Revisiting the Use of English as the Language of Instruction in Tanzanian Secondary Schools

Cyprian T.K. Kilangi[*] (iD)
University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
cypriankilangi@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: *There are various challenges facing the use of English as the language of instruction policy in Tanzania secondary schools. These include low levels of English among teachers, a lack of qualified teachers, and a lack of guidelines about how to teach in English. The challenges negatively affect the learning of content subjects as well as the learning of the English language itself. This article examines English as the language of instruction policy in secondary schools by reviewing theoretical bases for adopting an additional language as a language of instruction and education approaches in which subject contents are taught using English as the medium of instruction. The paper discusses the weaknesses of the current practice and recommends refocusing English as the language of instruction policy by highlighting its implicit goal of improving language skills through the integrated content and language learning approach.*

KEYWORDS: Language of Instruction, English as Medium of Instruction, Content and Language Integrated Learning, Tanzania Language Policy

_____
* Corresponding author: **Cyprian T.K. Kilangi,** cypriankilangi@gmail.com

1. Introduction

One of the reasons English is used as the language of instruction (hereafter LoI) in Tanzania's secondary school education level is to aid students in mastering it. However, it is widely acknowledged that this target has not been achieved. The level of English proficiency among secondary school graduates is a reliable indicator of this observation. Despite low English proficiency among graduates, there has been little effort to raise the standards of English language education. One of the reasons for this is the debate concerning the choice of language of instruction, which has, to a large extent, drawn researchers' attention away from English pedagogy. The debate has generated an ongoing discussion in Tanzania that has been going on for several decades. This discussion revolves around which language between English and Kiswahili should be used as the language of instruction in Tanzania. The arguments in favour of English are based on the position and roles that English plays in the globalised world. Scholars who argue in favour of English see that learning through this language will help learners master it hence unlocking further learning and employment opportunities (Kapoli, 1998; Kadeghe, 2003; Mapunda, 2022). Supporters of Kiswahili argue that Kiswahili ought to be LoI because it is widely understood by students and teachers. As such, its use will facilitate learning and make education more inclusive, useful, and relevant (Ngonyani, 1997; Qorro, 1999, 2008, 2013; Puja, 2003; Vuzo, 2008; Kimizi, 2008). The Kiswahili side of the debate is further reinforced by numerous studies that have shown the negative effects of the English LoI policy in Tanzanian secondary schools on access to education (Mlama and Materu, 1978; Mvungi, 1982; Roy-Camble and Qorro, 1987; Galabawa and Lwaitama, 2005; Vuzo, 2008). These studies also indicated that English LoI has failed to bring improved English fluency among students. Thus, they call for a change of language of instruction from English to Kiswahili.

It is not clear if there will be a switch from English to Kiswahili as the language of instruction in secondary schools. In 1999, the government, through the education policy, reaffirmed the position of English as the language of instruction stating it will continue to reinforce the use of the English LoI at all levels of education. This suggests that there is a low chance of a change in the LoI in the near future. Thus, there is a need to re-examine the English LoI policy in Tanzania secondary schools to improve both the learning of content subjects and the English language. Therefore, this paper reviews English Medium Instruction (EMI) and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), two language learning contexts where subjects are taught through the medium of an additional language. The paper examines the objectives and designs of these approaches and argues that in order to improve the learning of both content and language, the use of English LoI needs to be reframed to CLIL from the current practice which is more EMI-like. In the subsequent sections, the paper discusses the theoretical underpinning of the use of an additional language as LoI. It then discusses English LoI policies in developing countries with a focus on Tanzania. Finally, it discusses the challenges facing English LoI in Tanzania and provides ways to remedy these challenges.

2. The Theoretical Basis for Using Additional Language LoI

The use of English LoI is becoming an increasingly common characteristic of the education system in many countries (Dearden, 2014; Graham et al., 2018). The reason often given to justify its use as LoI has been to create an environment conducive to learning it. Rwanda, for example, switched its language of instruction from Kinyarwanda and French to English to enable students to master English, the language of business and progress that would help Rwanda join the global economy (Nakafeero, 2015). English LoI is seen to be creating a suitable environment for its acquisition by increasing the language input and practice for the learners. This understanding appears to be grounded in the Natural Approach to language learning (Krashen & Terrell, 1983). Krashen and Terrell argue that the ability to communicate in another language is acquired through communicative practice in real-world situations by using language for specific functions. This claim is extensively elaborated in the Monitor Model (Krashen, 1982). According to this model, the subconscious acquisition of language is responsible for the ability to understand and speak a second language easily and precisely. Krashen and Terrell (1983) argue that language is best taught when it is used

to transmit messages, not when it is explicitly taught for conscious learning. Based on the success of Canada's immersion program, these authors recommend content-based activities as an effective way to provide students with comprehensible input (input that is slightly more above learners' current language proficiency level, known as $I + 1$) which they claim is the only thing learners need to acquire the target language.

