

Pre-service teachers' perceptions and practices: integrating digital literacy in English education

Eduard Campbell, CMPEDU001

A dissertation for the fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree of Master of
Education

Faculty of Humanities

University of Cape Town

2016

The financial assistance of the National Research Foundation (NRF) towards this research is hereby acknowledged. Opinions expressed and conclusions arrived at, are those of the author and are not necessarily to be attributed to the NRF.

COMPULSORY DECLARATION

This work has not been previously submitted in whole, or in part, for the award of any degree. It is my own work. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in, this dissertation from the work, or works of other people has been attributed, and has been cited and referenced.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	1
ABSTRACT	4
ANONYMITY IN THIS STUDY	6
ABBREVIATIONS	6
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	7
CHAPTER 1: Introduction	8
1. Context and rationale	8
2. Research Questions	10
3. Theoretical framework: the New Literacy Studies	10
4. Methodology	11
5. Description of chapters.....	12
6. Conclusion.....	12
CHAPTER 2: Literature Review	13
1. Introduction	13
2. The Digital Divide.....	13
3. Teacher Education.....	15
3.1 Digital Literacy in Education	16
3.2 Digital Literacy in the high school English classroom.....	18
3.3 A rationale for focusing on perceptions and practices	21
4. Literacy Studies.....	23
4.1 The shifting view of literacy.....	23
4.2 Literacy in Education.....	24
5. The New Literacy Studies	25
5.1 Discourse	27
5.2 The situated self as an approach to identity.....	28
5.3 Designated and Actual Identities.....	28

5.4 Social Practice	29
5.5 Digital Literacy.....	30
5.6 Academic Literacy.....	31
5.7 Multiple literacies and Multimodal Literacies.....	32
5.8 Digital Literacy Practices	32
6. Conclusion.....	32
CHAPTER 3: Methodology.....	34
1. Qualitative research approach	34
2. Case study as research strategy	35
3. Participants.....	36
4. Data Collection.....	38
5. Data Analysis	42
6. Validity.....	45
6.1 Reactivity.....	46
6.2 Bias	47
7. Shortcomings.....	47
8. Ethics.....	49
9. Conclusion.....	50
CHAPTER 4: Data Analysis.....	51
1. Introduction	51
2. Perceptions of DL practices and Actual DL Practices	51
2.1 The participants' DL practices	52
2.2 Perceptions of other teachers' DL practices	60
2.3 The Learners' DL practices	67
3. Alignment with the eight elements of DL.....	77
4. Summary of data analysis	83
CHAPTER 5: Discussion.....	86

1. Introduction	86
2. Authentic Learning and the ill-defined task	86
3. Integrating Digital Literacy into teacher education.....	89
3.1 Their own DL practices: overcoming the sense of being overwhelmed	89
3.2 Their own DL practices: Modelling, play and simulation.....	92
3.3 The Learners' DL practices	95
3.4 Assessing perceptions at regular intervals.....	98
4. The final ill-defined task	99
5. Conclusion	100
CHAPTER 6: Summary and recommendations	101
REFERENCES	104
APPENDICES	109
Appendix A: The Questionnaire	109
Appendix B: Reflection Prompt Questions (sent as e-mail)	110
Appendix C: Focused Group Interview Questions	111
Appendix D: Case Study Database	112
1. Participants' questionnaires	112
2. Participants' reflections	118
3. Participants' completed tasks	129
4. Focused group interview transcription	149
Appendix E: First e-mail to participants	179
Appendix F: Informed consent forms	180
Appendix G: Table index	182

ABSTRACT

Teachers are increasingly expected to use digital resources to facilitate learning. Recent research in Higher Education has indicated the existence of a digital divide among students. With the changing role of the English teacher as a facilitator of critical skills and the traditional centrality of literacy to the English classroom, digital literacy has an integral place in English teacher education, despite its absence from the current South African English curriculum. However, integrating digital literacy is challenging and often resisted by teachers. This qualitative case study provides a detailed description and analysis of how pre-service English teachers perceived their own, their learners' and other teachers' digital literacy practices, and how these perceptions relate to their own practices.

The study is informed by post-structuralist theory, drawing on the New Literacy Studies (NLS), which views literacy as embedded in social practice, imbued with power and highly dependent on context. It is believed that gaining a deeper understanding of perceived and actual digital literacy practices within specific contexts could lead to an in-depth knowledge of how digital literacy may be integrated in teacher education.

The case comprises four English Method students at a relatively elite South African university who were enrolled for the Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) professional qualification. The participants viewed their own proficiency in digital literacy as limited. The data were gathered from four sources: the participants' detailed lesson plans where digital literacy has been integrated; their reflections upon these lesson plans; questionnaires providing background on their biographies and experiences with technology and a focused group interview.

The study found that the participants associated some digital resources with their own and their learners' private lives and therefore did not recognize the value of these resources as educational tools. In addition, the participants experienced the internet as overwhelming and conflated digital literacy with 'Internet Literacy'. They did not find good examples of practice from other teachers at the schools where they undertook their teaching practicals. The way they perceived their learners' practices could have serious consequences for how they facilitate learning and negotiate power differentials in the classroom.

Drawing on these findings, the thesis ends with a framework for the integration of digital literacy into teacher education. The framework draws on insights from Authentic Learning,

New Literacy Studies and constructivist notions of learning to propose a carefully-scaffolded model which starts with students' own internet practices and provides models and authentic tasks in order to show them the affordances of digital literacy for promoting learning in the English classroom.

ANONYMITY IN THIS STUDY

All the students who participated in this research have done so on condition of anonymity. The names and locations have been altered to pseudonyms to protect their privacy.

ABBREVIATIONS

AL – Academic Literacies

CAPS – Curriculum Assessment Policy Statements

ICT – Information and Communication Technologies

DL – Digital Literacy

HE – Higher Education

NLS – New Literacy Studies

PGCE – Postgraduate Certificate in Education

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor, Associate Professor Kapp, for successfully inducting me into the practices of a discipline that was completely unfamiliar to me in 2014. Not only has the movement between universities been quite hard, but the migration from more traditional humanities (Music and English Studies) to social sciences has also proved to be exceptionally challenging. Associate Professor Kapp was patient and helpful through all the misconceptions and the exhausting amount of “new ideas” – I truly appreciate it.

This study has been funded by the National Research Fund (NRF). I am grateful for their faith in this research and their timeous and professional conduct.

Although it is not customary to thank the proofreader, I would like to thank Mrs Butler for her outstanding feedback – she provided more than a proofreading service; she educated me. I would also like to thank Dr Cheryl Brown for her insightful input.

Personally it has been a tumultuous two years in my life. That is not even close to an overstatement; when I look at these pages I sometimes wonder who wrote them and when. The contributions from the man I married somewhere between 2014 and now have been priceless, despite these insights sometimes leading to healthy domestic academic warfare. His guidance through good and bad days is what kept me going.

My own family does not know what I do. I think they often wonder why I do not have a “regular” job. Despite all of this they still patiently listen when I vigorously explain, badly yet *at length*, fascinating, “every day” concepts, ranging from Secondary Discourses to Designated Identities. I would like to express my gratitude for their unfaltering support and my sincere apologies for the thousand times I got carried away.

Additionally I would like to thank Rochelle for introducing me to the wonderful world of literacies (who knew?), and for playing mother through quite a few difficult shifts and changes in my personal life. Lastly, to my brand new parents-in-law, both brilliant academics: thanks for all your wine and wisdom... hopefully I'll be able to spend more time with you soon.

CHAPTER 1: Introduction

1. Context and rationale

Research in Higher Education has recently investigated the digital proficiency of students. It has been found that stark differences in digital proficiency exist among the students ranging from the highly proficient, who are often referred to as digital natives (Prensky, 2001), and those who struggle with the use of digital resources, referred to as digital strangers (Czerniewicz & Brown, 2013). Thinyane (2010:1) argues that digital proficiency in South Africa is “heterogeneous”, with varying levels of proficiency and that many students appear not to use a wide array of digital resources, or are not interested in using it in their studies. There is thus a digital divide within the classroom.

Both sides of the digital divide have negative consequences for student learning. On the one side, the digital native’s reliance on technology could “disrupt conventional academic literacy practices” (Lea & Jones, 2011:377), whereas the digital stranger’s ineffective practices with technology could cause them to miss out on technology’s “great promise for supporting continual improvements in academia” (Ranjan, 2008:442). It has thus become important to integrate digital literacy into the classrooms of Higher Education, for it could remedy the problems experienced on both sides of the proficiency spectrum, but the digital divide itself makes this a daunting task. Focusing on the one side of the spectrum is therefore a good start in the process of understanding the divide. First gaining an in-depth understanding of the digital stranger, for instance, could provide valuable insights into the integration of digital literacy (DL), which is defined by Martin (2008:167) as:

the awareness, attitude and ability of individuals to appropriately use digital tools and facilities to identify, access, manage, integrate, evaluate, analyse and synthesize digital resources, construct new knowledge, create media expressions, and communicate with others, in the context of specific life situations, in order to enable constructive social action; and to reflect upon this process.

The problem of the digital divide can be seen in many academic disciplines, including teacher education. The consequences of the divide in the teacher education have far-reaching implications: (1) the digital strangers in teacher education might experience problems in using technology in their teaching practice, something that is expected from teachers on a more frequent basis; and (2) they might struggle to allow or encourage their learners to engage in digital literacy practices that will benefit their learning. Teachers are thus

responsible for addressing a possible digital divide in their future classes, for digital literacy has become “an essential requirement for life in a digital age” (Bawden, 2008:630). Integrating digital literacy into teacher education has become urgent.

The changing role of the English teacher as a facilitator of critical skills and the traditional centrality of literacy to the English classroom mean that digital literacy has an integral place in English teacher education, despite its absence from the current South African English curriculum. With the heightened need for context-based professional development, focusing on one specific context in teacher education is integral to the effective integration of digital literacy and there is sufficient motivation for focusing on the English teacher education classroom.

A central premise in this study is that a focus on practice, specifically digital literacy practices, could provide greater understanding of the digital divide and the integration of digital literacy into teacher education. Furthermore, knowledge of the relationship between pre-service teachers’ perceptions of digital literacy practices (their own, other teachers’ and their learners’) and their actual digital literacy practices could create an even deeper understanding. Although there are not many qualitative, sociocultural studies in teacher education that focus on DL practices, studies that do use this approach manage to provide an in-depth view of the problem and how to address it (Prinsloo & Sasman, 2015; Ivala et al, 2013; Chigona, 2013), proving the approach to be valuable.

The purpose of this study is:

- (1) to gain a clearer understanding of the actual digital literacy practices of PGCE English Method students and the relationship between these practices and their perceptions of their own, other teachers’ and their learners’ practices;
- (2) to gain an understanding of the problem of the digital divide among these students and
- (3) to develop a framework for effective integration of Digital Literacy (DL) into teacher education, in particular English education.

The study was motivated by my experience of working within teacher education. In 2014 and 2015, I facilitated a series of Digital Literacy classes for PGCE English Method students at the University of Cape Town, which revealed how complex the issue of the digital divide

among students could be. Dealing with a classroom of 37 (2014) to 45 (2015) students, with vastly varying academic and personal backgrounds and interests, as well as varying levels of digital proficiency, made the class a challenge to teach. Engaging with diversity on so many levels complicated the matter of how to approach teaching DL. What level of digital proficiency could I presuppose? How much of the input should be focusing on teaching ‘computer and software skills’? What would the students’ attitudes be towards DL? Although I had an idea of what I wanted to do in the class, I was uncertain about how to approach the problem of negotiating the digital divide in the classroom. I therefore made the task they had to complete as broad as possible, so they could approach the problem in their own ways. Yet, even with a relatively unspecific task, the reactions from the students were still very varied, ranging from students who were excited, to students who immediately raised barriers and refused to participate. My research questions were thus informed by these experiences. I realized that in order to improve the effectiveness of future classes I must understand the digital divide better: how these students engage with digital resources, their motivations for using it for academic purposes, and how they position DL with regards to the rest of their lives.

2. Research Questions

1. How do pre-service teachers perceive their own, other teachers’ and their learners’ DL practices?
2. How do these perceptions relate to their actual DL practices?
3. What is the significance of these insights for the integration of DL into teacher education generally and particularly English teacher education?

3. Theoretical framework: the New Literacy Studies

This study is strongly informed by post-structuralist theories on literacy, which have emphasised the importance of situating literacy acquisition and learning in context and the importance of understanding what people do with literacy, i.e. literacy practices. With the focus on practice within a specific context, this study opted for the framework posited by New Literacy Studies (NLS), which redefines the way in which literacy is viewed in educational contexts. According to NLS, literacy is seen as “situated and contextually embedded sets of social practices, imbued with power” (Street, 1984:1). The need for the redefining of literacy is due to various reasons ranging from “the radical education movement, the 1970s literacy crisis in the USA, economic growth and social well-being, the

growth of sociocultural theory” and the movement from an industrial era to a “knowledge-based society” (Lankshear & Knobel, 2011:19). Reckwitz (2002:245) defines ‘literacies’ from an NLS perspective:

Literacies are socially recognized ways in which people generate, communicate, and negotiate meaning, as members of Discourses, through the medium of encoded texts.

Derived from the New Literacy Studies (NLS), this study builds its own definition of DL practices, which will be more fully explained in Chapter 2:

Digital Literacy Practices are the routinized activities associated with ‘what students do’ with the socially recognized generation, communication and negotiation of meanings through digital resources, by combining technology, knowledge and skills within the context of the PGCE English Method course for academic purposes and as pre-service English teachers in a South African high school for teaching purposes, as members of Primary and Secondary Discourses, specifically as students and pre-service teachers.

4. Methodology

This study used a qualitative approach, which can be defined as an approach that is appropriate when “researchers are interested in the quality of a particular relationships, activities and situations” and there exists a “greater emphasis on holistic description” (Wallen & Fraenkel, 2001:432). Using this approach aligns the study with NLS, because of its potential to gather information regarding social practice and develop an in-depth understanding of the situation.

This study uses a case study research method, which is applicable where “the main research questions are ‘how’ and ‘why’”, a researcher has “little control over behavioral events”, and where the focus “of the study is a contemporary...phenomenon” (Yin 2014:2). Because the aim of this study is to ascertain how a group of students in a particular context engage in digital literacy practices and how they perceive their own and others’ practices, without controlling how students interact with digital resources, the case study approach seems apt.

The participants for the study consisted of 4 PGCE English Method students who volunteered to be part of the study. All these participants perceived themselves as digital strangers.

5. Description of chapters

Chapter 2 provides the theoretical framework for the study, focusing on the concepts that are aligned with NLS. Chapter 3 describes the methodology of the study, focusing on qualitative research and case study research method. This chapter also outlines issues of validity, shortcomings, limitations and ethics. Chapter 4 answers the first two research questions by means of a discussion of the relationship between the participants' perceptions of DL practices and their actual DL practices. This chapter also compares these relationships with Belshaw's (2011) elements of DL: the framework for the previous integration of DL into English teacher education. Chapter 5 uses the insights gained from Chapter 4 to answer the third research question about how DL could be integrated into teacher education, specifically English teacher education. Chapter 6 provides a short overview of the study's findings and consequent framework for digital integration, discusses the study's limitations, and makes recommendations for future research.

6. Conclusion

This thesis is a qualitative case study conducted at a relatively elite university in South Africa, which argues that an in-depth understanding of student teachers' DL perceptions and practices has the potential to provide insight into how best to position them to integrate digital literacy into their classrooms.

CHAPTER 2: Literature Review

1. Introduction

The purpose of this study is to gain a deeper understanding of English pre-service teachers' DL perceptions and practices in order to integrate DL into English education. The research questions for this study are therefore as follows:

1. How do pre-service teachers perceive their own, other teachers' and their learners' DL practices?
2. How are these perceptions related to their actual DL practices?
3. What is the significance of these insights for the integration of DL into teacher education generally and particularly English teacher education?

This chapter will discuss the digital divide that exists in the teacher education classroom in detail, in order to integrate DL into the pre-service teacher classroom. It will be shown that a gap exists in the literature where research has focused on DL practices in teacher education. A case will be made for the importance of qualitative research focusing on literacy as embedded in social practice and the integral role of DL within the English classroom.

The problem is approached from the perspective of New Literacy Studies and thus the shift in the definition of 'literacy' will be discussed first. This approach argues that the problem of the digital divide could be addressed by focusing on social practice, in this case digital literacy (DL) practices. The concepts of Primary and Secondary Discourses, the situated self, designated and actual identities, social practice, digital literacy, academic literacy and multiple/multimodal literacy will be defined in order to provide a conceptual framework that will aid in answering the first two research questions. It is believed that a thorough understanding of pre-service teachers' perceptions of their own, their learners' and other teachers' digital literacy practices will provide some insight into how to address the digital divide. An even deeper understanding can be gained by relating these perceptions with their actual DL practices and their perceptions of DL in general.

2. The Digital Divide

Recent research has tended to emphasise the digital proficiency of university students. Those who are "highly proficient" are sometimes termed "digital natives" to signify that "they have spent their whole lives surrounded by and using computers... and [other] tools of the digital age". Firat (2013:1) argues that, "today, the computer, internet and mobile technologies like

e-book readers, mobile phones, android devices, smart phones and tablet computers have become all-day business and communication tools used by digital natives”. It is therefore sometimes stated that these students’ reliance on technology could be to blame for problems experienced in academia since findings show that technology can often “disrupt” traditional academic practices (Lea & Jones, 2011:377). According to Lea and Jones (2011:377), “concerns are frequently raised about undergraduates being so immersed in web-based technologies in their broader lives that they have difficulties engaging in more conventional study practices...” While the picture painted by the idea of the digital native is therefore of students that are fully comfortable with technology, it is also apparent that students are not necessarily able to transfer these technologies for effective use within their disciplinary contexts.

Further studies have shown that, in countries with stark economic divides like many countries in Africa, it is problematic to assume that all students are “digital natives”. Thinyane (2010:1) argues that South African students in HE have “varying levels of access to and use of technology”. He argues that participants in his study, although excited by Web 2.0 technologies, “appear not to use such technologies” and are “not interested in using [them] in their studies” (Thinyane, 2010:1). More recently, research done by Czerniewicz and Brown (2013:1), also in South Africa, has revealed what they term “a subgroup of digital strangers”. They argue that the concept of the digital native is a myth in South Africa and that “students across a range of contexts have varied skills, experience and interest in using technology”. The digital stranger can be found beyond South African borders too. Prinsloo and Walton (2008:99) state that the benefits of globalization are hardly noticeable in Africa, where many often “don’t have access to clean water, let alone communications technology”. Keeping in mind that technology can offer “great promise for supporting continual improvements in academia” by facilitating connections across disciplinary, institutional, geographical, and cultural boundaries (Ranjan, 2008:442), there is the danger that digital strangers may be disadvantaged because they are not able to utilise technology effectively in their academic work.

The digital divide is more complex than simply the juxtaposition of ‘digital natives’ and ‘digital strangers’. This is because this digital divide exists not only among students, but among teachers, and also between students and teachers. Recent studies have often criticized teachers for their lack of confidence and competence and teachers are often presented as “less

technologically expert than pupils” (Burnett, 2011: 234). This debate is further fuelled by “arguments about inadequate access to equipment” for which several culprits, often including teachers, are blamed (Burnet, 2011:234). To make matters even more complex, another divide has presented itself over the course of the past ten years: the difference between students’ and teachers’ use of digital resources at school, for academic purposes, and at home, for communication and/or leisure. Keating, Gardiner and Rudd, in a study conducted in the United Kingdom in 2009, found that while most learners had “good access to technology at home”, their uses varied (Keating et al, 2009:44&45). Studies like these suggest that there is a much more prominent and diverse relationship between [digital] literacies within and beyond school and express a need to understand more about these continuities and discontinuities, while fostering a greater awareness among teachers regarding the use of technology (Keating et al, 2009:46). Integrating digital literacy into teacher education is therefore a very complex matter, with many finer nuances to consider.

It is evident that the integration of DL into teacher education is important for it could address the digital divide within the pre-service teacher and high school classroom. However, many studies that focus on the integration of technology into teacher education focus on “evaluating programmes for integrating technology; audits of pre-service teachers’ technological skill; or surveys of pre-service teachers’ digital confidence” (Burnett, 2011:235). Most of these studies thus approach technology use as a set of skills that could be taught to pre-service teachers and that would consequently lead to better technology integration by these teachers. There are few studies that focus on technology use as a literacy, embedded within social practice, which could lead to a much deeper understanding of how pre-service teachers use and perceive the use of technology. It is for that reason that this study is very important.

3. Teacher Education

There are many studies that focus on DL within Education, but very few to date that specifically look at DL practices in teacher education, let alone South African teacher education. Some of these studies occasionally touch on the subject of DL in teacher education, but as part of studies with different foci. These studies include research done by Prinsloo and Sasman (2015) where they investigated the use of interactive whiteboards in early schooling. Research done by Ivala et al (2013) investigated a case where digital storytelling was used in order to facilitate reflective practices in pre-service teachers. Their

study looks at a specific way of integrating DL into teacher education, but focuses on its ability to foster teachers' reflective practice, rather than DL integration in itself. Walton and Pallit (2012) focus on young people's game literacy and the implications for informal learning. Chigona (2013) investigates how the completion of a digital story aided in the building of a Community of Practice for pre-service teachers. The study focuses on the use of multimedia to form a Community of Practice, rather than investigating the DL practices of the pre-service teachers *per se*. Czerniewicz and Brown (2013) focus on Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) in the South African Higher Education context, but not necessarily DL in specifically teacher education. Overall, the research focuses a lot on the DL practices of the learners or practising teachers, meaning that there is a considerable gap in the literature regarding the DL practices in teacher education.

In the section that follows, the importance of DL in teacher education is highlighted, focusing on the need to conduct qualitative research regarding pre-service teachers' DL practices. It will be shown that the idea of "teaching" DL to pre-service teachers is very complex due to the dual purpose for its integration: (1) to allow the pre-service teachers themselves to become more comfortable with digital resources, thus addressing the digital divide that exists within the teacher education class *and* (2) to build their capacity to use DL to facilitate learning in their classes. The issue of the pre-service teachers' own use of DL, personally or in their future classrooms, will first be discussed by focusing on the need for DL education for pre-service teachers in general. The second purpose of integration will then be discussed by focusing on the high school English classroom.

3.1 Digital Literacy in Education

Over the past 15 years, studies have shown that technology is not used optimally in classrooms, regardless of its affordances. Lim and Khine (2006:28) conclude that, despite its capability to transform teaching and learning, many teachers experience barriers when integrating technology, which leads to its use often remaining in the periphery. Similarly, Prinsloo and Walton (2008:104) found that technology is used infrequently and often in the form of pedagogically unsound use of "drill-and-practice" games. Despite this lack of effective integration of technology by teachers, Teo (2009:309) holds that the teacher is central to its effective use in the educational system and it is therefore important that effective integration should be part of teachers' professional development. More recently, Hughes and Robertson (2013:69) agree with the enhancing role of technology in teaching and learning as well as the central role of the teacher in this. They believe that the aim of integrating DL in

teacher training is to make pre-service teachers not only users of digital resources, but “questioners and producers of technology”. It is evidently important that DL needs to be integrated in teacher education, but how to do this remains problematic, especially given the digital divide within pre-service teacher classrooms.

Numerous paths have been taken in order to gain a better understanding of the digital divide in the pre-service teacher classroom in order to integrate DL into teacher education. However, few of these studies are aligned with a qualitative approach, which focuses on a specific context. As mentioned before, many of these studies focus on programme evaluation and teacher skills and confidence (Burnett, 2011:235). These studies thus do not necessarily view DL as embedded in social practice, and focus on DL as a fixed skills set rather than a tool that could be used to help pre-service teachers make meaning of the world around them.

Many studies try to define the digital divide in the pre-service teacher classroom with rigorous quantitative research. Teo (2013:1) uses the “Digital Native Assessment Scale” (DNAS), a highly quantitative research method based on self-assessment, to assess how pre-service teachers “perceive themselves to be digital natives”. Other quantitative models attempt to predict technology acceptance, of which the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) is possibly the most popular (Davis, Bagozzi, & Warshaw, 1989; McCoy, Galletta, & King, 2007). The contributions made by these studies are very valuable. They reveal the existing problems of a lack of confidence in using and a resistance to new technology. These studies also show how many programmes that attempt to teach technological skills to teachers have been ineffective. However, these quantitative studies, although identifying the existence of a problem, do not tell us much about its details; in other words, ‘how’ to integrate DL in teacher education remains unclear.

While there is a lack of local qualitative research focusing on DL as a kind of social practice, there are international studies that show that an in-depth understanding of pre-service teachers’ use of digital resources might be gained from such research. Hughes and Robertson (2013) focus on how digital literacy “shapes and transforms” teacher identities, providing one of the very few in-depth investigations of pre-service teachers’ digital literacy practices. They conclude that, through sociocultural approaches like New Literacies and Multiple Literacies, pre-service teachers can engage in “transformative practices” which “deconstruct” the ways they were taught and reflect on their “own social identity” which will work to bring “changes in culture and society” (Hughes & Robertson, 2013:69).

An important study outside South Africa that focuses on DL practices and the digital divide is a study conducted by Burnett at the University of London on three pre-service teachers. The study focuses heavily on "contingency in identity" when pre-service teachers engage in digital literacy practices (Burnett, 2011:433). Her framework constitutes three main ideas: (1) managing identities in different networks, (2) developing and sustaining self-narratives and (3) reflexively reworking identity (Burnett, 2011:438). She concludes that caution should be taken against viewing pre-service teachers' digital literacy practices in an "overly simplistic" and decontextualised way (Burnett, 2011:446). She subsequently suggests that further in-depth research, investigating the relationship between "digital literacy and identity in and beyond educational contexts", needs to be conducted (Burnett, 2011:446). This study thus takes note of Burnett's suggestions by investigating pre-service teachers' digital literacy practices within various specific contexts, while relating the findings of the investigation to the impact it has on the pre-service teachers' identities. The framework for identity used in this study will be discussed in 5.2 and 5.3.

Although not many studies focus on the integration of DL in South African teacher education, studies that view DL as embedded in social practice have proven to be very helpful in gaining a deeper understanding of the digital divide. One of the few cases is a study done by Prinsloo and Walton in 2008 in the Western Cape, South Africa. This study was conducted after a funded programme had commenced that would put "computers and connectivity into otherwise poor and under-resourced schools across the region" (Prinsloo & Walton, 2008:102). The aim of their research is to understand the African digital divide, by understanding how digital literacies operate in marginal settings. By observing learners' digital literacy practices in three well-described instances, including the use of first generation "drill-and-practice" literacy software and a Google search on electrical and sound energy, they conclude that the ways in which digital literacy is used in otherwise deprived and poorly resourced educational settings "do not fit with common assumptions about the value of such technology for enhancing learning" (Prinsloo & Walton, 2008:102). The study by Prinsloo and Walton is very informative to this study, in that it illustrates the in-depth understanding gained through the observation of learners' digital literacy practices.

3.2 Digital Literacy in the high school English classroom

There are international studies, however limited, that focus on the use of DL in order to facilitate a learning outcome typically associated with the English classroom. A good example of such a study is the research done by Martin and Lambert in 2015 in the US,

where the effects of digital writing instruction on the learners' ability to differentiate between various digital textual genres were investigated. This study highlights the positive effects of digital writing instruction on student learning while revealing valuable insights into the learners' DL practices that could be used to inform further integration of DL.

Bawden (2008:630) describes DL as “an essential requirement for life in a digital age...” DL is described in Hobbs (2010:vii) as a constellation of life skills that are necessary for “full participation in our media-saturated, information-rich society”. The pre-service teachers must thus be inducted into the practices of DL, not only for their own use, but because they have to induct learners in their future classes into these practices. The integration of DL into teacher education is therefore not just a question of ‘how’, but also ‘for whom’. Careful thought must be given to which pre-service teachers are targeted, as well as whom they will be teaching DL to one day.

This study focuses on DL integration into high school English teacher education. The choice to focus on the pre-service English teacher can be justified based on two issues: (1) the traditional view of the English classroom as the ‘place’ for literacy and (2) the shifting role of the English teacher.

From a traditional point of view, “English has been the site where literacy work has been done with regards to the school” (Lankshear, 1999:7). This still holds true in many cases despite the fact that “important work has been undertaken at the several interfaces between literacy, English as a school subject, and curriculum theory and practice” (Green, 1993:1) and despite the changing view of literacy to include ‘literacy’ teaching in “varying genres associated with subject-based modes of inquiry and production, as well as addressing aspects and issues of subject disciplines as discursive practices” (Lankshear, 1999:7). This traditional view of literacy may see literacy as ‘reading and writing’ and this view is still evident in recent curricula, the South African 2011 curriculum, The National Curriculum Statement’s (NCT’s) *Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statements (CAPS)*, included. Anything pertaining to literacy thus belongs to the language classroom and therefore “Digital Literacy” could be seen as belonging to this space, regardless of the fact that DL has its roots in a different way of looking at literacy.

English classrooms have traditionally been conceptualised in terms of language (narrowly conceived as grammar), creative writing and literature and English teaching is still more or less described in this fashion in the CAPS curriculum, with slight variations in terminology.

However, this role has shifted with the recognition of the importance of teaching students to engage critically and imaginatively with a range of text types in diverse modes and contexts. It has also changed with the recognition of the centrality of the language classroom to literacy across the curriculum. DL connects with the English classroom due to the shifting role of the English teacher: “it is fruitful to think of the [English] classroom as a place where the ‘content’ to be learned is vitally connected to learning to think, act, react, debate, deliberate, problem solve, innovate and collaborate in a networked world” (Jenkins & Kelley, 2013:190). Similarly, the US National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), in a call to re-orientate English Language Arts education, states that in order to help students to adapt to a changed world, English Language Arts teachers must “increasingly focus on problem solving, collaboration, analysis, skills with word processing, hypertext, LCDs, Web cams, digital streaming podcasts, SMART Boards, and social networking software” (NCTE, 2008:1). Bomer (2011:5) emphasises the increased complexity of what content one ought to teach in the English class due to the drastically changing nature of ‘literacy’ and calls for the integration of “literacy in the digital environment” specifically into the English classroom.

Despite strong cases for the integration of DL into the school curriculum, it is important to mention that the current South African curriculum still does not give a prominent place for DL in the English curriculum. Both the Senior Phase (Grade 7 to 9) and Further Education and Training (Grade 10 to 12) CAPS curricula place an emphasis on the acquisition of visual literacy. In separate cases, the reading of online material, like “internet sites, web pages and blogs”, are required, but mostly as an afterthought or as an option, falling under the category of “visual texts for enjoyment” (CAPS2, 2011:28). As a matter of fact, the reading of online material is listed with nine other traditional modalities, which include “pamphlets and brochures” (CAPS2, 2011:28). Regardless of these slight indications of the reading of the kind of texts found in digital domains, no explicit mention is made to the integration of DL into the English curriculum. This often makes the justification for the integration of DL into teacher education difficult, but it does not mean that it is not important, as research has shown on numerous occasions.

It can be seen that a strong case exists for the following: qualitative research addressing the digital divide, focusing on social practices in a specific context; the integration of DL into teacher education; and the integration of DL into pre-service English education. With the problem clearly defined, the gap in the research identified and the importance of this research flagged, a theoretical framework can be identified, starting with ‘Literacy Studies’.

3.3 A rationale for focusing on perceptions and practices

Hogarty, Lang and Kromrey (2003:140) discuss the lack of effective technology integration, but mention that teachers who “reported that they were better prepared to use technology were more likely to actually use it than those who reported being less well prepared”. This connects technology integration to three aspects: (1) teachers’ perceptions of DL practices (their view on how “well they are prepared”); (2) teachers’ actual DL practices (their actual “use”) and (3) teacher education (being “prepared”). In order to better prepare teachers for the integration of DL into the classroom, Kopcha (2012:1110) suggests “situated professional development” to “promote long term” changes in teachers’ perceptions and practices with technology in the classroom by providing “support in the context of the real classroom”. They mention that there are not many existing studies that relate perceptions with actual practices.

Hew and Brush (2007), Hixon and Buckenmeyer (2009) and Lawless and Pellegrino (2007), in Kopcha (2013:1110), criticize studies focusing only on self-reports of teachers, therefore focusing only on their perceptions, because they state that teachers are “prone to exaggerating... actual practices with technology”. However, investigating the relationship between perceptions and actual practices is seen as crucial in the integration of technology, especially if teachers’ perceptions of the barriers of DL integration are related to their actual practices, for Kopcha (2013) states that despite the barriers of technology integration being clearly defined in the literature, teachers still do not integrate technology effectively. Kopcha (2013:1110) thus concludes:

there is a current and pressing need for research on situated professional development... that improves on... our understanding of the relationship between... teachers’ perceptions of the barriers [of technology integration], and ultimately teachers’ instructional practices with technology.

As can be seen from the research questions, this study focuses strongly on the pre-service teachers’ perceptions and actual practices. Apart from the rationale stated above, the further rationale for this focus resides on the theoretical assumption of: constructivism, situated learning, the New Literacy Studies (discussed in detail in section 5 of this chapter) and Authentic Learning (discussed in detail in section 7).

3.3.1 Constructivism

Jones and Brader-Araje (2002:3) in describing the ideals of constructivism, mention the importance of prior knowledge in learning:

Teachers are typically acutely aware of the role of prior knowledge in students' learning, recognizing that students are not blank slates or empty vessels waiting to be filled with knowledge. Instead, students bring with them a rich array of prior experiences, knowledge, and beliefs that they use in constructing new understandings.

Perceptions and actual DL practices, as viewed in this study, are seen as evidence of the pre-service teachers' "prior experiences". Their perceptions regarding DL practices and their actual DL practices are therefore very important when deciding how to integrate DL into teacher education, for these views are likely to inform their engagement with DL in the classroom.

In teacher education, there is often a problem with changing pre-service teachers' "preconceptions" leading to a "poor transfer of theory taught and skills trained on campus to classroom teaching practice" (Wubbels, 1992:137). This problematic gap between theory and practice therefore needs to be addressed, once again stressing the importance of an in-depth understanding of perceptions, specifically the pre-service teachers' perceptions regarding their own, other teachers' and their learners' DL practices.

3.3.2 Situated Learning

The concept of Situated Learning provides an important framework for engaging with teachers' perceptions. Hanks, in Lave and Wenger (1991:13), states that "Situated Learning... explores the situated character of human understanding and communication. It takes as its focus the relationship between learning and the social situations in which it occurs". As will be seen in Section 5 of this chapter, the literacy framework used for this study, the New Literacy Studies, focuses largely on the situational aspects of literacy and could thus be aligned with Situated Learning. An important question about Situated Learning has always been how to operationalise it (Brown & Duguid, 1993:10). These questions regarding the operationalization of Situated Learning are very important in this study, seeing as the integration of DL into teacher education here refers to its integration into the formal classes presented before and after the pre-service teachers' teaching practicals. It thus does not focus on the actual classroom situation in the way that studies using Situated Learning as a framework for "learnership models of teacher education" do (Mawoyo & Robinson, 2005:109).

Herrington's **Authentic Learning** principles (*defined in Chapter 5*) provide a useful operationalisation for Situated Learning within teacher education.

4. Literacy Studies

This section will briefly outline a historical overview of Literacy Studies in the 20th Century, focusing on the shifting view of literacy from an independent to a dependent variable. I will then describe the literacy work done in Education specifically, reviewing South African studies in literacy practices and the South African English curriculum.

4.1 The shifting view of literacy

Literacy Studies developed from numerous disciplines in the 20th Century. Graff (1991:xxii) traces the explicit study of literacy back to the 1950s, where research in literacy was conducted predominantly by historians. The field progressed from being focused on the direct study of the historical factors influencing literacy in the 1950s by historians like Webb and Hoggart, the so-called “first generation” of literacy study scholars, to a “second generation” focusing on changing patterns in literacy in the 1970s (Graff, 1991:xxii). The second generation in the 1960s, pioneered by Johansson, Lockridge, Cressy, Houston and Graff himself, approached literacy as an independent variable, which could be understood through quantitative research methods. Still within historical studies, a third generation in the late 1970s and 1980s, comprising of Scribner, Cole and Heath - to name a few - produced works that would set the stage for sociocultural approaches to literacy (Lankshear, 1999:2). These historians viewed literacy as a dependent variable, which was not only influenced by context and social practice, but also influenced the same contexts and practices simultaneously, departing drastically from previous historical studies in literacy.

Concurrent to historical studies in literacy, cross-disciplinary work in the field also contributed to the current debates surrounding literacy. Scholars from philosophy, classical studies, anthropology and linguistics wrote about the “great divide” that a “lack of literacy” could cause (Lankshear, 1999:3). In the 1960s and 1970s, scholars like Goody, Havelock, Watt and Ong believed that writing is necessary for a “primitive” culture to become “advanced” (Lankshear, 1999:3). These scholars also saw literacy as an independent variable. The 1980s saw a drastic paradigm shift in cross-disciplinary research in literacy referred to as the “social turn” by Gee (1999:1). Street's 1984 seminal work, *Literacy in Theory and Practice*, provided a strong foundation for sociocultural literacy, where literacy is a dependent variable, greatly embedded in social practices. Scholars like Hodge and Kress,

Lankshear and Lawler, Michaels and Stubbs strongly supported this view (Lankshear, 1999:3). This social turn came from numerous cross-disciplinary “movements of change”, according to Gee (1999:1), of which post-structuralism, postmodern social theory, sociology and the emerging New Literacy Studies can be foregrounded.

4.2 Literacy in Education

The current major debates surrounding literacy in education stem from the differing views in historical and cross-disciplinary research of literacy as a dependent or independent variable. Street’s *Literacy in Theory and Practice* (1984) presents us with two models: a traditional autonomous model and an ideological one. The traditional view of literacy describes literacy as largely a “psychological ability, something to do with our heads” (Lankshear, 1999:6). This view reflects the strong influence of cognitive psychology on education during the 20th Century. Street however states that the practices of reading and writing play out within contexts involving relations and structures of power. Advocates of the New Sociology of Education like Freire (2005), Bernstein (2003), Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) strongly agree with literacy’s connection with power and argue that literacy can reproduce differences in class, race and gender. Literacy is thus a dependent variable that cannot be seen as “neutral” or as a producer of effects “in its own right” – literacy can both reflect and promote particular aspects of social life.

There is a great need for the redefinition of literacy in education today, yet it is often found that research activities are stuck within the ‘old’ ways of viewing literacy. The need for the redefining of literacy is due to various reasons ranging from “the radical education movement, the... literacy crisis.., economic growth and social well-being, the growth of sociocultural theory” and the movement from an industrial era to a “knowledge-based society” (Lankshear & Knobel, 2011:19). Literacy suddenly became an “important educational task” (Lankshear, 1999: 3). This means that literacy scholarship has arisen anew from numerous seemingly removed disciplines presenting research ranging from ‘technological literacy’ to ‘science literacy’. Many of these studies however approach literacy as reading and writing only, a skill that should be mastered, and they talk about “levels” of literacy. These levels of literacy remove literacy from the context in which it is practiced and therefore subscribe to literacy as an independent variable.

Not only are research activities often aligned with the traditional view on literacy, but teaching practice often reflects this too. This is illustrated in a study on township schools in

the Western Cape, where it is shown that “literacy teaching is most often a drill-and-practice activity that focuses on the surface features of text” (Prinsloo, 2005:87). This picture of school literacy as a skills-based, drill-and-practice culture can be seen in other studies in South Africa, like the study conducted by Prinsloo and Stein in 2004, and in other parts of Africa, like a study conducted by Williams in 1996 in Malawi and Zambia. Recent research and literacy teaching practice thus often align themselves with literacy as an independent variable, which is in conflict with the sociocultural paradigm of literacy.

It is not only teaching practice that is not aligned with literacy as a dependent variable. Policy is also not aligned with it. Despite the fact that ‘reading and writing’ has been replaced by ‘reading and viewing’ and ‘writing and presenting’ in the CAPS 2011 curriculum, it is clear that the policy is associated with the traditional autonomous model of literacy teaching as mentioned before. The lists of textual genres prescribed under reading and viewing (CAPS2, 2011:28) mention the importance of context, but provide no indication of the actual contexts in which these texts are embedded and it gives the impression that reading should be conducted independently for the sake of reading.

Due to the conflicts within approaches to literacy, Gee (1996:123) states that literacy remains a “socially contested concept” and argues that the debate surrounding literacy “ultimately comes down to moral choices about what theories one wants to hold based on the sorts of social worlds these theories underwrite in the present or make possible in the future”. Gee continues by stating that reading and writing can only be understood “in context of the social, cultural, political, economic, historical practices to which they are integral and of which they are part” (Gee, 1996:123). This concept of embedded practice, or “meaningful ways of doing things”, is at the heart of the New Literacy Studies.

