Teaching and Learning of the Mother Tongue Siswati as a First and Second Language: A Comparative Study

Portia P. Mkhonta-Khoza[1] , Musa S. Nxumalo[2] , Celiwe C. Mohammed[3]

Faculty of Education: University of Eswatini ppmkhonta@uniswa.sz
Eswatini SiSwati Subject Teachers' Association mzethinxumalo@gmail.com
Ministry of Education and Training mohammedceliwe7@gmail.com

Abstract: *Entrenching the mother tongue siSwati in the education system of the Kingdom of Eswatini has become a concern over the past years. Finally, to fulfil the socio-linguistic needs of learners in the Kingdom of Eswatini, with all efforts exhausted in the senior level of schooling, the mother tongue siSwati is taught both as a first and second language. The major objective of the descriptive study was to compare the syllabus for EGCSE siSwati as L1 and L2 using content analysis in terms of the objectives, assessment strategies and teaching resources. Information from the content analysis revealed that both EGCSE siSwati L1 and L2 curricula are skills-based and learner-centred with L2 getting more into technology. However, the skills assessed in L1 are soft whilst, those assessed in L2 are visible and practical. Additionally, both L1 and L2 demand physical and electronic resources. The two curricula differ in terms of the content, objectives and assessment strategies. Significantly, the content for EGCSE siSwati L2 does not have the modern literature and culture as well as grammar components; the assessment objectives for L1 integrate language, literature and culture whilst L2 objectives are an integration of the practical receptive and productive language skills. Whilst, there are prescribed texts for L1, there are no prescribed texts for L2. The assessment for L1 is standardised and traditional whilst for L2, it is the alternative assessment. In conclusion, L1 is more of a knowing curriculum whilst, L2 is more of a doing curriculum. The study recommends that teaching and learning of L2 should offer a great opportunity for the inclusion of ICT in the teaching of siSwati and the need to improve the use of alternative assessment.*

Key words*: EGCSE siSwati L1, EGCSE siSwati L2, Language Policy.*

I.   Introduction

The policy that enforces teaching and learning of the mother tongue siSwati as a second language in the Kingdom of Eswatini is an educational innovation which is complex and requires consideration of factors such as teaching strategies, resources and assessment. According to Dunkin and Biddle (1974) three variables affect teaching and learning; the presage, context and product variables. The presage variable has to do with the teacher training experience, personality and social background; the context variable is the environment at which teaching and learning takes place and the learners' previous knowledge and experiences. The product variable is the immediate and long-term outcome of the teaching and learning process**.** These variables are intertwined components that reflect the complexity of the educational system. However, research reveal that teacher identity; personality or character, personal or life experience, career experience or professional identity greatly influences and shape implementation of curriculum innovation by virtue of teachers being at the centre of teaching and learning (Dunkin & Biddle, 1974, Fullan, 2000, Berg, 2002).

Berg (2002) comments that implementation of educational policies is met with negative and positive attitudes by teachers. The tendency is that teachers' opinions, views and conceptions about change do not conform to the proposed innovation. Research reveals that teachers' opinions, views and perceptions on change are influenced by their practical experiences and knowledge of actual practice (Erickson, 1959; Fullan, 2000; Berg, 2002). Hall (2015) argues that these concerns often present barriers to the adoption of an innovation in the education system. It is for this reason therefore, that researchers suggest that the adoption of pedagogical innovation is a process of change that can easily be facilitated by addressing the concerns of teachers (Brownell & Tanner, 2012; Hall & Hord, 1987). According to Fullan and Miles (2016) change demands re-culturing and restructuring that is accompanied by unlearning old beliefs and practices, a shift from the familiar to the new and from old competency to new competency. Therefore, Park (2012) advises that it is important that educators understand what types of interventions lead to the resolution of the concerns. Fullan (1969) hypothesised that in change implementation, arousal of a concern is an affective experience whereas the resolution of a concern is

more of a cognitive task. Therefore, the study addresses teachers' concerns on the objectives, resources and assessment strategies necessary for the implementation of siSwati as a second language (L2) at the senior level of schooling in the Kingdom of Eswatini. Findings of the study provide information that will help education stakeholders understand the major differences between the two curricula; EGCSE siSwati as a first language (L1) and EGCSE siSwati as a second language, thus guiding the implementation of EGCSE siSwati as a second language.

II.   Background and setting

Though most African countries are multilingual, Eswatini is a monolingual country with siSwati spoken by a majority of the population (Mkhonza, 1987). However, the lack of an explicit language policy has resulted in colonial languages; English, French and Afrikaans introduced to compete with siSwati, the mother tongue. Eswatini gained independence in 1968, though linguistically the country is still dependant on its colonial masters, the British Colony. The historical experience of colonialism lends itself to Eswatini adopting the language of the colonial master. The two languages; English and SiSwati are declared as official in the Constitution of the Kingdom of Eswatini. The tough competition brought by the existence of the two languages; siSwati the mother tongue and English the colonial language, necessitates the need for the development of a language policy to protect the mother tongue. Mkhonza (1987) cites that a language policy in the Kingdom of Eswatini can help define the socio-cultural, political and economic language needs of the emaSwati society. Also, a language policy can enhance and sustain the language, preserve and promote ethnic identity and culture, provide curriculum focus in schools, create awareness of multiculturalism and linguistic diversity as well as enhance growth and awareness of ethnic identity (Hertzler, 1968). Bamgbose (2011, p. 3) concurs with the idea of the need for a clear language policy by pointing out that "The mere fact that almost all African languages were subjected to colonial rule, colonial languages continue to be perpetuated, even decades after independence and there is a clear dominance of imported European languages". This has got implications to the teacher and the learner, the parent and the country at large. In the Kingdom of Eswatini, the mother tongue shares the same status with other imported languages especially English. Weinstein (1980) attributes the widespread, development and promotion of European or foreign languages in Africa to Africans' ignorance to promote their languages.

In the 21st century communication has become the major purpose of language, thus, the vocational side of any language whether first or second, foreign or native, modern or ancient, verbal or non-verbal is the ability to break communication barriers (Williams, 2013). Schleicher (2012, p. 43) advises teachers that the 21st century demand them to be "Wikiwise" search, develop and share with their learners and amongst themselves educational resources thus, effective communication in the 21st century is accompanied by use of ICT devices. Driven by the overarching need to communicate, the Anglophone and Francophone countries promoted each other's' official language especially at the secondary level of schooling. The Francophone took advantage of their proximity to English-speaking countries and pulled it as an international language and a compulsory language at the secondary level. Regardless of the complaints on the ineffectiveness of the curricula; teaching-learning methods and materials, English has been learnt and is used by a relatively large number of people (Weinstein, 1980). The Anglophone countries further moved on to promote learning and teaching of French at the tertiary level through developing and preparing up-to-date syllabi and more suitable materials and their famous slogan was the "Madame Thibault method" (Tripod, 1996, p. 3). To promote the acquisition and teaching and learning of French in the Kingdom of Eswatini the Alliance Francoise put up a building which to date is located behind the Ministry of Education and Training (MoET) where people freely access French instructional materials and a language laboratory. Beyond that, the French embassy offers the people free instruction.

Evidence of the Anglophone countries' success are known and supported by the escalating rate of learners and countries that offer French at Early Childhood, Primary and Secondary levels. The Kingdom of Eswatini is one of those countries that took advantage of French and introduced it at all levels. Mkhonza (1987) comments that one of the major problems that resulted from the expansion of French in Eswatini were emaSwati students who learned only colonial languages; French and English thus, the education system has been producing emaSwati learners who have not learned their own language. Though French did not sustain at the secondary level in most African countries because of shortage of competent teachers, it still challenges and compete with the mother tongue in most African countries.

