

Eating soup with a fork – why the EFAL syllabus cannot promote learning across the curriculum

A B S T R A C T Dismal literacy figures of South African learners, on the one hand, and poor matriculation results of public school learners who still prefer English as a medium of instruction, raise the question whether the current second language curriculum has failed to promote academic literacy and additive bilingualism. The authors argue that more time spent in the EFAL classroom will not necessarily mean that the objectives as envisaged by the curriculum will be attained. In order for academic literacy to be improved, the distinction between a language of learning and a language as subject matter should be acknowledged. In lieu of this distinction, a new English curriculum should be introduced from Grade 1-12 in all South African schools where English is used as the medium of instruction. The authors propose the implementation of an adjunct CBI and CLIL syllabus where language development and content development are not regarded in isolation and where the focus is on the intersection of language, content and thinking objectives.

Keywords: English medium of instruction; CLIL; Content and language integrated learning; CBI; Content based instruction; English First Additional Language; EFAL

1. Problem statement

Although South Africa has a multilingual language policy where different models of bilingual and dual medium instruction can be identified (Macdonald, 2002), the educational situation displays many characteristics of an immersion program similar to the Hong Kong medium of instruction programme during the late 1990s. Some of these are:

- South African learners are assumed to already have a strong command of their second language (L2) when they enter Grade 4. Learners are thus expected to learn through their

second language without any focused scaffolding or additional language lessons at the time of their transition in Grade 4.

- The L2 is spoken in the classroom only. Especially in lower socio-economic environments learners do not speak the language outside of the classroom.

This state of affairs is much maligned by the advocates for mother tongue education, who argue that second language medium of instruction is the reason for the majority of second language learners' poor academic achievements, lack of functional literacy, high drop-out numbers and a general loss of cultural pride (Langhan, 1993; Burkett, 2001; De Varennes, 2009). Researchers maintain that education in one's own language is desirable not only for effective education at least in the first seven years of school, but also for retaining cultural diversity (Heugh, 2002; Bedford, 2007; De Varennes, 2009). In spite of this, many parents and learners prefer English as a medium of instruction, because English as the language of commerce and trade, government and law, is seen as a solution to the poverty problem (Kgosana, 2006; Saunders, 2009).

The highest enrolment for any subject in the curriculum is, therefore, English as a First Additional Language. Since most South African learners "undergo the majority of their schooling, learning and being assessed in English, as their second language" (DoE, 2009:14). English has become the common denominator in multicultural classrooms within the diverse South African society and plays an increasingly more important role in education in this country (Burkett *et al*, 2001).

In acknowledgement of the importance of proficiency in English as the language of learning, the Task Team for the review of the implementation of the National Curriculum Statement (2009:42) recommends that, English as a First Additional Language (EFAL) and Language of Learning and Teaching (LOLT) needs greater specification in the curriculum, with attention paid to preparation for the use of English across the curriculum. In view of this argument, more time should be made available in preparing learners for English medium of instruction and the use of English across the curriculum.

In this article the authors argue that:

1. the distinction between a language of learning and teaching and a language as subject matter should be acknowledged;
2. more time spent in the EFAL classroom will not necessarily mean that the academic literacy objectives as envisaged by the NCS will be attained;
3. the EFAL syllabus, which focuses on the teaching of English as a subject, may not be suitable for promoting academic literacy in the language of learning; and
4. in lieu of the distinction between a language of learning and teaching and a language taught as a subject, a new English medium of instruction curriculum, adjunct to the present FAL and Home Language curriculum and focused on the attainment of academic literacy in the language of learning, should be introduced from Grade 1-12 in all South African schools where English is used as the medium of instruction.

The following questions are addressed in this article:

- Why is the EFAL syllabus not sufficient for promoting the level of academic literacy required for learning across the curriculum?
- What alternative curriculum should/could be implemented?

- What are the objectives of an adjunct English medium of instruction curriculum?
- How should this new curriculum be implemented?

2. Why the current EFAL curriculum is failing to promote adequate academic literacy for learning across the curriculum

The South African National Curriculum Statement envisages that objectives in the English class (First Additional Language) 'should provide for levels of language proficiency that meet the threshold level necessary for effective learning across the curriculum' (DoE, 2003b:11). These objectives include the abstract cognitive academic language skills required for thinking and learning. The NCS furthermore states that:

the Languages Subject underlies all other Subjects, since language is the medium through which all teaching, learning and assessment takes place. Thus without language no other Subject could exist. The language teacher has an important responsibility to ensure that languages are fully utilised across the curriculum. Sufficient time and attention need to be given to the languages of learning and teaching for all other Subjects (DoE, 2003a:19).