I believe that the digital divide can be understood and possibly addressed if I understand students’ DL practices. This study aims to understand the DL practices of pre-service English teachers, who will take their beliefs and values regarding DL with them into their future classrooms, where they will address the digital divide themselves. Therefore this study aligns itself with the sociocultural paradigms set out by the New Literacy Studies.

5. The New Literacy Studies

New Literacy Studies (NLS) theorists have redefined the way in which literacy is viewed in educational contexts. Street (1984), its foremost proponent, argues that literacy comprises situated and contextually embedded sets of social practices that are imbued with power. The

NLS conception of literacy contests the notion of literacy as sets of discrete, decontextualized and generic skills, which see literacy as autonomous (Street, 1984). The redefining of literacy as embedded within social practices, means that ‘literacy’ includes various types of modalities and it is emphasised that these literacies are “multiple, multimodal, and multifaceted” (Alverman, Unrau & Ruddell, 2013:1150). Kress and Van Leeuwen (2001:4) argue that traditionally, “meaning is made once”, but that “multimodal texts” can be seen as “making meaning in multiple articulations”. It is from this starting point, that ‘Digital Literacy’ and ‘Academic Literacies’ are defined, and thus these literacies are included within the umbrella term of NLS (see Coiro, Knobel, Lankshear & Leu, 2008, Lea & Street, 1998, Mills, 2016, Goode, 2010 and Brown, 2012).

Reckwitz (2002:245) defines ‘literacies’ from an NLS perspective:

Literacies are socially recognized ways in which people generate, communicate, and negotiate meaning, as members of Discourses, through the medium of encoded texts.

This definition is particularly useful in this study and will be returned to more than once in this section. What will follow in this section is a clear definition of the concepts ‘Discourse’, ‘Encoded Texts’, ‘Social Practice’, ‘Digital Literacy’ and ‘Academic Literacies’. After these concepts have been clarified, a definition for ‘Digital Literacy Practice’ will be derived.

Because NLS calls for a specific context and emphasizes the centrality of power, it might be useful to provide a short rationalization of what constitutes power within the classroom. The teacher’s power over the learners is typically associated with two sources: his/her association with the institution and his/her superior knowledge on the subject matter (McCarty, 2006:190). Learners may “resist” this power however (ibid.). Apart from the resistance of the teacher’s power, an inverted power differential could also occur when learners appear to possess superior knowledge to the teacher’s on a specific subject, like for instance DL. Power differentials can be defined as “the enhanced amount of role power that accompanies any position of authority” (Barstow, 2008:1). Shifts in power differentials could often lead to a teacher experiencing a lack of control over the classroom.

5.1 Discourse

By foregrounding the importance of literacy in its social context, NLS has gone beyond conventional Socio-linguistics, which defines discourse as a ‘stretch of language’ or ‘language beyond the sentence’ and tends to focus on speech context or language within a text. Gee, who has been a key figure alongside Street, has stressed the importance of understanding what it means to be literate in a Discourse. He draws on Foucault’s 1982 work, *The Subject and Power*, to define Discourse (with a capital ‘D’) as “a socially accepted association among ways of using language, of thinking, feeling, believing, valuing, and of acting that can be used to identify oneself as a member of a socially meaningful group or ‘social network’, or to signal (that one is playing) a socially meaningful ‘role’” (Gee, 2008:143). This definition foregrounds the ideological nature of discourse and its association with power. Gee states that making meaning is a social matter, and states that “to understand sense making in language, it is necessary to understand the ways in which language is embedded in society and social institutions” (Gee, 2008:116).

For Gee (1990:142), “a powerful literacy is not a specific literacy *per se* but, rather, a way of using a literacy”. Meaning making, according to Gee, has a lot to do with the reader’s awareness of the ability of a speaker in a text to vary their style of speaking in order for them to speak in a “language that essentially gives them options between equivalent ways of saying the same thing, but that differ in terms of their associations with various socially defined groups (e.g., class, gender, ethnic group, work group, area of expertise, etc.)”. (Gee, 2008:115)

Gee further distinguishes between Primary and Secondary Discourses. Primary Discourses include our “home Discourses”, which refer to ways of thinking that are “naturally acquired” and include “face to face communication with intimates” (Lankshear & Knobel, 2011:20). Secondary Discourses refer to Discourses associated with the abovementioned ‘associations with various socially defined groups’ through participation in “secondary institutions” such as schools, churches, community groups, workplaces and so forth (ibid.). Literacy thus becomes more powerful with the heightened awareness of and ability to engage with secondary Discourses. In this study, there will often be references to the pre-service teacher’s use of DL for private or social use, which refers to their Primary Discourses, while the secondary Discourses referred to are their use of DL within multiple other Discourses (like academia and the high school classroom).

The definition of literacies in 3.2 can now be adapted for this study as follows:

Literacies are socially recognized ways in which people generate, communicate, and negotiate meaning, as members of *Primary and Secondary Discourses*, specifically as students and teachers, through the medium of encoded texts.

5.2 The situated self as an approach to identity

The NLS connection to the way literacy is used and the foregrounding of perceptions in this study mean that a framework for identity is crucial. It is thus useful to establish a framework for identity for this study. According to Gee, the ‘situated self’ can be understood as “meaningful *coordinations* of human and non-human elements” (Gee, 2008:154). These coordinations together form Discourses while the Discourses in turn also make these coordinations recognizable and meaningful (Gee, 2008:155). The coordinations can include human elements like “thinking, acting, feeling, moving, dressing, speaking, gesturing, believing, and valuing”, while also including non-human elements like “tools, institutions, networks, places, vehicles, machines, physical spaces, buildings, and so on” (Lankshear & Knobel, 2011: 43). Gee (2008) further states that to be proficient in a Discourse means that one is able to coordinate the elements in that Discourse and to be coordinated by them. This is useful when considering a student’s digital literacy practices are considered as elements of coordinations, and also as coordinations of Discourses.

In their academic Discourses, accessing the internet in order to get a definition of a word while reading a printed academic article in order to complete an essay might be seen as an element in the enactment of a particular coordination that constitutes part of being “a student/academic”. The student’s digital literacy practice from this perspective can be seen as an element in a coordination. This notion of the ‘situated self’ thus provides a framework for looking at how individuals are situated by Discourses, as well as how they situate themselves.

5.3 Designated and Actual Identities

Sfard and Prusak (2005:1) define identity as “a set of reifying, significant, endorsable stories about a person”. Secondly, in order to operationalize the notion of identity, Sfard and Prusak divide these “stories” into two subsets:

“*actual identity* [authors’ own emphasis], consisting of stories about the actual state of affairs, and *designated identity*, composed of narratives presenting a state of affairs which, for one reason or another, is expected to be the case, if not now then in the future” (Sfard & Prusak, 2005:16).

Because students are usually engaged in studies due to the fact that they are striving to become something other than students, Sfard and Prusak's notion of "designated" and "actual" identities is useful.

Sfard and Prusak (2005:18) argue that "designated identities give direction to one's actions and influence one's deeds to a great extent, sometimes in ways that escape rationalization". Because these identities are so connected to actions and deeds, they are also connected to Discourses, according to the definition by Gee supplied above, for deeds and actions can be viewed as coordinations. Viewing Discourses from a designated and actual identity stance provides further insight into the complexity of secondary Discourses: a student's designated identity is intertwined in his/her current secondary Discourse (student in teacher education/academia), while the designated identity is embedded within his/her target secondary Discourse (teachers in a South African high school). While as Sfard and Prusak (2005) themselves argue, it is not possible to read identities from interviews, their work provide a useful frame for thinking about how student teachers position and reposition themselves in relation to the multiple discourses they inhabit as they negotiate university education and school contexts.

5.4 Social Practice

Reckwitz (2002:250) provides a definition of social practice which is very appropriate to this study: 'practice' is a "*routinized* type of activity that consists of several interconnected elements" which makes practice relatively stable although nonetheless "dynamic, mutable, and not completely monolithic". According to Scribner and Cole (1981:236), a practice in this context, consists of three components: "technology, knowledge and skills". These components are all interrelated, "dynamically connected to one another, and mutually evolving" as people's ideas about purposes and tasks change. Literacy, from their point of view, is the application of reading and writing "for specific purposes in specific contexts of use", not simply "knowing how to read and write". From this starting point, literacy, when connected to the concept of practice, involves bringing together technology (where technology is not necessarily confined to the digital), knowledge and skills "within some context of point and purpose". Barton and Hamilton (1998:6) describe a literacy practice as "what people do with literacy", i.e. literacy practices are social and situated. An adaptation of the definition for literacies can now be used to derive a definition for social practice in this study:

Social practices are the *routinized activities* associated with ‘*what students do*’ with the socially recognized generation, communication and negotiation of meanings through encoded texts, by combining technology, knowledge and skills, for *specific purposes in specific contexts*, as members of Primary and Secondary Discourses, specifically as students and pre-service teachers.

5.5 Digital Literacy

Digital Literacy (DL) is defined by Gilster (1998:1) as “the ability to understand and use information in multiple formats from a wide variety of sources when it is presented via computers and particularly through the internet”. For the purposes of this study, Gilster’s definition of DL will be referred to as ‘Internet Literacy’, because of its focus on the internet. Martin (2008:156), in an attempt to broach the dichotomy between two conceptions of DL - “mastering ideas” versus “mastering keystrokes” - has used the term “literacies of the digital”, which recognises the evolving nature of DL and expands it to include “computer/IT/ICT literacy, technological literacy, information literacy, media literacy, visual literacy and communication literacy”. Gilster’s focus on the internet is thus broadened to the effective use of many digital resources simultaneously. It is for this reason that the following definition is very appropriate to this study and it will be what is referred to when DL is mentioned:

the awareness, attitude and ability of individuals to appropriately use digital tools and facilities to identify, access, manage, integrate, evaluate, analyse and synthesize digital resources, construct new knowledge, create media expressions, and communicate with others, in the context of specific life situations, in order to enable constructive social action; and to reflect upon this process. (Martin, 2008:167)

5.5.1 Digital Resources

For clarification, ‘digital resources’ will be defined in a simple way as computers, the internet and mobile technologies like e-book readers, mobile phones, android devices, smart phones and tablet computers.

5.5.2 Eight elements of Digital Literacy

The integration of DL in the PGCE English Method course at UCT thus far has been greatly informed by the theoretical framework of the eight elements of DL. According to Bawden (2008), DL operates in terms of four components: underpinnings, background knowledge, central competencies, and attitudes and perspectives. It is from these components that Belshaw (2011:206) suggests eight elements of DL, which are: cultural; cognitive; constructive; communicative; confident; creative; critical and civic. These elements will be

properly defined in Chapter 3, for they were used as a framework to analyse the participants' written academic tasks, which was one of the sources of data in this study.

5.6 Academic Literacy

Academic literacies (AL) apply the theoretical approach of NLS to literacy within Higher Education settings (Lea and Street, 1998). AL is an approach which is in opposition to literacy as “a single, universal and autonomous cognitive capacity or skill that is transferable from context to context and expressed in facility with grammar and vocabulary” (Bastalich et al, 2014:374). Lillis and Scott (2007) describe literacy as concerned with social practice, rather than just text. Lea and Street (1998), referring to their research conducted within the UK context, argue that there are three main perspectives or models to the study of literacy, which are not mutually exclusive: study skills, academic socialisation and academic literacies. According to Jacobs (2013), there has been a shift in South African views of literacy education from the study skills model. The shifted view “sees writing and literacy as primarily an individual and cognitive skill”, towards the academic socialisation model, which “is concerned with students' acculturation into disciplinary and subject-based discourses and genres” (Lea & Street, 2006:227).

According to Jacobs (2013), there are however few examples of the academic literacies model in South African research. This model is defined as “a shifting in focus from ‘fixing problems...’ to introducing the linguistic traditions and conventions of higher education, and the subtle relationship of power and authority embedded in them” (Bastalich et al, 2014:374). The academic model is thus defined as “concerned with meaning making, identity, power and authority and foreground the institutional nature of what ‘counts’ as knowledge in any particular academic context” (Lea and Street, 2006:227-228). This definition clarifies AL's relevance to this study: the eight elements of DL provide a way in which students' perceptions of digital literacy could be analysed in general, while academic literacies situates this analysis within the context of academia, which connects with the pre-service teacher's current Secondary Discourse, and its inherent social practices.

Although academic literacy creates a broad context that connects with the pre-service teacher's secondary Discourses in question (as students), the definition of social practices calls for specific practices and purposes. This study has therefore narrowed the context to that of the pre-service English teacher education. The definition of literacy should thus be adapted to:

Literacy is the routinized activity associated with ‘what students do’ with the socially recognized generation, communication and negotiation of meanings through encoded texts, by combining technology, knowledge and skills *within the context of an English teacher education course for academic purposes and the English classroom in a South African high school for teaching purposes*, as members of Primary and Secondary Discourses, specifically as students and pre-service teachers.

5.7 Multiple literacies and Multimodal Literacies

Encoded texts are the medium through which “meanings are generated, communicated... and negotiated” as stated in the definition of literacies in 3.2. This could mean texts “that have been rendered in a form that allows them to be retrieved, worked with, and made available independently of the physical presence of another person” (Lankshear & Knobel, 2007:5). Literacies can thus involve any kind of codification system that captures language, putting this view of texts and literacy at odds with the view that literacy is reading and writing alone. This definition of the encoded text moves the view of texts towards the idea of “multimodality” in which “common semiotic principles operate in and across different modes, and in which it is therefore quite possible for music to encode action, or images to encode emotion” (Kress and Van Leeuwen, 2001:2). In this study, encoded texts constitute digital resources: software application interfaces, video and audio found on the web, the layout of social media platforms etc.

5.8 Digital Literacy Practices

Returning to the definition of literacies and social practice, and further adapting it, we could derive the final definition:

Digital Literacy Practices are the routinized activities associated with ‘what students do’ with the socially recognized generation, communication and negotiation of meanings through *digital resources*, by combining technology, knowledge and skills within the context of the PGCE English Method course for academic purposes and as pre-service English teachers in a South African high school for teaching purposes, as members of Primary and Secondary Discourses, specifically as students and pre-service teachers.

6. Conclusion

A close analysis of English pre-service teachers’ DL practices will lead to a better understanding of the digital divide among them, which in turn will benefit the integration of DL into English teacher education. Additionally, addressing the digital divide within the

teacher education classroom can help to address the digital divide in the high school classroom as these pre-service teachers integrate DL into their future classes. This assumption is based on the theoretical stipulations associated with the New Literacy Studies (NLS), which views literacy as embedded within social practices that are imbued with power and connected to a specific context.

As will be seen in Chapter 3, it is believed that an even deeper understanding can be gained if these pre-service teachers' actual DL practices are related to their perceptions about their own, their future learners' and other teachers'. The need for this study arises from a gap in research focusing on DL practices to understand the integration of DL, and more so the practices of pre-service teachers, specifically English teachers on which a lot of the responsibility to integrate this type of literacy falls. Despite the lack of research on these practices of pre-service teachers, it has been shown that the field would greatly benefit from qualitative, sociocultural research.

CHAPTER 3: Methodology

1. Qualitative research approach

This study adopted a qualitative approach, which can be defined as an approach that is appropriate when “researchers are interested in the quality of a particular relationships, activities and situations” and there exists a greater emphasis on “holistic description” (Wallen & Fraenkel, 2001:432). However, this type of research is not necessarily associated with a specific theory, discipline or paradigm. It could consequently be transdisciplinary, interdisciplinary and sometimes even “counterdisciplinary” (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998:5). It is therefore very important that the use of this approach be fully justified for this study. A brief discussion will show how a specific way of viewing the approach could be aligned with the theoretical framework of NLS and the research questions of this study.

Focusing on the four purposes of qualitative research as outlined by Marshall and Rosman (1995:10) helps to answer the research questions of the study. These four purposes are: exploration, explanation, description and prediction. Because there are no variables defined in the research questions, an exploratory approach helps to identify subtle and hidden aspects of the preservice teachers’ perceptions and practices regarding DL. The questions are all ‘how’ questions, where the social problems of the digital divide and the integration of DL are complex and solutions might have unanticipated outcomes. Marshall and Rosman (1995:12) hold that qualitative methods could help to find the “natural” solutions to these kinds of complex problems. This could be done through a qualitative research approach’s emphasis on “thick description” (Marshall & Rosman, 1995:12), where systematic inquiry and detailed analysis will yield valuable explorations and explanations of the study’s questions.

Qualitative research can also be aligned with the sociocultural views on which NLS is based. Qualitative researchers often stress the socially constructed nature of reality, the relationship between the researcher and what he/she is studying, taking special note of the social context that may influence the inquiry (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998:8). Viewing qualitative research in a way that foregrounds various socially constructed realities, the presence of subjectivity and the importance of context aligns the research with the sociocultural paradigm of NLS.

Lastly, the approach entails the immersion into the setting chosen for the study (Marshall and Rosman, 1995:4), which is ideal for inquiries regarding contextualized social practice. This

view of qualitative research has been derived from the Chicago School that established its importance for the study of human group life (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998: 1). They hold that it is a multi-method approach, which studies its subjects in their natural social settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena “in terms of the meanings people bring to them”. Through immersion into the everyday life of the subjects, researchers try to discover the values and perspectives of the participants through description and analysis, relying heavily on “the words” and behaviour of their subjects (Marshall and Rosman, 1995:4). A qualitative research approach is thus appropriate due to this study’s focus on social practices in the preservice teachers’ natural social settings and the focus on the descriptions provided by them.

2. Case study as research strategy

This study used the case study research strategy. Yin provides the following definition for case study research:

A case study is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident. In other words, you would use the case study method because you deliberately wanted to cover contextual conditions – believing that they might be highly pertinent to your phenomenon of study. (Yin, 1994:13)

According to Yin, case study research is applicable where “the main research questions are ‘how’ and ‘why’”, a researcher has little control over behavioural events, and where the focus “of the study is a contemporary...phenomenon within some real-life context” (Yin, 2014:2). Because the aim of study is to ascertain how a group of students in a particular context engages in DL practices without controlling how students interact with digital resources, the case study approach is apt. As mentioned before, there is an absence of variables in this study’s research questions. Yin states that a case study research strategy is appropriate for discovering the unknown variables through “thorough, rich, detailed description” (Yin, 1994:2).

The case study as a research strategy is an all-encompassing method and thus a “comprehensive research strategy” (Yin, 1994:13). This also means however that a case study can contain quantitative data – quantitative and qualitative evidence do not distinguish the various research methods within the strategy (Yin, 1994:14). It can therefore not be assumed

that the case study research strategy would be appropriate simply because a qualitative research approach is followed. In order to justify the decision of case study research strategy for this study, the instances where case study connects with the qualitative approach was explored. This was done by expanding the definition provided by Yin and stating that case study seeks to “engage with and report the complexity of social and educational activity”, in order to ascertain the various truths that social actors bring to the context in question (Somekh & Lewin, 2011:53). Viewing case study in this way connects it with the NLS framework.

The case study focuses on answering explanatory, exploratory, descriptive and predictive research questions (Yin, 1994:6) like the ones posed in this study. This focus coincides with the purposes of qualitative research as outlined by Marshall and Rosman (1995:10). Case studies focus on these types of research questions because they are designed to cope with situations where there may be many unanticipated themes that arise from the data (Yin, 1994:13). One of the biggest strengths of case studies is that it can use multiple methods and data sources to explore the case in depth, revealing these hidden themes (Somekh & Lewin, 2011:54). It can thus achieve the “thick description” called for in a qualitative approach and that the research questions of this study call for.

Lastly, it is stated that case study “benefits from the prior development of theoretical propositions to guide data collection” (Yin, 1994:13). This is due to the many unknown variables that may arise from the data as mentioned above. This study has initially been developed from the theoretical framework of NLS. The focus on social practices called for by this framework has guided many of the choices concerning data collection. The case study strategy is thus not only appropriate for this study, but the strategy itself also benefits from choices made prior to the decision to adopt it.

3. Participants

The participants for the study consisted of four Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) English Method students who volunteered to be part of the study. I requested volunteers after briefing the PGCE English Method class about the study. It is important to mention that I facilitated two classes that formed components of this course and thus the participants for the study were also taught by me prior to the selection process. However, my role in the course

as a whole was limited to five classes in total throughout the year. I did not assess any of their tasks or assignments. They volunteered via e-mail.

Volunteers were asked to complete a brief questionnaire, which established their general digital proficiency, attitudes towards digital literacy and social class background (see Appendix A). The population was diverse in educational background and viewed themselves as struggling with technology. I was particularly interested in pre-service teachers that struggle with technology because the research has shown that such teachers are less likely to implement DL in their classes (see Chapter 1 and 2). A reluctance to integrate DL into their own classes could be detrimental to student learning and I therefore wanted to focus on integrating DL to cater for the needs of the ‘digital stranger’ first. A similar, comparative study conducted on ‘digital natives’ and the students viewing themselves as falling in between the digital divide extremes would complement this study.

Apart from the reasons mentioned in Chapter 2, where I explained the need for the integration of DL into Teacher Education and specifically the English classroom, there were also practical reasons for the decision to use these participants in particular. Firstly, I had access to them due to the fact that I facilitated two of their classes prior to this study. Secondly, the research design depended a lot on written reflection of their DL practices and I hoped that these participants’ assumed language proficiency and extensive experience of reflective practice during the PGCE course would result in descriptive, detailed manifestos, which it did in fact. Lastly, the assignments used in this study (see below) actually contained these participants’ own lesson plans where DL would be integrated, thus providing extra depth to the study by providing insight into their actual DL practices, without them describing their views themselves.

Generic pseudonyms were used for all four participants: Kate, Nina, Susan and Alicia. Kate is in her mid-twenties with previous teaching experience, a “basic” knowledge of technology as she describes it, with a middle-class background. Nina is the oldest of the participants, in her mid-thirties, also from a middle-class background with the most teaching experience. She has a lot of anxiety when working with technology. Susan, in her early to mid twenties, has the strongest academic background, with honours degrees in both English and Psychology. She is the participant who perceives her DL practices as the most ineffective. She has had very little exposure to technology, coming from a township and a disadvantaged background. Alicia is the participant who has the highest regard for her DL practices, although she

believes that she could improve them. She comes from a middle to working class background and is the youngest of the participants. All the participants are South African.

4. Data Collection

Yin (1994:78) postulates that evidence for case studies may come from various sources including documents, archival records, interviews, direct observation, participant-observation and physical artifacts. The benefit of using multiple sources is that it presents a “chain of evidence” (Yin, 1994:78) converging on the same set of findings, which links the data collected, the conclusions drawn and the questions that were asked. Denzin and Lincoln (1998:4) agree with Yin, stating that “the combination of multiple methods, empirical materials [and] perspectives...” in a single study is best understood as a strategy that adds rigor, breadth and depth to any investigation. Yin (1994) further argues for a proper case study database that contains all the data collected for the study. He stresses that case studies should strive to present the data collected in a manner that allows other investigators to review all the evidence directly. The study therefore does not rely wholly on written reports by the researcher. The various sources presented in the database should be highly complementary and a good case study will try to use as many sources as possible (Yin, 1994).

This study used four sources for data collection: a short questionnaire (mentioned earlier); completed academic tasks; reflections written by the participants and a focused group interview. Care has been taken to compile a complete database of the data collection, as stipulated by Yin; this database can be found in Appendix D. Following are short descriptions of the data sources:

(1) *A questionnaire*: a short questionnaire completed by volunteers for the research that asks questions pertaining to their social class background, experience with digital resources, academic background and views on technology in general (see Appendix A). This questionnaire set the stage for the rest of the study because it was the first introduction to who the participants were. The questionnaire was particularly helpful to compare findings from the other sources with their social class backgrounds.

(2) *Completed academic tasks* (referred to here as ‘completed tasks’): academic tasks where students engaged in some form of DL practice. These tasks could be any academic task of their choice (like academic essays, lesson plans, posters, multimedia projects or whatever is expected from them in the PGCE as a whole) or the tasks set out within the current DL component of the English Method course. Yin (1994:80) describes this kind of

documentation as beneficial for the case study since the source is “stable and unobtrusive (not created as a result of the case study)” with “exact details” and “broad coverage”. The tasks were all descriptions of hypothetical lesson plans that the participants had to design, where digital resources were integrated into the lesson plan itself. This meant that the completed tasks serve as an indication of the participants’ actual DL practices: how they would integrate digital resources into their own classrooms. One completed task per student was expected.

(3) *Students’ reflective practice* (referred to here as ‘reflections’): written reflections regarding their own DL practices while completing the above tasks and the integration of DL in their lesson plans. Reflective practice can be defined as the “capacity to reflect on action so as to engage in a process of continuous learning” (Schön, 1983:1). The participants were asked to reflect on their own DL practices, the difficulties experienced and how they approached the task by responding to prompt questions that were given to them (see Appendix B). Yin (1994:80) describes this type of source as “targeted” and “insightful”, which aligns the use of this source with the stipulations for qualitative research. Participants were asked to submit a minimum of two pages’ worth of reflections per student, choosing any medium for reflection, although the use of digital resources was encouraged. The reflections would be a helpful source, providing a personal description of their views of their own DL practices, including their views on their future learners’ and other teachers’ DL practices, albeit to a lesser degree. The reflections were also done on their own time and alone, which meant they had ample time to think about the prompt questions. They could thus carefully formulate responses that were not filtered due to the presence of others.

(4) *A focused group interview*: an interview used for further insight. Milward describes focused group interviews as:

...test, appraise, or produce hypotheses about a particular concrete situation in which the respondent(s) have been involved (e.g., a shared event or salient experience). The *focus* of the interview is circumscribed by relevant theory and evidence and involves skilled facilitation of the process (in a one-on-one or group forum) using an interview guide, allowing for unanticipated views to also be uncovered and explored. (Milward, 2004:396)

Yin (1994) describes the focused group interview as an opportunity to consult with the respondents for a short period of time, an hour for example, adding further focus and insight to the findings derived from the other sources. These kinds of interviews are meant to be open-ended and conversational, but the researcher is urged to focus on questions derived from the research questions. Some of these questions may serve to “corroborate certain facts”

(Yin, 1994:80) that have already been established and researchers should therefore avoid asking leading questions. Somekh and Lewin (2011:62) state that the aim of the interview is to provide a stage for the “emergence of voices” where participants are allowed to talk freely about the topics presented to them. They add that each person should add his/her view, challenge or deny the views of others so that complex “interacting views” could emerge. The depth attained by the focused group interview aligns with the stipulations for qualitative research.

The interview for this study was conducted in a group setting and participants were given the opportunity to talk about their experiences with digital resources and their DL practices. Morgan (1996:133), states that focused group interviews have the ability to “give a voice to marginalized groups”, and can be used where there exists “a difference in perspectives” between the researcher and among the members of the group, for it empowers participants, thus minimizing any power differentials. Because there could have existed a stark differences between my view on DL and that of the participants and because of the power differential at play due to the fact that I already facilitated two of the English Method classes, the decision for a focused group interview, rather than individual interviews, helped to put participants at ease. These interviews were video recorded, with an additional audio track recorded for clarity, in order to retain the details of the interview for repeated viewing during the analysis of data.

After participants volunteered, they were asked to make careful notes about their DL practices while they were completing academic tasks. See Appendix E for the correspondence sent to the participants informing them that they had been selected for the research and stipulating what was expected from them initially. Participants wrote reflections on their practices, either during or after the tasks. Reflections related to the completed task that they decided to submit for this study in order to better facilitate the triangulation of data, which will be discussed below. I received three reflections (from Susan, Nina and Alicia) before the focused group interview, while the participants were busy with teaching practical in April 2015. The remaining reflection (from Kate) was received on the day of the interview. All completed tasks were received before 31 May 2015.

The interview was conducted on the 20th of May 2015. The benefit of conducting the interview at this time was that the tasks and reflections submitted were either still ‘fresh’ in the participants’ memories, or they were still busy working on them. Conducting the

interview too early could have resulted in idealistic responses which did not reflect their actual DL practices - since they would not actually have done the tasks and reflections - and conducting the interview later than May might have resulted in them not being able to recall their experiences properly. The participants also returned from teaching practical just before the interview, which meant that they had a more realistic sense of the challenges of DL in the classroom.

The interview lasted one hour and twenty minutes. Kate was not present for the first twenty minutes of the interviews, while Alicia was not present for the last twenty minutes, due to their personal schedules. Nina and Susan were present for the entirety of the interview. See Appendix C for sample questions that were discussed during the interview. The database (Appendix D) also contains a full transcription.

The following table summarises who the participants were and where to find the data sources connected to them; it will be useful as a reference for later chapters:

Table 1 – Participant summary

Participant pseudonym	Description	Questionnaire	Reflection	Completed task
Kate	In her mid-twenties with previous teaching experience, a “basic” knowledge of technology as she describes it, with a middle-class background.	p.114	p.121	p.136
Nina	The oldest of the participants, in her mid-thirties, also from a middle-class background with the most teaching experience. She has a lot of anxiety when working with technology.	p.115	p.123	p.141
Susan	In her early to mid twenties, has the strongest academic background, with honours degrees in both English and Psychology. She is the participant who perceives her DL practices as the most ineffective. She has had very little exposure to technology, coming from a township and a disadvantaged background.	p.116	p.126	p.146
Alicia	The participant who has the highest regard for her DL	p.113	p.118	p.129

	practices, although she believes that she could improve them. She comes from a middle to working class background and is the youngest of the participants.			
--	--	--	--	--

5. Data Analysis

Case study analysis has a tendency to be “inductive”, where the key issues for analysis arise from the data itself (Somekh & Levin, 2011:55), the research questions and the chosen theoretical framework. If these issues are related to “social practices” within a “specific context”, then the analysis aligns itself with NLS (see Chapter 2). The logic of case study data analysis approach was to focus on depth rather than coverage (Somekh & Levin, 2011:55). This further aligns the data analysis with the stipulations for qualitative research as well as NLS.

The data sources mentioned in the previous section were first read three times. This was done in order to avoid ‘jumping to conclusions’ about the data at an early stage, which would prevent an in-depth analysis. Notes were however made to preserve some of the initial responses to the data, which could later be compared to the in-depth analysis. All the data sources were then transferred to QSR International’s NVivo, which is a software programme that lends itself to the analysis of qualitative data. Using NVivo, the data could be *coded* (terminology used by the software package) into several main categories, each containing several *nodes* (ditto) that describe the issues that arose from the data. Reading the sources from the NVivo interface for a fourth, fifth and sixth time, the data presented was coded into categories and nodes, while making additional notes using NVivo’s “Notes” function. It was essential that, when a particular excerpt from a source was coded, that it would be coded in more than one category. This helped with an in-depth analysis of the data, for the various aspects of one excerpt could be highlighted. Where possible, multiple nodes within one category were indicated to further increase the depth of the analysis.

Five categories, each containing a variable quantity of nodes, were identified during data analysis. A short description of the five categories and their various nodes follows. I will first provide the category (in bold), followed by a short description of the categories and then the various nodes in *Italics*:

1. **General perceptions.** This category included the nodes that showed the general perceptions, especially stances, toward the topic or digital resource discussed. *Negative; positive; both positive and negative feelings and beliefs expressed (neutral stance); unsure about use of the digital resource; unsure about the use of the digital resource (but believes there might be a way to use it); very negative and very positive.* “Negative” and “Positive” stances were distinguished from “Very Negative” and “Very Positive” stances by judging the adjectives used as well as the amount of words used to express the stance.
2. **Specific perceptions.** This category included the nodes where more specific perceptions about a topic or digital resource were expressed. *Can teach without the digital resource; feeling innovative, confident and competent; marked disappointment with themselves, DL or talking about shame; DL can help in the classroom and is better than the traditional; DL makes no difference; DL makes the class “come alive” or is an “enhancement” (participants’ own words); DL makes the class worse or traditional methods are better; feelings of incompetence; feeling intimidated; no influence of DL practice or the digital resource not seen as part of DL at all; reluctance to talk about subject or avoiding subject and surprise at how much DL is used in the classroom.*
3. **Topics.** This category included topics discussed within the sources that do not necessarily correlate with specific digital resources. *Balance; “centrality” of DL (participants’ own words); collaboration; consistence; control; critical evaluation; current DL practices; discipline-specific training; expectation of other teachers to use more DL; independence; interactivity and active learning (grouped by participants themselves); lack of resources in schools; feeling overwhelmed by all the information on the internet; the social and academic “mixture” online (a participant’s own words); DL in teacher education; learners’ interest in DL; learners’ competence in DL; learners’ use of DL in general; the need for integrating DL into the high school classroom; how to integrate DL into lesson plans; theft; lack of time to integrate DL into the classroom; typing; visually-oriented learners.*
4. **Digital resources.** This category included various digital resources discussed in the data sources. *Apps; audio only/podcasts; cell phones; computers and laptops; Google Search; the internet; iPads; Paint (software programme); images; Powerpoint (software programme); search engines (excluding Google Search); overhead*

projectors; the SMART Board (interactive whiteboard); Social Media; Tablets and Notepads (excluding iPads); television; video games and videos.

5. **Connection to Belshaw’s DL elements (see below).** This category was used exclusively during the analysis of the participants’ completed tasks. Notes were made on where the lesson plans displayed a connection with one of the elements and where they showed some kind of awareness of the element. *Cognitive connected; Cognitive awareness; Constructive connected; Constructive awareness; Communicative connected; Communicative awareness; Confident connected; Confident awareness; Cultural connected; Cultural awareness; Creative Connected; Creative awareness; Critical connected; Critical awareness; Civic connected and Civic awareness.*

Detailed definitions of Belshaw’s (2011) elements of DL can be found below. With this study’s focus on specific context, it is important that these elements are viewed in context, so a proper contextualization is included along with an example.

Table 2 – Contextualisation of the elements of Digital Literacy

Element of DL	Definition	Contextualisation
Cultural	paying attention to the culture in which the literacy is situated and being able to move between different digital environments.	<i>Using various platforms, like social media, for personal as well as academic purposes. Example: using a Facebook group to discuss the themes in a play</i>
Cognitive	mastering the technical ‘how-to’ of using a literacy, but also thinking about the procedures while executing them.	<i>Executing subject-specific tasks while using various platforms, software packages and devices. Example: using video and audio software effectively in order to create a digital story</i>
Constructive	striving to use digital resources in reflexive and appropriate ways, including the re-use and remixing of existing resources.	<i>Integrating various online sources in order to finish an academic essay or adapting material found online to suit a specific learning need. Example: writing fan-fiction about a television series and posting it on a blog, or posting a video of a class re-enactment on Youtube</i>
Communicative	being aware of the values, norms and codes that could change the way we communicate effectively.	<i>Displaying an awareness of different registers and tones in online texts, identifying bias and being able to communicate clearly while not offending <u>and</u> being properly understood within the context. Example: making an unbiased and well-informed comment on an online news article that contributes to the knowledge about the subject</i>
Confident	having the confidence to immerse in a	<i>Being able to use various online platforms, databases</i>

	digital environment, taking chances and experimenting with various options, while also capitalizing on the differences between analogue and digital resources and using the digital environment to its greatest potential.	<i>and search tools to gather information on a subject, combining these sources with traditional texts and using pen and paper as well as software programs to complete an academic task. Example: completing a literary essay on Pride and Prejudice while watching videos, critically evaluating other readers' online critique, using academic secondary sources from online journals, making notes on paper and on a pdf-file and using the various tools offered by a word processor</i>
Creative	mustering literacy to make new things and valuing the randomness of discovery, while understanding the processes, procedures and systems behind the literacy.	<i>Seamlessly using hardware, software and other digital resources to freely create resources for academic use. Example: creating a website that assists with English grammar, which learners could visit for supplementary tutoring</i>
Critical	using the ability to critically evaluate the literacy used and understanding the assumptions behind digital tools and practices.	<i>Being able to choose a limited amount of appropriate sources from carefully selected databases and online journals after critically judging numerous options presented online. Example: providing learners with high quality online sources that they could consult when preparing for an oral presentation</i>
Civic	participating fully in society and using the literacy to link with local, national and global organisations.	<i>Showing the ability to participate in and understand the most current debates in a discipline and using various platforms and digital resources in the process. Example: understanding the debates surrounding the differing views on literacy and being able to contribute to the collaborative creation of knowledge by publishing articles, opinion pieces and comments online</i>

The method of data analysis described here was used to answer the first two research questions pertaining to pre-service teachers' perspectives of their own, their learners' and other teachers' DL practices and these perspectives' relation to their own actual DL practices. The insights gained from this analysis were then used to address the third research question regarding the integration of DL into teacher education. This was done by relating the insights to the principles of Authentic Learning (see Chapter 5).

6. Validity

The issue of validity is relevant to qualitative studies for "if qualitative studies cannot produce valid results, then policies, programs and predictions based on these predictions cannot be relied on" (Maxwell, 1992: 279). According to Maxwell (1992:280), there are two aspects to validity: reactivity and bias. Reactivity refers to the way in which the researcher

can possibly influence the reactions of the participants or/and the environment, whereas bias refers to the researcher's own subjectivity influencing the results of the research. Both reactivity and bias were possible hazards in this study and I took the necessary precautions to mitigate their effects, as will be discussed below.

6.1 Reactivity

Reactivity could occur in three instances in this study: when the students were writing their reflections, during the focused group interview and when they were deciding which completed task to submit for analysis. According to Heath and Street (2008:8), human beings use "tacit meaning-making processes that they take for granted, and their explanations of these often bear little relationship to realities of usage". It can thus be stated that "subjects, or individuals, are seldom able to give full explanations of their actions" (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998:24). For example, students might give the idea within their reflections that they have a positive attitude towards the use of DL practices in the classroom, but the reality might be that they do not specifically feel comfortable using them, or they do not use them in a way that is optimal to the learning process. The students might also shape their reflections according to what they think the researcher wants to hear.

In order to mitigate the effects of reactivity during this study, multiple sources of evidence were used as previously discussed. Yin (1994:92) states that the use of multiple sources is important in the development of "converging lines of inquiry" and that findings in a case study are more believable if it is based "on several different sources of information" (ibid.). It is therefore likely that the use of multiple sources would decrease the effects of reactivity. The use of multiple sources also leads to the triangulation of data. Cohen et al (2013:195) describe the triangulation of data as an attempt to explain "the richness and complexity of human behaviour by studying it from more than one stand-point". By thus using completed tasks, reflections and a focused group interview, data from multiple sources are used to cross-check for "regularities in the research data" (O'Donaghue & Punch, 2003:78).

To further minimize the effects of reactivity, it was made clear to the students that I was not judging their performance, but rather wanted to understand their DL practices as they are. The way that I presented myself in the DL component of the English Method course was as a facilitator and fellow postgraduate student rather than as lecturer, in order to make the participants in the class feel comfortable as well as to create a sense of solidarity. This sense

of solidarity was very useful during the focused group interview for students needed to be comfortable enough to express their actual views.

6.2 Bias

When conducting research, it should be kept in mind that the personal biography of the researcher, who belongs to a specific gender and “speaks from a particular class, racial, cultural, and ethnic community perspective”, should be accounted for (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998:24). It is therefore important that the researcher recognize how his/her way of investigating a case is “filtered through the lens of language, gender, social class, race and ethnicity” (ibid.). The researcher must acknowledge that there are no objective observations, only observations that are embedded within the given context. This view of bias is thus closely aligned with NLS. There are numerous instances within this case study where my personal bias could have influenced the research and I will briefly mention two of them.

It was possible that my own experiences and preconceived ideas might come into play when conducting the focused group interview. Edwards and Westgate (1994:172) state that it is impossible to be perfectly unbiased in qualitative research, but that that should not hinder the researcher. By referring to “insights” rather than “findings”, an open-minded approach could be established (ibid.). Although it was impossible to be completely objective during the interview, I constantly evaluated my own demeanour and attitude in order for the participants to feel comfortable enough to state their own views.

While comparing the data sources with one another, I had to be aware of my own perspectives regarding individuals from other social class backgrounds. This was particularly important when comparing the data of the questionnaire with the other sources. By constantly being critical about the insights gained from the data, I managed to alleviate bias as much as possible, although I am aware that it is impossible to completely strip all insights from my personal bias.

7. Shortcomings

Apart from the validity issues for which qualitative research is often criticized, there are often other shortcomings inherent to case study research. A popular criticism against case study research is that it is impossible to generalize from “one or a small number of cases” to the population as a whole (Somekh & Lewin, 2011:54). It is also difficult to decide on the boundaries of the research (ibid.): what to include and exclude. It is true that only four

participants were used out of a class of 45 and this study is trying to understand how DL could be integrated into teacher education as a whole. To address this criticism, Yin (1994:10) suggests that the way in which knowledge is viewed should be altered: the insights gained from case studies are generalizable only to “theoretical propositions” and not populations. The case is thus not seen as a sample, but rather as a means to “expand and generalize theories”. Another shortcoming of case studies is that they can be time consuming because of the collection of various data sources.