III.   Importance of learning a mother tongue

The social role of education is to enable people to fulfil their individual potentials and to contribute to the economic, political and social transformation of their countries (UNESCO, 2013b). For people to fulfil their individual potentials and contribute to the social, political and transformation of themselves, others, the nation

and global society at large they need language. "Without language a social thing or abstract idea are practically impossible" Trudgill 1986 as cited in (Magwa & Mutasa, 2007, p.62). Thus, language whether native, foreign, indigenous is a key instrument of communication. SiSwati is a medium of communication in the public and education sector (Meyers, Malambe, Nkosi & Sibanda, 2008). Therefore, foreign learners in Eswatini do need the siSwati language to use for communication in order to meet their social, economic and political wellbeing, something which their mother tongue cannot afford. Bamgbose (2011) cites that besides communication, language is important to other parts of national life like participatory democracy, access to justice and information on health.

Research and practice reveal that imperialism is still a dominant feature of languages in education in Africa. In some Anglophone countries, the mother tongue is used as a language of education in the early years of primary education and in literacy programmes, but taught as a subject afterwards at all levels of education (Obanye, 1996; Bamgbose, 2011, p. 6). The mother tongue is used as the language of the basic cycle of education in Tanzania, Madagascar, Burundi, Rwanda, Somalia and Ethiopia; the mother tongue is used a subject and not a language of instruction by Francophone and Lusophone countries. Virtually, all African countries use the colonial language (English, French, Spanish and Portuguese) as language of instruction at the post basic level (Weinstein, 1980). In Nigeria, more Nigerian languages are taught in schools and used as languages of instruction in the first three years of formal schooling. In the Kingdom of Eswatini, the mother tongue siSwati is taught as a subject and is to be used as a medium of instruction in literacy programmes and from the 1st four grades of schooling after which English is expected to take over (Eswatini Education and Training Sector Policy, 2018). Bamgbose (2011, p. 6) use the phrase "the early exist model" to describe the use of the use of the mother tongue described above .

IV.   Teaching and learning siSwati as first language

Teaching and learning of the mother tongue siSwati in the Kingdom of Eswatini began in the year 1969 after independance. The first examination of the mother tongue siSwati was in 1979 offered under the General Certificate of Education (GCE) O' Level curriculum which was then changed to become the International General Certificate of Secondary Education (IGCSE) in 2007 and later on localised to become the Swaziland General Certificate of Secondary Education (SGCSE) in 2009. The country's change of name from Swaziland to Eswatini necessitated the change of the SGCSE curriculum to Eswatini General Certificate of Secondary Education (EGCSE). Under the EGCSE curriculum, siSwati is offered as one of the core subjects taught as L1 to native speakers and as L2 to non-native speakers. The teaching methodology assumes that learners learn the Language, Culture and Literature components of the EGCSE siSwati syllabus (EGCSE siSwati syllabus, 2021-2023). The study of the literature component is concerned with the literature of the siSwati language. The teaching approach regards literature, language and culture components of the siSwati subjects as interphilological. The literature component covers different forms of literary texts; drama, poetry and prose fiction which explore human experience in terms of the culture and social conditions of the emaSwati context. Thus, literature exposes learners to the language and culture of the emaSwati people. Additionally, Christ (1972) considers culture as life, therefore, cites that the three Ls; literature, language and life are interrelated.

The language aspect of the EGCSE siSwati subject regards human language as the basis of thinking and cognition. Therefore, it equips learners with the linguistic aspect; a set of words used by emaSwati people to express their thoughts. Thus, the siSwati language is a basic need for human existence and culture of the emaSwati nation. Language, whether current, ancient or modern; written, spoken or non-verbal (sign language) is better learned in language studies, therefore, learning siSwati like all language studies form the base for the building blocks and rules that shape the siSwati language into meaningful constructs. The siSwati language helps emaSwati children understand how meaning is conveyed, adopt language practices, categorise linguistic aspects, understand the media of communication and trace the historical background behind the emergence of the siSwati language whilst considering the cultural, social and medial factors. Studying the siSwati language also helps us understand the different dialects of the siSwati language as well as how the language is acquired, produced and accepted.

Regardless of the provision for L1 and L2 in the teaching and learning of the mother tongue siSwati, the dominance of European languages continue to get the mother tongue suffering as most schools would offer siSwati as an option to French or Afrikaans. French and English gave the mother tongue siSwati a tough competition to the extent that schools, parents and teachers motivated the learning of European languages. Schools and other supporting agents would launch debates, writing competitions, awards and prizes towards improving English. Additionally, in the Kingdom of Eswatini English has been a passing subject ever since till January 4, 2020 when the Minister for Education and Training announced that *"English is no longer a passing/failing subject in Eswatini schools"* (Mabuza, 2020 p. 2) in Eswatini News.

Worse is that English is also a language used in official domains, thus all efforts are directed towards improving English language. Mngometulu (2017) in the Kingdom of Eswatini studied teachers' implementation

of the grammar component of the EGCSE siSwati curriculum. The findings of the study showed that teachers are faced with challenges of limited and inadequate teaching material. According to Mngometulu (2017) most learners have a negative attitude towards the siSwati subject and teachers struggle daily to make siSwati grammar exciting to the learners. Mkhonta (2017) analysed the challenges faced by teachers of siSwati and findings revealed that siSwati is looked down upon by parents, learners and teachers as well. Thus, teachers' efforts are taken down the drain.

The negative attitude towards the mother tongue siSwati is gradually moving the country to a state of language decay. Regardless of the fact that the mother tongue siSwati is declared an official language in the Constitution of the Kingdom of ESwatini (2005); a compulsory subject in the EGCSE curriculum and taught as a first language to native speakers and as a second language to non-native speakers, most schools in the Kingdom of Eswatini had been offering siSwati as a first language or no siSwati at all. Some schools were offering the mother tongue siSwati as an option to European languages. The problem lies not with the offering of European languages but with European languages being offered at the expense of the mother tongue siSwati. The situation has been like that until the 2017 mother tongue siSwati conference declarations that the teaching and learning of the mother tongue siSwati should be compulsory for all learners at all levels in the Kingdom of Eswatini. The tendency for schools has been offering EGCSE siSwati L1 or an option to French, Portuguese and Afrikaans with some schools. The situation has been like that until the Kingdom of Eswatini hosted the mother tongue conference in the year 2017. Thereafter, the MoET in its 2017 Selected Circulars captures resolutions based on the contributions made at the conference. Reads No. 12 of 2017 Selected Circulars

"It has been noted that the siSwati language is at the point of being extinct. The young generation does not speak siSwati fluently anymore but speak English. Of great concern to the government of Eswatini is that the young generation in schools is not fluent in English nor are they fluent in siSwati, they are passive bilinguals. Therefore, the government of the Kingdom of Eswatini through the Ministry of Education and Training takes this opportunity to remind all schools the following;

The Kingdom of Eswatini has two official languages. These are siSwati and English as per the constitution of the Kingdom of Eswatini. English and siSwati should be treated in the same equal status at school levels. Head teachers shall ensure that in the school timetables siSwati is not paired with any other subject where learners are made to choose between siSwati and any other subject. All learners are to take English and siSwati as core subjects; any other language shall be taken as an elective subject. As a core subject, siSwati shall be taught in all levels and be passed by all learners. Teachers should encourage learners to practice speaking, reading and writing in both languages in school in order to make learners fluent in these languages. Teachers should promote debates and creative writing in both languages particularly in the siSwati language. Through this circular, the MOET hopes that all schools and school committees shall seriously adhere to this circular without any deviation". (MoET, 2017, p. 23)

According to a report made by the Senior Inspector for siSwati during a prelude to the mother tongue day for 2020; "*All schools in the Kingdom are offering siSwati and all learners are learning siSwati; some as a first and some as a second language*" (C. Mohammed, personal communication, February 20, 2020). Thus, the 2017 Mother Tongue Conference has revived the teaching and learning of the mother tongue siSwati as a first and second language at the senior level of schooling which has been ignored by most of the schools. Therefore, the study seeks to compare the syllabus for siSwati as a first and siSwati as a second language in terms of objectives, resources and assessment approaches.

