An Analysis of Teachers' Classroom Application of the Eclectic Method to English Language Teaching in Multilingual Zambia

David Sani Mwanza

The University of Zambia

Abstract: - **The Eclectic Method is the recommended method for teaching English as a second language in Multilingual Zambia. This implies that teachers need to posses the required competencies and skills to apply the method in multilingual classroom with learners of diverse abilities and language backgrounds. Through the use classroom lesson observation and interviews with 30 teachers of English drawn from 6 secondary schools in the Central Province of Zambia, this study provides an analysis of teachers' classroom application of the Eclectic Method and the challenges they faced in so doing. The paper also provides suggestions regarding what teachers should do to implement the method in under resourced and challenging contexts. The findings showed that while some teachers understood the method and applied it in the classroom, others shunned it for various reasons. Some of the challenges faced were lack of English proficiency among learners, poor training received by teachers and shortage of teaching materials which were needed for the method to be applied. By drawing on multimodality and its extended notions of Resemiotisation and semiotic remediation, the paper shows how teachers can still apply the eclectic method in under-resourced countries and contexts.**

Key words: **English, Teaching, Teachers, Multilingualism, Multimodality, Critical Discourse Analysis, Resemiotisation and semiotic Remediation**

I. BACKGROUND

The history of language teaching has been characterised by a search for more effective ways of teaching language. Although much has been done to clarify these and other important questions in language teaching, the profession is continually exploring new options for addressing these and other basic issues and the effectiveness of different instructional strategies and methods in the classroom. According to Richards and Rodgers (2001), language teaching came into its own as a profession in the twentieth century. The whole foundation of contemporary language teaching was developed during the early part of the twentieth century. Since then, a number of teaching methods and approaches have been developed.

The Grammar Translation method was the earliest method to be formalised and used in the classroom. However, it was criticised for its bilingual approach to teaching because it became apparent that language teaching and learning was spontaneous and that learners could use the target language as medium of instruction. This led to the development of the Direct method which was a monolingual approach to language teaching. However, in the 1950s, the Audiolingual method was developed in order to train military personnel in oral language. Soon, the method became popular in schools. Regardless, the method was criticised for its emphasis on memorisation and repetitive drills. Thus, the Cognitive Code Approach was developed. This method was influenced cognitive psychology and transformational generative grammar. It became popular because the learner was viewed as an active participant and error was viewed as part of the learning process. Even so, its limitation of teaching the language outside the context of use rendered it weak. Thus, the situational method was developed. This method viewed language as situational and therefore, language was introduced and practiced in situations. Although this was a major development in language teaching, the method was criticised because it tended to predict what and how language would be used in specific situation when in fact, language and language use cannot be predicted. Therefore, in the 1980s, the Communicative language teaching method was developed. This method was influenced by Dell Hymes Communicative competence which was a reaction against the weaknesses of Chomsky's linguistic competence. The communicative language teaching method has been popular for its focus on the learners and approaching language as a whole. However, in some contexts, the communicative language teaching method is viewed as outdated and prescriptive just like the other methods when in fact, methods and decisions regarding how language should be taught cannot be prescribed owing to the dynamic learning contexts where teachers are support to operate (Mwanza, 2016).

From the foregoing, it is clear that each method has weaknesses and strengths and none of them is best for the teaching of language. Gebhard, Gaitan and Oprandy (1990) argue that there is no convincing evidence from pedagogic research, including research into second language instruction, that there is any universal or 'best' way to teach language. They further state that while particular approaches are likely to prove more effective in certain situations than others, a 'blanket prescription' is difficult to support theoretically. Nunan (1991:228) is probably correct when he remarks that "it has been realised that there never was and probably will

never be a method for all". Since none of the methods discussed earlier could not be used effectively in isolation from other methods, the idea of Eclecticism – a conscious blending of different methods - was developed. It must be mentioned here that in this paper, the term Eclecticism will be used synonymously to Principled Eclecticism.

In Zambia, the recommended approach to teaching English is eclecticism. On methods of teaching, the syllabus states "The teaching of English be eclectic"(CDC 2012:36). The syllabus also states: "It is recommended that the Senior Secondary School English Language Syllabus is interpreted through two general methodologies which should be used concurrently – the Communicative Approach and the Text-based, Integrated Approach" (Curriculum Development Centre 2012:4). The concurrent use of the communicative approach and the text based integrated approach results into eclecticism. As Al Hamash and Younis (1985:22) put it, "eclecticism is defined as a type of methodology that makes use of the different language learning approaches instead of sticking to one standard approach". Thus, the use of the two broad methods mentioned in the syllabus recommendation fits into what eclecticism is. Further, considering that the communicative approach is itself eclectic confirms that this recommendation is on eclecticism. Pachler and Field (1997:44) state that "the communicative approach can be seen as an eclectic assortment of traditional and novel approaches based on the tenet of the development in learners of an ability to communicate in the target language rather than as a prescriptive method of how to teach." It can therefore be reiterated that the method being recommended in the syllabus is indeed the eclectic approach.

Brown (2002) argues that eclecticism provides the solution to teaching language because the approach allows the teachers to select what works within their own dynamic contexts. Gao (2011) further states that principled eclecticism challenges the teacher to ensure that every decision about classroom instruction and activities is based on a thorough and holistic understanding of all learning theories and related pedagogies, in terms of the purpose and context of language teaching and learning, the needs of the learners, materials available, how language is learnt and what teaching is all about.

Larsen-Freeman (2000) states that a teacher can choose to be pluralistic, in which case a teacher will pick and choose from among methods to create their own blend which make allowances for differences among learners. This implies that a teacher will create his/her own method by blending aspects of others in a coherent and principled manner which result into principled eclecticism. Freeman adds that the selection of a method to be used in the classroom will be influenced by the teacher, the students, the conditions of instruction and the broader social cultural context. He advises that there should not be any method that should be prescribed for success for everyone because each leaning context requires particular methods.

Since method selection involves both thoughts and actions, it is expected that eclectic teachers should be able to give reasons for why they do what they do. Most of their decisions take into consideration the complexity of the classroom reality, including what is happening socially among the learners (Allright 1984; Nunan 1992; Prabbu 1992; Clarke 1994).

Luo, He and Yang (2001) in Gao (2011:362) sum up the five features of successful eclectic teaching as:

> 1) Determine the purposes of each individual method; 2) be flexible in the selection and application of each method; 3) make each method effective; 4) consider the appropriateness of each method and 5) maintain the continuity of the whole teaching process. The teaching procedure should be divided into three stages namely: (a) teacher-centred at the input stage; (b) learner-centred at the practice stage; and (c) learner-centred at the production stage.

This means that the application of the eclectic approach is systematic and the teacher should have a thorough understanding of the approach and how it works in order to apply it appropriately and correctly in the classroom situation. The teacher should be aware of how s/he can recontextualise this approach to the teaching of English Grammar in his/her unique classroom situation.

Recontextualisation is a very important skill which teachers should develop during teacher training and they need it in their lesson preparation and delivery in the school. The interpretation of the syllabus requires that the teacher knows how to recontextualise education knowledge and the means (teaching methods) by which knowledge can be transferred from the syllabus to the learner in the classroom. Larsen-Freeman (2000:181-182) was right when he stated the following about the nature of methods:

> Methods themselves are decontextualised. They describe a certain ideal based on certain beliefs. They deal with what, how and why. They say little or nothing about to who/whom, when and where.

This means that a teacher has the responsibility of recontextualising the methods in the classroom depending on the learners, their background and the general context of teaching and learning. It can be assumed that syllabus designers at the national level contextualise the methods at a national level. Larsen-Freeman (2000:82) warned that "there can be no method for everyone…methods should not be exported from one situation to another". This requires that a teacher decides what to do depending on his/her peculiar classroom situation. To justify this proposition further, Larsen-Freeman (2000:xi) noted that the "Decisions that

teachers make are often affected by the exigencies in the classroom rather than by methodological considerations.

From this background, it is clear that there is no one method for all. The best way to teach is to use the eclectic approach which is a blend of methods depending on the teacher, learners linguistic backgrounds and abilities, materials available, the culture of the teacher and learners, social cultural background of the learners and the learning objectives. This requires that teachers are adequately trained in order to have a thorough understanding of the eclectic and how it can be recontextualised in the classroom to suit the target learners. Teachers understanding of eclecticism and recontextualisation of education knowledge become particularly crucial in teaching. Considering that Zambia is multilingual and that English is learnt as a second language, Zambian languages and cultures become part of the learners' background. Hence, the consideration of these factors in the teaching and learning of English grammar was interesting to establish.

Therefore, within the theoretical and contextual framework provided, this study aimed to reveal how teachers recontextualised the approach in the teaching of English grammar in selected secondary schools in Central Province of Zambia.

Statement of the Problem

Zambia teaches English as a second language, and the subject curriculum for English recommends the use of the eclectic approach. However, the problem was that it was not known how teachers of English in Zambia actually implemented eclecticism in the classroom situation when they taught English, specifically English grammar. This study therefore provides an analysis of teachers' classroom application of the Eclectic method in the teaching of English Grammar in Multilingual Zambia.