The fact that the population consisted of ‘digital strangers’ only and not a more diverse group that included ‘digital natives’, could be limiting to the decisions regarding the integration of DL into the English Method class. The fact that the group represents the one side of the digital divide must be kept in mind before decisions are made that will affect the whole class. The use of digital resources by the ‘digital natives’ in the class, as well as the students who are characterized as lying between digital native and stranger, should be studied and taken into account in future research.

The data sources used also have their own individual shortcomings. All of the sources that included some form of documentation (completed tasks, reflections and questionnaires) are subject to “biased selectivity” and “reporting bias” (Yin, 1994:80) as mentioned before. The reliance on reflections and interviews can lead to an “overly empiricist analysis – locked into the ‘here-and-now’ of participants perceptions” (Somekh & Lewin, 2011:55). Although this is mentioned as a criticism in the literature, the “here-and-now” is exactly what an NLS approach calls for - due to its strong focus on context - meaning that an empiricist analysis is important to a degree. An “overly empiricist analysis” could however be avoided by paying attention to relevant literature, which might enable the researcher to look “beyond the immediate and explore participants’ memories and explanations of why things have come to be what they are” (ibid.).

This study is informed by a detailed literature review that deeply influenced the questions asked for the reflections and during the focused group interview. This was done to mitigate the chances of the case study being overly empiricist. The data sources were also collected from the participants at varying instances in order to get a sense of change over time. The fact that some data sources were collected before their teaching practical while others, specifically the interview, was conducted afterwards plays a crucial role in gaining insight into how their perspectives changed over time.

The reflection and interview questions had to be carefully designed to avoid other possible regularly cited shortcomings of reflections and interviews, i.e.: bias due to poorly constructed questions and inaccuracies due to poor recall (Yin, 1994:80). In order to mitigate the effects of the latter, reflections were encouraged during or soon after the completion of the task as mentioned earlier and the interview was conducted very soon after the teaching practical.

Lastly, the fact that students had contact sessions (classes) with me might increase reactivity in their responses and what they chose to submit. It could as a matter of fact also increase bias from my side for I might have analysed reflections and completed tasks according to my experience with the participants in class. I therefore had to make sure that I was analysing the data sources in the most objective manner possible and minimizing any influence on their decisions of what to submit.

8. Ethics

Ethical frameworks during social research are very important and should describe the exact circumstances under which “anonymity, confidentiality and rights of access are to be constructed” (Somekh & Lewin, 2011:64). The politics and ethics at play during the research must be considered at all stages for these aspects to “permeate every phase of the research process” (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998:23). This study received ethical clearance from the University of Cape Town before commencing any research activities and strictly followed the stipulations proposed by the university (see Appendix F). A brief summary of what this ethical clearance entails is given below.

The participants were not harmed in this research, neither did the study infringe on their privacy. All participation in this study was voluntary and students provided the required permission to be part of the study and for the focus group interview to be recorded (see Appendix G). The students were fully aware of what was expected of them and the information and tasks required by the study. Under no circumstances did the research activities negatively affect the interviewees’ attitudes toward Higher Education (HE), the PGCE English Methods course, or their educators. Reflections were completed at times suitable to the participants and did not interfere with their academic responsibilities. Participants were allowed to withdraw from the research at any time, and were anonymous. The research did not interfere with the assessments of tasks presented for the PGCE English Method course.

9. Conclusion

This study was a qualitative case study with four participants that volunteered to take part. The volunteers were all part of the PGCE English Method class, which I taught on five occasions throughout the year. The data sources consisted of questionnaires, reflections, completed academic tasks and a focused group interview. Data were analysed by reading through the sources and allowing themes to arise from the data itself. The completed tasks were further analysed by comparing them to the eight elements of DL as stipulated by Belshaw. Reactivity and bias were mitigated as much as possible. Shortcomings of the research were accounted for to the best of my ability and the research adhered to a strict ethical framework.

CHAPTER 4: Data Analysis

1. Introduction

This chapter will provide evidence from four data sources (the questionnaire, the participants' completed tasks, their reflections and the focused group interview) that will be used to answer the first two research questions. These questions are, as mentioned previously:

1. How do pre-service teachers perceive their own, other teachers' and their learners' DL practices?
2. How are these perceptions related to their actual DL practices?

Several themes that arise from the data will be discussed. The four sources have been analysed by closely reading the perceptions and beliefs expressed in each source. I have examined the participants' perceptions in relation to various digital resources and have distinguished between their own use of DL, their perceptions of other teachers' relationship to DL, their learners' use of DL and their notion of the relationship between DL and student learning. The topics that will be discussed specifically are their views on the overwhelming nature of the internet, their strong connection of DL with Internet Literacy, acquiring DL practices from other teachers and HE, their uncertainty with regards to the SMART Board, the degree to which they view their learners' DL practices as superior or similar to their own, control in the classroom and social media. Throughout the discussion, I will link their perceptions with their actual DL practices as illustrated in their completed tasks to show how their perceptions relate to their actual practices. With a clear idea of how they perceive DL practices and how these perceptions relate to their actual DL practices, the alignment of these perceptions and practices with the eight elements of DL will be discussed. This discussion will set the stage for answering the third research question in Chapter 5.

2. Perceptions of DL practices and Actual DL Practices

In order to address the first and second research questions of this study, I will first describe and analyse the participants' perceptions of their own, then other teachers' followed by their learners' DL practices. In each section, these perceptions will be related to their actual practices.

2.1 The participants' DL practices

This section discusses the participants' perceptions of their own DL practices. The discussions focus on their strong connection of their own DL practices with the internet, the problems they experience when engaging with the internet and their important association of DL with Gilster's (1998) 'Internet Literacy' (see Chapter 2). It is important to remember that this study views DL as the engagement with many digital resources and "mastering ideas" (Chapter 2). In this conception, the internet is seen as only one of many resources. The section will start with a description of the data followed by an analysis that draws on the theoretical framework described in Chapter 2.

2.1.1 Description

In all of the data sources, the participants talk about how they perceive the internet. Some of the strongest opinions are expressed in the focus group interview:

Kate: Yes. Well, I find personally that, and I think it translates the same evidently, that online there is so much information, and a lot of it is nonsense and a lot of it is stuff you could actually use, you know, depending on what you're looking for... So for example like, you know, if I'm just looking at current affairs or whatever, you know, you're sort of choosing which website has the most accurate information and then the same with journals, you know, online journals... that we have access to at UCT, you know, there's so many and... sifting through so much to find out what's going to help with this assignment or this essay or this kinda thing. So, I think it is... and it's similar if you're planning a lesson, you need so much information, you sorta need to know where to look, where to find the accurate information...

Kate provides an exemplary instance of the typical way that the participants perceive the internet, specifically drawing on her own experience here by referring to "online journals". A sense of being overwhelmed is seen in "so much information", "there's so many" and "sifting through so much". Typically, all of the participants would talk about how much information can be found on the internet, followed by some indication of an awareness that the right, "accurate information" must be somewhere, meaning that they perceive the internet as possibly useful, but that there is always the action of "sifting" that has to happen. Similarly, Nina mentions the "information overload". In one instance, she also talks about Kate's "sifting" process:

Nina: I think if you're using... if you're going online for academic purposes there... for me there's all the sudden information overload... you don't know *where* [my emphasis] to finally stop now... to use that information.

Here a general discussion about the internet leads to one of the few times that Nina actually talks about her own DL practices, giving the idea that she might have a more negative view

regarding the internet compared to the other participants and also that she connects her own DL practices almost exclusively to the internet. Nina later returns to the subject of the internet and her own DL practices:

Nina: ...there are so many things... like myself... if I'm online, I get quickly distracted...

Here the word "distracted" speaks of a decisively negative attitude. There is only one case where she mentions any benefits of using the internet for her own use, and this instance immediately connects with the idea that there is always "something more", which might reflect a sense of disappointment in her own DL practices, for she might feel that she is not 'good enough' to find the right information:

Nina: Whenever I look for... when I'm doing research, I always think there is something better.

The fact that she says, "I *always* think there is something *better*" indicates a possible dissatisfaction with her current Internet Literacy. It does not just show that she thinks there is "something more", but it shows that she does not think she has the ability or skill to find it. It is now clear that Nina has a more negative view of the internet.

The other participants sometimes mention the internet in a positive light, in most cases where they mention their own DL practices. In the following instance where the participants are asked to describe their own DL practices, Susan provides evidence that she believes that it is important to know how to look for information on the internet, showing that she believes in the possible benefits:

Kate: That's the thing... so much choice and then you actually just... don't want so much choice.

Me: Mmmmm... Susan, is there anything that you would like to add?

Susan: No-no, I'm just thinking how it... I suppose... one of the things to do would be to... sort of... develop this skill where you know how to sift and you know how to...

Kate: Mmmmmm (nods)

Susan: ... know it's enough... I've gone over ten sites...

Kate: ... it's a skill!

Susan: ...looking for this... journal. I found only five and just five is enough, you know, but then how to sift and... this is ok, I've got so much and I'm not gonna spend another minute trying to...

Susan shows that she believes that the internet is important as part of her own DL practices because she believes that one should “develop this skill” of sifting. However, her ambivalence is quickly shown where the sense of being overwhelmed appears in “I found *only* five and five is enough”. Because she is constantly aware that there is “so much” out there, she seems to view five journals as insufficient. The issue of time shows up here in, “I’m not gonna spend another minute trying to...”

The only participant who does not seem to share this view of the internet, judging by the interview, is Alicia. However, it becomes clear in Alicia’s reflection that, despite the fact that she has a much more positive view of the internet, she also experiences it as overwhelming:

(Alicia’s reflection) The only difficulty I experienced in using these digital resources, was trying to decide which ones to include and which ones to exclude. There is so much to choose from, and it’s just not possible to use them all in one lesson. I still think I might have used too many, in terms of pictures and poems I downloaded from the Internet.

Here, Alicia is talking about what she describes as the “overuse” of technology in the lesson plan that she submitted. At the start of this quote from her reflection, it might seem that she is talking about an array of “digital resources”. It is interesting to note that, judging by the last sentence of the quote, the term “digital resources” is actually referring to “the Internet”. The phrases “so much to choose from”, “not possible to use them all” and “too many”, show that she too feels overwhelmed by the internet and the fact that she uses “digital resources” as a substitute for “the Internet” means that she might view “DL” as “Internet Literacy”. Her feelings of being overwhelmed could have negative consequences for student learning: it seems that she became so distracted by the quantity of “resources” on the internet, that she forgot about the learning experience, which is central to the lesson plan. The lesson became about using as many sources possible “in one lesson”, rather than student learning.

Both Kate and Susan make similar remarks regarding the overwhelming nature of the internet in their reflections, both actually using the terms “overwhelming” or “overwhelmed”:

(Kate’s reflection) From carrying out this assignment, I realised the power of the internet in two ways. The first is that it provides so much information that could aid a teacher in teaching so many different concepts. However, it can be extremely overwhelming, as one does not always know where to find the best information.

(Susan’s reflection) Had I planned my time effectively and not felt so overwhelmed, these are the digital resources I would have used...

Susan then provides a list of reasons of why she felt overwhelmed, which revolves around videos from YouTube and a better Wi-Fi connection, once again showing a strong connection between her own DL practices and the internet. Notice how both participants are talking about their own DL practices here and how the phrases “so much information” and “had I planned my time effectively” once again reminds of the feeling of being overwhelmed and the time that it takes to find information on the internet. Susan believes that effective time management could have possibly unlocked the potential of the internet, meaning that she does recognise the benefits of the internet, while Kate clearly states this belief in, “information that could aid a teacher”; although Kate does find the internet time consuming and overwhelming, she does believe that there are teaching benefits connected to it.

Nina’s reflection does not mention anything about the internet. This makes sense because of her apparent more negative view of the internet mentioned earlier in this section. This view of the internet could be the reason why there is very little use of the internet described in her completed task and thus her reflection does not mention it either.

When looking at the participants’ questionnaires, the issue of the internet being strongly connected to their own DL practices, as well as its overwhelming nature, manifests clearly in two of the participants’ reports and provides extra evidence that Alicia too feels overwhelmed:

(Alicia’s questionnaire) In every lesson I have taught so far, I have made use of the internet and technology... but if I had to rate myself on a scale of 1 – 10, I would have to say 5. I know there’s still lots of room for improvement! And I would like to learn to use Prezzie... and any other teaching aids I may discover as I go along. I doubt whether I’d use them all, but it is good to know that I have them available to me as options.

Alicia immediately talks about the internet when asked to rate her own DL, showing her strong connection of DL with the internet. She shows that she is overwhelmed by the internet in a slightly disguised manner here: she talks about her wide use of the internet in her lessons, but immediately afterwards gives herself a rating of “5 out of 10”, meaning that the thought of the internet might have caused her to feel inadequate, believing that there is still so much out there (on the internet) that she has not taken note of yet. The internet might be creating a culture of ‘there must be something more out there’, as is seen in “I doubt whether I’d use *them all*”, meaning that she believes that there must be so much out there that it will be impossible to use all of it in the classroom. Once again there seems to be a distraction from

student learning, this time linked to the idea that there is always something more: the focus shifts from student learning to the quantity of digital resources used in the classroom.

Susan, in her questionnaire, summarises what can be seen in all the sources, as voiced by all the participants:

(Susan's questionnaire) This PGCE programme is harder because there is a lot of practical work needed alongside the theory. I am finding that it takes time to Google ideas that assist me to make a lesson plan or game that is relevant and fun. I leave everything to the last minute. It does become very frustrating. I always under calculate the time I take to search (there is always so much).

Susan is talking about how hard the PGCE programme is and then immediately mentions how much time it takes to "Google ideas". This means it is possible she sees the sifting through the information on the internet as one of the hardest tasks of an already hard programme. If one takes into consideration that she is asked here to describe what she wants to see in a DL course, immediately talking about "Google" and thus the internet, emphasises her conflation of DL and the internet. Finally, the idea of wasting time and the internet being overwhelming arises again in, "I always under calculate the time I take to search", and, "there is always so much".

The participants' completed tasks reflect their sense of being overwhelmed. Alicia uses quite a lot of internet resources, from poems and pictures to videos, and complains in the interview that she became too excited and might have overused the internet:

Alicia: ...I started to integrate some digital technology in there [her lesson plan] and I think that I overdid it a little bit, because there was "no way" I could do all of those things.

Alicia is probably the participant who has had the most experience with digital resources and states in her questionnaire that she is "always connected". Despite her exposure to the internet from a young age, she describes her DL practices as "reasonable". This refutes any argument that more exposure to the internet could help the participants to gain a more optimistic view. Alicia's insistence that she "overused" the internet in her lesson plan, a possible consequence of her high exposure to the internet, proves the opposite.

As mentioned before, Nina does not integrate the internet into her completed task, a reflection of her overall disappointment with her own Internet Literacy. Because the participants view so much of DL as Internet Literacy, this could mean that she has lost faith in her own DL practices entirely, because of her perceived failure with the internet. Nina does mention that

she has not grown up with a lot of digital resources, making mention of not growing up with the internet. For this reason she describes her DL as “Beginner/Pre-intermediate”.

Kate almost exclusively uses the internet in her completed task, proving her strong connection of DL with Internet Literacy. Kate’s slight sense of disappointment with her own DL practices surfaces in her questionnaire where she says, “I feel I should have more than basic skills, considering I use technology every day”.

Susan repeatedly complains about running out of time when completing her task. It therefore makes sense that she minimizes her use of DL in her completed task to only pictures she has downloaded from Google Images. This not only shows her connection of DL with Internet Literacy, but it also indicates that the fact that she ran out of time and could not search the internet properly might have caused her to experience negative feelings regarding her own DL practices. It must be mentioned that Susan states in her questionnaire that she has a relationship with digital resources that is driven by necessity and that she has previously shown aversion to its use by saying, “I once thought I hated Bill Gates” in her questionnaire.

Susan grew up in a township that was not well-resourced and her teachers, according to her questionnaire, warned them about “the dangers of the computer” which she grew to “believe as truth”. She thus had to change the beliefs that she grew up with in favour of using digital resources in her completed task, which makes her failure to access what she needed from the internet even more disappointing for her. This disappointment is voiced in the interview:

Susan: ...I just got stuck, because I procrastinate... I did not have enough time, I just ended up Googling a picture of a cat, the fog and... just pictures, and then I would explain the poem, open it for discussion, ask them and then... this is a picture of a cat and... ja. Just very basic at the end. It wasn’t what I originally wanted.

Susan shows here that the volume of information along with the time that it takes to find it, could give rise to negative feelings like disappointment and shame. The fact that she says that her lesson plan ended up being “very basic” and not what she “originally wanted” indicates these feelings. Later in the interview she confirms this deep disappointment again by stating that she does not feel “empowered” when it comes to DL and saying that she could not do “what she wanted to do”. The incident has made her “reluctant... to explore and to really engage”. Susan has thus decided to challenge the beliefs that she grew up with, believing that it might actually lead to empowerment, but her negative feelings towards what the internet had to offer have caused her to now avoid engaging in DL practices.

The participants' shared perception of not engaging effectively with the internet is similar to their perceptions regarding their engagement with other digital resources. In three completed tasks, the participants made use of DL practices they are already familiar with, but all three of them express specifically in their reflections how they do not think they are good enough: Kate does not perceive her knowledge of "basic programmes" as sufficient; Susan states she could have done much more than just "showing pictures"; and Nina thinks her use of a cell phone to record a class could have been done much better if she had used a Dictaphone. Alicia shows that she perceives what she knows currently as not good enough in her questionnaire - not in her completed task - where despite her high exposure to digital resources throughout her life according to her questionnaire, she believes that when it comes to her teaching, "other teaching aids" will be discovered as she "goes along". She therefore makes it clear she does not view her current DL practices as enough and that new practices, "other teaching aids", must be discovered on the way in order for her to engage in the DL practices expected from her as a teacher.

The DL practices in three of the participants' completed tasks coincide with the way they perceive their current DL practices in the interview, reflections and questionnaires: Susan uses very little DL in her task, showing her reluctance; Kate combines familiar, every-day software programmes, which she describes as "basic" in the questionnaire; and Nina, with her negative view of the internet according to the interview, avoids the use of internet sources. It can thus be said that the participants rely on their current DL practices when completing the task; they do not experiment with what they think will be expected from them as teachers. This is important, for there is a general sense of dissatisfaction with their DL practices in the completed tasks. Their wish to be able to engage in "better" or different DL practices provides evidence that the participants do not view their current DL practices, the practices associated with their identities as students, as having much to do with their identities as teachers. The teacher engaging in effective DL practices remains a vague concept to them.

2.1.2 Theoretical analysis

As seen from the above discussion, the participants have strong connections with DL as 'Internet Literacy'. Most of the times, when they mention the internet, they talk about being overwhelmed by all the information available on the internet and not having enough time to search through all the information. What is important here is that they talk about the internet and the overwhelming amount of information found on it when they talk about their own DL

practices by default. There are very few instances where the concept of the internet is not mentioned when talking about their own practices.

Conceptually, the participants' own involvement in internet Discourse is viewed by them as insignificant, because they feel they are only interacting with such a small part of the full Discourse. This is because they are constantly made aware of the bigger Discourse of the internet with every search they conduct, or when they engage in any kind of social media. The internet thus creates a culture of "there must always be something more", because the bigger Discourse is perpetually visible. This explains the existence of both negative and positive views on the internet: it *sounds* great that there is always something out there to use in their classrooms, but the idea of finding it within that huge Discourse seems daunting. The fact that it looks so daunting, constantly reminds them that when they want to find any kind of information on the internet, it will take a lot of time – time they do not think they have. As was seen in the case of Alicia their view that there must always be something more has potentially negative consequences for student learning in their classrooms, as the focus falls on presenting quantity and not the learning experience itself.

The data show that the vastness of the internet as perceived by them distances the internet from their current Secondary Discourses, academia. This is expressed in the way they mention that "there must be more" on several occasions. As mentioned in Chapter 2, the 'situated self' can be understood as the "meaningful *coordinations* of human and non-human elements" (Gee, 2008:155). The coordinations together form Discourses while the Discourses in turn also make these coordinations recognizable and meaningful (Gee, 2008: 155). In this case, the participants coordinate themselves with regards to the internet by using it in various ways when completing academic tasks: "searching for journals" or images on Google, or "sifting" through information to find what to include in lesson plans. From the data sources it is apparent that the participants feel their coordinations related to the internet are not "socially recognizable" (Barton & Hamilton, 1998:6) and meaningful enough compared to what they think it should be and they therefore struggle to situate themselves in what they perceive the whole Discourse of the internet to be.

The participants automatically view this struggle to coordinate themselves with regards to the internet as an inability to engage powerfully with other digital resources: they strongly connect DL to Internet Literacy as mentioned before. This means that they struggle to situate themselves within the Discourse of DL as a whole. DL in its entirety then feels foreign, even

overwhelming, terrifying and intimidating. These negative feelings toward DL have an impact on their “actual identity” (Sfard & Prusak, 2005:1) as students engaging in DL practices, sometimes leading to barriers flaring up because of the disappointment and feelings of incompetence and inferiority they might experience, as expressed by Susan in the interview and her questionnaire. The problems they are experiencing in their actual identities have consequences for their “designated identities” (ibid.) as teachers, as will be seen in the next section.

2.2 Perceptions of other teachers’ DL practices

This section will examine the participants’ perceptions regarding other teachers’ DL practices. The discussion focuses on how the participants look at other teachers to set examples of sound DL practices that will help to move from being pre-service teachers (their actual identities) to in-service teachers (their designated identities) who engage in effective DL practices. It is argued that when they are not provided with good examples of DL practices from the teachers they encounter during their teaching practical, they expect HE to induct them into these practices. The SMART Board¹ is singled out as an example of a digital resource that instils a lot of uncertainty. They therefore look at other teachers’ DL practices to find examples of how the SMART Board could be used in the classroom, but they seldom find any, contributing to their negative perceptions of other teachers’ DL practices. This section, like the previous one, will start with a description of the data sources, followed by a theoretical analysis.

2.2.1 Description

The data show some of the strategies that the participants employ during teaching practice to try and get a clearer understanding of what will be expected from them as teachers with regard to the use of digital resources in the class. A lot of the dissatisfaction with other teachers’ DL practices is expressed in the interview, when talking about what they experienced during their teaching practicals:

Nina: Well, for one of my classes, the teachers brought in their own laptops for a play so the students could listen. The sound quality wasn’t very good, so they could have improved on that, and then another thing is, if you wanted to use a projector, you had to go to the school the same day and... I don’t think the teachers always know how to hook-up the stuff and the wires and stuff... and if it’s not working you have to get somebody in to see how to fix it...

¹ The SMART Board “is an interactive whiteboard that can save and store any information that is written on it, as well as enable the user to refer to notes downloaded from the Internet or other sources. The term smartboard usually refers to a specific brand of electronic whiteboard made by the company SMART Technologies, but the term is increasingly being used to refer to any brand of electronic whiteboard” (taken from wisegeek.com/what-is-a-smartboard.htm). The SMART Board has recently become quite common in South African classrooms.

If Nina had been looking for guidance regarding setting up a projector in the classroom, she could have been looking at other teachers to guide her in this instance. Unfortunately it is clear that she does not get the model she is looking for, coming to the conclusion that she does not “think the teachers always know how”. Soon afterwards in the interview, Nina talks about a failed attempt of another teacher to use a projector to show a video, once again voicing her dissatisfaction with the teacher’s attempt:

Nina: ...that wasn’t too good for the students, because it was a very sunny day and they had to squint their eyes on the wall... so, I mean, at least they tried, but there were some improvements that had to be made.

Nina expresses that she has not been provided with the example from the teachers that she wanted by saying that “they tried”, meaning it was not good enough, and she clearly judges the other teacher’s performance by saying that “some improvements... had to be made”.

Alicia shows frustration with the other teachers’ lack of integration of DL into their lesson plans on quite a few occasions, notably one where she resorts to rather strong language. In this case, she is talking about the computers at her teaching practice school:

Alicia: Now every single class has a computer... that was not always connected to the internet, but the ones closer to the office where the hub is, they’d be connected, but not all the classes had them, so the teachers could not log on assignments, it wasn’t able... you weren’t able to integrate it into the lesson *per se* as good as you can and in one class, I just think it is because the teacher was a lazy S-O-D to be honest... The projector was there for months already, but it had never been hooked up to a computer or laptop ever...

Although there are a few instances where the lack of the integration of DL is connected to the lack of digital resources in schools, that does not seem to be what Alicia is talking about in this case, for she quickly blames another teacher for being “lazy”, not focusing on the fact that the school might have been under-resourced. Alicia is thus not getting the example she thought she would get and therefore voices her frustration by calling the teacher an “S-O-D”. Alicia concludes later in the interview that it has seemed to her that other teachers “were trying to stay away from it [digital resources]”.

Similarly, Kate voices a feeling of being underwhelmed by other teachers’ DL practices:

Kate: I think I was in a very well-resourced school for teaching prac, and I liked how they made use of videos. So, like YouTube clips and stuff the teachers would use, but that was kind of the extent of it...

Kate’s view on the other teachers’ DL practices is not as negative as Nina or Alicia’s, which could be because Kate states in the interview that she has done her practical at a “very well-

resourced school”, but it is clear that she expected more by adding that videos have been “kind of the extent of it”. Another reason why Kate does not display such a negative perception is because, throughout the interview, in her reflection and also in her completed task she shows a particular affinity towards videos, once becoming very excited when talking about TedTalks-videos in the interview.

It is interesting to note that Susan never makes mention of any instance where other teachers use digital resources in an interesting way, or where they have failed to use it. This is partly due to the fact that the school where she has done her teaching practical is under-resourced. The silence indicates that she has not found any notable instance where a proper example has been set for her. Although she does not mention any examples of other teachers’ digital practices, she is the first one in the interview to hint at another strategy the participants use to help them envision themselves as teachers integrating DL in the classroom – a strategy where they look at teacher education to induct them into the necessary DL practices:

Susan: I think when I started obviously I had a clear picture, but then as I tried and I noticed that I could not because I did not have the knowledge or ability to do it *that way*, but then, then I thought I could ask...

Kandiko and Mawer (2013:71), in a study about students’ expectations of HE in the United Kingdom, state that students believe that HE “should provide... support and enable their learning and enhance their career prospects”. Susan here talks about not having the “knowledge or ability” which links to what students expect to get from HE, in this case teacher education. It is not clear whom she has thought she could “ask”, but if it is true she saw no examples of other teachers’ DL practices, as her silence on the matter suggests, then it is very possible that she is expecting the answer from teacher education. When talking about sifting through the information found on the internet, Susan describes her concern about her learners’ abilities to do this and says that that they should be “trained *also*” (Susan in the interview). Soon afterwards in the interview, Kate explicitly mentions that teachers should be trained in DL:

Kate: ... so it [DL] just *adds*. Though, because it’s not a necessity, then I don’t see that a teacher should have to, but if it’s there, then I do think it’s the teacher’s responsibility to use it... maybe they should receive training...

It is clear Kate is aware that DL practices will be part of her role as a teacher when she says, “I do think it’s the teacher’s responsibility to use it”. It is not clear whom she thinks is responsible for providing the “training”, but it is clear that, when she envisions herself as a teacher, she quickly concludes she should receive more training in order to be one. Kate

mentions “training” many times in the interview. Another instance where she mentions training can be found when she talks about the money spent by institutions on placing technology in schools:

Kate: ...I don't think that... because I remember, there are so many things... I know Microsoft does a lot with sponsoring laptop and... to African schools and they just send you iPads... and it's not enough, 'cause I really think you have to know your context... you have to know where you are, because, you know, even if, yes, things get stolen because people are desperate, but even if you lock the laptop to the desk and no one can get it, you need to train a person to use it, because they have not... yeah.

In this instance Kate refers to a lack of resources and theft, two common themes that are present in the data, but where Alicia has previously blamed other teachers' insufficient DL practices, Kate makes it clear that just providing digital resources will not lead to effective DL practices and concludes that one still needs to “train a person to use it”.

The negative perception of other teachers' DL, as well as their perception that training might help them to become teachers that engage in effective DL practices can be found in their reflections too. Two instances appear in the reflections of Nina and Kate:

(Nina's reflection) Teachers could show the students educational video clips to do with the lesson topics. In an ideal teaching world all students would have computers at home and would have unlimited internet access for school research/study purposes. Students would be able to access digital libraries and submit their work online. Projectors in the classroom would also be useful, but this is an under-resourced school and they have to make do with a board and chalk/whiteboard and markers most of the time. Some teachers do bring in their laptops for students to listen to recordings.

In this quote, Nina has been asked to describe the integration of DL in the perfect world. She talks in the subjunctive mood using “would” and “could”, as is expected from the format of the question, but her use of the subjunctive also aligns with what she mentions in the interview about how she did not see any example of good DL practice from other teachers during her teaching practical. The only time she mentions the reality of what she has seen so far, she expresses a sense of being underwhelmed, mentioning it at the very end and by using the phrase “some teachers” – not many, just a few. The reality seems bleak compared to the ideal world she describes, a description that might express what she thinks the expectation from her as a teacher could be.

Kate, as is expected, mentions teachers being trained in DL at four separate instances in her reflection, one being a more obvious hint than the others:

Secondly, programs like Paint, Google and Powerpoint can aid a teacher in adding to their lessons. These are just basic programmes. If one had the knowledge and access to better programs, they could create better resources for lessons and take much less time doing it.

Here Kate is talking about what she could have done to improve her lesson plan. Notice how she also evokes the subjunctive mood, in this case to express a wish for better training, by saying that she wished she had the “knowledge and access to better programs”. What is interesting here is how she undervalues her own DL practices by not thinking that “Paint, Google and Powerpoint” could be enough and how she refers to them as “just basic programmes”. These programmes are in fact used effectively many times in the classroom and it can therefore be seen that Kate does not have a clear idea of what the effective use of DL practices in the classroom would entail; otherwise she would not have devalued her current DL practices to such an extent.

Although this section has dealt with the DL practices associated with various digital resources up to now, it is insightful to single out one digital resource that evokes a lot of uncertainty within the participants. The DL practices associated with the SMART Board serve as a prime example of what the participants want to learn from other teachers. However, they do not find these examples during their teaching practical and thus look at HE to induct them into these practices. An in-depth look at their perceptions regarding the SMART Board illuminates this issue.

Nina, Susan and Kate do not mention the SMART Board in their completed tasks, reflections or questionnaires. However they mention it three times in the interview. This could be because the other data sources were collected before teaching practical; thus they have only been made aware of the extent of the use of the SMART Board in South African classrooms during the teaching practical. In the following example from the interview, it is clear that Kate is not quite sure how the SMART Board could aid in the classroom:

Me: ...do you think it [the SMART Board] could be relevant to the English class?

Kate: I think so (she frowns). I think so, but, it's also... you need to know “how”... ‘cause I think a lot of these things can... a lot of these things don't add to a class...

Although Kate says that she thinks that the SMART Board might add to the English class, she provides no example of how it could be used and rather reverts to the theme of training teachers in DL mentioned earlier in this section. She then talks about how DL, “these things”, sometimes does not add to the class. It becomes clear that she associates the SMART Board

with one of “these things”. Alicia, the only participant to mention the SMART Board in her reflection, mentions it when asked how she would have improved her lesson plan. However, she neglects to say how she would have used it, showing her uncertainty about how it could be used. This relates to Kate’s uncertainty regarding the SMART Board’s use.

In the next example, Nina immediately refers to the SMART Board the moment she is asked to talk about the differences between her own DL practices and her DL practices as a teacher:

Me: Do you imagine that you should be using digital literacies in a different way in the classroom than your own personal use, and in your own academic use?

Nina: Well, if you are using a SMART Board then it could be a bit different...

Nina thus instantaneously identifies the SMART Board as the aspect that makes the DL practices of the teacher different from her current DL practices. She later talks about her academic DL practices as a student and something similar happens, with Nina affirming the sense of the SMART Board being separate from their current DL practices by making a sarcastic comment:

Nina: Oh, yes. I use it, laptop to cell phone, kindle... it’s integrated somehow, except the SMART Board, of course...

In the two examples that follow, Kate and Alicia express the idea that it is important to use the SMART Board, not as something that could add to the class and facilitate student learning *per se*, but rather simply because it is “there” and it is “expensive”. These are their replies when asked how the SMART Board could contribute to the English class:

Kate: That’s the whole debate, isn’t it: if it is in your classroom, you should maybe yourself just try to see if it could add to your [lesson plan]...

Kate uses modality that expresses uncertainty here, “maybe”, “just try” and “see if”, as if she thinks it could add to the class, although it becomes clear that she believes it should actually be used because “it’s there”. Later in the interview, she agrees that it should be used because it “costs money”. Alicia expresses a similar sentiment about the price of the SMART Board:

Alicia: So I was still quite upset about the whole whiteboard [it is confirmed later that she means the SMART Board] issue, because it’s such an expensive piece of equipment and now it’s just being used as a white screen...

Alicia therefore shares Kate’s sentiment that the SMART Board should be used because it cannot just be “used as a white screen” (“it’s there”) and because it is an “expensive piece of equipment”, not necessarily because it adds to student learning. It becomes apparent that the participants are in fact talking about not only their own use of the SMART Board, but also

indirectly about other teachers' use of the SMART Board with their insistence that it "should" be used. The use of the word "should" implies they do not believe that it is actually used in the classroom, possibly because they did not see enough examples of its effective use during their teaching practicals. This possibility is explored below.

Although Alicia does not seem to understand how the SMART Board could enhance the English class in her reflection, she provides some evidence during the interview that she gained some understanding:

Alicia: So it took them [the other teachers] a while to, kind of, sort that out, but eventually I did see what you could do with it and you could put a poem up and actually bring the kids in front to annotate... you could... it was amazing... I did not use it in one of my lessons...but I'm just thinking along the lines of that, because I used the overhead projector, the old school ones, to annotate myself and that was quite... but with a whiteboard you could have the poem right there and someone brought up an interesting thing: they could go and circle it and write it down and you can actually convert that to text as well...

Alicia here provides an example of how the SMART Board could be integrated in a poetry lesson, yet she states that she has not used it. The SMART Board has therefore not become part of her DL practices, despite the fact that she can imagine what its use could be. The context of this quote also provides evidence that there is still a lot of doubt surrounding the SMART Board: before this instance she talks about other teachers not using the SMART Board because of "software needed" and after this instance she talks about how the SMART Board's projector has not been "properly calibrated" and later that the projector "was stolen". Notice that she mentions it "took them a while" to set up the SMART Board, providing a glimpse of her dissatisfaction with other teachers' DL practices. Alicia is thus the only participant to recognize the value of the SMART Board for the English class, but the understanding is still placed within a context of uncertainty and difficulties, for she did not see enough examples of its effective use from other teachers.

2.2.2 Theoretical analysis

It becomes clear in the data that the participants are not sure what exactly is expected from them in their designated identities as teachers engaging in DL practices. When they turn to other teachers, the representatives of their designated identities, to set an example, they are frustrated because teachers do not provide them with good examples of DL practices in the classroom. In some cases, they thus emphasise teacher education with regard to DL, meaning they expect to gain a better understanding of their designated identities from teacher education. The designated identity is thus not present to "drive the actual identity" (Sfard &

Prusak, 2005:18), for as students engaging in DL practices, they do not see how their actual identity and their designated identity are related. This could explain why they do not view their current DL practices associated with their actual identities as providing them with much of a foundation for what is expected from them.

Their perception that their current DL practices have little to do with their DL practices as teachers is further exacerbated by the fact that there might be digital resources in classroom Discourse that are not used in their current Discourses. Some of the digital resources are projectors and screens, but the digital resource that they mention the most is the SMART Board. The fact that the SMART Board is not mentioned in sources other than the interview could mean that they do not view the SMART Board as part of their current DL practices, because they have relied on their current DL practices when completing their assignments. This shows a lack of experimentation with DL practices that could lead to the induction into new practices more closely associated with the target Discourse, the classroom.

The participants cannot coordinate themselves in relation to the SMART Board: it is not part of their Primary Discourse, nor their dominant current Secondary Discourse, which is academia. This means they will not be able to coordinate themselves with regards to it to make their use of the SMART Board “recognizable and meaningful” (Gee, 2008:155). The absence of the SMART Board from all their current Discourses makes sense because the SMART Board is part of classroom Discourse and classroom Discourse alone, which seems to be the root of the problem here. It can thus be stated that, because the SMART Board is not present in any of their current Discourses, its unfamiliarity makes it a major cause of the confusion mentioned earlier regarding what will be expected from them as teachers.

2.3 The Learners’ DL practices

This section will discuss the participants’ perceptions regarding their future learners’ DL practices and their notion of the relationship between DL and student learning. As with the previous two sections, this section will first present a description of the data, followed by theoretical analysis.

2.3.1 Description

Below I describe two instances where participants mention other individuals’ use of perceived ‘hi-tech’ digital resources, revealing that a perception exists where the pre-service teachers construct the users of these digital resources as individuals who engage in effective DL practices, practices which are very different from their own. On the other hand, learners’

possession of these digital resources intimidate the participants, who devalue their own DL practices. On the other hand, it will be shown that the participants have a conflicting perception too: they believe that their learners will experience difficulty with certain DL practices, especially navigating the internet, which shows that they perceive their learners' DL practices as similar to theirs.

In the interview, Kate describes how “intimidated” she felt when teaching in a classroom where all the learners had iPads:

Kate: Ja, I was also... and when they said, “well, can we Google this, can we Google that?”, I don't know. I don't know what you're gonna find... I don't know, and when I said... and also I said... we did a poem and I said, “look up the words you don't know”, but there's no such thing as a dictionary anymore in these kinda schools, so they all just get their iPads out and I said, “but what are you searching? Are you just searching in Google?”, because... is that accurate? “Oh no, but there's Oxford...” They were educating me...

It is clear from the extract that Kate feels intimidated and has experienced a feeling of being different from her class, because her perception is that *all* the learners know more than she does when it comes to DL. This perception can be seen in the generalised manner she talks about her learners: “they said”, “they all just” and “they were”. Her learners become one entity (“they”) that is perceived as homogenous by her and that is juxtaposed to a separate, very different entity (“I”), hence the ‘I said-they said’ character of her narrative. The separation has been caused by them “getting their iPads out”, a digital resource Kate does not possess and is not familiar with as seen in her questionnaire. It is thus not the way in which the learners' use their iPads which intimidated Kate, but simply the fact that they possessed these digital resources.

Similarly, Susan views individuals who possess perceived hi-tech digital resources as engaging in different, or better DL practices than she does:

(from Susan's reflection) In my English Methods class the other students appeared to be extremely “techno savvy”. They also brought with them all these technological gadgets (notepads, tablets, iPods etc.). I was intimidated.

Just like Kate's view of her learners, Susan sees the “other students” as one group of equally digitally literate individuals who are all “techno savvy” – something she clearly does not consider herself to be according to her questionnaire. It is clear that she associates the presence of “technological gadgets” as an indication of effective DL practices. If she therefore were to enter a class where the learners possessed these “gadgets”, she would

probably perceive them as “techno savvy”. Kate and Susan thus construct learners who possess certain digital resources as more digitally literate.

In three cases learners are perceived as having similar DL practices to the participants. Nina expresses another important view during the interview:

Nina: I think that could be difficult for students also, like, how... how much time do they spend looking at different sites for information? For us, that time they spent looking, they could have been just reading already what they had...

Nina’s perception is that the use of the internet “could be difficult for students *also*”, connecting her own perception of the internet as overwhelming, discussed in 2.1, to her learners’ DL practices.

It is not only Nina who holds this perception about the learners. When talking about searching for information on the internet, Susan and Kate seem to agree that their learners need to be trained:

Susan: So maybe have them... maybe trained also, in a way on how to navigate through all this information...

Kate: Yes! So they won’t get side-tracked, because they know that they don’t have to open Google and get side-tracked by that... they know that they don’t have to go onto Twitter, ‘cause they’re going to this specific place to get what they need, but then I suppose that must be so hard, because there isn’t just one. Often there isn’t just one.

Susan and Kate here provide insight into how they see their learners using the internet. They seem to experience doubts about the learners’ DL practices associated with the internet; they believe learners need to be “trained” so they will not be “side-tracked”. Kate, Susan and Nina all thus believe there are similarities between their DL practices and their learners’. This perception seems to contradict the view that the learners’ DL practices will be different or better than theirs. It is therefore safe to say that the pre-service teachers’ perception regarding whether their learners’ DL practices will be different or similar to theirs changes across contexts.

Losing control when allowing learners to engage in DL practices in class seems to be an important issue, especially for Susan:

Susan: I think it’s good, you know, we would be advancing, but then how do you, also, control so that you as the teacher are in control and you know, “yes, they have the poem or whatever text in front of them”, and they are not doing something else.