Despite its intuitive appeal, Krashen's monitor model has been heavily criticised. Mclaughlin (1987) for instance, pointed out that the term comprehensible input ($i + 1$) is not precisely defined, and thus can be interpreted differently. It is difficult to determine learners' current levels (i). Moreover, the formula may have different meanings because of learners' differences which makes it difficult to apply in classroom teaching. Scholars have also questioned the conceptual demarcation between acquisition and learned knowledge into a separate system embodied in the Monitor model. DeKeyser (1998) for example, argues that learned knowledge can be converted to acquired knowledge through communicative practices.

There has been some theoretical advancement in the way language is acquired in naturalistic environments. Schmidt, for instance, raised concerns about the overwhelming emphasis on unconscious language learning processes. Schmidt (2010) contends that language acquisition is primarily influenced by conscious attention, whether intentional or not. In his noticing hypothesis, Schmidt argues that language input does not become intake for language learning unless it is consciously registered (Schmidt, 2010). From another perspective, Long shifted attention from the comprehensible input toward the role interaction between language learners and target language users. In his Interaction hypothesis, Long (1996) argues that environmental contributions to the acquisition are mediated by selective attention and the learner's developing L2 processing capacity. Furthermore, he asserts that these resources are most useful, although not exclusive, during the negotiation of meaning. According to Long, negative feedback obtained during negotiation work or elsewhere may facilitate L2 development, at least for vocabulary, morphology, and language-specific syntax, and essential for learning certain specifiable L1-L2 contrasts.

Unlike the Natural Approach, these later perspectives emphasise the manipulation and modification of language input as important requirements for implicit language learning conditions. This suggests that focusing on language form maximises implicit language learning. However, in most developing countries like Tanzania, the use of additional/foreign language LoI seems to be still based on SLA theories that emphasise the unconscious nature of implicit language acquisition like the Monitor Model and its emphasis on the mere exposure to language input. As a result, apart from exposure to raw language input in the classroom through LoI, no other deliberate measures are taken to ensure that this raw language input is manipulated to facilitate its intake.

3. Comparing EMI and CLIL

Both EMI and CLIL are forms of Content-Based Instruction (CBI), an umbrella term that describes education contexts where students are taught content subjects through a language they are still learning (Lightbown, 2014). Dearden defines EMI as the use of the English language to teach academic subjects in countries or jurisdictions where the first language (L1) of the majority of the population is not English. According to Dearden and Macaro (2016), EMI does not make direct reference to the aim of improving language proficiency. Its focus is on the mastery of academic subjects and often lacks explicit language learning objectives (Brown and Bradford, 2016). The language is not explicitly taught and serves only as a tool for communication in the classroom. Teachers in EMI settings do not typically consider themselves language instructors as it is assumed that both teachers and students have sufficient English proficiency to be able to carry classroom interaction in English. In this aspect, EMI differs from CLIL which is a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used to learn and to teach both content and the language (Coyle, Hood & Marshal, 2010).

The major similarity between EMI and CLIL is that both are education approaches where an addition is used as the medium of instruction. However, in EMI, the teaching is specified to be in English while in

CLIL the teaching may be through any additional language. The main difference between these approaches as mentioned above is their purpose. CLIL is a dual-focused approach in which the objectives of teaching subject contents and language are explicitly stated whereas in EMI, there are no language objectives stated. The aim is to provide knowledge of subject content using English as LoI with expectations that language will be acquired implicitly. From a theoretical perspective, EMI can be seen to be informed by Krashen and Terrell's (1983) Natural Approach to language learning, which emphasises implicit language acquisition resulting from accessing comprehensible input. In the classroom context, comprehensible input is derived from subject content reading materials and teachers. Unlike EMI, CLIL is based on approaches that acknowledge the importance of both implicit and explicit language learning (Long, 1996; Schmidt, 2001; Swain, 1995, 1985).