Theoretical Framework

This study was framed by two theories. These are the Code and Pedagogic Discourse Theories as well as Multimodality Theory with its extended notions of resemiotisation and semiotic remediation.

Code and Pedagogic Discourse Theories

The code and pedagogic discourse theory is used in this study together with its extended notion of recontextualisation of education knowledge. Under this theory, it is believed that classroom teaching does not take place in a vacuum. It is affected by several factors such as government through curriculum, syllabus, teacher training, national exams, school inspections, school administration and the context of the school on one hand, and informal knowledge and the learners' social cultural background on the other hand. In the teaching of language, language ideologies and how a particular country conceptualises language also play a part. These factors are critical ingredients in effective classroom

practice through recontextualisation of prior knowledge. These factors affect what method/s a teacher will use and how the teacher applies the chosen method/s in the classroom. This is true to the application of the eclectic approach to the teaching of English grammar. Thus, the classroom application of the eclectic approach was analysed within this framework.

Bernstein (1973) argues that every pedagogic discourse is characterised by power and control. Haugen (2009:152) offers the following explanation of Bernstein's code theory: 'the code theory examines the reproduction of power in schools by looking at the way content is classified and the interactions are framed". This shows that the concepts of 'classification' and 'framing' are central to Bernstein's theory of Pedagogic Discourse. Sadovnik (2001:3) notes that "classification is concerned with the organisation of knowledge into the curriculum" while "framing is related to the transmission of knowledge through pedagogic practices". In the education system, classification may refer to governments' powers over the curriculum and regulations on what schools or teachers should do while framing is concerned with the amount of control teachers and learners have over what goes on in the classroom. Framing also includes the control (or lack of it) teachers have in implementing the curriculum. Bernstein (1973b:88) describes framing even clearer when he noted "frame refers to the degree of control teacher and learner possess over the selection, organisation, pacing and timing of the knowledge transmitted and received in the pedagogical relationship". It is important to note that this study mainly looked at how teachers applied the eclectic approach to the teaching of grammar. However, this would not be done without considering the factors behind the eclectic approach and the grammar which teachers needed to teach. That is the reason why the concept of framing as it relates to the power that teachers and learners have over what goes on in the classroom is very important in this study.

Framing can be internal or external. According to Bernstein (2000:14), "internal framing refers to the influence the learners will have over the teaching" while external framing "refers to the control from outside pedagogic practice on communication." Examples of internal framing include the learners' preferences, choices, interests, background including language backgrouns, age and other special characteristics of the learner. Examples of external framing include the influence of the government through government policies and expectations. It must however be mentioned that depending on the decisions made by the teacher and implicitly by the influence of the state, internal framing may be weak of strong meaning that the learner may be or may not be considered as an important factor on classroom choices and decisions. Sadovnik (2001:3) states "strong framing refers to a limited degree of options between teacher and students; weak framing implies more freedom". Both teacher and learners freedom is crucial to the understanding and application of the eclectic approach. Hence, this theory is very helpful in analysing teacher lesson preparation, lesson procedure and practices, and how much freedom in the classroom is exercised by both

the teacher and the learners in the learning process. This is especially important in the context of the eclectic approach in which both the teacher and the learners should have the freedom and flexible over what does on in the classroom.

From the argument above, it is clear that external framing seriously affect internal framing in formal teaching. Therefore, the question which is important in the application of this theory in the analysis of the data is how much governments control is there and how do teachers teach or negotiate their control during their teaching. This analysis also includes the freedom of the learners and how this affects (positively or negatively) the application and appreciation of the eclectic approach by the teachers. Aware of the challenge that arise out of external and internal framing, Bernstein (1973:88) observes that "education may be wholly subordinate to the agencies of the state or it may be accorded a relatively autonomous space with respect to discourse areas and practices". Haugen (2009:12) adds that "power relations are exercised and negotiated in discourse". Zambian secondary schools are not immune to this reality. Hence, the analysis of teaching and the choices about methods and teaching strategies and techniques cannot be done without considering these important factors. This is what renders this theory a lot of importance in the analysis of the finding in this study. In this case, the theory helps to decipher how external framing affected internal framing as teachers teach English grammar using the eclectic approach.

Related to the argument above is the fact that Zambian schools, like schools around the world, are characterised by both vertical and horizontal discourses. Bernstein (1999:159) defines horizontal and vertical discourse as follows:

> [Horizontal discourse] is a form of knowledge, usually typified as every day or common sense knowledge. Common because all, potentially or actually have access to it…it is likely to be oral, local, context dependent and specific, tacit, multi-layered, and contradictory across but not within contexts… A vertical discourse takes the form of a coherent, explicit and systematically principled structure, hierarchically organised…or it takes the form of specialised languages with specialised modes of interrogation and specialised criteria for the production and circulation of texts

Haugen (2009) believes that the background of every learner is very important to every teaching and learning situation in school. I draw on the concepts of vertical and horizontal discourses when analysing the teaching of English grammar in multilingual Zambia, given a language situation characterised by indigenous Zambian languages and the home grown Zambian English. How, in other words, do teachers accommodate learners' sociolinguistic backgrounds while still trying to teach the official syllabus using Eclecticism?

This question lead me to a core concept in this study – 'recontextualisation'. According to Bernstein (1996) cited in Singh (1997:7) "recontextualisation refers to the rules or procedures by which educational knowledge is moved from one education site to another". In other words, how do the teachers in my study interpret the official syllabus of the Ministry of Education and implement it through their classroom practices in their own particular learning situations and contexts?

In a multilingual country like Zambia where English is only spoken by a very small population, it is expected that most children enter school without English proficiency. They learn English upon entry into school. In most Zambian homes specially the lower and middle class, the home language is one of the Zambian indigenous languages and not English. Another point to consider here is the variety of English spoken in Zambia. As noted in the previous chapter, there are two broad varieties of English in Zambia- formal and informal.

With this scenario in mind, the big question is: what is the place of Zambian languages, and the home grown Zambian English in the process of teaching and learning the formal variety of English. In the study, using the principle of recontextualisation, the data was analysed to find out whether or not teachers found Zambian languages and the home Zambian English as resources which they could use to help learners access the Standard English variety. The educational principle of teaching from the known to the unknown also augments this point. One cannot teach standard grammar to learners who speak the informal variety without recognising the resources and knowledge which learners come with to the classroom. Concerning the argument that the horizontal discourse can be used as a resource to access the vertical discourse, Bernstein (1999:169) states the following:

> When segments of horizontal discourse become resources to facilitate access to vertical discourse, such appropriations are likely to be mediated through the distributive rules of the school. Recontextualising of segments is confined to particular social groups, usually the less-able. This move to use segments of horizontal discourse as resources to facilitate access, usually limited to the procedural or operational level of the subject, may also be linked to improving the students ability to deal with issues arising (or likely to arise) in the students everyday world.

This part of the theoretical framework informs my analysis of the relationship between the official and unofficial knowledge, power relations in the Zambian education system regarding what method/s the syllabus recommends, the

method/s which teacher educators recommend to teachers in teacher training institutions and how teachers actually teach language in the classroom. However, Apple (2006) reminds us that education policies are normally not characterised by progression or regression but by contradictions, and undoubtedly many contradictions and incongruences emerged from this study as teachers tried to recontextualise official policy and methodology within their own unique contexts. The section on findings will show how teachers recontextualised the English language syllabus.

Multimodality

Since this study looked at language teaching in the classroom, multimodality is used in this study to analyse the types and forms of teaching materials, teaching aids and language forms which teachers used to communicate meaning in the English grammar classroom while using the Eclectic Approach. Hence, multimodalities were viewed as teaching resources.

Mambwe (2014:45) notes that "the term multimodality or MDA has been used to describe approaches that seek to explain communication and representation as being more than language which addresses a wide range of communication forms that people engage in during interaction, for example, gaze, posture, sound and their relatedness'. Iedema (2003:39) notes that the term multimodality "highlights that the meaning work we do at all times exploit various semiotics" and that semiotics can co-occur and work together to make and communicate meaning. Siegel (2006) argues that children have always been multimodal in the way they use their social cultural resources such as talk, gesture, drama and drawing in meaning making.

In this study, I draw on the multimodal approach and its extended notions of resemiotisation and semiotic remediation. Kress and Van Leeuwen (2001) observe that traditionally, classroom research focuses on teachers and learners using spoken language to communicate in the classroom, with books as teaching materials. Multimodality recognises that while spoken or written language is important in classroom communication between teachers and learners, there are other modes or semiotic resources which are available and can be used. They further argue that learning does not depend centrally on language (written or spoken) but on other modes too which include image, gesture, action with models and writing. Bock (2014) adds that multimodality recognises that all communication (including classroom communication) uses a variety of modes where mode is defined as the different semiotic resources used for making meaning both verbal (written and speech) and non-verbal (image, gesture, gaze, posture, music, colour and discarded objects). Jewitt (2005) claims that in the 21st century, image, sound and movement have entered school classrooms in new and significant ways. Iedema (2003) suggest that television, film and the computer may also be useful resources in communication. Kress (1999:68) advises scholars and in this case teachers "to realize

that written language is being displaced from its hitherto unchallenged central position".