V.   Teaching and learning a language as L2

All humans are born with an innate ability to learn additional languages. As much as there are similarities in learning L1 and L2 there are major differences noted. "Children do not need an explicit instruction to learn their 1st language, they just pick it up" (Kosur, 2019, p. 1), thus the three terms; language acquisition, language learning and language immersion. L1 exposes children to language forms; speech sounds (phonology), vocabulary (semantics and meaning), grammar (syntax/ word order/ morphology), intonation and rhythm (prosody) and other aspects of the language like cognitive structures, emotional states, relationships and etc (Kosur, 2019). In L2 language learning is different from acquisition in the sense that learning demands explicit instruction in speaking, reading, writing and listening while in L1 the process of language acquisition occurs unconsciously (Kosur, 2019). The brains of L1 acquisition are innately wired to master word patterns while brains of L2 need to be retrained in order for them to accept language systems outside their first language. Language immersion on the other hand is an L2 language learning process in which learners get immersed in learning the L2. To immerse learners in English language in the Kingdom of Eswatini, parents take their children to schools that use English as a medium of instruction.

In England teaching and learning a foreign language began in 2014 and is aimed at liberating children from insularity and exposing children to other cultures i.e intercultural competency (Myles, 2017). MacIntrye and Mercer (2014) in support of the idea contend that the primary purpose of language is communication that is aimed at producing fluent language speakers, evoking a sense of reality and creating an awareness of language usage. As much as grammar is important, the ability to read, write, speak and listen suppresses it all in learning a second or foreign language. Literature reveals that effective L2 teaching and learning require interactive exercises that engage learners with the content as opposed to those that are mechanical (MacIntyre & Mercer, 2014; Kosur, 2019).

According to the European Commission (2012) the aims of teaching a second language is to expose learners to spoken and written language from a variety of authentic sources. Thus, teaching and learning L2 help learners understand and respond to language, speak with increasing confidence, fluency and spontaneity, and help them find ways of communicating what they want to say in different manners; engaging in and influencing the direction of a conversation, discussion, asking questions and continually improving the accuracy of their pronunciation and intonation. During the process of learning L2 learners write language at varying lengths, for different purposes and audiences, using the variety of grammatical structures that they have learnt as well as discover and develop an appreciation of a range of writing in the second language (Myles, 2017). Soliman (2014) argues that in teaching a second language, teachers need to focus on the typical cognitive processes of Blooms' taxonomies; classifying, defining, hypothesising, comparing, contrasting, showing cause and effect etc while in a first language teachers hope that learners know how to do that automatically.

In the Kingdom of Eswatini the introduction of EGCSE siSwati as a second language is aimed at closing the gap that exists between foreign learners and their emaSwati nationals' counterparts. The first examination for EGCSE siSwati as a second language was in 2009. The teaching of L2 emerges as the Kingdom's efforts to fit foreign learners into the cultural contexts of the Kingdom of Eswatini through suggestions and recommendations made by the SiSwati Subject Panel and the National Language Board (Mkhonza, 1987). They moved for the idea that there should be an alternative syllabus for children of foreigners who go to schools in the Kingdom of Eswatini. According to the MoET (2021 - 2023) the learners study the language in order to promote their educational or employment prospects (EGCSE siSwati as a Second Language Syllabus, 2021-2023). The rationale for siSwati as a second language is based on siSwati being one of the two languages of communication in the Kingdom of Eswatini. Candidates are expected to understand a wider range of social registers and styles than they can produce and use the language appropriately to communicate at formal and semi-formal relationships (EGCSE siSwati as a Second Language Syllabus, 2021-2023, p. 4). In the Kingdom of Eswatini there are no teachers trained specifically for teaching EGCSE siSwati as a second language, let alone the reality that few graduates are inclined into teaching the mother tongue siSwati. Most of them are contract teachers. Thus, the situation depicts that the re-introduction or enforcement of teaching EGCSE siSwati L2 may mean that the same teachers teaching EGCSE siSwati L1 may find themselves having to teach EGCSE siSwati L2 as well. This therefore, gives value to the need for the descriptive study that compares the curriculum for siSwati L1 and L2 in terms of objectives, resources and assessment strategies.

VI. Assessment for L2

Assessment strategies recommended for L2 is alternative assessment that demonstrate learners' abilities in speaking, reading, writing and listening the language (Chirumbu, 2013). Learning L2 is focussed on developing learners in the grammar, vocabulary and orthography of the language which together come up as the four linguistic abilities; reading, writing, speaking and listening. Alternative assessment is any form of assessment or activity that measures learners' performance Chirumbu (2013). In the teaching and learning of languages, alternative assessment differ from traditional or conventional assessment in that alternative evaluate learners' linguistic progress and performance through continuous demonstration of visible abilities, thus it is evidence-based, process-oriented, realistic and authentic (Chirumbu, 2013; Eaton, 2010). Alternative assessment is not norm referencing rather it is criterion referenced; is not focussed on right or wrong answers, grading and ranking immediate performance but allow learners room to build up language competencies that will last long (Chirumbu, 2013). Eaton (2010) add that it is systematic, dynamic and flexible; does not compare the learners' level of knowledge and competencies with each other but monitor students' individual progress over time. It further takes into account individual students' learning styles, background and knowledge level.

L2 learning is more practical; alternative assessment too requires learners to produce evidence of accomplishment of the curriculum objectives; measures what the learners know, can do, say, make and write not what they do not know (Chirumbu, 2013, p. 93). It can be concluded that the alternative approach to assessment amplifies the students' strengths and minimise the weaknesses. Care, Vista and Kim (2018) define alternative assessment as one that assesses the head, hand and heart. Learners' records as evidence of learning are put in the form of a performance, project or portfolio and can be archived and used at a later date with other pieces of learning evidence (Erben et al., 2009, p. 153; Eaton, 2010). There are many attributes that qualify the use of

alternative assessment in L2; L2 learning is context-specific, alternative assessment and is context-specific too. Moreover, L2 allows teachers to use and contextualise assessment tools to meet the targeted aim which is communicative language learning. Such flexibility with alternative assessment makes it easy for teachers to adapt and infuse ICT tools available at the learners' disposal for teaching and learning siSwati L2. Thus, use of alternative assessment makes learners develop positive attitudes towards learning L2 and increase their confidence in speaking, reading, writing and listening in the siSwati language. In support of the idea MacIntyre and Mercer (2014) state that the more learners use the L2 the more they get accustomed to it.

Erben et al. (2009) list three basic performance types of assessment namely; performance-based assessment, portfolios and projects. Alternative assessment in L2 helps the teacher and the learner monitor language progress and performance in different activities learners engage on. Writing tasks, portfolio and classroom assessment are three approaches to alternative assessment recommended for use in L2 (Yap, 1993; Chirumbu, 2013). Four types of portfolios are used in assessment; working portfolios, performance portfolio, assessment portfolio, group portfolio etc (Yap, 1993). The following items could be found inside student portfolios; tests, quizzes, home works, projects, assignments, audiotapes of oral work, diary entries, self-assessments, tape recordings, comments from peers and from the teacher. In alternative assessment self-assessment is used, though subject to subjectivity it gives students an intuitive sense to understand which pieces of work to assess, thus making them independent thinkers (Blanche, 1990; Eaton, 2010). The above facts on alternative assessment give clear understanding of the reason why educators alternatively use the terms; authentic assessment, portfolio-based assessment, holistic assessment, integrative and peer-assessment to refer to alternative assessment.

Whilst in traditional and standardised testing the teacher assumes the role of being a test generator, administrator and examiner, in alternative assessment the teacher becomes a guide, advisor, enabler, helper, a teacher-preneur and a community developer. In the 21st century the teacher is no more "the man of knowledge" Nisbet 1971 (as cited in Eaton, 2010, p. 9). To relinquishing the role of being an expert and a knowledgeable partner in L2 learning, teachers are expected to support, mentor and motivate students based on their different abilities to speak, listen, read and write the siSwati language. The teacher needs not focus much on grammatical mistakes, sentence constructions but on the learner's efforts to communicate (Eaton, 2010; Chirumbu, 2013) thus, must embrace mistakes as a learning curve. Teachers must appreciate and recognise students' ability to understand, use and produce language in variety of forms and purposes (Eaton, 2010, p. 12). This can easily be done through affording learners' opportunities or avenues for articulation of their ideas i.e debates, poetry readings, storytelling and mini-research activities (Eaton, 2010).