The difference in objectives between EMI and CLIL is reflected in their curriculum design, teaching and learning methods, and assessment. Unlike EMI which does not require a specially designed curriculum, CLIL uses a coordinated curriculum with both language and subject content areas. For language, lessons are designed to engage students in all four language skills: reading, writing, listening, and speaking (Coyle et al., 2010; Mehisto et al., 2008). Content in CLIL is not a topic of general interest but rather academic subjects which are the focus of the education program. The integration of content and language is achieved through attention to four key elements of CLIL teaching, known as the four Cs of CLIL: content, communication, cognition, and culture. The table below, adapted from "CLIL activities: A resource for subject and language teachers" by L. Dale and R. Tanner (2012), summarises the main differences between CLIL and EMI

	CLIL	EMI
What is aimed?	To teach content and language	To teach content
What is the assumption?	The learning of content depends on language and the learning of language depends on content	Content is learned without explicit attention to language.
How is the curriculum designed?	Integrated curriculum with subject matter and subject language	Subject matter curriculum
Who teaches	Language teacher and subject teacher or a teacher trained in both subject matter and language.	Subject teacher
What kind of language is focused	General language, and language of the subject	Little or no attention is paid to language per se as teaching is done in another language
What is assessed	Assess and mark content and language	Asses and mark content

Table 1. Differences between CLIL and EMI

4. English LoI Policy in Tanzanian Secondary Schools

The English LoI policy in secondary schools in Tanzania is controversial due to the lack of interplay between its goals and implementations. The policy, from a political rhetoric view, is seen as a form of acquisition planning aimed at improving learners' proficiency by increasing exposure to the language and practice. Mwalimu Julius Nyerere, the first president of Tanzania, against the recommendation of the 1980 presidential commission, remarked that if English was not used as the medium of instruction, it might die

in Tanzania (Ngonyani, 1997). In its draft report, the commission had recommended the change of LoI from English to Kiswahili by January 1985 in secondary schools and 1992 in Universities (Ripoti/Mapendekezo ya Tume ya Rais, 1982 as cited in Qorro). In line with Nyerere's remarks, Prof. Joyce Ndalichako, Tanzania's minister for education in 2019, while responding to the question in the parliament, which asked when the government would start using Kiswahili as the language of instruction in primary and secondary education to improve students' understanding of the subjects, stated that:

> …serikali bado itaendelea kutumia lugha ya kiingereza katika kufudishia na kujifunzia katika ngazi ya elimu ya sekondari, vyou vya kati na vyuo vikuu na hii ni kutokana na umuhimu wa lugha hiyo katika masuala ya kitaifa, kikanda na kimataifa kwa ajili ya mawasiliano na biashara ili kuwajengea wanafunzi ufahamu na umahiri wa lugha hiyo (Hansard, June 12, 2019).

> …the government will continue to use English as the language of instruction in secondary schools, colleges and universities to help students develop proficiency in this language; and this is due to the importance of this language for communication and business in national, regional and international affairs (author's translation).

However, despite the statements of government officials which suggest that one of the reasons English is used as LoI is to improve student's language proficiency, there have never been any solid plans to match this aspiration. Secondary education in Tanzania, among other things, aims to promote the development of linguistic skills and the effective use of communication skills in Kiswahili and English. However, it is not clear how English LoI will facilitate the attainment of these goals. There are no language objectives planned in content subjects. The emphasis is on mastery of subject content with the assumption that language proficiency will develop naturally as the student is exposed to English language input. The lack of language learning objectives and seeming emphasis on mastery of subject content has contributed to sustaining code-switching practice in the classroom as a coping mechanism to overcome challenges brought by teaching and learning through English (Mwinsheikhe, 2008). One negative effect of this practice can be reflected in students' poor performance in examinations since they are taught and learn in Kiswahili but examined in English. It also deprived students of the English language input they would receive from the teacher.

5. Challenges Facing English LoI Policy Implementation in Tanzania

The challenges facing the English LoI policy in Tanzanian secondary education can be attributed to low English proficiency among teachers, lack of qualified teachers to teach using English, and lack of clear guidelines on how to teach and learn through English.