This excerpt raises the following questions:

- What is the syllabus content of EFAL and will this provide sufficient opportunity for teaching and learning the academic skills required for learning across the curriculum?
- Is it the responsibility of the language teacher alone to ensure that the language of learning is taught across the curriculum?
- How much time is 'sufficient' for attaining language skills required for academic learning?

2.1 EFAL curriculum content

The current South African National Curriculum Statement claims that the Language curriculum provides strong enough support that 'by the end of Grade 9, these learners should be able to use their Home and First Additional Languages effectively and with confidence for a variety of purposes, including learning' (DoE, 2003a:20). However, it is clear that a clear distinction between learning a language as a subject and using language as a tool for learning. Quane and Glanz (2005) call neither the current NCS nor the revised Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement CAPS (DoE, 2010:6) makes this distinction "critical". The only indication of such a distinction can be seen in the NCS's exclusion of learning outcome five (Thinking and Reasoning) from the Second Additional Language syllabus. Presumably, a person who learns a language for communicative purposes does not need to use language to think and reason, and access, process and use information for learning (DoE, 2003a:21-22).

Neither the NCS or CAPS document is clear on how a language for learning and teaching, as opposed to learning a language for general purposes, may differ in the teaching methodology and content. This is illustrated by the statements that in 'practice it is not necessary to have a rigid division between the teaching of Home and Additional Languages', and that the 'teaching and learning of Home Languages and Additional Languages is not different in approach or methodology' (DoE, 2003a:20). This implies that the content of the FAL syllabus is similar to that of the Home Language in terms of the focus on creative writing, the study of literature, and the study of grammar instead of equipping learners with academic literacy skills.

According to the objectives for FAL learning in the NCS (2003b) and the new CAPS document (2010), the FAL syllabus (should) “provide for levels of language proficiency that meet the threshold levels necessary for effective learning across the curriculum” (DoE, 2010:6). This includes the abstract, cognitive academic language skills required for thinking and learning. A careful analysis of the approaches to teaching, however, proves that the focus is on the attainment of general language skills for social purposes as opposed to acquiring academic literacy skills for learning across the curriculum.

As far as learning across the curriculum is concerned, the NCS explains how teachers should link language teaching with themes and topics derived from the other subjects, yet no prescribed body of knowledge exists for the Language Subjects. This means that teachers do not have a coherent plan for teaching the academic literacy skills across the curriculum and may randomly select themes for attaining the language learning objectives.

An excerpt from a typical Learning Programme for Grade 8 learners of EFAL (Future Entrepreneurs, 2007) contains the following topics:

<p style="text-align: center;">LO AS</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Title/Objective (Skills/Knowledge/Values)</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Listening</u> 8.1.2(a) 8.1.4 8.2.3(a)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Listening to and giving directions Communicate interpersonally and observe and discuss communication</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Writing</u> 8.4.2 8.4.4(h)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Creating a map Design a basic map of a specific area</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Speaking</u> 8.2.2 8.5.1(f)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Having a discussion Discuss relevant social and environmental issues</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Reading and viewing</u> <u>Thinking and Reasoning</u> 8.3.3 8.3.4(a), (b), (c), (d) 8.5.1(a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f) 8.5.2(a), (b) 8.6.1(c)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Reading and viewing Consider a text in depth</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Grammar and Structures</u> 8.6.2(a)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Parts of speech Study information and do exercises involving parts of speech</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Writing</u> 8.4.2 8.4.4(b)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Travel Create an advertising poster and write a prose report</p>

