Kinyarwanda is used. This practice has implications on communicating content knowledge in the language of instruction. The ongoing lack of development of English skills affects the learners' performance during assessment. It can be noted that Atkinson (1987) and Moodley (2013) concur on the invaluable role of the first language in learning the target language when switching between both languages is done strategically.

The overuse of CS due to insufficient English proficiency in this study can also be traced from the interview data. The analysis of the principals' behaviour towards the teachers' and learners' code-switching reveals that PRS1 and PRS2 take switching between languages as a normal process of teaching and learning, because they know that the teachers' and learners' English proficiency is insufficient to enable them to teach and learn in English only.

> *(i) It is normal for me ...our teachers have not yet mastered English, and our pupils don't understand when teachers talk to them in English only* (PRS1).
> *(ii) It does not bother me! ...teachers are not skilled well yet in speaking English; they are not fluent in English. When they get stuck they use Kinyarwanda* (PRS2).

However, PUS1 and PUS2 do not encourage teachers to switch between languages in the classroom. For these principals, mixing languages prevents the practice of the language of instruction that teachers and their pupils need in order to improve their English proficiency.

(i) *I don't normally encourage mixing languages especially when one is teaching. ...teachers should know and use different methods of teaching, so that, after trying and seeing that problems are still there, then, translation can be used, eh, but as the last solution* (PUS1).
(ii) *In meetings with teachers, I encourage them to use English only because it helps learners to adopt the culture of using the language of teaching* (PUS2).

These interviews express opposite perceptions of CS in terms of the rural and urban divide, which is also reflected by the data in Table 6.1. The majority of teachers in rural schools (75%) agree that they code-switch in the classroom, while in urban schools it is a minority (49%) of teachers who agree that they code-switch. It seems that differences of perception between principals in terms of the rural and urban divide is based on their perceptions about the teachers' English proficiency. From the interviews it is apparent that teachers in urban schools are regarded as more proficient in English than their counterparts in rural schools. This observation has some evidence in the results of the analysis of instances of CS in Table 6.2. This table shows that TRS1 code-switches more than other teachers, and that in this classroom the K-E CS is more than the E-K CS. The case of the other rural school, TRS2, reflects similar data in two lessons.

For teachers, CS is important in the classroom. It is evident from the interviews that teachers switch to Kinyarwanda because they prioritise the content. TRS1, whose lessons seem to overuse CS (see Table 6.2) and over-rely on Kinyarwanda, claims 'I want my pupils to learn more content in the language they understand better which is Kinyarwanda'. To explain such practices, this teacher states that he does not have any other option because it is through the MT that his pupils can learn more content. This is an indication of the teachers' assumption that learners do not understand the content well if they do not get explanations in Kinyarwanda. However, one of the four teachers points out that over-reliance on Kinyarwanda exists, which, according to him, has become a culture that hinders the mastery of foreign languages in Rwanda. He states:

> *I think, we, Rwandans, have to change our behaviour towards language use. Yes, we love our language but we also need international languages. We cannot speak these languages without practice. 'Practice makes perfect', that's a saying! If we don't change our behaviour, we won't speak foreign languages. It often surprises me, we learn English in class, but out of it, it is Kinyarwanda. You go in offices, people will always be speaking Kinyarwanda!* (TUS1).

This extract indicates that the overuse of Kinyarwanda in the classroom may also originate from the priority that Rwandans give to Kinyarwanda and the behaviour of Kinyarwanda speakers when they meet. In the classroom, teachers and learners use English and code-switch, but outside the classroom they speak Kinyarwanda because it is the language they all understand and through which they can express their cultural affiliation and affective engagement. It seems that this affinity with the MT is also the cause of CS and over-use of Kinyarwanda in the classroom. As noted in Chapter Four, most participants have positive attitudes towards English, a factor that would normally trigger much practice of English and promote its effective learning. However, as expressed in the above interview, the Rwandans' behaviour towards language use does not promote effective learning of foreign languages. This has also been the view of varied research findings (Ntakirutimana, 2005; Niyomugabo, 2008; Maniraho, 2013), which show that the predominance of Kinyarwanda in all domains, official and non-official, is one of the factors hindering the practice of foreign languages in Rwanda. This behaviour of attaching more importance to Kinyarwanda is also reflected in this study, where Kinyarwanda's frequent use tends to affect the practice of English.

Interviews reflect different language strategies that teachers use to help learners understand SS. The data shows that teaching through English requires teachers to supplement English with Kinyarwanda for ease of expression in the classroom and to ensure learners' comprehension of the lesson content. From the teachers' statements, it appears that the four interviewees acknowledge their lack of familiarity with English as the source of teaching difficulties. To address those language challenges due to English as the MoI, teachers resort to CS and to supplementing the language with other teaching strategies that are part of pedagogical devices presented in Section 6.2.2.

Summary

CS as identified in the audio-recordings was used by teachers for different purposes, such as to explain concepts, vocabulary, or language structures. There were cases of CS to elaborate on certain points, to give instructions in the classroom, to check comprehension, or to introduce new information. CS was also resorted to as a means that teachers use for their ease of expression in the classroom and for linguistic solidarity with learners. The data shows that teacher participants code-switch from E-K or vice versa, and that there were no instances of CS between English and French. It was evident that, for the benefit of teachers, CS helps teachers explain clearly and ensure that the content has been conveyed to learners. The analysis of the words for which teachers are required to switch to Kinyarwanda indicates that most of these words are abstract words, culturally-specific words, or technically scientific words. Observations revealed that for most concrete words, teachers either use maps, symbols, gestures, or pictures to facilitate the learners' understanding. This is described in the next section.

6.2.2 Use of non-verbal communication aids

'Non-verbal communication aids' refer to any strategy of communicating meaning rather than spoken communication. The analysis of the data from questionnaires, classroom observations, and audio-recordings of lessons and interviews revealed that teachers have several ways of presenting the lesson content using various tools, either available in the classroom or those they use outside of the classroom. These teaching strategies are used to support or replace verbal explanations that the teachers provide. In this section, the researcher

presents different pedagogical devices that were observed in the classroom practices in order to show the impact of English as the MoI on learning processes.

6.2.2.1 Use of teaching aids

The findings from the questionnaires (92%, p = 0.0001) indicate that the overwhelming majority of teachers agree that they use teaching aids in their lessons, i.e. any device or object used by the teacher to clarify or enliven the lesson. The open-ended responses indicate that 24 of the teachers who were given a questionnaire wrote 'the use of teaching aids' (Appendix A2e) as a strategy they use when they are teaching through English. Observations of lessons revealed that the four Grade 6 classrooms were equipped with basic material resources usually found in the classroom such as blackboards, chalk, rubbers, rulers, and other materials teachers bring in using their own initiative, in an effort to explain knowledge or lesson concepts. For instance, all four teachers of SS came to class with at least two maps, i.e. a world map or a globe and a geographical map of Rwanda illustrating the five provinces of Rwanda and their various geographical features. Almost all classrooms had drawings of various mathematical shapes such as spheres, squares, rectangles, triangles, and prisms. In addition to these teaching aids, the classrooms were furnished with learners' desks, the teacher's desk, and chair, a cupboard for the teacher's books and notebooks, and the learners' books.

All four teachers that the researcher observed made use of the teaching aids to make themselves much clearer. Teachers used these objects in order to embellish the lessons, and they often served to make the teachers' explanations more understandable and clearer to learners, as two of the teachers stated:

> *(i) It is easy and simple when a teacher explains to pupils what something means by drawing, doing or showing a picture of what it means.* (TUS1).
>
> *(ii) You can't come to class without didactic materials[20]! For me they are as important as the language of instruction because when it is difficult to explain something in English you use them and pupils understand* (TRS2).

[20] Teachers often use the term 'didactic materials' to mean teaching aids.

Principals also support the use of teaching aids and encourage teachers to have adequate teaching aids to help them express ideas clearly when providing English explanations is difficult.

(i) *We have trained our teachers on how to use teaching aids because we know that they have not yet mastered English. We assist them in the pedagogy they need for English as the language of instruction* (PUS2).

(ii) *A solution to English problems is the use of teaching aids; they do apply their pedagogy for successful teaching!* (PRS2)

These interview statements indicate how English is a challenge in the classroom. It can be seen that English as the MoI requires the teacher's expertise in using teaching aids to mediate learning. It is evident in the data that neither teachers nor principals trust the teachers' ability to transmit knowledge through English only, because of their limited proficiency in the language. Therefore, they use teaching aids such as maps and globes, even if they are necessary tools for any teacher of geography for instance, they play a particularly important meditational role in the context of teaching through English as a foreign language. The teaching aids compensate the limited interactions in English, thus promoting effective learning of the content.

6.2.2.2 Use of body language, miming, and gestures

In the classrooms, teachers used body language, miming, and gestures as techniques to help learners understand the lessons without talking too much or spending too much energy looking for appropriate language to express an idea or explain the meaning of a word. For instance in the lesson about foreign influence in Rwanda, TRS1 used a box of chalk that he put on his head imitating a person going to the market to sell a basket of potatoes. This teacher did this to explain the word 'trader' supporting his words to explain 'traders' as 'people who take goods from one place and bring them to another place' (teacher's definition). Similarly, to help learners understand the importance of water to humans, TRS2 mimed 'we drink water' by imitating someone putting a bottle of water to the mouth, 'we swim in water' by bending as if he was lying on water, stretching his arms and swinging them to simulate movement in water. To explain the cause of earthquakes, TUS1 made

gestures to show how magma shakes the earth during an earthquake. The teacher shook his body as he articulated the phrase 'shakes the earth' (see Extract 6.10):

Extract 6.10 [US1/L12: Physical features of Rwanda]

47. T: Now, listen carefully, if the magma hits a very hard rock and can't come out, it shakes the earth! [Teacher shakes his body as someone shivering with the cold] The movements of the magma hitting the rock, going there and coming back here makes the earth shake and that is earthquake.

Extract 6.10 shows that the teacher understands the meaning of the concept 'earthquake' well and is able to explain it clearly in good English. The mimes in this explanation serve to reinforce meaning and help learners grasp it effectively.

From observations, teachers are good at illustrating ideas by appropriate and adequate teaching aids. They consciously show that they are skilled in selecting the kind of gestures or mimes that make sense to learners so that they can retain and easily remember what has been taught through such teaching aids and gesticulation. However, the lack of adequate language explanations in English to accompany gestures or mimes is likely to assist comprehension of concepts, but not to assist in the expression of the concepts. As a consequence, learners become frustrated when they have to explain in English, what they know about a given concept or idea, either verbally or in writing. Extracts 6.11 and 6.12 provide examples of such a case.

Extract 6.11 [RS1/L4: Important places in Rwanda]

48. T: Volcano eruption. Do you know what volcano eruption is? (.) **Ukuruka kw' Ikirunga** *(volcano eruption)*. Look here, this is magma **yasohotse ikajya hanze** *(*this is magma *that exploded out)*, then eh [...] it makes puum....[Teacher mimes signs for explosion] (.) there is fire here! Eh, and after some days, [...] **ya miriro ivamo amakoro** *(those hot semi-solid liquids become volcano ashes)*. This picture is a volcano eruption. Do you understand?

49. Ls: Yes.

Extract 6.12 [US1/L12: Physical features of Rwanda]

50. T: What is this?
51. L: It is a volcano vomiting. [Learners and teacher laugh].
52. T: Yes, okay, good Fiona, a volcano vomiting! **Mu Kinyarwanda tuvuga ko ikirunga cyarutse!** *(In Kinyarwanda we say that 'a volcano has vomited'),* right? In English we don't say 'a volcano vomits', but we say 'a volcano erupts'.

In extract 6.11, the teacher is equipped with relevant teaching tools, i.e. a picture showing a volcano eruption and skills of miming. He understands what a volcano eruption is, but he does not manage to explain it in English. Learners who are required to explain what a volcano eruption is during examinations are going to find it difficult to do so because the teacher's explanation does not provide a clear definition and context of the concept; what has been provided is a Kinyarwanda translation 'ukuruka kw' ikirunga' *(volcano eruption)*, which, as seen in another class session (see Extract 6.12), if the context has not been well understood, this can mislead learners who may provide the wrong explanation, such as 'volcano vomiting' instead of 'volcano eruption' since 'ukuruka' in Kinyarwanda also means 'vomit'. In fact, turn 51 shows that the learner provides what she knows by translating the Kinyarwanda term to English in a context that the word does not fit. In turn 52, the teacher understands what the learner wants to say and translates the idea in Kinyarwanda in order to correct the learner without embarrassing her.

The above example clearly shows how the teacher's lack of language proficiency inhibits the learners' expression of concepts when they have to answer questions in a test or examination. The evidence for this can be drawn from extract 6.11. Even if learners affirmed that they had understood (turn 49), they did so as a matter of routine, not because they had necessarily did understand. After the lesson when the researcher asked a group of six pupils to explain what a volcano eruption was, they simply said it means 'ikirunga cyarutse' *(a volcano which erupted)*. No one could explain the concept in English, or at least repeat what the teacher had said, because the teacher failed to provide a clear English definition.

6.2.2.3 Use of visual aids

Visual aids are part of teaching aids. In this study, they refer to both physical and digital aids, and they are highlighted here to show how a variety of methods using visual aids enhances effective learning. Visual aids identified that were in the observed classes are drawings, maps, pictures, videos, and hand-crafted objects representing natural environmental features. For instance, teachers draw pictures on the blackboard, demonstrate on the map, show pictures from the books, and play videos when they get time and opportunity. In most classes, teachers often use drawings to help learners understand quickly. Even for those teachers who cannot draw well, when they do draw pictures reflecting the ideas they want to express, learners understand better and more easily than when they have to identify meaning from language only. The use of maps and pictures serve to lead-in, elicit, and prompt some ideas and language from learners. For instance TUS1 uses a picture to explain the concept *volcanic eruption* (see Extract 12). Immediately after showing the picture of ashes and fire and stones at the peak of a mountain, a learner understood that it was a 'volcano vomiting', which reflected her previous knowledge of the phenomenon in Kinyarwanda. Even if the expression of the concept was wrong, the learner's comprehension had taken place, and from the learner's response towards the visual, the teacher could provide the correct English term and was sure of the learners' comprehension.

Videos are useful tools to lead-in, elicit, explain, and illustrate. In this study, although some schools, such as US1, US2, and RS2, had video equipment, there was no lesson that used a video aid. However, TUS1 referred to a film that was shown to learners some days before the lesson to explain water transport (see Appendix B3/L9). More interestingly, US2 had an object of art designed by the learners who were assisted by the music and art teacher during a creative competition at that school. This object illustrates the physical features of Rwanda and it is made of clay and painted in different colours to show the waterways, flora, snow, lowlands, highlands, sky, and so on. To teach content related to volcanoes, hills, plains, plateaus, valleys, and waterfalls, the teacher used that art object and the map.

Teachers use visuals in order to help learners understand the content of the lessons. Two teacher interviewees stated that visual aids facilitate the teacher's task and make the learners' comprehension easier.

(i) *The reason I use many visuals is because they help me in providing explanations and it is good for learners because, with visuals, comprehension is easy and quick* (TUS2).

(ii) *There are some terms which are not easy to explain in English without visual materials (*TRS2).

From these interview statements, it seems that teaching in English requires teachers to use more visual materials than they would usually use when teaching in a language they are familiar with. During one observation, TRS1 performed an interesting teaching activity. It was an afternoon and learners appeared tired. The teacher took them outside the classroom behind the school where we could see geographical features such as the peak of a mountain, the root of a mountain, valleys, hills, and plains, and other natural features such as horizons and clouds. In a conversation, this teacher told me that he often takes learners out of the classroom to show them natural phenomena that he wants to teach them. During a twenty minutes outdoor session, TRS1 pointed out the highlands, lowlands, valleys, mountains, and hills that he had explained previously to the learners in the classroom. After this session, the researcher realised that learners could clearly distinguish those concepts in their MT, and that helped them learn the concepts more easily in English. The findings from interviews with this teacher indicate that he believes that looking at physical features naturally provides better instruction than talking about something in the abstract.

> *I do the outdoors lessons; I take learners out of the classroom and show them real things. Showing learners real objects such as mountains, valleys, or natural phenomena such as horizons, dawn, mist and so on, makes more sense to learners, and, for me, it helps me explain better than when I simply talk about things pupils cannot see* (TRS1).

Although this strategy instructs learners more naturally, it requires more skills and attention to monitor the class to avoid wasting time. From the examples provided in this section, it appears that teachers use visual materials in SS to facilitate explanations in English, and it seems that teachers claim that they use more visuals than they used to do before English was made the MoI.

6.2.2.4 Other strategies

The data from the questionnaires revealed CS and use of non-verbal communication aids as the main strategies teachers use to address the classroom challenges posed by English as the MoI. The analysis of qualitative data revealed more strategies, namely use of drills for the retention of vocabulary, and the use of label quests to negotiate meaning. Both strategies are discussed in the next sections.

Use of drills for retention of vocabulary

Drills consist of giving learners intensive and controlled practice in the classroom (Atkinson, 1993). They are practiced and led by the teacher in order to help learners assimilate terms. Teachers use drills as a strategy to help learners assimilate and remember concepts by repeating them in a fun atmosphere. The following extract illustrates the use of drills.

Extract 6.13 [RS1/L2: Arrival and influence of foreigners]

53. T: ...in the 19th century, **habayeho** *(there was)* industrial revolution. Industrial what? ↑
54. Ls: Revolution.
55. T: Industrial ….. ↑
56. Ls: Revolution
57. T: Industrial revolution. Repeat ↑.
58. Ls: Industrial revolution.
59. T: Okay! This time Europeans came in Africa as traders.

All the teachers in the audio-recorded data used drills. In Extract 6.13, the teacher simply made pupils repeat terms ‘industrial revolution’ many times. By repeating, pupils could learn pronunciation but there was no evidence that they understood what ‘industrial revolution’ means. It appeared that the teacher does not engage in content explanation because he went on with the next point. This skip may mean that either the teacher does not want to struggle explaining the concept in English and pretends that the concept has been understood, or he wants to advance the lesson to make up lost time. According to Rubagumya (2003, p.162), this practice characterised by ‘the encouragement of chorus answers from pupils, repeating

phrases or words after the teacher and copying notes from the blackboard' gives the appearance of teaching the lesson, while little is actually being learnt. When this is done because the teacher lacks the confidence or language skills to work with meaning, this has been referred to as 'safe talk' (Heller & Martin, 2001). As shown in the literature, drills and safe talk often occur because of language barriers that push the teacher to make learners repeat and memorise lessons instead of helping to understand them (Alidou & Brock-Utne, 2011).

Critiques on the traditional behaviourist drilling methods indicate that repeating words and phrases correctly, many times, does not lead to mastery of content, because language learning is a more complex and creative process (Cameron, 2001; Tice, 2004). In SS, teachers use repetition drills mechanically by making learners memorise, and the danger of such practice is that learners regurgitate without understanding. Even if repetition drills can sometimes help learners familiarise themselves with new words or new grammatical forms for content learning, teachers are advised to use substitution drills that give pupils learning opportunities by transforming what the teacher provides. For instance, in teaching a grammatical structure using '*let's',* the teacher can provide words, pictures, or prompts for learners to produce a sentence, as in:

> T: Cinema.
> Ls: Let's go to the cinema.
> T: Football.
> Ls: Let's play football.
> (Doff, 1988 cited in Cameron, 2005, p. 118).

In this example, learners are able to show their understanding of the structure by using the word provided by the teacher with the appropriate verb after *let's*. This kind of drill encourages the learners' creative skills because it leads them to think about matching the word provided by the teacher with the right verb in their own sentence. For instance, after the first sentence, *Let's go to the cinema*, learners did not think of using *go to* with *football,* they used *play,* thus, showing their understanding of the words and structure.

The observed data on drills usage suggests more professional language teaching to help learners acquire English in a creative way. In addition to drills, qualitative data displays label quests, which are presented below.

Label quests to negotiate meaning

As illustrated in Extracts 6.14 and 6.15, label quests were identified in this study as techniques in which teachers start the first syllable to help learners remember the concept. In this practice, learners are expected to provide the targeted concepts after the teacher has only pronounced the first syllable of the word, as illustrated in Extract 6.15.

Extract 6.14 [US1/L10: Physical features of Rwanda]

60. T: What is this? What is this?
61. Lr1: Agriculture.
62. T: Agriculture? [Teacher nods the head] What is this? Look carefully on the picture. What are these things?
63. Lr2: Plantation beans.
64. T: Good, plantation of....↑ (.) class, plantation of... ↑
65. Ls: Beans.
66. T: Plantation of beans. Plantation of beans. Repeat class, all of you.
67. Ls: Plantation of beans.

Extract 6.15:

68. T: The hot air is transformed into claaa... ↑ [the sound is /kra:/]
69. Ls: Clouds. (Appendix B1/Les...)
70. T: Another group of foreigners we have here is Tra… ↑ [The sound is /trei/]
71. L: Traders. (Appendix B4/ Les..)
72. T: ...for the meeting of the prime minister, ministers and ministers of state together, we use the name Caaa… ↑ [The sound is /ka:/]
73. Ls: Cabinet. (Appendix B3/Les ...)

In Extract 6.14, the lesson is about the importance of physical features of Rwanda, and the teacher is explaining the importance of hills as having fertile land for crops such as beans. In turn 60, the teacher is eliciting the concept ‘plantation of beans’. He shows a picture and

waits for learners to mention the name. By trial and error, learners get to the almost correct answer. In turn 64, the teacher leads learners to the correct answer by changing his intonation (↑) and leaving learners to complete the half of the response. The label quest is complete in turn 66 where the answer is provided in full, then, learners are asked to repeat it for memorisation. Label quests were used in almost all the lessons for word and concept learning through repetition and memorisation. For instance, in Extract 6.15, the words *clouds*, *traders* and *cabinet* are taught through label quests, and this helps teachers check whether learners have learnt and can remember the concepts. As seen with drills, label quests also help shy learners to repeat the words and phrases, practice in groups, and to remember the meaning and the use of the words.

From the above discussion, one can deduce that using drills and label quests contributes to helping pupils learn new forms of the language in terms of vocabulary and grammar, by repeating and memorising them. Echoing Cameron (2001), learning through repetition and memorisation does not guarantee the learners' comprehension, i.e., there is no certainty that pupils are able to use what they learnt on their own in different contexts. In the context of this study, it seems that teachers choose drills and label quests because they are easy to monitor. They are strategies which facilitate teaching especially when there is insufficient proficiency in the language of instruction. It is worth noting that while some of these strategies are useful for learning form, few of them work with meaning. For successful language and content teaching it is important that teachers work with both.

6.3 Strategies used by learners

Learners utilise different strategies to address the classroom challenges of English as the MoI. The analysis of the responses from the questionnaire indicates two strategies and a disposition as follows:

(i) Strategy 1: Code-switching.
(ii) Strategy 2: Peer consultations.
(iii) Disposition: Perseverance in learning in English.

These strategies and their percentages are presented in Table 6.2.

Table 6.2: Strategies used by learners to address the classroom challenges posed by English as the MoI

Strategies		**Overall results**			**Comparison**				
					Rural schools		**Urban schools**		
No	Statement	A	D	*p*	A	D	A	D	*p*
(i)	Learners code-switch in the classroom.	**60**	40	0.0001	**72**	28	37	**63**	<0.0001
(ii)	Learners consult with peers in the classroom.	**65**	35	< 0.0001	**69**	31	**59**	41	0.0080
(iii)	Learners persevere in learning in English.	**53**	47	0.0439	**68**	32	33	**67**	0.0001

Table 6.2 illustrates the findings of the analysis of the questionnaire in terms of the learners' responses regarding strategies they use to address the classroom challenges caused by English as the MoI. It also shows the findings of a comparison of the data from rural schools and urban schools. The three strategies are presented in detail as follows:

6.3.1 Code-switching

The findings from the analysis of the questionnaires indicate that learners switch between languages with teachers and peers in order to express their ideas and understand content information. As Table 6.2 reflects, the majority of learners (60%, $p = 0.0001$) agree that they code-switch. Similarly, the data from audio-recordings of lessons demonstrate that learners code-switch imitating their teachers. For instance, in Extract 6.6, in turn 30, the teacher asks a question in Kinyarwanda '**Ni iki mwumvise?'** (*What have you understood?*), and in turn 31 the learner answers by code-switching: '**Numvise ko ibara ry'umuhondo rivuga** wealth **aribyo ubukungu cyangwa ubukire**, **naho** blue **ni** peace **bivuga amahoro'** *(I understood that yellow means wealth which is richness while blue means peace).* It is clear from this example that the learner's CS is triggered by the teacher's question in Kinyarwanda. Such instances occurred frequently and naturally as in the circumstances where teachers ask questions such as 'Do you understand?' or 'Are we together?' and learners answer with a 'Yes' or 'No'. If these questions were asked in Kinyarwanda, the data indicates that learners also answered in Kinyarwanda.

The teacher's influence on the learners' CS can also be identified from the learners' focus group interviews. The findings reveal that the majority of learners claim that they ask their teachers to translate for them in Kinyarwanda when they do not understand the English. For instance four of them mention:

(i) *I ask him to translate and give an example in Kinyarwanda. That's how I can understand.* (US2/Lr3)

(ii) *When you ask a question in Kinyarwanda, the teacher also answers in Kinyarwanda and you understand explanations.* (US1/Lr1)

(iii) *Examples that the teacher gives us in Kinyarwanda help us to understand social studies because many lessons are difficult in English.* (RS1/Lr5)

From the above statements, one can ascertain that learners deal with language barriers due to English as the MoI by asking teachers to translate for them and provide examples in Kinyarwanda, and by code-switching with the teachers and classmates in order to understand the content. For learners, switching to Kinyarwanda is a facilitative way of understanding the content in English. For teachers, learners code-switch because they do not have any other

option. The lack of vocabulary and grammar in English makes learners express their ideas in Kinyarwanda.

> *I feel that they do not have any other alternative. …some words are difficult to pronounce in English, or they do not know the appropriate words to say what they know in Kinyarwanda* (TRS2).

Unlike teachers, one principal does not tolerate learners who code-switch, because he believes that code-switching is a hindrance to learning English.

> *...it is a problem and I don't like it because it affects practising English* (PUS1)

For this principal, CS in the classroom does not promote the learning of the target language. His statement echoes some researchers' argument against CS (Canale & Swain, 1986; Tarone & Swain, 1995), who state that using CS in the classroom inhibits the learners' efforts to understand the target language because CS encourages learners to wait for the translation. However, opposite views in support of CS demonstrate that by using CS strategically the learning of the target language is promoted, the learners' cognitive and linguistic skills are developed, and the teacher's classroom management and pedagogical strategies are facilitated (Moodley & Kamwangamalu, 2004; Moodley, 2007, 2010, 2013). Extract 6.6 illustrates a good example in which a learner demonstrates her understanding of the terms 'wealth', 'blue' and 'peace' when she switches to Kinyarwanda. The same extract also shows that CS helps the teacher make herself understood when she explains the concepts of'prosperity' and 'productivity' by elaborating in Kinyarwanda. Even if the CS in that extract is not used strategically, it helps in content learning. Similarly, interviews with two principals reveal that code-switching is a part of learning when the target language is not well known by learners.

(i) *They can't use the language they cannot speak... I cannot blame learners!* (PUS2).

(ii) *The use of Kinyarwanda is inevitable this time when English is being learnt. Children use it to understand English words; they learn a language through another, and that's how we learnt French when we were young!* (PRS1)

The above statements reveal the necessity of CS in learning through English in Rwanda. Most of the principals believe that teachers and learners need to learn English and regard CS

as a normal part of the process of learning a target language. Apart from PUS1 who takes CS as a hindrance to English and imposes strict use of English-only at school, the other three principals understand the reasons why learners code-switch and are flexible on the use of both English and Kinyarwanda in teaching and learning in Rwanda. As noted in the findings from the analysis of the questionnaire and interviews, most principals encourage CS for the benefit of teaching and learning content, and claim to promote the learning of English. It appears that the principals' perspectives regarding the use of CS to remedy English challenges in the classrooms is based on the language abilities demonstrated by their teachers and learners.

A comparison of the rural and urban schools indicates a significant difference ($p < 0.0001$) in CS, in which the rural schools appear to be more involved in CS than the urban schools. The reasons for this difference are not clear in the audio-recordings because learners often produce one word answers or question in one language depending on which language the teacher used at the end of his explanation. The data from the focus groups also indicates that learners from both rural and urban schools equally claim that switching to Kinyarwanda in SS enables them to express themselves and understand the content. Other evidence can be found in the next section, in which all the learners support peer learning because they can use both languages.

6.3.2 Peer consultations

Another strategy that learners use to address language challenges is to consult their peers. As Table 6.3 shows, the majority of learners (65%, $p < 0.0001$) agree that they consult their peers, i.e. classmates, and, when necessary, ask the teacher, or consult a dictionary in order to understand the content of SS lessons in English. As shown in Chapter Five, there were two sessions in which teachers organised group work. The analysed group discussions reveal that learners code-switch when they are explaining to each other. Consider the following example in which learners were trying to answer the teacher's question: 'Why are museums important to us?'

Extract 6.16:

74. Lr1: **Turavuga kuri** (*Are we talking about*) museums? National museum?
75. Lr2: Yes, museum. Why museums are important to us. Number one?
76. Lr3: They are, […] **habayo ibintu ndangamuco** *(There are cultural objects)*.
77. Lr2: Yes, **ibintu ndangamuco, mu Cyongereza ni**…(*Cultural objects, in English they are called…*)
78. Lr4: **Ndakizi (***I know it)***, ni** (*it is)* cultural objects. Cultural objects.
79. Lr2: Cultural objects **nibyo** *(you are right)*. **Reka ncyandike** *(Let me write it)*. One,… cultural objects.
80. Lr3: **We!** *(You guys!)* **Tuvuge ku macumu n'imiheto** *(Let's talk about spears and arrows)* and traditional clothes, **sibyo?***(right?)*

Extract 6.16 illustrates an example of peer CS for social and psychological benefits of the learners. In this extract, learners help each other to remember and learn words in English through CS. This group comprised five members, and Lr2 was leading the discussion and taking notes. In this discussion, a learner could ask for clarification on the task to be done (Turn 74) or ask group-mates for help to recall or learn words in English (Turn 77). In the extract it is evident that by CS the learner reinforces her confidence in telling her classmates that she knows the correct answer, and, in this case, CS serves a psychological function (Turn 78). In addition, this extract indicates a social function of CS expressed in turn 80 where the learner calls group-mates informally in Kinyarwanda using '**we!'** *(you guys!)*. The learner communicates naturally with friends, thus fulfilling a social function. From the observed groups, it appears that learners enjoy peer collaboration because they get opportunities to use their MT in order to understand the content well. This finding is not surprising because, as Donald et al. (2006) state, peer collaboration increases the learners' confidence and enhances their ability to solve problems in their own ways, and in a more social and natural situation. In her study on the strategies that students at higher education at the University of Rwanda use to cope with English as the language MoI, Kagwesage (2013) found that informal well-structured peer collaboration was a construct that the students adopted in order to overcome their language problems. Similarly, in the context of the Rwandan primary education, learners feel more comfortable if they are given opportunities to have peer mentoring in which they interact in both English and Kinyarwanda. This strategy reduces the learners' frustration and increases their understanding opportunities, thus enabling them to achieve effective learning.

A comparison of the findings from rural schools and urban schools indicates that there is a significant difference (p = 0.0080) in which the rural schools (69%) use this strategy more than the urban school (59%), but the reason is not clear. During observations, before learners could ask the teacher a question, they often talked to each other in Kinyarwanda about a new concept that the teacher had just introduced. When the researcher asked them why they talk to each other instead of talking to the teacher and to the whole class, many of learners replied:

(i) *Because the teacher will ask me to say it in English* (US1/Lr3).
(ii) *With friends we talk in Kinyarwanda* (RS1/Lr1).
(iii) *A classmate explains in Kinyarwanda* (US2/Lr5).
(iv) *When I don't understand, my friend explains in Kinyarwanda* (RS2/Lr3).

From their statements it can be observed that irrespective of the rural and urban divide, the learners prefer consulting each other because they can talk in Kinyarwanda.

6.3.3 Perseverance in learning in English

The findings from the analysis of the statements given to learners to investigate their behaviour when they are faced with language challenges in the classroom indicate the learners' disposition towards persevering to learn in English. The results (53%, p = 0.0439) indicate that most learners are determined to learn English despite difficulties they have in the classroom. From the questionnaire it appears that most learners agree with statements such as, *In the Social Studies class in English, I have to force myself to listen to the teacher,* and disagree with, *When the teacher asks me a question in English, I do not answer it.* The responses to these statements may depend on various reasons linked to how much learners like or dislike the lesson, the teacher, or English. Even if the learners' correct reasons for responses are not specific in the questionnaire, one can connect their responses to their attitudes towards English as the MoI in order to determine their perseverance to learn in English. Despite the lack of confidence identified in Chapter Four, it seems that the learners' perseverance to learn in English, as they show in the questionnaire, emanates from their

positive attitudes towards English and motivation they receive from their teachers since they like English and desire to learn in it, as noted in Chapter Four.

