

**TEACHERS' APPLICATION OF THE COMMUNICATIVE METHODOLOGY IN
THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH GRAMMAR AT SELECTED MULTILINGUAL
PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN CENTRAL PROVINCE OF ZAMBIA.**

BY

GWEN MUTOLWA

A Thesis Submitted to the University of Zambia in fulfilment of the requirement for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) in Applied Linguistics

The University of Zambia

APRIL, 2025

COPYRIGHT

All rights reserved. No parts of this thesis may be reproduced, stored in any retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means: electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the consent of either the author or the University of Zambia.

© GWEN MUTOLWA, 2025.

DECLARATION

I, Gwen Mutolwa, declare that this thesis, ‘Teachers’ application of the Communicative Methodology in the teaching of English grammar at selected multilingual Primary Schools in Central Province of Zambia’, is my own work, except where otherwise acknowledged, and it has not been submitted for any degree or examination at the University of Zambia or any other university.

Signed: _____ Date: _____

APPROVAL

This thesis by GWEN MUTOLWA is approved as a fulfilment of the requirements for award of a degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Applied Linguistics.

Examiner 1	Signature	Date
.....

Examiner 2	Signature	Date
.....

Examiner 3	Signature	Date
.....

Chairperson Board of Examiners	Signature	Date
.....

Supervisor	Signature	Date
.....

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my parents; To my late Father, Mr Dickson Mutolwa (MHSCRIP) who always believed in me and supported the genesis of my PhD Journey. And to my mother Mrs Mary Munkombwe Mutolwa, for the encouragement and prayers.

ABSTRACT

In the present-day multilingual Zambian society, multilingual classes are unavoidable. All classes have learners with diverse linguistic backgrounds. In Zambia, the language of instruction from grade five to tertiary level is English language and the recommended methodology in the Zambia English syllabus for primary schools is the Communicative Language Teaching approach which stipulates the use of English to teach the target language. The study therefore is aimed at finding out how teachers apply the Communicative Language Teaching approach in the teaching of English grammar to grade six learners in multilingual primary schools. The study was guided by four objectives; 1. To establish teachers' understanding of the Communicative Language Teaching approach, 2. To analyse teachers' classroom application of the communicative language teaching approach in English grammar lessons. 3. To analyse how teachers negotiate learners' multilingual identities through language practice. 4. To identify challenges faced by teachers when teaching English grammar using the CLT in multilingual classrooms. The study was guided by two theories, that is the Expertise theory and the Translanguaging theory. The study adopted an interpretive paradigm, and a qualitative approach was used. The participants were 20 grade six teachers and 10 pupils from each class drawn from three districts in Central province namely Serenje, Mkushi and Kapiri Mposhi. Data was collected through interviews, lesson observations and Focus Group discussions. The study findings revealed that teachers had limited understanding of Communicative Language Teaching approach because they failed to describe it. It was also found that most teachers were not able to apply most of the CLT principles when teaching English grammar. The study established that teachers used interpretation and translation, translanguaging, code switching, use of familiar language and use of language at the level of learners and homework to negotiate the different multilingual identities of through language practice in their classrooms. The study revealed some challenges the teachers faced when teaching English grammar using CLT in multilingual classes which included learners lack of English proficiency, teachers' lack of proficiency in the familiar languages of the learners, high enrolment levels, lack of teaching and learning materials, low classroom participation by learners, and teachers' judgement of multilingualism as a problem. The study recommended that teachers should be deployed to areas where they are familiar with the language so that they can help meet the linguistic needs of the learners. Schools should intensify Continuous Professional Development programmes to enhance teachers' pedagogical skills in the teaching of English grammar. Colleges and Universities should train teachers intensely in pedagogy and the Ministry of Education should ensure that schools have enough teaching and learning resources for effective application of CLT.

Key words: Multilingual, Grammar, Communicative Language Teaching approach, application

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe it to GOD for good health, strength, knowledge and focus throughout this academic journey

To my supportive supervisor, Professor David Sani Mwanza, for the encouragement to upgrade my studies, patience as I worked through, guidance as I moved through the stages of my work. You were always there to remind me to continue pushing even when I doubted myself. Your level of commitment is unmatched. Only God can surely reward you more because he alone knows how selfless you have been.