5.1 Low English Proficiency Level

The problem of low levels of English among teachers and students is well documented in research on the language of instruction in Tanzania (Qorro, 2013; Mwinsheikhe, 2008; Rubagumya, 2008). Qorro (2013) reviewed 18 studies on the language of instruction in Tanzania published since the 1970s. This review reveals that the English language proficiency of teachers and students is extremely low and therefore, she argues, forcing these teachers with low language proficiency to teach using English will result in students ending up picking incorrect English from their teachers. Teachers' low English proficiency level negatively affects the acquisition of English in various ways. First, it limits the amount of language input learners receive in the classroom for teachers and students tend to switch to Kiswahili as a coping mechanism for overcoming the language barrier due to proficiency deficiency in English (Mwinsheikhe, 2008). Switching from English to Kiswahili is very common in many secondary schools in Tanzania to the extent that Kiswahili has become the de facto LoI in the majority of secondary schools. Although switching to Kiswahili offers a practical solution for communication problems in a classroom, it restricts English acquisition in the classroom since it deprives or limits the amount of English language input learners would receive and opportunities for language practice.

Low English proficiency levels can also have an impact on the kind of classroom talk and pattern of interaction in the classroom. As Rubagumya (2008) notes, occasionally when English is used in a classroom, it is often characterised by "safe talk." According to Rubagumya (*ibid*.), this is a kind of classroom talk that allows participation without any risk of loss of face for teacher and learners and maintains an appearance of being active in the lesson while a little learning is taking place. According to him, this particular style of interaction arises from teachers' attempts to cope with the problem of using the former colonial language LoI which is remote from learners' experience outside school. Moreover, Rubagumya further noted that most lessons where English is the language of instruction were teacher-dominated with students allowed to say something generally along the IRF (Initiation, Response, Feedback) format in which the teacher asks a question, and the answer is provided by an individual student nominated by the teacher or in chorus and then the teacher gives feedback by accepting the answer as correct or reject it as incorrect. This kind of classroom communication limits English language input and language practice and consequently implicit language acquisition and control.

5.2. Lack of Qualified Teachers

The lack of enough qualified teachers poses a big challenge to teaching through the medium of English. There are two aspects of this problem; low level of English proficiency and lack of preparation for content teachers to teach through English. An adequate level of English proficiency is crucial for successfully teaching language learners using English. In Tanzania, English is learned and taught as a foreign language. Therefore, the classroom is likely to be the major source of language input which can help students to improve their proficiency. In this context, teachers become the main source of language input to feed students' interlanguages. However, as discussed in the previous paragraph, most secondary school teachers in Tanzania do not possess adequate language proficiency, which affects the quality and quantity of language input they provide to students in the classroom.

The second aspect of teachers' qualification problem goes beyond teachers' language proficiency. It involves the lack of sound pedagogical strategies for accommodating the linguistic needs of students. Generally, secondary school teachers are drawn from universities and teacher education colleges. These universities and colleges prepare teachers to have a good command of their respective subjects and how to teach these subjects. The student-teachers are taught the subject contents and teaching methodology courses related to specific subjects they are prepared to teach in secondary schools. They are not provided with courses preparing them to teach using English. This problem was once raised in a 2019 parliamentary session by a member of parliament who wanted to know when the government will build a college to train teachers who will be teaching in English medium schools. Responding to this, Prof Ndalichako, then the minister for education science and technology, as quoted in Hansard, acknowledged the need for the government to prepare teachers who will be teaching in English medium schools and stated that the government will consider the issue to ensure that training is offered by colleges, within a short period.

> …suala lake ni la msingi kwamba serikali iandae walimu ambao watafundisha katika shule ambazo zinatumia lugha ya kiingereza, na niseme suala hili si lazima tujenge chuo, nimwambie kwamba suala hilo serikali imelipokea na tutaangalia utaratibu ambao tunaweza ndani ya muda mfupi tukaanza kuwa hata kuwa tunatoa mafunzo hayo katika vyuo ambavyo vipo hapa chini (Hansard, June 12, 2019).