A comparison of the rural schools and urban schools indicates that there is a significant difference ($p < 0.0001$) between rural schools and urban schools in terms of effort to use English in the classroom. For instance, while 68% of rural school learners agree that they persevere to learn in English, 67% of urban school learners disagree with the statement. One of the reasons for this difference is possibly the teachers' English proficiency. As can be seen in the respondents' profiles in Chapter Three and Appendix A1a, US1 and US2 had more specialist language teachers than RS1 and RS2, which had generalist primary school teachers teaching English to learners. It can be seen that these language teachers have a significant influence on the learners' motivation in terms of the English language learning because, as research shows (Cameron, 2001; Johnstone, 2009), young learners of a second or foreign language exploit the intrinsic motivation, i.e. enjoyment of learning a language, interest and curiosity for the language that they get from the teacher, and self-awareness that they are becoming successful learners of the language. It is evident from the questionnaire responses and the focus group interviews that learners in urban schools have developed a self-esteem in English that their counterparts in rural schools have not developed. This may also be the result of other factors such as school literacy resources, and home literacy motivation and activities, as described in Chapter Five.

Summary

This section showed that learners use CS as a strategy that enables them to express their ideas and understand the teacher and content information through peer tutoring. In fact, the findings revealed that switching to Kinyarwanda among learners themselves, or between learners and their teachers, facilitates comprehension, and opens communication in the classroom. The section also indicated that the learners' attitudes towards English as the MoI enhance their effort to learn in it, despite difficulties they encounter in using it as an unfamiliar language.

6.4 Conclusion

The aim of this chapter has been to investigate the strategies that teachers and learners use to address the challenges that English as the MoI presents in learning SS in Grade 6 of the four Rwandan primary schools. The analysis of the data from questionnaires, audio-recordings of 16 lessons, semi-structured interviews, and focus group interviews has revealed a variety of strategies used in the classroom. Oral CS was found to be the main strategy used by both teachers and learners to deal with language challenges posed by English as the language of instruction. Even if written CS is not supported by educators, it happens in the learners' writing because of their language difficulties. The practice of CS is not a new phenomenon, since many instances of learning through English as a second or foreign language in different nations of Africa such as South Africa, Tanzania, Botswana, Malawi, Swaziland, and different Asian countries such as China, Malaysia, and Singapore reflect CS as a strategy used in the classrooms. In the context of Rwanda, the practice of CS often resulted in Kinyarwanda being used as ML and English as EL, which, according to research (Moodley & Kamwangamalu, 2004; Moodley, 2007, 2010, 2013) is non-strategic CS that hinders learning in the second or foreign language.

The above observation reflects what most Rwandan primary school teachers and education stakeholders are aware of. For instance in the opening ceremony of the training of trainers for 100 Rwandan teachers who were selected countrywide to attend a seven-day training session on how to teach in English and help their colleagues to teach in English, teachers showed that there were teachers, mainly in rural schools, who still did not know how to teach in English. One of them stated, 'Hari abarimu bamwe usanga bigisha isomo runaka, akaritanga mu cyongereza gisa n'ikinyarwanda' (There are some teachers who teach certain lessons in poor English which is 'Kinyarwandalike') (Nkurunziza, 2012). On the same occasion, the Minister of State in charge of primary and secondary schools emphasised, 'Abarimu nkabo bagikoresha icyongereza cy'ingaramatika, cy'igikiga utamenya uko ugisobanura bikwiye gucika' ('Such teachers who are still using non-grammatical English, a kind of dialectical poor English that we cannot know how to call, these things should change') (Nkurunziza, 2012).

Such comments reflect the problems that arise when content is taught in a language that teachers and learners are not familiar with, and more importantly, they show how English is a

foreign language to which most teachers and learners in Rwanda have not been sufficiently exposed. This is not a new phenomenon, as we find similar cases in Africa and Asia in which the use of English second/foreign language as the MoI has encountered many problems. With reference to the African context, a number of empirical studies such as Kyeyune (2010), Alidou and Brock-Utne (2011), Brock-Utne and Alidou (2011), and Wolff (2011) have shown many educational problems that have arisen because teachers and learners are not sufficiently proficient in English as the language of instruction.

For most educators in this study, CS is a normal practice that serves to fill the gaps due to the lack of communicative competence in the language of instruction, and is regarded as normal linguistic behaviour by learners in the classroom. For instance, the data reveals that CS helps learners enjoy the lessons because it facilitates understanding of the teachers' input and helps the learners to answer some questions. These findings corroborate earlier findings that indicate that CS is a classroom-conscious practice and a resource when it is used strategically (Moore, 2002; Moodley, 2003, 2007, 2010; Macaro, 2006; Abad, 2008). Throughout all the lessons observed in the present study, CS seems to be a necessary practice for teaching in English in Rwanda.

The chapter has also shown that CS is supported by various non-verbal communication aids. It was found that the use of teaching aids, visuals, and body language contributes positively to the teachers' achievement of the lessons' objectives. The lack of English proficiency prevents the teachers' fluency in this language of instruction and requires them to support it with multiple non-verbal communication aids. It was found that teachers use more body language and visuals to mediate learning, which is consistent with the sociocultural perspective on learning, suggesting that physical tools play an important role as mediators of learning (Vygotsky, 1978). However, even if the findings reflect efficient strategies to overcome language challenges in English as the MoI, it is also clear that teachers use them because they do not have any other option. For instance, the use of repetition drills and label quests are dated strategies that often qualify as safe talk (Rubagumya, 2003) and are regarded as rote learning (Brock-Utne & Alidou, 2011), strategies that do not encourage learner-centeredness nor do they promote effective cognitive development of the learners. The chapter showed that teachers may choose to use other strategies that might lead learners to higher levels of thinking skills, but language barriers limit the use of such effective strategies.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Introduction

This study has investigated the attitudes of educators and learners towards English as the MoI, explored the challenges posed by learning through the medium of a foreign language and revealed the strategies educators and learners employ to bridge the tension between their actual language abilities and the requirements of the policy with respect to effective learning. The research was motivated by the desire to increase knowledge on the growing adoption of English globally as a foreign instructional language for content learning, and the limited research in the Rwandan context. The study has also investigated the implementation of a relatively new language policy. In this chapter, the researcher revisits the most pertinent findings in relation to the research questions of the study. Thereafter, the researcher proposes recommendations to different stakeholders in education in Rwanda. Finally, issues regarding limitations of the study and further inquiry will be considered.

7.2 Main findings of the study

The findings of this study are revisited and discussed in relation to the research questions. The researcher presents a summary of the most pertinent findings and their significance for the existing knowledge on the use of a foreign language for content learning.

7.2.1 Attitudes towards English as the MoI

The first research question was aimed at identifying attitudes that educators and learners in Grade 6 of Rwandan primary schools have towards English as the MoI. The question was first considered in the questionnaire and then thoroughly explored in the interviews. The findings revealed that the majority of educators and learners are in favour of the use of English as the MoI. It was clear that the majority of respondents feel positively about English

as a language, and are highly motivated to use it as their instructional language. There were a number of factors that influenced the respondents' positive attitudes towards English as the MoI. These factors can be classified into two main motivational categories: integrative motivation and instrumental motivation (Gardner, 1985). Integrative motivation includes factors that push participants to opt for English because it is a global language of communication. It was found that all the participants in this study are aware of the global spread of English. For principals and teachers, English is regarded as a global language with higher potential than other languages used in Rwanda, namely French and Kinyarwanda. For the learners, the data demonstrates that they are mostly motivated by future symbolic and material benefits. They consider English to be the language of potential for the whole world, and therefore, their priority is to learn and use this global lingua franca.

Instrumental motivation comprises educational, economic, political, and social factors. Educational factors that motivate participants' positive attitudes towards English relate to the fact that English has taken the status of the global language of education since most scientific documents, ICT facilities, and print media are in English, as well as the fact that English has become a mark of education in Rwanda. The motivation to learn English for individuals' education and academic consideration was high among the majority of participants in this study. This has some foundation in the language use changes that occurred in most administrative and business institutions after the 1994 genocide of Tutsis in Rwanda. This was found to be one of the important factors that saw English gain more power than French, because English was the language of the high-ranking national leaders, politicians, and businessmen. In addition, most non-governmental organisations and corporations operating in Rwanda after the Genocide were English-speaking. Thus, any chance of getting a job or help from these organisations required English proficiency. It was found that the majority of participants have positive attitudes towards English because they are motivated by job and business opportunities, especially after Rwanda has joined regional and global communities such as the EAC and the Commonwealth. In this line, English became the medium of instruction in a bid to make Rwandans more competitive and fully functional in the countries where English is used (Lynd, 2010; Kimenyi, 2008). Besides integrative and instrumental motivation for English as the MoI in Rwanda, the study revealed the outstanding role of the political institutions and globalisation for the respondents' positive attitudes towards English.

Role of political institutions

The 2009 language-in-education policy in Rwanda was mainly motivated by political influence rather than educational considerations. The study indicated that political aspirations in relation to quick political, social, and economic development of the country resulted in a top-down language planning and policy. In fact, the 2008 Rwandan Cabinet resolution on the MoI required all Rwandan educational institutions to start teaching in English at all levels. Referring to Baker (1992) in terms of language policy making, Rwanda did not provide adequate human resources in the form of well-trained teachers, proficient in the new language of instruction. This was identified in the attitudes of teachers characterised by fear and a lack of confidence when using English in the classroom. However, participants were highly supportive of the decision that the government took, by replacing French, the language that most participants associate with the 1994 genocide of Tutsis, with English, which, in the view of many Rwandans, happened to be regarded as the language of reconciliation, good governance, and new visions (Samuelson & Freedman, 2010).

Government propaganda was found to be one of the factors that boosted the people's positive attitude towards English in Rwanda. In consideration of the processes of policy planning and implementation (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997), the study revealed that Rwanda motivated the attitudes of the community towards the policy change but did not adequately prepare the implementors in terms of training teachers in English proficiency before the policy change was implemented. It was found that the respondents' positive attitude towards using English as the MoI is more the result of the government's propaganda, rather than the community's willingness to use the language they did not know (Samuelson & Freedman, 2010; Pearson, 2013). In addition to this, it was realised that, contrary to other cases of language-in-education planning and policy (Ricento, 2006a), Rwanda did not have a written language policy to guide implementers on what they were required to do, which, in addition to the lack of confidence mentioned above, resulted in the educators' frustration in using English in the classroom.

Role of globalisation

The increasing demand of a common, global MoI encouraged the respondents' positive attitude towards English as the MoI in Rwanda. Even though Rwanda had not been an

English colony, the participants strongly believed in investing in English as a foreign language, which they consider to be a language with significant potential. The exceptionally positive attitude towards English in this study, especially among young learners, resulted from the learners' beliefs that English would enable them to access symbolic and material resources (Norton, 2013, 2010; Pierce, 1997, 1995). The choice of English as the MoI, where this language is used as a foreign language, suggests the use of English as a tool that helps learners to open opportunities to access knowledge and keep pace with globalisation processes (Coleman, 2006; Van Splender, 2010). Rwandans particularly characterise English as a commodity (De Swaan, 2001; Rosendal, 2009; Samuelson & Freedman, 2010) and a gateway to educational, political, and economic development, and social success and prosperity (Marsh, 2006).

Despite the respondents' awareness of language difficulties, the findings revealed that English remains the most preferred language of instruction among young Rwandan learners. It emerged from this study that the preference for English as the MoI in the context of Rwanda is rooted in the way Rwandans consider English as a lingua franca and as an enabling tool for knowledge, and a gateway to access social mobility, academic and economic development, and other opportunities in the globalised world (Coleman, 2006; Marsh, 2006; Dewey, 2007; Van Splunder, 2010). Despite little exposure to English language, educators and learners enthusiastically made every effort to use English because of both the government propaganda and the force of globalisation.

Identifying attitudes of educators and learners towards English as the MoI in Rwanda was an important objective of this study because attitudes affect behaviour (Ajzen, 2005), which means that the way educators and learners provide efforts to learn and use English as the MoI simultaneously depends on how they perceive and regard this language. Considering the participants' feelings, beliefs, and readiness for learning and using English as the MoI in Rwandan primary schools, it is clear that participants have positive attitudes towards English as the MoI.

7.2.2 Challenges posed by English as the MoI

The present thesis highlighted the various challenges posed by the use of a foreign instructional language for content learning in Grade 6 of primary school. The findings revealed that English as the MoI in Rwandan primary, especially in rural schools, is used with many challenges relating to comprehending, speaking, reading, and writing English, and a lack of confidence in the classroom.

The problems of comprehending English in the classroom were found to be the result of learning through a language that is not well known by learners (Alidou & Brock-Utne, 2011; Shohamy, 2006). The findings show that teachers were required to switch to Kinyarwanda many times in order to help learners understand the concepts of SS lessons. In addition, observations revealed that learners preferred to hear explanations in Kinyarwanda and could actively interact with the teacher if they had the opportunity to reply or ask a question in Kinyarwanda. These were examples of English difficulties that affected the learners' comprehension in the classroom.

Speaking challenges were found to be prominent in this study. Learners remain unresponsive in the classroom because of language barriers. This is not a new phenomenon because, as research shows, many African children are taught in a language they do not know (Brock-Utne & Alidou, 2011). In most cases, including the Rwandan case, the outcome of the use of the unfamiliar language in the classroom is a teacher-centred method that requires the teacher to speak on their own while learners remain silent and passive during the lesson (Alidou & Brock-Utne, 2011). This was evident in this study which revealed that learners showed confidence, certainty, and joy when the teacher allowed the use of Kinyarwanda in the lesson because it was the language learners were familiar with, while the use of English made the lesson silent, boring, and difficult for the teacher to handle because learners could not understand.

Reading challenges were identified as resulting from the learners' inability to speak and understand English. It was found that the limited use of English inhibits the improvement of reading skills. In addition, the study revealed problems pertaining to differences between the Kinyarwanda and English syllable systems, which also complicated reading in English.

The writing problems identified in the present study were attributed to the learners' inability to match the pronunciation and spelling of English words. This is also a problem of insufficient vocabulary and grammar, since learners have not yet developed their written English language skills. The observations revealed that learners were only copying what the teacher had written on the blackboard. Writing was difficult for the majority of learners because lessons were delivered in the form of 'safe talk' as teachers struggled with the language of instruction and did not have any other option available to assist learners get used to writing. The findings revealed that learners had to copy and memorise what the teacher provided on the blackboard without understanding them. The study suggests a need to teach English spelling, pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar to enable learners to write on their own, without always having to copy the content.

The study revealed the teachers' and learners' lack of confidence in their ability to handle the language of instruction. It was shown that lack of confidence characterised by silence and short answers stifles the learners' oral participation in the classroom, and that occurs as a consequence of the learners' unfamiliarity with English. As research shows, when learners are unfamiliar with the language of instruction, the classroom discussion and answers to the teachers' questions are limited to one word, even if the learners are familiar with the topic (Mchazime, 2001). To be unfamiliar with the instructional language has negative implications on the teachers because they do not manage to provide knowledge easily and accurately, and it affects the learners because their inability to communicate prevents them from contributing to the lessons. As Norman and Hyland (2003) propose, the lack of confidence prevents teachers and learners from engaging fully in the classroom processes necessary for effective learning.

The findings highlighted the negative impact of using an unfamiliar language of instruction. It was found that the use of English as the MoI in Rwandan primary schools negatively affects both the teaching of the language of instruction and the teaching of the content of the subject. The study found that the teaching of language in the content lessons prevents teachers from focusing on explaining the content of the lesson because they devote more time to helping learners get used to pronunciation, learn new words and grammatical structures, and speak the unfamiliar language, rather than teaching the content. In addition, it was found that the learners' low level of English proficiency persists despite three years of English as the MoI. This was found to be a consequence of the lack of exposure to English as a foreign

language in Rwanda. The study revealed that the problem with limited English proficiency in this study is that learners lack terminology and fear making mistakes. Very often they do not understand what the teacher says and often fail to ask for clarification. Understandably, this situation is likely to result in frustration and failure that lead to dropouts (Brock-Utne, 2011; Desai, 2012).

The fact that English has been a foreign language in Rwanda for a long time has limited exposure to this language. This has complicated the implementation of English-only policy. In the Rwandan context, the lack of exposure to the English environment makes school the only place of practice, which is not fully exploited because of the language problem. The study suggests a need to develop English language skills to create confidence in speaking, reading, and writing in the classroom activities and enable comprehension of the contents. The language difficulties that teachers and learners face were also found to be partly attributable to complex materials in the syllabus. Even if the focus of the study was not to analyse the contents of the curriculum, the findings revealed a mismatch between the level of the contents and the level of the learners' cognitive and conceptual abilities.

Identifying the underlying challenges of the language of instruction in the English medium classes was one of the important objectives of this study. The awareness of these language challenges and their effects on learning offers a fascinating insight for education stakeholders to help them consider what could help teachers and learners to improve their English knowledge and skills. These challenges led to strategies that teachers and learners utilise in order to cope with the challenging MoI.

7.2.3 Strategies used in teaching through English

Since the research was conducted in a context where all participants can speak the same MT (Kinyarwanda) and are learning in a foreign language (English), it came as no surprise that the use of CS to mediate learning was one of the prominent strategies used by both teachers and learners. It was found that CS in the English medium classes at Rwandan primary schools was an unavoidable practice. The teachers' use of Kinyarwanda depends on the learners' specific needs. For instance, teachers prefer to switch to Kinyarwanda to help learners understand the new concepts in English, introduce new vocabulary, explain grammatical structures, control classroom discipline, and to give instructions. It appeared that

learners are allowed to code-switch in oral talk, but are strictly forbidden to switch between languages in their writing to avoid tendencies to do it when they are writing their national examinations. In line with a number of empirical studies (Nation, 2003; Moodley, 2003; Scott de la Fuente, 2008), resorting to Kinyarwanda, in this study, was found to be a natural phenomenon and unavoidable for Rwandans using English as a second/foreign language in the classroom practices. Echoing Cook (2013, p.48), second/foreign language users 'do not simply duplicate the uses of language that monolingual employ: they have unique uses of language of their own, like code-switching and translation'.

What Cook (2013) points out reflects the practices of teaching through English in Rwandan primary schools with some differences. The data (see Chapter Five) indicated that teachers switch to Kinyarwanda and translate English concepts, terms, and ideas into Kinyarwanda to scaffold learning. However, it was realised that teachers overuse Kinyarwanda because they do not have faith in their own or their pupils' English proficiency. Even if such a practice might help learners understand the content better, it impedes their English development and may result in their examination failure, because without adequate language skills, learners cannot provide answers in English, orally or in writing. As Atkinson (1993, p.12) puts it, 'the more L1 is used, the less English practice students get', while 'the more students practice English in the classroom, the better their English will become'. This means that limited and well-controlled CS from E-K in the primary school classes could be beneficial because, as the researcher demonstrated in Chapter Four, educators support the use of English as the MoI in order to promote English proficiency. Given that teachers and learners are not yet sufficiently proficient in English, CS is used in a beneficial way for content learning. However, in terms of language learning, the data indicates a non-strategic CS, which, in the researcher' s view, would hinder the development of English language in Rwanda.

The context of using an unfamiliar language as the MoI called for the use of intensive non-verbal communication aids. These are comprised of different pedagogical practices, namely body language such as mimes, gestures, and voice pitch, and teaching aids such as pictures, maps, and digital visual aids. The findings revealed that even if these pedagogical practices are common to teachers everywhere, they have a particular significance in this context. The teachers in the present study use plenty of these pedagogical aids in order to support the language use for effective teaching and learning. They mediate learning by making learners interact with people (teachers themselves) and objects in the classroom environment

(Vygotsky, 1978). Referring to Lantolf (2000), these teachers are aware of the importance of what Vygotsky calls tools in mediating the human mind, and they use them to solve problems that cannot be solved in the same way without them. More importantly, the language gaps, or absence of symbolic tools in Vygosky's terms, made teachers creative in terms of pedagogy in which, for instance, they use natural phenomena in an outdoor class (see Chapter Five) or borrow natural hand-crafted objects that are familiar to learners, in order to illustrate the contents that would be complicated to understand in the absence of those teaching aids. This was found to be an important feature of the social nature of learning as suggested in the sociocultural perspective on learning (Vygotsky, 1978).

In addition, the study demonstrated that even if the use of non-verbal communication aids contributes positively to the teachers' achievement of the lessons' objectives, it is important that they are used as supplements to the oral expression for the benefit of the learners' written activities, tests, and examinations. The findings suggest the learning of English language skills for both teachers and learners in order to be able to respond to the classroom communicative demands for effective learning.

A particular focus on the learners revealed that collaboration, which, according to Vygosky (1978), serves as a means of reaching the learners' potential performance level in the ZPD, was hindered by the absence of groupwork in this study. Learners indicated the willingness to engage in collaborative work (see Chapter Four), but the teachers' assumptions about the learners' inability to understand and use English in classroom interactions was a hindrance to groupwork, which was almost non-existent. In the 16 observed lessons, there were only two sessions of groupwork. The lack of groupwork has implications on the learners' appropriation of the acquired knowledge. As Vygotsky (1978) shows, learners acquire knowledge through interactions with people at the social level first, and later, they assimilate and internalise what has been learnt at the personal level and make it their own property that they can use on their own. It is worth noting that, in this study, the lack of groupwork, given the language difficulties, prevents learners from having the opportunities of learning content and internalising it because, as seen in Chapter Five, the school, in particular the classroom, is the only place of practice that most Rwandan learners have. As a consequence, learners become used to reproducing what the teacher offers them, but they are actually incapable of using them in different contexts on their own. As Vygotsky (1978) advocates, social interactions

mediate learning when the learner succeeds in performing a task with the help of a more knowledgeable person, and then internalises it so that s/he can use it on her/his own.

In the context of English as a foreign language used as the MoI in Rwanda, CS and peer learning were the prevailing strategies that teachers and learners used for content learning. These strategies were beneficial for content learning because of limited proficiency in the instructional language.

7.2.4 Significance of the findings

The findings on attitudes towards English as the MoI and practices in the classroom suggest that the study could inform the ministry of education and other education stakeholders in Rwanda about what is happening in the English medium classrooms. It is also important to make policy planners in Rwanda aware that positive attitudes motivated by instrumental and integrative reasons are not sufficient to warrant the success of the language planned to be used as the MoI. The context in which the study took place indicates that more effort should have been put into the human and material resources before implementing English as the MoI in Rwanda. It emerged from the study that the mediating role of English and its potential to facilitate or inhibit learning at Grade 6 of Rwandan primary schools needs to be given due attention by providing English language knowledge to both teachers and learners.

The challenges posed by English as the MoI, and the strategies used to address classroom challenges, show that the shift from French as the MoI to the English-only policy in Rwandan primary education was abrupt and sudden, as also found by Samuelson and Freedman (2010) and Pearson (2013). In particular, the present study revealed that the sudden adoption of English-in-education in primary school in Rwanda contributed to educators' anxiety about low English proficiency and led to learners' frustration with their language abilities not matching their conceptual requirements. The policy revision that shifted the language of instruction from English to Kinyarwanda for the first three years of primary school in March 2011 is the reason for the implementation challenges, further exacerbated by the sudden launch of the English-only policy.

Language problems were found to be overwhelming for teachers and learners in rural schools because they experience less exposure to English and learners lack home support in terms of

language and literacy tools. The study revealed that learners in rural areas only encounter English at school because the environment they live in at home with parents, relatives, and neighbours does not favour or facilitate the use of English, and these learners do not have access to English books that could help them acquire vocabulary and grammar to use at school (Krashen, 1982). The urban schools were more comfortable with English as the MoI but indications are that they expended significant effort and energy in order to reach a stable situation in using English as the MoI. The investigation of the rural and urban divide indicated that the socio-economic status of the children's families, school location, methods of teaching, materials of teaching, and teachers' qualifications all have a fundamental influence on the different schools' achievements (Pattanayak, 1986).

The findings on classroom challenges indicated that most teachers in the selected schools are qualified to teach their particular subjects. However, most of them do not feel confident about teaching the subjects in English because they have limited competence in the MoI. This suggests a need for well-trained and competent teachers in order to develop confidence to teach in English, which would provide the learning support that pupils need from their teaching staff.

The findings of this study make a contribution to existing knowledge in four main ways. Firstly, this study was conducted on Rwanda, a country which has opted for an English-only education system while countries elsewhere have tended to move away from a reliance on only one language. In this line, the study offers a contribution to the literature, particularly as not much has been written about language education in Rwanda. Secondly, the body of data collected offers a particular contribution to the international research community by presenting a new case of significant research interest. Thirdly, contrary to other studies on attitudes towards the language of instruction in a context where the majority population does not know this language, this study revealed the overwhelming positive attitudes to English despite the challenges of using it as the MoI at school and showed that positive attitudes that respondents revealed are not enough for English to be the MoI in Rwanda. Finally, a set of strategies that educators and learners in the Rwandan English medium classes use offers inspirational ideas about dealing with content subjects in the context where the language of instruction is not used and known by teachers and learners.

In the next section, important issues that require attention for better management of the English-in-education in Rwanda will be presented.

7.3 Recommendations

This study set out to investigate attitudes and practices in the English medium classrooms at Rwandan primary schools. Based on the findings, attitudes are favourable to English as the MoI in Rwanda, but practices need more attention and support from stakeholders in order to reach more successful results of teaching through English at primary schools. The researcher would like to make recommendations that could contribute to improvements in the classroom practices.

Since effective learning takes place through interactive communication between the more knowledgeable person and the learner (Vygotsky, 1978), there must be a more empowering plan to ensure that teachers and learners have basic capacity to use English as the MoI. As one principal suggested, there is a need to strengthen the English language skills of the teachers to enable them to explain the content subjects to learners in clear and adequate language. Similarly, learners need to be taught English before using it as the MoI. Given the Rwandan linguistic landscape, even if teachers of content subjects were well-trained and confident in the instructional language, they would still be spending a great deal of time teaching the language of instruction because learners would still lack adequate levels of proficiency. That effort on the teachers' and learners' language of instruction skills can trigger effective learning because learning takes place if the learners can understand what the teacher is telling them (Alidou & Brock-Utne, 2011). The need for teacher training in English has also been reiterated by most of the teacher participants, suggesting how the government can help them improve their English, enable them to build confidence in the classroom, and increase the quality of teaching. One teacher suggests long-term training at the school of languages of the University of Rwanda that normally trains first year students in the language of instruction before they can start using it for their respective subjects. He suggests:

> *…they* [education stakeholders] *can send us to EPLM*[21] *or School for Foundation Language Skills at the National University of Rwanda where we can learn English and come back to teach when we can speak, write and comprehend English!* (TRS1).

It was realised in this study that teacher participants did not appreciate what they learnt from the training organised by the Ministry of Education after the launch of English as the MoI, because they were taught the methodology of teaching through English while what they needed to learn was English as a language.

As the lack of confidence in using English in the classroom hinders negotiating and mediating knowledge, it is advised that teachers and learners be allowed to use multiple languages that would serve as tools for communicating knowledge. This has research evidence that shows that code-switching has social and cognitive benefits because when it is used in a well-regulated way, it increases the learners' confidence and participation in the classroom activities (Vygotsky, 1978; Lantolf, 2000; Hornberger & Link, 2012; Makalela, 2013). In addition, due to the fact that all Rwandans can speak and understand Kinyarwanda, it would be simple and practical to use Kinyarwanda and English as a way of attaining multicompetence (Cook, 2013), i.e., the individual's ability to use more than one language. Switching between English and Kinyarwanda would promote the learning of content and the target language. With globalisation and new trends of teaching English as second/foreign language, teachers should not worry about CS and translation if these strategies of language use in the classroom can help achieve the teaching objectives.

The findings in Chapter Four and Chapter Five indicated that speaking is a big challenge to learners and teachers as well. It is important to have conversation groups in which learners interact among themselves as classmates, and conversation clubs in which they can converse with peers, language mentors, and teachers. This study found a widespread concern among teacher participants who do not provide learners with opportunities of group discussions. There is a great need to have conversation groups at school, since it is the only place of foreign language practice in the context of Rwanda. This practice can be done at two levels:

[21] EPLM (Ecole Pratique des Langues Modernes) referred to as the School for Foundation Language Skills in English was founded in 1996 with the aim to teach English and French to non-speakers of those languages. This was conceived as a part of developing a bilingual English-French policy adopted in Rwanda after 1994.

the micro and macro levels. At micro level, teachers should know that collaborative work builds the learners' understanding and develops their thinking abilities and, therefore, they should organise groupwork and supervise it in the classroom so that pupils benefit from it. As seen in Chapter Four and Six, learners consult each other in order to solve their own problems. This shows that they are positive about collaborative work. Since they are young learners, they need well-regulated group discussions that can help them learn the content and practice the language of instruction. These conversation groups can help pupils learn together and correct each other when necessary, without feeling embarrassed by the outsiders when they make mistakes.

At the macro level, teachers, in collaboration with principals, should organise a conversation club that would enable the school community, i.e. learners, teachers, and school leaders to practice the language of instruction. This conversation club can help learners and teachers speak English freely, offer opportunities to learn from the more knowledgeable speakers from the group, and help them feel integrated into an English-speaking environment. This practice can build learners' and teachers' confidence to speak English in and out of the classroom, hence developing their English proficiency.

Teachers should feel confident enough to speak English in the classroom and out of it in order to show their pupils that 'practice makes perfect', and they should not yield to their insecurities about making vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammatical errors and mistakes, because mistakes and errors are part of learning process (Krashen, 2006). Educators should be aware of the fact that the world is influenced by the waves of multilingualism in which all linguistic abilities have a place because of the increasing migratory movements (Cook, 2013). In the environment of world Englishes (Kachru, 1997), communication in English has become the best option for people from various language backgrounds and different cultures (Kilickaya, 2009). The contact of the inner-circle English with other language backgrounds and cultures have made the outer and expanding circles produce what Cook (2013) calls successful English second language users who are not native speakers or shadows of native speakers, but speakers of English in their own repertoires (Cook, 2013). This information provides a rationale for encouraging the learning of English in the contexts of the learners' prior language backgrounds and cultures.

To raise the learners' confidence to speak English, teachers should avoid correcting their learners' mistakes every time they make them, to avoid frustrating them. Instead they could adopt a system of providing feedback on the errors made and explain how corrections work.

This study revealed that the opportunities to learn and practice foreign languages in Rwanda are in schools. As suggested by earlier research (Muhirwe, 2012) in the Rwandan context, there is a need for the increase of access to literacy in and out of schools.

There must be a written language-in-education policy, and not just Ministerial office orders, to guide teachers in implementing the policy effectively. It was realised that there is a lack of common practices in terms of the use of the instructional language in relation to other languages used in Rwanda. In secondary and tertiary education, 'all languages spoken in Rwanda are used in a complementary way for educational purposes despite the fact that some are not officially recognized as instructional languages' (Kagwesage, 2013, p. 71). In primary schools, the use of Kinyarwanda for learning purposes was found to be a resource instead of a hindrance when used when necessary. However, some teachers were tempted to overuse Kinyarwanda, which research warns against. It is recommended that teachers should remember that the MoI is English.

Policy-makers need to know what is happening in the classroom for further implementation decisions, and consider the implementers' views before the launch of the policy. As shown in Chapter Five, teachers would like to be part of decision-making regarding the choice of the language to be used as the MoI. They advocated for the choice of the language of learning and teaching, for participating in decision-making, and receiving training in the language intended to become the MoI.

7.4 Limitations of the study

The limitations encountered in carrying out this study are discussed in two sets, namely methodological limitations and contextual limitations. Measures taken to offset possible impact of these limitations are also discussed.

With regard to methodological limitations, this study encountered some drawbacks associated with the use the mixed methods research paradigms. These flaws mainly stemmed from the

fact that the researcher combined a variety of methods. This research took more time to carry out, and consequently, it became more expensive than it would have been if it were either quantitative or qualitative research. In addition, the researcher needed to be conversant with both quantitative and qualitative methods in order to be able to deal with some aspects of the mixed methods research such as the issues of how to deal with conflicting results and how to analyse qualitative data quantitatively and vice versa, which, as stated by Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004), are still unclear.

Most of these methodological limitations were likely to affect the present study. However, the researcher was aware of them, and this enabled him to take appropriate measures to reduce their likely impact on the quality of the research. For instance, the issue of being conversant with both quantitative and qualitative approaches, the researcher dealt with it by using peers to check the research instruments and results and honing his knowledge and skills in the various research designs that were intended to be used in the present study.