Here Susan is also talking about the learners using iPads in the classroom. In her reflection, she mentions specifically that, in an ideal world, all her learners would use tablets, but that she would like to find a way to “disable social media” in order to regulate what they were viewing. She also mentions she wants to apply “parental control” that will ensure that whatever they are viewing would be “educational”. In her questionnaire, she expresses a wish to be trained in programmes that are “teacher... and also pupil friendly”, i.e. “not overwhelming to the degree where [she] would not be able to ‘control’ it”. In the excerpt from the interview where Kate talks about her learners using iPad, she says “I don’t know” three times, showing her submission of power as possessor of “superior knowledge” (McCarty, 2006:190). It is thus clear that, in that instance, Kate also experienced a feeling of losing control.

Susan and Kate seem to think allowing learners to engage in DL practices in the classroom might lead to loss of control. Even if they do not perceive their entire class as engaging in superior DL practices than them, they might still be reluctant to integrate DL where the learners are allowed to use or improve their DL practices (“teaching” DL), because of this fear of losing control.

The participants talk about the use of social media in the classroom on four occasions. In each instance it links to their learners’ DL practices, for the integration of social media would include their learners’ using it in most cases. While social media is not connected to the learners’ DL practices explicitly, it is strongly connected with the participants’ personal lives and there exists a strong possibility that they associate it with their learners’ personal lives in a similar way, as will be seen in the discussion below.

In the interview, Kate moves from talking about the overwhelming nature of the internet to social media:

Kate: ...I think similarly with social media. On a personal level, I think something like Facebook and Instagram can have very bad, what’s the word, connotations, but then they can also be used for good things, like keeping in touch with other people... also promoting bad things, so it sorta that... and also you could use social media. I think you should try and use social media in lesson, ‘cause it’s what kids care about, but just deciding how to do it. It’s the same in your personal life, deciding how to use your social media and how to use it in a classroom.

Kate moves from expressing a negative view in “very bad... connotations” to a positive one in “can also be used for good things”, then back to a negative view in “promoting bad things”. Despite this ambivalence, she seems to recognise some benefit to using social media

in a lesson plan, not because it inherently contains any pedagogical value, but rather because it is “what kids care about”. She also seems to connect social media with something that is private, by mentioning “on a personal level” and “personal life”. The quote, “but just deciding how to do it”, expresses her uncertainty regarding the use of social media in the classroom. This quote sets the stage for the general sentiments shared by all the participants.

Alicia seems to be the most enthusiastic about social media, describing it as her “life blood” in the interview, yet she seems to move from negative to positive opinions too:

Alicia: ...at [name of school] they have Shakespeare sleepovers. They take selfies while it's happening, so it kinda helps everyone to get excited about school. A lot of kids start to add me on Facebook and I had a nice little chat, I was like, “guys, I don't want you to see me up in the clubs”. I just told them there are boundaries and none can pass that, but in the same breath, I won't give you my... I won't add you on Facebook...

Alicia gets quite excited about this use of social media in teaching Shakespeare. However, it is not clear how social media has been used as an educational tool here. If learners take “selfies” of “Shakespeare sleepovers”, it rather connects with their personal social media practices, and it does not serve much of a purpose other than maybe getting learners excited about school. So its use cannot be described as educational, or beneficial to teaching English in this instance. This excitement is immediately followed by her talking about “boundaries”, pointing out a negative aspect of using social media in the classroom. She also talks about how Facebook might reveal her personal life in “see me up in the clubs”, which shows how she connects social media with her private life.

In an instance where the participants are talking about how “the social” and “the academic” seem to be “mixed” online, there's an enthusiastic conversation between Nina, Kate and Susan where Kate leads the conversation:

Kate: ...there is so much out there. Personally, if I wanted to know, “what wedding dress?”, then it's there for me if I want it, but academically there's so many journals so many webs...

And then later:

Kate: If you had... I mean... I get that nobody knows where to find everything, but something like TedEd, you know, you know the kinda thing you're going to get.

In these extracts Kate provides examples of how the internet could be used “personally” and “academically”. The “wedding dress” has been mentioned before in the interview, where she explains how she wasted time on Instagram, a social media platform. So looking at a

“wedding dress”, a personal endeavour on the internet, is connected to social media, but her use of the internet for academic reasons is connected to “journals” and “TedEd”, an institutional website containing the videos that Kate previously praised for containing information that is relevant to her class. The use of the internet for purposes that are academic (not private) thus excludes social media, strengthening the connection of social media with her private life once again. The participants thus associate social media mainly with their private lives. Seeing as it has been shown before that the participants view their learners’ DL practices as similar to their own in certain contexts, then chances are the participants associate social media with their learners’ private lives too. If this is true, then social media is removed from the classroom according to their perceptions.

Neither Susan nor Nina share Alicia’s enthusiasm about social media in the classroom and rather supply alternatives, or explicitly mention regulating the use of social media:

Nina: The video games it’s also a lot of visual there... but it seemed like it’s something quite exciting. I’d rather take a look into that more than using Facebook or Twitter or any of those things.

Nina does not see the value of using social media in the classroom and here suggests the integration of video games as an alternative. Susan expresses her disdain for the use of social media by actually mentioning that she would ban it in the ideal world that she describes in her reflection:

(from Susan’s reflection) I would have used a programme to disable social media networks such as Whatsapp, Mixit, Twitter and so.

However, Susan, like Kate also connects social media with something that the learners find interesting, but they do not connect social media to student learning:

Susan: I think it [social media] is the culture that [in which] they were born and now living in.

In this instance in the interview, the participants are talking about how their learners are more visually- oriented and they provide this as an explanation of the popularity of social media. Susan thus concedes there exists a “culture” in which social media is a dominant phenomenon, yet she still does not want to admit its use in the ideal world expressed in her reflection, meaning she views it as a distraction and cannot see how it could be used as an educational tool.

During the same conversation, Kate mentions that Facebook, Twitter and Instagram are “only about the visuals” and that she does not think “they [the learners] really read that much”

when engaging in social media practices. She is thus not connecting social media with the English curriculum, which once again indicates that the social media “culture” is separated from academic life. The idea that Susan, Kate and Nina are uncertain about the use of social media in the classroom is strengthened by the fact that they do not mention the integration of social media in their completed tasks, their questionnaires, and their reflections.

Although Alicia is less ambivalent about social media in the classroom, it is still not clear whether she knows how to integrate it into the classroom as an educational tool. Alicia’s completed task is on the topic of social media. The lesson plan includes debates about social media, uploading videos about skits dealing with social media onto social media and two poems about social media including questions on the poem. In her reflection, Alicia provides the rationale for this lesson plan:

(Alicia’s reflection) My comprehension lesson with the focus on social media, has the ability to generate a rich discussion around a topic most of the students, and myself, have a strong interest in.

The topic of the lesson itself is thus social media and the reason for the lesson is that learners are assumed to have “a strong interest in” it. This makes it clearer why learners are expected to upload their videos onto social media, as stated in Alicia’s completed task: not because they will be exposed to a DL practice that might be unfamiliar to them, but because they are interested in social media. There is no mention in the reflection that the use of social media in the classroom has any substantial benefits as an educational tool. It is rather emphasized that talking *about* social media might “generate rich discussion”, which coincides with the CAPS curriculum. She is therefore not integrating social media into the classroom as an educational tool, but simply talking about social media as a sociocultural phenomenon. It must be made clear that “talking about social media” was indeed the overall theme of a task the participants had to complete in their PGCE courses. The point is however that, even with the topic being social media and Alicia mentioning in the interview that she likes social media, there is still no evidence she has a grasp on how *the use of* social media could serve as a tool to facilitate learning in the English classroom.

To summarise this discussion about social media, it is clear that the participants are ambivalent about the use of social media in the classroom generally and also the English classroom, expressed through: (1) their ambivalence when talking about social media; (2) their connection of social media with their private lives and (3) the lack of examples of how social media could be effectively integrated into the English classroom.

2.3.2 Theoretical analysis

As shown in Chapter 2, the teacher's power over learners is typically associated with two sources: his/her association with the institution and his/her superior knowledge on the subject matter (McCarty, 2006:190). It has also been stated that learners may "resist" this power however. The insecurity and feelings of inferiority that the participants experience with regards to their own DL practices, mentioned in 2.1, may in certain contexts mean that they perceive their power as individuals with superior knowledge as being under threat. The threat to this kind of power is further strengthened through the fact that they sometimes perceive their learners as engaging in DL practices that are superior to their own, as seen in 2.3.1.

The participants' perception that the learners engaging in DL practices in the classroom might lead to them as teachers losing control over their classes, relates to their power associated with their positions within the institution (the school). Due to this power over their learners, they should at all times be aware of what their learners are viewing/doing and able to regulate what activities are performed inside the class, and to a degree, outside the class, just like Susan mentions in her reflection and in the interview (see 2.3.1). Losing control, as the participants describe it, will definitely mitigate that power.

With its potential to threaten their power, they perceive the classroom where the learners' DL practices are strongly embedded as an unfamiliar space with an inverted power differential that is not typical of classroom Discourse. As mentioned in Chapter 2, power differentials can be defined as "the enhanced amount of role power that accompanies any position of authority" (Barstow, 2008:1). When it comes to DL, the participants therefore view the classroom as removed from its normal Discourse: a place where the learners could possibly possess more role power than them. But what are the possible consequences of this shift in power?

In response to her power being under threat, Alicia overloads the lesson plan in her completed task with compulsory activities, tasks and additional homework in order to regulate what activities are performed inside and outside the class: two sets of questions; a performance of a skit; a recording of it; uploading it on social media; two journal entries; readings of the journal entries; a class discussion; the awarding of prizes; and a ban on the use of social media that lacks motivation. These activities are described with added affirmations of power over the learners like "they'll have one week" or "which will be assessed". Susan, in an attempt to gain control, wishes to disable all social media and further

regulate their use by applying “parental control”. She is thus trying to control what her learners are doing/viewing at all times.

It can therefore be seen in the data that when teachers perceive a threat to their power, they might try to regain their position of authority - eliminating the ‘unusual’ power differential - by emphasizing their institutional power to a greater extent. This process might seem irrational and unmotivated to their learners, which might lead to the learners resisting power in response.

It has been stated in 2.3.1 that the way pre-service teachers view their DL practices as different or similar from their learners’ could vary from context to context. The level in which specific DL practices are embedded in their Primary and Secondary Discourses could be used to predict which kind of contexts will lead the pre-service teacher to perceive their learners’ DL practices in a specific way, as seen below.

In the example where the participants view their own DL practices as different from their learners, there are digital resources involved that are not familiar to the participants (“iPads” and other “gadgets”). Since these resources are situated outside their Primary and Secondary Discourses, they struggle to coordinate themselves with regards to these resources, leading to their perceptions that their DL practices are inferior to their learners’ in that specific context. However, in the example where they view the learners’ DL practices as similar to theirs, they are talking about the internet and internet searches, a resource and a practice that are strongly embedded in the participants’ Primary and Secondary Discourses, especially because of their high exposure to the internet during tertiary studies. What is important is that they view their DL practices in this context as similar to their learners’ (“it is difficult for them *also*”), despite the fact that they view their internet practices as inferior (see section 2.1). It could thus be stated that:

the degree to which pre-service teachers view their own DL practices in a specific context as being similar to their learners’ is proportional to the level in which these practices are embedded in their Primary and/or Secondary Discourses, *regardless of how superior or inferior they believe these practices to be.*

There may even be contexts where they perceive their own DL practices as superior to their learners, but that is not evident in the data of this study.

The participants' ambivalence regarding social media integration and their tendency to connect social media with their private lives could be explained by referring to Primary and Secondary Discourses. Social media is strongly associated with their Primary Discourses, which include their "home Discourses" that are "naturally acquired" and of which they could have "only one" (Lankshear & Knobel, 2011:20). It makes sense that they view social media as part of their Primary Discourses, because so many coordinations required by social media - like communicating with friends and family and pursuing personal interests - can be seen as home Discourses that are natural. With this strong connection of social media to their Primary Discourses, using social media for academic purposes, which is associated with their Secondary Discourses, feels counterintuitive, for there can only be one Primary Discourse. This leads to the separation of 'the internet' (for academic/educational purposes) from 'social media' (for the use in their private lives), explaining why they struggle to see how social media could be integrated into the English classroom - an educational environment - as an educational tool. It could be that this perception is further strengthened by similar views expressed by many educational institutes and popular media sources.

Alicia's reference to feeling "uncomfortable" with the learners becoming too familiar with her on social media indicates the existence of "boundaries", which emphasizes the separation of internet and social media mentioned above: the "boundaries" also refer to the separation of the singular Primary from the plural Secondary Discourses. This makes it clear once again that the participants coordinate themselves as users of social media within their Primary Discourse. Does this mean that they view their learners' use of social media as belonging to the learners' private lives too?

Susan mentions in her reflection that she wishes to "disable all social networks". She also mentions in the interview that this ban on social media is because she will not be able to tell what they are looking at. She is thus talking about losing control once again, something that might be a threat to her power due to her association with the institution. Her decision to ban social networks is thus not related to the fact that social networks are foreign, like the "gadgets" to her or the "iPads" to Kate. As can be seen in the interview and the questionnaires of Kate, Nina and Alicia, social media is deeply embedded in their Primary Discourses, with Alicia even mentioning that it is her "life blood" and Kate talking about wasting time on social media on two occasions.

If the degree in which they view their DL practices in a specific context as similar to their learners' DL practices is proportionate to the level in which the DL practices in that context are embedded in their Primary and/or Secondary Discourses, as stated earlier, then it is safe to say they view their learners' use of social media as similar to their own. This means they do perceive their learners' use of social media as associated with the learners' private lives, in a similar way as they associate social media with their own private lives. This provides more evidence for their ambivalence and lack of examples about the use of social media as an educational tool: they associate it with their own *and* their learners' singular Primary Discourses, removed from the Secondary Discourse of the classroom.

3. Alignment with the eight elements of DL

Section 2 provided insights into how pre-service teachers perceive DL practices and how these perceptions relate to their actual practices, answering the first two research questions. Because I based the integration of DL in the English Method course on the Belshaw's eight elements since 2014, it seems appropriate to ascertain how their perceptions of practice and their actual practices align with the elements in order to provide a good point of departure for future integration. This understanding helps to establish a clear picture of their "prior knowledge"; the foundation on which they must "construct" a more in-depth perception of DL, associated with more effective practices. The discussion in this section will focus on this alignment, answering the second research question, and will set the stage for Chapter 5, which answers the third research question pertaining to the integration of DL into teacher education.

This section will look closely at some of the views expressed by Kate, Susan and Nina in the interview, reflections and questionnaire, but will focus mostly on how the participants use DL in their completed tasks. If taken into account that they submitted these tasks after being asked to submit an example where they felt they integrated DL, it could be said that these assignments reflect how they view DL.

The participants seem to perceive DL as a cognitive skill, mostly concerned with technical 'know-how' and understanding procedures (Belshaw, 2011:206). Their perception can be explained by their exposure to "computer skills" education, which focused on "mastering keystrokes" (Martin, 2008:156). Susan mentions in her questionnaire that she had to attend "computer skills" classes in high school, which she did not like at all. In the interview, Susan

talks about not having the “knowledge or ability” to work with digital resources the way she wanted:

Susan: I think when I started obviously I had a clear picture, but then as I tried and I noticed that I could not because I did not have the knowledge or ability to do it *that way...*

Susan mentions that she “had a clear picture” of what she wanted to do in her completed task, but that something formed an obstacle between “*that way*” and what her DL practices could enable. She describes this obstacle as “knowledge or ability”, the “how-to”-aspect of DL, which connects with the **cognitive element** of DL (Belshaw, 2011:206). Susan thus clearly recognizes the cognitive aspect of DL. However, it might be that the cognitive element, only one element in eight, is what Susan thinks DL is in its entirety, which is more aligned to the way she has been educated in high school.

Similarly, Kate expresses her view of DL as ‘knowing something’ that will enable one to engage in better DL practices, when talking about some of the obstacles when integrating DL into her lesson plan:

Kate: ...just the whole assignment made me realize how it all came “from” technology, *but* if I knew a lot more about technology, I could have made it, you know, better.

Here Kate talks about ‘knowing more about technology’. She never mentions anything about having ‘more experience’ with technology, or ‘using technology more often’. Knowing “about” technology does not necessarily lead to engaging in effective DL practices. Her view coincides with Susan’s because she believes that “knowledge and ability” are what she needs to improve her DL practices, once again showing that the participants perceive DL in its entirety in terms of its cognitive element only.

It has been seen that Susan, Kate and Nina show an over-reliance on the cognitive element of DL in the interview and questionnaires. This aligns with their use of DL in their completed tasks, for there are very few indications of where their DL practices connected with the other elements of DL. As mentioned before, the participants were asked to submit an assignment where they felt they integrated DL. Susan limited the use of DL integration to “showing pictures”, because she got tangled up in the “how-to” aspects of DL, thus the cognitive part of it.

Nina is overwhelmed by the cognitive aspect of using the cell phone to record, wishing she had a Dictaphone, which would make it “easier”. The task of recording the lesson became so

overwhelming to her that it became the full extent of what she believes DL integration is. Yet this DL integration connects with none of the other seven components of DL. Because Nina and Susan describe themselves as the least digitally literate in their questionnaires, both stating that they had limited exposure to technology in their lives, it makes sense that they find only the one component of DL overwhelming. The limited view of DL, aligned with only the cognitive element, might limit their integration of DL into their classrooms in the future, which will be to the detriment of student learning.

The **critical element** of DL calls for the ability to evaluate the literacy (Belshaw, 2011:206). This critical evaluation often entails searching through a large quantity of information online and deciding which sources would be the best. Belshaw (2011:206) states that in order to align with the critical element of DL, an individual must “develop an understanding” of “data management” and the “power structures” that underpin digital resources. The practices associated with “searching” thus become an integral part of effective DL practices. During the interview, Nina refers to the time spent by learners “looking at different sites of information”. She mentions how this searching through information is a waste of time and that learners could have been busy “reading what they already had”. She thus does not perceive the ability to critically evaluate sources while searching as part of effective DL practices. It is rather the end product, the ‘right’ information that counts as knowledge.

Nina’s statement that the learners could have been reading instead of searching illuminates her view on DL in another way too. It shows that she sees literacy in a more traditional sense, where it is seen as an “independent variable”, aligned with the “autonomous model” that views it as a set of skills that is transferable from context to context (Street, 1984). If it is then the action of reading and writing, a way of viewing literacy that is not aligned with NLS (from which DL and its elements are defined), then the goal of a literacy is ‘to get to’ the reading and writing part, and the practices involved prior to this action are not seen as part of it. If this is the way in which she views literacy, a valid way many scholars still view it, then it is understandable that her perception of DL will differ from the way it is defined here.

In her questionnaire, Susan also seems to devalue the activity of searching:

(from Susan’s questionnaire) I am finding that it takes time to Google ideas that assist me to make a lesson plan or game that is relevant and fun. I leave everything to the last minute it does become very frustrating.

Here Susan is not seeing the value in searching as an activity and she actually calls it “frustrating”. The idea of searching being a means to an end is expressed in “ideas that assist me to make a lesson plan...” The purpose of the whole exercise is thus ‘to get to’ the writing of the lesson plan. Once again, the DL practice is only valuable if it involves some form of traditional literacy, in this case writing.

There are only two instances where Kate and Susan’s completed tasks align with elements of DL other than the cognitive. Although these tasks briefly touch on the other elements, it cannot be said that they align with the full scope of them:

(from Kate’s completed task) I have created pictures to illustrate this second story that I will hand out or display on an overhead projector if possible.

Kate’s creation of pictures, using Paint, illustrates the use of digital technologies to create new things, which have value to herself and others (Belshaw, 2011). Her lesson plan thus connects with the **creative element** of DL. She also displays an ability to mix analogue and digital elements, by mentioning a “hand out” as well as the use of the “overhead projector”. This mixture connects with the **confident element** of DL, according to Belshaw (2011). She later in the completed task encourages her learners to make similar presentations, which means that she also is integrating the creative element into her learners’ DL practices. Yet this is the only instance where Kate’s DL practice reflects a connection to parts of DL other than the cognitive. Kate’s use of pictures shows an awareness of the **communicative element** of DL, similarly to Susan: Susan also “shows pictures” in her completed task. Showing pictures connects with another component of DL, the communicative element, for it shows some understanding of the many different ways one can communicate with different devices (Belshaw, 2011). This is however only a small part of the communicative element of DL.

The participants’ exclusive alignment with the cognitive element of DL can be used to explain why they struggle to associate their current identities with their designated identities as teachers engaging in DL practices (see section 2.2.2). If DL is an independent variable - something of which they must learn the “know-how” separately first before they could engage in the practices associated with it - then they might struggle to recognize their own practices - which are “routinized social practices” as Lankshear (Chapter 2) defines it - as having anything to do with their designated identities. For example, the participants not seeing “searching for information” on the internet as anything valuable, could be because the searching on the internet is already a routinized practice for them and they thus do not need to

be “taught” the “know-how” of searching. Learning how to engage in new DL practices, like the ones associated with their designated identities, therefore becomes about ‘learning what they *do not know*’ and their current DL practices that are routinized - where ‘knowing things’ is only one aspect of the whole practice - have thus very little to do with the kind of learning they have in mind. If they do not recognize their current DL practices as valuable or as part of the practices associated with being teachers, there would be no construction of knowledge from “prior knowledge” (Jones & Brader-Araje, 2002:3), meaning that a DL classroom in teacher education would not be able to operate according to constructivist principles.

This section has so far looked at the practices of Susan, Nina and Kate, but Alicia has been omitted. This is because Alicia indeed shows a greater awareness of the elements of DL and she attempts to integrate DL in ways that connect with much more than the cognitive component of DL on quite a few occasions in her completed task. However, the fact that she has a broader perception of DL sometimes leads to her “overdoing” the integration of DL, as she mentions in the interview. This will be explored below.

In her completed task, Alicia allows the learners to first perform a skit, recording it in class and then uploading the videos online. There thus exists some movement between different digital environments and using technologies in a variety of different contexts (Belshaw, 2011): (1) re-using a recording of the skit in a different context connects strongly with the **constructive element** (see Chapter 3); (2) the movement from recording a video, on the learners’ “cell phones or video cameras” (from Alicia’s completed task), to *social media* where the videos will be uploaded aligns with the **cultural element** of DL. It also allows the learners to connect with the confident element, by moving from analogue (writing and performing a skit) to the digital (the video and social media). This task further connects with the creative element allowing learners to make something new that is meaningful to themselves and others (Belshaw, 2011).

The questions that she sets in the lesson plan are all successfully connected with the critical element of DL, specifically critically engaging with social media, as the assignment required:

(from Alicia’s completed task) Teenagers have a lack of experience and feel invincible. They believe social media is harmless.

Alicia wants her learners to fully comment on the above statement, provide a “solid example” and link it to “their own experiences”. Here Alicia expects her learners to become “aware of the power structures and assumptions behind different digital tools and practices” (Belshaw,

2011:206), aligned with the critical element of DL. Unfortunately Alicia does not provide examples in her memorandum of what she considers a “solid example”. It is thus not possible to ascertain to what extent she herself connects DL to the critical element.

Alicia’s awareness of the critical element of DL is once again illustrated later in her completed task, but this time it becomes clear she is not sure about her own view regarding the communicative and **civic elements** of DL, although she shows some knowledge of their existence:

(from Alicia’s completed task) Hopefully the assignment will let the students know that social media has both its dangers and its benefits: that it is possible for them to switch off their phones for a weekend and make it out alive on the other side; but that their ability to successfully use social media could have positive spinoffs, like the chance to win movie tickets in an English class.

By saying that the successful use of social media could lead to “the chance to win movie tickets in an English class”, she is not fully realizing the full potential of the effective use of social media, since her example of what the effective use could lead to is not connected to anything outside the “English class”. She is therefore not showing a full awareness of how her digital environment (social media in this case) can help her self-organise and foster links with “local, national and global organisations” (Belshaw, 2011:206), thus not quite connecting the activity in class with the civic element of DL. The example also fails to demonstrate whether she has deeper insight into the importance of networks and communication and the important role they play in developing her digital literacy (Belshaw, 2011), which would connect the integration of DL with DL’s communicative component. However, she does show some awareness of a broader role of DL, which could connect with its communicative and civic components; she does mention that the successful use of social media could have “positive” consequences.

It is puzzling that Alicia also complains about DL being overwhelming, since she seems to be the most digitally literate of the participants (according to her questionnaire and completed task), seldom complaining of the overwhelming nature of the internet. It could however be that Alicia’s sense of being overwhelmed is not as strongly connected to her use of the internet - connecting DL with ‘Internet Literacy’ - but rather because she does not specifically connect DL with Internet Literacy only, and has consequently developed a much broader sense of DL. It is precisely this view that leads to her sense of being overwhelmed and her tendency to overdo the integration of DL.

The following table provides an overview of the participants’ connections with (C/W) and awareness of (A/O) the elements of DL (using the first three letters of elements, except for the confident element, which is indicated as “conf”):

Table 3 – Overview of participants’ connections with the elements of Digital Literacy

Participant	C/W Cog	A/O Cog	C/W Con	A/O Con	C/W Cri	A/O Cri	C/W Cre	A/O Cre	C/W Com	A/O Com	C/W Conf	A/O Conf	C/W Cul	A/O Cul	C/W Civ	A/O Civ
Kate	yes	yes	no	no	no	no	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	no	no	no	no
Nina	yes	yes	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
Susan	yes	yes	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	yes	no	no	no	no	no	no
Alicia	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes

The table shows that all the participants’ completed tasks connect strongly with the cognitive element of DL, but Nina and Susan’s completed tasks do not connect with any other elements. Kate’s lesson plan further connects with both the creative and the confident elements, while she and Susan both show an awareness of the communicative element. Alicia’s completed task shows an awareness of all of the elements and a connection with all of the elements except for the critical, communicative and civic.

4. Summary of data analysis

In this chapter, I have answered the first two research questions regarding pre-service teachers’ perceptions of their own, other teachers’ as well as their learners’ DL practices and how these perceptions relate to their actual DL practices. It has been found that they have a tendency to associate DL with ‘Internet Literacy’. Because they find the internet overwhelming, they struggle to coordinate themselves with regards to the internet, meaning they believe they are not being effective in the DL practices overall. When it comes to other teachers’ DL practices, they do not seem to believe they are receiving the models they are looking for, notably when it comes to resources they are not familiar with. They thus look at teacher education to provide them with the “knowledge and ability” to include these resources in their DL practices. They struggle to describe how they would integrate specific classroom resources into their teaching practice, because those digital resources are not present in their current Discourses. One of these digital resources is the SMART Board, about which they also express a lot of uncertainty.

When it comes to the learners’ DL practices, the way in which they view their learners’ DL practices vary from context to context. They view their own DL practices as inferior to their learners’ in specific contexts where they do not view the DL practices associated with that

context as embedded in their Primary and/or Secondary Discourses. However, the way in which they view their learners' DL practices as being similar to theirs is proportional to the level in which these practices are embedded in their Discourses, regardless of their perceived effectiveness with these practices. In other words, when they do not use a specific digital resource, they assume that learners who do use such resources are doing so more effectively than them. However, if the participants are using similar resources, they assume that their practices are similar.

When pre-service teachers view their own DL practices as inferior to their learners, it often leads to a shift in power differentials, as well as a failure to integrate the learners' DL practices in the classroom in order for the learners to improve their practices. The power differentials, caused by a threat to the teachers' power as an individual possessing superior knowledge, could lead to overstressing their power associated with the institution to balance the differential. Balancing the differential may seem irrational and unmotivated to the learners, which might lead to the learners resisting the teachers' power.

Concerning the learners' use of social media, the pre-service teachers view social media as something belonging to their own and the learners' private lives. They thus do not recognize the value of integrating social media as an educational tool that could benefit the English classroom; they rather limit social media integration to discussions about social media itself. On the other hand, they want to limit the learners' DL practices in the classroom, mostly because the learners might also be overwhelmed by the internet, or because there may be a problem with control.

The second research question has been addressed further by investigating how the participants' completed tasks have been aligned with the eight elements of DL. It has been shown that they limit their view of DL mostly to the cognitive – where DL skills, the “how-tos”, have to be taught to them in teacher education. Three of the participants do not value searching for information as a valuable practice, and consequently do not value the critical element. One participant showed that a broader perception of DL, more aligned to its elements, could lead to its overuse in a lesson plan, which could have dangerous consequences.

With a clearer picture of how pre-service teachers view their own, other teachers' and their learners' DL practices and how these perceptions and practices are related to their actual practices, I can focus on the third research question, pertaining to what these insights might

teach us about the integration of DL into teacher education and specifically English teacher education. This will be discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 5: Discussion

1. Introduction

Chapter 4 answered the first two research questions. This chapter will address the third and final research question:

What is the significance of these insights (from Chapter 4) for the integration of DL into teacher education generally and particularly English teacher education?

I will draw on the understanding of the pre-service teachers' perceptions on their own and their learners' DL practices, how these perceptions are related to their actual DL practices and how these perceptions and practices are aligned to the eight elements of DL as described in Chapter 4. The 'induction' into effective DL practices through teacher education is the overall focus of this chapter: it is argued that the effective integration of DL into teacher education will address some of the issues surrounding the acquisition of these practices, specifically addressing the problem of the digital divide within teacher education. It must be mentioned that ideally these practices would best be acquired in the high school classroom during teaching practical (through apprenticeship and modelling), as well as through HE (Gee, 1990). This study however focuses exclusively on acquisition through HE. The following chapter uses the principles of Authentic Learning to operationalize the integration of DL, constantly situating the integration in the context of teacher education, specifically English teacher education, by referring to the classroom setting and the NCS CAPS curriculum throughout.

2. Authentic Learning and the ill-defined task

Chapter 2 provided a rationale for focusing on practices using the theoretical concept of Situated Learning, which is described as "the situated character of human understanding and communication" and focuses on "the relationship between learning and the social situations in which it occurs" (Lave & Wenger, 1991:13). Situated Learning viewed in this way is then aligned with NLS, which focuses on social practice. Herrington's Authentic Learning principles provide a useful operationalisation for situated learning and will be heavily drawn upon in this Chapter. I often refer directly to the work of Herrington in order to avoid some common misinterpretations about Authentic Learning, which will be discussed below. The principles, according to Herrington (2006:4), are summarized below:

1. *An authentic context.* This context reflects the way the knowledge will be used in real life... it is not enough to simply provide suitable examples from real-world situations to illustrate the concept or issue being taught. The context needs to be all-embracing, to provide the purpose and motivation for learning, and to provide a sustained and complex learning environment that can be explored at length.
2. *Authentic activities.* The learning environment needs to provide ill-defined activities which have real-world relevance, and which present a single complex task to be completed over a sustained period of time, rather than a series of shorter disconnected examples.
3. *Access to expert performances and the modelling of processes.* In order to provide expert performances, the learning environment needs to provide access to expert thinking and the modelling of processes, access to learners in various levels of expertise, and access to the social periphery or the observation of real-life episodes as they occur.
4. *Multiple roles and perspectives.* In order for students to be able to investigate the learning environment from more than a single perspective, it is important to enable and encourage students to explore different perspectives on the topics from various points of view, and to 'criss cross' the learning environment repeatedly.
5. *Collaborative construction of knowledge.* The opportunity for students to collaborate is... important... tasks need to be addressed to a group rather than an individual, and appropriate means of communication need to be established. Collaboration can be encouraged through appropriate tasks and communication technology.
6. *Reflection.* In order to provide opportunities for students to reflect on their learning, the learning environment needs to provide an authentic context and task, as described earlier, to enable meaningful reflection... [and provide] opportunity for learners to compare themselves with experts and other learners in varying stages of accomplishment.
7. *Articulation.* In order to produce a learning environment capable of providing opportunities for articulation, the tasks need to incorporate inherent—as opposed to constructed—opportunities to articulate, collaborative groups to enable articulation, and the public presentation of argument to enable defense of the position.
8. *Coaching and scaffolding.* In order to accommodate a coaching and scaffolding role principally by the teacher (but also provided by other students), the learning environments needs to provide collaborative learning, where more able partners can assist with scaffolding and coaching, as well as the means for the teacher to support learning via appropriate communication technologies.
9. *Authentic assessment.* In order to provide integrated and authentic assessment of student learning, the learning environment needs to provide the opportunity for students to be effective performers with acquired knowledge, and to craft polished, performances or products in collaboration with others. It also requires the assessment to be seamlessly integrated with the activity, and to provide appropriate criteria for scoring varied products.

“Authentic tasks” refer to “ill-defined” tasks where the way the outcome of a specific task must be reached is not stipulated in detail. This principle of Authentic Learning is especially important when approaching the integration of DL into a class where there exists a digital divide: the learners can approach the completion of the task according to their own ability, using the DL practices they are already familiar with, and hopefully building on them in the process. However, there exists the danger of defining “Authentic Learning” as “ill-defined authentic tasks” and consequently abandoning or neglecting the other crucial eight principles. These tasks might consequently overwhelm and intimidate the pre-service teachers who do not have sound foundations in the DL practices that are assumed for the task. However, focusing too much on compensating for these pre-service teachers’ practices might end up disengaging the ones who already engage effectively with these practices. The digital divide is thus an important consideration when using Authentic Learning.

The “ill-defined” task as stipulated by Authentic Learning can also be described in terms of Belshaw’s eight elements of DL. It is argued here that the ideal “authentic task” when dealing with the integration of DL will connect with many, if not all of the elements of DL in order to be considered a successful task. Therefore, just as it is important to first create a strong foundation through expert performances, modelling and scaffolding, it might be equally important to limit the amount of elements the integration of DL connects with, gradually increasing the amount of elements until the pre-service teachers are confident to combine all the elements in their ill-defined task.

I therefore argue in this chapter for a very careful consideration of expert performances and modeling, and meticulous coaching and scaffolding prior to the pre-service teachers attempting the ill-defined task. Constant and in-depth reflection, articulation and the careful creation of authentic contexts where pre-service teachers are allowed to engage in authentic activities that cannot be described as ill-defined tasks, should compliment the expert performances, modelling, coaching and scaffolding prior to assigning the final task. One thing should be kept in mind at all times when integrating these principles into the lesson plan: they should all be strongly connected to the target curriculum, in this case the high school English curriculum. Concurrently, the digital divide should be considered at all times when integrating DL and should thus play an integral part in the incorporation of Authentic Learning principles.

3. Integrating Digital Literacy into teacher education

In each subsection, the insights gained from Chapter 4 will be reiterated briefly, followed by how Authentic Learning could aid in addressing the issues that have arisen from the data sources while simultaneously considering the digital divide. A short example will be given in some cases, illustrating how DL could be integrated into English teacher education, making mention of where the integration connects with NCS CAPS English Home Language for Senior Phase and FET and Belshaw's eight elements of DL. For demonstrative purposes, the number of elements of DL the examples connect with will increase over the course of this chapter, to illustrate how the complexity of tasks could build up to the eventual ill-defined task.

3.1 Their own DL practices: overcoming the sense of being overwhelmed

This section focuses on the pre-service teachers' perceptions of their own DL practices and how these are related to their actual DL practices as outlined in Chapter 4. It focuses on methods in which DL could be integrated in order to address their perceptions of the internet being overwhelming. This section also proposes the introduction of the eight elements of DL as content.

3.1.1 Focus on scaffolding: guided to unguided internet tutorials

The previous chapter revealed that pre-service teachers conflate DL with 'Internet Literacy'. The Discourse of the internet seems so vast to them; they struggle to situate themselves with regard to it. This led to the participants feeling overwhelmed by the internet, often leading to barriers. During the integration of DL into teacher education, it might thus be wise to first explore the topic of the internet so that the students could coordinate themselves more effectively within its Discourse, through scaffolding, where multiple perspectives regarding feelings surrounding the internet could be expressed. Scaffolding learning does not imply supplying the answers (Herrington, 2006), but rather allowing the pre-service teachers to collaborate, encouraging the more able individuals to assist.

Through class discussions which focus on how they feel about the internet as an educational tool, they could be given the opportunity to articulate their thoughts, which helps them to work collaboratively to construct meaning and provide form to their understanding of the internet (Herrington, 2006). The pre-service teachers will then be able to realize they share many of the same feelings and anxieties surrounding the internet. Through collaborative activities, they might also see how their current DL practices regarding the internet are in fact

valuable and not inferior. If they can effectively situate themselves with regards to the internet initially - the digital resource that seems to dominate DL practices in their minds - they will be better prepared and open to explore other digital resources and a broader scope of DL.

An exercise that could be used in class to facilitate reading and viewing is what I refer to as 'guided and unguided internet tutorials'. The curriculum states that "skimming and scanning text features: titles, headings and sub-headings, captions, illustrations, graphs, charts, diagrams, bold-faced print, italics, headings, subheadings, numbering, captions, illustrations, graphs, diagrams, maps, icons, pull down menus, key word searches" (CAPS1, 2011:26) are important and necessary activities during pre-reading. The facilitator can provide the pre-service teachers with two or three search goals that involve numerous searches on the internet in order to gather specific information, similar to a treasure hunt.

The search goals could be highly guided at first, telling the pre-service teachers exactly where and how to search, while also allowing more competent pre-service teachers to help the less competent. The facilitators can reduce their input (Herrington, 2006) with every search, until they feel comfortable conducting the searches themselves. During the exercise, they must judge numerous websites, which connects with the critical element of DL which calls for the "critical evaluation of literacy" (Belshaw, 2011:206), while getting used to the "how-to" of internet searches, which connects with its cognitive element (ibid.). This kind of exercise not only connects with the pre-reading stipulation of the curriculum, but also to "the interpretation of visual texts" (CAPS1, 2011:27). A simple exercise like this could help the pre-service teachers build a foundation for future DL integration by first making sure that they are comfortable with the internet and limiting the elements of DL to the cognitive and critical.

3.1.2 Engaging and creative critical evaluation

A certain degree of modelling could also be incorporated while attempting to situate the pre-service teacher with regards to the internet. This modelling could be executed by the facilitator, showing the learners how he/she conducts searches that are connected to the curriculum, constantly explaining the process. However, expert performance and the modelling of processes cannot be satisfied by reference to a single expert view (Herrington, 2006), so it is preferable that modelling should not be limited to the facilitator's DL practices only. In addition, embarking on a demonstration might be useful to pre-service teachers who

are struggling, but it might become tedious to the ones who do not. Therefore, the facilitator's search may be foregrounded, but it should also be a partly collaborative effort, where pre-service teachers are allowed to make suggestions and question the facilitator's choices. This may also bring about the incorporation of multiple roles and perspectives, as the pre-service teachers get the chance to assume authoritative teacher roles in some instances, while providing the rest of the class with perspectives that might vary from the facilitator's. A collaborative internet search on the critical evaluation of websites will also lead to multiple perspectives from experts in the field being incorporated into the classroom, as long as the search is connected with the curriculum, as will be seen below.

It is often useful to judge the pedagogical soundness of a website, using a document that outlines website stipulations. After an expert performance by the facilitator, the pre-service teachers could be allowed to construct critical evaluation checklists from websites that provide information on this topic as a method. Working in groups, individuals could then defend their document while critiquing other members'. Apart from connecting with the pre-reading stipulation of the CAPS curriculum, the latter part of the exercise is suited for teaching listening and speaking at FET-level. The curriculum calls for the learners to demonstrate listening skills by paying "complete attention to the listening task and demonstrate interest" (CAPS2, 2011:15) and demonstrating their speaking skills through "speaking directly to the audience" (CAPS2, 2011:17). Both these stipulations are met with the above exercise, while it also connects with the critical and cognitive elements of DL again. However, the constructive element is added through their use of existing sources on critical evaluation and "remixing it" (see Chapter 3) to make something new. The exercise encourages a connection with the cultural component of DL through them possibly discussing how various sources could be applicable in certain contexts, but not always within the academic context, allowing them to "move between contexts" (Belshaw, 2011:206).

3.1.3 Introducing the elements of DL

In order to move the pre-service teachers' view of DL towards a broader view that is more aligned to the eight elements, Belshaw's elements could be introduced to them. However, the danger of an introduction like this is that the "integration of DL" could become too much about the concept itself, removed from the context of the English classroom. It is therefore imperative that the elements of DL must be approached while constantly providing an authentic context. Also, if the elements of DL are discussed at an early stage of DL integration in teacher education, the connection to an authentic context "reflects the way the

knowledge will be used in real life” (Herrington & Oliver, 2003:115). The pre-service teachers can through reflection - defined in this case as “social decision making” - “collaboratively decide” on the best ways that the various elements of DL could be integrated into the classroom (Herrington, 2006:3-4). This connects the skills set - that is the elements of DL - with the context in which these skills will be practiced in, thus connecting Belshaw’s elements with social practice.