<p><u>Reading</u> 8.3.4 (c)</p>	<p>Reading a weather report Interpret a weather report Draw conclusions</p>
<p><u>Listening</u> 8.1.2(a)</p>	<p>Listening to a weather report Obtain information by listening to a weather report</p>
<p><u>Grammar and Structures</u> 8.6.2(a), (b), (c), (e)</p>	<p>Clauses Study information on clauses Complete language exercises</p>
<p><u>Speaking</u> 8.2.2 8.2.3</p>	<p>What worries you? Discussion, survey and graph to represent results</p>
<p><u>Listening and Speaking</u> 8.1.2 8.2.3 8.3.1 8.6.4</p>	<p>Thando's been arrested Listening to and taking part in a conversation</p>
<p><u>Reading</u> 8.3.1 8.3.2 8.4.6 8.4.7 8.4.8 8.6.9</p>	<p>Overcrowding Reading, word games, and comprehension</p>
<p><u>Writing</u> 8.3.1 8.4.1 8.6.6 (a) – (d)</p>	<p>Dear Mary Asking for advice</p>
<p><u>Grammar and Structures</u> 8.6.2</p>	<p>Any one or a special one a, an, the – determiners</p>
<p><u>Reading: Speaking</u> 8.3.1 8.3.2 8.6.2 8.6.3 8.6.9</p>	<p>Plagues and diseases reading, translating, determiners and prepositions</p>
<p><u>Speaking</u> 8.1.2 8.2.3 8.3.2 8.6.6 (a) – (d)</p>	<p>All fall down! Talking about things, asking and responding to questions</p>

An excerpt from a Learning Programme for Grade 10 EFAL learners for one year (Reyneke, 2008) shows themes such as *Celebrities; Advertising; Soccer 2010; Global warming; Physical and Spiritual Health;* and *The World's Richest People*. Learning activities for the cycle based on "Celebrities" include the following: Use informal speech; Start a vocabulary list; Study a comprehension passage and answer questions; Write a Précis; Form questions, negatives and tag questions; Conduct an interview; Write a magazine article; Analyse poem(s) and answer questions.

An analysis of this Learning Programme shows that the themes and activities selected reflect a general purpose language learning approach, aimed at enabling the learner to communicate effectively in a variety of situations. It is also clear that, in spite of the fact that the prescriptions of the NCS are followed regarding Learning Objectives and Assessment Standards, the themes and topics and subsequent language skills developed focus little on the acquisition of academic skills across the curriculum. As in the NCS, the compilers of these Learning Programmes seem to believe that a general knowledge of the language and a wide range of randomly selected topics that create a certain context for learning will enable a learner to function effectively when using the language as a tool for learning.

In contrast with this general purposes approach for language learning, which will allow learners to use English for a variety of purposes as prescribed by the NCS, it is now believed that the language skills that students need for social interaction with their peers and teachers in the English subject class are different from those needed to function in a formal academic language class (Short, 2002). The differences include not only specialised vocabulary, but also special forms of expression related to specific academic domains. Language learning for academic purposes, therefore, cannot take place in isolation, as is the case when it is taught as an academic subject. Consequently, even though second language children may be attending FAL classes, many researchers agree that general purpose language instruction that is taught in isolation of the rest of the school curriculum will not necessarily be transferred or be useful for coping with academic instruction (Genesee, 1995; Johns, 1997; Grabe and Stoller, 1997; Eskey, 1997). It is now generally recognised that when a language has to be used for learning across the curriculum, academic literacy skills will be acquired more effectively when the language is learned in conjunction with meaningful content and purposive communication, and where the language is not the object or purpose of the learning but only the vehicle of instruction.

2.2 Time allocated for acquiring the language of learning

Although the Task Team for the Review of the Implementation of the National Curriculum Statement makes it clear that "more time needs to be made available in preparing learners for English medium of instruction, and the use of English across the curriculum" (DoE, 2009:42) the question is, how much time is sufficient for teaching and learning language for all other Subjects? Also, would extra time spent in the EFAL classroom result in more effective learning across the curriculum?

Cummins (1995) maintains that a child can acquire basic interpersonal skills within two years, yet it may take five to seven years to acquire academic literacy. But, taught for only seven hours per week, during which time the content of English as a subject may be the focus, the time spent and skills acquired in the English First Additional Language class are not sufficient to

enable second language speakers to meet required standards of academic reading and writing skills in the content areas (Hugo, 2008).

It is generally accepted that teachers of English 'have the leading role in providing learners with the knowledge, skills and understanding they need to read, write, speak and listen effectively' (Goodwyn & Findlay, 2003:27). Both the NCS (DoE, 2003a:21) and CAPS document make it clear that language teachers should enable learners to "study the language skills required for academic learning across the curriculum" (DoE, 2010:7).

However, Fillmore and Snow (2000), Klaassen, (2002:19) and Uys *et al.* (2007) maintain that a two-fold approach, where both the English language teacher and the subject teacher are active agents for promoting learners' language proficiency while they are learning subject content, is much more effective for acquiring academic literacy.