To enhance responsibility, teachers are to guide and monitor students as they develop their portfolios that contain evidence of oral, reading and writing tasks. The cumulative evidence of learners' work is aimed at balancing the process and the product of the learners' work. Besides keeping records of learners' work portfolios in L2 equip learners with self-monitoring and self-assessment skills (Eaton, 2010). Portfolios are flexible; can be done manually, through pen and paper and ICT as well. However, teachers should help students design electronic portfolios (Eaton, 2010) as a way of harnessing ICT and enhancing creativity and innovation skills.

Research has shown that teaching a second language requires teachers who are specialists and have a good command of the language (Murphy, 2014). Teachers who have a poor command of the language and little or no training in second language pedagogy are not recommended (Murphy, 2014). Murphy (2014) has observed that language graduates trained to teach languages in universities are always insufficient, thus raising fears about specialists in second language learning. The worse reality about L2 teaching and learning is the tendency by many schools to use one dedicated language teacher for the whole school supplemented by the use of a peripatetic specialist teacher, who goes from school A to school B. Critical situations observed are schools that use a teacher trainee who is learning it at the same time as the learners (Murphy, 2014). On the other hand, Garbati and Mady (2015) reveal that there are no best teacher practices in L2 teaching. Thus, the study compares the curriculum for siSwati L1 and L2 in terms of objectives, resources and assessment strategies.

VII. Theoretical framework

The study is modelled by the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) by Hall and Hord (2015). The CBAM is a model used to study the adoption of educational innovations. It focuses on how teachers, administrators and policy makers respond to change (Hall & Hord, 1987). Thus, leaders, evaluators and researchers use the CBAM to understand, monitor and guide implementation of innovative practices. CBAM includes three diagnostic dimensions; the Stages of Concern (Soc) which addresses the personal issues faced by the implementers, the Levels of use (LoU), which describe the behavioural profiles of users and non-users and Innovation Configuration (IC) which represent the possible forms of change that can be assessed against the intentions of the designers of the innovations (Hall & Hord, 2015). Specifically, the study draws on the Innovation Configuration as way of assessing the forms of change evident in the siSwati L2 curriculum in terms

of the objectives, resources and teaching strategies as per the intentions of the Ministry of Education and Training, the designers of the siSwati L2 curriculum. The descriptive study therefore, provides a comparison that helps all stakeholders responsible for the implementation of the siSwati L2 curriculum understand the demands of L2. Furthermore, the study is a form of monitoring and evaluation of the demands of the L2 siSwati curriculum. Therefore, findings will guide teachers on the effective implementation of the L2 curriculum. According to Hall and Hord (2015) the IC is a valid way of making claims about implementing pedagogical innovations and a useful mechanism for assessing side preparedness and other contextual demand side factors. The findings of the study offer valuable knowledge on the forms of change evident in the L2 siSwati curriculum against L1 in terms of attainment of its major objectives, strategies and resources that are much demanded by the L2 siSwati curriculum.

VIII.   Problem statement

The declaration of siSwati as a compulsory subject for all learners at all levels in the Kingdom of Eswatini has led to urban schools with foreign learners adopting teaching siSwati as a first language to native speakers and siSwati as a second language to non-native speakers. This is curriculum change/improvement within the siSwati subject because there are two different curricular to be used. It is a year since schools in the Kingdom of Eswatini have been strongly warned against making teaching and learning of siSwati optional rather the schools have been compelled to teach it both as L1 and L2. Such changes in curricular call for a change in pedagogy as well. Fulfilment of this declaration calls for evolving strategies, methods, approaches, teaching resources and assessment practices in the teaching and learning of EGCSE siSwati. Much curiosity lies with the reality that the same teachers, environment and resources are supposed to be used to teach two different aspects of the same subject; siSwati as a first language and as a second language.

IX.   Research Aim

The aim of the study was to compare the EGCSE siSwati as a second language curriculum against the curriculum for EGCSE siSwati as a first language.

Research Objectives
1. To determine the differences between the objectives of the curriculum for EGCSE siSwati as a second language against the objectives for EGCSE siSwati as a first language.
2. To determine the assessment strategies used in EGCSE siSwati as a second language.
3. To determine the resources required for teaching EGCSE siSwati as a second language.

Major research question:
What is the difference between the curriculum for EGCSE siSwati as a second language and the curriculum for EGCSE siSwati as first language?

Research sub-questions
1. How are the objectives of the curriculum for EGCSE siSwati as a second language different from the objectives for EGCSE siSwati as a first language?
2. Which assessment strategies are used in EGCSE siSwati as a second language?
3. Which resources are required for teaching EGCSE siSwati as a second language?

X.   Methodology

The study was a descriptive research that employed the qualitative design approach. The data collection procedure was content analysis of the EGCSE siSwati as a first language and EGCSE siSwati as second language curriculum. After a thorough review of literature, a checklist was developed. The EGCSE siSwati as a first language curriculum was compared to EGCSE siSwati as a second language curriculum in terms of the objectives, resources and assessment strategies. Facts on the similarities and differences between the two curricular were drawn, thus giving a full description of the situation. Analysis of the differences between the two curricular allowed the researchers to determine the differences between the two curricular in terms of content covered, objectives, skills developed, resources and assessment strategies. Information was analysed and presented in tables and charts.
To ensure pedagogical effectiveness of the EGCSE siSwati as a second language, comparison of the two curricular were made to identify the differences and similarities in terms of the objectives, skills developed, content offered, methods, resources and assessment strategies in each of the two curricular.

XI.   Findings

Objective 1
Comparison of the EGCSE siSwati as a first language against the EGCSE siSwati as a second language in terms of objectives
Content analysis of the objectives of EGCSE siSwati as a first language and EGCSE siSwati as a second language
The results of the study indicated that the objectives for EGCSE siSwati as a first language and EGCSE siSwati as a second language are completely different.

Table 1 Objectives for EGCSE siSwati L1 and EGCSE siSwati L2

EGCSE siSwati L1	EGCSE siSwati L2

• Express ideas, facts and opinions clearly and effectively using a range of appropriate vocabulary
• Understand and convey information
• Handle spelling and grammar accurately
• Understand, order and present facts, ideas and opinions
• Evaluate information and select what is relevant to specific purposes
• Show a sense of audience and awareness of style in both formal and informal situations of their own and others' making
• Recognise and appreciate ways in which writers use language
• Recognise and appreciate other ways in which writers achieve their effects (e;g characterisation)
• Respond to text critically, sensitively and in detail
• Use textual evidence to illustrate and support points of view
• Recognise and respond to linguistic devices, grammatical features and register (e.g. similes, metaphors, qualificatives, interjectives etc)
• Show creativity and persuasiveness in their writing
• Demonstrate a clear control over internal cohesion and overall coherence in continuous prose writing
• Communicate a sensitive and informed personal response to what is read
	1. Reading
	  • R1 understand and respond to information presented in a variety of forms
	  • R2 select and organise material relevant to specific purposes
	  • R3 recognise, understand and distinguish between facts, ideas and opinions
	  • R4 infer information from texts
	2. Writing
	  • W1 communicate clearly, accurately and appropriately
	  • W2 convey information and express opinions effectively
	  • W3 employ and control a variety of grammatical structures
	  • W4 Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of a range of appropriate vocabulary
	  • W5 observe conventions of paragraphing, punctuation and spelling
	  • W6 employ appropriate register/style
	3. Listening
	  • L1 understand and respond to information presented in a variety of forms
	  • L2 select and organise material relevant to specific purposes
	  • L3 recognise, understand and distinguish between facts, ideas and opinions
	4. Speaking
	  • S1 communicate clearly, accurately and appropriately
	  • S2 convey information and express opinions effectively
	  • S3 employ and control a variety of grammatical structures
	  • S4 demonstrate knowledge of a range of appropriate vocabulary
	  • S5 engage in and influence the direction of a conversation
	  • S6 employ suitable pronunciation and stress patterns