Classroom interaction normally involves face to face interaction between teacher and learners as well as learner to learner. However, the crucial point is that even face to face interaction is multimodal in nature. This is reflected in Strivers and Sidnell's (2005:2) definition of face to face interaction when they stated that face to face interaction is "a multimodal interaction in which participants encounter a steady stream of meaningful facial expressions, gestures, body postures, head movements, words, grammatical constructions and prosodic contours". This means that when a teacher is teaching in class and learners are contribution through class discussion, group and pair work, they are not only using words to communicate but integrate words with paralinguistic features to make and communicate meaning. For this reason, teachers may deliberately speak as well as gesture when illustrating or demonstrating a point. Actually, Strivers *et al.* (2005) adds that when talk and gesture are used together, they aid each other in meaning making.

Multimodality has found its place in the classroom and teachers and learners have found it very useful. I now present why and how the theory of multimodality can be used in the classroom. As already stated, the theory is being viewed in this study as providing the teacher with varied resources for teaching. During lesson preparation, teachers need to state or plan properly how he/she will use the different semiotic resources in the lesson. In fact, de-centring spoken language during classroom interaction is part of the eclectic approach. In this case, classroom interaction encompasses various material affordances. Jewitt (2005:15) suggests that decisions should be made regarding "when and how writing, speech and image are used to mediate meaning making". This proposition explains why in this study, classroom communication is expected to be multimodal.

With the advent of multimodality, the role of the teacher has also changed in order to cope with the complex nature of modern communication. Hasset and Curwood (2009:271) state that in the new media age, besides the teacher being a facilitator of learning, instructor and model, other teacher roles include:

> (1) teacher as resource manager-teacher manages a range of resources-print based and otherwise-that he or she knows will enable the students to develop the skills and critical abilities needed to navigate new texts and/or complete their purpose (2) teacher as co-constructor of knowledge-teacher and students explore and learn together because the teacher acknowledges that students sometimes know as much, if not more about certain things.

The above quote entails that the teacher should mobilise and create learning materials and further ensure that he/she engages learners in the co-construction of knowledge.

It is also believed that today, even text books have become multimodal (cf. Curwood, 2009).When text books have both text and pictures or images, it becomes easier for learners to make sense of the material as they make relations to the picture. This is why teachers should have knowledge of multimodality and how it works in the classroom. The teacher may even transfer the picture from a text book to a chart to help learners understand the concept which would otherwise take long to be understood if only spoken language was used. For example, if a teacher is teaching 'present continuous tense', he/ she can draw boys walking, a man chopping wood, a girl running. When learners see these pictures, they will generate thoughts which if transformed into sentences will be in the present continuous tense. Hence, this is easier as the picture will aid spoken language but learners will also link the structure being learnt in class to everyday life. When pictures or text are used in a lesson, Chambers (1985) cited in Unsworth (2001:261-262) state that learners will analyse the "subtle interweaving of words and pictures, varieties of meanings suggested but never stated, visual and verbal clues to intricate patterns, structures and ideas". In this case, it is not surprising therefore why Stivers *et al.* (2005:1) note that "different modalities work together to elaborate the semantic content of talk".

It is clear that books and indeed other teaching materials ought to be multimodal. It is certain that multimodal materials when used in the classroom help learners to make sense of the text easily just like teachers also find it easier to explain concepts because learners are likely to easily understand the concept under consideration. In this study, it was important to analyse the lessons in terms of how multimodal they were.

Resemiotisation and Semiotic Remediation

There is often a question of whether there is a limit to the resources one can use to communicate meaning in the classroom. The answer is that there is not limit; anything can work as long as it is suitable for the lesson at hand. In fact, even what is not originally meant to be used for English teaching can be changed to suit the objectives of the lesson. For example, in order to teach composition, a teacher of English can use a science text book which has a description of a process of a chemical reaction. The science text and illustration can be used to teach how to write a descriptive composition (how to describe a process). In this case, a science text book is used to teach writing in an English lesson. Since this study is on English grammar, it can be argued that if a teacher wants to teacher English vocabulary, he or she can get a newspaper and select a story which the class will read and discuss the denotative and connotative meanings of words. Initially, the newspaper was meant to communicate a story to its readership. In this case, the newspaper has been repurposed as teaching material while the content is resemiotised from media content to a classroom text used to teach grammar. Here, it is clear that teaching materials can be drawn from a wide range of sources, not necessarily from a single domain. The process or practice where a modality has been repurposed and used anew to serve a different function is referred to as semiotic remediation (Bolter and Grusin 2000; Prior and Hengst 2010). At the heart of the notion of semiotic remediation is *repurposing*, which refers to how people re-use other people's words in talk, frequently re-perform others' gestures and actions, redesign objects, represent ideas in diverse media and thus restructure both their environments and themselves (Prior and Hengst 2010). On the other hand, resemiotisation is explained by Iedema (2003) as being about "how meaning shifts from context to context, from practice to practice, and from one stage of practice to the next".

Resemiotisation entails that materials can be created and recreated in different forms and practices, while remediation means using material for a different purpose to what is it originally known (Banda and Kenkeyani 2015). Therefore, the often stated challenge among teachers about lack of teaching materials in schools is lessened by resemiotisation and repurposing. The teacher only has to be created and free enough to identify the materials which can be repurposed and used in the classroom according to the lesson objectives at hand. Thus, the notions of Resemiotisation and semiotic remediation were used to analyse teachers' creativity in creating and mobilising teaching materials. It was also used to analyse the competence of a teacher in as far as teaching and material production is concerned, as this forms part of the eclectic approach to English language teaching.

II. METHODS AND MATERIALS

The study adopted a qualitative Design. This was used in order to generate detailed data on how teachers applied the Eclectic method and to get their views about their experiences in the teaching of English using the Eclectic method. Here, the aim was get views of the teachers on the challenges they faced as they were using the method to teach. Thus, data was collected through classroom lesson observation, interviews and focus group discussion with the teachers. A total of 90 teachers participated in the study and they were drawn from nine secondary schools. Three schools were from urn area, three from peri-urban while the other three were drawn from rural secondary schools. Schools and teachers were selected through purposive sampling. The reason for using purposive sampling was because we wanted to select only those teachers who were relevant to the study. Analytically, the data was analysed through thematic analysis. Thus, the collected data was coded, categorised and presented under the themes and emerging themes. Ethics were also observed. All participants took part in the study through informed consent. They were told about their rights. Thus, there were told that they were free to participate and that they were free to withdraw from the study at any time for any reason. Confidentiality and anonymity were also assured. In short, the study adhered to research ethical requirements.

III. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

This section presents findings of the study. The section has combined the findings and discussion. However, findings are presented before the discussion.

Teachers' Classroom Application of the Eclectic Approach: Classroom Observation Data

I start this section by presenting descriptions of lessons by five different teachers in five different schools. School A was drawn from a rural area. School B was from a peri-urban area. School C was drawn from an urban area. School D was a boarding school located in an urban area. School E was a boarding school located in a peri-urban area and drew learners from the local areas as well as from other places which including rural, peri-urban and urban areas. The five schools are referred to as schools A, B, C, D and E and the corresponding teachers as Teacher A, B, C, D and E respectively. After presenting the descriptions of the five lessons, I present an analysis of the lessons by focusing on common themes picked up in each one as well as some important observation in certain lessons from an eclectic method point of view.

Lesson Descriptions

School A/ Lesson A/ Teacher A

The school is located in a rural area. The teacher is a male and holds a teachers Diploma from a private college. The class has 48 learners. The teacher has no lesson plan.

The teacher writes the topic on the board "past continuous tense". Thereafter, he asks learners what a present tense is and to give examples. No one responds. The teacher gets frustrated and asks learners to stand up. While standing, learners make attempt and some correct answers are given. Due to some incorrect answers, the teacher warns learners that if they do not answer questions from the previous lesson, he will punish them. He asks them "are we tired?" the learners say they are not. After two more correct examples, he asks them to sit down saying "we can sit down now". The teacher starts explaining the rule (+ing) and asks learners if they understand. Only a few say "yes". Then he raises his voice and asks them to answer, at which point the class chorus the "yes" together. Thereafter, he mentions that today's lesson is on "past continuous tense". He asks the class to read the topic and they do so repeatedly. Then, he asks what the past continuous tense means. A girl gives a correct answer and the teacher remarks "very good". He asks for examples. When a correct answer is finally given, the teacher remarks "very good". The teacher adds that the structure of the verb still maintain -ing ending. He asks for more examples. As examples are being given, the Deputy Head teacher enters the class to give an announcement. She asks learners if her announcement is clear. Class chorus a "yes". She leaves.

Teacher asks for more examples. The teacher approves the answers and starts talking about first, second and third person use when constructing sentences then he asks learners to start constructing sentences using I, he, she, they, we, you or it. Thereafter, teacher asks learners to give any verb in the present continuous tense. Thereafter, teacher asks learners to construct sentences in past continuous tense using the listed verbs. After several answers, he asks if there are any questions. No questions. The teacher then asks the learners to be changing sentences from positive to negative and question forms respectively. Teacher emphasises word order in sentences. Teacher wonders whether everyone knows what is meant by negative form. No one responds. Then, he asks if everyone knows and they all say 'yes'. Then the teachers ask the learners to get the books and write the class exercise. The teacher writes the exercise on the board from a textbook. He first writes the rubric and example. Then, he asks the learners to read the rubric and examples together. The class does that twice. Afterwards, he continues to write the questions on the board which learners have to answer.