With respect to contextual limitations, the present study was conducted in an environment that the researcher was familiar with and on a topic about which he had particular experiences and opinions. In conducting this study, especially at the stage of data collection, there was the risk that the researcher's subjective opinions could have interfered with his desire to let the participants' voices be clearly heard. To deal with this challenge, even if qualitative researchers such Brantlinger, Jimenez, Klingner, Pugach and Richardson (2005) state that subjectivity cannot completely be controlled, the researcher followed Henning, Van Rensburg and Smit's (2004) advice that the researcher should be the main research instrument who makes meaning of the research data by interacting with the research process. For this purpose, the researcher was conscious of the possible effects of his subjectivity on the conduct and eventual outcome of the research and made effort to ensure that his subjectivity does not get in the way of the research process.

7.5 Future research

This study was conducted as a case study in order to investigate in detail the impact of English as the MoI in four Rwandan primary schools. The scope of this study could cover a wider range of schools throughout Rwanda in order to yield a much clearer picture of how

teaching through English is implemented. It is highly recommended that an extensive study be conducted on a larger scale, covering the whole country.

The focus of the present study was to get a comprehensive picture of how the content subjects such as SS is learnt through an unfamiliar instructional language. Since the findings indicated that teachers do a double task, i.e. teaching English and teaching in English, it could be of high value to investigate how English is taught as a subject, because it was found that most learning challenges are due to a lack of the language of instruction. Collaboration between English subject teachers and content teachers would be very useful to reinforce and improve the use of the instructional language effectively. In addition, this study was conducted in Grade 6, the senior learners of primary school. It could be of importance to study how learning through English is done at lower levels. This could contribute to identifying the causes of the language gap at Grade 6 and inform support mechanisms for language learning at primary school level.

References

Abad, L.S. (2005). Code-switching in the classroom: A clash of two languages? *LEAPS: Miriam College Faculty Research Journal*, 25(1), 36-52.

Abadzi, H. (2006). *Efficient Learning for the Poor. Insights from the Frontier of Cognitive Neuroscience*. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

Adgbija, E. (1994). *Language Attitudes in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Sociolinguistic Overview*. Clevedon: Multilingual matters.

Agutamba, K. (2012). Teacher English tutorial program at risk over pay. Retrieved from http://focus.rw/wp/2012/02/teacher-english-tutorial-program-at-risk-over-pay/

Airey, J.& Linder, C.(2006). *Language and the experience of learning physics in Sweden. European Journal of Physics*, 27, 553-560.

Ajzen, I. (2005). *Attitudes, Personality and Behaviour* (2nd edition). New York: Open University Press.

Alenezi, A.A. (2010). Students' language attitudes towards using code-switching as a medium of instruction in the college of Health Sciences: An exploratory study. *ARECLS*, 7, 1-22.

Alidou, H. (2004). Medium of instruction in post-colonial Africa. In J.W. Tollefson and A.B.M. Tsui (Eds.), *Medium of Instruction Policies: Which agenda? Whose agenda?* (pp. 195-218). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associations Inc.

Alidou, H., & Brock-Utne, B. (2011). Teaching practices - teaching in a familiar language. In A. Ouane & C. Glanz (Eds.),*Optimising learning, education and publish in Africa: the language factor. A review and analysis of theory and practice in mother tongue and bilingual education in sub-Saharan Africa* (pp. 159-186). UIL/ADEA.

Anderson, L.W., & Krathwohl, D.R. (Eds.) (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching and assessing. A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. Boston: Pearson Education Group.

Andersson, I., Kagwesage, A.M., & Rusanganwa, J. (2012). Negotiating meaning in multilingual group work: a case study of higher education in Rwanda. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 16(4), 1-15. DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2012.695771.

Andersson, I., & Rusanganwa, J. (2011). Language and space in a multilingual undergraduate physics classrooms in Rwanda. *International Journal of Bilingual*

Education and Bilingualism. 14(6), 751-764.

Arthur, J. (1996). Code switching and collusion: Classroom interaction in Botswana primary schools. *Linguistics and Education*, 8(1), 17-33.

Auerbach, E.R. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 9-32.

Baker, C. (1992). *Attitudes and Language*. Clevedon: Multilingual matters Ltd.

Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* (3rd ed.). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters LTD.

Baker, C. (2006). Psycho-Sociological Analysis in Language Policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An Introduction to language Policy: Theory and Method* (pp. 211-228). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Balaban, N. (1995). Seeing the Child, Knowing the Person. In W. Ayers (Ed.), *To Become a Teacher*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Baldauf, R.B., & Kaplan, R.B. (2004). *Language planning and policy in Africa*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Bamgbose, A. (2000). *Language and exclusion: The consequences of Language Policies in Africa*. Hamburg: LIT.

Bamgbose, A. (2004). Language of Instruction Policy and Practice in Africa. Available at: http://www.unesco.org/education/languages_2004/languageinstruction_africa.pdf.

Banda, F. (2007). Study groups and peer roles in mediated academic literacy events in multilingual educational contexts in South Africa. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics. 37*,1-21.

Barrett, T.C. (1968). Taxonomy of cognitive and affective dimensions of reading comprehension. In H.M. Robinson (Ed.), *Innovation and change in reading instruction* (pp. 17-23). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Bauer, L., Holmes, J., & Warren, P. (2006). *Language matters.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bernard, H.R. (2002). *Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and quantitative Methods* (3rd ed.). California: AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek.

Best,J.W. & Kahn, J.V. (1998). *Research in Education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Inside the Black Box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80, 139-148.

Black, P., Harrison, C., Lee, C., Marshall, B., & Wiliam, D. (2004). Working inside the black box: Assessment for learning in the classroom. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 86, 8-21.

Bloom, B. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Handbook: Cognitive domain*. New York: David McKay Co. Inc.

Bonacina, F. (2009). Multilingual label quests: a classroom practice in a migratory educational context. *BAAL Annual Conference 2009*, Newcastle University.

Bonacina-Pugh, F. (2013). Multilingual label quests: A practice for the 'asymmetrical' multilingual classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, 24(1), 142-164.

Brantlinger, E., Jimenez, R., Klingner, J., Pugach, M. & Richardson, V. (2005). Qualitative Studies in Special Education. *Exceptional Children*, 71(2), 195-207.

Bray, M., & Koo, R. (2004). Postcolonial Patterns and Paradoxes: Language and Education in Hong Kong and Macao: Comparative Education, *Postcolonialism and Comparative Education*, 40(2), 215-239.

Brock-Utne, B. (2005). Language-in-Education Policies in Africa with Special Focus on Tanzania and South Africa- Insights from Research in Progress. In A.M.Y.Lin & P.W. Martin (Eds.) *Decolonisation, Globalisation: Language-in-EducationPolicy and Practice* (pp.173-193). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Brock-Utne, B., & Alidou, H. (2011). Active students-learning through a language they master. In A. Ouane & C. Glanz (Eds.), *Optimising learning, education and publishing in Africa: the language factor. A review andanalysis of theory and practice in mother tongue and bilingual education in sub-Saharan Africa* (pp. 187-216). UIL/ADEA.

Brock-Utne, B., Desai, Z., & Qorro, M. (Eds.). (2004). *Researching the Language of Instruction in Tanzania and South Africa*. Vlaeberg: African Minds.

Brown, H.D. (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs N.J.: Prentice Hall Regents.

Brualdi, A.C. (1998). Classroom questions. Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation. Retrieved from http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=6&n=6.

Bruner, J. (1977). *The process of education*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. (1983). *Child's talk: learning to use language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bunyi, G.W. (2005). Language Classroom Practices in Kenya. In A.M.Y.Lin & P.W. Martin (Eds.), *Decolonisation, Globalisation: Language-in-EducationPolicy and Practice* (pp.131-152). Clevedon: Multilingal Matters Ltd.

Callahan, M. (2002). The Matrix Language Frame model and Spanish/English code switching in fiction. *Language & communication*, 22, 1-16. Berkeley: University of California.

Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching Languages to young learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1986). *Bilingualism in education*. London: Eduard Arnold.

Canvin, M. (2007). Language and Education Issues in Policy and Practice in Mali, West Africa. In N. Rassool (Ed.), *Global Issues in Language, Education and Development: Perspectives from Postcolonial Countries* (pp.157-186). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Chaiklin, S. (2003). The zone of proximal development in Vygotsky's analysis of learning and instruction. In A. Kozulin, B. Gindis, V. Ageyev, & S.M. Miller (Eds.), *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context* (pp. 39-640). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chamot, A.U. (2004). Issues in Language Learning Strategy Research and Teaching. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 1(1), 14-26.

Chappuis, S., & Stiggins, R. (2002). Classroom assessment for learning. *Educational Leadership*, 60(1), 40-43.

Cherryholmes, C.H. (1992). Notes on pragmatism and scientific realism. *Educational Researcher*, 21(6), 13-17.

Chick, K., & Seneque, M. (1987). The role of applied linguistics in language planning: the medium of instruction problem in Kwazulu-Natal. In D. Young (Ed.), *Language Planning and the Medium in Education.* Cape Town: SAALA.

Choi Fam Tam, A. (2011). Does the switch of the medium of instruction facilitate the language learning of students? A case study of Hong Kong from a teachers' perspective. *Language and Education, 25 (5)*, 399-417.

Clark, B.A. (2002). First-and second-language in early childhood. In D. Rothenberg (Ed.), *Issues in early childhood education: curriculum, teacher education, and dissemination of information* (pp. 181-188). Available at http://ceepp.crc.uiuc.edu/pubs/katzsym/clark-b.pdf.

Cenoz, J. & Gorter, D. (2011). A holistic approach to multilingual education: Introduction. *Modern Language Journal*, 95, 339-343.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education (*7th ed.). London: Routledge Falmer.

Coleman, J.A. (2006). English-medium teaching in European higher education. *Language Teaching*, 39(1), 1-14.

Commonwealth Network Rwanda (2012). Independent schools in Rwanda. Retrieved from

http://www.commonwealth-of-nations.org/Rwanda/Education/Independent_Schools.

Concept to Classroom (2004). Constructivism as a Paradigm for teaching and Learning. Retrieved from http://www.thirteen.org/edonline/concept2class/constructivism/index.html.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the First Language in the Classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3), 402-423.

Cook, V. (2013). What are the goals of language teaching? *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 1(1), 44-56.

Corolado, C. (2008). Helping Young Children Develop Strong Writing Skills. Retrieved from http://www.colorincolorado.org/article/21885/.

Crawford, J. (2004). *Educating English Learners: Language diversity in the classroom*. Los Angeles: Bilingual Educational Services.

Creese, A. & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching. *Modern Language Journal*, 94, 103-115.

Creswell, J.W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J.W. (2010). Mapping the developing landscape of mixed methods research. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research* (pp.45-68). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J.W., & Plano Clark, V.L. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J.W., Plano Clark, V.L., & Garrett, A.L. (2008). Methodological Issues in Conducting Mixed Methods Research Designs. In M.M. Bergman (Ed.), *Advances in Mixed method research* (pp. 66-83). London: Sage.

Creswell, J.W., Plano Clark, V.L., Gutmann, M., & Hanson, W. (2003). Advanced mixed methods research designs. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research* (pp. 209-240). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd ed). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cummins, J. (1999). BICS and CALP: Clarifying the Distinction. *Opinion Paper: Supplied by EDRS.*

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual matters Ltd.

Cummins, J. (2009). Multilingualism in the English-language Classroom: Pedagogical Considerations. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(2), 317-321.

Dabašinskienė, I. (2012). Gender Differences in LanguageAcquisition: A Case Study of Lithuanian Diminutives, *Journal of Baltic Studies*, 43(2), 177-196.

Darlington, Y., & Scott, D. (2002). *Qualitative research in practice: Stories from the field.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Dawson, C. (2007). *A Practical Guide to Research Methods: a User-Friendly Manual for Mastering Research Techniques and Projects*. (3rded.). United Kingdom: How to Books.

DeCoster, J. (1998). *Overview of Factor Analysis*. Retrieved from http://www.stat-help.com/notes.html.

Denzin, N.K. (1978). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods*. New York: Praeger.

De Swaan, A. (2001). *Words of the world. The global language system*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Dewey, M. (2007). English as a lingua franca and globalisation: An interconnected perspective. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 17(3), 332-354.

Donald, D., Lazarus, S., & Lolwana, P. (2006). *Educational psychology in social context*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

EAC (2007). Treaty of accession of the Republic of Rwanda into the East African Community. Kampala, 18th June 2007.

Eagly, A.H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). The Psychology of Attitudes. *Psychology and Marketing.* 12(5), 459-466.

Eagly, A.H., & Chaiken, S. (2007). The Advantages of an Inclusive Definition of Attitude. *Social Cognition*, 25(5), 582-602.

Edwards, J.R. (1994). *Multilingualism*. London: Routledge.

Euromonitor International (2010). English language quantitative indicators: Cameroon, Nigeria, Rwanda, Bangladesh and Pakistan (A custom report compiled by Euromonitor International for the British Council). Retrieved from http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/sites/teacheng/files/Euromonitor%20Report%20A4.pdf.

Evans, S., & Green, C. (2007). Why EAP is necessary: A survey of Hong Kong tertiary students. *Journal of English for Academic purposes*, 6(1), 3-17.

Evans, S., & Morrisson, B. (2011). Meeting the challenges of English-medium higher education: The first year experience in Hong Kong. *English for Specific purposes*, 30, 198-208.

Fairclough, N. (2006). *Language and globalisation*. London: Routledge.

Fasold, R., & Connor-Linton, J. (2006). *An Introduction to Language and Linguistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fazio, R.H. (1986). How Do Attitudes Guide Behavior? In R. M. H. Sorrentino & E. Tory (Eds.). *Handbook of Motivation and Cognition: Foundations of Social Behaviour* (pp. 204-243). New York: Guilford Press.

Ferguson, G. (2006). *Language planning and education*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Feuerstein, R. (1990). The theory of structural cognitive modifiability. In B. Presseisen (Ed.), *Learning and thinking styles: Classroom applications* (pp. 68-134). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Gahigi, M. (2008). Rwanda: English language teaching kicks off. *allAfrica.com*. Retrieved from http://allafrica.com/stories/200812010940.html. Accessed 11 July 2013.

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

García, O. & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging. Language, Bilingualism and Education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gardner, R.C., & Lambert, W.E. (1959). Motivational Variables in Second Language Acquisition: *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 13, 266-72.

Gardner, R.C. (1985). *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The Role of Attitudes and Motivation*. London: Edward Arnold (Publishers) Ltd.

Garton, S., Copland, F., and Burns, A. (2011). Investigating Global Practices in Teaching English to Young learners. *ELT Research Papers*, 11(1), 1-42. London: British Council.

Ghazvini, S.D., & Khajehpour, M. (2011). Attitudes and Motivation in learning English as Second Language in high school students. *Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 15(1), 1209-1213.

Ghiglione, R. & Matalon, B. (1985). *Les dires analysés*: *l'analyse propositionnelle du discours*. Saint-Dénis: Presses Universitaires de Vincennes.

Gillham, B. (2002). *Developing a Questionnaire*. London: Continuum.

Goodman, Y.M., & Goodman, K.S. (1990). Vygotsky in a whole language perspective. In L. C. Moll (Ed.), *Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology* (pp. 223-250). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Green, A., Fagging, W., Cochrane, P., Dayson, J., & Paun, C. (2012). English spreads as

teaching language in Universities worldwide. *University World News: The Global Window on Higher Education, 229*.

Green, J.C., Caracelli, V.J., & Graham, W.F. (1989). Towards a conceptual framework for mixed-method evaluation designs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 11(3), 255-274.

Grosser, M.M., & Nel, M. (2013). The relationship between the critical thinking skills and the academic language proficiency of prospective teachers. *South African Journal of Education*, 33(2), 1- 17.

Habineza, M., Kabanza, E., & Kamali, C. (2009). *Our Lives Today: Social Studies, Teacheres Toda*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Habyarimana, H. (2006). Multilingualism and change on the Kinyarwanda sound system post-1994. Unpublished master's research report, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

Hancock, D.R. & Algozzine B. (2006). *Doing Case Study Research*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Harvard, G. (1997). The key ideas of Vygotsky and their implications for teaching and schooling: In R. Fox (Ed.), *Perspectives on constructivism* (pp. 38-56). Perspectives series No 56: University of Exeter.

Heath, S.B. (1986). Sociocultural contexts of language development. In D. Holt (Ed.), *Beyond language: Social and cultural factors in schooling language minority students* (pp.143-186). California State University.

Heller, M. & Martin, J.M. (Eds.) (2001). *Voices of Authority. Education and Linguistic Difference*. Westport, CT: Ablex Publishers.

Henning, E., Van Rensburg, W. & Smit, B. (2004). *Finding your way in qualitative research*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Henriksen,S.M. (2010). *Language Attitudes in a Primary School: A Bottom-Up Approach to Language Education Policy in Mozambique*. PhD dissertation: Roskilde University.

Herbert, J.B. (1992). *Language and Society in Africa: The theory and Practice of Sociolinguistics*. Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand Press.

Heugh, K. (2000). *The case against bilingual and multilingual education in South Africa*. PRAESA Occasional Paper No. 6. Cape Town: PRAESA.

Heugh, K. (2007). Language and Literacy Issues in South Africa. In N. Rassool (Ed.), *Global Issues in Language, Education and Development: Perspectives fromPostcolonial*

Countries (pp.187-217). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Heugh, K. (2009). Literacy and Bi/multilingual Education in Africa: Recovering Collective Memory and Expertise. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas, R. Phillipson, A.K. Mohanty & M. Panda (Eds.), *Social Justice through Multilingual Education* (pp. 103-124). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Hlatshwayo, A.H. (2011). An applied linguistics investigation of patterns of interaction in university tutorials. PhD thesis. Pretoria: University of South Africa.

Ho, W.K. (2003). English language teaching in Asia today: An overview. In W.K. Ho and R.Y.L. Wong (Eds.), *English Language Teaching to East Asia Today: Changing Policies and Practices* (pp. 463-473). Singapore: Eastern Universities Press.

Hoover, W., & Tunmer, W. (1993). The components of reading. In G. Thompson, W. Tunmer, & T. Nicholson (Eds.), *Reading acquisition processes*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Hornberger, N.H. & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging and transnational literacies in multilingual classrooms: a biliteracy lens. *International Journal of bilingual education and bilingualism*, 15(3), 261-278.

Hossler, D., & Vesper, N. (1993). An exploratory study of the factors associated with parental savings for post secondary education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 64(2), 140-165.

Hulan, N. (2010). What the students will say when the teacher is away: An investigation into student-led and teacher-led discussion within guided reading group. *Literacy Teaching and Learning*, 14(1), 21-64.

Ivankova, N.V. (2004). *Students' persistence in the University of Nebraska-Lincoln distributed doctoral program in Educational Leadership in Higher Education: A mixed methods study*. PhD dissertation, University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Jemimah, L. (2011). Shifting the country's education curriculum from French to English persists-with turbulence. *The Independent.* Available at: hungryoftruth.blogspot.com/2011/10/Rwanda-shifting-country-education.html.

Jick, T. D. (1979). Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: Triangulation in action. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 602-611.

Johnson, K. (2001). *An introduction to foreign language learning and teaching*: London: Pearson Education Limited.

Johnson, R.B., Onwuegbuzie, A.J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7), 14-26.

Johnson, R.B., Onwuegbuzie, A.J., & Turner, L.A. (2007). Towards a definition of mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed methods research*, 1(2), 112-133.

Johnston, L., & Miles, L. (2004). Assessing contributions to group assignments. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 29(6), 751-768.

Johnstone, R. (2009). An early start: What are the key conditions for generalised success? In J. Enever, J. Moon and U. Raman (Eds.), *Young Learner English Language Policy and Implementation: International Perspectives* (pp. 31-41). Reading: Garnet Publishing Ltd.

Kachru, B.B. (1990). *The other tongue: English across cultures* (2nd ed.). Oxford: University of Illinois Press.

Kagwesage, A.M. (2012). Higher Education Students' reflections on Learning in Times of Academic Language Shift. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 6(2), 1-15.

Kagwesage, A.M. (2013). Coping with Learning through a Foreign Language in Higher Education in Rwanda. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 2 (2), 1-12.

Kamwangamalu, N. (2000). *Language policy and mother-tongue education in South Africa: The case for a market-oriented approach. Georgetown University Pound Table on Languages and Linguistics*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Kamwendo, G.H. (2006). No Easy Walk to Linguistic Freedom: A Critique of Language Planning During South Africa's First Decade of Democracy. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*,15(1), 53-70.

Kao, P.L. (2010). Examining second language learning: Taking a sociocultural stance. *ARECLS, 7*, 113-131.

Kaplan, R.B. & Baldauf, R.B. (1997). *Language Planning from Practice to Theory*. Multilingual Matters.

Karahan, F. (2007). Language attitudes of Turkish students towards the English language and its use in Turkish context. *Journal of Arts and Sciences*, 7, 73-87.

Kenrose, S. (2009). Lev Vygotsky and the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). *Yahoo Contributor Network*. Available at http://voices.yahoo.com/lev-vygotsky-zone-proximal-development-3879832. html.

Kimenyi, F. (2008, October 15). Kagame reiterates the use of English as education medium. *The Newtimes*, Retrieved from http://www.igihe.com.

Kozulin, A. (2003). Psychological tools and mediated learning. In A. Kozulin, B. Gindis, V. Ageyev, and S.M. Miller (Eds.), *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context*

(pp. 15-38). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kozulin, A., Gindis, B., Ageyev, V., & Miller, S.M. (2003). Sociocultural theory and education: Students, teachers, and knowledge. In A. Kozulin, B. Gindis, V. Ageyev, and S.M. Miller (Eds.), *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context* (pp. 1- 11). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kramsch, C. (2012). Why foreign language teachers need to have multilingual outlook and what that means for their teaching practice. *Muitas Vozs, Ponta Grossa,* 1(2), 181-188.

Krashen, S.D. (1982). *Principals and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Krashen, S.D. (2006). *Second language acquisition and second language learning* (3rd ed.). New York: Pergamon Press.

Kyeyune, R. (2003). Challenges of using English as a medium of instruction in multilingual contexts: A view from Ugandan classrooms. *Language, Culture and Curriculum. 16* (2), 173-184.

Kyeyune, R. (2010). Challenges of using English as a medium of instruction in multilingual contexts: A view from Ugandan classrooms. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 16*(2), 173-184.

Lamb, M. (2004). Integrative motivation in globalising world. *Systems*, 32(1), 3-19. University of Leeds.

Lantolf, J.P., & Appel, G. (1994). Theoretical framework: An introduction to Vygotskian approaches to second language research. In J.P. Lantolf and G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 1- 32). Norwood, N.J: Ablex.

Lantolf, J. (2000). Introducing sociocultural theory. In J. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning (*pp. 1-26). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lantolf, J., & Thorne, S. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Laughlin, P.R., Carey, H.R. & Kerr, N.L. (2008). Group-to-Individual Problem-Solving Transfer. *Group Processes Intergroup Relations*, 11(3), 319-330. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1153.

LeClerc, J. (2008). *Rwanda: L' aménagement linguistique dans le monde*. Retrieved from http://www.tlfq.ulaval.ca/axl/afrique/rwanda.htm.

Le D://www.tlfq.ulaval.ca/axl/afrique/rwanda.htm.Group-to-Inaching local languages in a

linguistically unified France. In P. Cuvelier, T. Du Plessis, & L. Teck (Eds.), *Multilingualism, Education and Social Integration. Belgium, Europe, South Africa, Southern Africa* (pp. 59-71). Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (2002). School Leadership and Teachers' Motivation to Implement Accountability Policies. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 38(1), 94-119.

Leseman, P.P.M., & De Jong, P.F. (2011). Home Literacy: Opportunity, instruction, cooperation and social-emotional quality predicting early reading achievement. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 33(3), 294-398.

Levin, T., Shohamy, E. and Spolsky, B. (2003). *Academic achievements of immigrants in schools*. Report submitted to the Ministry of Education.

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and conceptualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18, 655-670.

Lin, A. M. Y. (2013). Classroom code-switching: Three decades of research. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 4(1), 195-218. DOI 10.1515/applirev-2013-0009.

Lin, A.M.Y., & Martin, P. (2005). From a Critical Deconstruction Paradigm to a Critical Construction Paradigm: An Introduction to Decolonisation, Globalisation and Language-in-Education Policy and Practice. In A.M.Y. Lin and P.W. Martin (Eds.), *Decolonisation, Globalisation: Language-in-Education Policy and Practice* (pp. 1-19). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Li, D., Remedios, L., & Clarke, D. (2010). Chinese students' perceptions of out- of- class group work in Australia. *The Australian Educational Researcher, 37(3)*, 95-112.

Livingston, J.A. (1997). Metacognition: An overview. Retrieved from http://gse.buffalo.edu/fas/shuell/cep564/metacog.htm.

Lo, Y.Y., & Macaro, E. (2012). The medium of instruction and classroom interaction: evidence from Hong Kong secondary schools. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15(1), 29-52.

Lynd, M. (2010). *Assessment report and proposal for an education strategy*. USAID: Rwanda.

Makalela, L. (2013). Teaching indigenous African languages to speakers of other African languages: The effects of translanguaging for multilingual development. *Multilingual Matters*.

Macdonald, C., & Burroughs, E. (1991). *Eager to Talk and Learn and Think: Bilingual primary education in South Africa*. Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman Ltd.

MacDonald, M.C. (2013). How language production shapes language form and comprehension. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 4(226), 1-16. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00226.

Mackey, A. (2006). Second language acquisition. In R.W. Fasold and J. Connor-Linton (Eds.) *Introduction to language and Linguistics,* (pp 433-461). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maniraho, S. (2013). *Attitudes and motivation of teacher training college teachers and students toward English learning and use as medium of instruction in Rwanda*. Unpublished MA dissertation: University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

Marsh, D. (2006). English as medium of instruction in the new global linguistic order: Global characteristics, local consequences. *METSMac*, 29-33.

Mbori, B.J.O. (2008). *The Interface between Language Attitudes and Language Use in a Post-conflict Context: The Case of Rwanda*. PhD dissertation, University of South Africa: Pretoria.

Mchazime, H.S. (2001). *Effects of English as a medium of instruction on pupils' academic achievement in social studies in primary schools in Malawi*. PhD thesis. University of South Africa.

McCrummen, S. (2008). Rwandans say Adieu to Français. Available at: http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/10/27/ AR2008102703165.html.

McGreal, C. (2008). Rwanda to switch from French to English in schools. Available at: http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2008/oct/14/rwanda-france.

McMillan, J.H., & Schumacher, S. (2006). *Research in Education: Evidence-Based Inquiry*. New York: Pearson.

McPeck, J.E. (1990). *Teaching critical thinking*. London: Routledge, Chapman and Hall Inc.

Merill, D.M., & Gilbert, C.G. (2008). Effective peer interaction in problem-centred instructional strategy. *Distance Education*, 29(2), 199-207.

Mercer, N. (1995). *The guided construction of knowledge. Talk amongst teachers and learners*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Mercer, N. (2000). *Words and mind. How we use language to think together*. London: Routledge.

Messick, S. (1996a). *Standards-based score interpretation: Establishing valid grounds for valid inferences. Proceedings of the joint conference on standard setting for large scale assessments, Sponsored by National Assessment Governing Board and The*

National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Messick, S. (1996b). Validity of Performance Assessment. In G. Philips (1996). *Technical Issues in Large-Scale Performance Assessment.* Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics.

Miller, L. (2009). Engineering lectures in a second language: What factors facilitate students' listening comprehension? *Asian EFL Journal,* 11(2), 8-30.

Milroy, L., & Gordon, M. (2003). *Sociolinguistics: methods and interpretation*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

MINECOFIN (2007). Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS 1). Kigali: Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning.

MINECOFIN (2013). Rwandan Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy 2013-2018. Kigali: Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning.

MINEDUC (2003). Law N° 29/2003 0f 30/08/2003 Establishing the Organisation and the Functioning of Nursary, Primary and Secondary Schools. Retrieved from http://www.mineduc.gov.rw/new/IMG/pdf/Mineduc_law.pdf.

MINEDUC (2008). *Instruction Ministérielle No 47.23/13.81/SR/2008 Portant Fixation de la Langue Officielle pour l'Education au Rwanda.* Kigali, 12 Novembre 2008.

MINEDUC (2010). *Education Sector Strategic Plan 2010 - 2015 (ESSP)*. Kigali: Ministry of Education.

MINICAAF (2008, October 8). Decisions of Cabinet Meeting held on 8th October 2008. Retrieved from http://primature.gov.rw.

MINICAAF (2011). Decisions of Cabinet Meeting held on 11 February 2011. Retrieved from http://primature.gov.rw.

Ministry of Local Government and Social Affairs (2000). *Implementation Strategy for National Decentralisation Policy*. Kigali: MINALOC.

Mitchell, R., & Myles, F. (2004). *Second Language Learning The*ories (2nd ed.). London: Oxford University Press.

Moate, J. (2011). The integrated nature of CLIL: A sociocultural perspective. *International CLIL Research Journal, 1*(3), 5-45.

Moodley, V. (2003). *Language attitudes and code-switching behaviours of facilitators and learners in LLC senior phase OBE classrooms*. PhD thesis. Durban: University of Natal.

Moodley, V. & Kamwangamalu, N.K. (2004). Code-switching as a technique in teaching

literature in a secondary school ESL classroom. *Alternation*, 11(2), 186-202.

Moodley, V. (2007). Code-switching in the multilingual English first language classroom. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(6), 707-722.

Moodley, V. (2010). Code-switching and communicative competence in the language classroom. *Journal for Language Teaching*, 44(1), 7-22.

Moodley, V. (2011). Effecting Technical Management Reform at a Semi-Functional School: A Case Study of a School in an Informal Settlement in Gauteng, South Africa. *International Journal for Cross-Disciplinary Subjects in Education (IJCDSE)*, SpecialIssue 1(1), 583-589.

Moodley, V. (2013). *Introduction to Language Methodology*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Moore, D. (2002). Case Study Code-switching and Learning in the Classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 5(5), 279-293.

Moosa-Mitha, M. (2005). Situating anti-oppressive theories within critical and difference-centered perspectives. In L. Brown & S. Strega (Eds.) *Research as Resistance: Critical, indigenous and anti-oppressive approaches* (pp. 37–72). Toronto:Canadian Scholars Press.

Morgan, D. (1998). Practical strategies for combining qualitative and quantitative methods: applications to health research. *Qualitative Health research*, 8, 362-376.

Morgan, D. (2007). Paradigms lost and pragmatism regained: Methodological implications of combining qualitative and quantitative methods. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(1), 48-76.

Morse, J. M. (1991). Approaches to qualitative-quantitative methodological triangulation. *Nursing Research*, 40, 120-123.

Mouhanna, M. (2009). Re-examining the Role of L1 in the EFL Classroom. *UGRU Journal*. Vol 8. Retrieved from: http://www.ugr.uaeu.ac.ae/acads/ugrujournal/docs/REL1.pdf.

Mouton, J. (2009). *Understanding Social Research*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Muhirwe, C. (2012). *Developing Academic Literacies in Times of Change: Scaffolding* PhD dissertation: University of Linköping.

Mukama, E. (2009). *Information and Communication Technology in Teacher Education: Thinking and learning in computer-supported social practice*. PhD dissertation: University of Linköping.

Munyankesha, P. (2004). *Les défis du plurilinguisme officiel au Rwanda. Analyse*

sociolinguistique. PhD dissertation. University of Western Ontario, Canada.

Mutwarasibo, F. (2003). *Dual-Medium Language of Instruction Policy and Practices in Rwandan Higher Education: A Case study of the National University of Rwanda*. Unpublished master's research report, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

Mwinsheikhe, H. M. (2002). *Science and the Language Barrier: Using Kiswahili as a Medium of Instruction in Tanzania Secondary Schools as a Strategy of Improving Student Participation and Performance in Science*. Oslo: Institute for Educational Research.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Duelling languages: Grammatical structure in codeswitching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (2006). Natural codeswitching knocks on the laboratory door. *Bilingualism: Language and cognition*, 9(2), 203-213. DOI: 10.1017/S1366728906002549.

Napell, S.M. (2001). Using questions to enhance classroom learning. *Education*, 99(2), 188-197. Berkeley: University of California.

Nation, P. (2003). The role of the first language in foreign language learning. *Asian EFL Journal*, 5(2), 1-8.

NCDC (2010a). *Social Studies Curriculum*. Kigali: MINEDUC.

NCDC (2010b). *English Curriculum*. Kigali: MINEDUC.

Ndayipfukamiye, L. (1993). *Teaching/learning bilingually: The case of grade five in Burundi primary schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation: University of Lancaster.

Neuman, W.L. (2000). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative approaches* (4thed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Nieto, S. (2010). *Language, Culture and Teaching: Critical Perspective for a New Century* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Niyibizi, E. (2010). *An evaluation of the Rwandan trilingual policy in some nursery and primary schools in Kigali City*. Unpublished MA dissertation: University of South Africa.