> …his question is very important, that the government should prepare teachers who will be teaching in schools that use English as the language of instruction. In this regard, I should say it is not necessarily that we need to build a college, let me tell him that the government has received his concern and we will find how, within a short period of time, we can be able to provide those training even in our existing colleges (author's translation)

However, there has been no implementation that has followed this commitment. It is generally assumed a good English proficiency would enable a teacher to teach in English language learners' classrooms and be

able to handle the linguistic needs of the students. However, for effective teaching in these classrooms, knowing the methodology for teaching using English as the language of instruction is as effective for promoting language learning as is good English language proficiency. Language learning opportunities are created and shaped by classroom communication such as questioning behaviour, exchange structure, turn-taking, negotiation, scaffolding, and language mediating language (Ellis and Shintani, 2014).

Implicit language learning in the classroom context largely depends on the teacher's classroom communication. Researchers have found that classroom interaction is an important variable affecting language acquisition and that certain features of language that teachers use (teacher-talk) when addressing L2 learners facilitate the acquisition of language. This kind of communication goes further than merely speaking a good and appropriate language to include the issue of language scaffolding. O'Neill (1994) provides the following features of effective teacher-talk: it is broken into sense groups; it is simplified but not unnatural and it is more redundant than ordinary speech; words and structures are naturally repeated or recycled at regular intervals. He further points out that effective teacher-talk is broken into segments to encourage or invite students to interrupt, comment, and ask questions; and when new vocabulary or structure is taught, typical examples are given. Linguistic accommodation of this kind is rarely offered in Tanzania secondary school classrooms despite the low proficiency level of most students. The common type of accommodation offered is code-switching aimed to ensure the subject content is understood.

5.3. Lack of Guidelines on how to Teach Through English

Good instructional planning is required when classroom learning is carried out using a language in which learners have limited skills and are still learning. Nevertheless, there are no clear guidelines about how to teach using English in Tanzania secondary schools despite the overwhelming evidence indicating that the majority of students in these schools have inadequate English language proficiency. Despite the desire to use English LoI to improve students' proficiency, there are no official guidelines on how to teach through English to achieve this goal. There are no language objectives planned to go with content subject objectives in the lesson. The taking care of language seems to be left to the individual teacher to decide; but since most of these teachers are not language specialists, they may feel that they are not responsible for developing English language competence in the students.

Parallel to the lack of language objectives, there is no English language competence requirement for teachers. The absence of this requirement has led to teachers with inadequate English language proficiency in the schools. Effective teaching in English requires that teachers have a relatively high level of competence in English. As Kampitanffy (n.d) reports, teaching a subject in a language that is not the mother tongue of the students is not the same as teaching in a mother tongue or a familiar language of the students. In cases where a foreign language is used, the teacher assumes dual functions. The teacher becomes both a subject content teacher and a language teacher. As discussed previously, the majority of secondary school teachers in Tanzania do not possess adequate English proficiency to effectively teach using English and this problem has persisted over the years (Qorro, 2013). This has a negative consequence on both English language learning and subject content learning. In a context like Tanzania where the use of English outside the classroom is limited, the teacher is seen as a trustworthy source of language input. Therefore, learners taught by teachers lacking a good command of the language, as predicted by Mlama and Matteru (1977) are likely to end up picking incorrect English.

6. Redressing the Challenges

The disconnect between the objective of using LoI English in secondary education and its practical implementation is obvious. This contributed to the apparent failure of the policy. Thus, there is a need to adopt an appropriate approach that will bridge the gap between the goals and methodology to ensure the use of English LoI brings about improvement in students' linguistic development and does not limit access to the content subject knowledge. This article suggests that CLIL (Content and Language Integrated

Learning) should be adopted in Tanzanian secondary schools. This should be made clear at the level of education and policy planning, as it has implications for other factors that influence the success of the teaching and learning process. It also proposes the creation of mechanisms for systematically preparing content subject teachers to teach through English.

6.1 Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)

Dalton-Puffer, Nikula and Smit (2014) provide the following features that distinguish CLIL from other similar approaches like immersion education. (1) A language used in CLIL education is in general a foreign language and not a second language. This means that the language of instruction is the one that students will encounter in school because it is not regularly used in the society in which they live. (2) The teachers in CLIL are normally not native speakers of the target language nor are they, in most cases, foreign language experts but content experts. (3) The classroom content is not taken from everyday life or general content of the target language culture but from content subjects such as geography, biology, and history. This means that CLIL lessons at school are usually scheduled as content lessons such as geography history or biology while the target language continues as a subject in its own right, taught by a language specialist. With these features, CLIL fits well within the Tanzanian educational context, so its adoption can help improve the acquisition of English and the learning of content subjects.