To Transforming Teacher Education (TTE) programme: Thank you for according to me a chance to gain more skills in research at Florida State University. Special thanks to Professor Stephanie Simmons Zuilkowski and Kristina Solum.

To the University of Zambia and the department of LSSE. Thank you for making it possible for me to be part of the 2023 NORPART Student Exchange programme and attend research studies in Norway which helped sharpen my research skills.

Special thanks to the DEBS (Mkushi, Kapiri Mposhi and Serenje) who granted me permission to carry out research in the schools and to the grade six teachers and pupils for the time and willingness to be part of the study.

To mum, thank for your motherly advise and love and to my siblings (Helga, Mumba, Diana and Mike), thank you for your encouragement.

To Mary Nkamba, Ramona Mweendo, Doctor Margaret Nambao Sichilima (my USA buddy) and Mwelwa Wise. Thank you for your advice and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COPYRIGHT	i
DECLARATION	ii
APPROVAL	iii
DEDICATION	iv
ABSTRACT	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	xiv
LIST OF TABLES	xv
LIST OF APPENDICES	xvi
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	xvii
CHAPTER ONE	1
INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
1.0. Overview	1
1.2. Background	1
1.3. Statement of the problem	9
1.4. The purpose of the study	9
1.5. Objectives	9
1.6. Research questions	10
1.7. Significance of the study	10
1.8. Delimitation of the Study	11
1.9. Limitations of the Study	11
1.10. Operational definitions	12

1.11 Chapter Summary	13
CHAPTER TWO	14
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	14
2.1. Overview	14
2.2. The Communicative Language Teaching Approach.....	14
2.2.1. Communicative Competence	19
2.3. Multilingualism	24
2.4. Grammar	26
2.5. Teachers' knowledge of the Communicative Language Teaching approach.	28
2.6. Teachers' classroom application of the Communicative Language Teaching approach in English grammar lessons.	33
2.7. Teachers' negotiation learners' multilingual identities through language practice.....	39
2.8. Challenges faced by teachers when teaching English grammar using the CLT in multilingual classrooms.	48
2.9. Summary of the chapter	54
CHAPTER THREE	55
THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK	55
3.0. Overview	55
3.1. The Expertise Theory.....	55
3.1.1. Types of Practices.....	56
3.1.2. Expertise in teaching	58
3.2. Translanguaging Theory.....	62
3.2.1. Translanguaging in the classroom.....	63
3.3. Summary of the chapter	66

CHAPTER FOUR.....	67
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	67
4.0. Overview	67
4.1. Research paradigm.....	67
4.1.1. Interpretivist (constructivist) paradigm	70
4.2. Research Method/Approach	72
4.3. Research design	74
4.4. Study Population.....	76
4.5. Study sample	77
4.6. Sampling Techniques	78
4.7. Data collection Methods and instruments	79
4.7.1. Interviews.....	80
4.7.2. Observation	83
4.7.3 Focus group discussion.....	85
4.8. Data Collection Procedure	88
4.9. Data Analysis	89
4.10. Trustworthiness.....	90
4.10.1. Credibility	90
4.10.2. Transferability	90
4.10.3. Dependability	91
4.10.4. Confirmability	91
4.11. Ethical consideration.....	91
4.11.1. Anonymity.....	92
4.11.2. Confidentiality.....	92

4.11.3. Voluntary participation.....	92
4.11.4. Option to opt out.....	92
4.12. Summary of the chapter	93
CHAPTER FIVE.....	94
PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS.....	94
5.0 Overview	94
5.1 Teachers’ knowledge of the Communicative Language Approach.	95
5.1.1. Teachers’ understanding of the English syllabus’s recommended methodology for teaching English at primary school.	95
5.1.2. Teachers’ knowledge of Communicative Language Teaching Methodology	96
5.2. Application of Communicative Language Teaching in English grammar Lessons.....	99
5.2.1. Teachers’ understanding of grammar.	99
5.2.2. Application of CLT when teaching English grammar	101
5.2.3. Teachers’ classroom application of the Communicative Language Teaching methodology: Classroom Observation data	104
5.2.4. Summary of the findings on the second research question.....	112
5.3. Teachers’ negotiation of learners’ multilingual identities through language practice	112
5.3.1. Teachers’ familiar languages.....	112
5.3.2. Language varieties and dominant Language in the classroom	114
5.3.3. Teachers’ preparedness to teach English as a second language in multilingual classrooms.....	116
5.3.4. How teachers accommodate multilingualism in their classrooms	118
5.3.5. Grade 6 pupils’ views on classroom language practices by their teachers	120
5.3.6. Pupils’ ideologies about translanguaging ideologies.....	124