Niyomugabo, C. (2008). *La glottopolitique du KIE/Rwanda: contribution à une sociolinguistique éducative.*Unpublished PhD dissertation: University of Rouen.

Nkosana, L.B.M. (2011). Language Policy and Planning in Botswana. *The African Symposium: An Online Journal of the African Educational Research Network,* 11(1),

129-137. University of Botswana.

Nkurunziza, F. (2012, April 17). Hakwiye amahugurwa ku barimu bigisha nabi Icyongereza. Retrieved from http://www.igihe.com/amakuru/mu-rwanda/hakwiye-amahugurwa-ku-barimu-bigisha-nabi-icyongereza.html.

Norman, M., & Hyland, T. (2003). The role of confidence in lifelong learning. *Education: Journal articles* (Paper 7). UBIR: University of Bolton. Available at http://digitalcommons.bolton.ac.uk/ed_journals/7.

Norton, B. (2013). Identity, literacy and English language teaching. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 1 (2), pp 85-98.

NPR (National Public Radio),(2009). English to Become Official Language in Rwanda. Retrieved from: http://www.npr.org/templates/story.php?storyId=97245421.

Ntakirutimana, E. (2005). The trilingualism policy in Rwandan education almost 10 years ago (Paper presented in the *38th Annual Meeting on Language and Identity in Applied Linguistics*, University of Bristol, 15–17 September).

Obura, N. (2003). *Never again: Educational reconstruction in Rwanda*. International Institute for Educational Planning: UNESCO.

O'Conner, J. & Geiger, M. (2009). Challenges facing primary school educators of English Second (or other) Language learners in the Western Cape. *SA Journal of Education*, 29(2), 253-269.

Olivera, F., & Strauss, S. (2004). Group-to-individual transfer of learning-cognitive and social factors. *Small Group Research*, 35(4), 440-465.

Oskamp, S. (1991). *Attitudes and opinions*, (2nd Ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Pattanayak, D.P. (1986). Educational Use of the Mother Tongue. In B. Spolsky(Ed.), *Language and Education in Multilingual Settings*, (pp. 5-15). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*, (3rd ed.). London: Sage Publications.

Paulston, C.B. (1986). Linguistic Consequences of Ethnicity and Nationalism in Multilingual Settings. In B. Spolsky (Ed.),*Language and Education in Multilingual Settings* (pp. 117-152). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Pearson, P. (2013). Policy without a plan: English as medium of instruction in Rwanda. *Current issues in Language Planning*. DOI: 10.1080/14664208.2013.857286.

Peirce, B. N. (1995). Social Identity, Investment, and Language Learning. *TESOL QUARTRLY, 29(1).*

Pennington, M.C. & Yue, F. (1994). English and Chinese in Hong Kong: Pre-1997 language attitudes. *World Englishes*, 13, 1-20.

Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an International Language*. Harlow: Longman.

Pennycook, A. (2008). Praise for Language as Commodity: Global Structures, Local Marketplaces. In P. Tan and R. Rubdy (Eds.), *Language as Commodity.* London: Continuum.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, R. (1999). International Languages and International Human Rights. In Miklós Kontra et al. (Eds.), *Language: A Right and a Resource-Approaching Linguistic Human Rights* (pp. 25-46). Budapest: Central European University Press.

Phillipson, R. (2009). *Linguistic Imperialism Continued*. New York: Routledge.

Pierce, B. N. (1995). Social Identity, Investment, and Language Learning. *TESOL QUARTERLY, 29(1).*

Pierce, B.N. (1997). Language, Identity, and the Ownership of English. *TESOL QUARTERLY*, 31(3), 409-429.

Pierson, H.D., Fu, G.S., & Lee, S. (1980). An analysis of the relationship between language attitudes and English attainment of secondary school students in Hong Kong. *Language Learning*, 30, 289-316.

Pinon, R., & Haydon, J. (2010). English Language Quantitative Indicators: Cameroon, Nigeria, Rwanda, Bangladesh and Pakistan. *Euromonitor International*: British Council.

Praxton, I.J.M. (2009). It is easy to learn when you are using your home language but with English you need to start learning language before you get to the concept: Bilingual concept development in an English medium university in South Africa. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 30(4), 345-359. http://www.unisa.edu.au/hawkeinstitute/cslplc/documents/Prinsloo&Janks.pdf

Probyn, M. (2005). Language and the Struggle to Learn: The Intersection of Classroom Realities, Langauge Policy, and Neocolonial and Globalisation Discourses in South African Schools. In A.M.Y. Lin and P.W. Martin (Eds.), *Decolonisation, Globalisation: Language-in-Education Policy and Practice* (pp. 153-172). Clevedon: Maltilingual Matters Ltd.

Probyn, M. (2006). Language and learning science in South Africa. *Language and Education*, 20(5), 391-415.

Prophet, R., & Dow, J. (1994). Mother tongue language and concept development in science. A Botswana case study. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 7(3), 207-217.

Pudi, T.I. (2002). *Teacher attitudes towards the implementation of the learning area technology*. PhD dissertation, University of South Africa: Pretoria.

Qorro, M. (2002). Language of instruction not determinant in quality education. *The Guardian*. Available at http://www.ippmedia.com.

Quane, A. and Glanz, C. (2010). Mother tongue literacy in sub-saharan Africa. Available at https://www.google.co.za/#q=mother+tongue+literacy+in+sub+saharan+africa.

Rassool, N. (2007). *Global Issues in Language, Education and Development: Perspectives from Postcolonial Countries*. Clevedon: Multilingual matters Ltd.

Republic of Rwanda (1996). *Official Gazette of the Republic of Rwanda*, No 3. Kigali.

République du Rwanda (2005). 3ème Recensement Général de la Population et de l'Habitat du Rwanda au 15 Août 2002. Kigali: Ministère des Finances et de la Planification Economique.

Richards, J.C., Platt, J., & Weber, H. (1992). *Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*. Essex: Longman Group UK Limited.

Ricento, T. (2006a). Language Policy: Theory and Practice-An Introduction. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Practice* (pp. 10-23). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Ricento, T. (2006b). Methodological Perspectives in Language policy: An overview. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An Introduction to language Policy: Theory and Method* (pp. 129-134). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

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

Rosendal, T. (2009). Linguistic markets in Rwanda: Language use advertisements and on signs. *Journal of Multilingual and multicultural Development*, 30(1), 19-39.

Rubagumya, C. (1997). Disconnecting Education: Language as a determinant of the quality of education in Tanzania. *Journal of Linguistics and Language in Education, 3*, 81-93.

Rubagumya, C. (2003). English-medium primary schools in Tanzania: A new 'linguistic market' in education? In B. Brock-Utne, Z. Desai and M. Qorro (Eds.), *The language of instruction in Tanzania and South Africa (LOITASA)* (pp. 149-170). Dar es Salaam: E & D Publishers.

Rugemalira, J.M. (2005). Theoretical and practical challenges in a Tanzanian English

medium primary school. *Africa & Asia, 5*, 66-84.

Ruterana, P.C. (2011). Exploring home literacy practices among Rwandan families. *International Journal of Research in Education*, 3 (1), 1-11.

Salkind, N.J. (2012). *Excel Statistics: A quick guide*. 2nd Edition. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Samuelson, B.L., & Freedman, S.W. (2010). Language Policy, Multilingual Education, and Power in Rwanda, *Language Policy (2010) 9, 191-215.* DOI 10.1007/s10993-010-9170-7.

Saussure, F. (1983). *Course in General Linguistics.* London: Duckworth.

Sawyer, R.K., & Berson, S. (2004). Study group discussion: How external representations affect collaborative conversation. *Linguistics and Education*, 15, 387-412.

Scott, V. and De La Fuente, M. (2008). What's the problem? L2 Learners' Use of the L1 During Consciousness-Raising, Form focused Tasks. *The Modern Language Journal*. Vol 92, No 1, pp. 100-113.

Seliger, H.W. & Shohamy, E. (1989). *Second language research methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language teaching*, 10(3), 209-231.

Sert, O. (2005). The functions of code-switching in ELT classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 10(8). Available at http://iteslj.org/Articles/Sert- CodeSwitching.html.

Shaw, L., Carey, P., & Mair, M. (2008). Studying interaction in undergraduate tutorials: Results from a small scale evaluation. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 13(6), 703-714.

Shaw, W.D. (1983). Asian Student Attitudes towards English. In L.E. Smith (Ed.), *Readings in English as an International Language* (pp. 21-34). Oxford: Pergamon Press Ltd.

Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language Policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. New York: Routledge.

Shulman, L.S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational researcher*, 15(2), 4-14.

Shulman, L.S. (1987). Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of the New Reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1-21.

Sinclair, J.K. (2012). English in Rwanda: 'Inevitability' meets obstacles on the ground. *Academia Edu*. Available at: http://www.academia.edu/4739064/English_in_Rwanda Inevitability_meets_obstacles_on_the_ground.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic Genocide in Education-or Worldwide Diversity and*

Human Rights? Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2001). The globalization of (educational) language rights. *International Review of Education*, 37(3-4), 201-219.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2009, October 20-24). International Hearing on the Harm Done in Schools by the Suppression of the Mother Tongue. Executive Summary of Findings and Recommendations. Port Louis: Mauritius.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & Heugh, K., (2012). Introduction: Reclaiming sustainable linguistic diversity and multilingual education. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas and K. Heugh (Eds.), *Multilingual education and sustainable diversity work: From periphery to centre*. New York: Routledge.

Spolsky, B. (1986). Overcoming Language Barriers to Education in a Multilingual World. In B. Spolsky (Ed.), *Language and Education in Multilingual Settings,* (pp. 182-191). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language Policy-Key Topics in Sociolinguistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Steflja, I. (2012). The Costs and Consequences of Rwanda's shift of Language Policy. *Africa Portal*, Backgrounder, No 30. Available at: http://www.africaportal.org/articles/2012/05/31/costs-and-consequences-rwanda%E2%80%99s-shift-language-policy.

Storch, N. and Wigglesworth, G. (2003). Is there a role for the use of L1 in an L2 setting? *TESOL Quarterly*. Vol 37, No 4, pp. 760-769.

Swann, J. (1994). Observing and recording talk in educational setting. In D. Graddol, J. Maybin & B. Stierer (Eds.). *Researching language and literacy in social context*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Tamtam, A., Gallagher, F., Naher, S., & Olabi, A.G. (2010). *EMI for engineering education in Arab world and twenty first century challenges* (3rd ed.). International Symposium for engineering Education. Ireland: University College Cork.

Tarone, E., & Swain, M. (1995). A Sociolinguistic perspective on second language use in immersion classes. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79(2), 166-178.

Tashakkori, A., & Teddie, C. (1998). *Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tharp, R., & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing minds to life: Teaching, learning and schooling insocial context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tharp, R., & Gallimore, R. (1998). A theory of teaching as assisted performance. In D.

Faulkner, K. Littleton & M. Woodhead (Eds.), *Learning relationships in the classroom* (pp. 93-109). London: Routledge.

Tice, J. (2004). Teaching English: drilling 1. *British Council*. Available at www.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/drilling-1.

The Rwanda Focus. (2009). Education reform gets grant of US$ 35 million. Retrieved from http://focus.rw/wp/2009/10/education-reform-gets-grant-of-us-35-million/.

The World Bank (2011). Rwanda - Education country status report: toward quality enhancement and achievement of universal nine year basic education - an education system in transition; a nation in transition. Retrieved from http:/go.worldbank.org/ 539BCGQ9Y0.

Tollefson, J.W. (2000). Policy and Ideology in the Spread of English. In J.K. Hall& W.G. Eggington (Eds.), *The Sociopolitics of English Language Teaching* (pp. 7-21). London: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Tollefson, J.W. (2006). Critical Theory in Language Policy. InT. Ricento (Ed.), *An Introduction to language Policy: Theory and Method* (pp. 129-134). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Trappes-Lomax, S.R. (1990). Can a foreign language be a national medium? In C.M. Rubagumya (Ed.), *Language in Education in Africa* (pp. 94-104). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Trudell, B. (2010). When 'prof' speaks, who listens? The African elite and the use of African languages foreducation and developmentin African communities. *Language and education, 24(4),* 337-352.

Van Splender, F. (2010). *English as a medium of instruction in Flemish Higher education: Language and identity management in a Deutch-speaking context*. PhD Thesis. University of Lancaster.

VOA News (2010). Rwanda Formally Welcomed Into Commonwealth. http://www.voanews.com/english/news/africa/Rwanda-Formally-Welcomed-Into-Commonwealth-87013602.html.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wang, L. (2007). Sociocultural learning theory and information literacy teaching activities in higher education. *Reference and User Services Quarterly*, 47(2), 149-158.

Webb, V. (2002). English as a second language in South Africa's tertiary institutions: A case

study at the University of Pretoria. *World Englishes*, *21*(1), 49-61.

Webb, V. (2004). African languages as media of instruction in South Africa: Stating the case. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, *28*(2), 147-173.

Wei, L. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 1222-1235.

Wells, G. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry: Towards a sociocultural practice and theory of education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wertsch, J.V. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action.* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Wertsch, J.V. (2008). From social interaction to higher psychological processes: A clarification and application of Vygotsky's Theory. *Human Development*, 52(1), 66-79.

Wilson, A. (2009). *Translators on Translating: Inside the Invisible Art.* Vancouver: CCSP Press.

Wolff, E. (2011). Language politics and planning. In A. Ouane & C. Glanz (Eds.) *Optimising learning, education and publishing in Africa: the language factor. A review and analysis of theory and practice in mother tongue and bilingual education in sub-Saharan Africa* (pp. 49-104). IUL/ADEA.

Yao, Z. (2012). *Breaking the language barrier: A game-changing approach*. Retrieved from http://books.google.co.za/books?id=j6TyEuj7d5YC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false.

Yashima, T. (2002). Willingness to Communicate in a Second Language: The Japanese EFL Context. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86(1), 54-66. DOI: 10.1111/1540-4781.00136.

Yin, R. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods (*4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zakaria, Z., & Abd Aziz, M.S. (2011). Assessing students performance. The second language (English) factor. *The International Journal of Educational and Psychological Assessment*, 6(2), 42-62.

Zar, J.H. (2010). *Biostatistical Analysis* (5th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

APPENDICES

Appendix A1: Questionnaire for Principals

QUESTIONS

NB: ***Even if the questions are in English, you can answer in any language you want.***

SECTION A:

(Please mark with an '**X'** in the box of your choice)

1. Age

18-22 years old	23-30 years old	31-35 years old	41-50 years old	Over 50 years old

2. Other information (please mark for each of **A**, **B** and **C**)

A. Gender		**B. Place of residence**		**C. Nationality**	
Male	Female	Town	Countryside	Rwandan	Other (Please state) ……..

3. Number of years of experience as principal

1-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	16-20 years	Over 20 years

4. Number of years of experience in education

1-3 years	4-6 years	7-10 years	11-20 years	Over 20 years

5. Area of expertise

Teacher-training	Languages (eg: English, French, African languages...)	Pure Sciences (eg; Biology, Chemistry, Mathematics...)	Economy and management	Other (please state) …….

6. Highest level of qualification

Secondary school certificate	Diploma (French 'Bacherier')	Bachelors Degree	Postgraduate diploma	Masters	Other (please state) ……

SECTION B:

(Please mark with an '**X**' in the box of your choice)

1. What is the **main** language you speak at home (first language/mother tongue)?

Kinyarwanda	English	French	Kiswahili	Other (Please state)…….....

2. What is your second language?

Kinyarwanda	English	French	Kiswahili	Other (Please state)……

3. Which other language(s) can you speak? (more choices are possible)

Kinyarwanda	English	French	Kiswahili	Other (Please state)……

4. Which language do you use at home with your family members?

Kinyarwanda	English	French	Kiswahili	Other (Please state)……..

5. Which language(s) do you use at school:

With teachers	Kinyarwanda	English	French	Kiswahili	Other (Please state)…….....
With pupils					Other (Please state).....

6. Which language do you use for professional communication (eg. Writing letters or reports to higher authorities)?

Kinyarwanda	English	French	Kiswahili	Other (Please state) ……

7. When and how did you learn English? (Please write your answer in the space provided)

7.1 **When**	Example: before school age; from primary 4 to grade 6 of high school; at university, etc.
7.2 **How**	Example: from parents; from books; from TV; with friends; as a subject at school/university, etc.

8. Which language did you have as medium of instruction when you were at primary school, high school or university? (Please write your answer in the space provided in the table)

Primary school	
High school	
University	

9. Currently, which language does your school mainly use to teach?

Kinyarwanda	English	French	Kiswahili	Other (Please state..……

10. Does your school use any other language for teaching purposes? (Mark your answer with an 'X')
Yes ☐ No ☐

If **yes**, explain why (write in the space provided below)

11. Before 2009, which language did you mostly use to teach social studies (Geography, History, civics)?

Kinyarwanda	English	French	Kiswahili	Other (Please state)……

SECTION C:

Please mark with an '**X'** in the appropriate column. Note that there is no 'right' or 'wrong'ranswer, you simply have to indicate what you feel or think by choosing between '***strongly agree***', '***agree***', '***disagree***'ior '***strongly disagree***'.

	Strongly agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly disagree**
1. English is the most desirable language in education worldwide.				
2. All levels of primary schools (i.e., P1-P6) should teach and learn in English.				
3. Teaching in English is costly for both parents and government in Rwanda.				
4. All teachers in Rwanda should teach in English.				
5. Learning in English is very difficult for pupils in primary schools of Rwanda.				
6. Teaching in English helps educators and learners improve their English proficiency.				
7. It is difficult to help primary school pupils increase their knowledge when using English as medium of instruction.				
8. English is necessary for an educated person.				
9. If a person cannot speak English, s/he cannot pursue her/his studies after school.				
10. Teaching in English is a very hard task for teachers in primary schools in Rwanda.				
11. English is necessary to obtain good jobs in Rwanda.				
12. Teachers need more training in English to increase their capacity to teach in it.				
13. English is necessary to obtain good jobs elsewhere in the world.				
14. Learning in English only places non-native-English children at a further disadvantage.				
15. Teaching in English is necessary to help Rwanda develop faster.				

16. Learning in English only limits the non-native-English children's creativity.				
17. English is necessary to communicate with the outside world.				
18. At primary school level, pupils should learn English as a subject only.				
19. English is the language that best expresses scientific concepts; we should all learn it.				
20. Learning in English only makes children lose their mother-tongue (Kinyarwanda).				
21. Learning in English only makes children lose their cultural identity.				
22. Children should be taught in English in order to be able to compete at the World job market when they grow up.				
23. Educators who teach in English are the most respected.				

SECTION D:

Please mark with an '**X'** in the appropriate column.

	Strongly agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly disagree**
1. It is difficult for teachers to explain new concepts in English to their pupils.				
2. Teachers do not feel confident to teach school subjects in English.				
3. When teachers ask questions in English many pupils do not understand them.				
4. English prevents pupils from participating in class discussion.				
5. Pupils switch between languages (use more than one language) for discussion in the classroom.				
6. Teaching in English motivates pupils' participation in the classroom.				
7. Teaching in English inhibits our pupils' comprehension.				
8. Teachers switch between languages (use more than one language) to explain concepts to their pupils.				
9. English enhances our pupils' motivation to read texts.				
10. Our pupils use English during group discussion in the classroom.				

11. Lessons in English complicate our pupils' understanding of scientific concepts.				
12. During written tests in English, teachers always explain questions to pupils before they can answer them.				
13. Teaching in English has increased the pupils' confidence in our school.				
14. Pupils switch between languages (use more than one language) to write their answers for homework or tests.				
15. English motivates our pupils' writing.				
16. During lessons, reading exercises in English complicates our pupils.				

If you have anything else that you would like to add about teaching in English in primary schools in Rwanda, please do so in the space provided.

SECTION E:

Please mark with an '**X**' in the appropriate column.

	I always do this	**I sometimes do this**	**I hardly ever do this**	**I never do this**
1. I provide teachers with dictionaries to help them learn English.				
2. I allow teachers to write notes in English and use another language (Kinyarwanda or French) to explain the content of the lesson.				
3. I advise teachers to switch between languages (use more than one language) to help pupils learn concepts in English and understand the content of the subject.				
4. I ask teachers to allow their pupils to ask questions in Kinyarwanda or French.				
5. I ask teachers to allow their pupils to write homework or tests in the language they feel comfortable with.				
6. I recommend teachers not to allow pupils to use any other language apart from English to write homework or tests.				

7. I strictly ask teachers to enforce the use of English in their classrooms.				
8. I punish pupils who talk to me in any other language apart from English.				

If you have anything else that you would like to add about what you do for teaching in English, please do so in the space provided.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND ASSISTANCE.

RESULTS

Appendix A1a: Principals' personal information

1. Age

Age range	18-22	23-30	31-40	41-50	Over 50	**Total**
RS1				1		**1**
RS2			*1	1		**2**
US1				1		**1**
US2				*1	1	**2**
Total			**1**	**4**	**1**	**6**

2. Gender, Place of residence, Nationality

	Gender		Place of residence		Nationality				
	Male	Female	Urban	Rural	Rwandan	Burundian	Ugandan	Other	**Total**
RS1		1		1	1				**1**
RS2	1	*1	1	*1	2				**2**
US1		1	1		1				**1**
US2	1	*1	2		2				**2**
Total	**2**	**4**	**4**	**2**	**6**				**6**

3. Number of years of experience as principal

	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	Over 20	**Total**
RS1				1		**1**
RS2		*1	1			**2**
US1					1	**1**
US2			*1	1		**2**
Total		**1**	**2**	**2**	**1**	**6**

4. Area of expertise

	Teacher-training	Languages	Pure sciences	Economy and management	Other	**Total**
RS1	1					**1**
RS2	2					**2**
US1	1					**1**
US2	2					**2**
Total	**6**					**6**

5. Highest level of qualification

	Secondary school certificate	Diploma	Bachelors	Post graduate diploma	Masters	Other	**Total**
RS1	1						**1**
RS2	2						**2**
US1		1					**1**
US2	*1	1					**2**
Total	**4**	**2**					**6**

Appendix A1b: Principals'planguage background

1. What is your first/mother tongue?

	Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	Other	**Total**
RS1	1					**1**
RS2	2					**2**
US1	1					**1**
US2	2					**2**
Total	**6**					**6**

2. What is your second language?

	Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	Other	**Total**
RS1				1		**1**
RS2			1	*1		**2**
US1				1		**1**
US2			*1	1		**2**
Total			**2**	**4**		**6**

3. Which other language(s) can you speak?

	Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	Other	**Total**
RS1			1			**1**
RS2		1		*1		**2**
US1			1			**1**
US2		*1	1			**2**
Total		**2**	**3**	**1**		**6**

4. Which language do you use at home with your family members?

	Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	Other	**Total**
RS1	1					**1**
RS2	2					**2**
US1	1					**1**
US2	2					**2**
Total	**6**					**6**

5. Which language(s) do you use at school with:

		Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	Other	Total
Teachers	RS1	1					1
	RS2	*1		1			2
	US1			1			1
	US2			2			2
	Total	**2**		**4**			**6**
Learners	RS1	1					1
	RS2	*1		1			2
	US1			1			1
	US2			2			2

	Total	**2**		**4**			**6**

6. Which language do you use for professional communication?

	Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	Other	**Total**
RS1	1					**1**
RS2	*1		1			**2**
US1			1			**1**
US2			2			**2**
Total	**2**		**4**			**6**

7. A) When did you learn English

	Before school age	From Primary 4 to Grade 6 of High School	At High school	At University	MINEDUC/school trainings	**Total**
RS1					1	**1**
RS2		1	*1			**2**
US1			1			**1**
US2		*1	1			**2**
Total		**2**	**3**		**1**	**6**

8. B) How did you Learn English

	From parents	From books	From TV	With friends	As a subject	**Total**
RS1					1	**1**
RS2					2	**2**
US1					1	**1**
US2					2	**2**
Total					**6**	**6**

9. Which language did you have as MoI?

		Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	Total
Primary school	RS1	1				1
	RS2	*1		1		2
	US1	1				1
	US2	1		*1		2

	Total	**4**		**2**		**6**
Secondary school	RS1				1	1
	RS2			1	*1	2
	US1				1	1
	US2			*1	1	2
	Total			**2**	**4**	**6**
University	RS1					1
	RS2					2
	US1				1	1
	US2				1	2
	Total				**2**	**6**

10. Currently, which language does your school mainly use to teach?

	Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	**Total**
RS1			1		**1**
RS2			2		**2**
US1			1		**1**
US2			2		**2**
Total			**6**		**6**

11. Does your school use any other language to teach?

	YES	Reasons	NO	**Total**
RS1	1	To explain the content of lessons		**1**
RS2	2	-To facilitate understanding -When there are difficulties to explain in English		**2**
US1	1	To help understanding		**1**
US2	2	Kinyarwanda to explain difficult words in English.		**2**
Total	**6**			**6**

12. Before 2009, which language did your school use to teach Social Studies?

	Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	English and French	**Total**
RS1				1		**1**
RS2					2	**2**

US1				1		**1**
US2					2	**2**
Total				**2**	**4**	**6**

Appendix A1c: Attitudes of principals towards English as the MoI

Scale range: 1=strongly agree; 2: agree; 3: disagree; 4: strongly disagree

Factors	**Variables/Statements**	**Scale/frequency**				**n**	*p*
		1	**2**	**3**	**4**		
1. English as a global language of education.	***Agree with statements***						
	1. English is the most desirable language in education worldwide.	4	2	0	0	6	
	6. Teaching in English helps educators and learners improve their English proficiency.	4	2	0	0	6	
	8. English is necessary for an educated person.	2	3	1	0	6	
	11. English is necessary to obtain good jobs in Rwanda.	5	1	0	0	6	
	13. English is necessary to obtain good jobs elsewhere in the world.	5	1	0	0	6	
	15. Teaching in English is necessary to help Rwanda develop faster.	4	2	0	0	6	
	19. English is the language that best expresses scientific concepts; we should all learn it.	1	3	2	0	6	
	22. Children should be taught in English in order to be able to compete at the World job market when they grow up.	4	2	0	0	6	
	23. Educators who teach in English are the most respected.	2	4	0	0	6	
	Total	**31**	**20**	**3**	**0**		
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**51**		**3**		**54**	
	%	**94.4%**		**5.6%**			**< 0.0001**
	Disagree with statements						
	18. At primary school level, pupils should learn English as a subject only.	0	2	3	1	6	
	20. Learning in English only makes children lose their mother-tongue (Kinyarwanda).	1	1	3	1	6	
	21. Learning in English only makes children lose their cultural identity.	0	2	3	1	6	
	Total	**1**	**5**	**9**	**3**		

	Frequency: agree/disagree	**6**		**12**	**18**	
	%	**33.3%**		**66.7%**		**0.0228**
2. English as a mark of education	***Agree with statements***					
	Total: statements 8, 23	**4**	**7**	**1**	**0**	
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**11**		**1**	**12**	
	%	**91.7%**		**8.3%**		
	Disagree with statements					
	9. If a person cannot speak English, s/he cannot pursue her/his studies after school	1	1	3	1	**6**
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**2**		**4**	**6**	
	%	**33.3%**		**66.7%**		**<0.0001**
3. English for communication with the outside world.	***Agree with statements***					
	17. English is necessary to communicate with the outside world.	6	0	0	0	6
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**6**		**0**	**6**	
	%	**100%**		**0%**		**0.0003**
4. English for economic development, societal success and prosperity	***Agree with statements***					
	Total: Statements 11, 13, 22, 15	**18**	**6**	**0**	**0**	
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**24**		**0**	**24**	
	%	**100%**		**0%**		**<0.0001**
5. English as non-detracting from mother-tongue and cultural identity	***Disagree with statements***					
	Total: Statements 20, 21	**1**	**3**	**6**	**2**	
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**4**		**8**	**12**	
	%	**33.3%**		**66.7%**		**0.0412**
6. English as a challenge	***Agree with statements***					
	3. Teaching in English is costly for both parents and government in Rwanda.	4	2	0	0	**6**
	5. Learning in English is very difficult for pupils in primary schools of Rwanda.	3	2	1	0	**6**
	7. It is difficult to help primary school pupils increase their knowledge when using English as medium of instruction.	2	3	1	0	**6**
	10. Teaching in English is a very hard task for teachers in primary schools in Rwanda.	1	4	1	0	**6**

	12. As teachers, we need more training in English to increase our capacity to teach in it.	5	1	0	0	**6**	
	14. Learning in English only places non-native-English children at a further disadvantage.	3	2	1	0	**6**	
	16. Learning in English only limits the non-native-English children's creativity.	4	2	0	0	**6**	
	Total	**22**	**16**	**4**	**0**		
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**38**		**4**		**42**	
	%	**90.4%**		**9.5%**			**< 0.0001**
	Disagree with statements						
	2. All levels of primary schools (i.e., P1-P6) should teach and learn in English.	0	2	4	0	**6**	
	4. All teachers in Rwanda should teach in English.	0	2	4	0	**6**	
	Total	**0**	**4**	**8**	**0**		
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**4**		**8**		**12**	
	%	**33.3%**		**66.7%**			**0.0412**

Abbreviations used in this table:

p **:** p-value

n: number of respondents

Appendix A1d: Perceptions of principals about the challenges that English poses to teachers and learners in the classroom

Scale range: 1=strongly agree; 2: agree; 3: disagree; 4: strongly disagree

Factors	**Statements**	**Scale/frequency**					*p*
		1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**N**	
1.Comprehension	***Agree with statements***						
	3. When teachers ask questions in English many pupils do not understand them.	3	2	0	1	6	
	7. Teaching in English inhibits our pupils' comprehension.	1	2	3	0	6	
	11. Lessons in English complicate our pupils'understanding of scientific concepts.	0	5	1	0	6	
	Total	**4**	**9**	**4**	**1**	**18**	
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**13**		**5**			
	%	**72.2%**		**27.8%**			**0.0038**
2.Speaking	***Agree with statements***						
	1. It is difficult for teachers to explain new concepts in English to their pupils.	3	2	1	0	6	
	4. English prevents pupils from participating in class discussion.	2	3	1	0	6	
	Total	**5**	**5**	**2**	**0**	**12**	
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**10**		**2**			
	%	**83.4%**		**16.6**			**< 0.0001**
	Disagree with statements						
	10. Our pupils use English during group discussion in the classroom.	0	2	4	0	6	
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**2**		**4**		**6**	
	%	**33.4%**		**66.6%**			**0.0412**
3.Writing	***Agree with statements***						
	14. Pupils switch between languages (use more than one language) to write their answers for homework or tests.	1	4	1	0	6	
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**5**		**1**		**6**	
	%	**83.4%**		**16.6%**			**0.0001**
	Disagree with statements						
	15. English motivates our pupils' writing.	1	1	3	1	6	
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**2**		**4**		**6**	

	%	**33.4%**		**66.6%**			**0.0412**
4.Reading	***Agree with statements***						
	12. During written tests in English, teachers always explain questions to pupils before they can answer them.	0	3	2	1	6	
	16. During lessons, reading exercises in English complicates our pupils.	1	4	1	0	6	
	Total	**1**	**7**	**3**	**1**	**12**	
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**8**		**4**			
	%	**66.6%**		**33.4%**			**0.0412**
	Disagree with statements						
	9. English enhances our pupils' motivation to read texts.	0	2	3	1	6	
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**2**		**4**			
	%	**33.4%**		**66.6%**			**0.0412**
5.Lack of confidence	***Agree with statements***						
	2. Teachers do not feel confident to teach school subjects in English.	3	1	1	1	6	
	5. Pupils switch between languages (use more than one language) for discussion in the classroom.	3	3	0	0	6	
	8. Teachers switch between languages (use more than one language) to explain concepts to their pupils.	3	3	0	0	6	
	Total	**9**	**7**	**1**	**1**	**18**	
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**16**		**2**			
	%	**89%**		**11%**			**< 0.0001**
	Disagree with statements						
	6. Teaching in English motivates pupils' participation in the classroom.	0	2	4	0	6	
	13. Teaching in English has increased the pupils' confidence in our school.	1	1	3	1	6	
	Total	**1**	**3**	**7**	**1**	**12**	
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**4**		**8**			
	%	**33.4%**		**66.6%**			**0.0412**

Data from open-ended questions

- 'Speaking English for many pupils and teachers in Rwanda is still a problem; they have not yet mastered the language' (PRS2).
- 'Pupils lose confidence in the classroom because they lack vocabulary to use in questions or answers' (PUS2)
- 'Learners memorise what they have not understood' (PUS1)
- 'Very often, teachers cannot finish what they have planned for a teaching period because they use many strategies to explain the content of the lesson' (PUS2)
- 'Different pronunciation styles of some words in English from different teachers confuse learners' (PRS2).
- 'Words for 40 minutes speaking English in the classroom are not easily handled by any teacher' (PRS1).
- 'Teachers write more than they speak' (PRS1).