School B/Lesson B/ Teacher B

The teacher has a Degree in English teaching. The class is situated in a peri-urban area. There are 43 learners in class. The teacher has no lesson plan.

The teacher explains that most of the times, the rich and the poor do not live together. He then writes the following sentences: (1) She is rich but she does not show off. (2) She is a very beautiful woman but she is not married. (3) She is very fat but she can run very fast. The teacher then asks learners what type of sentences they are and learners do not respond. Teacher says that the sentences given are called contrast sentences and he then explains the meaning of contrast. He asks the learners to turn to page 102 of the text book. He refers to a dialogue and asks learners the meaning of the word 'dialogue'. Learners do not answer .Teacher explains the meaning. He then turns to the dialogue in the book and he starts reading the dialogue to the learners. He then explains the overall message from the dialogue and gives illustrations of contrast and emphasises how it is used. In one of the contrasts, some intelligent grade nines had failed the examination. In recasting the expression, the teacher said the following in part "all those that we thought are going to perform well at the end of the year, they have failed". When explaining the contrast about the behaviour of rich people, in part, the teacher said "usually, people that are rich, they are always showing off". When he refers to the earlier examples of fat, he draws a fat person on the board and the class laughs. Teacher then asks learners to identify contrasting ideas on the dialogue. Learners are not responding. Teacher says they are either side of the table. He then writes them on the board.

Afterwards, he identifies the ideas and explains the meaning and points out the idea which contrasts the other. He gets to the next and he identifies one and asks learners to mention the other. A learner responds correctly and the teacher approves. Teacher moves to the next, he identifies the parts and explain why it is contrasting. After that, he turns to expressions of

contrast with present participle. He asks class for meaning of present participle but learners do not respond. Teacher explains with examples. The teacher then writes a sentence on the board starting with 'despite' and asks learners to replace it with 'in spite'. Learners cannot respond. He returns to the sentence on the board and learners read along with him. Teacher then explains the meaning of 'in spite' and despite and gives examples. He then asks learners to construct a sentence which should start with 'in spite'. After some correct answers have been given, the teacher then asks learners to look outside and see how cold it is yet some learners are not wearing jerseys. He then asks them to construct contrasting sentences based on the weather. After a few attempts, teacher emphasises and gives his own examples. He then starts reading some sentences from the text book and some learners read along with him. Afterwards, the teacher writes the exercise on the board. He reminds learners to write the date and topic. He asks them if there are any questions and some learners say "no". He then thanks the class for their time.

School C/Lesson C/ Teacher C

The teacher is a graduate with a Bachelor's Degree with a major in English Language Teaching. The school is located in an urban area. The class has 42 learners. The teacher has no lesson plan.

The teacher explains that people pause while speaking. She states "in our speech ok, in our speech *aaa*, in every speech *right?,*, we pause, when we say, *no* I went to the market, from there I went to see grandmother". She asks the class why people pause in speech. After some attempts, the teacher clarifies that pauses are for clarity and easy understanding. She tells learners that the lesson is on punctuation. She writes topic on board and the names of different punctuation marks. She asks the class when to put a full stop. A learner suggests at the end of the sentence. Teacher asks for examples. Examples are given and teacher emphasises and adds that a sentence should also have a subject and a main clause. She asks for examples. Examples are given. Teacher asks learners to comment on every answer and encourages those who are quiet to also speak.

Later, teacher asks class when else full stops are used. Most learners put up their hands and one of them suggests UNZA while some protest. Teacher asks those who are protesting why they are protesting. No one answers. Teacher writes UNZA on the board. She asks what UNZA stands for. Some give wrong attempts and one correctly says University of Zambia. Teacher asks learners where full stops should be put. Learners make several suggestions e.g putting full stops after each letter. One learner puts up a hand and explains that UNZA is a short form of writing University of Zambia and there is no need to put any full stop. Most learners protest. Teacher then says that since it is a short form, there is need for full stops. Most learners shout a "yes" to affirm what the teacher is saying. After some debate, the teacher agrees with learners who suggested putting a full stop between N and Z as

UN.ZA. She then explains that when abbreviating, one should put full stops. It is only when writing in full when full that you do not. She asks if it is clear. A few learners say "yes". She repeats the question with a raised voice and more learners say "yes". Then she asks for different examples of abbreviations and learners suggest more. Later, the teacher says they should look at the use of the comma. She asks the class when a comma is used. Learners give suggestions. Teacher asks for example sentences and where commas would be put and learners respond. Thereafter, the teacher says they should consider the use of capital letter. Learners are involved in coming up with examples and the answers. Later, teacher summarises the lesson using teacher asks learners to be justifying their sentences on the chart.

School D/ Lesson D/ Teacher D

The teacher has a Bachelor's Degree in English Language Teaching. The school is a boarding school and it is situated in an urban area. He does not have a lesson plan. There are 34 learners in class.

Teacher writes the topic ADJECTIVES on the board. He asks the meaning of adjectives. He walks outside and comes back. He says they are words such as names of colours. He writes the word colour on the board. He then asks the names of different colours. Learners raise their hands and give names of colours. The teacher writes names of colours: green, blue, red, and white. Three learners mention pink, purple and orange respectively. The teacher says he will not get into colours he does not know. He does not write the three colours on the board. As he says that, one girl mentions brown. The teacher ignores her and the class laughs.

He asks learners to mention the shapes they know. As the lesson is going on, there is continuous fidgeting, whispering and murmurs in class while one learner is seen moving from one place to the other as the lesson is in progress. In response to the question, one learner says 'round'. Teacher agrees and writes the word on the board. The other learner sitting in the front row says "corner". The teacher with a big smile looks at the learner and asks him "is corner a shape" and the whole class laughs together with the teacher. Others suggest oval and flat and the teacher takes note. One learner later shouts square. The teacher looks at him with a smile and some learners laugh. Then the teacher tells learners to only mention shapes which they know. Then, he writes the word size and asks learners to give words denoting size. Learners shout different words such as big, small, wide and shallow. The teacher asks the opposite of shallow. One learner says "narrow". The teacher looks at the learner and asks him disapprovingly with a smile "the opposite of shallow is narrow?" to which the learners laugh. He then reminds the learner that he is in grade 11.

The teacher then writes the word 'quality' and asks for words denoting quality. Learners are shouting words and write some for them on the board. The teacher ignores wrong answers and only writes correct ones. The teacher then says that adjectives

are used to describe someone. Learners start describing each other and the teacher just smiles. The teacher then writes notes on the board while some learners are coping. The teacher writes example sentences and starts explaining the use and position for adjectives. It is now time up. The teacher says the lesson was just an introduction and some learners laugh. He announces that the next lesson will be describing a person from the class. He specifies that the description will be centred on the face of a particular learner. Learners laugh as they suggest who to describe.

School E/ Lesson E/ Teacher E

The teacher has a Bachelors degree in English language Teaching. She teaches at a boarding school situated in a peri-urban area. There are 32 learners in class. She has a lesson guide (plan).

The teacher asks what a sentence is. Learners give answers. Teacher says all three answers are correct. She emphasises the meaning of the word sentence and she adds saying, "a sentence gives a complete thought, right? ". She then writes a long sentence which is not punctuated. She asks the class to comment on the sentence. Learners start talking and the teacher asks them to speak through the chair (teacher). Some learners point out that it is not punctuated and together with the teacher, they punctuate the sentence. Teacher then mentions that the topic for the day is Run-on-line sentences. She asks the class what roll-on-sentences are. Several attempts are made. One learner says, "a run-on-sentence is a sentence which does not make sense". Learners laugh. Teacher asks the class not to laugh as the learner has the right to speak and give an answer . She asks the others to give their own opinion. Another learner says "a roll-on-sentence is a continuous sentence separated by a comma where there is supposed to be a full stop". The teacher interjects sharply "omm" and the class laughs loudly while some clap. Then the teacher while laughing says he is entitled to his opinion and asks for more. More responses are given and later, the teacher summarises the responses and says run on lines can be avoided by correct punctuation. She divides the class into groups of six each as she writes roll-on-line sentences on the board which learners should punctuate in groups. As the groups are discussing, she goes round and speaks to individual groups. After a group discussion, she asks group representatives to go in front and present the answers. Each representative writes and explains to the classroom. After the explanation, the teacher asks class members to comment or ask. She asks them to stand while speaking and address the presenter as a teacher. The teacher encourages opposing views. When learners are not agreeing, the teacher explains. One boy puts up a hand and explains that a sentence has a subject, verb, and predicator. He then asks the presenter to show those parts in the sentence being punctuated. The class laughs. The teacher asks if anyone can show where the predicator is. One boy raises his hand and says he will only comment on the punctuation. The teacher says he should answer the question just asked. The boy responds as follows:

"madam, his question is out of the topic. You can answer him later. I want to answer the question on the topic of the day". The class laughs. The teacher allows the boy to proceed with the answer. He gives his explanation. The teacher agrees with a compliment. Another teacher walks in, makes an announcement and leaves. The class teacher ends the lesson by giving homework and thanking the learners for their cooperation.