Academic literacy can only be promoted once all content teachers understand how learning tasks, content and language interact, and 'how knowledge of one of the three knowledge bases required for academic literacy implies and necessitates knowledge of another base' (Short, 2002:14). How a learning task is to be accomplished requires knowledge, not only of the procedures involved in the task itself, but also of the (subject) content and the formal and functional characteristics of language, which can vary from one context to another. Because knowledge bases are interdependent, the content teacher's responsibility is not only the promotion of subject knowledge, but also to help learners acquire semantic, syntactic and pragmatic knowledge about how English is used in the specific subject area (Schleppegrell *et al.*, 2004).

Anstrom (1999:1), Al-Ansari (2000:194) and Short (2002:18) claim that learners' probability of attaining academic literacy is much higher if subject teachers teach the four language skills and consciously promote the development of functional language skills in the content classroom. Academic literacy entails more than the conventional notion of literacy as the ability to read and write. It requires the ability to understand how language construes meanings in content-area texts and how meanings and concepts are realised in language (Schleppegrell *et al.*, 2004). Science texts, for example:

unlike the familiar content and predictable story grammar of children's literature, contains unfamiliar content and text structures, heavy conceptual demands, and unique vocabulary. The purpose of scientific text is to assist uninformed and misinformed readers to construct meaning about specific science ideas using an expository approach, words (concept labels) with specific meanings, complex and interconnected sentences, and specific text structures (description, collection, compare/contrast, problem/solution, causation) Many teachers fail to recognize the unique differences between narrative and expository text and cling to the traditional notions that meaning resides solely in the text and that readers simply extract the meaning. They unknowingly design instruction involving science as if science texts were narrative rather than expository and as if reading was a meaning- taking process rather than a meaning-making process (Yore *et al.*, 1997).

Al-Ansari (2000:175) states that 'more hours spent on English medium of instruction in content subjects may be more beneficial than hours spent on formal language instruction in the English subject class'.

3. What additional English curriculum should be implemented?

In contrast to the EFAL syllabus that is currently being used in South African schools, the authors argue for an English medium of instruction syllabus that focuses on the acquisition of semantic, syntactic and pragmatic knowledge about how English is used in specific subject areas, and the development of academic literacy. Such a syllabus will focus on English as a tool for teaching and learning. It will be functional in the sense that it will concentrate on what is required to function in academic classes and it will become increasingly complicated as the child's cognitive abilities develop and academic demands increase.

For this purpose, a combination of the Content Based Instruction (CBI) model used in English language teaching curriculum design in America and the Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) programmes currently employed in Europe, is well-suited. Content Based Instruction makes use of instructional materials, learning tasks, and classroom techniques from academic content areas as the vehicle for developing language, content, cognitive and study skills. The target language is used as the medium of instruction. In this approach students learn a variety of language skills which prepare them for the range of academic tasks they will encounter (Grabe & Stoller, 1997:19; Colombo & Furbush, 2009:76). Within CBI there are four models for implementing content and language integrated learning of which the adjunct model is appropriate for the South African context, as it implies a two-fold approach involving both language teachers and content teachers. This means that the content in the EFAL class will be taken from the learners' school subjects and that the subject teacher is trained to deliver language sensitive content instruction (Sheppard, 1997:23). Similarly, the CLIL programme fuses both content and language learning. Based on the constructivist theory emphasising learner activity, learner autonomy and task involvement the CLIL model for second language medium of instruction is a highly appropriate method to achieve academic literacy in a second language (Eurydice, 2006:2; European Commission, 2003). Contrary to current medium of instruction practice in South Africa that displays characteristics of an immersion programme and which subsequently results in subtractive bilingualism (Du Plessis and Louw, 2008), the CLIL curriculum respects the role of the Mother Tongue in second language acquisition. It acknowledges and values transferable language skills brought to the second language classroom and is, therefore, considered an appropriate method to achieve additive bi- and/or multilingualism and to raise educational standards (Coyle, 2006:7; Colombo & Furbush, 2009:xv).

While the CLIL programme promotes a gradual and cautious switch to the L2 and provides a transparent and planned approach to language and content, it creates a large zone of proximal development and recognises the need for significant and elaborate scaffolding to ensure successful learning. Furthermore, it provides opportunities for 'problem-solving, risk-taking, confidence-building, communication skills, extending vocabulary, self-expression and spontaneous talk' (Coyle, 2006:7). In CLIL the L2 is taught as a medium and not as a goal, analytical and hypothesising skills are developed, learning techniques and study skills are taught, a more favourable environment for learner autonomy is provided, and cognitive development is promoted (Eurydice, 2006:2; European Commission, 2003).