Appendix A1e: Strategies used by principals to address classroom challenges posed by English as the MoI
Scale range: 1: I always do; 2: I sometimes do; 3: I hardly ever do; 4: I never do

Factors	**Variables/Statements**	**Scale/frequency**					
		1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**n**	*p*
Code-switching	***Agree with statements***						
Encouragement in speaking	2. I allow teachers to write notes in English and use another language (Kinyarwanda or French) to explain the content of the lesson.	0	4	2	0	6	
	3. I advise teachers to switch between languages (use more than one language) to help pupils learn concepts in English and understand the content of the subject.	0	4	2	0	6	
	4. I ask teachers to allow their pupils to ask questions in Kinyarwanda or French.	1	4	1	0	6	
	Total	**1**	**12**	**5**	**0**	**18**	
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**13**		**5**			
	%	**72%**		**28%**			**0.0038**
	Disagree with statements						
	8. I punish pupils who talk to me in any other language apart from English.	1	1	1	3	6	
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**2**		**4**		**6**	
	%	**33.4%**		**66.6%**			**0.0412**
Discouragement in writing	***Agree with statements***						
	6. I recommend teachers not to allow pupils to use any other language apart from English to write homework or tests.	2	2	1	1	6	
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**4**		**2**		**6**	

	%	**66.6%**		**33.4%**			**0.0412**
	Disagree with statements						
	5. I ask teachers to allow their pupils to write homework or tests in the language they feel comfortable with.	0	2	2	2	6	
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**2**		**4**		**6**	
	%	**33.4%**		**66.6%**			**0.0412**
Motivating learning English	***Agree with statements***						
	1. I provide teachers with dictionaries to help them learn English.	4	2	0	0	6	
	7. I strictly ask teachers to enforce the use of English in their classrooms.	3	2	1	0	6	
	Total	**7**	**4**	**1**	**0**		
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**11**		**1**		**12**	
	%	**91.7%**		**8.3%**			**< 0.0001**

Data from open-ended questions

- 'I advise teachers to use varied methods which suit the kind of class they are teaching.'
- 'I buy enough teaching aids in order to support my teachers to help learners understand the content of lessons.'
- 'We give our teachers trainings in English at least once a month.'
- 'I ask teachers to read books and newspapers in English and talk to each other in English in order to help one another develop their level of English.'
- 'Our teachers translate in Kinyarwanda what pupils cannot understand in English.'
- 'I employed a teacher of English who has a Bachelor degree in English in order to help our teachers to learn and prepare notes.'
- 'I encourage and help teachers to post pictures and drawings with names of English on in their classrooms.'
- 'We organise creative writing and speaking competitions in English and the learners who excel are awarded.'
- 'Teachers use both English and Kinyarwanda to explain in the classroom.'

Appendix A2: Questionnaire for teachers

QUESTIONS

***NB:* Even if the questions are in English, you can answer in any language you want.**

SECTION A:

(Please mark with an '**X'** in the box of your choice)

1. Age

18-22 years old	23-30 years old	31-35 years old	41-50 years old	Over 50 years old

2. Other information (please mark for each of **A**, **B** and **C**)

A. Gender		**B. Place of residence**		**C. Nationality**	
Male	Female	Town	Countryside	Rwandan	Other (Please state) ……

3. Number of years of teaching experience

1-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	16-20 years	Over 20 years

4. Area of expertise

Teacher-training	Languages (eg: English, French, African languages...)	Pure Sciences (eg; Biology, Chemistry, Mathematics...)	Economy and management	Other (please state) ……..

5. Highest level of qualification

Secondary school certificate	Diploma (French 'Bacherier')	Bachelors Degree	Postgraduate diploma	Masters	Other (please state) ……

SECTION B:

(Please mark with an '**X'** in the box of your choice)

1. What is the **main** language you speak at home (first language/mother tongue)?

Kinyarwanda	English	French	Kiswahili	Other (Please state)……

2. What is your second language?

Kinyarwanda	English	French	Kiswahili	Other (Please state)……

3. Which other language(s) can you speak? (more choices are possible)

Kinyarwanda	English	French	Kiswahili	Other (Please state)……

4. Which language do you use at home with your family members?

Kinyarwanda	English	French	Kiswahili	Other (Please state)…….

5. Which language(s) do you use at school with your colleagues?

Kinyarwanda	English	French	Kiswahili	Other (Please state)……..

6. Which language do you use for professional communication (eg. Writing letters or reports to higher authorities)?

Kinyarwanda	English	French	Kiswahili	Other (Please state)……

7. When and how did you learn English? (Please write your answer in the space provided)

7.1 **When**	Example: before school age; from primary 4 to grade 6 of high school; at university, etc.
7.2 **How**	Example: from parents; from books; from TV; with friends; as a subject at school/university, etc.

8. Which language did you have as medium of instruction when you were at primary school, high school or university? (Please write your answer in the space provided in the table)

Primary school	
High school	
University	

9. Which language did you learn as a subject?

Kinyarwanda	English	French	Kiswahili	Other (Please state……..

10. Currently, which language do you mainly use to teach?

Kinyarwanda	English	French	Kiswahili	Other (Please state)…….

10. Do you use any other language to teach? (Mark your answer with an 'X') Yes ☐ No ☐
If **yes**, explain why (write in the space provided below)

11. Before 2009, which language did you mostly use to teach social studies (Geography, History, Civics)?

Kinyarwanda	English	French	Kiswahili	Other (Please state)……..

SECTION C:

Please mark with an '**X'** in the appropriate column. Note that there is no 'right' or 'wrong'ranswer, you simply have to indicate what you feel or think by choosing between '***strongly agree***', '***agree***', '***disagree***'ior '***strongly disagree***'.

	Strongly agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly disagree**
1. English is the most desirable language in education worldwide.				
2. All levels of primary schools (i.e., P1-P6) should teach and learn in English.				

3. Teaching in English is costly for both parents and government in Rwanda.				
4. All teachers in Rwanda should teach in English.				
5. Learning in English is very difficult for pupils in primary schools of Rwanda.				
6. Teaching in English helps educators and learners improve their English proficiency.				
7. It is difficult to help primary school pupils increase their knowledge when using English as medium of instruction.				
8. English is necessary for an educated person.				
9. If a person cannot speak English, s/he cannot pursue her/his studies after school.				
10. Teaching in English is a very hard task for teachers in primary schools in Rwanda.				
11. English is necessary to obtain good jobs in Rwanda.				
12. As teachers, we need more training in English to increase our capacity to teach in it.				
13. English is necessary to obtain good jobs elsewhere in the world.				
14. Learning in English only places non-native-English children at a further disadvantage.				
15. Teaching in English is necessary to help Rwanda develop faster.				
16. Learning in English only limits the non-native-English children's creativity.				
17. English is necessary to communicate with the outside world.				
18. At primary school level, pupils should learn English as a subject only.				
19. English is the language that best expresses scientific concepts; we should all learn it.				
20. Learning in English only makes children lose their mother-tongue (Kinyarwanda).				
21. Learning in English only makes children lose their cultural identity.				
22. Children should be taught in English in order to be able to compete at the World job market when they grow up.				

23. Educators who teach in English are the most respected.				

SECTION D:

Please mark with an '**X**' in the appropriate column.

	Strongly agree	**Agree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly disagree**
1. It is difficult for me to explain a new concept in English to my pupils.				
2. I feel confident when I comment on a point or ask a question in English.				
3. When I speak to my pupils in English, they do not experience any problems understanding me.				
4. When I ask a question in English, my pupils do not understand it.				
5. English prevents my pupils from participating in class discussion.				
6. Teaching in English motivates my pupils' participation in the classroom.				
7. Explaining in English inhibits my pupils' comprehension.				
8. Lessons in English complicate my pupils' understanding of scientific concepts.				
9. English raises my pupils' confidence to answer my questions.				
10. Learning in English enhances my pupils' motivation to read texts.				
11. My pupils use English during group discussions.				
12. During written tests in English, I always explain questions to pupils before they can answer them.				
13. Pupils switch between languages (use more than one language) to write their answers for homeworks or tests.				
14. Pupils switch between languages for discussion in the classroom.				
15. English motivates my pupils' writing				
16. During my lesson, reading exercises in English complicates my pupils.				

If you have anything else that you would like to add about teaching in English in primary schools in Rwanda, please do so in the space provided.

SECTION E:

Please mark with an '**X**' in the appropriate column.

	I always do this	**I sometimes do this**	**I hardly ever do this**	**I never do this**
1. I always consult a dictionary to find words to explain new concepts of the lesson in English.				
2. I write notes in English and use another language (Kinyarwanda or French) to explain the content of the lesson.				
3. I switch between languages (use more than one language) to help my pupils learn concepts in English and understand the content of the subject.				
4. I allow my pupils to ask questions in Kinyarwanda or French.				
5. When I give homework to my pupils, I allow them to write it in the language they feel comfortable with.				
6. I never allow my pupils to use any other language apart from English to write homework or exams.				
7. During group discussions, I allow my pupils to interact in Kinyarwanda or French.				
8. I strictly enforce the use of English in my classroom.				
9. In the classroom, I punish a pupil who uses any other language apart from English.				
10. To prepare my lessons, I always consult textbooks in French and translate in English.				
11. To prepare my lessons, I usually consult textbooks in English.				

If you have anything else that you would like to add about what you do while teaching in English, please do so in the space provided.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND ASSISTANCE.

RESULTS:

Appendix A2a: Teachers' personal information

1. Age

Age range	18-22	23-30	31-40	41-50	Over 50	**Total**
RS1		3			3	**6**
		50%			50%	
RS2		4	1		1	**6**
		66.7%	16.6%		16.6%	
US1		1	5			**6**
		16.6%	83.4%			
US2		1	1	2	2	**6**
		16.6%	16.6%	33.3%	33.3%	
Total		**9**	**7**	**2**	**6**	**24**
		37.5%	**29.2%**	**8.3%**	**25%**	

2. Gender, Place of residence, Nationality

	Gender		**Place of residence**		**Nationality**				
	Male	Female	Urban	Rural	Rwandan	Burundian	Ugandan	Other	**Total**
RS1	2	4	1	5	6				**6**
	33.3%	66.7%	16.6%	83.4%	100%				
RS2	5	1	2	4	5		1		**6**
	83.4%	16.6%	33.3%	66.7%	83.4%		16.6%		
US1	3	3	6		6				**6**
	50%	50%	100%		100%				

US2	3	3	6		6				**6**
	50%	50%	100%		100%				
Total	**13**	**11**	**15**	**9**	**23**		**1**		**24**
	54.2%	**45.8%**	**62.5%**	**37.5%**	**95.8%**		**4.2%**		

3. Number of years of teaching experience

	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	Over 20	**Total**
RS1	2	1	1		2	**6**
	33.3%	16.6%	16.6%		33.3%	
RS2	3	2			1	**6**
	50%	33.3%			16.6%	
US1	1	2	2	1		**6**
	16.6%	33.3%	33.3%	16.6%		
US2	1	1	2		2	**6**
	16.6%	16.6%	33.3%		33.3%	
Total	**7**	**6**	**5**	**1**	**5**	**24**
	29.2%	**25%**	**20.8%**	**4.2%**	**20.8%**	

4. Area of expertise

	Teacher-training	Languages	Pure sciences	Economy and management	Other	**Total**
RS1	5	1				**6**
	83.4%	16.6%				
RS2	3	1	1	1		**6**
	50%	16.6%	16.6%	16.6%		
US1	6					**6**
	100%					
US2	6					**6**
	100%					
Total	**20**	**2**	**1**	**1**		**24**
	83.3%	**8.3%**	**4.2%**	**4.2%**		

5. Highest level of qualification

	Secondary school certificate	Diploma	Bachelors	Post graduate diploma	Masters	Other	**Total**
RS1	6						**6**
	100%						
RS2	4	1	1				**6**
	66.7%	16.6%	16.6%				
US1	5	1					**6**
	83.4%	16.6%					
US2	6						**6**
	100%						
Total	**21**	**2**	**1**				**24**
	87.5%	**8.3%**	**4.2%**				

Appendix A2b: Teachers' language background

1. What is your first/mother tongue?

	Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	Other	**Total**
RS1	6					**6**
	100%					
RS2	5				1 (Luganda)	**6**
	83.4%				16.6%	
US1	6					**6**
	100%					
US2	6					**6**
	100%					
Total	**23**				**1**	**24**
	95.8%				**4.2%**	

2. What is your second language?

	Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	Other	**Total**
RS1				6		**6**
				100%		
RS2			5	1		**6**
			83.4%	16.6%		

US1				6		**6**
				100%		
US2			3	3		**6**
			50%	50%		
Total			**8**	**16**		**24**
			33.3%	**66.7%**		

3. Which other language(s) can you speak?

	Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	Other	**Total**
RS1		1	3	2		**6**
		16.6%	50%	33.3%		
RS2		4			2(Lunyankore, Luganda)	**6**
		66.7%			33.3%	
US1			6			**6**
			100%			
US2		1	3	2		**6**
		16.6%	50%	33.3%		
Total		**6**	**12**	**4**	**2**	**24**
		25%	**50%**	**16.7%**	**8.3%**	

4. Which language do you use at home with your family members?

	Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	Other	**Total**
RS1	6					**6**
	100%					
RS2	5				1 (Luganda)	**6**
	83.4%				16.6%	
US1	6					**6**
	100%					
US2	6					**6**
	100%					
Total	**23**				**1**	**24**
	95.8%				**4.2%**	

5. Which language(s) do you use at school with your colleagues?

	Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	Kinyarwanda and English	Kinyarwanda and French	Other	**Total**
RS1	4					2		**6**
	66.7%					33.3%		
RS2	2		2		2			**6**
	33.3%		33.3%		33.3%			
US1	2				2	2		**6**
	33.3%				33.3%	33.3%		
US2	4				2			**6**
	66.7%				33.3%			
Total	**12**		**2**		**6**	**4**		**24**
	50%		**8.3%**		**25%**	**16.7%**		

6. Which language do you use for professional communication?

	Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	Kinyarwanda or English	Kinyarwanda or French	Other	**Total**
RS1	1				2	3		**6**
	16.6%				33.3%	50%		
RS2	1		5					**6**
	16.6%		83.4%					
US1	1				2	3		**6**
	16.6%				33.3%	50%		
US2	2				4			**6**
	33.3%				66.7%			
Total	**5**		**5**		**8**	**6**		**24**
	20.8%		**20.8%**		**33.3%**	**25%**		

7. A) When did you learn English

	Before school age	From Primary 4 to Grade 6 of High School	At High school	At University	MINEDUC/school trainings	**Total**
RS1			4		2	**6**
			66.7%		33.3%	

RS2		5			1	**6**
		83.4%			16.6%	
US1		1	4		1	**6**
		16.6%	66.7%		16.6%	
US2		3	2		1	**6**
		50%	33.3%		16.6%	
Total		**9**	**10**		**5**	**24**
		37.5%	**41.7%**		**20.8%**	

B) How did you Learn English

	From parents	From books	From TV	With friends	As a subject	**Total**
RS1					6	**6**
					100%	
RS2					6	**6**
					100%	
US1					6	**6**
					100%	
US2					6	**6**
					100%	
Total					**24**	**24**
					100%	

8. Which language did you have as MoI?

		Kinyarwanda	French	English	Total
Primary school	RS1	5	1		6
		83.4%	16.6%		
	RS2	4		2	6
		66.7%		33.3%	
	US1	6			6
		100%			
	US2	4		2	6
		66.7%		33.3%	
	Total	**19**	**1**	**4**	**24**

		79.2%	**4.1%**	**16.7%**	
Secondary school	RS1		6		6
			100%		
	RS2		1	5	6
			16.6%	83.4%	
	US1		6		6
			100%		
	US2		3	3	6
			50%	50%	
	Total		**16**	**8**	**24**
			66.7%	**33.3%**	
University	RS1				6
	RS2			2	6
				33.3%	
	US1			1	6
				16.6%	
	US2				6
	Total			**3**	**24**
				12.5%	

9. Which language did you learn as a subject?

	Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	English and French	**Total**
RS1					6	**6**
					100%	
RS2			4	2		**6**
			66.7%	33.3%		
US1					6	**6**
					100%	
US2					6	**6**
					100%	
Total			**4**	**2**	**18**	**24**
			16.7%	**8.3%**	**75%**	

10. Currently, which language do you mainly use to teach?

	Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	Other	Total
RS1	1		5			**6**
	16.6%		83.4%			
RS2			6			**6**
			100%			
US1			6			**6**
			100%			
US2			6			**6**
			100%			
Total	**1**		**23**			**24**
	4.2%		**95.8%**			

11. Do you use any other language to teach?

	YES	Reasons	NO	**Total**
RS1	6	To help learners understand better		**6**
	100%			
RS2	5		1	**6**
	83.4%		16.6%	
US1	6			**6**
	100%			
US2	5		1	**6**
	83.4%		16.6%	
Total	**22**		**2**	**24**
	91.6%		**8.4%**	

12. Before 2009, which language did you use to teach Social Studies?

	Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	Other	**Total**
RS1	1			5		**6**
	16.6%			83.4%		
RS2	1		4	1		**6**
	16.6%		66.8%	16.6%		

US1			1	5		**6**
			16.6%	83.4%		
US2			3	3		**6**
			50%	50%		
Total	**2**		**8**	**14**		**24**
	8.3%		**33.3%**	**58.4%**		

Appendix A2c: Attitudes of teachers towards English as the MoI

Scale range: 1: strongly agree; 2: agree; 3: disagree; 4: strongly disagree

Factors	Variables/Statements	Scale/frequency				n	$\overline{X}$	S	p
		1	2	3	4				
English as a global language of education	***Agree with the statements***								
	1. English is the most desirable language in education worldwide.	12	11	1	0	24	1.54	0.58	< 0.0001
	6. Teaching in English helps educators and learners improve their English proficiency.	13	11	0	0	24	1.45	0.50	< 0.0001
	11. English is necessary to obtain good jobs in Rwanda.	13	5	6	0	24	1.70	0.85	0.0001
	13. English is necessary to obtain good jobs elsewhere in the world.	17	7	0	0	24	1.29	0.46	< 0.0001
	15. Teaching in English is necessary to help Rwanda develop faster.	3	19	2	0	24	1.95	0.46	< 0.0001
	19. English is the language that best expresses scientific concepts; we should all learn it.	10	10	4	0	24	1.75	0.73	< 0.0001
	22. Children should be taught in English in order to be able to compete at the World job market when they grow up.	11	13	0	0	24	1.54	0.50	< 0.0001
	23. Educators who teach in English are the most respected.	7	9	8	0	24	2.04	0.80	0.0049
	Total	**86**	**85**	**21**	**0**				
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**171**		**21**		**192**			
	%	**89%**		**11%**					**< 0.0001**
	Disagree with statements								
	18. At primary school level, pupils should learn English as a subject only.	1	2	10	7	20	3	0.80	0.0058
	20. Learning in English only makes children lose their mother-tongue (Kinyarwanda).	2	3	9	10	24	3.30	0.76	< 0.0001
	21. Learning in English only makes children lose their cultural identity.	0	4	8	11	23	3.30	0.76	< 0.0001
	Total	**3**	**9**	**27**	**28**				
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**12**		**55**		**67**			
	%	**18%**		**82%**					**< 0.0001**
English as a mark of education	***Agree with statements***								
	8. English is necessary for an educated person.	7	15	1	1	24	1.83	0.70	0.0001

	23. Educators who teach in English are the most respected.	7	9	8	0	24	2.04	0.80	0.0049
	Total	**14**	**24**	**9**	**1**				
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**38**		**10**		**48**			
	%	**71%**		**29%**					< 0.0001
	Disagree with statements								
	9. If a person cannot speak English, s/he cannot pursue her/his studies after school.	2	7	9	6	24	2.79	0.93	0.0701
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**9**		**15**		**24**			
	%	**37.5%**		**62.5**					**0.0416**
English for communication with the outside world	***Agree with statements***								
	17. English is necessary to communicate with the outside world.	10	12	2	0	24	1.66	0.63	< 0.0001
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**22**		**2**		**24**			
	%	**91.6%**		**8.4%**					**< 0.0001**
English for economic development, societal success and prosperity	***Agree with statements***								
	Total: Statements 11, 13, 22, 15	**44**	**44**	**8**	**0**				
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**88**		**8**		**96**			
	%	**91.6%**		**8.4%**					**< 0.0001**
English as non-detracting from mother-tongue and cultural identity	***Disagree with statements***								
	Total: Statements 20, 21	**2**	**7**	**17**	**21**				
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**9**		**38**		**47**			
	%	**19.1%**		**80.9 %**					**< 0.0001**
English as a challenge	***Agree with statements***								
	3. Teaching in English is costly for both parents and government in Rwanda.	9	11	4	0	24	1.79	0.72	< 0.0001
	5. Learning in English is very difficult for pupils in primary schools of Rwanda.	9	11	2	1	23	1.78	0.79	0.0005
	7. It is difficult to help primary school pupils increase their knowledge when using English as medium of instruction.	6	9	8	0	23	2.08	0.79	0.0091
	10. Teaching in English is a very hard task for teachers in primary schools in Rwanda.	5	15	4	0	24	1.95	0.62	0.0001
	12. As teachers, we need more training in English to increase our capacity to teach in it.	18	6	0	0	24	1.25	0.44	< 0.0001
	14. Learning in English only places non-native-English children at a further disadvantage.	9	10	3	2	24	1.91	0.92	0.0023

	16. Learning in English only limits the non-native-English children's creativity.	10	7	5	0	22	1.77	0.81	0.0002
	Total	**66**	**69**	**26**	**3**				
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**135**		**29**		**164**			
	%	**82.3%**		**17.7%**					**< 0.0001**
	Disagree with statements								
	2. All levels of primary schools (i.e., P1-P6) should teach and learn in English.	1	8	12	2	23	2.65	0.71	0.1610
	4. All teachers in Rwanda should teach in English.	1	9	13	1	24	2.58	0.65	0.2762
	Total	**2**	**17**	**25**	**3**				
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**19**		**28**		**47**			
	%	**40.4%**		**59.6%**					**0.0317**

Appendix A2d: Perceptions of teachers about the classroom challenges posed by English as the MoI

Factors	Statements	1	2	3	4	n	$\overline{X}$	S	p
	Agree with statements								
Comprehension	4. When I ask a question in English, my pupils do not understand it.	2	10	11	0	23	2.39	0.65	0.2129
	7. Explaining in English inhibits my pupils' comprehension.	1	14	8	1	24	2.37	0.64	0.1650
	8. Lessons in English complicate my pupils' understanding of scientific concepts.	0	17	4	1	22	2.27	0.55	0.0316
	Total	**3**	**41**	**23**	**2**	**69**			
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**44**		**25**					
	%	**64%**		**36%**					**0.0006**
	Disagree with statements								
	3. When I speak to my pupils in English, they do not experience any problems understanding me.	2	7	10	5	24	2.75	0.89	0.0910
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**9**		**15**		**24**			
	%	**37%**		**63%**					**0.0416**
Speaking	***Agree with statements***								
	14. Pupils switch between languages for group discussion in the classroom.	5	15	4	0	24	1.95	0.62	0.0001
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**20**		**4**		**24**			
	%	**83.4%**		**16.6%**					**< 0.0001**
	Disagree with statements								
	11. My pupils use English during group discussions.	1	5	15	2	23	2.78	0.62	0.0207
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**6**		**17**		**23**			
	%	**26%**		**74%**					**0.0006**

Writing	***Agree with statements***								
	13. Pupils switch between languages (use more than one language) to write their answers for homework or tests.	4	13	7	0	24	2.12	0.67	0.0053
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**17**		**7**		**24**			
	%	**70.8%**		**29.2%**					**0.0019**
	Disagree with statements								
	15. English motivates my pupils' writing.	3	7	10	4	24	2.62	0.92	0.2646
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**10**		**14**		**24**			
	%	**41.6%**		**58.4%**					**0.1241**
Reading	***Agree with statements***								
	12. During written tests in English, I always explain questions to pupils before they can answer them.	2	10	10	0	22	2.36	0.65	0.1619
	16. During my lesson, reading exercises in English complicates my pupils.	6	10	5	1	22	2.04	0.84	0.0090
	Total	**8**	**20**	**15**	**1**				
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**28**		**16**		**44**			
	%	**63.6%**		**36.4%**					**0.0053**
	Disagree with statements								
	10. Learning in English enhances my pupils' motivation to read texts.	0	11	11	1	23	2.56	0.58	0.3124
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**11**		**12**		**23**			
	%	**48%**		**52%**					**0.3840**
Lack of confidence	***Agree with statements***								
	1. It is difficult for me to explain a new concept in English to my pupils.	3	10	8	3	24	2.45	0.88	0.3916

	2. I feel confident when I can comment on a point or ask a question in English.	6	16	2	0	24	1.83	0.56	<0.0001
	5. English prevents my pupils from participating in class discussion.	6	12	4	0	22	1.9	0.68	0.0002
	Total	**15**	**38**	**14**	**3**	**70**			
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**53**		**17**					
	%	**75.7%**		**24.3%**					**< 0.0001**
	Disagree with statements								
	6. Teaching in English motivates my pupils' participation in the classroom.	0	4	15	4	23	3	0.60	0.0003
	9. English raises my pupils' confidence to answer my questions.	1	5	16	1	23	2.73	0.61	0.0421
	Total	**1**	**9**	**31**	**5**	**46**			
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**10**		**36**					
	%	**21.7%**		**78.3%**					**< 0.0001**

Data from open-ended questions

- 'I do not know much vocabulary in English; it is not easy to speak as fluently as I do in French!' (TRS1).
- 'The trainings we had in English last years were on pedagogy and methodology that we already know instead of teaching us the English languages, vocabulary, speaking and grammar' (TUS2).
- 'Big challenge for many colleagues in this school is pronunciation of words in English. Some spellings of English words are difficult to read' (TRS2).
- 'My pupils fear to speak to me in English because they do not have enough vocabulary' (TRS2)
- 'The English used in the social studies book is very high; my pupils can rarely understand it when I read or explain concepts to them' (TRS2).
- 'Preparation of a lesson in English is very complicated for me because I take many hours reading and consulting an English dictionary to understand some terms which I have to explain to pupils' (TRS1).
- 'I understand the content of the lesson but when I explain it in English the vocabulary I know does not help me clearly tell what I need to say to my pupils' (TRS1).
- 'When we teach in English, the class is not as dynamic as it is when we change in Kinyarwanda to explain a phenomenon or a concept' (TUS2).
- 'We do not finish the programme because we take more time using different pedagogical ways to help our pupils understand the content of the lesson (TRS1)
- 'Pupils are not confident to ask questions or answer me in English; but they answer to my questions, and their answers are often 'yes', or 'no' '(TSU2).
- 'It is difficult to debate in English in the classroom because learners are shy; the teacher is always speaking alone, and if he does not translate in Kinyarwanda, the lesson is boring' (TUS1)

Appendix A2e: Strategies used by teachers to address classroom challenges posed by English as the MoI

Strategies	Variables/Statements	Scale/frequency					$\overline{X}$	S	p
		1	2	3	4	n			
1.Code-switching	***Agree with statements***								
In speaking	2. I write notes in English and use another language (Kinyarwanda or French) to explain the content of the lesson.	4	9	8	2	23	2.34	0.88	0.1963
	3. I switch between languages (use more than one language) to help my pupils learn concepts in English and understand the content of the subject.	5	12	4	3	24	2.20	0.99	0.0756
	4. I allow my pupils to ask questions in Kinyarwanda or French.	6	8	5	5	24	2.37	1.09	0.2824
	7. During group discussions, I allow my pupils to interact in Kinyarwanda or French.	6	9	2	7	24	2.41	1.17	0.3549
	Total	**21**	**38**	**19**	**17**	**95**			
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**59**		**36**					
	%	**62%**		**38%**					**0.0004**
	Disagree with statements								
	8. I strictly enforce the use of English in my classroom.	3	8	9	4	24	2.58	0.92	0.3370
	9. In the classroom, I punish a pupil who uses any other language apart from English.	0	5	7	10	22	3.22	0.81	0.0002
	Total	**3**	**13**	**16**	**14**	**46**			
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**16**		**30**					
	%	**34.8%**		**65.2%**					**0.0018**
In writing	***Agree with statements***								
	6. I never allow my pupils to use any other language apart from English to write homework or exams.	13	3	3	4	23	1.91	1.20	**0.0138**
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**16**		**7**		**23**			
	%	**69.6%**		**30.4%**					**0.0040**
	Disagree with statements								
	5. When I give homework to my pupils, I allow them to write it in the language they feel comfortable with.	1	4	6	12	23	3.26	0.91	0.0003
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**5**		**18**		**23**			
	%	**21.8%**		**78.2%**					**0.0001**
2.Use of teaching aids and	***Agree with statements***								
	1. I always consult a dictionary to find words to explain new concepts of the lesson in English.	11	12	1	0	24	1.58	0.58	< 0.0001

consultation of English materials	11. To prepare my lessons, I usually consult textbooks in English.	19	2	3	0	24	1.33	0.70	< 0.0001
	Total	**30**	**14**	**4**	**0**				
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**44**		**4**					
	%	**91.7%**		**8.3%**					**< 0.0001**
	Disagree with statements								
	10. To prepare my lessons, I always consult textbooks in French and translate in English.	1	2	5	14	22	3.45	0.85	< 0.0001
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**3**		**19**					
	%	**13.6%**		**86.4%**					**< 0.0001**

Data from open-ended questions

- Use of teaching materials/teaching aids. (24 times)
- Use of gestures and body language such as mimes, imitations and other body signs. (24 times)
- Draw pictures, show maps or any other type of visuals. (22 times)
- Use of Kinyarwanda to explain what pupils could not understand through the use of other means. (21 times)
- Ask pupils to discuss what has been taught before explaining it in Kinyarwanda when they show they have not understood. (20 times)
- Explain in English and Kinyarwanda. (19 times)
- Explain in simple words of English. (16 times)
- Give pupils exercises to check whether they have understood. (13 times)
- Give notes in simple language. (8 times)

Appendix A3: Questionnaire for learners

QUESTIONS / IBIBAZO

NB:*You can answer in one of the languages you want. English is written in the white colour and Kinyarwanda in the dark colour.*
Ushobora gusubiza mu rurimi ushaka. Icyongereza cyanditse mu ibara ry'umweru naho Ikinyarwanda kiri mu ibara ryijimye.

SECTION A/ IGICE A:

(Please mark with an '**X'** in the box of your choice/ shyira aka kamenyetso '**X'** ku gisubizo kiri mu kazu wahisemo)

1. What is your gender?
Igitsina cyawe

Boy	Girl
Umuhungu	Umukobwa

2. How old are you?
Ufite imyaka ingahe?

10 years old	11 years old	12 years old	13 years old	Over 14 years old
Imyaka 10	Imyaka 11	Imyaka 12	Imyaka 13	Hejuru y'imyaka 14

3. What is your nationality?
Ubwenegihugu bwawe

Rwandan	Burundian	Congolese	Ugandan	Tanzanian	Other nationality (write it here) .....
Umunyarwanda	Umurundi	Umunyekongo	Umugande	Umutanzaniya	Ubundi bwenegihugu (bwandike hano).....

SECTION B/ IGICE B:

(Please mark with an '**X'** in the box of your choice/ shyira aka kamenyetso '**X'** ku gisubizo kiri mu kazu wahisemo)

1. What language do you speak at home?/Ni uruhe rurimi muvuga iwanyu mu rugo?

Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	Other (write it here): .....
Ikinyarwanda	Igiswahili	Icyongereza	Igifaransa	Urundi rurimi (rwandike hano).....

2. Which language do you speak in the lesson of social studies? If you use 2 or 3 languages, please mark them all with an 'X'.
Ni uruhe rurimi muvuga mu isomo ry'amateka, ubumenyi bw'isi n'uburere mboneragihugu? Niba muvuga indimi 2 cyangwa 3, zose zishyireho akamenyetso '**X'**.

Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	Other (write it here): .....
Ikinyarwanda	Igiswahili	Icyongereza	Igifaransa	Urundi rurimi (rwandike hano) .....

3. Which language do you use to speak to your teacher or principal?
Ukoresha uruhe rurimi iyo uvugisha mwarimu wawe cyangwa umukuru w'ishuri?

Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	Other (write it here): .....
Ikinyarwanda	Igiswahili	Icyongereza	Igifaransa	Urundi rurimi (rwandike hano) .....

4. Which language do you use to write to your friends?
Ukoresha uruhe rurimi wandikira inshuti zawe?

Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	Other (write it here):.....
Ikinyarwanda	Igiswahili	Icyongereza	Igifaransa	Urundi rurimi (rwandike hano) .....

5. Which language do you use to write to your teacher or principal?
Ukoresha uruhe rurimi wandikira mwarimu wawe cyangwa umukuru w'ishuri?

Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	Other (write it here):.....
Ikinyarwanda	Igiswahili	Icyongereza	Igifaransa	Urundi rurimi (rwandike hano) .....

6. What language is used by the TV programmes you watch?
Ni uruhe rurimi rukoreshwa muri gahunda za televiziyo ukunda kureba?

Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French
Ikinyarwanda	Igiswahili	Icyongereza	Igifaransa

7. What language is used by the radio stations you listen to?
Ni uruhe rurimi rukoreshwa muri gahunda za radiyo ukunda kumva?

Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French
Ikinyarwanda	Igiswahili	Icyongereza	Igifaransa

SECTION C/ IGICE C:
(Please mark with an '**X'** in the box of your choice/shyira aka kamenyetso '**X'** ku gisubizo kiri mu kazu wahisemo).
NB: There is no right or wrong answer. Simply say what you feel or think by choosing between ***'Yes, Istrongly agree'***, ***'Yes, Iagree***', '***No, Idisagree***', '***No, Istrongly disagree'***.
ICYITONDERWA: Nta gisubizo kiricyo cyangwa kitaricyo. Tanga igisubizo cyawe ukurikije uko ubyumva cyangwa uko ubitekereza uhitamo kimwe muri ibi byemezo '***Yego, ndabyemera cyane'; 'Yego, ndabyemera'; 'Oya, simbyemera'; 'Oya, simbyemera na busa'.***

		Yes, I strongly agree. Yego	**Yes, I agree. Yego, ndabyemera.**	**No, I disagree.Oya simbyemera.**	**No, I strongly disagree.Oya, simbyemera na**

		ndabyemera cyane.			**busa.**
1.	English is a very beautiful language.				
	Icyongereza ni ururimi rwiza cyane.				
2.	English is the most important language in the world.				
	Icyongereza nirwo rurimi rufite akamaro kurusha izindi ku isi.				
3.	I love English.				
	Nkunda kwiga mu Cyongereza.				
4.	I am happy when the teacher explains the lesson in Kinyarwanda.				
	Numva nishimye iyo mwarimu atanze ibisobanuro by'isomo mu Kinyarwanda.				
5.	Learning in English helps me improve my English language.				
	Kwiga mu Cyongereza bimfasha kumenya uru rurimi kurushaho.				
6.	I am happy when the teacher explains the lesson in French.				
	Numva nishimye iyo mwarimu atanze ibisobanuro by'isomo mu Gifaransa.				
7.	I am happy when the teacher allows me to ask a question in Kinyarwanda.				
	Numva nishimye iyo mwarimu anyemereye kubaza ikibazo mu Kinyarwanda.				
8.	English helps me learn social studies better than any other language.				
	Icyongereza kimfasha kwiga neza amateka, ubumenyi b'isi n'uburere mboneragihugu kurusha izindi ndimi.				
9.	I understand my teacher well when s/he speaks in English.				
	Numva ibisobanuro bya mwarimu wanjye iyo abitanze mu Cyongereza.				
10.	I am happy when the teacher allows me to ask a question in French.				
	Numva nishimye iyo mwarimu anyemereye kubaza ikibazo mu Gifaransa.				
11.	I can express my ideas better in Kinyarwanda.				
	Nshobora gutanga ibitekerezo byanjye neza iyo mvuga mu Kinyarwanda.				
12.	If I can speak English, I can travel all over the world without any communication problems.				

	Ndamutse nshoboye kuvuga Icyongereza, nabasha kujya ku isi hose nta kibazo cy'ururimi mfite.				
13.	I can express my ideas better in English than in Kinyarwanda.				
	Nshobora gutanga ibitekerezo byanjye neza mu Cyongereza kurusha mu Kinyarwanda.				
14.	I understand the teacher's question when it is asked in Kinyarwanda.				
	Numva kurushaho ikibazo cya mwarimu iyo akibajije mu Kinyarwanda.				
15.	I understand the teacher's question when it is asked in French.				
	Numva kurushaho ikibazo cya mwarimu iyo akibajije mu Gifaransa.				
16.	I hate English and speakers of English.				
	Nanga Icyongereza n'abakivuga.				
17.	People who speak English are knowledgeable persons.				
	Abantu bavuga Icyongereza baba ari abahanga.				
18.	I can express my ideas better in French.				
	Ntanga ibitekerezo byanjye neza iyo mvuga mu Gifaransa.				
19.	I am unhappy when the teacher asks me to do homework in English, I would rather do it in Kinyarwanda.				
	Birambabaza iyo mwarimu ampaye umukoro mu Cyongereza, numva nawukora mu Kinyarwanda.				
20.	I still need more English classes to be able to write and speak it properly.				
	Ndacyakeneye amasomo y'Icyongereza kugira ngo nshobore kucyandika no kukivuga neza.				
21.	People who speak English have more chances to get better jobs than those who speak Kinyarwanda or French.				
	Abantu bavuga Icyongereza bafite amahirwe menshi yo kubona akazi keza kurusha abavuga Ikinyarwanda cyangwa Igifaransa.				
22.	I always feel that my classmates speak better English than me.				
	Buri gihe numva abana twigana bavuga Icyongereza kiza kundusha.				
23	I feel uncomfortable to ask a question in English.				
	Ngira impungenge zo kubaza ikibazo mu Cyongereza				

SECTION D/ IGICE D:

(Please mark with an '**X**' in the box of your choice)/ shyira aka kamenyetso '**X**' ku gisubizo kiri mu kazu wahisemo).

		Yes, I strongly agree. Yego ndabyemera cyane.	**Yes, I agree. Yego, ndabyemera.**	**No, I disagree.Oya simbyemera.**	**No, I strongly disagree. Oya, simbyemera na busa.**
1.	It is difficult for me to understand a new concept when the teacher explains it in English.				
	Birangora kumva ikintu gishya iyo mwarimu agisobanura mu Cyongereza.				
2.	I feel scared when the teacher asks me a question in English.				
	Ngira ubwoba iyo mwarimu ambajije ikibazo mu Cyongereza.				
3.	It is difficult for me to make sentences when I speak in English.				
	Birangora gukora interuro iyo mvuga mu cyongereza.				
4.	Many times, I have something to say but feel I cannot find words to say it in English.				
	Ni kenshi mba mfite ikintu cyo kuvuga ariko nkabura amagambo yo kukivuga mu Cyongereza.				
5.	When the teacher is talking to us in English, I feel bored, keep silent or get sleepy.				
	Iyo mwarimu arimo kutuvugisha mu Cyongereza numva narambiwe, nkicecekera cyangwa ngasinzira.				
6.	I get fewer marks in homework and tests when lessons are taught in English.				
	Mbona amanota make mu mikoro no mu bizami kubera ko twiga mu Cyongereza.				
7.	Reading social studies in English is very hard for me.				
	Gusoma amateka, ubumenyi bw'isi n'uburere mboneragihugu ni ikibazo kinkomereye cyane.				
8.	I do not say everything I would like to say when I am writing in English.				
	Iyo nandika mu Cyongereza sinshobora kuvuga ibyo nifuzaga kuvuga byose.				

SECTION E/ IGICE E:

(Please mark with an '**X'** in the box of your choice)/ shyira aka kamenyetso '**X'** ku gisubizo kiri mu kazu wahisemo).

		I always do this. Buri gihe ndabikora.	**I sometimes do this. Mbikora rimwe na rimwe.**	**I hardly ever do this. Mbikora gake gashoboka.**	**I never do this. Sinjya mbikora na rimwe.**
1.	If I do not understand the teacher's explanation in English, I ask a friend to explain it to me in Kinyarwanda later.				
	Iyo ntumvise ibisobanuro bya mwarimu mu Cyongereza, nsaba inshuti yanjye ikaza kunsobanurira mu Kinyarwanda.				
2.	When the teacher asks me a question in English, I do not answer it.				
	Iyo mwarimu ambajije ikibazo mu Cyongereza singisubiza.				
3.	If I have a question during social studies classes, I ask it in Kinyarwanda.				
	Iyo mfite ikibazo mu isomo ry'amateka, ubumenyi bw'isi n'uburere mboneragihugu nkibaza mu Kinyarwanda.				
4.	If I have an answer to the teacher's question, I write it on a piece of paper in Kinyarwanda and show it to the teacher.				
	Iyo mfite igisubizo cy'ikibazo mwarimu yabajije, ncyandika mu Kinyarwanda ku gapapuro nkagaha mwarimu.				
5.	In the social studies class in English, I have to force myself to listen to the teacher.				
	Mu isomo ry'amateka, ubumenyi bw'isi n'uburere mboneragihugu, numva ibisobanuro bya mwarimu bingoye.				
6.	If the teacher gives me homework in English that I do not understand, I ask her to translate it for me in Kinyarwanda.				
	Iyo mwarimu ampaye umukoro ntumva mu cyongereza, musaba kunsobanurira mu Kinyarwanda.				
7.	I always need to use a dictionary to understand my notes in English.				
	Buri gihe nkenera digisiyoneri kugira ngo numve note z'Icyongereza.				
8.	I always need to ask my teacher to understand my notes in English.				
	Buri gihe mbaza mwarimu kunsobanurira note z'Icyongereza.				
9.	Every time when I cannot think of a word in English, I use a Kinyarwanda word.				

	Buri gihe iyo mbuze ijambo ryo gukoresha mu cyongereza nitabaza iry'Ikinyarwanda.				

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND ASSISTANCE.

RESULTS:

Appendix A3a: Learners' personal information

1. Gender

Gender	Male	Female	**Total**
RS1	25	31	**56**
	44.6%	55.4%	
RS2	24	28	**52**
	46.1%	53.9%	
US1	14	15	**29**
	48.3%	51.7%	
US2	21	27	**48**
	43.75%	56.25%	
Total	**84**	**101**	**185**
	45.4%	**54.6%**	

2. Age

Age range	10	11	12	13	Over 13	**Total**
RS1			7	17	32	**56**
			12.5%	30.4%	57.1%	
RS2		3	20	17	12	**52**
		5.8%	38.5%	32.7%	23%	
US1		9	10	7	3	**29**
		31%	34.5%	24.1%	10.4%	
US2		8	12	21	7	**48**
		16.6%	25%	43.8%	14.6%	
Total		**20**	**49**	**62**	**54**	**185**
		10.9%	**26.5%**	**33.5%**	**29.1%**	

3. Nationality

Nationality	Rwandan	Burundian	Congolese	Ugandan	Tanzanian	Other	**Total**
RS1	56						**56**
	100%						
RS2	52						**52**

	100%						
US1	29						**29**
	100%						
US2	48						**48**
	100%						
Total	**185**						**185**
	100%						

Appendix A3b : Learners' language background

1. What language do you speak at home (Mother tongue)?

Language	Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	Other	**Total**
RS1	55		1			**56**
	98.2%		1.8%			
RS2	52					**52**
	100%					
US1	26		3			**29**
	89.7%		10.3%			
US2	45		3			**48**
	93.75%		6.25%			
Total	**178**		**7**			**185**
	96.2%		**3.8%**			

2. Which language do you speak in the lesson of Social Studies?

Language	Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	English and Kinyarwanda	Other	**Total**
RS1			19		37		**56**
			34%		66%		
RS2			10		42		**52**
			19.2%		80.8%		
US1			15		14		**29**
			51.8%		48.2%		
US2			36		12		**48**
			75%		25%		

Total			**80**		**105**		**185**
			43.2%		**56.8%**		

3. Which language do you use to speak to your teacher or principal?

Language	Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	English and Kinyarwanda	Other	**Total**
RS1	17		32		7		**56**
	30.4%		57.1%		12.5%		
RS2	12		37		3		**52**
	23%		71.2%		5.8%		
US1			27		2		**29**
			93.1%		6.9%		
US2			46		2		**48**
			95.8%		4.2%		
Total	**29**		**142**		**14**		**185**
	15.7%		**76.8%**		**7.5%**		

4. Which language do you use to write to your friends?

Language	Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	English and Kinyarwanda	Other	**Total**
RS1	38		6		12		**56**
	67.9%		10.7%		21.4%		
RS2	28		20		4		**52**
	53.9%		38.4%		7.7%		
US1	16		11		2		**29**
	55.1%		38%		6.9%		
US2	24		21		3		**48**
	50%		43.75%		6.25%		
Total	**106**		**58**		**21**		**185**
	57.3%		**31.3%**		**11.4%**		

5. Which language do you use to write to your teacher or principal?

Language	Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	English and Kinyarwanda	Other	**Total**

RS1	29		24		3		**56**
	51.8%		42.8%		5.4%		
RS2	5		47				**52**
	9.6%		90.4%				
US1	8		21				**29**
	27.6%		72.4%				
US2	8		40				**48**
	16.7%		83.3%				
Total	**50**		**132**		**3**		**185**
	27%		**71.4%**		**1.6%**		

6. What language is used by the TV programme you watch?

Language	Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	English and Kinyarwanda	Other	**Total**
RS1	26		16	3	4		**49**
	53%		32.7%	6.1%	8.2%		
RS2	33		12		2		**47**
	70.2%		25.6%		4.2%		
US1	17		8	2	2		**29**
	58.6%		27.6%	6.9%	6.9%		
US2	24		18	3	3		**48**
	50%		37.5%	6.25%	6.25%		
Total	**100**		**54**	**8**	**11**		**173**
	57.8%		**31.2%**	**4.7%**	**6.3%**		

7. What language is used by the radio station you listen to?

Language	Kinyarwanda	Kiswahili	English	French	**Total**
RS1	46		5	2	**53**
	86.8%		9.4%	3.8%	
RS2	46		6		**52**
	88.4%		11.6%		
US1	29				**29**
	100%				

US2	44		3	1	**48**
	91.7%		6.3%	2%	
Total	**165**		**14**	**3**	**182**
	90.7%		**7.7%**	**1.6%**	

Appendix A3c: Attitudes of learners towards English as the MoI

Scale range: 1=strongly agree; 2: agree; 3: disagree; 4: strongly disagree

Factors	**Variables/Statements**	**Scale/frequency**					$\overline{X}$	S	p
		1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**n**			
1. Desire for English as a global languag e.	***Agree with statements***								
	1. English is a very beautiful language.	139	44	0	0	183	1.24	0.42	< 0.0001
	2. English is the most important language in the world.	106	68	11	0	185	1.48	0.60	< 0.0001
	3. I love English.	125	51	7	2	185	1.38	0.61	< 0.0001
	5. Learning in English helps me improve my English language.	141	38	2	0	181	1.23	0.44	< 0.0001
	8. English helps me learn social studies better than any other language.	110	49	15	5	179	1.52	0.76	< 0.0001
	12. If I can speak English, I can travel all over the world without any communication problems.	107	44	21	7	179	1.59	0.84	< 0.0001
	17. People who speak English are knowledgeable persons.	95	59	21	9	184	1.69	0.85	< 0.0001
	21. People who speak English have more chances to get better jobs than those who speak Kinyarwanda or French.	87	62	28	8	185	1.76	0.86	< 0.0001
	Total	**910**	**415**	**105**	**31**				
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**1325**		**136**		**146 1**			
	%	**90.7%**		**9.3%**					**< 0.0001**
	Disagree with statements								

	16. I hate English and speakers of English.	22	34	73	49	178	2.83	0.96	< 0.0001
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**56**		**122**		**178**			
	%	**31.4%**		**68.6%**					**< 0.0001**
2. Desire of English for communication with the outside world.	***Agree with statements***								
	Statement 12: **Frequency: agree/disagree.**	**151**		**28**		**179**			
	%	**84.4%**		**15.6%**					**< 0.0001**
3. English for social success, economic development and prosperity.	***Agree with statements***								
	Statements 17, 21: **Total**	**182**	**121**	**49**	**17**	**369**			
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**303**		**66**					
	%	**82.1%**		**17.9%**					**< 0.0001**
4. Preference of English as MoI	***Disagree with statements***								
	6. I am happy when the teacher explains the lesson in French.	2	26	76	77	181	3.25	0.74	< 0.0001
	10. I am happy when the teacher allows me to ask a question in French.	21	39	85	40	185	2.77	0.91	< 0.0001
	15. I understand the teacher's question when it is asked in French.	10	26	98	49	183	3.01	0.79	< 0.0001
	18. I can express my ideas better in French.	11	26	86	58	181	3.05	0.84	< 0.0001
	19. I am unhappy when the teacher asks me to do homework in English; I would rather do it in Kinyarwanda.	36	45	53	51	185	2.64	1.08	0.0398
	Total	**80**	**162**	**398**	**275**				

	Frequency: agree/disagree	**242**		**673**		**915**			
	%	**26.4%**		**73.6%**					**< 0.0001**
5. Lack of confidence in English.	***Agree with statements***								
	4. I am happy when the teacher explains the lesson in Kinyarwanda.	114	56	10	0	180	1.42	0.59	< 0.0001
	7. I am happy when the teacher allows me to ask a question in Kinyarwanda.	105	61	14	0	180	1.49	0.63	< 0.0001
	11. I can express my ideas better in Kinyarwanda.	81	74	20	6	181	1.72	0.78	< 0.0001
	14. I understand the teacher's question when it is asked in Kinyarwanda.	80	66	31	6	183	1.79	0.83	< 0.0001
	20. I still need more English classes to be able to write and speak it properly.	89	53	21	18	181	1.76	0.86	< 0.0001
	22. I always feel that my classmates speak better English than me.	65	57	53	10	185	2.04	0.92	< 0.0001
	23. I feel uncomfortable to ask a question in English.	47	73	43	19	182	2.18	0.93	< 0.0001
	Total	**581**	**440**	**192**	**59**	**1272**			
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**1021**		**251**					
	%	**80.2%**		**19.8%**					**< 0.0001**
	Disagree with statements								
	9. I understand my teacher well when s/he speaks in English.	20	32	96	37	185	2.81	0.87	< 0.0001
	13. I can express my ideas better in English than in Kinyarwanda.	25	34	84	42	185	2.77	0.95	0.0001
	Total	**45**	**66**	**180**	**79**	**370**			
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**111**		**259**					
	%	**30%**		**70%**					**< 0.0001**

Appendix A3d: Perceptions of learners about classroom challenges posed by English as the MoI

Scale range: 1=strongly agree; 2: agree; 3: disagree; 4: strongly disagree

Factors	**Statements**	**Scale/Frequency**					$\overline{X}$	S	p
		1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**N**			
1.Listening Comprehension challenges	***Agree with statements***								
	1. It is difficult for me to understand a new concept when the teacher explains it in English.	55	79	41	10	185	2.03	1.85	0.0003
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**134**		**51**		**185**			
	%	**72.4%**		**27.6%**					**< 0.0001**
	Disagree with statements								
	5. When the teacher is talking to us in English, I feel bored, keep silent or get sleepy.	17	24	56	88	185	3.16	0.97	< 0.0001
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**41**		**144**		**185**			
	%	**22%**		**78%**					**< 0.0001**
2.Speaking challenges	***Agree with statements***								
	3. It is difficult for me to make sentences when I speak in English.	41	57	54	25	177	2.35	0.99	0.0227
	4. Many times, I have something to say but feel I cannot find words to say it in English.	44	65	47	24	180	2.28	0.98	0.0015

	Total	**85**	**122**	**101**	**49**				
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**207**		**150**		**357**			
	%	**58%**		**42%**					**< 0.0001**
3.Writing challenges	***Agree with statements***								
	6. I get fewer marks in written homework and tests for lessons taught in English.	35	64	42	41	182	2.48	1.04	0.3978
	8. I do not say everything I would like to say when I am writing in English.	40	50	54	24	168	2.36	1	0.0357
	Total	**75**	**114**	**96**	**65**				
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**189**		**161**		**350**			
	%	**54%**		**46%**					**0.0171**
4.Reading challenges	***Agree with statements***								
	2. I feel uncomfortable when the teacher asks me to read in English.	42	59	51	33	185	2.40	1.02	0.0920
	7. Reading social studies in English is very hard for me.	33	62	51	26	172	2.40	0.96	0.0868
	Total	**75**	**121**	**102**	**59**				
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**196**		**161**		**357**			
	%	**54.9%**		**45.1%**					**0.0044**

Appendix A3e: Strategies used by learners to address the classroom challenges posed by English as the MoI

Factors	Variables/Statements	Scale/frequency					$\overline{X}$	S	p
		1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**n**			
Code-switching	***Agree with statements***								
	3. If I have a question during social studies classes, I ask it in Kinyarwanda.	42	69	36	30	177	2.30	1.01	0.0046
	9. Every time when I cannot think of a word in English, I use a Kinyarwanda word.	50	63	43	27	183	2.25	1.01	0.0005
	6. If the teacher gives me homework in English that I do not understand, I ask her to translate it for me in Kinyarwanda.	31	68	49	34	182	2.47	0.98	0.3401
	Total	**123**	**200**	**128**	**91**				
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**323**		**219**		**542**			
	%	**59.6%**		**40.4%**					**< 0.0001**
Consultations with peers	***Agree with statements***								
	1. If I do not understand the teacher's explanation in English, I ask a friend to explain it to me in Kinyarwanda later.	35	77	56	14	182	2.26	0.85	0.0001
	7. I always need to use a dictionary to understand my notes in English.	74	62	29	20	185	1.97	0.99	< 0.0001
	8. I always need to ask my teacher to understand my notes in English.	45	61	52	23	181	2.29	0.98	0.0022

	Total	**154**	**200**	**137**	**57**				
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**354**		**194**		**548**			
	%	**64.6%**		**35.4%**					**< 0.0001**
Self-determination/ perseverance	***Agree with statements***								
	4. If I have an answer to the teacher's question, I write it on a piece of paper in Kinyarwanda and show it to the teacher.	28	71	54	31	184	2.47	0.94	0.3328
	5. In the social studies class in English, I have to force myself to listen to the teacher.	36	58	47	38	179	2.48	1.04	0.3986
	Total	**64**	**129**	**101**	**69**	**363**			
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**193**		**170**					
	%	**53%**		**47%**					**0.0439**
	Disagree with statements								
	2. When the teacher asks me a question in English, I do not answer it.	7	38	67	64	176	3.06	0.85	< 0.0001
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**45**		**131**		**176**			
	%	**25.5%**		**74.5%**					**< 0.0001**

Appendix A4: Comparisons of rural versus urban (quantitative data)

Appendix A4a: Results from principals

Appendix A4a1: Comparison of attitudes of principals

Factors	**Variables/Statements**	**RS**			**US**			
		A	**D**	**n**	**A**	**D**	**n**	*p*
1. English as a global language of education.	***Agree with statements***							
	1. English is the most desirable language in education worldwide.	3	0	**3**	3	0	**3**	
	6. Teaching in English helps educators and learners improve their English proficiency.	3	0	**3**	3	0	**3**	
	8. English is necessary for an educated person.	3	0	**3**	2	1	**3**	
	11. English is necessary to obtain good jobs in Rwanda.	3	0	**3**	3	0	**3**	
	13. English is necessary to obtain good jobs elsewhere in the world.	3	0	**3**	3	0	**3**	
	15. Teaching in English is necessary to help Rwanda develop faster.	3	0	**3**	3	0	**3**	
	19. English is the language that best expresses scientific concepts; we should all learn it.	1	2	**3**	3	0	**3**	
	22. Children should be taught in English in order to be able to compete at the World job market when they grow up.	3	0	**3**	3	0	**3**	
	23. Educators who teach in English are the most respected.	3	0	**3**	3	0	**3**	
	Total	**25**	**2**	**27**	**26**	**1**	**27**	
	%	**92.6%**	**7.4%**		**96.3%**	**3.7%**		**0.2762**
	Disagree with statements							
	18. At primary school level, pupils should learn English as a subject only.	2	1	**3**	0	3	**3**	

	20. Learning in English only makes children lose their mother-tongue (Kinyarwanda).	0	3	**3**	2	1	**3**	
	21. Learning in English only makes children lose their cultural identity.	0	3	**3**	2	1	**3**	
	Total	**2**	**7**	**9**	**4**	**5**	**9**	
	%	**22.3%**	**77.8%**		**44.4%**	**55.6%**		**0.1587**
2. English as a mark of education	***Agree with statements***							
	Total: statements 8, 23	**6**	**0**	**6**	**5**	**1**	6	
	%	**100%**	**0%**		**83.4%**	**16.6%**		**0.1481**
	Disagree with statements							
	9. If a person cannot speak English, s/he cannot pursue her/his studies after school	2	1	**3**	0	3	**3**	
	%	**66.6%**	**34.4%**		**0%**	**100%**		**0.0416**
3. English for communication with the outside world.	***Agree with statements***							
	17. English is necessary to communicate with the outside world.	3	0	**3**	3	0	**3**	
	%	**100%**	**0%**		**100%**	**0%**		**-–**
4. English for economic development, societal success and prosperity	***Agree with statements***							
	Total: Statements 11, 13, 22, 15	**12**	**0**	**12**	**12**	**0**	**12**	
	%	**100%**	**0%**		**100%**	**0%**		**-**
5. English as non-detracting from mother-tongue	***Disagree with statements***							

and cultural identity	**Total:** Statements 20, 21	**0**	**6**	**6**	**4**	**2**	**6**	
	%	**0%**	**100%**		**66.6%**	**34.4%**		**0.0072**
6. English as a challenge	***Agree with statements***							
	3. Teaching in English is costly for both parents and government in Rwanda.	3	0	**3**	3	0	**3**	
	5. Learning in English is very difficult for pupils in primary schools of Rwanda.	3	0	**3**	2	1	**3**	
	7. It is difficult to help primary school pupils increase their knowledge when using English as medium of instruction.	3	0	**3**	2	1	**3**	
	10. Teaching in English is a very hard task for teachers in primary schools in Rwanda.	3	0	**3**	2	1	**3**	
	12. As teachers, we need more training in English to increase our capacity to teach in it.	3	0	**3**	3	0	**3**	
	14. Learning in English only places non-native-English children at a further disadvantage.	3	0	**3**	3	0	**3**	
	16. Learning in English only limits the non-native-English children's creativity.	3	0	**3**	3	0	**3**	
	Total	**21**	**0**	**21**	**18**	**3**	**21**	
	%	**100%**	**0%**		**85.7%**	**14.3%**		**0.0361**
	Disagree with statements							
	2. All levels of primary schools (i.e., P1-P6) should teach and learn in English.	0	3	**3**	2	1	**3**	
	4. All teachers in Rwanda should teach in English.	0	3	**3**	2	1	**3**	
	Total	**0**	**6**	**6**	**4**	**2**	**6**	
	%	**0%**	**100%**		**66.6%**	**34.4%**		**0.0072**

Appendix A4a2: Comparison of principals' views about challenges posed by English as the MoI

Factors	**Statements**	**RS**			**US**			
		A	**D**	**n**	**A**	**D**	**n**	*p*
1.Listening Comprehension challenges	***Agree with statements***							
	3. Teaching in English gives a hard task to pupils to understand their teachers' lessons well.	3	0	3	2	1	3	
	7. Teaching in English has reduced our pupils' performance.	3	0	3	0	3	3	
	11. Teaching in English reduces children's abilities to understand scientific concepts.	3	0	3	2	1	3	
	Total	**9**	**0**	**9**	**4**	**5**	**9**	
	%	**100%**	**0%**		**45.5%**	**55.5%**		**0.0043**
2.Speaking challenges	***Agree with statements***							
	1. It is difficult for teachers to explain new concepts in English to their pupils.	3	0	3	2	1	3	
	4. English prevents pupils from participating in class discussion.	3	0	3	2	1	3	
	Total	**6**	**0**	**6**	**4**	**2**	**6**	
	%	**100%**	**0%**	**6**	**66.6%**	**34.4%**		**0.0607**
	Disagree with statements							
	10. Our pupils use English during group discussion in the classroom.	0	3	3	2	1	3	
	%	**0%**	**100%**	**3**	**66.6%**	**34.4%**		**0.0416**

3.Writing challenges	***Agree with statements***							
	14. Pupils switch between languages (use more than one language) to write their answers for homework or tests.	3	0	3	2	1	3	
	%	**100%**	**0%**	**3**	**66.6%**	**34.4%**		**0.1367**
	Disagree with statements							
	15. English motivates our pupils' writing.	1	2	3	2	1	3	
	%	**34.4%**	**66.6%**	**3**	**66.6%**	**34.4%**		**0.2071**
4.Reading challenges	***Agree with statements***							
	12. During written tests in English, teachers always explain questions to pupils before they can answer them.	3	0	3	0	3	3	
	16. During lessons, reading exercises in English complicates our pupils.	3	0	3	2	1	3	
	Total	**6**	**0**	**6**	**2**	**4**	**6**	
	%	**100%**	**0%**		**34.4%**	**66.6%**		**0.0072**
	Disagree with statements							
	9. English enhances our pupils' motivation to read texts.	0	3	3	2	1	3	
	%	**0%**	**100%**	**3**	**66.6%**	**34.4%**	**3**	**0.0416**
5.Lack of confidence	***Agree with statements***							
	2. Teachers do not feel confident to teach school subjects in English.	3	0	3	1	2	3	

	5. Pupils switch between languages (use more than one language) for discussion in the classroom.	3	0	3	3	0	3	
	8. Teachers switch between languages (use more than one language) to explain concepts to their pupils.	3	0	3	3	0	3	
	Total	**9**	**0**	**9**	**7**	**2**	**9**	
	%	**100%**	**0%**		**77.8%**	**22.3%**		**0.0668**
	Disagree with statements							
	6. Teaching in English motivates pupils' participation in the classroom.	2	1	3	0	3	3	
	13. Teaching in English has increased the pupils' confidence in our school.	2	1	3	2	1	3	
	Total	**4**	**2**	**6**	**2**	**4**	**6**	
	%	**66.6%**	**34.4%**		**34.4 %**	**66.6%**		**0.1241**

Appendix A4a3: ***Comparison of principals' views about strategies employed to address classroom challenges***

Factors		**RS**			**US**			*p*
		A	**D**	**n**	**A**	**D**	**n**	
Code-switching	***Agree with statements***							
	2. I allow teachers to write notes in English and use another language (Kinyarwanda or French) to explain the content of the lesson.	3	0	**3**	0	3	**3**	

Encouragement in speaking	3. I advise teachers to switch between languages (use more than one language) to help pupils learn concepts in English and understand the content of the subject.	3	0	**3**	1	2	**3**	
	4. I ask teachers to allow their pupils to ask questions in Kinyarwanda or French.	3	0	**3**	2	1	**3**	
	Total	**9**	**0**	**9**	**3**	**6**	**9**	
	%	**100%**	**0%**		**34.4%**	**66.6 %**		**0.0013**
	Disagree with statements							
	8. I punish pupils who talk to me in any other language apart from English.	0	3	3	2	1	**3**	
	%	**0%**	**100%**		**66.6%**	**34.4 %**		**0.0416**
Discouragement in writing	***Agree with statements***							
	6. I recommend teachers not to allow pupils to use any other language apart from English to write homework or tests.	1	2	**3**	3	0	**3**	
	%	**34.4%**	**66.6%**		**100%**	**0%**		**0.0416**
	Disagree with statements							
	5. I ask teachers to allow their pupils to write homework or tests in the language they feel comfortable with.	2	1	**3**	0	3	**3**	
	%	**66.6%**	**34.4%**		**0%**	**100 %**		**0.0416**
Motivating learning English	***Agree with statements***							
	1. I provide teachers with dictionaries to help them learn English.	3	0	**3**	3	0	**3**	

	7. I strictly ask teachers to enforce the use of English in their classrooms.	2	1	**3**	3	0	**3**	
	Total	**5**	**1**	**6**	**6**	**0**	6	
	%	**83.4%**	**16.6%**		**100%**	**0%**		**0.1481**

Appendix A4b: Results from teachers

Appendix A4b1: ***Comparison of attitudes of teachers***

Factors	**Variables/Statements**	**RS**			**US**			p
		$\overline{X}$	S	**n**	$\overline{X}$	S	n	
1. English as a global language of education	***Agree with the statements***							
	1. English is the most desirable language in education worldwide.	1.41	0.51	12	1.66	0.65	12	0.1530
	6. Teaching in English helps educators and learners improve their English proficiency.	1.58	0.51	12	1.33	0.49	12	0.1169
	11. English is necessary to obtain good jobs in Rwanda.	1.66	0.77	12	1.75	0.96	12	0.4012
	13. English is necessary to obtain good jobs elsewhere in the world.	1.25	0.45	12	1.33	0.46	12	0.3355
	15. Teaching in English is necessary to help Rwanda develop faster.	2.08	0.51	12	1.83	0.38	12	0.0935
	19. English is the language that best expresses scientific concepts; we should all learn it.	2	0.73	12	1.15	0.67	12	0.0035
	22. Children should be taught in English in order to be able to compete at the World job market when they grow up.	1.58	0.51	12	1.5	0.52	12	0.3536
	23. Educators who teach in English are the most respected.	2.16	0.71	12	2.41	0.9	12	0.2290