Discussion of Findings

The following section provides an analysis of the findings. This is done through comparing the results to existing literature as well as the theories which are used to analyse the findings.

To start with, these were the methods I observed being used in the five lessons described above:

- Teacher A used the cognitive code approach and the audio-lingual method. The emphasis in the lesson was on the mastery of the rule governing the past continuous tense. Question and answer technique and chorusing were the techniques used in the lesson. There was oral practice when learners were asked to construct sentences using the rule which the teacher had explained.
- Teacher B applied the cognitive code and the situational approaches. He also used the question and answer technique. The lesson was largely teacher centred as he explained a lot of rules and gave examples on his own. He also read the dialogue alone without involving the learners.
- Teacher C used the cognitive code and the situational approaches. She employed a question and answer technique throughout the lesson. She involved learners through the technique used.
- Teacher D applied the Cognitive Code approach only. Like the other teachers, he also used the question and answer technique.
- Finally, teacher E was relatively more eclectic than the others. She combined the cognitive code approach, situational approach and the communicative language teaching method. She used the question and answer technique and classroom activities included class discussion, group discussion, simulation and role play.

Based on the methods used by the teachers, I wish to state that teachers A, B, C and E used the eclectic approach while Teacher D used a single method. Further, I wish to note that even among the teachers who applied the eclectic approach, teacher E was more successful than teachers A, B and C. As noted in the summary of the methods used, teachers A, B and C combined two methods each in their endeavour to apply eclecticism. However, the quality of the eclectic approach which they employed was not very sophisticated.

Firstly, teacher A combined the cognitive code approach and the audio-lingual method. While the learners responded well to the application of the cognitive code approach through active participation in constructing sentences when applying the rule, some of them did not show the same kind of interest in the use of the audio-lingual method. This was observed through non participation by almost half of the class in chorusing responses and repetitive drills. The teacher had to insist on learners to repeat after him for more learners to join in chorusing. Thus, while the teacher thought that the two methods would help him teach effectively, one of the two methods- audio-lingual method- was not well received as some learners did not show willingness to participate in repetitive drills and chorusing.

Note that that the cognitive code approach and the audio-lingual method are based on contrasting theoretical basis. While the cognitive code approach is based on cognitive psychology which views learning as a creative process, audio-lingual method is based on behavioural psychology which views learning as habit formation. Thus, combining the two into one lesson can easily be understood as being unprincipled eclecticism (See Weidemann 2001). However, I asked the teacher after the lesson why he used chorusing and repetitive drills. He said "here (rural area), some of the children do not know how to read. So, we need to help them like they in grade one". Based on the reason the teacher gave, I take this combination to have been principled and not unprincipled. It shows that he was responding to the exigencies of the classroom. What this means is that the teacher was responding to the individual needs of some learners by helping them to read what was written on the board thereby implicitly teaching them reading. The reasoning behind his use of audio-lingual method is in line with Rodgers (2001:251) who noted that eclectic "teachers should respond to learners' difficulties and build on them". Kumar (2013:3) also states that "if a teacher does not pay attention to the needs of respective students, the whole teaching practice is useless". Thus, in the case of teacher A, although some learners were not enthusiastic about chorusing probably because they could read on their own without help, it was still important for the teacher to do so in order to reach out to the minority who could not read. Therefore, instead of viewing the teacher as unprincipled theoretically, he was actually principled as he did so due to the needs of some learners in the classroom.

Teachers B and C combined the cognitive code approach and the situational approaches. While the use of these two approaches in the same lesson was eclectic, their approach was rather basic. The cognitive code approach is based on the assumption or understanding that language is rule governed (cf. Krashen 1982). Thus, when a learner masters a rule, s/he can construct an infinite number of sentences because the rule operates anew. Since this method was used by all the five teachers including the other three not presented in this chapter, it appears that these teachers see language as a rule-governed system. In addition, their use of the situational approach shows that they also look at language as being situational or contextual (cf. Richards and Rodgers 2001). Thus, since teaching methods also show the nature of language and the language ideologies of the teacher, the combination of the cognitive code approach and the situational approaches in the same lesson suggests that teachers B and C conceive language as being rule governed and that it is situational.

The use of the situational approach in the observed lessons focused on linguistic and visual situations while neglecting social situations depicting the real life situations in which learners used language in their daily lives. Some situations were brought up just to enable learners to construct individual sentences and not to use language as discourse. For example, teacher A did not give any situation throughout the lesson. Teacher B drew a fat person on the board to illustrate the point that although the person was fat, he ran fast. The teacher only randomly referred to the weather on that day (which was cold). After observing that some learners did not wear jerseys, he constructed a sentence that although it was cold, some learners did not wear jerseys. Although this was clearly a good example because it was based on an authentic situation, the teacher only constructed one sentence and did not allow learners to construct more sentences or to have a discussion about the weather. What I see here is that the teacher was only interested in the correct construction of individual sentences expressing contrast. The teacher did not come up with more situations depicting contrasting happenings in society and allow learners to engage with each other. The senior secondary school syllabus recommends the use of life like situations when teaching grammar and advises teachers not to focus on isolated sentences only (see CDC 2012). The teachers' classroom behaviour here shows that although he is under the authority of government (through syllabus and policy), he also has powers in the classroom in which he can agree with, disagree or negotiate the provisions of the syllabus (cfHuckin *et al.*, 2012:115) through practice.

Teacher C, in her lesson on punctuation, used the cognitive code and the situational approach, combining them with the question and answer technique. Teacher D only used the cognitive code with the question and answer technique. It is important to note that teacher D used a single method to teaching grammar which was against the recommendation of the syllabus- eclectic. As noted before, this shows that while some teachers (teachers A, B, C and E) followed the policy recommendation by using the eclectic approach, other teachers (teacher D) resisted the recommended and negotiated or imposed a single method in the classroom. This means that government policy and educational recommendations are not always adhered to. In this case, the teacher chooses what he thinks will work and not what the government decides. What I see here is a situation where education policies seek dominance over teachers while some teachers resist the provisions of the policy through their classroom practices and choices (cf. Wodak, 2002; Huckin *et al..*, 2012; Banda and Mohammed 2008). Therefore, this suggests that education policies are not always characterised by acceptance and

positive implementation but resistance and contradictions too (cf. Haugen 2009) where a classroom teacher (Teacher D) uses a single method contrary to the ministry of education recommendation of the eclectic approach.

As stated earlier, teacher E was more eclectic than the rest. Although she also lacked rich social contexts in which learners could practice the language item being taught, she employed various techniques which did not only make the lesson more participatory and lively but allowed learners to interact among each other too. She used class discussion, group work, simulation and role play. During group work, she moved from one group to another talking to individual groups. This allowed the teacher and the learners to interact closely. This made more learners including those who looked shy to participate through group discussions. Some learners were involved in role play as they acted the role of the teacher. The class teacher even advised the learners to address the presenters in front as sir/madam. The use of role pay and simulation made the lesson interesting, lively and highly participatory.

In short, four of the teachers whose lessons I have presented used the eclectic approach while one did not. Furthermore, among those who were eclectic, Teacher E was more eclectic than others.

Another observation which was common in all the observed lessons was the lack of using a variety of teaching resources or materials. Teacher A did not use any teaching aids. He only had one text book which he was referring to, and the learners had no text books. Teacher B did not use any teaching aids apart from the text books which were distributed to the class- one copy for every three learners. Teacher C only had a chart containing sentences to be punctuated. Teacher D did not come with any teaching material. He did not even have any reference material. He taught everything from his head. Teacher E did not have teaching materials either. Like the other teachers, she wrote the sentences on the board. However, she had notes on a piece of paper which she referred to. The use of various teaching materials to help learners grasp the concepts is part of the eclectic approach (cf. Ali 1981). It was therefore expected that teachers would use charts, substitution tables, realia, pictures or maps to teach. When I asked the teachers I observed why they did not use (various) teaching aids, teachers B, C, D and E said that the school did not have teaching materials as the government was not supplying schools with materials. Teacher A however said that he was too busy and he could not find time to prepare teaching materials. What I see here is that the application of the eclectic approach is negatively affected by a lack of teaching materials which teachers can use to realise the full potential and benefits of using this approach.

Another common feature in all the lessons which were observed was that none of the teachers used modern technology or ICTs in their teaching. There was no use of computers, television, film, radio or any other technological gadget. This is despite the fact that the spoken word has been decentred as the only or the main way of meaning making and expression of meaning (cf. Kress 1999).This means that television, film, music and the computer should be used as resources in communication (Iedema 2003) including classroom communication. When teachers were asked why they did not make use of technological devices, most of them stated that schools did not have the equipment and in some cases, they revealed that even if the schools had, some teachers did not know how they would use the computer. Thus, even with computers available, some teachers would still not use computers in their teaching. Some teachers informed me that they could not use technological equipment because Head teachers did not allow them to do so arguing that doing so was against the syllabus. For example, teacher A had the following to say:

"Ba Sir, our head and inspectors do not allow that. He (school manager) says that we should stick to the syllabus. Sometimes, I want to use scrabble for word formation or the laptop in class but he says it is wrong. They say the syllabus does not mention the laptop or scrabble. So, we can't (use ICTs). So, we just use books and maybe charts".