4. A model for the development of a content and language integrated curriculum (CLIC)

The outcome of this model is the specific academic literacy for learning across the curriculum in different subject areas. Short (2002) defines academic literacy for learning across the curriculum as consisting of three knowledge bases:

- knowledge of the subject content;
- knowledge of how the learning task is to be accomplished; and
- knowledge of the language required to understand the content and complete the task at hand.

The challenge of developing a curriculum that is fully integrative in content and language cannot be accomplished by English language teachers working alone. It calls for the involvement of content teachers (Genesee, 1995). In the proposed curriculum it will thus be possible for subject teachers and academic language teachers to work together on the development of a learning programme that is suitable for acquiring academic literacy. Marland (2001:1) asserts that the contextual teaching of language in the different subject courses strongly extends the learners' knowledge and ability to use language effectively in all aspects of their lives

The language teacher teaching the adjunct model and the subject teacher will have the same learning objectives in mind and will both be working on different levels to attain these. The subject teacher will supply the topic and subject content that needs to be understood, simultaneously focussing on the academic literacy language skills identified for mastering the task and communicating the knowledge in a coherent and cohesive way. This means that these teachers form a partnership to develop the academic learning through medium of English while the EFAL teacher will focus on the teaching of English for a variety of communicative purposes.

The CLIC (Content and Language in the Classroom) curriculum proposed in Figure 1 is based on the following theories:

1. Learners require specific academic language skills and content knowledge to function in academic classes. These skills may differ from subject to subject.
2. The integration of language and subject matter learning supports the development of important subject matter skills (Lamsfuß-Schenk, 2002).
3. English as a medium of instruction is a tool for learning and teaching and is not learned as a goal but as a vehicle for learning (Eskey, 1997).
4. There should be a gradual introduction of the L2. The CLIC curriculum should be introduced gradually from Gr 1-12 and become increasingly complicated as the child's cognitive abilities develop and academic demands increase.
5. The appreciation and reinforcement of both L1 and the medium of instruction have a complimentary effect on the learners' cognitive and social development (Du Plessis and Louw, 2008:54).
6. L1 proficiency has to be maintained while acquiring the L2. The adjunct model embraces focused, formal Mother Tongue instruction based on a traditional language syllabus as a means for learners to attain reading and writing skills.
7. Multilingualism should be promoted. The CLIC curriculum operates separately from the Language Curricula. Learners are encouraged to learn a first and second additional language. In order to develop language proficiency in English for a variety of purposes, the EFAL course runs alongside (adjunct to) the CLIC curriculum. A second additional language may be

introduced in Grade 7 and learners can elect to take this as a subject after Grade 9. Learners may also choose to take a different language as an elective in Grade 10, depending on what the school offers. These languages are taught according to a traditional language acquisition and appreciation syllabus e.g. the teaching of communicative skills (BICS), literature, grammar of the language, creative writing, and the culture of the target language.

	LANGUAGE	SYLLABUS	SUGGESTED TIME ALLOCATED
Grade 0	MOTHER TONGUE	Receptive skills Conceptualisation Basic Literacy	2-3 hours per day
Grade 1	MOTHER TONGUE	Basic Literacy: Reading in the Mother Tongue	2-3 hours per day
	ENGLISH	Receptive skills Total Physical Response syllabus	30 minutes per day
Grade 2	MOTHER TONGUE	Basic Literacy: Reading and Writing Appreciation of rhymes	2 hours per day
	ENGLISH	Total Physical Response (School related Intercommunicative skills)	30 minutes - 1 hour per day
Grade 3	MOTHER TONGUE	Literacy	2 hours per day
	ENGLISH	Transfer of basic literacy skills Conceptualisation of selected subject content	2 hours per day
Grade 4	MOTHER TONGUE	Traditional Mother Tongue syllabus	1 hour per day
	ENGLISH AS A MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION	Content Based syllabus Basic academic Literacy	90 minutes per day
	LANGUAGE IN THE CONTENT CLASSROOM	Conceptualisation: subject specific language skills. Some code switching may still take place	Assisted Subject classes
	ENGLISH FAL	English for general purposes	2-3 times a week
Grade 5	MOTHER TONGUE	Traditional MT syllabus	1 hour per day
	ENGLISH AS A MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION	Content Based syllabus Basic academic Literacy	90 minutes
	LANGUAGE IN THE CONTENT CLASSROOM	Conceptualisation: subject specific language skills. Some code switching may still take place	Assisted subject classes
	ENGLISH FAL	English for general purposes	2-3 times a week