Since CLIL is a dual-focused educational approach, fusing subject contents and language learning, it should involve both content and language aims. Research suggests that having clear language objectives and explicit language components in the lessons helps learners develop their language skills (Arias, 2021; Genesee and Hamayan, 2016). The instruction should be structured in a way that, as the teacher and students use the language in the teaching-learning process, learners are focused on some language features that need to be learned in the input. This can be achieved through counterbalanced instruction. This approach systematically integrates content-based and language form-focused instruction by orienting learners in the opposite direction to that which their classroom environment has accustomed them to (Lyster, 2007). Counterbalanced instruction accounts for the dynamic interplay between form-oriented and meaning-oriented approaches in classroom learning. Thus, in the case of Tanzanian secondary education settings where the focus is on the learning of subject content, counterbalanced instruction would shift students' attention to the English language. For instance, in the learning of history where the focus is on the ability of students to recount historical events, explain the cause and effect of the events, and provide interpretation of these events, language aim can be to develop reading and writing skills as well as linguistic resources necessary to respond to the characteristics of the historical genre (Del Pozo and Llinares, 2021). The shift of focus and the setting of language aims in the lesson are intended to increase the salience of the language features and consequently improve implicit language acquisition.

6.2. Teachers and Teachers' Preparation

Structured preparation and professional development of teachers are important for teaching in English. In this context, the teacher is expected to perform a dual function in the classroom, teaching the subject content and language. It is therefore important that they are prepared to handle both tasks. Discussing the need for teachers' preparation to teach in a language learners' classroom, Dellicarpini and Alonso (2015) give the following remarks about a middle school mathematics teacher in New York City teaching in an English language learner student classroom (ELLs):

> Ms. J delivered a sufficient content lesson but made no accommodations for the linguistic challenges that the students in her classroom faced. No language scaffolds, no consideration of polysemous vocabulary, no breaking down of the complex syntactic structures contained in the word problems, and in fact, no consideration at all of the language challenges of these students (Dellicarpin and Alonso, 2015).

Dellicarpin and Alonso argue that although the teacher was teaching the appropriate content, little was being understood by the students. This is because the teacher made absolutely no accommodations for the linguistic challenges that the students in her classroom were facing.

This highlights the importance of preparing teachers working in an educational context that use additional language as a language of instruction to work with language-learner students. Prospective teachers should be provided with coursework on second language learning and language teaching methodology. The current teacher education programs in most universities and colleges in Tanzania do not offer these courses to students prepared to teach non-language subjects. It is therefore recommended that colleges and universities should start offering these courses to equip non-language subject teachers to teach effectively through English by performing both language and content teaching effectively. The courses should focus on the aspects of language-related skills that determine a language teacher's ability to teach language effectively as suggested by Elder (1994). These include the following: the ability to use English as both the medium and target of instruction; the ability to modify the English language input to render it comprehensible to learners; and the ability to draw learners' attention to formal features of the language. It is also recommended that in-service teachers should also be provided with regular professional development courses through workshops and conferences.

6.3. Teachers' English Language Competence Requirement

Along with measures discussed previously, there is a need to establish English language proficiency requirements for teachers to be able to teach using English. Currently, there is no English language proficiency requirement for teachers in Tanzania. Consequently, teachers with very limited English language proficiency have found a way into teaching. This has adverse effects on the teaching-learning process of both subject contents and language. As Cullen (2002) argues, teachers with a poor command of English have difficulty with essential classroom procedures such as giving instructions, asking questions, giving explanations and replying to students' questions. They also lack authority and self-confidence which affects their performance (Cullen, 2001). Language proficiency is also viewed as the basis for a teacher's ability to engage in improvisational teaching. The fluent teacher can adjust his/her speech to an appropriate level of difficulty and solve unpredictable communication problems from moment to moment or scaffold the learners in the target language (Mitchell, 1988 as cited in Richards, 2017).

7. Conclusion

The purpose of this article was to re-examine the use of English language learning in secondary schools in Tanzania. The paper examined EMI and CLIL, two approaches that employ an additional language as the language of instruction to aid in understanding English LoI policy in Tanzania. It has pointed out the challenges facing the implementation of this policy in secondary schools in Tanzania and argues that one of the reasons for these challenges is because the objective of the policy to develop students' English language is not explicitly stated. The paper recommends refocusing the current approach which is more EMI-like, to CLIL as a way of bringing out the language learning goals of the policy; systematic preparation of prospective subject content teachers to teach through the medium of English; and establishment of the language competence requirement for teachers.