The above quote adds to the reasons why teachers did not use ICTs in their lessons. As stated earlier, other reasons include lack of technological equipment in schools as well as ICT illiteracy among teachers, with some of them stating that even if the school had ICT equipment, they would not use it because they were not trained to use them in teaching. However, the other reason as deciphered from the quote above is that school authorities also prohibit some teachers from using the ICT equipment saying that the syllabus does not say so. Thus, in following orders from administrators, teachers decide not to use ICTs even when they can personally source some of the equipment. Firstly, stopping teachers from using technological equipment is against the principles of the eclectic approach which allows the teacher to select any materials which can work in particular contexts (cf. Brown 2002). Secondly, what teacher A reported shows the power struggle which exist in the education system between policy makers, school managers and teachers – a confirmation of Bernstein's view (2003:198) that "all education is intrinsically a moral activity which articulates the dominant ideologies of dominant groups". In this context, teachers, as the weakest group in the power relations, yield to the commands, directives and advice of individuals in high decision making positions (Head teachers and school inspectors in this case).Further, school managers and school inspectors can be said to be abusing their powers in dominating the teachers by telling a teacher that the syllabus does not allow the use of a laptop even when, in fact, the syllabus is silent on teaching materials.

Since the syllabus does not state anything on teaching materials makes it ironic for the school heads and inspectors not to allow the use of certain materials (scrabble and laptop) arguing that the syllabus does not allow while the syllabus

does not state anything on materials. On the other hand, the teacher says that they only use books and charts assuming that, that is what the syllabus recommends when in fact, the syllabus says nothing about books and charts as well as it is silent on scrabble and laptops. The point here is that while schools heads and inspectors abuse their power by stopping teachers from using ICTs, the silence of the syllabus on teaching materials is also problematic as it needs to give direction on the issue of teaching materials.

Some of the reasons teachers gave for not using any/different teaching material/s also implies that they do not have the skills to create their own materials or they are simply not motivated since the government or the school had not bought materials. It appears that teachers also expect government to produce and provide materials and they seem to suggest that it is not their duty to produce materials. While this shows the inability or lack of willingness by teachers to produce materials, it also shows the failure by government to provide schools with adequate materials.

In addition, this finding where none of the teachers used ICTs while some used only one to no material at all also has implications on teacher training. It means that teacher training institutions may not have adequately equipped teachers during training in multimodal pedagogy where they would acquire the skills of resemiotisation and semiotic remediation. This analysis is in line with what Manchishi and Mwanza (2013) and Manchishi and Mwanza (2016) found that teacher training at the University was problematic in as far as reflecting what went on in secondary schools was concenmred. Both studies showed that what student teachers learnt while at the University was too broad and unrelated to what obtained in secondary schools where they would teach upon graduation. Just like the two studies recommended, there is need for teacher training institutions to ensure that teacher training responds to the pedagogic needs of teachers. In the context of this study, it means that teacher training should encompass preparing student teachers with skills of resemiotisationa and semiotic remediation. Multimodality means that teachers will not only use talk in the classroom but will combine talk with other material affordances (see Archer 2012). The skills of semiotic remediation would help them repurpose materials even in the absence of government-provided materials. Archer (2012) states that pedagogy can no longer be limited to the realm of language alone, but has to recognise the role of images and other modes of meaning-making in texts, including, the audio and the visual. Information technologies have become important ways through which people including school going youths communicate today (Constanzo 1994; Jewitt 2006; Kress 2003) and have to be used in classroom communication too.

According to Archer (2014), multimodality in teaching also means that teachers can use materials from the local environment in which learners live even if such materials are not officially prescribed in the official syllabus. He further argues that doing so means bringing and recognising the

materials affordances which learners come with to the classroom (see Archer 2006). Although Archer (2014:1) states that "formal education often closes down access to a range of semiotic resources and multimodal classrooms can potentially recover 'recognition' of these", Siegel (2006) argues that multimodality is not strange to the classroom because children have always been multimodal in the way they use their social cultural resources such as talk, gesture, drama and drawing in meaning making in their daily lives even outside the classroom. Therefore, using multimodal tools especially those connected to the culture of the learners connect schooling to their daily life experiences thereby making learning both social and natural.

Another observation which was common in all the five lessons we observed was the exclusive use of English as a medium of classroom communication and interaction. Teachers consistently used English and all the learners who participated in the lessons spoke English only. We also observed that there were learners who could not participate throughout the lesson. They were also passive during group discussions as discussions seemed to be dominated by those who spoke English fluently and therefore had the confidence and 'voice' to speak. Teachers stated that some learners did not participate in communicative classroom activities because they could not speak English. Respondents also stated that they would rather have a learner not to participate than to speak any other language or variety other than formal English. One point I pick from the negative attitudes of teachers towards Zambian languages and informal English which results into monolingual classroom practices is that learners' home languages and literacies are not recognised in the process of learning English. As the findings show, it means that only those who can speak and understand English well can participate actively in class. Cummins (2009:162) labels "the exclusive use of students' second language (L2) as a medium of instruction with the goal of developing proficiency only in the language of instruction" as 'sink' or 'swim'. This means that those who are familiar with the language of instruction will 'swim' while those who are not familiar will 'sink'. As explained in the previous sections, the reasons why learners' home languages are not allowed are because officially, English is the only language which is officially sanctioned in the constitution and the education curriculum framework as an official language and as a medium of classroom instruction from grade 5 to university. Consistent with this reasoning, Helot and Young (2006) observed that teachers' monolingual ideologies and practices are normally influenced by policies and school authorities. However, as hinted above, monolingual classroom practices have negative effects on the process of learning. McKinney, Carrim, Marshall and Layton (2015:105) note that "monoglosic ideologies informing official policy and classroom practice ultimately remove 'voice' from children in the sense of their capacity to be beard" resulting into symbolic violence (Bourdieu, 1990) in which learners who cannot speak the

language of power are denied their position as knower (Frisker 2007, 2012).

Cummins (2015) argues that despite the monolingual education language policies, teachers have the pedagogical freedom in their classroom to come up with classroom activities and practices which would promote learning among learners from linguistically diverse backgrounds. This means that even in the presence of Zambia's education policy where English is the sole language of instruction in secondary schools, teachers have the pedagogical freedom to permit learners linguistic repertoires and use them as resources to promote learning. Further, it also means that in the teaching of English Grammar, the grammars of learners' home or familiar languages can also be used as stepping stones in the learning of English grammar. This is more so considering the characteristics of the eclectic approach where it is a flexible method that can be adjusted to different language teaching and learning contexts (see Kumaravadivelu 2006; Weidemann 2001; Gao 2011; Li 2012).

Moreover, Banda and Mwanza (2017) argue that if the goal of teaching is to enable learners access learning, their home languages and literacies should be allowed in the classroom as stepping stones to accessing learning. As stated above, this means that Zambian languages and informal English varieties may need to be allowed in the classroom to enable learners participate and create a classroom environment where learners from different language backgrounds become part of the classroom process of learning the English language. In this case, home languages will aid the second language in the process of learning the school language (see Kumravadivelu 2006) and learners will be given the 'voice' to engage with teachers and fellow learners for purposes of epistemic access. But as the lessons show, teachers of English only used English which made some to participate while others did not. Similar findings were found in Mwanza (2012) who found that some teachers in grade one in the cosmopolitan city of Lusaka insisted on using a medium of instruction which the majority of learners did not understand and the result was lack of participation by some pupils and consequently symbolically violated.

Larsen-Freeman (2000) also explains that methods are de-contextualised and that the goal of teachers is to contextualise and recontextualise the methods according the prevailing conditions of the classroom and the school. Thus, having a class where some learners do not speak English fluently requires that the teacher uses the eclectic approach in such a way that all learners participate in the lesson. In short, the eclectic approach can still work even in classroom contexts where some learners cannot speak the target language. This would require pedagogical practices which allows for the use of learners' familiar languages in the classroom such as translanguaging. In so doing, translanguaging becomes part of the eclectic approach.

According to Garcia (2014), translanguaging entails allowing students to draw from their home languages in the process of learning the target language and teachers accept it as legitimate pedagogical practice. Garcia and Sylvan (2011:385) states that translanguaging is "the constant adaptation of linguistic resources in the service of meaning making". Creese and Blackledge (2015) explains that translanguaging helps liberates the voices to those learners who would not communicate if a language they do not understand is used exclusively. It also implies that teachers should not see language as pure and bound entities. Rather, they should look at language as permeable resources that can cohesively be used in the classroom for meaning making in which learners' linguistic resources become useful in classroom communication (see Banda and Mwanza 2017). As such, McKinney, Carrim, Marshall and Layton (2015:106) states that there is need for a:

> consideration of the individual [learner] as locus of repertoire of linguistic and other meaning making resources that includes their past, present and future trajectories as the more recently developed notion of repertoire outlines; and of the possibilities for enabling meaning making that come from movements across different linguistic resources s well as the use of integrated or mixed codes.