Grade 6	MOTHER TONGUE	Traditional First Language Syllabus	1 Hour per day
	ENGLISH AS A MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION	Content Based syllabus developed in conjunction with Content teachers Basic academic Literacy	90 minutes per day
	LANGUAGE IN THE CONTENT CLASSROOM	Conceptualisation: Subject specific language skills	All day
	ENGLISH FAL	English for general purposes	2-3 times a week
Grade 7	MOTHER TONGUE	Traditional First Language Syllabus	1 hour per day
	ENGLISH AS A MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION	Content Based syllabus developed in conjunction with Content teachers Basic academic Literacy	90 minutes per day
	LANGUAGE IN THE CONTENT CLASSROOM	Conceptualisation: Subject specific language skills	All day
	ENGLISH FAL	English for general purposes	2-3 times a week
	A SECOND ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE is introduced	Receptive skills in SAL	2-3 times per week
Grade 8	MOTHER TONGUE	Traditional First Language Syllabus	1 hour per day
	ENGLISH AS A MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION	Content Based syllabus developed in conjunction with Content teachers Basic academic literacy	90 minutes per day
	LANGUAGE IN THE CONTENT CLASSROOM	Conceptualisation: Subject specific language skills	All day
	ENGLISH FAL	English for general purposes	2-3 times a week
	A SECOND ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE	Traditional SAL syllabus	2-3 times per week
Grade 9	MOTHER TONGUE	Traditional First Language Syllabus	1 hour per day
	ENGLISH AS A MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION	Content Based syllabus developed in conjunction with Content teachers Basic academic Literacy	90 minutes per day
	LANGUAGE IN THE CONTENT CLASSROOM	Conceptualisation: Subject specific language skills	All day
	ENGLISH FAL	English for General purposes	2-3 times per week
	A SECOND ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE	Traditional SAL Syllabus	2-3 times per week

Grade 10	MOTHER TONGUE	Traditional First Language Syllabus	1 hour per day
	ENGLISH AS A MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION	Content Based syllabus developed in conjunction with Content teachers Basic academic Literacy	90 minutes per day
	LANGUAGE IN THE CONTENT CLASSROOM	Conceptualisation: Subject specific language skills.	All day
	English FAL	Traditional FAL syllabus	2-3 times per week
	SECOND ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE AS SUBJECT IF PREFERRED	Traditional syllabus	2-3 times per week
Grade 11	MOTHER TONGUE	Traditional First Language Syllabus	1 hour per day
	ENGLISH AS A MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION	Content Based syllabus developed in conjunction with Content teachers Basic academic Literacy	90 minutes per day
	LANGUAGE IN THE CONTENT CLASSROOM	Conceptualisation: Subject specific language skills	All day
	English FAL	Traditional FAL syllabus	2-3 times per week
	SECOND ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE AS SUBJECT IF PREFERRED	Traditional syllabus	2-3 times per week
Grade 12	MOTHER TONGUE	Traditional First Language Syllabus	1 Hour per day
	ENGLISH AS A MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION	Content Based syllabus developed in conjunction with Content teachers Academic Literacy Skills	90 minutes per day
	LANGUAGE IN THE CONTENT CLASSROOM	Conceptualisation: Subject specific language skills	All day
	ENGLISH FAL	Traditional syllabus	2-3 times per week
	SECOND ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE	Traditional syllabus	2-3 times per week

5. Advantages of CLIC

Apart from the advantages of a CLIL programme that fuses language and content teaching as identified by (Mehisto and Asser, 2007), the adjunct model offers the following advantages for South African learners. It:

- promotes academic literacy in the language of learning;
- focuses on subject content and the specific linguistic needs of the subject;
- allows for teachers to work together across the curriculum;

- allows learners to receive language support in all classes;
- promotes mastery of English for general purposes as well as for learning;
- promotes multilingualism;
- promotes teaching of the Mother Tongue. This hypothetically means that regardless of the fact that English is the tool for learning, more than one Mother Tongue can be taught in one school. This will not only promote respect for cultural diversity but will also allow for additive bilingualism;
- allows learners to fully benefit from the advantages of bilingualism: learners will reap full benefit of the cognitive advantages of bilingualism; and
- provides proper training for all teachers enabling them to support learners in language acquisition for learning purposes.