References

- Arias, A. (2021). EFL teachers' challenges to write content and language objectives for CBI lesson plans at a Mexican University. *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning,* 13(2), 215–240.
- Brown, H., & Bradford, A. (2017). EMI, CLIL, & CBI: Differing approaches and goals. In P. Clements, A. Krause, & H. Brown (Eds.). *Transformation in language education*. Tokyo: JALT.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Cullen, R. (2001). The use of lesson transcripts for developing teachers' classroom language. *The system*, 29(1), 27–43.
- Dale, L. & Tanner, R. (2012). *CLIL activities: A resource for subject and language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dalton-Puffer, C., Nikula, T., & Smit, U. (2010). *Language use and language learning in CLIL classrooms* (Vol. 7). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Dearden, J. (2015). English as a medium of instruction —a growing global phenomenon. London: British Council. Retrieved from https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/e484_emi_cover_option_3_final_web.pdf.
- Dearden, J., & Macaro, E. (2016). Higher education teachers' attitudes towards English medium instruction: A three-country comparison. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 6, 455-486. https://doi.org/10.14746/sllt.2016.6.3.5
- DeKeyser, R. (1998). Beyond focus on form: Cognitive perspectives on learning and practicing second language grammar. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.). *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 42 – 63.
- Del Pozo, E. & Llinares, A. (2021). Assessing students' learning of history content in spanish CLIL programmes: A content and language integrated perspective. In C. Hemmi & D.L. Banegas (Eds.). *International perspectives on English language teaching*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 43 – 61.
- DelliCarpini, M. & Alonso, O.B. (2015). Teaching everything to no one and nothing to everyone: Addressing the content and content based instruction. In T.S.C. Farrell (Ed.). *International Perspectives on English Language Teacher Education*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 51 – 73.
- Elder, C. (1994). Performance testing as benchmark for foreign language teacher education. *Babel: Journal of the Australian Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations,* 29(2): 9–19.
- Galabawa, J. C, & Lwaitama, A. F. (2005). A quasi-experimental study: A comparative analysis of Kiswahili and English as languages of instruction at secondary level in selected Tanzania schools. In B. Brock-Utne, Z. Desai, & M. Qorro (Eds.). *LOITASA research in progress* (pp. 139-159). Dar es Salaam: KAD Associates, 139 – 159.
- Genesee, F., & Hamayan, E. (2016). *CLIL in context: Practical guidance for educators*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Graham, K.M., Choi, Y., Davoodi, A., Razmeh, S. & Dixon, L. Q. (2018). Language and content outcomes of CLIL and EMI: A systematic review. *LACLIL*, 11(1), 19-37.
- Hansard. (2019). Maswali na Majibu [Kikao cha Kumi na Tano]. https://www.parliament.go.tz/polis/uploads/documents/1566195000-12%20JUNI,%202019.pdf
- Kimizi, M. (2008). Why has the language of instruction policy in Tanzania been so ambivalent over the last forty years. In M. Qorro, Z. Desai, & B. Brock-Utne (Eds.). *LOITASA: Reflecting on phase I and entering phase II*. Dar es Salaam: E & D Limited, 160 – 189.
- Kadeghe, M. (2003). In defense of continued use of English as the language of instruction in secondary and tertiary education in Tanzania. In B. Brock-Utne, Z. Desai, & M. Qorro (Eds.).
- *Language of instruction in Tanzania and South Africa (LOITASA)*. Dar es Salaam, 170 – 186.