The argument above by McKinney *et al.* (2015) means that learners should be the centre of classroom instruction in terms of consideration for their linguistic repertoires. This is actually consistent with the tenets of eclecticism which states that under the eclectic approach, the focus is on the learner (see Wali 2009; Ali 1981; Brown 2002).

The last point of analysis in the way teachers applied the Eclectic method relates to their relationship with learners and how they treated them. In some lessons, the relationship between teachers and pupils was not pedagogically sound. Firstly, there were threats posed to learners by teacher A who consistently warned learners that he would punish them if they did not answer his questions correctly. He also warned that he could punish them if they did not pay attention to him. At one stage in the lesson, he asked them to stand up because they could not remember what they learnt in the previous lesson. I consider this as giving punishment to learners during the lesson. Within the context of power relations, this shows how teachers abuse the power which they have. According to the tenets of CDA, "the classroom is the place in which power is circulated, managed, exploited, [and] resisted" (Hunckin, Andrus and Clary-Leman 2012:115). Pedagogically speaking, teacher A abused his power by issuing threats to learners which had the potential to make learners learn with fear and uneasiness.

In addition, some teachers did not respond favourably to learners who gave wrong answers. While they encouraged

learner participation through question and answer technique, they did not appreciate those learners who gave wrong answers to their questions. With reference to the lessons which were observed, teacher D did not treat learners who gave wrong answers well. He sometimes made fun of their answers which normally resulted in other learners laughing at the learner who had made the mistake. In some cases, he also participated in laughing at the learner. At other times, the teacher looked at the learner who made the mistake scornfully until other learners laughed at the respective learner. This is against one of the principles of eclecticism which holds that error is part of the learning process (cf. Wali 2009) which implies that the teacher should encourage and value all those who participate even if they make a mistake.

IV. CONCLUSION

In summary, the major points coming out of the findings are that while 4 teachers were eclectic in their teaching, one was not. Further, among those who were eclectic, the depth of their eclecticism was limited to using aspects from only two methods in most cases while only one used more than two methods. All the teachers did not present social contexts in which learners could practice what was being taught. Moreover, there was little or no variation in the teaching materials used, and none of the teachers used ICTs in their teaching. This was because some schools lacked teaching materials and ICT equipment; teachers did not have time to prepare materials, lacked training in ICT or were prohibited by school administrators from using them. The fact that some teachers could not use any or various teaching materials in their lessons implied that they could have lacked skills of resemiotisation and semiotic remediation with which they mobilise materials through repurposing. Moreover, learners' home languages and varieties were not recognised in the classroom leading to those who could not speak English not to participate in communicative classroom activities. All of these factors affected the depth and extent to which teachers could be eclectic in their lessons.

REFERENCES

[1] Ali, A.M. (1981). *Teaching English to Arab Students.* Jordan: Al-Falah House.
[2] AL- Hamash I. K. and Younis, H. (1985). *Principles and Techniques of Teaching English as a second language.* Bagdad: Alshaay Press.
[3] Allwright, D. (1984). The Importance of Interaction in Classroom Language Learning. *Applied Linguistics,* 5 (2): 156-171.
[4] Allwright, R. L. (2000). Exploratory Practice: An "appropriate methodology" for Language Teacher Development. *In 8th IALS Symposium for Language Teacher Educators*, Edinburgh, Scotland.
[5] Apple, M. W. (2006). *Educating the" right" way: Markets, standards, God, and inequality.* New York: Routledge.
[6] Apple, M. W., & Buras, K. L. (2006). *The Subaltern Speak: Curriculum, Power, and Educational Struggles*. New York: Routledge.
[7] Archer, A. (2006). A multimodal Approach to Academic Literacy Practices: Problematising the Visual/Verbal Divide. *Language and Education*. 20(6): 449-462. DOI: 10.2167/le677.0.
[8] Archer, A. (2012). Writing as Design: Enabling Access to Academic Discourse in a Multimodal Environment. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 26(3): 411-421.
[9] Archer, A. (2014). Designing Multimodal Classrooms for Social Justice. *Classroom Discourse*. 5(1): 106-116. DOI: 10.1080/19463014.2013.859842.
[10] Banda, F and Mohamed, H.I. (2008). Classroom Discourse and Discursive Practices in Higher Education in Tanzania. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development,* 29 (2): 95-109.
[11] Banda, F., and Kunkeyani, T. E. (2015). Renegotiating Cultural Practices as a result of HIV in the Eastern Region of Malawi. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 17(1): 34-47.
[12] Banda, F and Mwanza, D. S. (2017). Language-in-education policy and linguistic diversity in Zambia: An alternative explanation to low reading levels among primary school pupils. In Banja, Madalitso Khulupirika (ed.). Selected readings in education, 109-132. Lusaka: University of Zambia Press.
[13] Bernstein, B. (1973a). Class, Codes and Control. Vol. 1. London; Routledge and Kegan Paul.
[14] Bernstein, B. (1973b). Class, Codes and Control. Vol. 2. London; Routledge and Kegan Paul.
[15] Bernstein, B. (1973c). On the Classificatin and Framing of Education Knowledge. In. B. Bernestein (ed). *Class, Codes and Control.* 1: 202-230. London; Routledge and Kegan Paul.
[16] Bernstein, B. (1999). Vertical and Horizontal Discourse: An Essay. *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* 20(2): 157-173.
[17] Bernstein, B. (2000). Pedagogy, Symbolic Control, and Identity: Theory, Research, Critique (No. 4). Rowman & Littlefield.
[18] Bernstein, B. B. (2003). Class, codes and control: Applied Studies towards a Sociology of Language (Vol. 2). *Psychology Press.*
[19] Bock, Z (2014). Approaches to Communication. In Bock, Z. and Mheta G. (eds) *Language, Society and Communication.* Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers. Pp 35-54.
[20] Bolter, J. D., Grusin, R., and Grusin, R. A. (2000). Remediation: Understanding new media. Mit Press.
[21] Bourdieu, P. (1990). The Logic of Practice. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
[22] Bourdieu, P. (1991). An Interview with Pierre Bourdieu, by Beate Krais. In P. Bourdieu, J. Cahmboredon, & J. Passeron (eds.) *The craft of sociology: Epistemological preliminaries.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 247–259.
[23] Brown, H.D. (2002). English Language Teaching in the 'Post-Method' Era: Toward better Diagnosis, Treatment, and Assessment. In J. Richards and W. Renandya (eds.), *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 9-18
[24] Brown, H.D (2001). Teaching by principles: An Interactive Approach Towards Language Pedagogy. (2nd ed). New York: Pearson Education.
[25] Chambers, I. (1985). *Urban Rhythms: Pop Music and Popular Culture*. Macmillan.
[26] Costanzo, W. (1994). Reading, Writing and Thinking in an Age of Electronic Literacy. In Selfe, C. and Hilligoss, S. (eds.) *Literacy and Composition: The Complications of Teaching and Learning with Technology*. New York: Modern Language Association of America.
[27] Cummins, J. (1999).'Alternative Paradigms in Bilingual Education Research: Does Theory have a Place?'*Educational Researcher,* 28(7): 26-32.
[28] Cummins, J. (2001).*Negotiating Identities: Education for Empowerment in a Diverse Society* (2nd ed.) Los Angeles: California Association for Bilingual Education.
[29] Cummins, J. (2009). Bilingual and Immersion Programs . In M. Long and C.J. Doughty (Eds). *The Handbook of Second Language Teaching,* 166-181. Oxfird: Blackwell Publishing.
[30] Cummins, J. (2012). Empowerment and Bilingual Education. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics (pp. 1890-1895). London: Blackwell. Published online November 5, 2012. DOI: 10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0368.
[31] Cummins, J. (2013). BICS and CALP: Empirical Support, Theoretical Status, and Policy Implications of a Controversial

Distinction. In M. Hawkins (Ed.), *Framing Languages and Literacies: Socially Situated Views and Perspectives,* 10-23. New York: Routledge.

[32] Cummins, J. (2015). The Social Construction of Identities: Reflections on 21st Century Education in Light of the Charlie Hebdo Slaughter. In Dragonas, T., Gergen, K.,, McNamee, S., &Tseliou, E. (Eds). *Education as Social Construction: Contributions to Theory, Research, and Practice*. WorldShare Books.

[33] Curriculum Development Centre. (2012). *Senior Secondary School English Language Syllabus.* Lusaka: CDC.

[34] Ellis, R. 2001. Introduction: Investigating Form-Focused Instruction. *Language Learning*, 51(1): 1- 46.

[35] Fairclough, N., and Wodak, R. (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis. In Van Dijk, TA (ed.) *Discourse as Social Interaction,* London: Sage, 271-280.

[36] Fricker, M. (2007). Epistemic Injustice. Power and Ethics of Knowing. Oxford. OUP. DOI.10.1093/acproof:050/9780198237907.001.0001.