KEY: R- Reading; W – Writing; L – listening; S – Speaking

Table 1 revealed that the EGCSE siSwati as first language objectives expect learners to demonstrate abilities in the literature, language and culture components of the curriculum while the EGCSE siSwati as second language objectives expect learners to demonstrate abilities in the four language skills; the receptive skills (reading and listening) and the productive skills (writing and speaking). However, both objectives for L1 and L2 are focussed towards equipping learners with the popular interdisciplinary skills that cut across all subjects offered under the EGCSE curriculum; communication and language, numeracy, problem-solving, technological awareness and applications, critical thinking, work and study, independent learning as well as working with others. However, the skills are developed at different levels of competencies and emphasis e.g communication skills developed in L1 are deeper than those learners acquire in L2 in that communication in L1 requires learners to show appreciation of the emaSwati cultural norms whilst in L2 focus is on use of the siSwati language to communicate. On the same note, language skills developed in L1 are too mechanical and observe strict rules like spelling mistakes, while L2 language skills are made simple and embrace spelling mistakes as a learning curve that forge a way forward. The findings concur with Chirumbu (2013) that in L2 focus need not be on right or wrong answers rather on building language competencies that will last longer. The same thing applies to all the other skills.

Though the rationale for the two curricula differs, both L1 and L2 equip learners with knowledge, skills, attitudes and values of the siSwati language though at different levels of competency as per Sustainable Development Goal No. 4. Also, the outcome or goal for both curricula is to enable learners to communicate in the siSwati language. The rationale for first language siSwati is based on siSwati being one of the official languages and is offered to native speakers. Because L2 is offered to ensure that non-native speakers of the siSwati language are able to communicate; its rationale is based on siSwati being one of the two languages of communication in the Kingdom of Eswatini. The findings concur with the European Commission (2012) that, the aims of teaching a second language is to expose learners to spoken and written language. Additionally, Myles (2017) defines the aim of teaching L2 as a process of equipping learners with intercultural competency. The differences in the rationale for the two curricula accounts for the different objectives of the two curricula. The two curricula differ in that the objectives for L1 curriculum integrate the language, literature and culture components of the siSwati language, whilst the objectives for L2 curriculum integrate the four language skills; reading, writing, speaking and listening. The findings concur with MacIntyre and Mercer (2014) that the purpose of any language is communication, thus in L2 there is no need of applying pressure on the mechanics of the siSwati language; phonology, semantics, syntax, prosody and other aspects of the language as long as learners can interact and engage with each other. Kosur (2019) adds that unlike language acquisition, L2 does not demand explicit instruction but focus should be based on as long as learners can read, write, speak and listen to the language.

The differences in the rationale and objectives of the two curricula also clearly highlight the different intentions of the curricula in terms of the broader aims. In L1 learners are to communicate clearly, appropriately and effectively in writing, understand and respond appropriately to what they have read and experienced. Thus, learners of siSwati L1 are compelled to enjoy and appreciate the variety of the siSwati language, develop pride and self-esteem, confidence and appreciation of the national cultural heritage. Learners are also expected to develop full knowledge of the cultural practices, their implications and the culture of reading siSwati literature texts. Over and above L1 aims to ensure that learners acquire the following skills; drawing inferences, ordering and presenting facts, speaking, reading, writing, listening to opinions, and detecting bias which in turn promote personal development and enhance understanding of themselves and others. To ensure that learners enjoy and appreciate the variety of the L1 siSwati; the experience of reading literature; understand and respond to a variety of literary texts, they study both Modern Literature and Traditional Literature and Culture. Contrary, the aims of the L2 curriculum are to equip learners with the ability to use siSwati effectively in practical communication; develop awareness of the nature of the siSwati language; equip learners with language learning skills and other skills that generally apply to their use of siSwati for communication purposes. It can be concluded that though L1 and L2 are both aimed at developing the learners personally, the approaches and levels of development differ. L1 develops abstract/soft skills in reading, writing, speaking, listening and analytical skills that ensure a deeper understanding of the literature and culture components. Contrary, L2 develops visible and practical skills of reading, writing, listening and speaking the siSwati language. Thus, emphasis is made that L1 may not be offered in the same session with L2.

Objective 2
Comparison of the EGCSE siSwati as first language and EGCSE siSwati as a second language assessment approaches

The findings of the study revealed that the assessment approaches for the two curricula are completely different. EGCSE siSwati L1 has got three formal examination papers that assess learners based on prescribed

reading materials and topics. Paper 1 is the continuous writing paper which assesses learners' creative abilities. Part A assesses the following tasks; narrative, descriptive, expository, factual, discursive and argumentative. Part B assesses directed writing skills in the form of letter, speech, diary, dialogue, continuation of a story, magazine article and reports. Paper 2 is the Reading and Directed writing paper that assesses learners' reading, writing and comprehension skills. In part A the learners are assigned two reading passages in the siSwati language extracted from a variety of sources; brochure, newspaper, magazine, article or any reading material on the siSwati language. After reading, learners are to answer different questions that asses their abilities on low order and higher order thinking skills; drawing inferences, ordering facts, presenting opinions, deducing meaning in context and vocabulary. Learners are also exposed to another creative or continuous writing task; letter, speech, diary, dialogue, magazine article, reports, and story continuation. Part B assesses learners' ability to identify, form, classify, explain and use the grammar of the siSwati language in context.

Paper 3 is the Literature and Culture paper. Part A assesses learners' ability to read, critically interpret, analyse and evaluate modern literature organised into the four genres; poetry, prose-fiction (novel and short story) and drama. The paper exposes learners to both context/passage/extract-based and general essay questions that expect learners to integrate personal response, language-based response and cultural response-based approaches to literature. Part B assesses learners' abilities in traditional literature and culture in order for them to analyse, evaluate and trace the development of cultural practices in their communities. Topics handled under traditional literature are traditional songs, traditional poems, family/clan praises proverbs and idioms. Under culture learners are exposed to the traditional homestead, family as an institution, food, traditional ceremonies, the funeral and etc.

In summary, the assessment for L1 exposes learners to a formal examination setting. Though all papers are compulsory, they carry different weightings. Paper 1 is weighted 25% of the final mark; Paper 2 is weighted 35% of the final mark while Paper 3 is weighted 40% of the final mark. All papers are compulsory. Grades are distributed from A* to G.

On the other hand, there are no specific topics assigned for the EGCSE L2 siSwati curriculum except that teachers are at liberty to select those that relate to the needs and interests of the learners. Specific examples given are topics centred on the following themes; education, the world of work, current affairs, health and welfare, travel, school affairs etc. The findings concur with Myles (2017) that in L2 learners write for different audiences and purposes. Teachers are to ensure that materials used expose learners to formal and informal settings, academic or occupational, field of work and public services. L2 assesses learners in three papers which are a combination of formal and practical examinations; Paper 1 is Reading and Directed writing. In Part A learners are given a short reading passage in the following formats; advertisement, brochure, leaflet, guide, report, manual or instructional. Learners read it for purposes of skimming and answer the following types of questions; information transfer, note making and summary. In part B learners read a passage that takes the form of a report, newspaper/magazine article and answer detailed comprehension questions. Part B also requires the learners to write approximately 150-200 words for a certain purpose, format and audience in continuous prose in response to a stimulus given in the form of pictures or short prompts.

Paper 2 assesses listening comprehension skills recorded in various writing styles; as dialogues, conversations and interview monologues. The questions are organised from the lower to higher order taxonomies. Exercise 1 is recordings on travel announcements and phone messages that demand short word answers. Exercise 2 are longer spoken texts that demand form filling skills, Exercise 3 are longer spoken texts as well but to be answered in true or false. Then Exercise 4 are longer spoken texts and open-ended questions that demand both short and sentence-length answers.