The pre-service teachers could be asked to connect four or more examples of lesson plans where DL has been integrated into the high school English classroom with the instances where these lessons connect with the elements of DL. The elements and their short definitions could be displayed constantly while the class is invited to make the connections with the curriculum. The idea is to get them thinking about the broader definition of DL, which is the engagement with multiple digital resources and “mastering ideas” rather than “mastering keystrokes” (from Chapter 2), while immediately connecting it with the context of the high school English classroom.

The pre-service teachers could then be challenged to create their own lesson plans in groups, collaborating to make an overarching lesson plan where they connect the lesson with as many elements of DL as possible. As an additional challenge, their insight into the curriculum could be tested by encouraging them to try and connect their lesson plans with the text-based approach in the curriculum. In this way, the creative element of DL is introduced along with the aforementioned elements in other sections. Although lesson plans like these are often very difficult to realize, the idea is here that the hyperbole presented to them will help them to think of ideas they would not usually consider.

3.2 Their own DL practices: Modelling, play and simulation

The pre-service teachers’ association of DL with Internet Literacy has been discussed in the preceding sections of this chapter and strategies to help them overcome their anxiety surrounding the internet have been suggested. I can now move away from the internet and discuss possible strategies that can remedy the problem of digital resources in the classroom that “are not used in their current Discourses” (see Chapter 4, section 2.1.1). In this case, a combination of a focus on modelling and providing an authentic context with simple authentic activities is key in allowing the pre-service teachers to familiarise themselves with the “foreign” digital resource, while providing motivation by allowing them to apply the resources in the exact same way as they would in the English classroom. According to Brown

et al., in Herrington (2006), the emphasis thus falls on providing a physical environment that reflects the way the knowledge will be used in the classroom.

Focusing on modelling can help the pre-service teacher to become familiar with the use of an unknown digital resource by providing a form of access whereby they can observe real-life episodes as they occur (Herrington & Oliver, 2003). However, it is important that the activities where the digital resource is integrated include “a sustained period of time for investigation” and “the opportunity for students to be effective performers with acquired knowledge, and to craft polished, performances” (Herrington, 2006:4). This means that, in addition to modelling, it is very important they should be given the opportunity to physically *play* with the digital resources, preferably in collaboration with other pre-service teachers.

Care must be given to prevent the “fragmentation” of the authentic context, which means that although there is a slight focus on one digital resource, it must be kept in mind that the authentic classroom might contain additional resources as well that can also be integrated. During this time, scaffolding and coaching at critical times are crucial and the pre-service teachers must understand that the facilitator is responsible for providing assistance for a significant period, although the facilitator’s involvement should decrease over time (Herrington, 2006).

3.2.1 Integrating unfamiliar digital resources: games on the iPad

It could be argued that it is often difficult to integrate enjoyable activities that connect with Language Structures and Conventions. This statement could be used to commence a class where the pre-service teachers get to play with iPads, consequently introducing a digital resource that is foreign to some of them. Their task would be to find free ‘apps’ using Apple’s *App Store*, play them, list them and then present their list to the class. In this way the activity connects both with Listening and Speaking. The ideal would be for three or four pre-service teachers to work in groups, so that they could collaboratively master the cognitive element of working with an iPad. The games that they find should help learners “to experiment with language to build meaning from word and sentence levels to whole texts, and to see how a text and its context are related” (CAPS1, 2011:49).

This method is mostly suited for integration into Senior Phase lesson plans, because many games focus on explaining specific parts of speech, like verbs or pronouns (see CAPS1, 2011:49-53), which is still taught explicitly at Senior Phase level, but not at FET-level, where “language structures... becomes a means to an end...” (CAPS2, 2011:40). While the pre-

service teachers are searching for and playing games, they are encouraged to make notes with pen and paper for a game they will be designing themselves that will help learners with “vocabulary development and figurative language” (CAPS1, 2011:53). Alongside all the elements mentioned before, this activity now introduces the confident element of DL because it helps them to capitalise on “differences between the analogue and digital” (see Chapter 2). If they are encouraged to further design their games using digital collaboration, the confident element is introduced through their use of digital resources to build a community of practice (Belshaw, 2011).

3.2.2 Integrating unfamiliar digital resources: the SMART Board

It has been mentioned in Chapter 4 that some of the resources that are almost exclusively connected to the classroom include projectors and screens, but the digital resource mentioned the most - while being associated with the most uncertainty - is the SMART Board (see Chapter 4). It is therefore important to include an example of where the SMART Board could be integrated into English teacher education, following the same principles mentioned in the previous section.

The use of the SMART Board could be focused on in a workshop-format class. This class would demonstrate how the SMART Board could be used to connect with Reading and Viewing FET, Listening and Speaking FET as well as Writing and Presenting for both phases. The workshop would consist of two main activities: a modelling class and what I term ‘SMART Board charades’.

The workshop could start with a simple modelling class where the facilitator uses the SMART Board for a poetry lesson. The poem is displayed on the SMART Board, while the facilitator pastes images, audio and video onto the text as “Literal meaning; Figurative meaning; Mood; Theme and message; Imagery; Figures of speech, word choice (diction), tone, rhetorical devices, emotional responses, lines, words, stanzas, links, punctuation, refrain, repetition, sound devices (alliteration, consonance and assonance, rhyme, rhythm, onomatopoeia) and enjambment” (CAPS2, 2011:25) are identified by the pre-service teacher during a discussion of the poem. During this time, the pre-service teachers will get the opportunity to see how the SMART Board could be used, while they are encouraged to ask questions regarding the technical aspects of it. If the pre-service teachers are allowed to articulate why they think the facilitator has associated certain images and videos with the

poetic devices, the activity also connects with the visual literacy stipulations of the curriculum.

The activity above however does not muster the SMART Board's interactive abilities, nor does it provide the pre-service teachers opportunity to "play" with the SMART Board themselves. The above exercise is thus a 'warm-up' exercise that will hopefully make them more comfortable with the use of the SMART Board. The exercise should however lead to a more interactive activity. Working in groups, the pre-service teachers collaboratively find ten random images on the internet using their own devices. They must then write a paragraph (see CAPS2, 2011:32) where they "use a variety of action verbs, adjectives and adverbs to give a specific impression and details and vivid description" (CAPS2, 2011:31) on a topic chosen by them. What they write should be based on the images they found. Each group will then get the chance to present their paragraph to the class by systematically displaying the images they have found on the SMART Board, moving them around and adding cryptic text to provide clues on the paragraphs they have written, without saying anything. The rest of the class has to guess what topic the group has chosen while trying to figure out what they wrote in their paragraph.

This "SMART Board charades" activity connects with all the DL elements of the previous sections, while deliberately not including the communicative and civic elements because the activity is already very complex as it is. Up to this point I have demonstrated how the elements of DL could be gradually increased while focusing on modelling, scaffolding, articulation, reflection, authentic context and activities that are not seen as completely ill-defined. By adding the communicative and civic elements of DL to the examples that remain, the activities become more closely associated with the ill-defined task integrating DL, as described by Herrington.

3.3 The Learners' DL practices

3.3.1 Understanding the digital divide and strategies to control

In order to create a foundation for critically thinking about the learners' DL practices, it is important that pre-service teachers' perceptions that their DL practices will be inferior to all their learners' must be discussed. The pre-service teacher could be presented with the relevant literature pertaining to digital natives and digital strangers in South African schools, especially the findings of Brown and Czernowicz (see Chapter 2), but because this is a complex matter that should be thoroughly discussed, articulation and reflection should be

encouraged in order to enable social as well as individual views on the matter through the expression of multiple insights and perspectives (Herrington, 2006).

As mentioned in Chapter 4, the power differentials that are created in the contexts where teachers feel that their own DL practices are inferior to their learners' practices, must be debated. Collaborative generation of knowledge on this topic should be encouraged through articulation and reflection, which means this topic is best discussed after the pre-service teachers have completed at least one teaching practical, so that they could talk about their actual experiences. Both these discussions are crucial as prerequisites for delving deeper into the learners' DL practices; the pre-service teachers must first have a clear idea of the complexities of these issues before the learners' use of DL practices in the English class can be specifically discussed.

3.3.2 Moving social media from the private to the classroom

The data show that the pre-service teachers struggle with the integration of social media into their classroom because of two main reasons: they do not perceive social media as possessing any value as an educational tool within the context of the classroom and because they associate social media with their own and the learners' Primary Discourses. Here, modelling could once again play a crucial part initially, where an expert performance (one where social media is actually used as an educational tool in the teacher education classroom) could provide valuable clues regarding the possible affordances of social media in the classroom. However, it is advisable that the modelling should be accompanied by reflection and articulation in order for the pre-service teachers to "compare themselves to other learners" regarding the use of social media and to collaboratively generate ideas of how to do so in an effective and pedagogically sound manner (Herrington, 2003:3-4).

By applying these techniques, the pre-service teacher could be given the opportunity to think about an alternative view on social media, where it has the potential to be used as an educational tool in the classroom, as they gradually connect it with a Discourse other than their Primary Discourses. Its association with private life, could also be discussed explicitly in the classroom. However, there is the distinct danger here that the class discussion can be focused too much on the phenomenon itself; it is therefore important to constantly enrich the discussion with examples that connect to the curriculum.

3.3.3 Allowing the learners' DL practices in the classroom

Once the pre-service teachers have a clear idea of the complexities surrounding the digital divide and how a belief that their own DL practices are inferior to their learners' could influence power differentials and how and why social media could be used in the classroom, they would be ready to move to authentic activities where they could focus on creating a lesson plan where the learners' DL practices are integrated. This activity should allow them to experience how it feels to define "the tasks and sub-tasks required to complete the activity" themselves, provide a "sustained period of time for investigation" and create the "opportunity to detect relevant versus irrelevant information", by actually performing some of the relevant tasks that are meant for their learners (Herrington, 2006:3-4).

It is crucial that the pre-service teachers understand that they are doing these authentic tasks because it might benefit their own DL practices, but that they are also examples of where the learners' DL practices could be utilised and/or improved in the classroom. Because some of these activities could be quite time-consuming and demanding, the understanding of the rationale above is imperative if the pre-service teachers are to retain enough motivation to complete the tasks.

In order to encourage reflection and articulation regarding the learners' use of DL, the pre-service teachers could be expected to connect the DL tasks set for them with the English curriculum during a class discussion in the beginning of the year. In this way they would hopefully recognize early on how these activities will be beneficial for the development of the learners' DL practices.

With this firm understanding of DL for the development of their own DL practices as well as the learners', they might have enough preparation and motivation to complete an ill-defined task where they have to use their DL practices. One such ill-defined task is digital storytelling, defined here as a video consisting of various images, which they could either create themselves or download from the internet, while a self-written narration supplies a voice-over². They are welcome to use music in the video. The topic of the digital story should preferably connect with the literature classroom and could express the themes and motifs of a play or novel done in class for example. They could work in groups, so that technically more

² It must be stressed that there are numerous definitions of digital storytelling in the literature and that the definition here might vary from some of the more traditional forms of digital storytelling. Digital storytelling has been adapted in this chapter in order to fit within the theoretical framework and to provide an example of a method that fulfills the needs of integrating DL into English teacher education.

advanced pre-service teachers could aid those who are not as advanced. Since this is a big task, they should be encouraged to collaborate using social media and other digital communication resources (like e-mail and Google Drive), so they could work on their videos outside class. The final product must be uploaded onto social media, where various groups will get the opportunity to view and comment on each other's videos.

Used in this way, digital storytelling connects with CAPS in many ways: reading and viewing (the topic is connected to the literature classroom); listening and speaking (watching other groups' videos and narrating their own); writing and presenting (self-written narrations), which implicitly connects with language structures and conventions also, especially the FET curriculum. The communicative and civic elements of DL are introduced in this task along with all the other elements, making it a fully-fledged ill-defined task. It connects with the communicative element because of the use of "networks and communications in DL development" (see Chapter 2) through the use of social media. By commenting on other groups' videos and collaborating digitally, the pre-service teachers "participate fully in society" (Chapter 2) through digital means, which links with the "public engagement" that the civic element of DL calls for.

3.4 Assessing perceptions at regular intervals

It has been mentioned in Chapter 4 that the participants seem to have a fairly narrow perception of what DL entails when comparing it to its elements, mostly connecting it to the cognitive element. Because it is not too important for the teachers to be constantly aware of the actual elements of DL, as mentioned before, there is no need for them to constantly connect the discussions and authentic tasks to these elements through articulation or reflection. However, it is advisable that the facilitator devise ways to "test" whether their perceptions of DL are broadening. The focus here is thus on testing for the broadening of perceptions, not for the alignment of their knowledge of DL with its elements.

It is safe to assume that student teachers' own integration of DL practices in their future classrooms will be based on their perceptions of DL - since it constitutes "prior knowledge" (Jones & Brader-Araje, 2002:3) and not necessarily their knowledge of the elements of DL - because they would probably have no need to discuss the integration of DL as explicitly as it would be done during teacher education in their own classrooms in the future. An implicit 'testing' whether perceptions are shifting could be done through coaching, where the facilitator tests the pre-service teachers' perception of DL practices "at critical times"

(Herrington, 2006:3-4) in order to ensure that their perceptions are broadening. As a brief exercise, the facilitator could present the problem of addressing language structures and conventions at FET-level. The students could be asked to brainstorm how digital resources could aid in showing learners “how writers make special use of, for example, grammatical structures” (CAPS2, 2011:40). The facilitator should be able to tell from their examples whether their perceptions are broadening and to what extent.

In the case of one of the pre-service teachers, it became clear that a broader perception of what DL entails could lead to feeling overwhelmed, which could sometimes lead to the overuse of DL in order to integrate its full scope in every lesson. This could be overcome by allowing them to micro-team their lesson plans through authentic tasks within authentic contexts, prior to engaging in an ill-defined task. This would allow them to gradually experience for themselves whether they are overusing DL or not.

The tasks should be carefully designed so that the pre-service teachers never feel overwhelmed by the tasks connecting with too many elements of DL. However, ensuring that the pre-service teachers are not overwhelmed in this manner is a rather daunting task, for an authentic context should not attempt to “fragment or simplify the environment” (Brown et al. 1989 in Herrington, 2000:4). It is thus advisable that the same testing process mentioned in the previous section should be applied in this case, providing coaching in certain cases and/or carefully re-designing the authentic activities and contexts in others. By maintaining a fine balance, and gradually increasing their exposure to the elements of DL before attempting the ill-defined task, their perceptions of DL could broaden while ensuring that their broadening perceptions do not overwhelm them.

4. The final ill-defined task

The final example is also a completely ill-defined authentic activity, meaning that all the elements of DL are present, given to the pre-service teachers only when the facilitator deems them ready. The activity is closely connected to digital storytelling in a sense that they must create a video that connects with the English curriculum in various instances. The level of digital collaboration and interactivity must be drastically increased in order to align this task to civic and communicative elements of DL - only partially represented in the previous example of digital storytelling - to a much greater degree.

The facilitator could post an old film that is not discussed in class on a blog. The class would be expected to analyse the film by digitally commenting on it and supplying secondary

sources they found online. From here on the class would be divided into four teams: story, sound, visual and marketing. The whole class must collaborate in order to write, produce and market a short film where the themes in the original film are used to create a short adaptation of the original for contemporary audiences. They could re-mix video clips, audio and images found on the internet to embody the visuals for the adaptation, or they could intersperse original footage, audio and photos recorded and taken with their own devices. Although certain teams would be responsible for specific components of production, the whole class would need to provide input at all stages, using social media. When their adaptation is done, the marketing team should use social media (Twitter, Facebook, Tumblr, Instagram and more) to promote the video and the final product should be uploaded onto Youtube, where global users of the site could critique and comment on it.

5. Conclusion

Although there is no particular order for the principles of Authentic Learning as stated by Herrington (2006), this chapter proposes that, when DL is integrated into a classroom where a digital divide exists, special attention should be paid to modelling and scaffolding prior to the pre-service teachers attempting authentic tasks. It is acknowledged that the students will still eventually engage in DL practices more effectively when they actually complete an ill-defined task, which is connected to the context in which they will be teaching. However it is argued here that, without proper expert performances, modeling, scaffolding and practice providing a strong foundation, the digital strangers in the classroom might be overwhelmed and intimidated by the authentic tasks. Similarly, the number of elements of DL that the integration of DL connects to should be limited at first in order not to overwhelm these individuals.

On the other hand, digital natives might become disengaged during modelling and scaffolding if multiple roles and perspectives, collaborative construction of knowledge, reflection, articulation and simple authentic activities³ are not carefully “built into” modelling and scaffolding. While this model has been specifically designed for English education, it could be argued that the constant provision of authentic contexts will aid in the integration of DL into any course, while acting as strong motivation in specifically teacher education.

³ The intricacies of assessment are beyond the scope of this study, so “authentic assessment”, although still very important, has been omitted.

CHAPTER 6: Summary and recommendations

This study has contributed to a deeper understanding of pre-service teachers' perceptions of their own, other teachers' and their learners' DL practices and the relationship of these perceptions to those practices. By comparing the insights gained from this qualitative case study with the framework previously used to integrate DL into English teacher education, a deeper understanding of the effective integration of DL into teacher education has been gained, which could consequently address the problem of the digital divide in the teacher education classroom. The study used the theoretical framework postulated by the New Literacy Studies and various concepts that could be aligned with it, focusing on literacy as embedded within context-specific social practice and imbued with power. The perceptions and practices of four pre-service English teachers were analysed and used to make suggestions for DL integration in both teacher education in general and English teacher education specifically. It has been shown that a focus on DL practices is extremely useful when deciding how to integrate DL.

An analysis of the data shows that the participants experience the internet as overwhelming and therefore perceive DL as 'Internet Literacy'. They do not find good examples of DL practices from other, practising teachers during teaching practicals and therefore expect to be inducted in the practices associated with unfamiliar digital resources - notably the SMART Board - during teacher education. Participants perceive their learners' DL practices as superior or similar to theirs, depending on the context and digital resources involved. One such instance is where learners use iPads, mainly because the participants are not familiar with the resource. They view their learners' practices with the internet as similar to theirs for the opposite reason. Viewing their learners' practices as superior to theirs could lead to power differentials in the classroom, a feeling of a lack of control when allowing learners' to engage in DL practices in the classroom. The study has shown that participants associate some digital resources, especially social media, with their own and their learners' private lives and therefore do not recognize the value of social media as an educational tool.

I recommend that the integration of DL in teacher education should carefully lay a solid foundation especially through modelling, "expert performances" (Herrington, 2006:4), scaffolding, reflection and small authentic tasks before an ill-defined task is attempted, in order to avoid overwhelming the digital strangers among them. Encouraging varying perceptions could prevent the digital natives from disengaging. The focus should initially fall

on internet practices, gradually increasing the elements of DL connected to the tasks until all these elements are inherent to the task, the definition of the ill-defined task posited in this study. Modelling of unfamiliar resources, like the SMART Board and iPad is important. The pre-service teachers should be made explicitly aware of the way in which their perceptions of their learners' DL practices in varying contexts could influence power differentials, especially when they view their learners' DL practices as superior to theirs. All activities should be explicitly connected to the school curriculum to provide an authentic context for the literacy at all times and also to show the educational value of digital resources, like social media, that are not perceived as valuable within the classroom context.

The limitations of the study are that it is difficult to generalize from one or a small number of cases to the population as a whole. It is also difficult to decide on the boundaries of the research: what to include and exclude. The fact that the population consisted of students who perceived themselves as “digital strangers” only and not a more diverse group that included those who perceived themselves as “digital natives”, could be limiting to the decisions regarding the integration of DL into the English Method class. The fact that there exists a stark digital divide must be kept in mind before decisions are made that will affect the whole class.

Future research should therefore also apply the theoretical framework of NLS with a focus on DL practices on other populations, specifically both pre-service teachers who perceive themselves as digital natives and those who perceive themselves as moderately digitally proficient. An understanding of DL practices from both sides of the digital divide can only increase the effectiveness of DL integration into teacher education. Larger populations of “digital strangers” could also aid in an even deeper understanding. Focusing on other subject areas within teacher education, like for example Mathematics or Science, could create a discipline-specific knowledge of how to integrate DL into those contexts. Comparing the findings of these varying contexts could be truly illuminating for the overall integration of DL into teacher education. Lastly, future research could focus on the practices associated with educationally useful digital resources that are outside the Discourses of some of the pre-service teachers, like the iPad, video games and SMART Board, and the differences in the use of these resources across disciplines.

REFERENCES

- Alvermann, D.E., Unrau, N.J., Ruddell, R.B., 2013. *Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading*, Newark: International Reading Association.
- Barstow, C., 2008. The Power Differential and the Power Paradox: Avoiding the Pitfalls. *Hakomi Forum*, 53(19), pp.53–62.
- Barton, D. and Hamilton, M., 1998. *Local Literacies: Reading and Writing in One Community*, London: Routledge.
- Bastalich, W., Behrend, M., Bloomfield, R., 2014. Is non-subject based research training a “waste of time”, good only for the development of professional skills? An academic literacies perspective. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 19(4), pp.373–384.
- Bawden, D., 2008. Scholarship in the Digital Age: Information, Infrastructure and the Internet. *Journal of Documentation*, 64(4), pp.630–631.
- Belshaw, D., 2011. *What is digital literacy? A Pragmatic investigation*. Duram University. Available at: <http://neverendingthesis.com/doug-belshaw-edd-thesis-final.doc>. Retrieved on 23 February 2016.
- Bernstein, B.B., 2003. *Class, Codes and Control: Theoretical studies towards a sociology of language*, Routledge. Available at: <https://books.google.co.za/books?id=MB83Xdd7aOUC>.
- Bomer, R., 2011. *Building Adolescent Literacy in Today's English Classrooms*, Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J., 1977. *Foundations of a Theory of Symbolic Violence*, Paris: SAGE Publications.
- Brown, C., 2012. University Students as Digital Migrants, *Language and Literacy*, 14(2), p. 41.
- Brown, J.S. and Duguid, P. 1993. Stolen knowledge. *Educational Technology*, 33(3), pp.10-15.
- Burnett, C., 2011. Pre-Service Teachers' Digital Literacy Practices: Exploring Contingency in Identity and Digital Literacy in and out of Educational Contexts. *Language and Education*, 25(5), pp.433–449.
- CAPS1, 2011. *National Curriculum Statement, Curriculum Assessment Policy Statements, Senior Phase (Grades 7-9). English Home Language*. Department: Basic Education, Republic of South Africa. Available at: <http://www.education.gov.za/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=5xCztldu%2BKw%3D&tabid=573&mid=1569>. Retrieved on 23 February 2016.
- CAPS2, 2011. *National Curriculum Statement, Curriculum Assessment Policy Statements, Further Education and Training (Grades 10-12). English Home Language*. Department: Basic Education, Republic of South Africa. <http://www.education.gov.za/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=WtjOh8RBcU0%3D&tabid=570&mid=1555>. Retrieved on 23 February 2016.
- Chigona, A., 2013. Using multimedia technology to build a community of practice: Pre-service teachers' and digital storytelling in South Africa. *International Journal of Education & Development using Information & Communication Technology*, 9(3), pp.17–27.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., Morrison, K., 2003. *Research Methods in Education*, New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., Morrison, K., 2013. *Research Methods in Education* 7th ed., London: Taylor & Francis.

- Coiro, J., Knobel, M., Lankshear, C. Leu, D.J., 2008. *Handbook of research on new literacies*, New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Covello, S., 2010. A review of digital literacy assessment instruments. *Syracuse University*, pp.1–31. Available at: http://www.apescience.com/id/wp-content/uploads/DigitalLiteracyAssessmentInstruments_Final.pdf. Retrieved on 23 February 2016.
- Czerniewicz, L. and Brown, C., 2013. The habitus of digital “strangers” in higher education. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 44(1), pp.44–53.
- Davis, F., Bagozzi, R., Warshaw, P., 1989. User acceptance of computer technology: a comparison of two theoretical models. *Management science*, 35(8), pp.982–1003.
- Denzin, N.K., and Lincoln, Y.S., 1998. *The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and Issues*, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Dillenbourg, P., 1999. What do you mean by “collaborative learning”? *Collaborative learning Cognitive and computational approaches*, 1(6), pp.1–15.
- Edwards, A. and Westgate, D.P.G., 1994. *Investigating Classroom Talk*, London and Washington: Taylor & Francis.
- Firat, M., 2013. Multitasking or continuous partial attention: A critical bottleneck for digital natives. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 14(1), pp.266–272.
- Foucault, M., 1982. The Subject and Power. *Critical Inquiry*, 8(4), pp.777–795.
- Franklin, U.M., 1999. *The Real World of Technology*, Anansi.
- Freire, P., 2005. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* 30th Anniversary Edition, New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group Ltd.
- Gee, J.P., 1990. Discourse Analysis. *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses, Critical Perspectives on Literacy and Education*, London: Routledge.
- Gee, J.P., 1996. *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses*, London: Taylor & Francis.
- Gee, J.P., 1999. The Future of the Social Turn: Social Minds and the New Capitalism. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 32(1-2), pp.61–68.
- Gee, J.P., 2003. *What Video Games Have to Teach Us about Learning and Literacy*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gee, J.P., 2008. *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Gee, J.P., 2015. *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses*, London: Taylor & Francis.
- Gilster, P., 1998. *Digital Literacy*, New York: Wiley.
- Goode, J., 2010. The Digital Identity Divide: How Technological Knowledge Impacts College Students, *New Media Society*, 12 (3), pp.495-513.
- Graff, H.J., 1991. *The Literacy Myth: Cultural Integration and Social Structure in the Nineteenth Century*, London: Transaction Publishers.
- Green, B., 1993. *The Insistence of the Letter: Literacy Studies and Curriculum Theorizing*, London: Falmer.

- Heath, S.B. and Street, B.V., 2008. *On ethnography: approaches to language and literacy research*, New York and London: Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Herrington, J. and Oliver, R., 2003. Exploring Technology-Mediated Learning from a Pedagogical Perspective. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 11(2), pp.111–126.
- Herrington, J., 2006. Authentic e-learning in higher education : Design principles for authentic learning environments and tasks Design principles for authentic learning environments and tasks. *World Conference on E-Learning in Corporate, Government, Healthcare, and Higher Education*.
- Hobbs, R., 2010. *Digital and media literacy*, Washington DC: The Aspen Institute.
- Hogarty, K.Y., Lang, T.R., Kromrey, J.D., 2003. Another Look At Technology Use In Classrooms: The Development And Validation Of An Instrument To Measure Teachers' Perceptions. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 63(1), pp.139–162.
- Hughes, J., Robertson, L., 2013. The Power of Digital Literacy to Transform and Shape Teacher Identities. *Cases on Online Learning Communities and Beyond*, pp.68–87.
- Ivala, E., Gachago, D., Condy, J., Chigona, A., 2013. Digital Storytelling and Reflection in Higher Education: A Case of Pre-service Student Teachers and Their Lecturers at a University of Technology. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 2(1), pp.217–227.
- Jacobs, C., 2013. Academic literacies and the question of knowledge. *Journal for Language Teaching = Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig*, 47(2), pp.127–139.
- Jenkins, H., Kelley, W., Clinton, K., McWilliams, J., Pitts-Wiley, R., 2013. *Reading in a Participatory Culture: Remixing Moby-Dick in the English Classroom*, New York and London: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Jones, M.G. and Brader-Araje, L., 2002. The impact of constructivism on education: Language, discourse, and meaning. *American Communication Journal*, 5(3), pp.1-10.
- Kandiko, C.B. and Mawer, M., 2013. Student Expectations and Perceptions of Higher Education a Study of UK Higher Education. Available at: <http://www.kcl.ac.uk/study/learningteaching/kli/research/student-experience/student-expectations-perceptions-HE.aspx>. Retrieved on 23 February 2016.
- Keating, A., Gardiner, C., Rudd, P., 2009. E-access, E-maturity, E-safety : A Learner Survey. Available at: <http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/73959/>. Retrieved on 23 February 2016.
- Kopcha, T.J., 2012. Teachers' perceptions of the barriers to technology integration and practices with technology under situated professional development. *Computers and Education*, 39(2012), pp.1102-1121.
- Kress, G. and Van Leeuwen, T., 2001. *Multimodal Discourse*, London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Lankshear, C., 1999. Literacy studies in education: Disciplined developments in a post-disciplinary age. *After the disciplines: The emergence of cultural studies*, pp.1–27.
- Lankshear, C. and Knobel, M., 2007. *A New Literacies Sampler*, New York: P. Lang.
- Lankshear, C. and Knobel, M., 2011. *New Literacies* 3rd ed., Bershire and New York: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Lave, J. and Wenger, E., 1991. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Lea, M.R. and Jones, S., 2011. Digital literacies in higher education: exploring textual and technological practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 36(4), pp.377–393.
- Lea, M.R. and Street, B.V., 1998. Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education*, 23(2), pp.157–172.
- Lea, M.R. and Street, B.V., 2006. The “Academic Literacies” Model: Theory and Applications. *Theory into Practice*, 45(4), pp.368–377.
- Lillis, T. and Scott, M., 2007. Defining academic literacies research: issues of epistemology, ideology and strategy. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4(1), pp.5–32.
- Lim, C.P. and Khine, M.S., 2006. Managing teachers’ barriers to ICT integration in Singapore schools. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 14 (1), pp.97–125.
- Marshall, C. and Rossman, G.B., 1995. *Designing Qualitative Research* 2nd ed., London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Martin, A., 2008. *Digital Literacy and the “digital society”*. In Lankshear, C., Knobel, M., 2008. *Digital Literacies*, New York: Peter Lang.
- Martin, N.M. and Lambert, C., 2015. Differentiating Digital Writing Instruction. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 59(2), pp.217–227.
- Mawoyo, M. and Robinson, M., 2005. The organisation of pedagogy in a learnership model of teacher education. *South African Journal of Education*, 25(2), pp.109–114.
- Maxwell, J., 1992. Understanding and validity in qualitative research. *Harvard educational review*, 62(3), pp.279–300.
- McCarty, T.L., 2006. *Language, Literacy, and Power in Schooling*, New York: Taylor & Francis.
- McCoy, S., Galletta, D.F., King, W.R., 2007. Applying TAM across cultures: the need for caution. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 16(1), pp.81–90.
- Mills, K.A., 2010. A review of the “digital turn” in new literacy studies, *Review of Educational Research*, 80(2), pp.246-271.
- Millward, L. in Lewis-Beck, M.S., Bryman, A.E., Liao, T.F., 2004. *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods*, California: SAGE Publications.
- Morgan, D.L., 1996. Focus Groups. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 22, pp.129–152.
- Muller, S., 2015. *Teachers’ Beliefs : Understanding the thinking of secondary mathematics teachers as a starting point for improved professional development*, Cape Town: University of Cape Town.
- NTCE, 2008. 21st-Century Literacies. *A Policy Research Brief*, pp.1–8. Available at: <http://www.ncte.org/positions/statements/21stcentdefinition>. Retrieved on 23 February 2016.
- O’Donoghue, T. and Punch, K., 2003. *Qualitative Educational Research in Action: Doing and Reflecting*, New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Prensky, M., 2001. Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants Part 1. *On the Horizon*, 9(5), pp.1–6.
- Prinsloo, M. and Sasman, F., 2015. Literacy and Language Teaching and Learning With Interactive Whiteboards in Early Schooling. *TESOL Quarterly*, 49(3), pp.533–554.

- Prinsloo, M. and Walton, M., 2008. Situated Responses to the Digital Literacies of Electronic Communication in Marginal School Settings. *Yearbook 2008: African media, African children*, pp.99–116.
- Prinsloo, M., 2005. The new literacies as placed resources. *Perspectives in Education*, 23(4), pp.87–98.
- Prinsloo, M. and Stein, P., 2004. What's inside the box? Children's early encounters with literacy in South African classrooms. *Cell Research*, 22(June), pp.67–84.
- Ranjan, J., 2008. Impact of information technology in academia. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 22(5), pp.442–455.
- Reckwitz, A., 2002. Toward a Theory of Social Practices: A Development in Culturalist Theorizing. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 5(2), pp.243–263.
- Schön, D., 1983. *The Reflective Practitioner How Professionals Think in Action*, New York: Basic Books.
- Scribner, S. and Cole, M., 1981. *The Psychology of Literacy*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Sfard, A. and Prusak, A., 2005. Telling identities Telling identities. *Educational Researcher*, 34(4), pp.14–22.
- Somekh, B. and Lewin, C., 2011. *Theory and Methods in Social Research* 2nd ed., London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi, Singapore: SAGE Publications.
- Street, B.V., 1984. *Literacy in Theory and Practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tapscott, D., 2008. *Grown Up Digital: How the Net Generation is Changing Your World*, New York: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Teo, T., 2009. Modelling Technology Acceptance in Education: A Study of Pre-service Teachers. *Computer and Education*, 52(2), pp.302–312.
- Teo, T., 2013. An Initial Development and Validation of a Digital Natives Assessment Scale (DNAS). *Computer and Education*, 67, pp.51–57.
- Thinnyane, H., 2010. Are digital natives a world-wide phenomenon? An investigation into South African first year students' use and experience with technology. *Computers and Education*, 55(1), pp.406–414.
- Wallen, N.E. and Fraenkel, J.R., 2001. *Educational Research: A Guide to the Process*, New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Walton, M. and Pallitt, N., 2012. "Grand Theft South Africa": games, literacy and inequality in consumer childhoods. *Language and Education*, 26(4), pp.347–361.
- Williams, E., 1996. Reading in Two Languages at Year Five in African Primary Schools. *Applied Linguistics*, 17(2), pp.182–209.
- Wubbels, T., 1992. Taking account of student teachers' preconceptions. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 8(2), pp.137–149.
- Yin, R.K., 1994. *Case study research: design and methods* 2d ed., London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Yin, R.K., 2014. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* 2nd ed., New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: The Questionnaire

Questionnaire for participation in Eduard Campbell's study for his Masters in Education

Thank you for volunteering to be part of this study. The purpose of this study is (1) to gain a clearer understanding of the digital literacy practices of PGCE English Method students; (2) to gain an understanding of the problem of the digital divide among students and (3) to develop a framework for effective integration of Digital Literacy (DL) into teacher education, in particular English education.

If you are selected as participant of this study, I will analyse (not assess) one or more completed task/s done for PGCE (you can pick any task where you used digital resources in the completion); and reflections written by you on the use of digital resources in the task (more information on this on selection). In May 2015, I will conduct a focused group interview where we will discuss your experience with digital resources in a relaxed setting. Your identity will remain known only to the other participants in the study, unless you choose to remain completely anonymous, which will exempt you from the group interview. Please complete the following questionnaire:

Full name: _____ e-mail: _____

Tell me a little more about who you are: Where did you grow up? Where did you go to school? What did you study before? What are your hobbies/interests? Anything that you think is interesting...

How would you describe your technological proficiency?

Describe your experience with technology before you came to university? Did you grow up using technology? When did you first begin using computers? When did you acquire your first cell-phone? Do you have connectivity in your home?

How do you use technology for academic purposes?

Appendix B: Reflection Prompt Questions (sent as e-mail)

Good day (Participant's name),

Everything has been cleared and we can start with the first of three parts of my research, which comprises of your reflection on your use of digital resources while completing an academic task. Just to refresh your memory: you can choose any task/s that you had to complete for the PGCE course where you felt that you used digital resources successfully, or where you particularly struggled.

I would like you to write reflections based on the questions below. Two pages of reflections (in total) would suffice. You are welcome to send me your reflections at any time electronically, or you could physically hand it to me when we do the group interview. Remember that you also have to hand in the completed task that you reflect upon. You can also send this to me whenever you have time, or you could physically hand it in during the interview. I am not a fan of deadlines, but if you could try to have the reflections and the completed task/s ready by the interview date, I would be very happy.

Please write a personal and detailed account of your use of digital resources - you needn't use sources, just be as honest and specific as possible. These are the prompt questions:

1. Describe the academic task that you want to discuss and which you will be submitting.
2. In a perfect world, what digital resources would you have liked to use while completing this task and how would you have used them?
3. Which digital resources did you actually use while completing the task and how did you use them?
4. In your opinion, why did you not use the ideal sources for the task, as described in question 2?
5. What difficulties did you experience while using these digital resources?
6. Lastly, how did the use of these digital resources benefit your task?

Concerning the interview: I am looking at the week of the 18th to the 22nd of May. It looks like Wednesdays suit most participants, but I really want everybody to be at the interview at the same time (it is a group interview after all), so let's refine the time over the course of the next few weeks until we have the perfect time. The interview will be no longer than an hour. Could you possibly let me know what times during Wednesdays will NOT suit you at all?

Hope to hear from you soon!

Kind regards,
Ed

Appendix C: Focused Group Interview Questions

1. Describe the task you submitted for this study to the group.
2. How did your view on your own use of digital resources change as you worked on this task? And as you worked on the reflections?
3. How did your view on your own use of digital literacies change during your teaching practical?
4. Describe a special instance where you thought another teacher used digital resources quite cleverly during your teaching practical.
5. After your practical, how would you do the task you submitted differently concerning:
 - a. your own use of digital literacies?
 - b. the digital literacies you used in your lesson plan?
6. Explain the differences and similarities of your use of digital resources in general, for academic purposes and for integration into your lesson plans.

Appendix D: Case Study Database

1. Participants' questionnaires

(continues on next page)

Questionnaire for participation in Eduard Campbell's study for his Masters in Education

Thank you for volunteering to be part of this study. The purpose of this study is (1) to gain a clearer understanding of the digital literacy practices of PGCE English Method students; (2) to gain an understanding of the problem of the digital divide among students and (3) to develop a framework for effective integration of Digital Literacy (DL) into teacher education, in particular English education.

If you are selected as participant of this study, I will analyse (not assess) one or more completed task/s done for PGCE (you can pick any task where you used digital resources in the completion); and reflections written by you on the use of digital resources in the task (more information on this on selection). In May 2015, I will conduct a focused group interview where we will discuss your experience with digital resources in a relaxed setting. Your identity will remain known only to the other participants in the study, unless you choose to remain completely anonymous, which will exempt you from the group interview. Please complete the following questionnaire:

Full name: Alicia (pseudonym)

Tell me a little more about who you are: Where did you grow up? Where did you go to school? What did you study before? What are your hobbies/interests? Anything that you think is interesting...

I grew up in Cape Town, in Athlone (which is close to Rondebosch, but would still be classified as a Cape Flats area). I had my schooling, both primary and secondary, at schools within walking distance from my home. I attended Sunnyside Primary, and [school name] High School (both underprivileged schools). My subjects at high school were Mathematics, Accounting, Physics, Life Science, English (HL), Afrikaans (FAL) and Life Orientation. I completed my undergraduate at UCT in 2012, majoring in English, Media and Writing and Linguistics. I then completed my Honours in English in 2013, also at UCT. Last year I took a gap, during which I worked in UCT's Linguistics Department as a part-time research assistant. I also did some tutoring during 2014, and that's what made me realise I'd like to become a high school English teacher. In terms of hobbies, I like what every other English major would: writing and reading. I am big on fitness as well, and I have completed the Sports Coaching course in the PGCE. I have a big interest in social media and its possibilities.

How would you describe your technological proficiency?

I would like to think I am reasonably proficient with technology. I know enough to set up a PowerPoint presentation with links to videos, etc. In every lesson I have taught so far, I have made use of the internet and technology... but if I had to rate myself on a scale of 1 – 10, I would have to say 5. I know there's still lots of room for improvement! And I would like to learn to use Prezzi (and make my class seasick as you said in one of our lectures!), and any other teaching aids I may discover as I go along. I doubt whether I'd use them all, but it is good to know that I have them available to me as options.

Describe your experience with technology before you came to university? Did you grow up using technology? When did you first begin using computers? When did you acquire your first cell-phone? Do you have connectivity in your home?

I have grown up using technology. I was in grade pre-school when my dad brought home our first computer, and I acquired my first cell phone (a Nokia 3310) when I was in grade 5. I have a good internet connection at home (uncapped, the last time I checked), and we are constantly connected. There's even a power supply that we can connect the modem (I think that's what it's called) to when Eskom acts up... so we're really connected all the time.

How do you use technology for academic purposes? Do you also want to ask something specific about which tools/programmes/devices they use? - *I search for journals online, use Google, and watch relevant videos. Sometimes I download podcasts. I always have my essays typed on the computer as well. Are there other resources I should be using, that I am unaware of? It seems my use of technology in terms of academic work is quite limited...*

Questionnaire for participation in Eduard Campbell's study for his Masters in Education

Thank you for volunteering to be part of this study. The purpose of this study is (1) to gain a clearer understanding of the digital literacy practices of PGCE English Method students; (2) to gain an understanding of the problem of the digital divide among students and (3) to develop a framework for effective integration of Digital Literacy (DL) into teacher education, in particular English education.