[37] Fricker, M. (2012). Silence and Institutional Prejudice. In *Out from the Shadows: Analytical Feminist Contributions to Traditional Philosophy*. Oxford: OUP.

[38] Garcıa, O. (2009). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

[39] Garcia, O. and Sylvan, C. (2011). Pedagogies and Practices in Multilingual Classrooms: Singularities in Pluralities. *The Modern Language Journal,* 95 (3): 385-400.

[40] García, O., and Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education.London:* Palgrave Macmillan.

[41] García, O. and Velasco, P. (2014). Translanguaging and the Writing of Bilingual Learners, Bilingual Research Journal: The Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education, 37:1, 6-23, DOI: 10.1080/15235882.2014.893270

[42] Gao, L. (2011). Eclecticism or Principled Eclecticism. *Creative Education*. 2(4): 363-369.

[43] Gebhard, J. G., Gaitan, S., & Oprandy, R. (1990). Beyond Prescription: The Student Teacher as Investigator. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second Language Teacher Education* (pp. 16–25). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[44] Grusin, R., and Bolter, J. D. (2000). *Remediation: Understanding new Media*. Cambridge, MA.

[45] Hassett, D. D., and Curwood, J. S. (2009). Theories and Practices of Multimodal Education: The Instructional Dynamics of Picture Books and Primary Classrooms. *The Reading Teacher,* 63(4): 270-282.

[46] Haugen, C.R. (2009). Recontextualisations of Trainability: Learning Strategies and Social Background. In Contextualizations and Recontextualizations of Discourses on Equity in Education (pp. 143–167). *PhD Thesis*. Trandheim: Norwegian University of Science and Technology.

[47] Heller, M. (Ed.). (2007). *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. Palgrave Macmillan.

[48] Hélot, C., and Young, A. (2006). Imagining Multilingual Education in France: A Language and Cultural Awareness Project at Primary Level. In O. García,T. Skutnabb-

[49] Hornberger, N.H. and Link H. (2012) Translanguaging and Transnational Literacies in Multilingual Classrooms: A Biliteracy Lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism,* 15(3): 261-278, DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2012.658016.

[50] Huckin, T., Andrus, J. and Clary-Lemon, J. (2012). *Critical Discourse Analysis and Rhetoric and Composition. National Council of Teachers of English,* 61(1):107- 129.

[51] Iedema, R. (2003). Multimodality, Resemiotization: Extending the Analysis of Discourse as Multi-semiotic Practice. *Visual Communication*, 2(1): 29-57.

[52] Jewitt, C. (2005). Multimodality,"Reading", and "Writing" for the 21st Century. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education,* 26(3): 315-331.

[53] Jewitt, C. (2006). *Technology, Literacy and Learning. A Multimodal Approach.* Oxon: Routledge.

[54] Karim, K. M. R. (2004). *Teachers' Perceptions, Attitudes, and Expectations about Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in Post-Secondary Education in Bangladesh*.Unpublished Master Thesis, University of Victoria.

[55] Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language* Acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon.

[56] Kress, G. (1999). Genre and the Changing Contexts for English Language Arts. *Language Arts,* 76(6): *461-469.*

[57] Kress, G., and Van Leeuwen, T. (1999). Representation and Interaction: Designing the Position of the Viewer. In A. Jaworsk and N. Coupland (eds). *The Discourse Reader*, 377-404. London:Routledge.

[58] Kress, G. (2000). Multimodality. In B. Cope and M. Kalantzis (Eds*.) Multiliteracies. Literacy Learning and the Design of Social Futures (182 – 202). London and New York: Routledge.*

[59] Kress, G., and Van Leeuwen, T. (2001). *Multimodal Discourse: The Modes and Media of Contemporary Communication.* London: Edward Arnold.

[60] Krige, N. (2009). Hybridity, The Uncanny and the Stranger: The Contemporary Transcultural Novel. *Doctoral Dissertation*, Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch.

[61] Kumar, C.P. (2013). The Eclectic Method: Theory and Its Application to the Learning of English. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications,* 3(6).ISSN 2250-3553.

[62] Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001). Toward a Postmethod Pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35: 537- 560. doi:10.2307/3588427.

[63] Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). Understanding Language Teaching: From Method to Postmethod. Mahwh, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

[64] Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[65] Larsen-Freeman, D. (2001). Teacher Learning and Learner Learning in TESOL. *TESOL Quartery,* 35 (4):608-629.

[66] Li, W. (2012). An Eclectic Method of College English Teaching. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research,* 3 (1): 166-171.

[67] Luo, L., He, F. and Yang, F. (2001). Introduction to Comprehensive Teaching Methods in College English Teaching. *Foreign Language World,* 4: 5-9.

[68] Mambwe, K. (2014). *Mobility, Transformation and Localisation of Language in Multilingual Contexts of Urban Lusaka*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Western Cape.

[69] Manchishi, P. C. and Mwanza, D.S. (2016). Teacher Preparation at the University of Zambia.: Is Peer Teaching Still a Useful Strategy? International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences Educations (IJHSSE). 3 (11) 88 – 100.

[70] Manchishi, P.C and Mwanza, D.S. (2013). The University of Zambia School Teaching Experience: Is It Effective? Excellence in Higher Education. 4 (2), 61-77.

[71] McKinney, C, Carrim, H., Marshall, A. and Layton,L (2015). What counts as Language in South African Schooling? Monoglossic Ideologies and Children's Participation. *AILA Review,* 28(2015): 103-126. DOI 10.1075/AILA.28.05mck.

[72] Mwanza, D.S. (2012). *The language of Initial Literacy in a Cosmopolitan Environment: A Case of Cinyanja in Lusaka District*. Unpublished Masters Dissertation, School of Education, University of Zambia.

[73] Mwanza, D.S. (2016). *A Critical Reflection on Eclecticism in the Teaching of English Grammar at Selected Zambian Secondary Schools*. Unpublished PhD Thesis: University of Western Cape, South Africa.

[74] Nunan, D. (1991). *Language Teaching Methodology*. Sydney: Prentice Hall.

[75] Nunan, D. (2001). Tradition and Change in the ELT Curriculum. Plenary Presentation at the Third International Symposium on ELT in China, Beijing, China.

[76] Pachler, N. and Field, K. (1997). *Learning to Teach Morden Foreign Languages in the Secondary School*. London: Routledge.

[77] Prabhu, N. S. (1990). 'There is No Best Method-Why?' *TESOL Quarterly,* 24(2): 161- 76.

[78] Prabhu, N.S. (1992). *Second Language Pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[79] Prior, P. A., and Hengst, J. A. (Eds.). (2010). *Exploring Semiotic Remediation as Discourse Practice*. Palgrave Macmillan.

[80] Richards, J. C. and Rodgers, T. S. (2000). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching.* Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press (By Arrangement with Cambridge University Press).

[81] Richards, J.C. and Rodgers, T.S. (2001). Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching (2nd Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[82] Rodgers, T. S. (2001). Language Teaching Methodology. *ERIC Issue Paper*, September, [online]. Available:http.//www.cal.org///resources/digest/Rodgers.html.

[83] Sadovnik, A.R. (2001). Basil Bernstein (1924-2000). Perspectives: *Revue Trimestrelles d'educacion Compare,* 31(1): 715-732.

[84] Sidnell, J. (2005). Talk and Practical Epistemology: The Social Life of Knowledge in a Caribbean Community (Vol. 142). John Benjamins Publishing.

[85] Siegel, B. (1999). The Kafulafuta Mission in Zambia. Spring 1999 Southeast Regional Seminar in African Studies (SERSAS) Meeting University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Charlotte, NC, April 3, 1999.

[86] Siegel, M. (2006). Re-reading the Signs: Multimodal Transformations in the Field of Literacy Education. Language Arts, 20(4), 455−475.

[87] Singh, P. (1997). From Software Design to Classroom Practice: An Australian Case Study of the Gendered Production, Distribution and Acquisition of Computing Knowledge. Feminist Critical Policy Analysis: A Perspective from Primary and Secondary Schooling, 109-133.

[88] Singh, P. (1997). Review Essay: Basil Bernstein (1996). Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 18(1): 119-124.

[89] Stivers, T., and Sidnell, J. (2005). Introduction: Multimodal Interaction. Semiotica,(156), 1-20.

[90] Unsworth, L. (2001). *Teaching Multiliteracies Across the Curriculum.* Buckingham- Philadelphia: Open University Press.

[91] Unsworth, L. (2006). Towards a Metalanguage for Multiliteracies Education: Describing the Meaning-Making Resources of Language-image Interaction. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique, 5* (1): 55 – 76.

[92] Wali, N.H. (2009). Eclecticism and Language Learning. Al- Fatih Journal . No .39. Diyala University-College of Basic Education.

[93] Weideman, A. (2001). The Old and the New: Reconsidering Eclecticism in Language Teaching. *Linguam,* 17(1):1-13. doi.org/10.5785/17-1-131.

[94] Wodak, R. (2002). Aspects of Critical Discourse Analysis1. ZfAL 36: 5-31.

[95] Wood, M. J., and Brink, P. J. (1998). Comparative Designs. *Advanced Design in Nursing Research, 143-159.*