- Kapitanffy, J. (n.d). A Foreign language as a medium of instruction in a secondary school in Hungary.
- Kapoli, Irenius J. (1998). "Teacher control and language input in ESL writing: an exploration of classroom discourse and writing in secondary schools", *Journal of Linguistics and Language in Education* (4): 53-74.
- Krashen, Stephen D. 1982. *Principles and practices in second language acquisition*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, Stephen D. and Tracy Terrell. 1983. *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom.* San Francisco: Alemany Press.
- Lightbown, P.M. (2014). *Focus on content-based language teaching. Oxford*. U.K: Oxford
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.). *Handbook of language acquisition* (Vol. 2). New York: Academic, 413 – 468.
- Lyster, R. (2007). *Learning and teaching languages through content: A counterbalanced approach*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Mapunda, G. (2022). Revisiting the English-Swahili debate on Tanzania's medium of instruction policy at secondary and post-secondary Levels of Education. *Journal of African Languages and Literatures*, (3): 1-21.
- Mehisto, P., Marsh, D. & Frgos, M.J. (2008). *Uncovering CLIL: Content and language integrated learning in bilingual and multilingual education*. Oxford: Macmillan Education
- Mlama, P., & Matteru, M. (1977). *Haja ya kutumia Kiswahili kufundishia elimu ya juu [The need to use Kiswahili as a medium of instruction in higher education]. A Research Report Commissioned by BAKITA*. Dar es Salaam: Bakita.
- MoEVT (Ministry of Education and Vocational Training). (2009). Sera ya elimu na mafunzo 2009, Rasimu ya I. Toleo Jipya, [The Education and Training Policy, Draft I. A New Issue]. June 2009.
- Mvungi, M. (1982). *The relationship between performance in the instructional medium and some secondary school subjects in Tanzania*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Dar es Salaam.
- Mwinsheikhe, H. (2008). Overcoming the language barrier. An an-depth study of the strategies used by Tanzanian secondary school science teachers and students in coping with the English-Kiswahili dilemma. In M. Qorro, Z. Desai, & B. Brock-Utne (Eds.), *LOITASA: Reflecting on phase I and entering phase II*. Dar es Salaam: E & D Limited, 123 – 142.
- Nakafeero, O. (2015). *Using English language as medium of instruction in selected schools in Kicukiro district–Rwanda: Challenges, implications, and prospects*. (Master's thesis, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda). Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/10570/5563
- Ngonyani, D. (1997). The failure of language policy in Tanzanian schools. *Social Education*, *61*(7), 412–418.
- O'Neill, R. (1991). The plausible myth of learner-centredness: Or the importance of doing ordinary things Well. *ELT Journal*, 45(4), 293-304
- Puja, G. K. (2003). Kiswahili and Higher Education in Tanzania: Reflections based on a sociological study from three Tanzanian university campuses. In B. Brock-Utne, Z. Desai, & M. Qorro (Eds.). *Language of instruction in Tanzania and South Africa (LOITASA)* (pp. 1 13-128). Dar es Salaam: E & D Limited, 113 – 128.
- Qorro, M. (2013). Language of Instruction in Tanzania: Why are research findings not heeded? *Int Rev Educ*, 59:29-45.
- Richards, J. C. (2017). Teaching English through English: Proficiency, pedagogy and performance. *RELC Journal*, 48(1): 7–30.
- Roy-Campbell, Z. M. & Qorro, M. (1987). A Survey of the reading competence in English among secondary school students in Tanzania. A Research Report Fund.

- Rubagumya, C.M. (2008). Going through the motion of learning: Classroom interaction in Tanzania. In M. Qorro, Z. Desai, & B. Brock-Utne (Eds.). *LOITASA: Reflecting on phase I and entering phase II*. Dar es Salaam: E & D Limited, 143 – 159.
- Shintani, N., & Ellis, R. (2014). Tracking 'learning behaviours' in the incidental acquisition of two dimensional adjectives by Japanese beginner learners of L2 English. *Language Teaching Research*, *18*(4): 521–542.
- Vuzo, M. (2007). Revisiting the language of instruction policy in Tanzania: A Comparative study of geography classes taught in Kiswahili and English. In M. Qorro, Z. Desai, & B. Brock-Utne (Eds.). *LOITASA: Reflecting on phase I and entering phase II*. Dar es Salaam: E & D Limited, 102–121.

Author's biography

Dr. Cyprian T.K. Kilangi is a Lecturer in the Department of Foreign Languages and Linguistics, at the University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. His fields of interest include language policy and planning, language learning, linguistic politeness and sociolinguistics. Dr Kilangi has previously worked and published on second language learning and heritage language transmission. He received his PhD from the University of Dar es Salaam in 2020, where he worked on a thesis titled Language Learning Strategies Use and Vocabulary Knowledge among Tanzanian Learners of Chinese as a Foreign Language.