Paper 3 assesses speaking skills. Learners take an oral test conducted by the teacher. The learner and the teacher engage in a conversation that takes approximately 10-15 minutes and is recorded in a soft copy. Usually, the teacher conducts a warm-up conversation on different topics provided for by the Examinations Council of Eswatini (ECESWA), the mother body responsible for the evaluation of the EGCSE curriculum. The purpose of the warm-up is to allow the learners room to choose a topic that seems suitable for the learner. Thereafter, the teacher uses the topic flexible for the learner to run the exercise.

In summary, Paper 1 assesses Reading and Directed Writing skills with six exercises, weighted 60%, Paper 2 is a listening examination with 4 exercises, weighs 25% and Paper 3 is a practical oral assessment test that is approximately 10 -15 minutes, weighs 15% of the final mark. All three papers are eligible for the award of Grades A* to G. The oral assessment is conducted internally by the teacher of siSwati and thereafter, recorded samples are moderated by ECESWA.

The findings on the procedure for the oral assessment reveal that teachers take 2 to 3 minutes guiding learners on the topic that seems best for the learner. This concurs with Eaton (2010) that L2 uses alternative assessment in which the teacher supports, guides and monitors learners based on their ability to speak the language. The same thing applies with the listening assessment; the teacher becomes an enabler as opposed to

an examiner as stated by Eaton (2010) that in the 21st century curriculum the teacher is expected to relinquish the role of autocracy.

The findings reveal that while there are specified topics for each of the three components; language, literature and culture in L1 there are no specified topics for L2 except for provision of themes that guide teachers' selection of teaching material. The findings concur with Scheichler (2012, p.43) that teaching in the 21st century requires teachers to be "Wikiwise" search, develop and share with their learners and amongst themselves educational resources. Thus, the teaching of L2 is an avenue emaSwati people to develop and promote the siSwati language so as to counteract Weinstein (1980) who attributes the widespread, development and promotion of European/foreign over indigenous languages in Africa to Africans' ignorance to promote their own languages.

The findings revealed that assessment for both L1 and L2 curricula assess reading and directed writing skills though at varying degrees; L2 assesses simple reading and writing abilities, while L1 assesses language mechanics, phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, intonation etc of the siSwati language. The findings concur with Kosur (2019) that L1 exposes learners to speech sounds, vocabulary and meaning, grammar, intonation, rhythm and emotional states.

Moreover, the assessment for L1 gives greater value to the literature and culture components as it weighs 40% as per the aim of developing the learners' understanding of themselves and others which is achieved through exposing learners to literature and culture. The assessment for L2 on the other hand, is aligned to the major aim of developing the ability to use the siSwati language effectively for practical communication (EGCSE SiSwati as a Second Language Syllabus, 2020) thus, focus is on helping learners understand other than produce the siSwati language. That is why greater value is put on measurement of the receptive skills of reading and directed writing skills that weigh 60% of the assessment.

The assessment strategies for the two curricular are completely different in that L2 assesses learners' ability on the practical skills of reading, listening, writing and speaking the siSwati language, thus assessment for L2 can be defined as one that is alternative, performance-based or authentic. The findings concur with Erben et al. (2009) that in alternative assessment, the learner produces evidence of accomplishment of the curriculum objectives; that is what the learner can say, do, think, write and make. It can be concluded that L1 assesses the visual, audio and action, thus making it liable to use ICT facilities as cited by UNESCO, 2015 (b); McNutty, 2018). Though Chirumbu (2013) mentions writing tasks, portfolio and classroom assessments as three approaches to alternative assessment in L2, the analysis of the siSwati L2 curriculum showed no evidence of the portfolio and projects as proof of learners' continuous and cumulative assessment on writing, speaking, listening and reading tasks. Additionally, out of the four types of portfolios; working portfolios, performance portfolio, assessment portfolio, group portfolio recommended for use in alternative assessment, neither of them is recommended in siSwati L2 assessment. However, in the IGCSE Consultative Document (2005) that guide teaching and learning of all subjects offered under the EGCSE curriculum, the project is cited as a 21st century teaching method that embrace problem solving, intrinsic motivation, experimental technique and learners' cooperation as opposed to an assessment task.

Though the assessment for L1 is comprehensive; assesses learners' abilities in all the components; language, literature, culture and creative writing in the siSwati language, its format is traditional and standardised. L1 assesses the learners' ability to write only though at varying levels of the cognitive learning taxonomies and learners' mental capabilities; lower order and higher order thinking skills. The findings are aligned to the major differences between L1 and L2 as stipulated by Kosur (2019) that L1 exposes learners to the mechanics of the language which can be measured using cognitive tasks. Thus, in L1 learners compete based on cognitive abilities only, whilst in L2 they compete based on what they speak, listen, write and read. To concur with the idea Erben et al. (2009); Chirumbu (2013) describe alternative assessment as process oriented and authentic in that it keeps records of learners' cumulative tasks in language abilities that are used to balance the process and the product.

Though the assessment and topics for L1 differ from those of L2, the teaching methods recommended for use in both curricula are the same. The following learner-centred methods are recommended for use in teaching the EGCSE siSwati curriculum; field work, project, debate, group discussion, role playing, resource persons, and values clarification. The findings concur with Eaton (2010) that in teaching L2, teachers are to mentor, guide and monitor learners based on their abilities to read, write, speak and listen the language as opposed to using traditional teaching methods. However, in terms of activities for teaching L2 Eaton (2010) suggests activities that allow for learners' articulation of ideas like debates, poetry readings, storytelling and mini-research activities.

Objective 3
Comparison of the EGCSE siSwati as a first language and EGCSE siSwati as a second language resources

The findings of the study indicated that the EGCSE siSwati as first language resources and the EGCSE siSwati as a second language resources are the same. The resources required for both curricular are a combination of physical, print media, technological facilities and human resources. Both curricular demand physical resources in the form of; laboratories, classrooms, charts, textbooks, cultural artefacts and teachers specifically trained for teaching EGCSE siSwati as a second language. Technological devices required are; videos, CD Roms, computers, access to internet, microphone, recording system, television sets, USB flash drives, cassette recorders and etc. Significantly, technological devices are of much demand and necessity in the teaching and learning of EGCSE siSwati as a second language.

Figure 3: Teaching resources for L1 and L2

Teaching resources	Type of resources
Reading material	Physical and technological
Textbooks	Physical
Language Laboratories	Physical and technological
Classrooms	Physical
Charts	Physical
Cultural Artefacts	Technological
Videos	Technological
Compact Disk Roms	Technological
Computers	Technological
Access to internet	Technological
Television sets	Technological
USB flash drives	Technological
Cassettes Recorders	Technological
Library	Physical and technological
Recording systems	Technological
Microphone	Technological
Teachers	Human

The findings revealed that both curricular require physical and technological resources that can be attained based on the learners' social background. Such findings provide evidence that the 21st century learning paradigm is non-discriminatory; it is inclusive education because it embraces physical and technological resources that do not have boundaries and territories. Also, the findings revealed that the ICT resources required for teaching L2 are tools and software that are available within and outside the school environment. The findings concur with Rhalmi (2017) that ICT resources are applicable to a certain context. The same thing applies to L2; it is practiced outside the classroom, thus, use of ICT resources to teach L2 offer learners opportunities for language practice anytime, everywhere, anywhere and anyhow. Sharma and Barrette (2007) add that this help speed up the learning process. Findings revealed that resources required for both curricular are a combination of textbooks, ICT tools and the human resource which is the teacher, thus they concur with advice by Sharma and Barret (2007) that in using ICT tools to teach L2, teachers should adopt the blended learning approach that combine face-to-face learning and online. Sharma and Barret (2007) further on advise that to avoid conflicting and confusing roles between ICT devices, the learner and the teacher in L2, roles for each must be defined. The findings also revealed the dire need for teachers specifically trained to teach L2 as the analysis reveal that any teacher of siSwati can conduct the oral or speaking examination, whilst research on L2 teaching and learning reveal the need for specialist and teachers who have a good command of the language (Murphy, 2014). There is no special mention to teachers trained for L2 and this concurs with Murphy (2014) that the tendency with teaching L2 is that many schools use one teacher for all classes or else a teacher-trainee.