5.3.7 Summary on the findings Teachers’ negotiation of learners’ multilingual identities through language practice.....	125
5.4. Challenges teachers face when teaching English grammar using the Communicative Language Teaching approach in multilingual classrooms.....	126
5.4.1. Poor learner proficiency in the English Language	126
5.4.2. Low classroom participation by learners	127
5.4.3. Teachers’ lack of proficiency in the dominant local languages spoken by learners	128
5.4.4. Teachers’ judgement of multilingualism as a problem	128
5.4.5. Teaching and learning materials.....	129
5.4.6. Poor teacher-pupil ratio	129
5.4.7. Summary on the findings on challenges faced by teachers.	130
5.5. Summary of Chapter five	130
CHAPTER SIX	131
DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS	131
6.0. Overview	131
6.1. Teachers understanding of the Communicative Language Teaching approach	131
6.1.1. Teachers’ knowledge of the recommended methodology for ESL Teaching.....	131
6.1.2. Teachers’ understanding of Communicative Language Teaching.....	132
6.2. Teachers’ classroom application of the Communicative Language Teaching approach in English grammar lessons.	135
6.2.1. Teachers’ Conceptualization of Grammar	136
6.2.2. Application of Communicative language Teaching Method when teaching English grammar to grade 6 learners	138
6.3. Teachers’ negotiation of learners’ multilingual identities in ESL Classrooms.	142

6.3.1. Teachers’ Linguistic profiles	143
6.3.2. Teachers’ preparedness to teach multilingual classes	143
6.3.3. Negotiation of different multilingual identities	145
6.3.4. Grade 6 pupils views of the language practices of their teachers	151
6.3.5. Pupils’ ideologies about translanguaging	152
6.4. Challenges faced by teachers when teaching English grammar using the CLT in multilingual classrooms.	153
6.4.1. Learners’ poor proficiency in English Language	153
6.4.2. Learners’ low classroom participation.....	155
6.4.3. Teachers’ lack of proficiency in the learners’ dominant local language.....	155
6.4.4. Lack of teaching and learning materials	157
6.4.5. Teacher to pupil ratio	158
6.4.6. Learners’ linguistic diversities in the classrooms.....	158
6.5. Chapter Summary	160
CHAPTER SEVEN	161
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	161
7.0. Overview	161
7.1. Conclusion.....	161
7.1.1. Teachers’ knowledge of the Communicative language teaching approach.	161
7.1.2. Teachers’ classroom application of the Communicative language teaching approach in English grammar lessons.....	162
7.1.3. Teachers’ negotiation of learners’ multilingual identities through language practice	163
7.1.4. Challenges faced by teachers when teaching English grammar using CLT in multilingual classrooms.....	163

7.2. The contribution of this study to the Body of knowledge.....	165
7.3. Recommendations.....	166
7.4. Suggestions for Further Research.....	166
REFERENCES.....	167
APPENDICES.....	197

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1. A model of Expertise in teaching	60
--	----

LIST OF TABLES

Table 5.1: Teachers' demographic information	94
Table 5.2: Teachers' knowledge of CLT.....	96
Table 5.3: Application of CLT	101
Table 5.5: Challenges	126

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Teachers' interview guide.....	197
Appendix 2: Pupils Focus Group Discussion guide	198
Appendix 3: Lesson Observation Checklist	199
Appendix 4: Ethical Approval Letter	201

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CLT:	Communicative Language Teaching
CDC:	Curriculum Development Centre.
DEBS:	District Education Board Secretary.
ESL:	English as a Second Language
FG:	Focus Group
UNESCO:	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
UNZA:	University of Zambia
USAID:	United States Agency for International Development.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

1.0. Overview

This chapter presents an introduction on Teachers' Application of the Communicative Methodology in the teaching of English grammar in selected multilingual Primary schools in Central Province of Zambia. The background of the chapter gives a brief outline of the languages situation in Zambia and the status of English, the language in education policy in Zambia after independence, the Zambia Primary English Syllabus, and the Communicative Language Teaching as the recommended methodology in the syllabus. The chapter further look at the statement of the problem, objectives, and subsequent research questions to be addressed, the significance of the study, delimitation and limitation of the study and finally provides a chapter summary.