6. Conclusion and recommendations

English medium of instruction is a reality in South Africa. Although currently experienced as a barrier to learning, it can be viewed as a national resource that has the potential to be implemented successfully to produce functionally and academic literate learners. This does not only require more time for teaching English as a medium of instruction, but also a paradigm shift regarding the content of English that should be taught at school and the training and responsibility of the content teacher as a language teacher.

The authors recommend that:

- The adjunct model proposed in this article needs to be implemented from Grade 1-12 in all South African schools where English is used as a medium of instruction. In line with the Task Team recommendation, English as a language of learning and teaching needs greater specification in the curriculum and more time should be spent in preparing learners for English medium of instruction, and the use of English across the curriculum.
- English medium of instruction training for all teachers who have to teach through medium of English should become compulsory. Because Grade 4 is the year of transition, all Intermediate Phase teachers should receive thorough training in second language acquisition and language teaching strategies. All Senior and FET content teachers should be trained in content and language integrated learning. Apart from those English language teachers who want to specialise in the teaching of English as a subject, English language teachers should be trained in Content Based Instruction. This implies a new career opportunity for many language teachers who prefer to teach academic literacy in English as a second language.
- In order to promote the transference of reading and writing skills to the second language, Mother Tongue as a subject should be promoted and appropriate time needs to be allocated to the teaching of MT.

REFERENCES

- Al-Ansari, S. 2000. Sheltered curricular exposure and unsheltered extra-curricular exposure as factors influencing the development of academic proficiency in ESL. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 38: 175-194.
- Anstrom, K. 1999. Preparing secondary education teachers to work with English language learners:

- Social Studies. *Resource Collection Series*, 13. [Available Online]: <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu> [Date of access]: 2004/07/02.
- Balfour, R. 2007. Mother-tongue education or bilingual education for South Africa: theories, pedagogies and sustainability. *Journal for Language Teaching*, 41(2): 1-14.
- Burkett, B. Clegg, J. Landon, J. Reilly, T. & Verster, S. 2001. The Language for Learning Project: Developing language-sensitive subject teaching in South African secondary schools. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 19: 149-161.
- Colombo, M. & Furbush, D. 2009. Teaching English Language Learners. Content and language in middle and secondary mainstream classrooms. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Coyle, D.O. 2006. Excerpts from the CLIL teacher's tool kit: A classroom guide. [Available Online]: <http://clil4teachers.pbwiki.com>. [Date of access]: 2010/02/09.
- Cummins, J. 1995. Knowledge, power and identity in teaching English as a second language. In: Genesee, F. (ed.). *Educating second language children: the whole child the whole curriculum the whole community*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 33-58.
- De Varennes, F. 2009. Can the Language of Instruction Influence the Higher Education Landscape? *Muratho*, April: 3-9.
- Department of Education. 2003a. The Revised National Curriculum Statement Grades R-9. Teacher's guide for the development of learning programmes. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- Department of Education. 2003b. National Curriculum Statement Grade 10–12 (General) Languages – English First Additional Language. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- Department of Education. 2009. Report of the task team for the review of the implementation of the National Curriculum Statement. Pretoria: Department of Education.
- Department of Education. 2010. Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS) First Additional Language. Final Draft. Pretoria: Government printers.
- Du Plessis, S. & Louw, B. 2008. Challenges to pre-school teachers in learners' acquisition of English as language of learning and teaching. *South African Journal of Education*, 28(1): 53-75.
- European Commission, 2003. Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity [Available Online]: http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/lang/policy/consult/consult_en.pdf. [Date of access]: 2008/01/21.
- Eskey, D.E. 1997. Syllabus Design in Content-Based Instruction. In: Snow, M.A. & Brinton, M.D. (eds.). *The Content-Based Classroom. Perspectives on Integrating Language and Content*. New York: Longman.
- Eurydice. 2006. *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at Schools in Europe*. [Available Online]: <http://www.eurydice.org.pdf>. [Date of access]: 2010/12/15.
- Fillmore, L.W. & Snow, C. 2000. *What teachers need to know about language*. [Available Online]: <http://www.cal.org/resources/teachers/teachers.pdf>. [Date of access]: 2004/04/18.
- Foley, Andrew. 2002. South African education and the dilemmas of multilingualism, *English Academy Review*, 19(1): 51-64.
- Future Entrepreneurs. 2007. *English Second Additional Language Learning Guide Grade 8*. Menlo Park.
- Genesee, F. (ed.). 1995. *Educating second language children: the whole child the whole curriculum the whole community*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grabe, W. & Stoller, F. Content-based instruction: Research foundations. In: Snow, M.A. & Brinton, M.D. (eds.). *The Content-Based Classroom. Perspectives on Integrating Language and Content*. New York: Longman: 5-21.