	Frequency: agree/disagree	**85**	**11**	**96**	**82**	**14**	**96**	
	%	**88%**	**12%**		**85%**	**15%**		**0.2600**
	Disagree with statements							
	18. At primary school level, pupils should learn English as a subject only.	2.8	0.91	10	3.5	0.52	10	0.0245
	20. Learning in English only makes children lose their mother-tongue (Kinyarwanda).	3	0.89	11	3.45	0.93	11	0.1300
	21. Learning in English only makes children lose their cultural identity.	3	0.73	12	3.63	0.67	11	0.0217
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**8**	**25**	**33**	**2**	**30**	**33**	
	%	**24%**	**76%**		**9%**	**91%**		**0.0493**
2. English as a mark of education	***Agree with statements***							
	8. English is necessary for an educated person.	1.83	0.83	12	1.83	0.57	12	1
	23. Educators who teach in English are the most respected.	2.16	0.71	12	2.41	0.9	12	0.2290
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**19**	**5**	**24**	**15**	**9**	**24**	
	%	**79%**	**21%**		**63%**	**37%**		**0.1020**
	9. If a person cannot speak English, s/he cannot pursue her/his studies after school.	2.91	0.9	12	2.66	0.98	12	0.2609
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**5**	**7**	**12**	**4**	**8**	**12**	
	%	**42%**	**58%**		**33%**	**67%**		**0.3366**
3.	***Agree with statements***							

English for communication with the outside world	17. English is necessary to communicate with the outside world.	1.66	0.65	12	1.66	0.65	12	1
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**11**	**1**	**12**	**11**	**1**	**12**	
	%	**92%**	**8%**		**92%**	**8%**		**1**
4. English for economic development, societal success and prosperity	***Agree with statements***							
	Frequency: agree/disagree: Statements 11, 13, 15, 22	**11**	**1**	**12**	**11**	**1**	**12**	
	%	**92%**	**8%**		**92%**	**8%**		**1**
5. English as non-detracting from mother-tongue and cultural identity	***Disagree with statements***							
	Frequency: agree/disagree: Statements 20, 21	**5**	**18**	**23**	**2**	**20**	**22**	
	%	**22%**	**78%**		**9%**	**91%**		**0.1210**
6. English as a challenge	***Agree with statements***							
	3. Teaching in English is costly for both parents and government in Rwanda.	1.91	0.53	11	1.66	0.79	12	0.1938
	5. Learning in English is very difficult for pupils in primary schools of Rwanda.	1.58	0.51	12	1.83	0.96	12	0.2171
	7. It is difficult to help primary school pupils increase their knowledge when using English as medium of instruction.	2	0.95	11	2.63	0.67	11	0.0430
	10. Teaching in English is a very hard task for teachers in primary schools in Rwanda.	1.83	0.57	12	2.08	0.66	12	0.1657
	12. As teachers, we need more training in English to increase our capacity to teach in it.	1.16	0.38	12	1.33	0.49	12	0.1763
	14. Learning in English only places non-native-English children at a further disadvantage.	1.83	0.93	12	2	0.95	12	0.3311

	16. Learning in English only limits the non-native-English children's creativity.	1.63	0.8	11	1.90	0.83	11	0.2232
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**73**	**10**	**83**	**60**	**22**	**82**	
	%	**88%**	**12%**		**73%**	**27%**		**0.0082**
	Disagree with statements							
	2. All levels of primary schools (i.e., P1-P6) should teach and learn in English.	2.90	0.66	12	2.41	0.77	12	0.0442
	4. All teachers in Rwanda should teach in English.	2.75	0.62	12	2.25	0.62	12	0.0305
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**6**	**17**	**23**	**15**	**9**	**24**	
	%	**26%**	**74%**		**63%**	**37%**		**0.0060**

Appendix A4b2: ***Comparison of teachers' views about the challenges posed by English as the MoI***

Factors	**Statements**	**RS**			**US**			*p*
		$\overline{X}$	S	**n**	$\overline{X}$	S	**n**	
	Agree with statements							
Comprehension	4. When I ask a question in English, my pupils do not understand it.	2	0.63	11	2.75	0.45	12	0.0017
	7. Teaching in English inhibits my pupils' comprehension.	2.08	0.51	12	2.66	0.65	12	0.0118
	8. Teaching in English reduces my pupils' abilities to understand scientific concepts.	2.27	0.46	11	2.27	0.64	11	1
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**28**	**7**	**35**	**17**	**18**	**35**	
	%	**80%**	**20%**		**49%**	**51%**		**0.0030**

	Disagree with statements							
	3. When I use English to teach, my pupils do not experience any problems understanding me.	3.25	0.75	12	2.25	0.75	12	0.0018
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**2**	**10**	**12**	**7**	**5**	**12**	
	%	**17%**	**83%**		**58%**	**42%**		**0.0175**
Speaking	***Agree with statements***							
	14. Pupils switch between languages for group discussion in the classroom.	1.88	0.71	12	2.08	0.51	12	0.2183
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**10**	**2**	**12**	**10**	**2**	**12**	
	%	**83%**	**17%**		**83%**	**17%**		**1**
	Disagree with statements							
	11. My pupils use English during group discussions.	3	0.6	12	2.54	0.68	11	0.0497
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**2**	**10**	**12**	**4**	**7**	**11**	
	%	**17%**	**83%**		**36%**	**64%**		**0.1413**
Writing	***Agree with statements***							
	13. Pupils switch between languages (use more than one language) to write their answers for homework or tests.	2.08	0.66	12	2.16	0.71	12	0.3888
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**9**	**3**	**12**	**8**	**4**	**12**	
	%	**75%**	**15%**		**67%**	**33%**		**0.3267**
	Disagree with statements							
	15. English motivates my pupils' writing.	3	0.73	12	2.25	0.96	12	0.0212
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**3**	**9**	**12**	**7**	**5**	**12**	

	%	**15%**	**75%**		**58%**	**42%**		**0.0488**
Reading	***Agree with statements***							
	12. During written tests in English, I always explain questions to pupils before they can answer them.	2.09	0.7	11	2.63	0.5	11	0.0252
	16. During my lesson, reading exercises in English complicates my pupils.							
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**19**	**3**	**22**	**9**	**13**	**22**	
	%	**86%**	**14%**		**41%**	**59%**		**0.0009**
	Disagree with statements							
	10. Learning in English enhances my pupils' motivation to read texts.	2.81	0.6	11	2.33	0.49	12	0.0235
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**3**	**8**	**11**	**8**	**4**	**12**	
	%	**27%**	**73%**		**67%**	**33%**		**0.0294**
Lack of confidence	***Agree with statements***							
	1. It is difficult for me to explain a new concept in English to my pupils.	1.91	0.66	12	3	0.73	12	0.0004
	2. I feel confident when I can comment on a point or ask a question in English.	1.75	0.62	12	1.91	0.51	12	0.2486
	5. English prevents my pupils from participating in class discussion.	1.72	0.64	11	2.09	0.7	11	0.1052
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**31**	**4**	**35**	**22**	**13**	**35**	
	%	**89%**	**11%**		**63%**	**37%**		**0.0061**
	Disagree with statements							
	6. Teaching in English motivates my pupils' participation in the classroom.	3.08	0.28	12	2.90	0.83	11	0.2428

	9. English raises my pupils' confidence to answer my questions.	2.66	0.65	12	2.81	0.6	11	0.2862
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**3**	**21**	**24**	**7**	**15**	**22**	
	%	**12%**	**88%**		**32%**	**68%**		**0.0563**

Appendix A4b3: ***Comparison of teachers' strategies about challenges posed by English as the MoI***

Strategies	**Variables/Statements**	**RS**			**US**			p
		$\overline{X}$	S	**n**	$\overline{X}$	S	**n**	
1.Code-switching In speaking	***Agree with statements***							
	2. I write notes in English and use another language (Kinyarwanda or French) to explain the content of the lesson.	1.91	0.79	12	2.81	0.75	11	0.0054
	3. I switch between languages (use more than one language) to help my pupils learn concepts in English and understand the content of the subject.	1.75	0.62	12	2.66	0.98	12	0.0063
	4. I allow my pupils to ask questions in Kinyarwanda or French.	2.08	0.99	12	2.66	1.15	12	0.0995
	7. During group discussions, I allow my pupils to interact in Kinyarwanda or French.	2.16	1.26	12	2.66	1.07	12	0.1531
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**36**	**12**	**48**	**23**	**24**	**47**	
	%	**75%**	**25%**		**49%**	**51%**		**0.0044**
	Disagree with statements							
	8. I strictly enforce the use of English in my classroom.	2.75	1.05	12	2.41	0.79	12	0.1899
	9. In the classroom, I punish a pupil who uses any other language apart from English.	3.18	0.75	11	3.27	0.9	11	0.4007
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**6**	**17**	**23**	**10**	**13**	**23**	

	%	**36%**	**74%**		**43%**	**57%**		**0.1078**
In writing	***Agree with statements***							
	6. I never allow my pupils to use any other language apart from English to write homework or exams.	1.83	1.19	12	2	1.26	11	0.3713
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**9**	**3**	**12**	**7**	**4**	**11**	
	%	**75%**	**25%**		**36%**	**64%**		**0.2770**
	Disagree with statements							
	5. When I give homework to my pupils, I allow them to write it in the language they feel comfortable with.	2.63	0.8	11	3.83	0.57	12	0.0002
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**4**	**7**	**11**	**1**	**11**	**12**	
	%	**36%**	**64%**		**8%**	**92%**		**0.0518**
2.Use of teaching aids and consultation of English materials	***Agree with statements***							
	1. I always consult a dictionary to find words to explain new concepts of the lesson in English.	1.41	0.66	12	1.75	0.45	12	0.0773
	11. To prepare my lessons, I usually consult textbooks in English.	1.5	0.79	12	1.16	0.57	12	0.1197
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**21**	**3**	**24**	**23**	**1**	**24**	
	%	**88%**	**12%**		**96%**	**4%**		**0.1481**
	Disagree with statements							
	10. To prepare my lessons, I always consult textbooks in French and translate in English.	3.3	0.82	10	3.58	0.9	12	0.2292
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**2**	**8**	**10**	**1**	**11**	**12**	
	%	**20%**	**80%**		**8%**	**92%**		**0.2136**

Appendix A4c: Results from learners

A4c1: ***Comparison of attitudes of learners***

Factors	**Variables/Statements**	**RS**			**US**			p
		$\overline{X}$	S	**n**	$\overline{X}$	S	**n**	
1. Desire for English as a global languag e.	***Agree with statements***							
	1. English is a very beautiful language.	1.31	0.46	108	1.14	0.35	75	0.0038
	2. English is the most important language in the world.	1.47	0.62	108	1.50	0.59	77	0.3705
	3. I love English.	1.45	0.69	108	1.28	0.48	77	0.0320
	5. Learning in English helps me improve my English language.	1.27	0.44	105	1.18	0.45	76	0.0901
	8. English helps me learn social studies better than any other language.	1.54	0.84	102	1.50	0.66	77	0.3652
	12. If I can speak English, I can travel all over the world without any communication problems.	1.47	0.7	104	1.77	0.99	75	0.0093
	17. People who speak English are knowledgeable persons.	1.54	0.72	108	1.92	0.99	76	0.0015
	21. People who speak English have more chances to get better jobs than those who speak Kinyarwanda or French.	1.81	0.88	108	1.71	0.84	77	0.2193
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**776**	**75**	**851**	**549**	**61**	**610**	
	%	**91%**	**9%**		**90%**	**10%**		**0.2207**
	Disagree with statements							
	16. I hate reading and listening to English.	2.04	0.93	103	3.44	0.64	75	< 0.0001
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**50**	**53**	**103**	**6**	**69**	**75**	
	%	**49%**	**51 %**		**8%**	**92%**		**< 0.0001**
2. Desire of English for commu nication with the outside	***Agree with statements***							
	Statement 12: **Frequency: agree/disagree.**	**92**	**12**	**104**	**59**	**16**	**75**	
	%	**88%**	**12 %**		**79%**	**21%**		**0.0575**

world.								
3. English for social success, economic development and prosperity.	***Agree with statements***							
	Statements 17, 21: **Frequency: agree/disagree**	**183**	**33**	**216**	**120**	**33**	**153**	
	%	**85%**	**15%**		**78%**	**22%**		**0.0602**
4. Preference of English as MoI	***Disagree with statements***							
	6. I am happy when the teacher explains the lesson in French.	3.43	0.65	106	3.01	0.79	75	0.0001
	10. I am happy when the teacher allows me to ask a question in French.	2.67	0.94	108	2.93	0.86	77	0.0282
	15. I understand the teacher's question when it is asked in French.	2.99	0.82	107	3.05	0.76	76	0.3079
	18. I can express my ideas better in French.	3	0.92	104	3.12	0.71	77	0.1709
	19. I am unhappy when the teacher asks me to do homework in English; I would rather do it in Kinyarwanda.	2.33	1.06	108	3.07	0.97	77	< 0.0001
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**150**	**383**	**533**	**92**	**290**	**382**	
	%	**28%**	**72%**		**24%**	**76%**		**0.0849**
5. Lack of confidence in English.	***Agree with statements***							
	4. I am happy when the teacher explains the lesson in Kinyarwanda.	1.32	0.55	105	1.56	0.64	75	0.0039
	7. I am happy when the teacher allows me to ask a question in Kinyarwanda.	1.42	0.57	108	1.61	0.72	72	0.2520
	11. I can express my ideas better in Kinyarwanda.	1.88	0.87	106	1.52	0.6	75	0.0011
	14. I understand the teacher's question when it is asked in Kinyarwanda.	1.71	0.78	106	1.92	0.89	77	0.0460

	20. I still need more English classes to be able to write and speak it properly.	1.57	1.1	105	1.53	0.73	76	0.3914
	22. I always feel that my classmates speak better English than me.	1.53	0.72	108	2.76	0.66	77	< 0.0001
	23. I feel uncomfortable to ask a question in English.	1.99	0.9	105	2.45	0.92	77	0.0005
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**624**	**119**	**743**	**397**	**132**	**529**	
	%	**84%**	**16 %**		**65%**	**35%**		**< 0.0001**
	Disagree with statements							
	9. I understand my teacher well when s/he speaks in English.	3.01	0.77	108	2.53	0.95	77	0.0001
	13. I can express my ideas better in English than in Kinyarwanda.	1.88	0.87	106	1.52	0.6	75	0.0011
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**45**	**171**	**216**	**64**	**90**	**154**	
	%	**21%**	**79 %**		**42%**	**58%**		**< 0.0001**

Appendix A4c2: Comparison of learners' views about challenges posed by English as the MoI

Factors	**Statements**	**RS**			**US**			p
		$\overline{X}$	S	**n**	$\overline{X}$	S	**n**	
Comprehension challenges in English	***Agree with statements***							
	1. It is difficult for me to understand a new concept when the teacher explains it in English.	1.70	0.67	108	2.49	0.88	77	< 0.0001
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**97**	**11**	**108**	**37**	**40**	**77**	
	%	**90%**	**10%**		**48%**	**52%**		**< 0.0001**
	Disagree with statements							
	5. When the teacher is talking to us in English, I feel bored, keep silent or get sleepy.	2.79	1.03	108	3.67	0.57	77	< 0.0001
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**37**	**71**	**108**	**4**	**73**	**77**	
	%	**34%**	**66%**		**5%**	**95%**		**< 0.0001**
Speaking challenges in English	***Agree with statements***							
	3. It is difficult for me to make sentences when I speak in English.	2.15	1.03	104	2.64	0.85	73	< 0.0001
	4. Many times, I have something to say but feel I cannot find words to say it in English.	2.04	0.97	106	2.62	0.88	74	< 0.0001
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**143**	**67**	**210**	**64**	**83**	**147**	
	%	**68%**	**32%**		**44%**	**56%**		**< 0.0001**

Writing challenges in English	***Agree with statements***							
	6. I get fewer marks in written homework and tests for lessons taught in English.	2.17	0.95	105	3.06	1.01	77	< 0.0001
	8. I do not say everything I would like to say when I am writing in English.	2.03	0.94	100	2.86	0.86	68	< 0.0001
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**139**	**66**	**205**	**52**	**95**	**147**	
	%	**68%**	**32%**		**35%**	**65%**		**< 0.0001**
Lack of confidence in reading English	***Agree with statements***							
	2. I feel uncomfortable when the teacher asks me to read in English.	2.03	0.91	108	2.92	0.95	77	< 0.0001
	7. Reading social studies in English is very hard for me.	2.10	0.9	102	2.84	0.89	70	< 0.0001
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**148**	**62**	**210**	**48**	**99**	**147**	
	%	**70%**	**30%**		**33%**	**67%**		**< 0.0001**

Appendix A4c3: Comparison of learners'strategies about strategies employed to address the classroom challenges

Factors	**Variables/Statements**	**RS**			**US**			p
		$\overline{X}$	S	**n**	$\overline{X}$	S	**n**	
Code-switching	***Agree with statements***							
	3. If I have a question during social studies classes, I ask it in Kinyarwanda.	1.85	0.82	101	2.90	0.92	76	< 0.0001
	9. Every time when I cannot think of a word in English, I use a Kinyarwanda word.	2.15	1.03	106	2.40	0.99	77	0.0506
	6. If the teacher gives me homework in English that I do not understand, I ask her to translate it for me in Kinyarwanda.	2.19	0.88	108	2.87	0.99	74	< 0.0001
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**226**	**89**	**315**	**84**	**141**	**225**	
	%	**72%**	**28%**		**37%**	**63%**		**< 0.0001**
Consultations with peers	***Agree with statements***							
	1. If I do not understand the teacher's explanation in English, I ask a friend to explain it to me in Kinyarwanda later.	2.20	0.86	106	2.35	0.84	76	0.1214
	7. I always need to use a dictionary to understand my notes in English.	1.97	0.99	108	1.97	0.99	77	0.0506
	8. I always need to ask my teacher to understand my notes in English.	2.03	0.94	106	2.65	0.92	75	< 0.0001
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**220**	**100**	**320**	**134**	**94**	**228**	
	%	**69%**	**31%**		**59%**	**41%**		**0.0080**
Self-determination/ perseverance	***Agree with statements***							

	4. If I have an answer to the teacher's question, I write it on a piece of paper in Kinyarwanda and show it to the teacher.	2.12	0.84	108	3.02	0.86	76	< 0.0001
	5. In the social studies class, I have to force myself to listen to the teacher.	2.17	0.93	102	2.89	1.03	77	< 0.0001
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**143**	**67**	**210**	**50**	**103**	**153**	
	%	**68%**	**32%**		**33%**	**67%**		**< 0.0001**
	Disagree with statements							
	2. When the teacher asks me a question in English, I do not answer it.	2.83	0.88	104	3.40	0.7	72	< 0.0001
	Frequency: agree/disagree	**36**	**68**	**104**	**9**	**63**	**72**	
	%	**35%**	**65%**		**12%**	**88%**		**0.0005**

APPENDIX B: Samples of audio-recorded lessons

Appendix B1: Sample transcripts from RS1

RS1		
Lessons	**Sample transcripts**	**Observations**
Lesson 1	**B1**/RS1/ **L1: Arrival and influence of foreigners.** T: **Noneho rero ibyo tugiye kwiga, tugiye kubishyira mu gihe. Turaca** time line [Teacher draws a line on the black board and splits it into many compartments]. In history **twari twavuze ko** time line **yerekana imibare kuva kuri 0**; **ushobora kujya muri** minus **cyangwa** plus **ukageza ku mubare ushaka**.Okay, **noneho dushyireho** century, **uracyumva** century **icyo aricyo?** (K-E) Ls: **(-)** T: **Ninde watubwira** century **icyo aricyo?** (K-E) Ls: (-) T: Century? Ls: [Murmuring] 21 century. T: Eh? twenty-one century uhh! We are in twenty-one century. **Noneho icyo tugiye kwiga, tugiye kureba duhereye kuri** century. **Turavuga tuti** nineteen century. **Tugiye kubishyirahano** (K-E)**.** [Teacher writes ordinal numbers beneath each compartment]. **Murakurikira? Izi ni za** century **tugezeho**. Ten century, eleven century, thirteenth century. **Noneho hano turavuga tuti,** we are in nineteen century (K-E). Ls: Uhhhh. T: Who can show the period of nineteenth century? Ls: (-) T: **Ese iyi** period **irahera hehe?** Nineteenth century **iratangira ryari, ikazarangira ryari?** Nineteenth century, **iratangira ryari,ikazarangira ryari?** Century, **aha twavuga ko ari** period **y'imyaka ingahe?** (K-E) How many years within a century? [Teacher demonstrates the 19th century counting from 1901 to 2000, and learners answer in chorus]. Ls: One hundred years. T: One hundred years, one, hundred, years. [Teacher repeats word by word]. **Noneho turavuga ngo,** nineteenth century, **ni uguhera ryari ukageza ryari?** (K-E). Ls: **(-)** T**:** I said period, **noneho iyi** period **ni uguhera ryari kugeza ryari?** Ehh, **ninde, ninde, genda werekane kuri uriya murongo, iyo** period **aho itangirira naho igera**. **Yee, uraza kumbwira umwaka, wowe uraza kuvuga uti, iyi** period **nshyize hano, kugeza hano, irahera ryari kugeza ryari?** Nineteenth century **irahera ryari kugeza ryari?** (K-E) From when to when? L: One […] one thousand, nine […] hundred and one. T: One thousand, nine hundred and one, you are right, speak louder! L: One thousand, nine hundred and one. T: Good! Is it correct? Ls: Yes. L: **Irangirira muri** two thousand (K-E).	*(The teacher is explaining the concept **'century'** and how to present it on a time line)* **Turns:** Teacher turns: 10 Learner turns: 6 Learner silence: 4 Total turns: 20 *Teacher:* **E: 94/233 = 40%** **K: 122/233 = 52%** **Total talking = 92%** *Learners:* **E: 14/233 = 7%** **K: 3/233 = 1%** **Total talking = 8%** **<u>Language Alternation</u>** **E-K: 6/17** **K-E: 11/17** **Learners:** **E-K: 0/1** **K-E: 1/1**

	T: Good. That is nineteenth century. One hundred years.	
Lesson 2	**B1/RS1/L2: Arrival and influence of foreigners, part 2.** T: Traders is plural of trader. What does trader mean? Ls: (-) T: What does trader mean? Trader, […] **umucuruzi**. **Twari twavuze yuko mbere yuko abazungu baza, abantu bacuruzaga gute?** (K-E)Tell me how people were buying and selling goods. Ls: (-) T: **Byagendaga gute?** L: **Uwabaga afite ibishyimbo ashaka kugura umwenda yaraguranishaga**. T: Yes, we called that goods exchange! Goods exchange. That means if Karaveri has meat and you have sorghum, you give him a basket of sorghum and he give you 2 kilos of meat. **Ibyo birumvikana?** (E-K) Ls: **Yego.** T: Trader **biva kuri** trade **bivuga ubucuruzi**. Traders of nineteen century **nabo bari** foreigners (E-K). They are people who take goods from one place and bring them to another place. To another place. Do you understand? Ls: Yes. T: People who do what? Ls: (-) T: Who take goods from one place and bring them to another place. **Akabivana kwaKaraveri**, **akabizana kwaKanamugire,uwo niwe bita** trader. **Mwabyumvise? (K-E)** Traders from Europe **baravuze ngo tujye gushaka aho twakura amasoko**. **Kuko muri iyi** century **habayeho** industrial revolution. **Ni ukuvuga barakoresha noneho amamashini** in their industries **bagakora ibintu byinshi**. **Barakora imodoka, niho imodoka zakorewe, niho imyenda yakorewe, niho bakoze amasukari menshi.** So, manufacturers became many in Europe. **Kuko bari bazi Africa barasomye ibitabo ba** Explorers **banditse**, **baza gushaka amasoko muri Afrika**. **Abo ni ba** Traders, **bazanaga ibyo bakorera mu nganda iwabo, bagatwara ibikoresho nk'impu, inyama zo gufunga mu dukopo, amabuye y'agaciro yo gukoramo ibyuma, ipamba yo gukoramo imyenda**. Traders, **abo nibo** foreigners **baje ari aba gatatu**. **Mwabumvise?** (K-E) Ls: Yego. T: Do you understand this? Ls: Yes. T: **Mwabyumvise?** Ls: **Yego.** T:Very good! (.) **Niba mwabumvise rero reka tujye ku ba kane aribo** colonialists (K-E)**.**	*(The teacher is explaining the concept **trader**)* Turns: Tt:11 Lt: 5 Ls: 3 T: 19 *Teacher:* **E : 81/208 = 39%%** **K : 119/208 = 57%** **Total talking = 96%** *Learners:* **E: 0/208 = 0%** **K: 8/208 = 4%** **Total talking = 4%** **<u>Language Alternation</u>** **E-K: 6/13** **K-E: 7/13**
Lesson 3	**B1/RS1/L3 : The government of Rwanda** T: The legislature is the parliament. What is the parliament? L: **Inteko ishinga amategeko.** T: **Inteko ishinga amategeko. Ni ukuvuga ko** parliament **ifite iyihe nshingano?** (K-E). What is the function of parliament?	*(The teacher is explaining the meanings and functions of the organs of the government of Rwanda, particularly **thelegislature** and*

	Ls: (-) T: **Inshingano y' Inteko ishinga amategeko**. L: **Gushyiraho amategeko.** T: Yes, the parliament makes laws. We can say that the function of the legislature is to do what? Ls: (-) T: To make laws! Repeat! Ls: To make laws. T: **Gushyiraho amategeko igihugu kigenderaho**. To make laws of the country. Do you understand? (K-E) Ls: Yes. T: Who can tell me the third organ of government? The third organ of government? L: Judiciary. T: Judiciary means what? L: Judiciary....eh....[…]! T: The judiciary interprets the law. **Twabonye ko** Laws **zishyirwaho naba nde?** (K-E) Ls: Parliament. T: Parliament **ishyiraho amategeko**, and the judiciary interprets the law when there are disputes between individuals, or between individuals and the government (E-K). **Iyo habayeho ibibazo hagati y'abantu hitabazwa iki?** L: **Ubucamanza.** T: Very good! **Ubucamanza**. Judiciary **rero ni icyo twita ubucamanza. Sibyo?** (K-E) Ls: **Yego.** T: **Iyo mwagize ibibazo mujya mu nkiko ku Kagari, ku Murenge cyangwa ku Karere cyangwa ku Ntara. Ku Ntara iyo binaniranye ujya ku rwego rw'igihugu muri** high court **na** supreme court; **naho byakwanga ukajya muri Tanzaniya** (K-E). (.) There is an international court **muri Tanzaniya aho bita Arusha**, do you understand? (E-K) Ls: Yes. T: **Mwarahumvise?** Ls: **Yego.** T: **Hari urukiko mpuzamahanga rwashyiriweho u Rwanda kubera imanza za Genoside**. International court, branch of Arusha. (.) **Noneho rero** the functions of judiciary. Function of judiciary is to interpret the law, **kugira ngo hakemurwe amakimbirane**. **Ibyo bikorerwa mu nkiko, zaba izo mu Rwanda cyangwa muri Tanzaniya.** We have Rwandan courts and Arusha International court to interpret what? Ls: The law. T: To interpret the law, that is the function of Judiciary.	***thejudiciary)*** Turns Tt: 15 Lt: 12 Ls: 2 T: 29 *Teacher:* **E: 126/245 = 126 = 51.4%** **K: 102/245 = 41.6%** **Total talking: 228/245 = 93%** Learners: **E: 10/245 = 4%** **K:7/245 = 3%** **Total talking: 17/245 = 7%** **<u>Language Alternation</u>** **E-K: 4/11** **K-E: 7/11**
Lesson 4	**B1/RS1/L4 : Important places in Rwanda** T: The important places we saw are rivers, lakes, oceans which have water as a common characteristic. Importance of water at home we saw that we can use water from tap to cook and wash our cloths and floor of our house. From rivers, we can have electric power. **Amazi yo mu mugezi tuyakuramo amashanyarazi**. Electricity. **Nabasobanuriye uko amasumo abyara amashanyarazi hakoreshejwe amazi, murabyibuka?** (E-K)	*(The teacher is explaining the importance of the lakes' and rivers' water)* Turns

	Ls: **Yego.** T: From lakes we produce another source of energy, for example methane gas. What? Ls: Gas. T: Methane gas. From lakes and rivers we get energy, electricity and methane gas. **Hanyuma** forests; forests are important because of their role in rainfall. Repeat, (E-K). Ls: Rainfall. T: Good! The rain falls from up to here. **Kugira ngo tubone imvura eh….Tugiye kureba uko imvura iboneka, murabyumva?** (K-E). Ls: Yego. **T:** We are going to talk about what we call water cycle. **Murebe hano kuri** map, **turahabona** water cycle. Murahabona? (K-E) Ls: **Yego.** T: **Izuba ricana hejuru y'amazi ya** ocean, **hanyuma amazi akabyara umwuka ushyushye uzamuka hejuru ukabyara** clouds **aribyo twita ngo iki**? Clouds **tuzita iki**? (K-E) Ls: (-) T: Clouds **ni ibicu**. **Ibicu murabizi** ? (K-E) Ls : **Yego.** T : Clouds. Repeat. Ls : Clouds. T: Okay, **hanyuma** clouds **zikabyara** rain. Rain **ni iki** ? (K-E) Ls: **Imvura**. T: Rain **niimvura**. Look here, the rain falls on what? (E-K). Ls: Forests. T: Good! Forests and what? LS: (-) T: Look here, what is it? Ls: (-) T: Grass. Vegetation, **ibyatsi murabona ko ari ibyatsi**; (.) **amashyamba níbyatsi byitwa** flora (K-E). Flora, repeat, Ls: Flora. T: Yes, flora. (.) **Hanyuma rero**, eh...the rain goes back to Flora and ocean; you can see it here; **hanyuma ya** cycle **ikongera igatangira nkuko twabibonye** (E-K). That is water cycle. Water cycle. Have you see water cycle here? Ls: Yes. T: Good.	Tt: 16 Lt: 10 Ls: 5 T: 31 *Teacher:* **E: 121/200 = 60.5%** **K: 73/200 = 36.5%** **Total talking = 97%** *Learners:* **E: 3/200 = 1.5%** **K: 3/200 = 1.5%** **Total talking = 3%** **<u>Language Alternation</u>** **E-K: 9/16** **K-E: 7/16**

Appendix B2: Sample transcripts from RS2

RS2		
Lessons	**Sample transcripts**	**Observations**
Lesson 5	**B2/RS2/L5: Our National Flag** T: Good. Now, for any country in the world, colours of the flag have meanings. **Arya mabara afite icyo avuga** (E-K). We are going to see what blue, yellow and green mean, and we will also see what the sun means. You can see this colour? Blue? In our flag it means peace. Do you understand what peace is? L: **Amahoro**. T: ...the yellow stands for wealth. Wealth. Repeat the word, all of you. Ls: Wealth. T: Wealth is a noun from the adjective wealthy. When you say for example Mugenzi is a wealthy man, we mean that he has money, he has cars. Do you understand? Ls; Yes. T: What wealthy means? Ls: (-) T: Look, Mugenzi is a wealthy man. It means he is rich. **Ni umukire. Afite ubutunzi**. Wealth **ni ubukire** (E-K). The colour, […], the yellow means that Rwandans must be what? Ls: Wealth, rich, wealthy T: Rwandans must be wealthy. **Mwabyumvise? Abanyarwanda bagomba gukira. Bagomba kugira ubukungu. Mwabyumvise?** (E-K) Ls: **Yego**. [Inaudible] T: We have seen blue and yellow. Have you understood what they mean? Ls: Yes. T: **Mwabyumvise?** Tell us; **Ni iki mwumvise?** Kamali? Kamali? (K-E) L: **Numvise ko ibara ry'umuhondo rivuga** wealth **aribyo ubukungu cyangwa ubukire**, **naho** blue **ni** peace **bivuga amahoro**. (K-E). T: Has everyone understood? Ls: yes. T: Now, the other colour is green. What does it mean? Ls: (-) T: Green represents our agriculture which is our main economic activity, our prosperity and productivity. Prosperity is living well, do you understand this? Ls: Yes. T: What does prosperity mean? Ls: (-) T: **Kubaho neza. Kugira ngo umuntu abeho neza rero agomba kuba afite ubushobozi bwo kongera umusaruro,**	*(The teacher is explaining the meaning of the colours in the National Flag of Rwanda)* Turns Tt: 13 Lt: 9 Ls: 4 T: 26 *Teacher:* **E: 167/222 = 75%** **K: 46/222 = 21%** **Total talking: 96%** *Learners:* **E: 6 = 2.5%%** **K: 3 = 1.5%** **Total talking: 4%** **<u>Language Alternation</u>** ***Teacher*** **E-K: 5/5** **K-E: 0/5** ***Learners*** **E-K: 0/1** **K-E: 1/1**

	productivity;we have to produce many products from our agriculture. **Tugomba kongera umusaruro w'ubuhinzi. Murabyumva?** (K-E) Ls: **Yego**.	
Lesson 6	**B2/RS2/L6: Importance of the natural environment of Rwanda** T: Today we are going to see the beauty of our country. In Kinyarwanda they say: **"Uwambaye ikirezi ntamenya ko cyera"** Do you know this proverb? (E-K)**.** Ls: Yes. T: Good, let me ask you another question. Is our country beautiful? Ls: (-) T: Can you answer my question? Ls: (-). T: You see, '**Uwambaye ikirezi ntamenya ko cyera"!** Is our country beautiful? **U Rwanda, igihugu cyacu ni kiza?** (E-K). L: Yes, Rwanda is beautiful. T: How is it beautiful? L: It has volcanoes and gorillas, people come to see them. T: Yes, what else? L: The national park of Akagera is beauty of Rwanda. T: Any other thing? Now look at this map and the names written on it; do they tell you something? Ls: (-) T: Okay, these names are names of beautiful features we have in Rwanda. We call them Physical features of Rwanda. Physical features are natural things which were created by God, which are around us, and which are important to us. These features constitute what we call natural environment. If you see on this map we have names and pictures of those physical features. **Murabibona neza?** (E-K). Ls: **Yego.** T: Good. We have Lake Kivu here, and in other parts of the country you can see other lakes. Which colour is this? Ls: Blue. T: Blue indicates water on the map. Water can be found in a lake such as Lake Kivu. **Ahandi dusanga amazi ni he? Kalimba, funga igitabo; mukurikirekuri** map**! Ahandi dusanga amazi ni hehe?** (K-E). L: **Mu migezi**. T: What is the English for **imigezi?** (E-K) L: Rivers. T: Good. We will also see that other areas we call swamps also contain water. **Mwitegereze hano. Abo inyuma murahabona neza? Murabona ko ari akantu k'akazenga gakikijwe n'ibyatsi! Turumvikana?** (E-K) Ls: **Yego.**	*(The teacher is explaining beauty and importance of the natural environment of Rwanda)* Turns Tt: 11 Lt: 9 Ls: 3 T: 23 *Teacher:* **E: 176/249 = 71%** **K: 47/249 = 19%** **Total talking: 90%** *Learners:* **E: 22/249 = 8%** **K: 4/249 = 2%** **Total talking: 10%** **<u>Language Alternation</u>** **E-K: 6/7** **K-E: 1/7**