If you are selected as participant of this study, I will analyse (not assess) one or more completed task/s done for PGCE (you can pick any task where you used digital resources in the completion); and reflections written by you on the use of digital resources in the task (more information on this on selection). In May 2015, I will conduct a focused group interview where we will discuss your experience with digital resources in a relaxed setting. Your identity will remain known only to the other participants in the study, unless you choose to remain completely anonymous, which will exempt you from the group interview. Please complete the following questionnaire:

Full name: Kate (pseudonym)

Tell me a little more about who you are: Where did you grow up? Where did you go to school? What did you study before? What are your hobbies/interests? Anything that you think is interesting...

I was born and grew up in Bloemfontein, I went to Eunice High School in Bloemfontein. I studied a Bachelor of Arts in English and Drama at UCT graduating in 2009. I then lived in London for a few years and am now back in South Africa and at UCT, doing my PGCE.

How would you describe your technological proficiency?

I have basic technological skills. I feel I should have more than basic skills, considering I use technology every day.

Describe your experience with technology before you came to university? Did you grow up using technology?

When did you first begin using computers? When did you acquire your first cell-phone? Do you have connectivity in your home?

I grew up with a computer in our house. I played educational computer games as a young child. We never had internet in our household throughout my adolescence, but my school had a computer lab with connectivity. When I was in high school, computer skills were becoming important and we were trained in basic computer skills. The internet and computer programs were sometimes necessary for projects in high school, but it was never the main focus of my education.

How do you use technology for academic purposes? Do you also want to ask something specific about which tools/programmes/devices they use?

During my undergrad, I used Microsoft Word to type up assignments and I used the online UCT library database of journals and academic docs. During my PGCE, the kind of resources permitted are more relaxed, and I can search the internet for ideas and lesson plans on certain topics.

Do you sometimes wish you could use technology more effectively in your academic work? Please provide details.

I would like to be able to use technology to save time and add to my work, rather than to take more time and take away from my work.

Questionnaire for participation in Eduard Campbell's study for his Masters in Education

Thank you for volunteering to be part of this study. The purpose of this study is (1) to gain a clearer understanding of the digital literacy practices of PGCE English Method students; (2) to gain an understanding of the problem of the digital divide among students and (3) to develop a framework for effective integration of Digital Literacy (DL) into teacher education, in particular English education.

If you are selected as participant of this study, I will analyse (not assess) one or more completed task/s done for PGCE (you can pick any task where you used digital resources in the completion); and reflections written by you on the use of digital resources in the task (more information on this on selection). In May 2015, I will conduct a focused group interview where we will discuss your experience with digital resources in a relaxed setting. Your identity will remain known only to the other participants in the study, unless you choose to remain completely anonymous, which will exempt you from the group interview. Please complete the following questionnaire:

Full name: Nina (pseudonym)

Tell me a little more about who you are: Where did you grow up? Where did you go to school? What did you study before? What are your hobbies/interests? Anything that you think is interesting... I was born in Lesotho in 1979. I moved to South Africa when I was about thirteen years My working experience includes one year and six months doing casual work in Israel. My last working experience was two years in South Korea teaching English. One of the most thrilling experiences I've had in my life is tandem paragliding. At UWC I studied Language and Communication, English Literature and Arabic (one and a half years). I attended school in the Northern Cape, Free State and Western Cape. I completed matric at Boston House College in Cape Town. My interests include the Amazon rain forest, tennis, travelling and space.

How would you describe your technological proficiency? __Beginner / Pre-intermediate_____

Describe your experience with technology before you came to university? Did you grow up using technology? When did you first begin using computers? When did you acquire your first cell-phone? Do you have connectivity in your home?

_____ No, I did not grow up using technology. I first began using computers when I was about 20 years old. I had been exposed to computers before this, but did not use them personally. I got my first cell-phone when I was about 19/20. Yes, I have connectivity at home. _____

How do you use technology for academic purposes? Do you also want to ask something specific about which tools/programmes/devices they use? For research.

Susan's questionnaire:

Where did you grow up? Where did you go to school? What did you study before? What are your hobbies/interests?
Anything that you think is interesting...

I was born in Pietermaritzburg. In a township called Ashdown. I grew up between Durban (Kwamushu, Montclair) and Pietermaritzburg. I went to Saint Nicholas School for pre-school. I attended Ridge Junior School and Pelham Senior Primary. I completed my High school in Midrand, Midrand High School.

I worked for two years to raise funds for my tuition. I read my Bachelor of Social Science at the UKZN (PMB) and majored in Psychology and English Studies. The following year (2011) I received a scholarship to go to Rhodes for my Honours in Literature (English). I went back to Durban and volunteered at a community centre in Chatsworth. The following year through TEACHSA I taught English at a secondary school in Soweto. In 2014 I read my Honours in Psychology at Stellenbosch University. Yay! Now I am about to qualify to become a 'real' teacher.

I love reading. I specialise in fiction and have started collecting books for my 'one day' library room. But I am a chronic procrastinator and get into trouble because I have a habit of 'tomorrowing' things. I enjoy 'lounging' and watching old films (Strictly Ballroom, Fame 1985). I went to start a NGO that is an extension of the school curriculum for school going learners from previously 'disadvantaged' locations. I bake the most decadent chocolate muffins and shortbread.

(Continues on next page)

How would you describe your technological proficiency?

On a scale of 1-10, I would give myself a 5. This is because I can Word, Powerpoint and Excel and SPSS (Statistica in Psychology). But I think all these are at a basic 'I can operate' these programmes level. I have not bothered to research or try new programmes or better ways of doing the above. My proficiency is very 'layman' like.

Describe your experience with technology before you came to university?

There was a time when I disliked Bill Gates: because I did not get why he had to invent Microsoft. "Now everyone is not using pen and paper". I would always hide in primary school and make like I was working when I was not. My teachers then emphasised the dangers of the computer and then it was easier to hold this belief as truth. Then I would have one of my friends complete whatever activities we had to do for 'Computer Class'. Since then I have unconsciously been weary of technology. The thought of teaching at a school that uses Tablets scares me. Hence I choose schools that are said to be 'under resourced'.

Before I came to university I could mostly really Word, Email and use Google. I had worked before in administration so I had had to learn Excel. In university I had to build on PowerPoint for presentations.

Did you grow up using technology? When did you first begin using computers? When did you acquire your first cell-phone? Do you have connectivity in your home?

I was in grade 16 when I acquired my first cell-phone (CellC-Alcatel). No at home we do not have connectivity. My first exposure to the technology (computer) was in primary school. I cannot remember the grade but either grade 5 or just before.

How do you use technology for academic purposes? Do you also want to ask something specific about which tools/programmes/devices they use?

In the past my courses have normally required that I submit essay type assignments that are typed. I have mostly used technology for this. On top of this is also the ability to use libraries database to search for articles needed to base one's argument on. Yes If I do not feel too retarded I will also ask about devices/ programmes that would assist me in the above.

Do you sometimes wish you could use technology more effectively in your academic work? Please provide details.

This PGCE programme is harder because there is a lot of practical work needed alongside the theory. I am finding that it takes time to Google ideas that assist me to make a Jesson plan or game that is relevant and fun. I leave everything to the last minute it does become very frustrating. I always under calculate the time I take to search (there is always so much). Perhaps some pointers on how new and more exciting 'presentation' programmes. Software that would be both teacher friendly- for someone who is almost like myself a novice and also pupil friendly also. Technology that is not overwhelming to the degree where I would not be able to 'control' it.

I have read and understood the purpose and intention of this study and the information provided by me is correct:

2015/13/18

(Student signature)

(Date)

2. Participants' reflections

Alicia:

Reflections on my use of Digital Literacy

I have included an example of an assignment where I believe I have integrated digital literacy successfully. It was a comprehension activity where social media was the focus. For the lesson I used my cell phone in the hook to grab the learners' attention, included a video from YouTube as a resource, and downloaded all the pictures and poems included in the lesson, from the Internet as well.

I did not immediately think of integrating digital literacy into a comprehension lesson, where the text and comprehension questions are usually the focus. This is the second lesson submitted in the PGCE where I have used digital literacy, and I think it went better than my first lesson, where I used FAR too many digital resources: I think the idea of using computers in the classroom made me too excited, so I ended up cramming 3 lessons' worth of digital resources into a single period lesson. I think having all these new resources available can be a bit overwhelming for me, but I managed to curb my enthusiasm in the second lesson, i.e. the one I've attached to this email.

My comprehension lesson with the focus on social media, has the ability to generate a rich discussion around a topic most of the students (and myself) have a strong interest in. I have yet to try it out in practice, but it looks like a good plan on paper. I give the class a chance to see what their lives would be like without social media for an entire weekend, and this provides a valuable opportunity to reflect on the importance or the impact digital literacy has on all our lives. Looking back now, I probably should have banned the Internet for the weekend as well, and not just social media, in order to truly experience a few days without digital media. Digital literacy obviously plays a vital role in our lives, so a weekend without it is bound to produce some rich reflective writing.

The task I have set is highly dependent upon digital literacy. I have done this so that those students who have a natural talent for digital literacy can show off their skills, and so that those who do not, can develop those skills. By structuring a task around digital literacy, I am also conveying the importance of it to the learners, and by adding a prize to the equation, I've raised the stakes to ensure they'll take it seriously.

I have enjoyed using digital literacy in this task, and continue to use it in practice wherever and whenever I see fit. I do not *always* use digital literacy, and integrate it into the lessons only when I believe it would improve the quality of my lesson.

Answering the questions:

1. A comprehension lesson with a focus on social media.

2. As stated above, I have not carried out this lesson in the classroom yet, but in a perfect world I would have an interactive whiteboard in the English class, and a complete sound system so that the videos and the materials can be displayed elegantly, and so that the learners can be called up to draw on the whiteboard and engage with the resources directly.

3. I used the Internet: downloading pictures and using links from YouTube that were relevant to the task. I also used my computer on which I typed the assignment as I would any other task submitted to the university. I used my cell phone to grab the learners' attention at the start of the lesson. In practice, learners would also use their cell phones or video cameras to film their skit about social media.

4. At the time of this lesson, I did not know how to use the interactive whiteboard, or the SMARTBoard yet. I did not even consider it as a resource when I wrote up this task... I was simply going to use the projector connected to a laptop. However, this week I asked three of the students known as the "I.T. guys" at Belgravia High, to teach me how to use the SMARTBoard. They were so eager that they spent their break time showing me how to operate the interactive whiteboard. Even though there were a few technical glitches, I at least know how it works now and my mind has been opened up to the possibilities it has for teaching and learning in the classroom.

5. The only difficulty I experienced in using these digital resources, was trying to decide which ones to include and which ones to exclude. There is so much to choose from, and it's just not possible to use them all in one lesson. I still think I might have used too many, in terms of pictures and poems I downloaded from the Internet.

6. I was able to complete my task a lot sooner by using digital resources. Were I to visit the library and try to find printed books about social media, I would have been a lot less efficient. By using digital literacy, my task has been completed using *current* resources; things learners themselves are likely to have stumbled upon on Facebook. By using resources the learners might be familiar with (i.e. the video that went viral), I am making important connections with the class by affirming their interests. My use of digital literacy in the comprehension task also promotes discussion and debate on topical issues where the learners would be able to give ample input. The digital literacy-centred task also allows students to

learn, and those who already know, to teach others. This peer-teaching/learning environment has the ability to strengthen ties and build new friendships in the classrooms, which contributes to an optimal learning environment.

Kate:

Reflection of Digital resources used while completing an academic task

I have chosen to discuss and submit an English assignment. The task was to create and submit a detailed lesson plan for a grade 8 class, introducing the concept of the metaphor.

To get some initial ideas for this task, I went onto Youtube and tried to find some videos that could give me some ideas. I came across a Ted Ed video called 'The Art of the Metaphor' by Jane Hirshfield. I am already a fan of Ted talks, but I was not aware of this series of Ted Ed videos – videos made specifically to teach concepts to school learners. I found this video extremely effective in describing what metaphors are and how they are used. The combination of the simple images and sound used in the video creates a powerful and memorable effect.

This video inspired me to create a similar effect in my lesson. As part of my lesson plan, I created two very short stories. The stories were the same, however for the first story I used no metaphors and for the second I used many metaphors to tell the story. I created images to accompany each part of my second story and explained that, in a classroom, I would show the images to the learners digitally while reading the story. The aim of this would be to show learners the images that this story conjures up in our minds, using only words. Hopefully learners would witness the effect of using metaphors in language.

To write my little story, I searched google to find a list of popular metaphors. I found many different lists through my google search and used some examples from various website lists that google sent me to. Once I had compiled my story, I tried to create a picture for each part of my story, using the metaphors. For example, 'Percy the pea had breakfast with an elephant in the room'. I would search google images for a picture of an elephant and a breakfast table and a pea etc. I would copy each image into Paint and try to create my own image. I then copied each image I had created onto Powerpoint slides to create a Powerpoint slideshow of the images. I explained in my assignment that in a classroom, I would read my story while showing the slideshow at the same time.

I found my assignment was dominated by technology. The initial idea for my lesson was sparked by watching a youtube clip. I found examples of metaphors

by google searching online. I found images to accompany my story by google searching online. I played around with the images in Paint. I put them all together using Powerpoint.

When creating my images to accompany my story, I wondered if there was not a more effective way of creating these images. Using the resources I knew, the process was time-consuming and my images looked mediocre. I also thought it would be so much more effective if my images could be put together to form some kind of a moving slide show/video, instead of just separate slides. However, I have very limited knowledge of where to find images online or where/how to create little video clips.

Thinking now outside my assignment, to a real classroom context, simply showing the video I got my idea from to learners would be extremely beneficial. It would benefit a teacher to know about good quality, creative videos like this and where to find them. As part of my assignment I was required to create a form of assessment for learners on the topic of metaphors. I created an assessment where learners had to create a story just like I had done, using metaphors. If I was a teacher and I had the knowledge and resources available, my class could create video clips of their own, creating images and combining sounds to create a video telling their stories.

From carrying out this assignment, I realised the power of the internet in two ways. The first is that it provides so much information that could aid a teacher in teaching so many different concepts. However, it can be extremely overwhelming, as one does not always know where to find the best information. Secondly, programs like Paint, Google and Powerpoint can aid a teacher in adding to their lessons. These are just basic programs. If one had the knowledge and access to better programs, they could create better resources for lessons and take much less time doing it.

Nina:

Saturday, 09 May 2015

Reflection on use of digital resources

1. Describe the academic task that you want to discuss and which you will be submitting.

I am going to discuss my use of digital resources while completing a classroom talk assignment for an English Methods subject. The assignment requires us to record a lesson that we teach and then to examine and discuss student/teacher talk time. I decided to use my cell phone to record the lesson. I could have used a laptop, a Dictaphone or a tape / CD recorder (I don't know if these still exist, or if one gets CD recorders). I did not use a laptop as the cell phone was the most convenient and unobtrusive item to use – quick and easy. Had I a choice I would have preferred using a Dictaphone, for ease of rewinding and fast forwarding the lesson when I transcribe it. I don't see rewinding or fast forwarding options on the cell phone. Maybe the more expensive ones have that option, I don't know.

Thus far I have not used too many digital resources in my studies for the PGCE programme, or during my practical teaching and observation period. So far I have used computers, cell phones and occasionally a kindle for looking up information from a book that I have downloaded.

The school I am at does not have any computers in their classrooms. They do have projectors which the teachers can use if they are booked at 7.30am on the day they are to be used.

2. In a perfect world, what digital resources would you have like to use while completing this task and how would you have used them?

I would have liked to use a Dictaphone to record the lesson and to save time use a program that types out the recording while it is played. Instead of listening to the recording and stopping it each time I need to transcribe, the program would have automatically typed out the recording. Transcribing the lesson took a lot of time, which could have been used for studying, drawing up lesson plans or working on an assignment.

3. Which digital resources did you actually use while completing the task and how did you use them?

For the recording I used a cell phone. The rest of the assignment (which I am typing out) will be completed on a laptop.

4. In your opinion, why did you not use the ideal sources for the task, as described in question 2?

I did not use a Dictaphone because I did not wish to purchase one to complete the assignment. I used the cell phone as it was the cheaper option. As for not using a programme that automatically types out recordings, I found it quicker to transcribe the recording than going online to search for programmes that type out recordings, if such exist.

5. What difficulties did you experience while using these digital resources?

A difficulty was the quality of the recording. That's where I spent most of my time with the transcription – replaying the recording from the beginning to listen carefully to what the students had said. The cell phone was in one spot during the recording. I did not want the students to feel self-conscious by knowing that the classroom talk was being recorded.

6. Lastly, how did the use of these digital resources benefit your task?

Having a cell phone enabled me to complete the assignment on my own, without having to ask someone else to do the recording for me. Being able to type out the assignment on my laptop saved me time from going in to use a computer lab at university.

I feel that the school I am at would benefit from using computers in the classroom, where the teachers could present PPT presentations on a screen instead of each time having to write out questions and answers for the students, which takes up classroom instruction time. Teachers could show the students educational video clips to do with the lesson topics. In an ideal teaching world all students would have computers at home and would have unlimited internet access for school research / study purposes. Students would be able to access digital libraries and submit their work online. Projectors in the classroom would also be useful, but this is an under resourced school and they have to make do with a board and chalk / whiteboard and markers most of the time. Some teachers do bring in their laptops for students to listen to recordings.

I agree with the following from <https://tw.wikispaces.com/Profile+of+a+Digital+Classroom>

“Student work is published for a wider audience: In a paper-based classroom, a student hands in a paper to the teacher, it gets graded and returned to the student who likely sticks it in his backpack, never to be seen again. In the digital classroom students are putting their writing on blogs or posting PowerPoints, podcasts, or PhotoStories online. These digital products are viewed by more than only the teacher. Peers, classmates, and parents can access the student's work to review and comment on it.

Assignments or projects that require collaboration and/or cooperation: Collaboration has been identified as an important "21st Century Skill." In the digital classroom there are opportunities to have students work together to create, revise, and publish their work. Examples include co-authoring documents using shared Google documents, peer review using a voice commenting with VoiceThread, etc.”

Susan:

1. Describe the academic task that you want to discuss and which you will be submitting.

The task was to create a lesson plan that would show how I would go about teaching what a metaphor and an extended metaphor are. I had to tune the lesson to suit 40 grade eights who have English as their home language as well as learners who had English as an additional language. The learning of these two literary devices had to be done through a poem by Carl Sandburg: "Fog". On top of this I had to include a rationale that explained why I chose to follow the plan that was on my lesson.

You can imagine my excitement on the when I found that we had to use a poem to base to base the teaching of metaphor and extended metaphor. I love the literature part of English. So I was feeling confident and geared up. I knew that I wanted to make the lesson plan bright, fun, interactive and engaging. This was going to be the first English Methods assignment I really liked Rochelle. She seemed like a 'cool' professor. I wanted to impress her and I also wanted to begin on a 'high' note in terms of my marks for the first term.

I was a bit apprehensive about the 'technology' side of it. I still had to sit down and figure what to use, how to use. In my English Methods class the other students appeared to be extremely "techno savvy". They also brought with them all these technological gadgets (notepads, tablets, ipods etc). I was intimidated.

2. In a perfect world, what digital resources would you have liked to use while completing this task and how would you have used them?

Had I planned my time effectively and not felt so overwhelmed in a perfect these are the digital resources I would used:

1. Each one of my students would have had a Tablet to work from. I would have used a programme to disable social media networks such as Whatsapp, Mixit, Twitter and so. I would have the ability to disable and enable programmes that

they needed to use in order to make the lesson effective and for my learners to get the best of out technology. An example is I would have 'parental control' to not allow music videos or other content from YouTube that was not 'educational'. I would have done this by creating a selection of videos that I deemed relevant for the lesson. When it come to homework and class work they would only have the supplied video content to use available to them.

2. Wi-fi connection would be available and I would have a 'back up' wi-fi connectivity that was not reliant on Eskom Load Shedding. Use my personal network subscription to wirelessly connect with my learners Tabs incase Eskom decided to shut down the lights.
3. I would have a projector. One that connects like Bluetooth®. So that I would not deal with all the wire that would make connection a hassle. Instead of a projector sheet I would paint the wall white. But the projector sheet has a shimmery almost silk feel and I have heard that there are paints that produce this effect and I would purchase the above paint. Projector sheets in the long run need replacement, get stuck and depending on how you treat them, they can tear at the edges and bottom.
4. Which digital resources did you actually use while completing the task and how did you use them?

I was disappointed with what I eventually managed to create and hand in for marking. I decided to use the white board and marker for the board. In my lesson plan I touched on how I used Google® images to search for and print out images of a cat on its hunches, fog and caterpillars. The caterpillar pictures I wanted to use to demonstrate metaphor and the difference between a metaphor and a simile. The other images were used to convey the poem so that my learners had the image of what the poet was writing about.

I asked researched some worksheets for my learners to use both in the class as a homework exercise to practise metaphor and extended metaphors.

5. In your opinion, why did you not use the ideal sources for the task, as described in question 2?

I procrastinate because I place a lot of pressure on myself to produce great work. I also doubted that I could 'pull off' being creative using digital resources. By the time I had to hand in something, anything I gave up on my original idea. It required some time to actually sit down and clearly think how I would connect the lesson to fit the sources I had wanted to initially use. I felt I was safer with white board and marker.

6. What difficulties did you experience while using these digital resources?

None. The white board is a modernised version of the black board so carrying out the lesson plan in my mind was easy.

7. Lastly, how did the use of these digital resources benefit your task?

I think including the images and worksheets helped because they showed that I was serious about teaching them metaphors and I could have left it out but I did not. Though because I lesson was not focused on a digital resource I think I disadvantaged myself. Only because it could have been more interactive and colourful with my first idea.

3. Participants' completed tasks

Alicia:

As a hook, I will walk into the classroom and very obviously be preoccupied with my cell phone. I will deliberately keep my eyes locked to the screen, tapping and scrolling and barely looking up at the learners as they file into the class. This will go on for half a minute, or until students begin to notice. This uncharacteristic behaviour should grab their attention, and I will use it as a launch pad for opening up the conversation on social media.

I will write words on the board: *Facebook, Instagram, Google Chat, WhatsApp, BBM, Mxit, Twitter*. How many of them use these platforms? Do they enjoy it? Are they addicted? Do they know their limits? I'll hand out two poems (included below), and get volunteers to read them. We'll have a brief discussion about the positive and negative effects of social media. Is social media good? Is the sentiment expressed in the poems relevant/true? Then we'll watch a short video of a poet informing us about the dangers of social media. (NB: I was unable to find any poetry or videos overtly in *favour* of social media... this is an illuminating fact, and I will make the class aware of this). The comprehensions will then be handed out, and we will skim for main ideas (looking at headings), work through difficult words, predict, and form expectations about what we think is happening in the comprehensions.

YouTube video that went viral:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BPszFpBSDZM>

The poems I will hand out:

Schedule your Tweets, maybe one every hour?
They should fall like rain drops, not the whole shower.
If you space them out right, I think that you'll find
People will read and re-read, and you'll stay top-of-mind.



Second, and this is big, don't get too cocky,
And start name-dropping yourself, like every movie with Rocky.
Even if your followers enjoy what you do,
They probably like reading about other things too.

See Twitter is a great place to share and to chat
About what you're doing, sure, but so much more than that.
Curate great content from other providers,
Be they bloggers, or clients or business insiders.



Social Media Poetry

By @fondalo





I look out my Windows and see a lady picking a BlackBerry and wonder if it isn't Apple season. An  will never be human, but then again you can have a Google of friends or even write a best selling facebook and you won't make her heart twitter beyond a mere flickr™

By @fondalo

So no matter whether you  the meaning of life, are LinkedIn to others or simply a flash in the pan, you still need to go BIGG. Get physical and bench press or at least  WORDPRESS useful intel that will produce results. Look to the  before you yell YAHOO! to be sure you don't piss someone off.

By @fondalo

Forget the  and keep it real, whether you are short or an amazon be in  with your market. Remember some are kissable, some Mashable but there is always a PayPal you can trust. Don't play foursquare like children on the playground and end up like a tumblr in the wind. Instead, engage and enjoy the  hootsuite results of Social Media.

a) Questions on Extract 1: *Social Networking is a Teenager's Most Dangerous Game*

1. List all the types of social media mentioned in the article.
2. Social media can make one feel powerful, or provide one with a false sense of security. Quote one word from the extract to prove this.
3. Why, according to the article, are teenagers specifically at risk when it comes to social media? Do you agree that teenagers are at risk? Provide an explanation for your answer.
4. Imagine going for an entire week without using your cell phone/computer: how would you deal with this? Do you think it would be a good thing, or are there other – less radical – ways to minimize the risks of social media? See if you can come up with other solutions, and write them down.
5. There is an element of irony in the article. Can you spot it? If you've forgotten what irony is, look it up in your textbook or dictionary.

Remember: Feel free to ask your friend or the teacher for help if you get stuck, or are unsure of how to answer a question.

Questions on Extract 2: *Teenagers and social networking – it might actually be good for them*

1. How would you find this article?
2. Without looking at the date of publication, how would you know this article was published later than the first one, entitled *Social Networking is a Teenager's most Dangerous Game*?
3. Social media is very useful and teenagers should use it all the time, and without restrictions. True or false? Provide evidence from the text to substantiate your answer.
4. Why is it important for parents to monitor teenagers' social media use? Do you think it is possible for parents to know what their child is doing 24/7 on social media? Substantiate your viewpoint.
5. The article states that teenagers can develop useful skills by using social media. Do you agree with this? Think about your own experience of social media: have you developed any useful skills over the years? How did you

develop them? Write down your skills. If you have not developed any skills/experienced any benefits from social media, why is this? Explain.

b) Memorandum

Answers to Questions on Extract 1: *Social Networking is a Teenager's Most Dangerous Game*

1. Twitter, blogs and Bebo.
2. "Invincible"
3. Teenagers have a lack of experience and feel invincible. They believe social media is harmless.

If *Yes*,

- Student must provide a solid example to illustrate why social media is harmful. Bonus marks for linking it to their own experiences.

If *No*,

- Student must provide a solid example to illustrate why social media is harmless. Bonus marks for linking it to their own experiences.

4. Student's own opinion in a full sentence.

If YES, student must provide a good reason that shows critical engagement with the question. If NO, student must provide a good reason that shows critical engagement with the question. The solutions provided should be reasonable, and implementable.

5. It is ironic that the article deals with the dangers of social media, and the banning of social media, and yet there is evidence that the author has a Twitter account and a blog.

Answers to Questions on Extract 2: *Teenagers and social networking: it might actually be good for them.*

1. Follow the hyperlink / The Guardian's website.
 2. The article mentions Snapchat and Instagram. These are relatively new social media sites.
 3. False. Accept answers that reference warnings and negative/dangerous effects of social media.
 4. So that teenagers do not abuse social media. It is a distraction that can waste a lot of time. They lose sleep, neglect homework, and cannot multitask efficiently. If YES, it is possible for parents to monitor teenagers' social media use, student must provide an example/explain how this is a feasible option. If NO, it is impossible to monitor teenagers' social media use, student must provide a reason for the infeasibility of this option.
 5. If YES, student must list the skills, and how they've developed them through social media use. If NO, student must critically evaluate his/her own social media practices and state why they have not contributed to the development of useful skills.
- c) I will divide the class into groups of 4 or 3, depending on the size, and get them to perform a little skit on the dangers/benefits of social media. They can decide amongst themselves, which side to lean towards (either positive or negative or middle ground), and perform the piece to the class in the following week. I'll give them the option of recording the presentation in class, and then uploading it on social media. Then, just to make things a bit more interesting, we'll have a competition: the video with the most likes will get a prize. But there'll be a twist: between when the task is handed out, and when the oral should be performed, there will be a weekend... and during this weekend NO social media should be used by anyone in the class – this includes the teacher. To show my solidarity, I will quit social media for one weekend.

Students will still be able to call each other, should they need to prepare for the oral the following week, or they could meet up over the weekend to rehearse. Two journal entries must be made by everyone in the class during their time away from social media. These will be graded, so they should be taken seriously. I, too, will make the journal entries, and present them to the class on the following Monday. Students who are willing, can read their entries to the class as well – for extra credit.

The oral presentations should provide some juicy material for class discussion, or a debate of some sort. I will give them one week to upload their videos online, and to get likes. The winners will be announced in class the following week, and they will be given their prizes (whatever I can afford on a teacher's salary!). Hopefully the assignment will let the students know that social media has both its dangers and its benefits: that it is possible for them to switch off their phones for a weekend and make it out alive on the other side; but that their ability to successfully use social media could have positive spinoffs, like the chance to win movie tickets in an English class.

Kate:

Rationale

As there may be First Additional Language learners in my class, I have attempted to create my lesson in a way that requires no previous knowledge on the concept of a metaphor.

Reading my stories aloud to the class, while displaying the images I have made, serves as my hook. I want the combination of audio and visual effects of the second story to engage the learners' imaginations. This will hopefully hold their attention and expose them to the effects that metaphors can have on the mind. Story two also serves as an example for later assessment.

The purpose of comparing the stories is to introduce the concept that using language in a certain way can create possibilities. This communicative approach emphasises the function of a metaphor in language. I use the form of a class discussion to encourage brainstorming based on independent thought. It also allows me to assess any prior knowledge on the topic and for learners who are not at all familiar with the concept to simply take information in at first.

Next I try to add a text-based approach, by allowing the learners to read the text and examine each metaphor used separately. This exercise, together with my explanation of a metaphor, should provide the learner with the basic tools needed to understand how to identify a metaphor and how it is used within a text.

I use the poem given as a way to challenge the learners on what they have learnt so far. I choose group work to make this unsupervised task less daunting. It also allows learners to share their knowledge with each other. The first question is literal and challenges the learners to identify the metaphor in the text. The second and third questions allow for inference, evaluation and appreciation to encourage independent thought, based on the knowledge they have acquired in the lesson.

Aims:

The aim of this lesson is to introduce learners to the concept of the metaphor. The lesson should provide learners with the tools to be able to identify a metaphor, describe how it functions in a text, explain its effects and create their own metaphors.

Resources:

Texts: 'Story 1 and 2', 'Fog', 'Images for Story 2'

Chalk and Board

Overhead projector if possible

Lesson Plan:

Strategy 1 (5mins)

To begin my lesson, I will read a story I have written (attached 'story 1') aloud to the class.

I will then read the second version of my story (attached 'story 2') aloud to the class. I have created pictures to illustrate this second story (attached 'images for Story 2'), that I will hand out or display on an overhead projector if possible.

Strategy 2 (5mins)

To encourage a class discussion on the differences between the two stories, I will ask the class the following question aloud:

- Which story did you find more interesting?

Hopefully the class will agree that the second story was more entertaining. I will follow up with the next question:

- What made the second story more interesting?

Strategy 3 (5mins)

I will explain the following to the class:

The two texts are telling the same story, but my second story contains hidden meanings. I have described something, but I meant something else. This way of describing something, but meaning something different, is called a metaphor. It may seem like metaphors are used to confuse us, but they actually make things easier to understand. They try to describe something, by comparing it to something else. In this way, they are using our imaginations as a tool for better understanding.

Strategy 4 (10 min)

To expand using examples, I will hand out a copy of ‘Story 1 and Story 2’ to each learner. While I ask them to read the stories to themselves, I will write the following metaphors on the board:

- Red-faced
- Wrong end of the stick
- An elephant in the room
- A grey blanket
- Raining cats and dogs
- Roar of a mighty lion
- To jump out of your skin
- Two peas in a pod

In the form of a class discussion, I will ask the class to use ‘story 1’ to help them to identify what is being compared to what in the above metaphors used in ‘story 2’. Together as a class, using the accompanying images I have made, we will link each metaphor to its meaning like so:

- Red-faced – angry
- Wrong end of the stick – misunderstanding
- An elephant in the room – an uncomfortable situation

- A grey blanket – storm clouds
- Raining cats and dogs – raining heavily
- Roar of a mighty lion – thunder
- To jump out of your skin – to get a fright
- Two peas in a pod – two of a kind, do everything together

Strategy 5: (10mins)

If the class is not already seated in groups, I will divide them into groups of four or five. I will hand out a copy of Carl Sandburg's poem 'Fog' to each learner. First I will read the poem aloud. I will then ask the learners to read the poem in their groups and to answer the following three questions:

1. What is the poet comparing fog to in this poem?
2. Why do you think the poet chose this comparison to explain the fog?
3. The poem is an extended metaphor, what do you think that means?

Strategy 6: (5mins)

We will then answer the questions as a class:

1. The poet is comparing the fog to a cat
2. Using this metaphor allows the reader to imagine the fog as a cat: Appearing quietly and softly, watching from a distance. It gives the reader another way to think about fog, by conjuring up an image in our minds.
3. An extended metaphor is a metaphor that is used throughout a text. The poet is using the entire poem to create the comparison between the fog and a cat.

Assessment

At the end of the lesson, I can ask the learners to write an exit-slip, describing what a metaphor is in their own words. This will allow me to assess what has been learnt in the lesson and it allows the learner to put into words what knowledge he/she has just acquired.

As a formal assessment, I would ask the learners to create their own stories like mine, using metaphors. To prepare them further for this task, we would focus on similes in the next lesson and we would spend time looking at the use of metaphors in children's literature. They could create stories in groups and present them to the class. If possible, they could present their stories to a younger grade too.

Nina:

01.11 Teacher: Students, today we are going to go over a poem. I won't give you the title just yet, because we're first going to read it. First you'll read it by yourselves, then you'll read it, a volunteer can read it. We're going to read it three times okay, then you must guess what the title could be.

01.32 Teacher: If you look at these pictures (pictures of suspects) what thoughts come to your mind? Please raise your hand if you want to answer. If you look at these pictures, what thoughts come to mind? Can everyone see?

01.45 Students: Yes

01.47 Teacher: What thoughts come to mind when you look at these pictures?

01.49 Students: Criminals

Students: They look like criminals who've been arrested.

01.53 Teacher: Criminals. Anyone else?

01.55 Student: Wanted people, thieves

01.58 Teacher: Anyone else?

02.01 Student: Missing people

02.03 Teacher: Missing people

02.05 Teacher: If you look at these pictures, what thoughts come to mind?

3 second pause

02.11 Teacher: Okay students, let's read the poem. Are there any Zulu speakers here? Are there any Zulu speakers here? No Zulu speakers?

Students: Yes

02.26 Teacher: Is this Zulu writing because the person who wrote this poem also speaks Zulu?

Students: Yes

02.46 Teacher: But we're just going to read the English part, okay. I'm just showing you the Zulu poem because he wrote poems in Zulu and in English.

Teacher hands out poems

03.03 Teacher: Who else needs a copy?

03.18 Teacher: Does everyone have a copy?

03.21 Students: Yes

03.26 Teacher: Please pass them out. Students, read the poem by yourselves and then afterwards highlight or underline any words or phrases you don't understand.

Students read the poem

03.58 Teacher: Read the poem silently. Highlight any words or phrases you don't understand.

04.24 Teacher: Students, you must remember poetry is related to music, so the sound is important. If you listen to your favourite song do you only listen to it once?

04.36 Students: No

04.37 Teacher: So, poetry you also need to listen to it, uuh, read it, listen to it more than once. To appreciate it more. Okay.

04.48 Teacher: have you finished reading?

04.51 Students: Yes

04.53 Teacher: Okay, who would like to volunteer to read it aloud? Okay, (to student who raised his hand) please speak loudly (student reads the poem)

05.53 Teacher: I'll read it one more time. While I'm reading students, try to think what title this poem has. What title would you give this poem? (teacher reads the poem)

06.46 Teacher: You have one minute to come up with a title for the poem. One minute. What title would you give this poem? One minute

06.53 Teacher: What title would you give this poem?

07.03 Teacher: What title would you give this poem?

07.08 Teacher: The what?

07.10 Student: The Wanted

07.11 Teacher: Okay, write it down

07.13 Teacher: Did you write it down? What title would you give it?

07.17 Teacher: What title would you give it?

07.46 Teacher: Students, there's no wrong or right

07.53 Students: The Wanted Gentleman

07.55 Teacher: Okay, did you write it down?

07.57 Teacher: Any volunteers to give us the titles they gave? You said?

08.01 Student: The Wanted (teacher writes it on the board)

08.19 Teacher: The Wanted. Anyone else?

08.28 Student: The Gentleman in the Suit.

08.30 Teacher: The Gentleman in the Suit?

Student: Ya (teacher writes title on the board)

08.35 Teacher: One more. Anyone?

08.46 Teacher: Anyone else?

08.48 Student: . . . (can't hear clearly what the student said)

08.50 Teacher: Is that the title?

08.51 Student: I think so. Yes

09.00 Teacher: The Clothes That You Wear Doesn't . . . (teacher writes it on the board)

09.11 Teacher: Does anyone have something shorter?

09.20 Student: Misunderstood

Teacher writes title on the board

09.27 Teacher: Okay students. I'll give you the title of the poem just before the end of the class. Okay.

09.37 Teacher: What is the mood of the poem? After you read the poem how did you feel? How did you feel after you read the poem?

Teacher: What is the mood of the poem? Is it happy, sad? Is it cynical?

09.55 Student: I think it's sad

Teacher: Sad. Okay, what else?

10.00 Teacher: I get up in the morning and dress like a gentleman.

10.03 Teacher: What is a gentleman?

10.08 Student: It's a man. Umm. It's a man who takes good care of himself. Cares about other people.

10.22 Teacher: Yes, it's a well-mannered and considerate man.

10.24 Teacher: You can make notes on the side, okay (teacher reads a stanza)

10.44 Teacher: The second stanza. What does that mean? "He tells me to produce"

10.50 Student: To make

10.54 Teacher: Do you know what "to produce" means?

10.57 Students: To show, give something

11.01 Teacher: Yes, to give or show something

11.09 Teacher: Okay, let's go to the third stanza. (teacher reads third stanza)

11.21 Teacher: "Document of my existence" What do you think that means?

11.26 Student: An id

The context of the recording (which part of the lesson, the grade, the topic etc)

The transcription begins immediately after the teacher greets the class at the beginning of the lesson. The teacher goes straight into the lesson. It is the first time the students have read this poem in class and the first time the teacher is teaching this class. In this lesson the teacher

and students together analyse the poem “Always a Suspect” by Oswald Mtshali. The students are grade ten English Home Language learners. There are about 35 students in the class during the recording. The class usually has about 40 students, some of which are absent on the day of the recording. The learners’ official teacher is also in the classroom, but she does not participate in the lesson as she has given sole control of the proceedings of the lesson to the student teacher.

Many of the students come from financially disadvantaged backgrounds. School fees are not obligatory. There is no library at school for the students to use during break times or after school. Even though the students learn all their subjects in English, it is not their home language. The majority of the students speak Afrikaans as a home language, followed by isiXhosa speaking students.

During the class the students are seated one at a desk each in rows facing the front of the class.

Patterns of classroom interaction (Initiation-response-feedback or?)

The teacher predominates classroom talk time. All interaction is between the teacher and the students, there is no cross discussion or student to student interaction. Through repetition of the same questions and phrases the teacher tries to extract responses from the students, for example, at 01.47 the teacher asks “What thoughts come to mind when you look at these pictures?” A student responds at 01.49 with the word “criminals.” The teacher acknowledges the student’s response by saying “Criminals. Anyone else?” She does not say yes or no to the student’s reply, but simply repeats what the students has said, thereby acknowledging the student’s contribution, without evaluating it as being correct or incorrect, in order to encourage other students to respond without feeling intimidated about whether their response will be labelled as correct or incorrect. At 01.58 The teacher repeats the phrases “Anyone else” and at 02.05 “. . . what thoughts come to mind?” She gives a three second pause before moving on to reading of the poem.

% of teacher talk % of learner talk

85 % teacher talk time, 15 % learner talk time

Types and functions of questions asked

There are mostly “what” questions, for example:

“What thoughts come to mind when you look at these pictures?” This could be considered an evaluative question as the learners look at pictures and then make a value judgement based on

their background knowledge. “What title would you give this poem?” This could be an inferential question as learners must create a title based on what they read in the poem. The title they choose will be influenced by the words in the poem. “What is the mood of the poem?” This is an inferential question as the mood of the poem is found in the diction of the poem. “What is a gentleman?” is a general knowledge question where learners define the term “gentleman.” Even though it seems like an easy word to know, not all learners give a precise definition of what it means, for example, at 10.08 a learner said that “It’s a man who takes good care of himself, cares about other people.” The definition is only partly right.

Participation of learners, types of answers

There is not as much participation from the learners as the teacher would like. One reason may be because this is the teacher’s first time teaching them. The answers the learners give are short, there are however a couple of longer sentences: at 09.00 the teacher repeats what the student said, “The Clothes that You Wear Doesn’t . . .”, and at 10.08 a student says “It’s a man. Umm. It’s a man who takes good care of himself. Cares about other people.”