1.2. Background

Zambia is a multilingual country because it has about 73 ethnic groups spread across it as compiled by the Central Statistics Office (CSO) in 2010 (Simungala & Jimaima, 2012). All individuals in the country speak one or more languages other than their mother tongue. According to Kashoki (1978), Zambia is a multilingual country because 'it has several languages within its borders as well as having nationals who claim to speak several languages' (p.36). However, out of the 73 languages, seven languages namely Bemba, Tonga, Nyanja, Lozi, Kaonde, Lunda and Luvale are recognised as regional official languages. Marten and Kula (2007) pointed out that Bemba is the main language of the Northern, Luapula, Copperbelt, and parts of Central province, Nyanja is the main language of the Eastern province as well as of Lusaka, Tonga is the main language in Southern province, and Lozi is the language found in Western province. The three languages Lunda, Luvale and Kaonde are spoken in the North-Western province because the province doesn't have one dominant language. Central province where the research was carried out is not only home to Bemba but also has languages like Lala, Swaka, Tonga, Lenje and Nyanja. However, the assumption is that most of the Zambian people are multilingual and since learners come with some languages from home, the classroom becomes multilingual because of the diverse linguistic backgrounds of the learners. It was on this basis that the study was carried out in Kapiri Mposhi, Mkushi and Serenje districts of Central Province.

Zambia was a British colony from 1924 up to 1964 and this left Zambia with English language in use in government as well as parliament, civil service, schools, and courts among others. The Zambian government adopted English as the official language because the country had too many indigenous languages and none could be accepted to be used country wide (Wakumelo, 2013). Despite the recognition of the seven local regional languages, English has remained the only official language recognised in the 1991 constitution (Gordon, 2014). “English is the Official language whereas a language, other than English, may be used as a medium of instruction in educational institutions or for legislative, administrative or judicial purposes, as prescribed” (Amended Constitution, 2016: 102). The reasons behind placing English as the official language was that it was meant to unity the country as a neutral language, reduce tribalism, and help in economic development (Ohannessian and Kashoki, 1978). English language, therefore, was seen as a neutral nonindigenous language that would be accepted by all the divergent linguistic and ethnic groups in the country and thus would foster national unity (Kashoki, 1990).

There have been many changes in the languages -in-education policies in Zambia and notable among them after independence are the 1966 Education Act, the 1977 Education Reforms recommendations and the 1996 Educating our Future policy document. The 1966 Education act recommended the use of English as the medium of instruction and Zambian Languages as subjects. Some reasons why English was recommended to be used as a language of instruction were; to avoid ethnic rivalry in case of choosing a local language among a lot, lack of competent teachers to teach in local languages, and English was seen as a prestigious international language (Simwinga, 2007). Short comings of the 1966 Education Act such as low literacy levels led the 1977 Education Reforms, which recommended the use of English as the medium of instruction from grade one and Zambian languages were taught as subjects and teachers were allowed to use local languages to explain complicated concepts to the learners (Ministry of Education (MOE), 1977). However, the 1996 Educating our Future, language in education policy recommended the use of English as the medium of instruction for all the subjects except for Zambian languages and recommended the use of familiar language to teach literacy in grade 1 (Banda and Mwanza, 2017). The implementation of the 1996 Educating our Future policy did not materialize as expected and this led to the implementation of the Primary Reading Programme (PRP) with its three components: New Break Through to Literacy (NBTL), a grade one programme whose recommendation was teaching literacy in mother tongue to help learners achieve initial literacy as a basis for