XII.   Conclusions, implication and recommendation

The conclusions drawn from the study are that both the curriculum for L1 and L2 are skills-based and learner-centred, thus similar teaching methods are recommended for both curricular. Given communication and language, numeracy, problem-solving, technological awareness and applications, critical thinking, work and

study, independent learning and working with others as general skills that the EGCSE curriculum aim to equip the learners with, both L1 and L2 are focussed towards development of communication as the major skills, then the others come up as sub-skills. However, the 21st century has since accorded ICT as another super skill for language development, thus ICT emerge as another major component of language and communication thus, the formation of the name "Information Communication Technologies". Whilst, the teaching methodology and content topics for L1 treat the language, literature and culture components of the siSwati subject as interrelated, the teaching methodology and content for L2 regard the four language skills of reading, writing, speaking and listening as interrelated pinnacles for L2 learning. This therefore, implies that in teaching both L1 and L2 teachers should use learner-centred approaches. These findings also account for the differences in the assessment objectives for the two curricular; L1 assesses learners' cognitive abilities in the three components; language, literature and culture whilst L2 assesses learners' abilities in the four language skills (RWSL).

Though both curricula assess siSwati language skills; the skills assessed in L1 are soft in nature, whilst the ones assessed in L2 are visible or practical. It can thus be concluded that L1 is a knowing/learning curriculum whilst L2 is a doing curriculum. It is for this reason therefore, that the assessment for L1 is traditional/standardised while, the one for L2 is alternative. However, the analysis prove that the alternative assessment recommended for L2 is lacking some aspects of alternative assessment i.e the use of the portfolio for keeping records of continuous evaluation of learners' performance and the project. The implication is that effective teaching and learning of L2 require teachers to engage learners with tasks that will make them speak, read, write and listen to the siSwati language and combine such performance with the summative evaluation reading, writing, speaking and listening tasks. Also, part of the conclusions drawn is that L1 assessment still value grading learners' performance based on the whole group and judgements on right and wrong answers as key in assessment, thus it is a norm-referencing curriculum in nature. L2 on the other hand, does not believe in grading nor right and wrong answers rather it appreciates learners' individual effort to read, write, speak and listen to the siSwati language, thus it is a criterion-referencing curriculum.

Resources required for teaching both curricular are a combination of physical, electronic and human. However, the invisibility of textbooks and topics recommended for teaching L2 imply that to ensure effective teaching and learning of L2, teachers should improvise and adjust teaching material based on the learners' context, needs and interests, thus the mentioning of themes. Though, the siSwati language is still not infused as a language of ICT, the comparison showed that an array of ICT tools and applications are recommended for use in teaching and learning L2 for recording speaking, listening and writing tasks. This therefore, implies that teachers of L2 should use the ICT applications recommended for use in L2 learning; visuals, audio and action-oriented apps to help learners create, design, store and transmit information.

The study recommends that teaching and learning of L2 offers a great opportunity for the infusion of ICT in the teaching of siSwati which shall gradually infuse siSwati as a language of technology. Lastly, there is need to improve the use of alternative assessment in L2.

References

[1]. Adegbija, E. (1994). *Language attitudes in Sub-Saharan Africa: a socio-linguistic overview*. Multilingual matters LTD. Clevedon. Philadephia. Adelaide.

[2]. Al-kamel, M. A. A. & Chouthaiwale, S. S. (2018). The use of ICT tools in English Language Teaching and Learning: A Literature Review. *Veda's Journal of English Language and Literature-JOELL*, 5(2), 29-33.

[3]. Bamgbose, A. (2011). African languages today: The challenge of and prospects for empowerment under globalisation. In Eyamba G. Bokamba et al., (Ed.*), Cascadilla Proceedings Project*. Selected proceedings of the 4th annual conference on African linguistics, 1-14. Somerville, MA.

[4]. Berg, R. V. D. (2002). Teachers' Meanings regarding Educational Practice. *Review of Educational Research*. Winter 2002, 72 (4), 577 – 525.

[5]. Blanche, P. (1990). Using standardised achievement and oral proficiency tests for self-assessment purposes: The DLIFLC study. "*Language Testing*", 7, p202-229.

[6]. Brownell, S. E., & Tanner, K. D. (2012). Barriers to faculty pedagogical change: Lack of training, time, incentives and tensions with professional identity? *CBE Life Sciences Education,* 11 *(4),* 339 – 346.

[7]. Care, E., Vista, A., & Kim, H. (2018). *Assessment of transversal competencies*: potential of resources in the Asian region. Bangkok: UNESCO.

[8]. Chirumbu, S. (2013). Using alternative assessment methods in Foreign language teaching. Case study: Alternative assessment of business English for University students. *Scientific bulletin of the politehnical university of Timisoara transactions in Modern languages 12* (1-2).

[9]. Christ, H. I. (1972). *Language and literature*. New York, Chicago. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, INC.

[10]. Dunkin, M. J. & Biddle, B. J. (1974). The study of teaching. *The Educational Forum* 39 (3). https://doi.org/10.1080/00131727509339083.

[11]. Eaton, S. E. (2010). *Global trends in language learning in the twenty -first century*. Calgary: Onate Press.

[12]. EGCSE (2021 - 2023). Eswatini General Certificate of Secondary Education. *First Language siSwati Teaching Syllabus*. Mbabane: Ministry of Education

[13]. EGCSE (2021 -2023). Eswatini General Certificate of Secondary Education. *Second Language siSwati Teaching Syllabus*. Mbabane: Ministry of Education.

[14]. Erbern, T. Ban, R. & Castaneda, M. (2009). *Teaching English language learners through technology*. New York. London. Routledge.

[15]. European Commission (2012*). First European Survey on Language Competencies: final report.*

[16]. Fullan, M. (2000). *Change Forces: Probing the Depths of Educational Reform*. London: the Falmer Press.

[17]. Fullan,G. M. & Miles, M. (2016). *Getting Reform Right: What Works and What Doesn't.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey – Bass Inc., publishers.

[18]. Fuller, F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: a developmental conceptualisation. *American Research Journal, 6(2),* 207- 226.

[19]. Garbati, J. F., & Mady, C. J. (2015). Oral skill development in Second languages: A review in search of best practices. *Theory and practice in Language studies, 5,* (9) 1763-1770.DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0509.01.

[20]. Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. (2015*). Implementing change: Patterns, principles and potholes (4th ed.)* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

[21]. Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. (1987*). Change in Schools: Facilitating the process*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

[22]. Hertzler, J. (1968). Social unification and language. In Lieberson, Lieberson, Stanley, *Exploration in Sociolinguistics,* Mouton & Company, The Hague.

[23]. IGCSE (2005). International General Certificate of Secondary Education Consultative Document. Ministry of Education, Swaziland: Mbabane.

[24]. Joynes, C., Rossignoli, S., & Amonoo-Kuofi, E.F. (2019). *21st century Skills: Evidence of Issues in definition, demand and delivery for development contexts (*K4D Helpdesk report). Brighton, UK: Institute of Development Studies.

[25]. Katherine, N. L. (2019). *Students perceptions of learning in the 21st century: An evaluation of the 4Cs.* Educational Leadership for Changing Populations. Notre Dame of Maryland University. Baltimore, Maryland. Spring .

[26]. Kosur, H. M. (2019). Teaching tips for foreign language instructors: teaching English-speaking students a second language. *Defining first language acquisition, second language learning, language immersion and 2nd language acquisition.* Retrieved from https://www.brighthubeducation.com/teaching-tips-foreign-languages/4258-language-acquisition-vs-language-learning.