The teacher was keen to hear what answers the students would give for suggested title of the poem. The titles they give would be suggestive of whether they picked up on the mood of the poem or not. The learners who answered did pick up on the mood of the poem as indicated in the following answers:

07.10 “The Wanted”, 07.53 “The Wanted Gentleman”, 09.20 “Misunderstood”.

One reason may be because this is the teacher’s first time teaching them.

The nature of the teacher’s feedback

The teacher does not say yes/no or correct/incorrect when students give their answers, for example, at 10.08 a student explains that a gentleman is “a man who takes good care of himself. Cares about other people.” Though part of this definition is correct, it does not encapsulate the full meaning of gentleman. The teacher builds on the student’s reply by saying “Yes, it’s a well-mannered and considerate man.” Later in the class the students receive a more detailed definition of what a gentleman is.

Susan:

Rationale for lesson plan

The CAPS document defines text-based approach (TBA) an approach that involves reading, writing and analysing texts. In order for these tasks to be carried out in TBA there needs to exist some prior knowledge of how the text in question is produced has to have been explained to the learner. In both the first additional and home language (FAL and HL) there would have been previous knowledge of what a poem and simile is. This is because these two facets would have been practised and I would have taught my learners prior to the metaphor lesson. The way we will explore how the poem 'Fog' works in relation to metaphor will be through not only reading the poem. But also designing sets in the lesson plan that describe the metaphor outside the poem. Hence the baby dolls that are 'cousins' and not brother and sister: an effort on my part to illustrate the relatedness and also difference in the simile and metaphor.

This will ensure that the language skill concerning metaphor is clearly and distinctively grasped the first time. There is a lot of interaction with the learners. I have tried to not lecture to them and to have them speak out and answer questions in class.

The home homework provided is largely connected to the communicative approach. The learners will have to read a short metaphor poem and answer five questions. They then would have to read another short poem and create five questions that are centred on what a metaphor is. They thirdly have to create a fine line metaphor poem of their own. This type of exposure will give them practise and the ability to at a basic level be able to produce a metaphor. In this way I would have incorporated the reading, writing and doing to understand what a metaphor is.

English Methods Assignment 1

9 MARCH 2015

WEEK 9 METAPHOR HOMEWORK

Grade 8 English

Metaphor poem 1

My family lives inside a medicine chest:
Dad is the super-size band aid, strong and powerful
but not always effective in a crisis.
Mom is the middle-size tweezer,
which picks and pokes and pinches.
David is the single small aspirin on the third shelf,
sometimes ignored.
Muffin, the sheep dog, is a round cotton ball, stained and dirty,
that pops off the shelf and bounces in my way as I open the door.
And I am the wood and glue which hold us all together with my love.

By: Belinda

1. Define the term metaphor (3)
2. What four things are being compared to a medicine chest? (4)
3. Name the characteristics that make the four family members compared to a medicine chest (4)
4. Choose two family members from the poem and discuss why you think the characteristics make the comparison effective (4)
- 5.

<https://www.teachervision.com/poetry/literary-techniques/5453.html?>

May 6, 2012 By Austin

Metaphor poem 1

My family is a refrigerator, there are always different things in there.
Dad is the apple; seems always heathy and keeps you healthy.
Mom is the outside of the fridge; always there to keep us together.
Brothers are the juices and the milk that are always refreshing.
And I am the meat sometimes rotten sometimes nice and juicy.

Create 5 questions you would ask your group if you were the teacher teaching the poem

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

<http://www.youngzine.org/article-u-write/collection-short-poems>

Task 3

Instruction: Learner must create own metaphor

- A. Include a **title** for your poem.
- B. The poem must be **five** lines long.
- C. Your poem must be based on **ONE** of the following topics:
 - 1. Playing sport
 - 2. Role model
 - 3. A fruit.
 - 4. An animal

All due on the 10th in third period. Remember every time you complete **ALL** your homework you get a 'completed homework' star and prize at the end of each third week.

PICTURES TO BE SHOWN TO CLASS 9 MARCH 9, 2015

(Susan provided several pictures taken from Google Images, but due to copyright issues, they can not be shown here)

4. Focused group interview transcription

Transcription of Focused Group Interview done on 20 May 2015 at 11:00 until 12:20

Me: Right. All of you comfortable? If you need some water... oh, you got some water, so that's fine. Great stuff. The microphone that we have over here is a very sensitive microphone, so you don't need to feel like you need to shout, you can speak normally. Uhm, I am videotaping this, so that you know. I am not going to use it excessively, I am much more interested in what you guys have to say obviously. So we are still waiting for Kate – I bet she'll pop in any time soon. But we are going to start so long seeing as Alicia has to go at 12. So we are first going to start with a bit of a warm-up. Not all of you know which tasks you submitted and Susan, not even I know what you have submitted. So if guys could just, to the group, explain what task you submitted for this research and why you chose it. Let's start with Nina.

Nina: Are you referring to uh...

Me: To that task that you sent me... About the transcription.

Nina: Oh. Ok, well, that's a classroom talk assignment where we had to do a recording of one of our lessons and analyse... make a transcript and then analyse it.

Me: Uh-hu...

Nina: So that's about it.

Me: And what did you find while doing that? Were there any difficulties?

Nina: Yes. I would have preferred using a Dictaphone or else I had to walk around in class with my phone. Well, I could have put maybe on me maybe in a little pouch or something. Uh, the phone was kept stationary on the desk, 'cause I did not want the students to see, but I suppose it doesn't make sense: with the Dictaphone they would have also noticed something.

Me: Ja. Ok. I suppose you'd want them to know in the class that you are recording this, so there's no kind of ethical concerns afterwards.

Nina: (sounds reluctant) Yeah... uhm... The sound wasn't very good and... and on my phone there's no rewind or fast-forward, so I had to listen from scratch...

Me: Oh, goodness... (laughs)

Nina: ...and I had to listen very carefully. It took a lot of time. With a Dictaphone I could just rewind it. So...

Alicia: ... (to Nina) there is an app on your phone, depending on the phone you got. 'Cause my phone has a sound recorder and you can kind of... you can't... you can't fast-forward and rewind by using a button, but you can scroll with your finger, so you are not gonna have to go through the whole thing. Just check, there should be some free app.

Me: Mmmm... And uhm, you said that at some point you, with the transcription, uhm, you thought that it would be lovely if there was actually a some software or an app that could do that.

Nina: (more sure of herself) Yes, and I checked later. There is some type of... (laughs)

Me: Oh! Ok! Do you remember the name of the app?

Nina: No. (looks down) I did not take down the name, 'cause I won't be needing one soon, so I did not make...

Me: How did you find the app?

Nina: I was searching online for something. Can't remember. Just that there are some (brushes hand through hair) that I can use, (more sure of herself) which is where you play the recording and then it (looks at me) types... it (a little unsure again)

Me: That actually would help a lot. I hope I can find that for this (points at video recorder), 'cause it is going to take a long time. (everybody laughs – they seem more at ease now). Susan, what task are you planning to...

Susan: ... so, the task I am going to submit for you is the... I think our first task for our English Method, uh, a poem, was it "Fog"? (looks at Nina for confirmation) The Fog, by Carl Sandberg. And it's basically about... it's a poem about, uh, the cat and the characteristics of and how (inaudible) is etcetera, etcetera...

Me: ...Mmmm...

Susan: Uhm (medium pause)... but yeah. Yeah, that's fine.

Me: Ok, so the, is it a task where you, while completing it actually used a lot of DL, or was it more for a lesson plan?

Susan: Oh, it was... so it was a poem we had to teach to, ah, a grade, (looks over my head), was it Grade nines?

Me: Mmmmm...

Susan: Yes. (she is constantly fiddling with her hands) Yes (tilts head), so Rochelle wanted us to submit a lesson plan, uh, and then step by step state how we would (hands become more controlled) start the lesson, complete it and obviously the body also within the, I don't know, forty-five, fifty minutes depending on the lesson plan... how you would create the book, how you would explain how you would engage with the learners, just make sure that everyone is on the same... same... on par with you. (her hands now rest in front of her. She has been rocking in her chair the whole time and is now crouched forward, where she sits still and looks at me)

Me: Oh. Ok.

Susan: (calmer now) And obviously I wanted to use some, some (pulls face while over-articulating the word) "technology" or something to make it more fun and interesting.

Me: What did you think of?

Susan: I wanted to sort of make, like, a video-thing. I used the projector (she starts gesticulating again) with my laptop and the poem would announce itself by sort of a background speaker reciting the poem, then, uh, pictures of the cat and the harbour (long pause while looking intently at me)... I wanted to do something like that (stops gesticulating)

Me: To make it come alive?

Susan: (nods) To make it come alive, but eventually I didn't because I (grimaces)... I just got stuck. I didn't really know how to... to... uh... (long pause) to present (big emphasis) that, to send it to Rochelle and then... I just got stuck, because I procrastinate... I did not have enough (emphasis) time, I just ended up googling a picture of a cat (looks up and smiles), the fog and... ah... just pictures, and then I would explain the poem, open it for discussion, ask them and then (comically lifts up right hand while smiling and in animated voice) this is a picture of a cat and... ja. Just... very basic at the end. It wasn't what I originally wanted.

Me: Oh, I see.

Susan: Ja.

Me: Yeah, I see. You basically... uh-bib, you basically say that time ended up being the issue there.

Susan: Ja. (nods head vehemently)

Me: It seems to be quite an issue with a lot of people.

(During both Nina and Susan's explanations, Alicia looked disinterested by looking up, down, and distantly touching her chin while looking at me every now and then, but now showed mild interest by looking at me and nodding slightly and briefly smiling. Nina has been staring blankly downwards as Susan spoke and does not seem to register this statement)

Me: Uh, Alicia.

Alicia: (smiles and checks her posture). I submitted...

Me: Ah, sorry...

Alicia: No, it's cool (smiles). I submitted the same assignment that (looks at Susan) Susan...

Me: Oh, yes! I remember.

Alicia: The metaphor, ja. And I started to integrate some digital technology in, in there and I think that I overdid it a little bit, 'cause there was (emphasis) "no way" I could do all of those things. It was a bit... I got so excited by the prospect of integrating all these things. As you said (looks at Susan) we try to bring it alive because it's just a flat page, you know? So what I did was, uhm, (inaudible 6:50) of a cat and the movement of the cat and it's an extended metaphor... (swallows and frowns)... so in order to scaffold that I... 'cause I'm obsessed with cats as well, and cat videos, I mean... and I tracked down, uhm, a cat video and the cat... how she stalks... so, someone had done it so beautifully with, du-du, the music from Jaws...

Me: Yeah, I see (sings) "du-du"...

Alicia: ...and the cat like lies like this (she bends forward to show how the cat is lying), and every time you move the camera out, the cat comes a little closer, and closer until they're up in your face.

Me: Mmmmm

Alicia: So, uh, (medium pause)... I wanted them to see how the cat can move, oh, and then I looked for a video on fog, uhm... the fog rolling in in like a big bank. It's this fog... mountain in, like, California, I think. So I played that video for them and then a video on buffalos. 'Cause I tried to compare how cats move, as opposed to something that is the complete opposite of that (gesticulates heavily at this point). So I showed this video of a herd of buffalo just stampeding. Uhm, and then, in the class we pretend to be cats for a while.

Me: Oh, I see.

(Nina is staring blankly still and has taken to fidgeting a little. Susan is looking directly at Alicia, smiling, nodding her head and seemingly listening intently)

Alicia: (smiles) and then we'd pretend to be buffalos just to see what the difference (medium pause) actually... just (long pause), uhm, contrasting the two.

(At this point Nina smiles for the first time since Alicia started talking

Me: And you also envision it for Grade nine?

Alicia: Grade nine. Ok, so, try to get them a bit, you know, (emphasis) "alive". A little bit of energy in the classroom. And then kind of I took, a couple of... they've got this beautiful, like, (big emphasis) "word art" (gesticulating) simile definitions metaphors things online, you can just google them. I pulled a few of those off, and a worksheet or two I think. That's how I...

Me: So it's quite a lot that you...

Alicia: Yeah (smiles nervously)

Me: So I think you, you, you, probably got quite excited

Alicia: I did (smiles)

(I get up to check the door. Nina looks down and smiles. Susan looks at me while smiling. Alicia looks like she wants to say more.)

Me: I just want to check if Kate is not maybe standing in front of the door... crying or something

(They all laugh. Nina looks at the camera and smiles. Alicia takes a sip of water)

Me: I'm gonna leave the door slightly open, because there is such a noise coming from there anyway. But... she can just as well... pop in. I'll just check the time here. Great! We are completely on time. Uhm... Now, the next question (I sit down again) that I wanna ask you guys, and from here on feel free to just kind of, uhm, make a comment, uh, so that it becomes a discussion. We don't have to go (gestures)... hop around (Alicia and Susan are nodding simultaneously, while Nina frowns at this and looks downwards and away from me). So you guys are all familiar with one another, you've seen each other in class, so, you don't have to shy. (all three of them smile). Uhm, (starts reading from questionnaire), how did your use on your own use of digital resources change as you worked on this task? Uhm, did you have... I know, Susan, with you specifically, you had something in your mind... uhm... there, there was a, you know, there was a glitch (Susan nods briefly). Uhm, and then also, first then as you were working on the task (starts gesticulating), and the lesson plan that you were developing, and then think (both Nina and Alicia start fidgeting, while Susan is still looking at me, sitting very still) how your view of your own use of digital literacies, uhm, started changing as you, uhm, started moving into the reflections that you wrote for me, but let's first start with the task. Uhm, what did you think would be able (both Susan and Alicia are looking at me intently, while Nina is really frowning at this point and she is breathing a little heavier) and is there anything that you noticed of your own use of digital literacies that started changing?

(very long pause)

Susan: I, I, I think when I started obviously I had a clear picture, aaah, but then as, as I tried and I noticed that I could not because I did not have the knowledge or ability to do it (gestures and emphasises) "that" way, but then, then I thought I could ask (looks up while gesticulating), but I wasn't sure who to ask and then sometimes I just feel very retarded when I go and I ask someone and, you know, they give you this "seriously"-look (she lowers her chin and looks at me), so, I just thought, no, I'll just hassle it out on my own... and at the end after I, I had handed in my assignment, I felt (medium

pause)... very, I felt down, I felt I was, aah, (long pause)... uh... uhm... what's the word, uhm, not empowered (shrugs) when it comes to, to digital literacy.

Me: Ja.

(Both Nina and Alicia are looking downwards at this point and don't seem to be listening to Susan)

Susan: (she stops gesticulating) Ah, whereas before I starting I thought, no, I was fine, it was ok-ish. Uh, (emphasis) "just" on average. Sooooo... uh... I think (smile) from... that day... (smiles and looks downwards)... ja, and, and it has created this sort of... mmmm... maybe not "fear-fear", but it's like (gesticulates)...

Me: Reluctant?

Susan: Yes! To explore or to... and to really engage too. I'm at the stage where, you know what?, if it's the basic and they sort of get, uh, the "gist" of where I'm going, then that's that, 'cause I don't want to have to say to myself (point finger in the air) this is what I want and then it doesn't come and then I drop, and then the feeling of resentment and thinking you're not good enough. I, I really (moves head to the left) did not enjoy feeling like that.

Me: So you found a lot of disappointment and you kind of, uh... your identity as a person working with digital literacies... you've had... it felt like you moved away from that identity (Susan smiles broadly, tilts and nods her head. Nina and Alicia are still looking downwards, not registering) like it is not part of you anymore...

Susan: Yes. Yes. (medium pause while she nods) Yes.

Me: That's, uh, that's quite sad that that happens, but it happens to quite a lot of people, so don't feel... alone. Uh, did any of you experience the same. (Alicia looks at Nina) Alicia and Nina?

Nina: No, uhm, if I was at a school where we were using computers in the classroom, I think I would have made more of an effort (she looks up and smiles) to... if they were using, uhm, if they had a platform where students could sit and they'd work and leave comments and opinions or something like that, then it would have been different. There was absolutely no, there (emphasis) "were" no computers in the classrooms and I... didn't... I'm well aware of that if I'm going to be an educator, I am going to have to learn, otherwise I'm going to be left behind (at this point she looks up for the first time in a while and at me). You have to move with the times, or else you'll be left behind (both Alicia and Susan are listening to her intently and now they are both nodding), but I only do that when I'm in that situation, where I (emphasis) "have" to do it and right now I'm not in that situation (she fidgets with her nose while looking at me). So I'm just doing what I need to do at the time I need to do it (she looks away from me).

Me: So it's kind of a necessity? It became a necessity-thing?

Nina: Yes. I have to... you have to move with the times, so that you won't be left behind (she stares distantly out the window)

(medium pause)

Me: That almost brings us to the next question where we, where we talk about the, uhm, you know, for you, if you know had to be very honest, uhm, do you, do you want to use digital literacies in your classroom because it is expected from you? Or because you really think there's a benefit?

Nina: I think in some instances there is a benefit. The school I was at, they did a lot of writing on the board, which took up a lot of classroom instruction time (Alicia nods). Uhm, the teacher could prepare beforehand and just save some time in the

classroom with some activities, and also with some activities you can... they become more engaging... the students. Not (emphasis) “always” (she frowns and looks out the window)... because I have worked in a environment where they have a big TV screen and a computer (she gestures to show a TV screen) and they’d show videos and Powerpoint and whatever. Uhm, after a while they get used to it, so you can’t use it all the time.

Me: Ja, so the, the, in Afrikaans we say, “die nuutjie is verby” (Nina frowns)... they kinda get over it

Nina: Yeah, but I don’t think you need to use it (emphasis) “all the time” (she smiles)

Me: Yeah-yeah, it’s, I can’t, and it has to fit into the classroom.

Nina: (almost absently) Yeah.

Me: Uhm...

Alicia: ... Well, I had seen first hand, before even signing up for any digital literacy... research, what an impact technology could have in the classroom. When I was on my two week observation at [name of school], right? (she points out the window) I saw (a lot of emphasis) “the most amazing teacher” that has ever walked the face of my life at least (she smiles while Nina also smiles warmly while looking at Alicia), uhm, he used digital technology and digital literacy in his classroom (big emphasis) “seamlessly” and my jaw dropped to the floor when I saw how he taught a Shakespearean sonnet, uhm, the world, I think it was by Shakespeare, uhm, the world is (inaudible 15:25) is that one by Shakespeare (she looks at the others – they nod). Getting and spending we had (inaudible 15:30) He had pictures of (gestures) of the earth, like, beautiful from the waterfalls and the monkeys and it was so stunning and the kids were so engaging and... (she smiles and looks to the side) I just thought there’s a whole... world of possibility with technology here. So when I came to the PGCE and I started assignments I didn’t feel that apprehensive (emphasis) “at all” about integrating digital literacy, ‘cause I had seen it being done successfully. Uhm, but then, when I completed that assignment... and Rochelle also said like (becomes animated) you have so much energy (smiles), but there is (strong emphasis) “way too much” in this one, it could spread across three periods. So after I completed my first assignment, I felt like I need to rein it in... big time for the next two (she looks at the others quickly. Nina is smiling at her and so is Susan), ‘cause... I’m not gonna finish what the poem is actually about.

Me: It’s true. We have to start at some point to get to the poem and start analysing the poem.

Alicia: Oh, but I did actually do, uhm, a lesson, a prose lesson with a Standard nine class, where I could see they got a little (big emphasis) “too” stimulated by all of the visuals and stuff...

Me: ... oh, I see... So they got distracted, almost?

Alicia: (nods) And it was my first lesson with this class, I didn’t know exactly who were the chatty ones (Nina is looking down and does not seem to register what Alicia is saying, while Susan is still looking at Alicia and seemingly listening intently)... very very ambitious trying to put all of those things (gestures) on the first one, but I learned now to...

Me: ... rein it in a bit?

Alicia: ... curb my enthusiasm a little bit. (Nina smiles)

Me: Yeah, usually a little bit goes quite a long way.

(Alicia and Susan nod. Nina looks at me and frowns)

Me: Before we move on to the next question, I just have to see if my technology is still working (Alicia and Susan laugh at this. Nina is still frowning and staring in the distance. I get up to check on the sound recorder)... uhm... because... this machine sometimes just stops (Nina nods and smiles)... uhm... and... this one... (I walk over to the video recorder) I've never used before, so, uhm, I'm not incred... oh! Look at that, well done! (I have checked the camera). I just hope that stops (gestures towards the window where there is a great noise coming from outside). I'm gonna remove this chair, because it doesn't look like Kate is coming, but it doesn't matter, I'll just make another appointment with her (I remove the chair from the view of the camera). Uhm... Right! Let's move on to the next question (picks up questionnaire) how did your view on your own use of digital literacies change during your teaching practical? 'Cause now you went in there and you saw how... you now spoke about how a teacher (I point at Alicia) just blew your mind, uhm, was there anything in this specific teaching practical where you went like, like, "oooh, wow, they could have actually used digital literacies a lot better" or you were basically sitting there going like, "wow, that is quite amazing, I never thought of that"?

(long pause. Alicia looks at Nina)

Nina: Uh... well, for one of my classes, the teachers brought in their own laptops... for a play so the students could listen. The sound quality wasn't very good, so they could have improved on that, and then another thing is, if you wanted to use a projector, you had to go to the school the same day and...

Me: Oh ja, you said that (I sound schocked)... at half-past seven, ja...

Nina: ...and I don't think the teachers always know how to hook-up the stuff (smiles) and the wires and stuff and stuff and if it's not working you have to get somebody in to see how to fix it and...

Alicia: ... when you say projector, do you mean the one that hangs from (she points to the ceiling)...

Susan: ...*(inaudible 18:55)* or the actual...

Alicia: ... the ones they use for transparencies?

Nina: It's the one that shows a picture on the wall (she gestures), on the white part of it...

Alicia: Oh, then it's the modern one

Nina: Uhm... but that wasn't too good for the students, because it was a very sunny day and they had to squint their eyes on the wall (she smiles), so... (she starts laughing)

Me: Oh, no! (Alicia and Susan smile) So it wasn't very seamless! (I laugh)

(Nina is laughing almost hysterically now)

Nina: So, I mean, at least they tried, but, uh, there were some improvements that had to be made (she is still laughing)

Me: Did you get the feeling that they were just using technology for the sake of using technology there?

Nina: No, (she suddenly becomes serious) I think the teacher sincerely wanted the students to and watch and to... get a feel for the play (she gestures) through the movie. I don't think she used it just because it was there, I mean, she made a special effort to go in at 7:30.

Me: Yeah, they make sure that you make a special effort (Nina and I laugh. Susan and Alicia are looking at Nina and smiling)

Susan: Uhm, uhm, it's interesting that she mentioned the play because I had to teach Grade tens Master Herold and the Boys and [school name] high does not have... they have a staff, sort of, computer room with five laptops, but no projectors and we were discouraged from bringing in our laptops. They said, "no, it's very dangerous" and I had to take the trains and they were like, "no-no-no, things happen"... but I would have loved to have them either watch the play or, or just bring some, some, some, something (medium pause)... digital for them to either see, hear or work with. Make it fun, because the lessons were, were just a bit slow and boring and redundant, 'cause all we could do really is just read and then I'd stop them: "these are the important bits, just take note of A B C" (she is speaking fluently while gesticulating prominently), but if, if we had... there was a projector, uhm, I don't know, I just felt it would have been more fun and interesting. So... surprisingly I was irritated that I couldn't bring something like that to them. And... ja, ja (she smiles and nods her head vehemently)

Me: Yeah, I think a... I think an excerpt from the play would have been lovely – it's such a heartfelt po... uhm, uh... play

Susan: Exactly! Historical...

Me: You want them to (emphasis) "see" it.

Susan: Yes (nods her head)

Me: It's true. The thing is... ja... the characters can become very abstract... uhm... if they are not brought to life. (looks at Alicia) You have another example for us? (slight giggle)

Alicia: Uhm... I... There were weird things happening with digital literacy and technology at the (inaudible 21:43) school where I was... uhm... there were about five whiteboards, I am not sure (inaudible 21:48) they had five whiteboards at the school, like, interactive whiteboards, and, uhm, there were projectors in those five rooms as well (Susan is watching Alicia, but Nina is now looking away) and then they had the old school overheads (gestures) that were hanging (inaudible 22:02)

Me: It's a technology... (giggles slightly)

Alicia: Ja, so, so, that's what they used for annotating poetry with the older kids: Grade elevens and so on, but, uhm, it was disheartening that at some classes there were projectors, right?, but the screen that you pulled down was missing cause it either got stolen, and there were modern projectors that you could connect to a computer and everything. When I went to (inaudible 22:29) just before my teaching prac, just to pop in and see how... how (both Susan and Nina are now watching her with tilted heads), what the vibe was, there were no computers in the classrooms, but, uh, now every single class has got a computer.

Me: Ah, ok!

Alicia: Uhm... That was not always connected to the internet, but, uh, the ones closer to the office where the hub is, they'd be connected, but I not all the classes had them, so the teachers could not log on assignments, it wasn't able... you weren't able to integrate it into the lesson per se as good as you can and in one class, I just think it is because the teacher was a lazy (gestures and smiles) S-O-D to be honest...

Me: (nervous giggle)

Alicia: The projector was there (she looks at Nina and Susan, indicating with her hand) for months already, but it had never been hooked up to a computer or laptop ever...

Me: Mmmm

(Nina and Susan is now clearly listening intently)

Alicia: ...And it was a Grade 12 class she had, it was a Grade 12 class. Uh, and (medium pause), and the screen was missing and she just (inaudible... might be swearing 23:19) and she's like, "we don't even have a screen or a sheet", and I'm just standing there trying not to look all "judgy", 'cause I'm thinking, "you could have brought something from home", but then (medium pause)... in the same (medium pause)... space was another teacher down in the corridor and I loved her so much 'cause she was really trying. She was older, about forty, but she had (says pointedly) "no skill", she had, uhm, a projector (inaudible 23:45) she hooked it up to her own laptop... before there was a computer and she took pieces of... paper and stuck them on the board (gestures with her hands), because she said that she wasn't going to let that piece of technology, like... gather dust there. I did do my lesson... this was the first lesson I did...

(Kate enters)

Kate: Hi, I'm so sorry...

Me: Kate? Yes! Don't worry

Kate: I had a big car troubles...

Me: Let's fit you into the screen here (Susan, Alicia and Nina are looking at Kate, smiling)

Kate: Yeah (to the others) I'm really sorry I'm late...

Me: ...you're going to... Because you're late you're gonna get centre stage here (everyone laughs)

(I put a chair in the middle of the room for Kate)

Me: No, no, don't worry about it. Let's just put it there so...

Kate: Oh! Right there! (points to her chair. Everybody is still smiling)

Me: Right there! It's a very small set, sorry! (laughs loudly)

Kate: I'm so sorry...

Me: Uh... Sorry, I should just quickly (points at Alicia), no, not quickly (gestures wildly and laughs), please not quickly... elaborate!

Alicia: (her face quickly becoming serious) In the same space, there was a teacher who was trying to make use of the digital technology, and, uhm, as you said there was a problem (frowns and looks at Nina) (inaudible 24:47) there's a problem with viewing (gestures) the projection because, there was too much light. So I did encounter that (coughs) sometimes my pictures... my beautiful pictures (grimaces) just looked (fast sweeping of her hand) (inaudible 25:01) uhm, but at [name of school]... because now I have been there so I can compare a little bit, in every classroom they had the screens black (gestures), I mean, the windows were all black...

Me: ...oh, so that you could actually...

Alicia: ...so it was beautiful seeing this integration of technology.

Me: Uhm, you touched on an interesting... thing there now, you, you said that, you know, you thank that the teacher was lazy and she could have brought her own technology to the class. Uhm...

Alicia: Not necessarily technology, because later on the computer was put in, all she needed to do was bring a screen or...

Me: You know, make a plan

Alicia: But it had never ever been used

Me: Ja. Do you, uh, just, you know, off the record... nope... still on the record (Kate and Susan smile, but Nina is looking just right of the camera, staring) uhm, what do you guys think? Do you think all technology that we use in classrooms: do you think that the school must provide it? Or do you think the teachers must bring their own stuff? I know that this is an age-old debate, but, now, be honest, what do you guys think? Kate, what do you think?

Kate: (frowns and looks down) Uhm (medium pause)... I don't know, initially I just think (fast sweeping of hand) it is up to the school... (looks at me while emphasising "school")

Me: Mmmmm

Kate: ...to provide technology (frowns and turns her head to the other participants) because I suppose my view (looks down) is that you can... teach without it (frowns and looks at me)

Me: Mmmmm

Kate: ... I mean (lifts her chin) you can get through a curriculum without it and (medium pause)... you're learners can pass matric without it...

Me: (softly) Yes.

Kate: ... so it just (emphasis) "adds". Though, because it's not a necessity, then I don't see that I teacher should have to (longer pause)... (her face lights up and she speaks louder) but if it's there, then I do think it's the teacher's responsibility to use it... Maybe not (swiftly moves head to the side), maybe they should receive training...

Me: Yes

Kate: ... but I think if it's there, they should try to (medium pause while she looks at me)...

Me: To at least you know...

Kate: Yeah, try and see how it could add to the lesson

Me: Yeah, it's a very good point that you, that you make there. I just, uh, I have to check the time (gets up). Kate could you so long, for the rest of the group, just explain the task that you are handing in for this study, you know, what, wha-what was it all about?

Kate: (strongly) Yes, so I chose... uhm... my English assignment (turns around to get the assignment out of her bag, which she can't seem to find, so she swings around and flaps her hands while the rest laugh)

Me: I am so sorry, it's a really awkward spot, there, just, don't turn around (everybody laughs loudly)

Kate: I chose my English assignment, uhm, the one on the metaphor...

Me: ... yes...

Kate: So we had to, uhm, create a lesson plan, uhm, for a Grade eight class using the concept of the metaphor

Me: ...yes...

Kate: So... to (longer pause)... do that I Googled, uhm, (touches her nose)... I went on Youtube and I tried to find, you know, videos and something to get some (gesticulates) inspiration about... and I found a really great, uhm, video from, uhm, TedEd?

Me: Oh! Yes, yes, I love TedEd!

Kate: I only knew about TedTalks (smiles and looks to the side)... I'm a big fan of TedTalks (Susan and Alicia smile, Nina is looking downwards), uhm... but I didn't know (Alicia says something inaudible. Kate looks at her and smiles)... yeah! But I didn't know there was this, uhm, TedEd... I didn't know anything about TedEd. So, this whole (gestures)... and I just quoted this whole TedEd thing. And, uhm, there was this lovely video on (slight emphasis) "metaphors"... uhm... that I (long pause. She frowns)... just felt was so (air quotes) "effective", the way that things were explained and images that were used and the sounds, it was a short video. I just found the whole thing very effective (gestures slightly). So, then I (Long pause. Kate looks down again and her face drops. Nina looks away at something close to the ceiling, Susan is looking at the camera while Alicia is looking at Kate) tried to use, (picks up speed again) so then I tried to make my own little story with metaphors, so I used Google to get a list of popular metaphors and make a story and then I tried to put images to the story to try and... to show learners (gesticulates with fast movements), just using words in a certain way could create images in your mind, I think, and then I, but then I used like clipart pictures and Paint made very mediocre images (she looks at me and smiles, gestures and then looks down again as she stops gesticulating) for parts of my story. Uhm, and just the whole (medium pause)... assignment made me realize how it all came (mild emphasis) "from" technology, (strong emphasis) "but" if I knew a lot more about technology, I could have made it, you know, better (fast gesture on this word).

Me: How do you think you could have made it better?

Kate: I think, uhm (long pause)... I think the (long pause)... it would have been great if I could have somehow made a video like the ones I saw...

Me: Mmmmm...

Kate: I mean it's also great to know (gets excited)... and also to (emphasis) "know" about those kinda videos: to know where to find them, you know, do people (emphasis) "know" about TedEd and... because if I was a teacher in class, I would have loved to show that video that I saw (medium pause)... and then (longer pause)... ja, just the way I thought... while I was putting in these little images together (fast movements with her hands), I thought it would be so great if I could (medium pause)... make... some kind of amateur video... uhm... on my little story, and if I was a teacher and if I was in a well enough resourced school, then the learners could do the same, and if there was a programme where we could all make our own stories and our own videos, and then (gestures with hands fluttering above her head while smiling) my ideas just went crazy (she smiles and looks at me. Nina smiles briefly while Susan and Alicia are looking at me with expressionless faces)

Me: Now, we are quickly just recapping with Kate. You guys must jump in at any time that you want to. Susan, you are hiding, uhm, can you just move slightly this way so we could see your face... and now Nina is out of the picture again, so if you could just move in (everybody laughs). Sorry, I'm so glad that all five did not pitch, because that would have been a disaster (they all nod their heads). Uh, anyway, uhm, so, just quickly your, your view on digital literacies, uhm, you obviously had something in your mind (talking to Kate), you worked on this before you went on teaching prac, I guess...

Kate: (Nods head) Mmmm-mmm...

Me: Uhm, and how did that view change, you know, during and after your teaching prac now?

Kate: (long pause) I think I was in a very well-resourced school for teaching prac, uhm (medium pause)... and... and I liked how they made use of videos. So, like Youtube clips and stuff the teachers would use, uhm (longer pause)... but that was kind of the extent of it...

Me: So it was a video focus?

Kate: Yeah, and there was, uh... all the classrooms had Smartboards (gestures to form a box), but a lot of the teachers just didn't use them...

Me: ...bother...

Kate: Yeah, just didn't use them, and I don't know... I should have found out (none of the other participants seem to be listening at this point. Nina is pulling her mouth and looking down. Both Susan and Alicia are looking down), I don't know if it is because they hadn't... (speaks louder) it didn't seem like they were trained (medium pause)... to use them.

Me: I see

Kate: But... that's the whole debate, isn't it: if it is in your classroom, you should maybe yourself just try to (makes a writing gesture with her hand) see if it could add to your...

Me: I see. That's why you mentioned it earlier...

Kate: (loudly) Yeah, if it's there...

Me: ...if it costs money...

Kate: ...exactly... why not use it?

Me: Uhm... Yes, and do you think it could be relevant to the English class? (gestures to Alicia) Sorry, I'll be with you in two seconds (Alicia smiles)

Kate: I think so (she frowns and then repeats more sure of herself with emphasis on "I") I think so, but, it's also, you need to know (slight emphasis as she looks at me) "how"... 'cause I think a lot of these things can (long pause)... a lot of these things don't add to a class...

Me: Mmmmm...

Kate: ...like (medium pause)... you know, like having information on a Powerpoint (gestures), instead of just writing on the board (medium pause)... you know, if you're writing out just words (makes a writing gesture) instead of on a board. To me there's not much of a difference (longer pause)... really.

Me: Chalk and talk at the end of the day...

Kate: (very sure of herself) Yeah

Me: ...but just a more, kind of, uhm, flashy version...

Kate: Yeah, flashy version (none of the others respond to this) (longer pause)... but apparently, you know, there, there are... there must be ways to make things easier and quicker. It's just, you know, "how?"

Me: Alicia, you wanted to add...

Alicia: On the topic of the whiteboard, uhm, (longer pause)... as I said there were five whiteboards at my school, but none of them were being used, and I refuse to kind of, look, I spoke to the teachers and they said (long pause)... that (medium pause)... the (medium pause)... (said loudly and quickly) software needed... they received laptops with the software installed when the whiteboards were given to them, uhm, but what happened to those laptops was that staff members who didn't have computers at home took them out and now they don't actually know what happened to them at all. So, uhm, I was still quite upset about the whole whiteboard issue, because it's such an expensive piece of equipment and now it's just being used as a white screen...

Me: Just... are you talking about a (emphasis) "Smartboard"?

Alicia: A Smart... with the interactive (gestures with her hand)... the...

Me: Yes, a Smartboard. Ok.

Alicia: I think it's like ninety thousand? I much does that thing cost?

Me: It's an expensive piece of equipment, yes.

Alicia: ... and then we're using it as... I mean, you could have had a whiteboard there...

Me: Mmmmm...

Kate: Mmmmm...

(Susan and Nina is looking at Alicia, but did not respond much to this comment)

Alicia: ...and then I spoke to... because I befriended three of the (air quotes) "technology guys" (she smiles)... they were like (air quotes) "I T"... best three I T students... and I asked them, "do you guys know how to work the whiteboard" (frowns), and they said, "yes, mam, we do, do you want us to show you?"... and they took their time, because they were really passionate and stuff... to show me... to give me a little tutorial during the first break. Skipped their lunch and everything...

Me: ...ag shame...

(Nina and Susan are showing more enthusiasm to this comment by Alicia by nodding and smiling. Kate is still listening intently)

Alicia: (nods her head) ...it was amazing, really. Uhm... but then the camera wasn't properly calibrated, so if you drew a line, it would appear on a different part of the screen...

Me: Mmmm...

Alicia: Uhm... so it took them a while to, kind of, sort that out (gestures), but eventually I did see what you could do with it and you could put a poem up and actually (makes a circle with her hand) bring the kids in front to annotate... you could... it was amazing (puts hand in front of mouth)

Me: So you actually had the children approaching the board and not just basically use a...

Alicia: (lifts chin) I did not use it in one of my lessons...

Me: ...but you think, ja...

Alicia: ...but I'm just thinking along the lines of that, because I used the overhead projector, the old school ones, to annotate myself and that was quite effective (medium pause)... uhm... but (medium pause)... with a whiteboard you could have the poem right there and someone brought up an interesting thing: they could (makes a circle with her hand) go and circle it and write it down (makes gesture of writing) and you can actually convert that to text as well...

(Kate agrees and Susan nods her head. Nina is listening to Alicia with her chin slightly down)

Me: Yes!

Alicia: ...so that kids with bad handwriting... becomes super-eligible...

Kate: (smiles) Oh really?

Alicia: ... so it was amazing to see that, but (smiles and gestures) the next day I was called into the office... "what's going on?"... they said they were looking all over for me, because... uhm... I used that classroom with three students the previous day... and as I say, it wasn't properly calibrated so they had fiddled up there (gestures) in the little box...

Me: ... I see...

Alicia: ... (with slight emphasis) it was stolen... (Kate shows visible surprise by gasping, while the other two are still not responding)

Me: Oh, no...

Alicia: ... that was on Friday that they helped me and the next Monday they called me in to ask do I know what... look, I'm an ex-learner at the school, so they trusted me, I was a goodie two shoes (fast gesture), they knew it would have been me, but they wanted to know which students gained access to that (inaudible 35:39)... 'cause it was just standing open...

Me: ... so you immediately just told them, "I'm sorry, I stole it, it was me and then..." (everybody laughs. Kate tilts her head)

Alicia: I actually thought that they had removed the overhead projector. Uhm... the teacher who have been absent the previous week came in and he said, "they stole the projector", but he was joking and then I said, "no, they probably just took it down to fix it or something", just... (gestures) it was weird...

Me: Ja, you don't think stealing immediately...

Alicia: Yeah, but then they came to me and they asked which students were there with me (slight contempt showing on her face) and the students who were with me were also good ones, but apparently it's like the third projector that got stolen...

(all three the other students are now clearly not listening to Alicia anymore)

Me: Oooh, noooo. Ja, see, it's a huge problem in South Africa. You know, the issue of technology, and the school actually buying technology and then it disappearing, but it has always been a problem, I mean, look at our labs... uhm... even before we had digital technology, people stole from the labs and, and things... until they decided they're not going to stock our science labs anymore.

Kate and Alicia: Mmmmm... (both Susan and Nina are looking downwards)

Me: (loudly) Let's quickly move on. Uhm... we... I think Kate is up to... to scratch now with where we are at the moment.

Kate: (nods)

Me: Uhm... We, we basically had... I had you guys describing a special instance where you thought another teacher used digital resources quite cleverly during your teach pr... your teaching practicals and some of you already (medium pause)... said that. Uhm, is there anything... any other instance that you can think of?

(very long pause)

Alicia: So like not on teaching prac now (gestures and frowns)?

Me: We're staying on teaching prac, where you actually witnessed another teacher using it... uh... in a very clever way...

Alicia: ... to be quite honest, I didn't see any interesting uses of digital technology on this teaching prac (grimaces slightly). They were trying to stay away from it...

Me: I see...

Alicia: Uhm... when I asked... one of... the head of department, he had... all the heads of the departments had whiteboards in their classrooms and he said if I needed it, I could just tell him a day or two before the time so that class could move into another class so that I could use it, but I would upset everybody by doing it, so I just stuck to the old school projector and when I was in the classroom I did, but I saw an interesting use of digital technology at [name of school], uhm, I did speak to you guys about this when I (inaudible 37:55) instead of having a static Powerpoint on the screen... because people tend to zone out, because they think it's gonna be uploaded...

Me: Ja, I know that, ja...

Alicia: ... he did not use it in a way in his lesson, but I, based on what he was doing, got an idea (medium pause as she gestures)... he was busy doing roll call on a Word document and he forgot to switch the screen off (she points to her right) (Susan and Nina are looking downwards, while Kate is staring out the window) and instead of the kids doing their work, they were watching, because words were appearing on the screen...