- Goodwyn, A. & Findlay, K. 2003. Shaping literacy in the secondary school: practice and agency in the age of the national literacy strategy. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 51: 20-35.
- Hakuta, K. & Bailystok, E. 1994. *In other words: the signs and psychology of second language acquisition*. New York: Basic Books.
- Heugh, K. 2002. The case against bilingual and multilingual education in South Africa: Laying bare the myths. *Perspectives in Education*, 20(1): 171-198.
- Hugo, J.A. 2008. Primary school teachers' opinion of their ESL learners' language abilities. *Journal for Language Teaching*, 42(2): 63-76.
- Johns, A.M. 1997. Taking students beyond content. In: Brinton, M.D. & Masters, P. (eds.). *New Ways in Content-Based Instruction*. Washington: TESOL: 234-239.
- Kgosana, C. 2006. Moedertaal eerste? Liewer Engels, sê sommige swart ouers. Rapport, 19 Februarie: 17.
- Klaassen, R.G. 2002. *The international University curriculum. Challenges in English medium Engineering education*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Delft: Delft University.
- Langhan, D. 1993. School language policy developments in South Africa: A practitioner's perspective. In: *Namibia National Conference on the Implementation of the Language Policy for Schools*. Windhoek: Longman Namibia: 131-140.
- Lamsfuß-Schenk, S. 2002. Geschichte und Sprache -Ist der bilinguale Geschichtsunterricht der Königsweg zum Geschichtsbewusstsein? In: Breidbach, S., Bach, G. & Wolff, D. (eds.). *Bilingualer Sachfachunterricht: Didaktik, Lehrer-/Lernerforschung und Bildungspolitik zwischen Theorie und Empirie*. Frankfurt: Lang: 191-206.
- Marland, M. 2001. Language across the curriculum comes to life. *Literacy Today*, 27. [Available Online]: www.literacytrust.org.uk. [Date of access]: 2005/06/03.
- Mehisto, P. & Asser, H. 2007. CLILL Programme Management in Estonia. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(5):683-701.
- Quane, A. & Glanz, C. 2005. Mother tongue literacy in Sub-Saharan Africa. Paper commissioned for the *EFA Global Monitoring Report, Literacy for Life*. [Available Online]: efareport@unesco.org. [Date of access]: 2009/11/07.
- Reyneke, E.M. 2008. *A model for objectives-based assessment of English First Additional language in the Further Education and Training band*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Potchefstroom: North-West University.
- Saunders, I. 2009. Mother tongue education in South Africa. [Available Online] https://www.givengain.com/cgi-bin/giga.cgi?cmd=cause_dir_news_. [Date of access]: 2010/10/28.
- Schleppegrell, J., Aghugar, M. & Oteiza, T. 2004. The grammar of History: enhancing content-based instruction through a functional focus on language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(1): 67-93.
- Sheppard, K. 1997. Integrating Content-ESL: A Report from the Front. In: Snow, M.A. & Brinton, M.D. (eds.). *The Content-Based Classroom. Perspectives on Integrating Language and Content*. New York: Longman: 142-158.
- Short, D. 2002. Language learning in sheltered social classes. *TESOL Journal*, 11(1): 18-24.
- Uys, A.H.C., Van der Walt, J.L., Botha, S.U. & Van den Berg, R. 2007. English Medium of Instruction in South Africa: A Situation Analysis. *South African Journal of Education*, 27(1): 69-82.
- Yore, L.D., Shymansky, J.A., Henriques, L., Chidsey, J.L. & Lewis, J.O. 1997. Reading-to-Learn and Writing-to-Learn. Science activities for the elementary school classroom. Paper delivered at AETS CONFERENCE.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Kotie Kaiser

North-West University
Private Bag x6001
Potchefstroom
2520
Email: Kotie.Kaiser@nwu.ac.za

Maryna Reyneke

North-West University
Private Bag x6001
Potchefstroom
2520
Email: Maryna.Reyneke@nwu.ac.za

Mandie Uys

North-West University
Private Bag x6001
Potchefstroom
2520
Email: Mandie.Uys@nwu.ac.za