Lesson 7	**B2/RS2/L7: Important places in Rwanda** T: ... now tell me one of the importances of mountains. Who can tell us? You don't know? Now, mountains act like source of rainfall. Rainfall, **ukugwa kw'imvura** (E-K)**. Kuki ahari imisozi hagwa imvura?** How are mountains source of rainfall?(K-E) L: They have forests on them. T: Okey, mountains have forests which attract rain. Do we have mountains in this country? Give examples? L: We have volcanoes, Sabyinyo, Muhabura, Kalisimbi T: Yes. L: We also have high mountains in the West of Rwanda. T: How are those mountains called? Ls: The Congo Nile Crest. T: Congo Nile Crest. Good. Ehhh, we were saying that volcanoes and mountains are important to man because they are sources of rain. Another importance of mountains? L: Mountains make the country beautiful. T: Yes, mountains beautify the country. How do, for example, the volcanoes beautify our country? Ls: (-) T: Which beauty do they have? L: They have gorillas. T: Very good! Volcanoes accommodate gorillas and those gorillas are sources of income for our country because of Tou..... Ls: Tourism. T: Okey, because of tourism. Tourism **twabonye ko ari iki?** (E-K). Ls: **Ubukerarugendo.** T: **Ubukerarugendo.** Tourism (K-E). We saw that tourism is the source of foreign money. Foreign money, **amadovise** (E-K)**. Abakerarugendo batuzanira** dollars**, amafaranga y'iwabo. Amadolari. Sibyo?** (K-E) Ls: **Nibyo.** T: Lakes now. Who can tell us the importance of lakes? Are lakes important for man? Yes, Fiona. L: Lakes are sources of water and water is important in life of man. T: Very good Fiona! But, how is water important to man? Others, how is water important to man? L: We drink water, we swim, eh...we wash clothes.	*(The teacher is completing the previous lesson by presenting the importance of environmental components, mountains, forests water,etc)* Turns Tt: 12 Lt: 11 Ls: 1 T: 24 *Teacher:* **E: 166/245 = 68%** **K: 19/245 = 7%** **Total talking: 75%** *Learners:* **E: 58/245 = 24%** **K: 2/245 = 1%** **Total talking: 25%** **<u>Language Alternation</u>** **E-K: 3/6** **K-E: 3/6**
Lesson 8	**B2/RS2/L8 : The government of Rwanda** T: The Parliament makes laws. Now, the procedure is that Deputies study and write the law and they pass that law to the Senators who approve it. **Ni ukuvuga ngo Abadepite biga itegeko ryarangira bakarishyikiriza Abasenateri ari bo baryemeza. Mwabyumvise?** (E-K) Ls: **Yego.** T: Another function of Deputies is to make a follow up on the performance of the cabinet. That is why you hear from the radio that a minister was called to explain some issues in front of the Deputies and the Senators. **Abaminisitiri bajya gusobanurira**	*(The teacher is explaining what the Legislature is and its function)* Turns Tt: 9

	Inteko imikorere yabo igihe cyose bakenewe (E-K)**.** You also know that Deputies represent the population. That is why they are called **Intumwa za Rubanda** (E-K). L: Please teacher, what is the function of Senators? T: Good question! Senators, we have just seen that they approve the law that Deputies have studied **(.) bemeza amategeko bagejejweho n'Abadepite** (E-K); that is one function. Another function is to supervise ministers and other politicians in the government. **Mwabyumvise mwese?** (E-K) Ls: **Yego.** T: Okey, our Parliament is made of how many Deputies and how many Senators? Ls: (-) T: Do you know their numbers? Ls: No. T: The Chamber of Deputies is made of 80 Deputies, and the Senate is made of 26 Senators. How many members of Parliament? Yes? L: One hundred and six. T: Good! Do you have any other question on the Legislature? Ls: (-) T: No question? Let's now talk about the Executive. This is the Government organ made of the President, the Prime minister, other ministers and ministers of state. We use the word cabinet to mean prime minister, ministers and ministers of state. **Murabyumva** cabinet **icyo aricyo?** (K-E) Ls: **Yego.**	Lt: 6 Ls: 3 T: 18 *Teacher:* **E: 201/251 = 80%** **K: 34/251 = 14%** **Total talking: 94%** *Learners:* **E: 13/251 = 5%** **K: 3/251= 1%** **Total talking: 6%** **<u>Language Alternation</u>** **E-K: 5/6** **K-E: 1/6**

APPENDIX B3: Sample transcripts from US1

US1		
Lessons	**Sample transcrips**	**Observations**
Lesson 9	**B3/US1/L9: Transport and communication** T: Water transport, what is it? Water transport? L: It is the transport made in water. T: It is the transport made in water. Okay. Can you tell me the means of that transportation? Ls: (-) T: Remember what we saw in the film of the last month. How were slaves transported to America? Were they swimming? Ls: No. T: How were they transported? L: In boats. T: Is she right? Ls: Yes. T: Good, slaves were transported to America using boats. This means that the means of water transport is a boat or a ship. You know these words, don't you? Ls: Yes. T: Okay, please wait to open your books! There in the back, look here! Good, I was going to say that boats and ships have some advantages and disadvantages that we are going to see. Let's start with advantages,...eh… Water transport is the cheapest kind of transportation. It carries many goods. It is suitable to carry damaged goods. Do you know what damaged goods mean? Ls: (-). T: Damaged goods? Ls: (-) T: Eh...[…] damaged goods, **Ibicuruzwa byangiritse** (E-K)**.** For example look at this picture of damaged goods. These are damaged goods…The disadvantage; it is very slow, the reason why it cannot transport urgent and perishable goods. Do you know what perishable goods mean? Ls: No. T: Perishable goods? Ls: (-) T: It is the same as damaged goods. **Ibicuruzwa bishobora kwangirika vuba.** Perishable or damaged goods (E-K). Okay? Ls: Yes.	*(In the lesson on transport and communication, the teacher is explaining water transport and its advantages and disadvantages)* Turns Tt: 11 Lt: 7 Ls: 4 T: 22 *Teacher:* **E: 191/211= 91%** **K: 6/211= 3%** **Total talking: 94%** *Learners:* **E: 14/211= 6%** **K: 0/211 = 0%** **Total talking: 6%** **<u>Language Alternation</u>** **E-K: 2/2** **K-E: 0/2**
Lesson 10	**B3/US1/L10: Physical features of Rwanda** T: Good. Importance of physical features. We are going to start with what? Ls: Hills T: What? Ls: Hills.	*(In a lesson about physical features of Rwanda, the teacher is explaining what hills are and their importance for*

	T: Good! Hills. (.) Now tell me, what are hills? Ls: (-) T: **Nimumbwire icyo mwumva kuri iri jambo** hills (K-E). What do you understand when someone says hills? Hills? Yes there? L: Small mountains. T: Okay, what? Speak loudly. L: Small mountains. T: Good! Small mountains. Do you understand? **Udusozi duto**! Small mountains, **udusozi duto**! Okay? Have you now understood? **Mwabyumise?** (E-K)**.** Ls: Yes. T: Now, look at this picture. What can you see on it? What can you see? L: Hills, grass, cows and eh..... and, and... T: And what? Others? What is this? What is this? L: Agriculture. T: Agriculture? What is this? Look carefully on the picture. What are these things? L: Plantation beans. T: Good, plantation of....class, plantation of... Ls: Beans. T: Plantation of beans. Plantation of beans. Repeat class, all of you. Ls: Plantation of beans. T: Good. Look here: plantation of beans, grass, cows on a hill! What is importance of a hill? Importance of a hill? Ls: (-). T: Look, on a hill we can plant beans, we have grass for our cows. There is fertile land for agriculture. Fertile land. Fertile land, **ubutaka bwera**. Do you understand? (E-K). Ls: (-). T: **Imisozi migufi igira ubutaka bwera, tukabuhingaho, tukanabwororeraho**. Do you understand? What is importance of hills? Importance of hills? (K-E) L: Hills have fertile land.	*people.)* Turns Tt: 12 Lt: 9 Ls: 3 T: 24 *Teacher:* **E: 172/217 = 79%** **K: 18/217 = 8%** **Total talking: 87%** *Learners:* **E: 27/217 = 13%** **K: 0/217 = 0%** **Total talking: 13%** **<u>Language Alternation</u>** **E-K: 5/6** **K-E: 1/6**
Lesson 11	**B3/US1/L11: The government of Rwanda** T: These people on the picture, what do they do? What is their job? How do you call them in Kinyarwanda? Ls: **Abacamanza.** T: How do you say '**Abacamanza**' in English? (E-K) L: Judges. T: Judges. They are judges. They work in courts. We will see this later. Now, these three pictures show us different organs of the government. When we say 'government' we mean a ruling organ of the state or country. Ruling organ **twabyita urwego nyobozi** (E-K). We will see that the government of Rwanda is composed of three main organs; we have the Executive, we have the Legislature and we have the Judiciary. Can you see that? Ls: Yes. T: What is the function of the Executive?	*(In a lesson on the organs of the government, the teacher is explaining the Executive and its functions).* Turns Tt: 11 Lt: 6 Ls: 4 T: 21

	Ls: (-). T: Do you know the importance of Executive in our government? L: The function is […] to […] to […] rule, to rule the country. T: Yes, you are right! Speak louder, you are right! The function is to do what? L: To rule the country. T: Very good! To rule, to govern the country. Yes, the function of the Executive is to implement the national policies. What do you understand by national policy? Ls: (-). T: A policy is a plan of the government. **Gahunda y'ibikorwa bya Leta** (E-K)**. Murabyumva? Nk'urugero Leta yashyizeho** policy **ya** nine years **mu burezi murayizi. Iyo ni** national policy**, ni ukuvuga imyaka icyenda y'uburezi bw'ibanze mu Rwanda ni** national policy (K-E). Are we together? Ls: Yes. T: Government has a lot of policies; for example there is a policy for peace and security of the country. **Ibirebana n'umutekano w'abantu n'ibintu**(E-K).The Executive will use the National police; very important! Be careful here! There is policy and police, two different words! I am saying that, for peace and security as government policy, the Executive will use the National police, **Igipolisi**, to bring peace and security in the country (E-K). That is the implementation of the national policy, **gahunda ya Leta** (E-K).	*Teacher:* **E: 207/249 = 82%** **K: 32/249 = 13%** **Total talking: 95%** *Learners:* **E: 9/249 = 4%** **K: 3/249 = 1%** **Total talking: 5%** **<u>Language Alternation</u>** **E-K: 6/8** **K-E: 2/8**
Lesson 12	**B3/US1/L12: Physical features of Rwanda** T: That is the Bible explanation, religion explanation of the existence of the world. **Ibyo ni ibisobanuro bya Bibiliya bijyanye n'ukwemera** (E-K)**.** In science, geography scholars, **abahanga mu bumenyi bw'isi**, scholars give us explanation about how physical features were formed (E-K). We will see the formation of hills, mountains and highlands. Do you understand? Ls: Yes. T: There are two ways through which hills, mountains and volcanoes were formed. Those 2 ways are: Volcanic activity and faulting. Let's now start with volcanic activity. Look at this picture. What is this? L: It is a volcano vomiting. T: Yes, okay, good Fiona, a volcano vomiting! **Mu Kinyarwanda tuvuga ko ikirunga cyarutse**! Right? (E-K). In English we don't say a volcano vomits, but we say a volcano erupts. We will see eruption of a volcano. But it is good that you know what this is. Now, this is a volcano, these different colours indicate different names of layers of the body of a volcano. Layers **ni ibice by'ubutaka bigize ikirunga uhereye mu mutima imbere kugera aho dushobora kubona** (K-E). Do you understand? Ls: Yes teacher. T: Inside here there are rocks which are very hot! The rocks of very high temperature. Rocks, do you understand what they are? L: Yes, they are very big stones. T: Good boy! They are stones. Now, because of the temperature and pressure, we saw temperature, **ubushyuhe, naho** pressure **yo ni iki**? (E-K). L: **Imyuka ifite ingufu**. T**:** Yes. Now, the temperature and pressure make the rock exist in what we call semi-solid state, **ikintu kimeze nk'igikoma.**	*(The teacher is explaining the formation of hills, mountains and volcanoes)* Turns Tt: 14 Lt: 10 Ls: 4 T: 28 *Teacher:* E: 181/252 = 72% K: 52/252 = 20% **Total talking: 92%** *Learners:* E: 16/252 = 6% K: 3/252 = 2% **Total talking: 8%**

	Semi-solid state, do you understand? Ls: Yes. T: A solid **ni nk'ibuye, itafari, ikintu gikomeye**, but a semi-solid **ni ikintu cyabaye nk'igikoma ariko na none atari amazi** (K-E) Okay? Ls: Yes.	**<u>Language Alternation</u>** **E-K: 8/8** **K-E: 0/8**

APPENDIX B4: Sample transcripts from US2

US2		
Lessons	**Sample transcripts**	**Observations**
Lesson 13	**B4/US2/L13: Arrival and influence of foreigners** T: Good. A foreigner is an outsider, a person from another country. When a Ugandan comes to our country we call him a foreigner; when a person from Europe or America, Asia and any other area of the world comes to our country we call him a foreigner. You too if you go to another country, what will people call you? Ls: (-). T: What will those people call you? Fo… Ls: Foreigner. T: Yes, they will call you a foreigner. (.) Now, foreign influence means anything from outside coming to change the way people or things were living before. **Iyo uhuye n'ikintu cyangwa umuntu mushya hari icyo biguhinduraho cyangwa bikumarira?** (E-K). Ls: **Yego**. T: **Mumpe urugero**. L: **Nkiyo uhuye n'Umunyamerika akakuvugisha mu Cyongereza umenya uko** American English **ivugwa** (K-E). T: Good. L: **Iyo bakubwiye indege utarayibona ntabwo wumva ko yatwara abantu benshi, ariko iyo uyibonye urabyemera.** T: Good! Let's now see how Rwanda was influenced by foreigners. Eh, before the year 1800, Rwandans did not have any contact with people from outside Rwanda; it is only in the 19th century that foreigners started to come to Rwanda for different reasons. The 19th century means which years? Ls: (-). T: We saw that a century is how many years? L: One hundred years. T: So, the 19th century is which years? Ls: (-) T: Look at this line and tell me which years. Yes, there. L: 1801 to 1900. T: Good. Clap for him! From 1801 Rwanda had groups of visitors from Europe [She puts a paper arrow on the map from Europe to Africa], and those groups were Explorers, Missionaries, Traders and Colonists. These groups of foreigners came to Rwanda having different purposes. **Aba bantu baje mu Rwanda bafite inshingano cyagwa impamvu zinyuranye** (E-K)**. Mwaba muzizi?** Ls**: Oya.** T: **Reka duhere kuri** Explorers (K-E). Explorers were the first foreigners who came to Rwanda. Who can guess why explorers came to Rwanda. Ls: (-). T: Explorers had the objective of discovering what was in the interior parts of Africa because they did not have information about	*(Teacher is explaining the arrival of foreigners (explorers, traders, missionaries and colonists) in Rwanda)* Turns Tt: 17 Lt: 10 Ls: 6 T: 33 *Teacher:* **E: 194/250 = 78%** **K: 24/250 = 10%** **Total talking: 88%** *Learners:* **E: 26/250 = 10%** **K:6/250 = 2%** **Total talking: 12%** **<u>Language Alternation</u>** **E-K: 2/3** **K-E: 1/3**

	Africa as a new continent for them. Are you following? Ls: Yes. T: They didn't have information about Africa. The only information they had was about the coasts of Africa [Teacher points at the coasts of Africa on the map]. Can you see the coast of Africa? Ls: Yes.	
Lesson 14	**B4/US2/L14: Political organisation of the Kingdom in Rwanda** L: Please teacher, is it correct to say 'The Mwami expanded the Kingdom?' T: Yes Serge, good question! It is correct because when Rwabugiri was the King or the Mwami Rwanda was a kingdom. So it is correct to say 'The Mwami expanded the Kingdom'. Good question! Clap for him!Another question? Ls: (-). T: Okay, let's continue. The Mwami of Rwanda had a highly organised political system to unite the country. At the top there was Kingdom led by him as a King or Mwami. The Kingdom was divided into Provinces, Provinces into Districts, Districts into Hills and Hills into Neighbourhoods. Can you see this? [Teacher draws a scheme on the black board showing the hierarchy of these divisions from Kingdom to Neighbourhoods]. L: Question teacher (-). Eh...[…] **Ntabwo habagaho Imirenge, Utugari n'Imidugudu?** (K-E) T: **Ikibazo cyiza Polina! Izo ni inzego z'ubuyobozi ziriho ubungubu. Ariko bifite aho bihuriye.** Look here for example **Umwami yayoboraga** Kingdom, **ubu dufite** Republic. **Hariho** Provinces, **nubu dufite** Provinces; **hariho** Districts **nubu dufite** Districts; **mu mwanya wa** Hills, **dufite** Sectors **ariyo Imirenge**; Neighbourhoods **dufite** Cells **cyangwa Utugari** (K-E**)**. **Hano hakiyongeraho Imidugudu itarabagaho mu gihe cy'Umwami! Murabibona neza?** Ls: **Yego.** T: The king was advised by a group of intimate people who were the Kingdom officials as we nowadays talk about government and other leaders' team. Do you understand? Ls: Yes. T: In the past, the advisers of the Mwami were the Queen Mother, the Ritual Specialists, the Counsellors and the chiefs. Here, the Queen mother is **Umugabekazi, yari nyina w'Umwami akamenya n'ibibera i bwami**. **Umugabekazi muramuzi?** (K-E) Ls: **Yego.** T: Ritual Specialists **bari Abiru, aba nibo bamenyaga amabanga y'i Bwami ni nabo bakoraga imihango yo kwimika Umwami bakanamenya uzamusimbura.** Counsellors **bazwi ku izina ry'Abasizi naho** Chiefs **nibo twita Abatware** (K-E). Have you understood? Ls: Yes.	*(The teacher is explaining the ancient kingdom political organisation comparing it to the current political structure of Rwanda)* Turns Tt: 13 Lt: 8 Ls: 4 T: 25 *Teacher:* **E: 155/250 = 62%** **K: 74/250 = 30%** **Total talking: 92%** *Learners:* **E: 15/250 = 6%** **K: 6/250 = 2%** **Total talking: 8%** **<u>Language Alternation</u>** **E-K: 4/8** **K-E: 4/8**
Lesson 15	**B4/US2/L15: Our National Flag** T: Look well here, there is blue, yellow and green, but here. Can't you see this? What is it? Ls: Sun. T: The sun. Which colour is it? Which colour is it? L: The colour is called gold.	*(In a lesson about the meaning of the symbols and colours of the national Flag of Rwanda, the teacher is explaining the meaning*

	T: Clap for him! Gold! Do you know what gold is? Ls: (-). T: Gold, what is it? L: **Zahabu.** T: Good, **zahabu**. Yes, this is a kind of minerals, **ni ubwoko bw' amabuye y'agaciro** (E-K**)**. The sun in our flag has the colour of gold, it is not yellow. Yellow is this second colour here. Can you see the difference? Ls: Yes. [Inaudible] T: Ok, is the sun important to us? Ls: yes. T: How is it important? Ls: (-). T: Tell me the importance of the sun. L: To dry things. T: Good! To dry. Another importance? L: When there is the sun, no cold. T: Yes, the sun warms the earth. Good idea! How does the sun dry things or warm the earth? Ls: (-). T: Okay! It dries because it is hot, and of course it emits light on the earth. You know sun rays? Ls; No. T: Sun rays are called **imirasire y' izuba**! (E-K). Now, to know a good and bad day we look at how the sun rises in the morning. When we look at the horizon and see it is dark, there is fog, it means what? Ls: Rain. T: And, eh...when there is sun it means what? Ls: (-). T: It means good day, it means there will be no rain. **Haba haza kubaho umunsi mwiza** (E-K)**. Murabyumva?** Ls: **Yego.** T: In our flag the sun means the new hope for Rwanda. It is showing the light to the people of Rwanda and tell them that their future will be good. The new hope for Rwanda. **Icyizere cy'ejo hazaza** (E-K). That is why you can see the sun and its rays; these are called rays of the sun, **imirasire y'izuba** (E-K). So, that is showing the new hope for Rwanda and Rwandans. Have you understood? Ls: yes.	*of the sun in the flag.)* Turns: Tt: 15 Lt: 11 Ls: 4 T: 30 *Teacher:* **E: 212/249 = 85%** **K: 16/249 = 6%** **Total talking: 91%** *Learners:* **E: 19/ 249 = 8%** **K: 2/249 = 1%** **Total talking: 9%** **<u>Language Alternation</u>** **E-K: 3/3** **K-E: 0/3**
Lesson 16	**B4/US2/L16: Important places in Rwanda** T: Wild animals **ni inyamaswa z'agasozi** (E-K). They are different from domestic animals which are, eh... we have cows, goats, pigs, hen, sheep and so on. Do you understand the difference? Ls: Yes. T: Now, the importance of the national park is to help our country get foreign money from tourists, and because Rwandans also	*(The teacher is ending explaining the importance of the Akagera National Park and is explaining the importance of the*

	visit the animals, they give our money and our economy grow up because of tourism. **Ubukerarugendo murabuzi?** (E-K)**.** Ls: **Yego.** T: **Butwinjiriza amadovize?** Ls: **Yego.** T: There are other places which when people visit them our country gets foreign money. For example look here, what is this place? L: The museum of Rwanda. T: Museum of Rwanda. Where is it? L: It is in Butare. T: Good! Mugabo, **mufunge igitabo mukurikire hano!** (E-K)**.** I don't want you to open books! You wait. Look at my picture here. **Araturangaje, twikomereze** (E-K). Now, why is the museum important? What do people want in the museum? Ls: (-). T: Why people go to the museum? L: [inaudible] T: We don't hear you! Speak louder! L: (-) [murmuring] T: Another? And you speak louder. L: They go to see old things. T. Okay**, ikindi?** (E-K) L: **Habayo ibintu ndangamuco.** T: Very important! Kaliza is saying that there are cultural objects, **ibirango by' umuco nyarwanda tubisanga mu nzu twita ngo iki?** (E-K) Ls: **Ingoro ndangamuco y' u Rwanda.** T: Yes, cultural objects are found in the national museum of Rwanda. Who can give us some examples of the objects of our culture which are in found in the museum of Rwanda. L: Traditional clothes called **inkanda** and **impuzu** (E-K). T: Good. L: Traditional houses. T: Traditional houses. L: **Intore, amasaro, imigara** and clothes of the king. T: Very nice! L: There are the things ancestors used to do the war with enemies, and to kill wild animals. T: Good! There are spears, arrows and many other instruments of protection used during ancient times.	*national museum)* Turns Tt: 14 Lt: 12 Ls: 1 T: 27 *Teacher:* **E:159/242 = 66%** **K: 22/242 = 9%** **Total talking: 75%** *Learners:* **E: 47/242 = 19%** **K: 14/242 = 6%** **Total talking: 25%** **<u>Language Alternation</u>** **E-K: 5/5** **K-E: 0/5**

Appendix C: Interview protocol

Appendix C1: Interview questions for principals

1. Would you tell me how English is used in this school?
2. Do teachers and learners in this school like English as a language? [probes for reasons]
3. Are teachers and learners happy with English as MoI? [probes]
4. Personally, how do you value English as a language?
5. Do you think that English is important in the education of Rwanda? [probes for reasons]
6. In your view, will Rwanda benefit from using English as official language and MoI? [probes for reasons]
7. How do teachers use English in the classroom? [probes for reasons]
8. Do you recommend teachers to mix languages in the classroom? [probes]
9. How do you feel when a teacher is mixing languages in her/his teaching? [probes]
10. How do learners use English in the classroom?
11. How do you feel when learners mix languages in the classroom or when they talk to you? [probes]
12. Personally, do you mix languages when you are talking to teachers or learners?
13. As far as you know, has English advanced or hindered teaching and learning at this school? [Probes for reasons]
14. What are the major challenges do teachers/learners have in their teaching/learning through English?
15. In your view, has there been any support by the ministry of education, the school and parents to facilitate the use of English as MoI in Rwanda? [probes in relation to MINEDUC, school, parents for kinds of support and reasons]

Appendix C2: Interview questions for teachers

1. Would you tell me how teaching through English is running in this school?
2. In your view, do teachers and learners in this school like English as a language? [probes for reasons]
3. Are teachers and learners happy with English as MoI? [probes]
4. Personally, how do you value English as a language?
5. Do you think that English is important in the education of Rwanda? [probes for reasons]
6. In your view, will Rwanda benefit from using English as official language and MoI? [probes for reasons]
7. Personally, how do youcope with teaching throughEnglish in social studies? [probes for reasons]
8. How do learners use English in the classroom?
9. Do you recommend learners to mix languages in the classroom? [probes]
10. How do you feel whenlearners mix languages in the classroom? [probes]
11. Personally, do you mix languages when you are talking to learners and colleagues? [probes]
12. As far as you know, has English advanced or hindered teaching and learning at this school? [Probes for reasons]
13. What are the major challenges doyou and your pupils have in teaching and learningsocial studies through English?
14. Do you have any strategies that you use to make your teaching through English effective? [probes for elaboration]

15. In your view, has there been any support by the ministry of education, the school and parents to facilitate the use of English as MoI in Rwanda? [probes in relation to MINEDUC, school, parents for kinds of support and reasons]

Appendix C3: Focus group questions for learners

1. Which languages can you speak?
2. Which language is your medium of instruction?
3. Which language do you like to be the medium of instruction? [probe for reasons]
4. Do you like English? [probes for reasons]
5. Which lesson do you like most? A lesson in English, a lesson in French and a lesson in Kinyarwanda. [probes for reasons]
6. Does English cause any problem to you in the classroom? [probes for what and reasons]
7. Does your teacher allow you to use English and Kinyarwanda in the classroom?
8. Do you mix Kinyarwanda and English words when you speak to your teacher in the classroom?
9. Do you mix Kinyarwanda and English words when you speak with friends in a discussion in the classroom?
10. Does your teacher mix Kinyarwanda and English words when teaching you social studies?
11. How is learning social studies through English? [probes for elaboration/what are causes of difficulties to learn social studies in English?]
12. What do you ask your teacher to do when you don't understand explanations in English?
13. What does the teacher do when you don't understand explanations in English? [probes: how do visuals help you?]

Appendix D: Other Documents

1. Ethics Clearance Letter

Wits School of Education

27 St Andrews Road, Parktown, Johannesburg, 2193 • Private Bag 3, Wits 2050, South Africa
Tel: +27 11 717-3007 • Fax: +27 11 717-3009 • E-mail: enquiries@educ.wits.ac.za • Website: www.wits.ac.za

Student Number: 0311394E
Protocol: 2010ECE54C

24 May 2010

Mr Hilaire Habyarimana
c/o AELS
WSoE

Dear Mr Habyarimana

Application for Ethics Clearance: Doctor of Philosophy

I have a pleasure in advising you that the Ethics Committee in Education of the Faculty of Humanities, acting on behalf of the Senate has agreed to approve your application for ethics clearance submitted for your proposal entitled:

Perceptions of educators and learners towards English as medium of instruction and classroom practices at 4 primary schools in Rwanda

The Protocol Number above should be submitted to the Graduate Studies in Education Committee upon submission of your final research report.

Yours sincerely

MMabeta

Matsie Mabeta
Wits School of Education

Cc Supervisor: Dr. V Moodley and Ms. A. Ferreira (via email)

2. Letters granting permission to conduct research

REPUBLIC OF RWANDA

KIGALI CITY
NYARUGENGE DISTRICT

Ref: 2957/01.01
16/07/2010

Mr Hilaire HABYARIMANA
PhD Student
University of Witwatersrand
Johannesburg
South Africa

Re: Approval in respect of request for permission to conduct research

Referring to your letter requesting permission to conduct a research in Nyarugenge District entitled "**Perceptions of educators and learners towards English as medium of instruction and classroom practices at primary schools of Nyarugenge**"

It is my pleasure to inform you that you are authorized to conduct such study in the selected schools of our District. However, you will have to collaborate with the school principals who will help you get access to the schools and classes that will participate in your research.

I wish you well in your research and hope the research findings will contribute to the improvement of teaching and use of English as medium of instruction in our District.

Regards.

UWIMANA Jean Pierre
Executive Secretary of Nyarugenge District

Cc
- Head teachers

B.P 1092 Kigali E-mail : nyarugengedistrict@minaloc.gov.rw, website : www.nyarugengedistrict.gov.rw

REPUBLIC OF RWANDA

Nyagatare, ku wa 21/02/2011
Ref..... /07.05.02.04 HM
0784.

EASTERN PROVINCE
NYAGATARE DISTRICT
TELE/FAX: 0252565249
P.O.BOX: 20 NYAGATARE
E-mail:nyagataredistrict@minaloc.gov.rw.

Mr. Hilaire Habyarimana
PhD student
University of Witwatersrand
Johannesburg

Dear Sir,

Re: Permission to carry out a PhD research in the schools of Nyagatare District

Referring to your letter of July 15th, 2010 requesting to carry out a PhD research on perceptions of educators and learners towards English as medium of instruction and classroom practices at primary schools of Nyagatare District, I am pleased to advise you that permission has been granted to you to conduct this research in the selected schools of our District. However, you will have to collaborate with the school principals who will help you get access to the schools and classes that will participate in your study.

I wish you successful research and hope that your research will contribute to the improvement of education in our District.

Yours faithfully,

SABITI ATUHE Fred
Mayor of Nyagatare District

REPUBLIC OF RWANDA

Rusizi, on July 23, 2010
N°0552/0306

WESTERN PROVINCE
RUSIZI DISTRICT
TEL : 537120/537998
FAX : 537254
P.O.BOX 253
E-mail : rusizidistrict@minaloc.gov.rw

Mr. Hilaire Habyarimana
PhD student
University of Witwatersrand
Johannesburg

Dear Sir,

Re: Permission to carry out a PhD research in the schools of Rusizi District

Referring to your letter of July 15th, 2010 requesting to carry out a PhD research on perceptions of educators and learners towards English as medium of instruction and classroom practices at primary schools of Rusizi District, I am pleased to advise you that permission has been granted to you to conduct this research in the selected schools of our District. However, you will have to collaborate with the school principals who will help you get access to the schools and classes that will participate in your study.

I wish you successful research and hope that your research will contribute to the improvement of education in our District.

Yours faithfully,

Fabien SINDAYIHEBA
Mayor of Rusizi District

Copy:
-Vice-mayors
-Executive Secretary
-District Education Officer
RUSIZI