Me: Ja...

Alicia: ...and I tried it in my own practice, uhm, when I did a lesson at [name of school]. Instead of having a static Powerpoint and me going through all that effort of digging up a Powerpoint, but just work in a Word document and then the suggestions that the kids were giving I'd type out. So, it's kind of the same thing as writing on the board, it is just a lot faster.

Me: Ja...

Alicia: And it's...

Me: And it's not as distracting

Alicia: ...it also kind of (inaudible 38:47) 'cause I could touch-type, right? When they saw these words appear at like a hundred words a minute (Nina is fidgeting with her bag now) they were like, "what, how did miss do that?" and then I explained to them, so I was kind of inspiring them to, like, not type like this (gestures with her hands)...

Me: Ja...

(Susan is staring blankly at Alicia, Nina is looking at the ceiling and Kate is still staring out the window)

Alicia: ...and then a couple of them, I told them, you know, how to (inaudible 39:02) the programme, you could teach yourself, so that's really cool.

Me: Do you guys... it's interesting now... you said that typing now... I never actually thought about it, but do you guys view typing as a digital literacy (Susan smiles, Nina looks down and frowns)

Kate: I never used to (she smiles and everybody laughs)

Susan: No... I just think it's a very basic thing

Me: What she said now... what she said now also about the teachers, kind of, trying to stay away, that kind of, Nina, that kind of... that's how you felt as well, it seems like, that you didn't see anything special really happening that blew your mind.

Nina: (looks down and frowns) Well, there were no computers in the classroom, so...

Me: Ja, you were at a specifically under-resourced school...

Alicia: I was

Nina: Also here (she nods. Susan nods as well. Kate is looking at Nina with a frown)

Me: Yes, (to Nina) you already said that your view on digital literacies did not change much with... in your, in your teaching prac

Nina: Ja, because there wasn't anything happening (she throws her head back and laughs loudly) (I laugh as well, while the others smile slightly and look at Nina)

Me: Ja, it's unfortunate, but ja... uhm... (Nina is still laughing)

Alicia: I did read an article in the Cape Argus a few months ago that said x amount of billion rand will spent in the next two to three years on (medium pause)... kind of getting computers and all of those things...

Me: They (mild emphasis) "do" that and they say that... ja... (gestures and laughs)... sorry...

(Alicia laughs, Susan smiles, Nina is staring just past the camera again while Kate is looking at me intently, smiling)

Alicia: ...but I thought that was the makings or the beginnings where every classroom had a computer. There is like a, uhm (looks away from me to her left), I went to them the first time a few months ago just to check what the classroom would look like... 'cause I was on observation... they had sport so I thought I'd just pop in there one day. There were no computers in the class when I went there, so maybe (her face becomes animated as she smiles) they are, kind of, trying to stick to that now. (looks at Nina) I am surprised that Spes Bona didn't, uhm, start with that (side glance at me).

Kate: But it (to Alicia) I also think that that's not (medium pause with emphasis) "enough" to just put them there (Alicia nods)...

Me: Mmmm...

Kate: ...I don't think that... because (she looks to the front and down and frowns)... I remember, there are so many things... I know Microsoft does a lot with, uhm, sponsoring (gestures) laptop and... to African schools and they just send you iPads... (looks at me) and its not enough, 'cause (looks back at Alicia) I really think you have to know your (head to the front, now

frowning a lot) context... you have to know where you are, because, you know, even if, yes, things get stolen because people are desperate, but even if you lock the laptop to the desk and no one can get it, you need to (fast gesture) train a person to use it, because they have not... yeah...

Me: So just bringing the technology is not...

Susan: It's not enough... otherwise (she shrugs)

Kate: Because even in a... (at Susan) exac... even in a well-resourced school where a person has had technology around her her whole life, if she doesn't know how to use a Smartboard...

Susan: (nods and mumbles something inaudible)

Kate: That's, yeah (looks to the front)... someone who has never seen one before (quick gesture as she looks back at me)

Me: And this training that you are, er, talking about, you guys are now in the, in the, English Method class, you are getting... you know what we are trying to do is, kind of, disciplinary-specific digital literacies (Kate and Susan nod. Nina is looking downwards and staring, while Alicia is looking at me). Do you think that's the way forward? What do you think about, you know, focusing your digital literacy skills (gestures) on a specific discipline? Uhm... Susan... (point at Susan)

Susan: (looks at me calmly) It definitely is a start as I think, you know, number one, we know our content (she shrugs), we know what a metaphor is and if we could, uhm, add some, some digital into it... into our lesson plans (medium pause)... yes, it's an add-on (looks up), but I think it's an add-on that, that makes learning relevant (gestures slowly with her one hand), because when you are teaching something (lifts hands) it makes sense to (looks)... to sort of, say (medium pause)... oh yes, you, you know something about this, or you've seen this somewhere (gesticulates quite wildly) here are the pictures, this is what it sounds like and, and then, you know, the learners they immediately... they want to catch up to it... so I think definitely, I think it's a step forward (gestures with flat hand on "forward")

Me: Mmmmm...

Susan: (short) Yeah

(Susan, Kate and Alicia are looking at me. Nina is looking in front of her and downwards)

Me: Uhm... Nina, your opinion on that... focusing on the discipline rather than trying to, to teach generic (gestures), uhm, digital stuff...

Nina: (nods slightly) Yes, I think that's (tilts her head. She is still looking downwards. Medium pause)... (looks up) I think you need a balance (looks at me) in life. Everything needs... you need to find a balance to do whatever you are doing and everything you are (slight emphasis) using. (looks at me again) So the trick is to find that balance.

(The other participants are looking at me expressionlessly)

Me: Mmmmm... You know, so it's kind of, you know, it's kind of generic skills and then you, you kind of move in (gestures with hands) and out, so now you're moving into your content, then you're moving away more to kind of a generic (gestures)... digital lite... I see what you're, what you're getting at...

Nina: Mmmmm...

Me: (gets up) Let me check my technology again, my foot is sleeping (Susan, Alicia and Kate smile. Nina is staring in front of her and downwards) so I'm gonna look like an idiot... uhm... and... the time... uhm, we... it's about quarter to... uhm... I wanna get to... to the (emphasis) "core" of what... of what I'm getting to, so we're going to (emphasis) "quickly", in four minutes, uhm, move through question five. Uhm... if you now think of your practical, how would you have done the task differently, ehm, and, I know, Nina, you're gonna tell me... not really, because you didn't really see anything happening there, uhm, and we're gonna focus first quickly on your (emphasis) "own" way of using digital literacies while completing the task, so forget about the lesson plan and the class now. Uhm... after you... how would you have done it differently? The task.

(Long pause)

Alicia: (shy smile while looking at me) I would have used far less digital resources than I did at first. Because I, I had struggled with time management, uhm (still smiling), but I'm learning to chop (fast gesture with one hand) it down... eh... streamline it, so I probably would have cut out the part where, as fun as it would have been, the part where everybody had to act out the fog and the... I would have just played the clips that I could (inaudible 44:55) or shorten it, like a couple of seconds and I think that would have made the lesson flow a bit easier

Me: Mmmmm... And did you... was that something that you specifically noticed while doing teaching prac, that, "oh, goodness, my idea is not going to work"?

Alicia: Ja, because, uhm, a lot of the time I did not allow for... (turns to face Nina) the lessons that I had given on metaphor (looks back at me) to the PGCE English Methods course... it's a class full of (medium pause)... adults. No one is disrupting me, no one is trying to kill each other.

Me: Exactly, ja, so it's...

Alicia: (emphasis) "That" (short pause)... took up a bit of my time. Every time just checking if everyone is on task... if everyone is paying attention, you know, people don't know me (gestures), uhm, sometimes I have to repeat myself again and again. All those things slowed me down a lot.

Me: Ok. Uh... let's try and focus just on your (strong emphasis) "own" use of digital literacy now while completing any academic task, like the one that you, that you did (inaudible 45:59) don't think of the lesson plan, uhm, now. Uhm... is there anything that, in your teaching prac you picked up that you thought, "oh, I could have actually, while completing this task...", we're talking about the academic part of the task now, things that you could have done, sites that you could have gone to, anything that you picked up there?

(long pause)

Susan: Uh, well, because [school name] is an under-resourced school, no computers, I mean, in classroom, there's just, like, a staff computer room... uh... I, I didn't use any... anything digital, I didn't. Uhm... So (shrugs slightly) I really do not know.

Me: Mmmmm...

Susan: Ja.

Me: So there's not, there's not really any academic change where you, where you thought, "oh, I could actually incorporate that into my own academic, uhm..."

Susan: Not really (shakes head) not from (emphasis) “that”.

Me: Not from that experience in your teaching prac. Ok, great. Now we’re getting to the big question. We have (emphasis) “eleven” minutes. Uhm... I first want to give you guys, just kind of a... some time to think about this, because this is quite an important question (Alicia is looking at me. Susan is looking down. Nina is staring with a tilted head to her right. Kate is looking out the window.) I want you guys to think about this (reads from questionnaire) explain the differences and similarities of your use of digi... digital resources in general?... so we are talking socially, you know, Facebook, Twitter, whatever (medium pause)... for academic purposes?... and then thirdly, for the integration into your lesson plan? Think of differences and similarities. Do you... we spoke about identity a little bit earlier, you know, what’s your digital literacies identity... is there a shift in these identities from the one site to the other? Uhm... if you guys... I’ll give you guys two minutes to just kind of think about it for a little while. Uhm... And then we are going to go from... to each person to just give me quick report. Ok?

(Alicia is looking at me. Nina is lightly touching her chin and staring into the corner. Susan is looking down, while Kate appears to be listening and looking downwards. They are all expressionless.)

Alicia: Do you want us to focus on the intersection between our personal use and (gestures fast to her right hand side with both hands) and...

Me: Yes! Yes! So it’s the relationship between those three things.

Alicia: Ok.

Me: It’s your personal use, your academic use, for the PGCE course and then what you imagine, uhm, you should be using in the classroom if you integrate it into the classroom.

(Alicia and Kate both nod. Susan and Nina seem to be writing with their heads down)

Me: You’re welcome to make notes and... and... everything, you’re basically (short pause) off the record for now (Kate and Alicia smile. Susan and Nina are still writing) I am going to stop this briefly (presumably goes to audio recorder to stop it momentarily. Walks over to the video camera to check if it is still on) Goodness, I hope I can hear anything with this racket going on... (there are noises from outside)

(They are all writing in silence from 48:40 to 50:59)

Me: Right! So we’re back after two minutes, and we’re going, uhm, I’m going to go one by one. Uhm, each of you have basically one minute to, uh, to tell me what your insights were on this question. I think, let’s start with Kate.

Kate: Yes. Uhm... well, I find personally that, uhm... and I think it translates the same (gestures) evidently, that online there is (emphasis) so much information, and a lot of it (medium pause)... is nonsense (smiles) and a lot of it is stuff you could actually use, you know, depending on what you’re looking for.

Me: Mmmmm...

Kate: So... uhm (long pause)... for example like, uhm, you know, if I’m just looking at current affairs or whatever, you know, your sort of choosing which website has the most accurate information and then the same with, uhm, with, you know, uhm, journals, you know, online journals... that we have access to at UCT, you know, there’s so many and... sifting through so much to find out what’s going to help with this assignment or this essay or this kinda thing. So, I think it is... and it’s

similar if you're planning a lesson, you need so much information, you sorta need to know where to look, where to find the accurate information...

Me: Yes.

Kate: ...and I think similarly with, uhm, social media, uhm, on a personal level I think something like Facebook and Instagram can have very bad, uhm (long pause)... what's the word... sorta connotations, but then they can also be used for good things, like keeping in touch with other people... also promoting bad things, so it sorta that... and also (starts playing with her hair) you could use social media. I think (quick, controlled gesture with one hand) you should try and use social media in lesson (quickly looks at me), 'cause it's what kids care about, but just deciding how to do it... it's the same in your personal life, deciding how to use your social media and how to use it in a classroom.

Me: So you think there can be a connection between social media...

Kate: (loudly while nodding head) I think there can be a connection...

Me: ... and academic way of using it?

Kate: Yes! I think there can be, I'm not sure how (broad smile. I laugh) And, uh, I know that there can also be bad ways (shakes finger while still smiling and then giggling. The others are all looking down at what they wrote themselves) So, it would be good to know (medium pause) how to use it, but I do believe that it can be used...

Me: Mmmmm...

Kate: ...well. I'm just not sure how (puts her hand in front of her mouth. I laugh. Susan smiles. Alicia looks at me. Nina is still looking down)

Me: Thank you, uh, Alicia I know you have to almost go, so I will give you the next chance.

Alicia: Well, I absolutely... I am obsessed with social media. So it's Facebook, Twitter, not so much Twitter... but Facebook and Instagram are (medium pause as she looks at me. Nina was smiling. Susan is looking at Alicia. Kate gave a little giggle)... my lifeblood. I... and I saw, uh, a definite space for that to be integrated into the classroom, I had seen it working (inaudible 53:54) at [name of school] and then I was keen to kinda, uhm, integrate some of those techniques, not in terms of getting resources from them, 'cause there's thing that I do on Instagram: I search through the hashtags, like "awesome English teacher" (she becomes slightly animated while make a gesture), (inaudible 54:10) "progressive English teacher" and all those things, and I see what's happening in different parts of the world, and I just found out a few interesting things, like I see how teachers organise their classrooms overseas, and then I kina say, "ooh, that's a cool idea"... putting the tags on all these things, it's just little things that will make (emphasis) "my" life a little easier...

Me: Mmmmm...

Alicia: ... and then one of these teachers... a child uploaded (gestures with hand), my teacher is better than yours (she frown and shakes head slightly), and she came to school in pyjamas, I'm not sure how it was connected to anything. I just thought, that's not something I would think of doing, and the rest of the class was also in pyjamas (frowns and puts her hand over her mouth. The others are staring downwards)... so I'm not sure what...

Me: What's the point? (the others giggle)

Alicia: ...uhm... but I did... I did (looks up) at [name of school]... they have Shakespeare (looks briefly at Nina) sleepovers, uh, and then... they take selfies (gestures) while it's happening, so it kinda helps everyone to get excited about school.

Uhm... a lot of kids start to add me on Facebook (lowers chin, raises eyebrows) and I had a nice little chat, I like, guys, I don't want you to see me up in the clubs (smiles)... (inaudible 55:09) I just told them (medium pause)... there are boundaries...

Me: Ja...

Alicia: ... and none can pass that, but in the same breath, uh, I won't give you my... I won't add you on Facebook, but I will give you my number so you could Whatsapp me... and through that, in the time that I was with them, they would send me voicemails saying, "miss I'm nervous about reading tomorrow" and I just say, "send me a voicemails so that I could hear how it sounds"... you can't obviously do that with every single student, but those who want to work can kind of (longer pause)... help them along, 'cause the periods are only forty minutes long...

Me: ... Yes, so do you feel it basically connects you... almost makes the time... the class time longer...

Alicia: ... Yes. (Kate nods. Susan is looking at Alicia, while Nina is fiddling with her nails)

Me: ... 'cause now, you know, there's more of a special needs thing happening with the Whatsapp...

Alicia: Definitely. Uhm... and obviously I did create a Whatsapp group at some point and that was a total failure, because there were two hundred messages every five minutes (smiles), but then I changed to a broadcast list and just letting them know, "guys, if I change my mind about what I'm gonna do in the lesson tomorrow", then I could just quickly send them a message saying, "can you just all bring this book tomorrow, we're gonna be doing that"...

Me: Mmmmm...

Alicia: ... and just miscommunications that happen in class are sorted out easily over Whatsapp and all those things (medium pause) so... I could only use (leans back slightly) Whatsapp (raises eyebrow), I couldn't use e-mail or any of those things, so I couldn't send the links as easily as I could have because no-one had... there was an issue of data (shakes head once) for everybody. They couldn't get my messages... they couldn't hook up to wifi or (inaudible 56:46) I am definitely using such technology and integrating social media, especially Facebook, all those things.

Me: Great stuff. Uh, thank you very much, if you want to go, you are welcome, but it would be nice if you could stay (laughs briefly)

Alicia: (slowly) It is twelve o'clock (looks at phone for time) I just wanna check, because I'm meeting my friend...

Me: Ok, sure, by all means, let's move over to Nina so long, then, we could... move along.

(medium pause. Susan and Kate look at Nina, while Alicia seems to be reading something from her phone)

Nina: I think if you're using, uhm... if you're going online for academic purposes there... for me there's all the sudden information overload... you don't know (strong emphasis) "where" to finally stop now... to use that information. It think that could be difficult for students also, like, how... how much time do they spending (gestures) looking at different sites for information. For us, that time they spent looking, they could have been just reading already... what they had...

Me: ... you could have given them something to read...

Nina: Ja. Uhm... uh, in my private life, the social media, I think, well, Kate you mentioned something about you did not know how they could use it (Kate looks at her. Susan is also looking at her. Alicia is looking somewhere to her left) in (longer pause)... social media...

Kate: Yes.

Nina: ...uh, at some place I was teaching the students, they were learning English (she looks down) and (medium pause)... they're teacher asked them to write English articles (gestures) and they posted it (coughs) on some site online and anybody who went onto website made (gestures) comments or they wrote about political stuff...

Me: Mmmmm...

Nina: ...so they felt... I don't know... they told us they more engaged and excited that they could (gestures and smiles) it was [good] for them to just publish their work to the world...

Me: ... I see...

(Nina laughs. Nina is looking at her. Kate is also looking and smiling. Alicia is looking downwards)

Nina: Ja, that helped (she is smiling and looking down. Long pause) Uhm... something I read about... social media, ah, I like the idea more of maybe incorporating video games... based on their academic work. I (longer pause)... (emphasis) "think" that a lot of kids play a lot of video games (Susan and Kate smile. Alicia looks up at Nina, smiles and nods) I don't know, I've never played them myself, I think they, you know (gestures quite dramatically with one hand) play a lot of video games (puts hand under chin and smiles)... there was an interesting article where (she looks up. Medium pause)... there are... they tried to create a virtual classroom and the students (medium pause)... (gestures) it's a (emphasis) "game" where they navigate (gestures with both hands) the classroom and, I don't know, it's based on (Alicia gets up, takes her back and smiles at me as if to say goodbye) academic work... but I like that idea (emphasis) "more" than maybe using Facebook, or Twitter, or Instagram, 'cause (frowns while looking down) there it's only, I think it's more about the visuals than... I don't think they really read that much, it's (gestures and tightens lips)...

Me: It's interesting that you mention that: that it's, it's a visual thing. Do you think... do you guys (walks to door to close it after Alicia left the room)... do you think that, uhm... uh, students are maybe a little bit (emphasis) "too" dependent on the visual these days?

Susan: (almost immediately answers) I think they are. I think it's the (longer pause)... the culture (shrugs) that they are now were born and now living in (gestures a circular movement).

Kate: Mmmmm...

Susan: They are... everything is see-see-see.

Kate: Mmmmm... but then if I think of that, that video that I found, going back to my assignment (gestures to the assignment lying next to her)... the TedEd video... I just felt that (emphasis while gesturing and smiling) "seeing" it just made it so much better. (Nina looks at her and smiles. Susan nods.)

Me: Sorry, Nina you were still busy.

Nina: Also... I think they're too many distractions if the kids are online. If you... there are so many things... like myself (looks down and smiles slightly) if I'm online, I get quickly distracted, so how's a child going to stay focused? (looks at me)

Me: Ja. Exactly. I, I, I, I sometimes... uh... what do think we could actually do about that, you know? I mean, obviously, there's this sea of information at our fingertips... uhm... what can we do to, you know, actually help our students not get lost in this endless sea of possibilities?

Kate: I think if there was... if they knew (long pause as she frowns)... where to look for what. I think if there was... there was more education about... if we were all more educated about where to find what we were looking for (lowers chin and frowns quite a lot)...

Me: Mmmm...

Susan: So maybe have them... maybe trained (moves head. Emphasis) "also", in a way on how to navigate through...all this information...

Kate: Yes! So they won't get side-tracked, because they know that they don't have to open (gestures) Google and get side-tracked by that... they know that they don't have to go onto Twitter, 'cause they're going to this (gestures) specific place to get what they need, but then I suppose that must be so hard, because there isn't just one. Often there isn't just one (laughs. Susan and Nina smile)

Me: The point of the internet is that it is a whole network

Kate: Exactly! (gestures with both hands. Susan nods vehemently while Nina is looking down and smiling) Ja (still smiling. Sighs) I don't know.

(longer pause)

Me: Back to Nancy and your...

Nina: (suddenly throws back head and smiles) The video games... it's also a lot of visual there, but I can't explain the article properly, but it seemed like (medium pause. She takes a deep breath)... I... it's something quite exciting. I rather take a look into that more than using Facebook or... (looks down. Medium pause)... or... Twitter or any of those things.

Me: What do you think would be the benefit of a game over using social media, because it's all very visual-based, but what do you think would be the specific benefit?

Nina: (tilts head) I think they would feel more part of the... part of the interaction... what's going (strong emphasis) "on", you know, they (medium pause as she looks up)... there's a difference, because the (she looks up. Long pause) they are (gestures quickly) part of what's going on... you can influence what's going on in the virtual classroom. You can change, you can add... you are part of virtual reality (looks at me) and you can influence what's happening (emphasis) "in it", whereas (gestures to the side) the other stuff you're just an (emphasis while she looks at me quickly) "observer" (she frowns)...

Me: Mmmm... It... It can become passive, you're saying?

Kate: Mmmm...

Me: And we want active learners obviously

Kate: (frowns) Yeah (nods)

(medium pause)

Me: Right, uh, the last person, Susan... and you guys are welcome to chirp in at any time with Susan as well... let's make it a challenge (Susan, Nina and Kate laugh)... Uhm... what was your answer to this?

Susan: I, I think one of my answers were what Nina has touched on, how... with both the social and academic (gestures with one hand) when it comes to the digital there (looks up, slowly moving both hands. Longer pause)... in both... there, there's a way where both the learner and perhaps the teacher... you feel like you're (quick hand gestures) part of something (smiles), like you can, you can (medium pause)... ah... go into a text and (emphasis) "change" and offer suggestions. You aren't just an observer, or a passive kind of participant...

Me: Mmmmm...

Susan: ... but it's a means of becoming more engaged and an opportunity to, to think outside of the box...

Me: Mmmmm...

Susan: Uhm... and, and then I also said that it's perhaps at times faster and convenient... uhm... I don't always think (emphasis) "easy", ah, but I think that's just because I've noticed how, on so many levels, I don't always have the know-how or skill on how to use (emphasis as she gestures to the one side) "this" so that I can better enhance, or better prepare something. Uhm (medium pause)... and then... also that obviously it's there to, to enhance so... uhm (looks up and gestures with both hands) I remember doing a, a L O, uhm, Life Orientation lesson at [school name] High School and I remember thinking back and thinking if we had, or if I had some digital element, it would have so much easier for me to... because I think I started on a very (gestures with one hand to indicate distance) abstract level explaining something and then I worked (whereas Nina and Kate were looking down through most of Susan's answer, they are now looking at her) down to the more tangible (gestures) so that they could see something they had not known, but have I introduced perhaps something, uhm... had I worked some digital works into the classroom, it would have been easier for me to work around it (Nina looks down. Kate is still watching Susan) and, "ok, here's something you know... here's something you can touch, you can see, or you have seen", and then work into the abstract (gestures to the same side where "abstract" was previously)... into terminology you guys have to learn for the exams... so, ja, it, it's at times it can be a very great, uhm, enhancement or add-on.

Me: Mmmmm...

Susan: So yes...

Me: Ok, so the final question is... to, to wrap... uhm, this whole thing up... uhm, is... uhm... when you think of these three different compartments of digital literacy use in your own life, uhm, would you say that there are (emphasis) "stark" differences... uhm... between these compartments... or, are they, kind of flowing into one another? (longer pause) Do you imagine that you should be using digital literacies in a different way in the classroom than your own personal use, and in your own academic use?

Nina: Well, if you are using a Smartboard then it could be a bit different, because you're not going to (smiles)...

Me: Ja... I see.

(Both Susan and Kate nod their heads at this)

Nina: So... but... a lot of the other things I use: laptop, the phone... I forgot to mention I did see some kids they had (gestures) a phone and they were playing a game... if they didn't have the phone, they wouldn't have been able to play the game... and the game included using your imagination. That was very nice (she looks at me and smiles)... so, uhm...

Me: ...and how... uh, tell me a bit more about...

Nina: I can't quite remember what the game's name is, but there's (looks down, picks up a paper and demonstrates on it) the screen... and then there's a word on it... and the person holding the (holds the screen in front of her face), uh, the, the phone has to guess (Susan and Kate are looking straight at Nina). The other students give the person clues as to what is...

Kate: ...oh...

Nina: ... I don't know what it's called (laughs). And then...

Me: ... oh, I see... so it's almost like charades, but... ja...

Kate: Mmmmmm...

Nina: ...Then they just flick it like that (flicks paper towards her chin) and then (gestures)...

Kate: Oh, heads-up or something!

Nina: (frowns while smiling) Something like that. (Still smiling) So that was nice for the kids, using a piece of technology and it was their own. Uhm (medium pause)... what was I saying before that? (everybody laughs)

Kate: Your, uh, using your phone...

Nina: Oh, yes. I use it, laptop to cell phone, kindle... it's integrated somehow, except the Smartboard, of course...

Me: Oh, it's always the Smartboard (inaudible while they all laugh)... Uhm...

Kate: (with a smile on her face, shaking her head. Animated) Everyone has a Smartboard in their home!

Me: Do you guys ever think of the fact that, you know, that, you know, your teaching at school is also... it's an academic (medium pause)... kind of, literacies kinda class: you're teaching these... these students how to be academic as well (Kate nods. Susan looks at me. Nina is frowning and looking down)... that you are actually going to have to... the skills that you have academically... you are going to... somehow have to (medium pause)... teach those same digital skills, uh, do you guys think of that often?

Kate: I think, uhm, just coming back to your question about personal and academic, I think it's quite similar, uhm, I think it's a similar thing that you need both personally and if you're teaching aca... academically, that you need to be... uhm... it's very easy to get (emphasis) "lost" in passive... you know... even if you ju... if I think of social media, you know (Susan nods) if I'm on Pinterest (gestures and pulls her face. Nina looks at her and nods) or... it's very easy to just start looking at (shakes head slowly and gestures) someone's wedding dress... for no reason...

Me: ...start going into a trance! (everybody laughs)

Kate: (very animated)... there is no reason why I should be looking (looks down)... and you can... you could literally spend hours, or looking at Taylor Swift's Instagram... I mean, for what? And then... but then you realize, you know, on Pinterest there's some really good stuff about teaching and... and organisation (gestures) and... god... whatever you... whatever is your thing. I think you can (medium pause with slight emphasis) "gain" a lot of information, (looks up and smiles) but you can also waste a lot of time, 'cause visuals are pretty (sways her head slightly. Susan nods vehemently). And I think it's the same academically: there's, there's... you can waste a lot of time with stuff that... that carries no weight, but then there can be stuff that's good, I think, personally, I think academically it is the same. (looks at me and looks sure of herself) I think it's the same thing (Susan nods. Nina frowns and looks downwards). I think your mind be... can be... (makes a fast gesture with one hand waving in front of her face) stuff can be going into your head that you don't need (looks back at me).

Me: Of course the internet out there is not specifically tailored for a specific purpose...

Kate: (strong emphasis) No. (tilts her head)

Me: ...it's for both...

Kate: Yes (nods).

Me: ...so you kind of have to... to sift through it. It's not like a textbook... (Kate closes her eyes and gives one definite nod while smiling. The others stare blankly at me)

Kate: Exactly...

Me: ... that is now specifically academic and this is how you're supposed to use it. That's interesting that you mention that, it's kind of, you know, the social and the academic are all kind of (gestures)...

Kate: Ja! (nods)

Me: ...infused...

Kate: Yes! (frowns and nods) I see it as the same problem...

Me: Mmmmm...

Kate: (her eyes suddenly light up and she looks at Nina) ...but also the same (emphasis) "greatness" (looks back at me. Medium pause)... is that there is so much out there, personally (looks at Susan) if I wanted to know, "what wedding dress?", then it's there for me...

Susan: (nods) You have to know...

Kate: ...if I want it, but academically there's so many journals so many webs... there's so much information (Nina slowly nods, looking downwards. Susan nods), which is great, but it's also (medium pause. Suddenly sounds less sure of herself)... to it detriment, (much softer) because...

Nina: Whenever I look for (medium pause)... when I'm doing research, I always think there is something (gestures) better.

Kate, Susan and Me: (simultaneously while nodding vehemently. Kate gestures sharply with one hand) Yes!

Kate: (claps hands once) That's so true! (covers her mouth while laughing. Nina and Susan are also laughing)

Susan: It's the most irritating thing when you are looking for (air quotes) "academic" information...

Nina: You waste your time, or else you could be reading a whole, whole (slight pause) chapter or something...

Kate: Yes... (they are all still smiling)

Me: I sometimes feel wish somebody would just put a book on my desk and say, "this is the only book that you're allowed to use for this"... (they laugh and nod)

Kate: That's the thing (makes a big gesture with both hands while smiling)... so much choice and then you actually just (puts her hand over her mouth and seems less sure of herself)... don't want so much choice.

(longer pause)

Me: Mmmmm... That's... uhm... Susan is there anything that you would like to add?

Susan: No-no, I'm just thinking how it... I suppose... the, the... one of the things to do would be to (medium pause)... sort of... uh... uh... (looks to her left sharply and quickly) develop this skill where you know how to sift (moves shoulders rhythmically) and you know how to...

Kate: Mmmmmm (nods)

Susan: ... know it's enough... I've gone (gestures heavily) over ten sites...

Kate: ... it's a skill!

Susan: ...looking for this... journal. I found only five and just five is enough, you know, but then (moves body) how to sift and... (gestures with both hands) this is ok, I've got so much and I'm not gonna spend another minute trying to...

Me: Knowing where to stop?

Susan: Exactly! (nods once)

Me: How do you think we could actually teach (emphasis) "that" to students (Susan immediately shakes her head) in... in the English class?

Kate: I think if you can teach them where to look (looks at me and puts finger on chin)...

Me: Mmmm...

Kate: If you had... I mean... I get that nobody knows where to find everything... but something like TedEd, you know, you know the kinda thing you're going to get...

Me: Mmmmm...

Kate: So, "if you are looking for something like that, look there"... not just... not just search engines. I think search engines are dangerous (shakes head very slightly), you know, not just type it into Google...

Me: 'Cause that's the (gestures a circle. Emphasis) "pool".

Kate: Yeah! If, if, if there was...

Susan: ...a specific (Nina is looking downward with no expression)

Kate: Ja... (gestures around her face) if there was a knowledge of, of specific website, but then it also depends what subject or what, you know (Nina nods briefly), but if there was a knowledge of... like in English, I... you know, during my teaching prac (medium pause. Looks to Susan)... when I had to teach poetry that I can't remember, then I'd look up (counts on her fingers) Sparknotes (both Nina and Susan nod)... you know (her eyes widen as she speaks louder) and knowing which ones are going to give you the best information...

Susan: (nods) Which ones are good and which ones are... (Nina nods)

Kate: ... and which ones you don't need. Yeah. And then you could say these are five, try those five...

Susan: Ja. (nods)

Kate: ...websites, but that takes (smiles) a lot of research.

Me: So, we, we focused a lot on, on the internet now and we've realized that it's... it's a bit of a mess...

Kate: (throws her head backward while laughing) Yeah...

Me: It's all over the place. Uhm... one last thing, uh, sorry, I'm... I'm pushing my boundaries here, Rochelle is going to kill me (points to Rochelle's desk)... uhm... but, uhm, the last thing is now... moving away from just the internet... let's think about iPads... let's think about the (gestures above his head) high level kind of digital resources that we can use in a classroom... what are your opinions... uhm... regarding iPads (medium pause)... in the classroom?

Nina: I heard recently of some (longer pause as she looks up)... iPads or something that went missing from the school, so I think that theft will always be a problem (Kate and Susan nod), you know, it's not going to work if stuff keeps going missing...

Kate: Ja...

Nina: ...completely, then it's not going to work. If it keeps going missing, you know, and some kids don't have it, then it's just not going to work during the class... (shakes head) it's just not going to work.

Kate: It's a big issue.

Nina: You have to know the stuff will be for (emphasis) "all" the students (points downwards with her finger. Kate and Susan nod) and not one day and then not the next day... you can't do... no.

Kate: Mmmm...

Susan: I think I'm just a bit worried... I wouldn't know... how do you control... how do you know that the learners aren't Youtube downloading...

Kate: Yes.

Susan: ...I don't know... someone else's (inaudible 1:12:57) or looking at a video and you're there teaching with your tablet... I, I just... control... I think it's good, you know, we would be advancing, but then how do you, also, control so that you as the teacher (gestures) are in control and you know, "yes, they have the poem or whatever text in front of them", and they are not doing something else.

Kate: Yeah.

Susan: Yeah, I think that would be our only...

Me: Is that your... (to Kate) Ja?

Kate: I think it's good (medium pause)... because I did my prac in a very well-resourced school, I mean, so resourced that each kid had an iPad, and that was just (softly) prerequisite. Even the kids that were, uhm, there were very few funded kids, but even if there were, that was a prerequisite, they needed it for school.

Me: How did that make you feel? (laughs)

Kate: Ja (laughs and looks down with whole head briefly) It made me feel very intimidated. Uhm... but (medium pause)... it's great for (frowns) saving paper (Susan nods. Nina is staring blankly in front of her). It's great for that kinda thing,

because you don't have to now... a worksheet... you don't have to print sixty pages (Nina nods slowly while still looking away. Susan nods and looks at Kate)... all you have to do is put it on the share drive and they access it (looks at Nina)... and you've got it, they've got it. It definitely (gestures) makes things easier...

Susan: Ja...

Kate: Ja, I was also... and when they, "well, can we Google this, can we Google that", (frowns) I don't know. I don't know what you're gonna find (grimaces and looks at Susan. Susan nods. Nina looks at Kate with her head tilted slightly backwards, grimacing).

Me: You're not the boss of Google...

Kate: Yeah! I don't know, and when I said... and also I said... we did a poem and I said, "look up the words you don't know", but there's no such thing as a dictionary anymore (raises eyebrows) in these kinda schools, so they all just get their iPads out and I said, "but what are you searching? Are you just searching in Google?", because... is that accurate? "Oh no, but there's Oxf... they were educating me (flapping movement with hand)... there's Oxford and there's...", (becomes slightly animated as she shrugs), "ok (slight pause)..."

Susan: Go ahead!

Kate: "...Go ahead!" (Nina smiles. Susan laughs) But then also if the wifi is not working, then your whole lesson stops... comes to a... and like you say (looks at Nina)... if one kid doesn't have...

Me: Ja, it's not... it's not fair. So let's... if you forget the theft, which is a major problem... uhm... if you forget about the... what is the...

Susan: The control.

Me: Control thing... if there was a way of actually controlling, uh, let's quickly focus on the benefits that (emphasis) "you" think an iPad could bring to the class.

Nina: Like Kate said: the saving of paper (rubs her head). Uhm (frowns)... (looks up) you could be able to look up the information very quickly (she stares at the ceiling)...

Kate: Mmmmm... (nods)

Susan: At the same time. (Calmly) It's just... everything is (slight emphasis) "there"...

Kate: (gestures with both hands to form a ball) It's organisation, it's all in...

Susan: It's all in one place. You don't have to look at a textbook, your writing book (gestures to different sides of her person), your pen is there, it's just there...

Me: Oh. That's the interesting thing. (Kate is making sounds of approval. Nina is not responding to this)

(longer pause)

Kate: But you also need, I think, if you have knowledge of programmes and the (gestures. Emphasis) "apps" that you could put on the iPad, then... then it could be amazing. To be like... let's just look at the video on it, everyone go to Youtube and type in this exact thing. It's all (gestures) up... now, let's go to this programme and put it into... I think it could be great, but

there's so much knowledge that need to be known (she smiles. Susan smiles and nods. Nina slowly nods while stiffening her lips and looking downwards with raised eyebrows)... so much knowledge...

Me: So much knowledge to be known right there, goodness! (They all laugh) If we could just know all the knowledge. Uhm... thank you guys very much, uhm, that was very very helpful and thank you guys for being, you know, talkative and... I was very scared that it was going to end up...

Susan: Stilted...

Me: ... end up in these silences, but (they all laugh) thank goodness I'm dealing with PGCE English students and they are not scared of talking! (they all laugh) So thank you very very much and, uhm, yes. (end of interview at 1:16:42)

Appendix E: First e-mail to participants

Good day (Participant's name),

I am happy to inform you that I would be honoured if you could participate in my research. At this time, I need you to do four things for me:

1. Start making general notes regarding your use of digital resources while you are busy completing ANY ACADEMIC TASKS for the PGCE course;
2. Start thinking about how the way that you use digital resources for academic work differ from the "normal" way you use digital resources (for personal use, social networking, etc.);
3. Start looking at completed academic assignments that you could send me by 30 April to have a look at and where you could reflect on your use of digital resources while completing the task;
4. Send me available times for a one hour focused group interview.

I am currently working on a form for you guys to "reflect" on (no more than two pages), which will provide questions that will prompt responses.

Of course, I am completely available if you have anything you would like to know, or if you need any help with your own use of digital resources.

I am looking forward to us working together!

Thank you again.

Kind regards
Eduard

Appendix F: Informed consent forms

Consent form:

Dear

Thank you for being willing to assist me with my Masters in Education study entitled ‘The Digital Literacy Practices of pre-service English teachers: a case study’. I hope that my research will help to improve our understanding of PGCE English Method students’ digital literacy practices in the completion of academic tasks.

Participation will involve allowing me to: (1) analyse at least one of your completed academic tasks (2) analyse reflections on your use of digital resources in the completion of the task/s and (3) conduct a focused group interview where we will discuss your digital literacy practices. I will also consult the short questionnaire you have completed when you volunteered for this study. Please note that the focused group interview will be video recorded in order for me to properly analyse it afterwards.

Analysis of completed tasks

I will not be involved in the assessment of the tasks that you submit for the study. My goal is merely to understand your digital literacy practice without judging how ‘good’ you are with digital resources. You can submit a task/tasks of your choice as long as it is a task completed for the PGCE (English Method or any other subject). It could be a task where you felt you specifically struggled with a digital component of the task, or where you think you specifically excelled in the use of digital resources. Please try to submit your completed task/s by **31 May 2015**.

Reflections

You are allowed to freely reflect on your use of digital resources while completing the task/s that you submit. You can write your reflections using MSWord or Google Docs and then e-mail it to CMPEDU001@myuct.ac.za. You can send the reflections at the completion of the task or you can keep various reflections and only send selected ones. Please try to submit your reflections by **31 May 2015**. When you reflect, you can think of the following: ‘describe the task that you needed to complete?’, ‘why and when did you use digital resources in the completion of this task?’, ‘where do you think you could have used digital resources more effectively?’, and ‘where did you experience difficulties when using digital resources?’. Prompt questions will be sent to you closer to the deadline.

Interview

A focused group interview will take place on 20 May 2015 at 11:00 in Prof Rochelle Kapp’s office. Please let me know ASAP if the date and time do not suit you, so that we could make arrangements for another interview date and time.

Permission

I have obtained the permission of the Human Research Ethics Committee of the UCT School of Education to do this research.

Participation in this study is entirely voluntary, and no harm is envisaged. If you choose to participate, you may choose to accept or decline to answer any questions, and you may

withdraw from the study at any time. You may also freely choose after the study to decline recorded segments being used as described above.

Research results

My research results will be presented in my Masters dissertation. I will provide you with a summary of my research results on completion if you would like me to.

In order to maintain anonymity and confidentiality, all names I use will be pseudonyms. Transcripts of the interviews and lessons will not contain the participants' names and participants will be allocated pseudonyms for the analysis, thereby ensuring anonymity of you and your learners.

Next steps

If you are willing to participate, please could you:

1. Start thinking about your use of digital resources. This could be while completing academic tasks, in everyday life, or in your future classroom.
2. Take note of how you use digital resources in your academic work. Start thinking about which completed tasks you could possibly submit for this study.
3. Start with your reflections.
4. I will keep you updated using the e-mail addresses you supplied when volunteering for this study.

Thank you once again for your participation!

Kind regards

Eduard Campbell

(All participants signed an abridged version of this form in order to provide written consent, but due to the anonymity clause stated on page 7, I am not at liberty to display these)

Appendix G: Table index

Table 1 – Participant summary (p. 41)

Table 2 – Contextualisation of the elements of Digital Literacy (p.44)

Table 3 – Overview of participants' connections with the elements of DL (p. 83)