[27]. Lewin, C., & McNicol, S. (2015). Supporting the development of 21st Century Skills through ICT. In Brinda, T., Reynolds, N., Romeike, R., & Schwill, A. (Eds.), *KEYCIT 2014: key competencies in informatics and ICT* (pp. 181 – 198). Retrieved from https://publishup.uni-potsdam.de/opus4-ubp/frontdoor/deliver/index/docid/7032/file/cid07.pdf.

[28]. Mabuza, L. (2020, January 4). English no longer a failing subject. Eswatini News, p.2.

[29]. Maclntyre, P. D. & Mercer, S. (2014). Second language learning and teaching: Introducing positive psychology to SLA. Department of English Studies, Faculty of Pedagogy and Fine Arts. Adam Mickiewicz University, Kaliz. *SSLLT 4* (2), 153 – 172. Doi:10.14746/ssllt.2014.4.2.2 http://www.ssllt.amu.edu.pl.

[30]. Magwa, W. & Mutasa, E.M. (2007). Language and Development: Perspectives from Sub – Saharan Africa. *NAWA Journal of Language and Communication, 10* (1), 57 – 68.

[31]. McLeod, S. (2018). Erik Erikson's stages of psychosocial development. Simply psychology. www.simplypsychology.org.

[32]. McNutty, N. (2016, July 11). Why teaching 21st Century Skills using educational technology is essential [web log post]. Retrieved from https://www.niallmcnulty.com/2016/07/why-teaching-21st-century-skills-using-educational-technology-is-essential.

[33]. McNutty, N. (2017, August 27). How EdTech can equip learners with the right skills for the 4th industrial revolution[Web log post]. Retrieved from https://www.niallmcnulty.com/2017/08/how-edtech-can-equip-learners-with-the-right-skills-for-the-4th-industrial-revolution/.

[34]. McNutty, N. (2018, July 08). Are South African schools ready for the 4th industrial revolution? [Web log post]. Retrieved from https://www.niallmcnulty.com/2018/07/are-south-african-schools-ready-for-the-4th-industrial-revolution.

[35]. Meyers, K., Nkosi, G., Malambe, G.,& Sibanda, E.(2008). Language policy and use in Swaziland 40 years after independence. CONF: Swaziland since 1968*: historical and contemporary meanings of independence.* Paper presented at International and Interdisciplinary Conference organised by the department of history, University of Eswatini. 21 – 24 September 2008.

[36]. Mkhonta, P.M. (2017). Tinkinga letibhekene nekufundvwa kwelulwimi lwesiswati etikolweni. In Lulwimi Lwemdzabu 2017(ed), *Phokophela likusasa lelikhonsako ngekufundzisa umfundzi ngelulwimi lalumunya.* Proceedings of the National Mothertongue siSwati Conference (pp. 11). George Hotel; Manzini, Kingdom of Eswatini 21 -23 March.

[37]. Mkhonza, S. T. (1987) *SiSwati or French*: *A Case for Language Planning in Swaziland*. University of Swaziland. Journal Volume.

[38]. Mngometulu, T. C. (2017). *Teachers' Implementation of the grammar component of the siSwati SGCSE curriculum.* (Unpublished Masters' thesis, University of Eswatini, Eswatini).

[39]. Murphy, V. (2014). *Second language learning in the early school years*: *trends and contexts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[40]. Myles, F. (2017). Learning foreign languages in primary schools: is younger better? *Languages Society & Policy.* https://doi.org./10.17863/CAM.9806.

[41]. National Education Association (2010*). Preparing 21st century students for a global society: An educators' guide to the "Four Cs.* Retrieved from htttp://www.nea.org/assets/docs A-Guide-toFour-Cspdf.

[42]. Obanya, P. (1996). Language Education in Africa. *Journal of education*. retrieved from http://fafunwafoundation.tripod.com/fafunwafoundation/id7html.

[43]. Park, J. T. R. (2012). *Teacher change in Bangladesh: A study of teachers' adapting and implementing active learning into their practice*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto, ONT). Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/1807/34833.

[44]. Partnership for 21st Century Skills (2006). *Framework for 21st century learning*. Retrieved March 03, 2020, from http://www.p21.org/documents/ProfDev.pdf.

[45]. Radio. Kingdom of Eswatini. (2020, September 12). Eswatini News.

[46]. Rhalmi, M. (2017, February 03). ICT tools and English Language Teaching: My English Pages. [Web log post]. Retrieved from https://www.myenglishpages.com/blog/ict-tools-and-english-language-teaching.

[47]. Saleh, S. E. (2019). 4Cs in the EFL Classroom: Conceptions, challenges and implementation. *University Bulletin*, 21 (4) 57 June 2019. From www.researchgate.net.

[48]. Schleicher, A. (ed.) (2012). "Preparing teachers to deliver 21st-century skills*", in Preparing teachers and developing school leaders for the 21st century: lessons from around the world*. OECD Publishing, Paris. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264174559-4-en.

[49]. Sekai, K. (2011, December 05). The importance of ICT in language teaching [Web log post]. Retrieved from https://pekokuromon.wordpress.com/2011/12/05/the-importance-of-ict-in-language-teaching.

[50]. Sharma, P. & Barret, B. 2007. *Using Technology in and Beyond the Language Classroom*. United Kingdom: Pavilion Publishing and Media Ltd.

[51]. Soliman, N. A. (2014). Using E-learning to develop EFL students' language skills and activate their independent learning. English Department, The British University in Egypt, Cairo, Egypt. *Creative Education, 2014* (5) 752 -757. http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ce.2014.510088.

[52]. The Kingdom of Eswatini (2011). *Ministry of Education and Training – The Swaziland Education and Training Sector Policy*. Ministry Policy. Mbabane: Government printers.

[53]. The Kingdom of Eswatini (2018). *Ministry of Education and Training – The Swaziland Education and Training Sector Policy*. Ministry Policy. Mbabane: Government printers.

[54]. The Kingdom of Eswatini, *Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs. Child protection and Welfare Act 2012*. UNICEF. Mbabane. ESwatini Government Press.

[55]. The Kingdom of Eswatini, Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs. *The constitution of the Kingdom of Swaziland* 2005. Mbabane. Eswatini Government Press.

[56]. The Kingdom of Eswatini. *Ministry of Education and Training*. Circular 11 of 2017, 12 February. Mbabane. ESwatini Government Press.

[57]. TRIPOD (1996). Language Education in Africa. *Fafunwa Foundation Internet Journal of Education*. Second Foundation Annual Lecture 1998. Language Education in Africa. Retrieved from http://fafunwafoundation.tripod.com/fafunwafoundation/id7.html.

[58]. UNESCO (2013b). *Teaching and Learning for Development*. Concept note for EFA Global Monitoring Report 2013. Paris: UNESCO from http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/ED/pdf/gmr2013-thematic-notesv2.pdf accessed 18February 2020.

[59]. UNESCO. (2015b). *2013 Asia – Pacific Educational Research Institutes Network (ERI-Net) regional study on transversal competencies in education policy and practice (phase111): Preparing and supporting teachers in the Asia-Pacific to meet the challenges of twenty-first century learning.* Bangkok: UNESCO.

[60]. UNICEF (2012). *Child Protection and Welfare Act*. UNICEF Unite for Children. Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs. Mbabane. Kingdom of Eswatini.

[61]. UNESCO (2018). *Preparing Teachers for Global Citizenship*: A Template, UNESCO Bangkok.

[62]. Weinstein, B. (1980). *Language Planning in Francophone Africa in Language Problems and Language Planning*, 4 (1), 55 – 77.

[63]. Williams, M. (2013, May 14). How do students best pick up languages? In Teacher Network &The Guardian. What's the best way to teach languages? Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/teacher-network/teacher-blog/2013/may/14/best-way-teach-language-schools.

[64]. Yap, K. O. (1993). "Integrating assessment with instruction in ABE/ESL programs". Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (ED 359 210). Atlanta, GA, April 12-16. From https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED359210.