reading skills in grade two and exposed learners to oral English; Step In To English (SITE) which incorporated English in grade 2 to help develop English and Read On Course (ROC) which used both English and the familiar language to improve reading skills (Tambulukani, 2015). The PRP was a literacy programme meant to help learners enhance their literacy skills using the local familiar language (Mkandawire, 2017a). However, the PRP had shortcomings such as lack of teaching and learning materials, lack of teachers for continuation among others. This led to the birth of the Primary Literacy Programme (PLP). To help improve the situation after noticing the challenges under PRP, MOE revised the curriculum and PLP that emphasized ‘the use of the familiar local language as the medium of instruction, from pre-school to grade four’ was developed. It was meant to address the weaknesses under PRP and improve literacy levels among learners in primary schools. PLP emphasized teaching literacy to Grades 1-4 using the seven regional official languages, namely: Ibibemba, Tonga, Lozi, Lunda, Luvale, Cinyanja and Kikaonde (Chibamba, Mkandawire & Tambulukani, 2018). It was concluded that the use of a familiar language in the early years would help learners enhance their literacy skills because of the familiarity of the language.

In 2013, the curriculum was revised. According to Mandyata et al. (2023), the current language in education policy came into effect in 2013 through the Zambia Education Curriculum Framework. Seven local languages were identified to be used as languages of instruction and these were Chitonga, Cinyanja, Ibibemba, Kikaonde, Lunda, Luvale, and Silozi. They were named official languages for instruction in early childhood education and grades one through to four and each of them had a designated area (Ministry of Education, 2013). The 2013 revised policy stipulated that local languages would be used as medium of instruction in all subjects in preschool and early grades 1 to 4 with English taught orally and then in writing (Kombe & Mwanza, 2019). ‘This is because there is evidence that children learn more easily and successfully through languages that they know and understand well’, (Ministry of Education (MOE), 2013 p.19). This meant that the familiar local language would be used as a language of instruction and English would not be taught until the learners transition at grade five to English as a medium of instruction and a local language taught as a subject (Iversen, 2023). The assumption is that by the age of ten or eleven children will have acquired sufficient literacy skills in a Zambian language, as well as in English, so that on entering Grade 5 they will be capable of independent and fluent reading in English (MOE, 2013). As regards to both the official and the regional languages, English instruction should begin in grade two and continue alongside local language until grade five, when English

becomes the Language of instruction (LOI) and the local language as a subject. However, the 2023 revised curriculum has proposed that English should be used as a language of instruction from ECE to tertiary level and Zambian languages should be used to explain concepts (MOE, 2023).

The developments in the language in education policy can only be achieved through a prescribed syllabus. The Zambia Primary School English Syllabus from grade 2 to 7 was produced to improve education at all levels of the education system. 'Literacy and Languages specifically aims at developing the four skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The use of a familiar language for initial literacy (at Grade One) should be used as a starting point for literacy in English'. (MOE, 2012). The Ministry of Education outlines that;

The new English Syllabus starts from Grade 2 to Grade 7. This has been a result of a lot of debate on the medium of instruction for the initial literacy. Many views indicate that it is rather confusing for the child who comes straight from an environment in which he or she speaks a Zambian familiar language to be introduced to English upon arrival in Grade 1 in school. The aim of introducing English at Grade 2 is therefore to give the child a year to first master the initial literacy skills in his or her Familiar Language. Equipped with this knowledge, the child will be able to graduate into English in Grade 2 (MOE, 2012 p5).

The Zambia English syllabus stipulates the methodology to be used when teaching English. The syllabus from Grades 2 to 4 has three parts namely, Listening and Speaking, Reading, Writing and grammar is taught within the different components. However, 'from Grade 5 to 7, Grammar can be tackled as an independent area. At this time, it is expected that elementary definitions and explanations of concepts can be introduced to the learners' (MOE, 2012). In addition, the Ministry of Education (MOE), 2012) outlines that the teaching methodology for the Zambia English syllabus from grade 2 to 7 should be based on a Communicative approach whose features include:

1. Integration of basic literacy and language skills.
2. Using literacy and language skills in real life situations.
3. Teaching literacy and language in context.

4. Using authentic teaching materials.
5. Using a variety of reading and writing activities including writing about real experiences and for a real purpose.
6. Placing learners in ability groups.
7. Using continuous assessment; and
8. Using varied learner centered communicative, interactive, and participatory techniques such as: Role play, Drama, Problem solving, Information transfer, Pair or group discussion, Field trips or project work, Case studies and Debate.

Since the recommended methodology in the Zambia Primary English Syllabus is Communicative Approach, this study is on the application of the Communicative Language Teaching in the teaching of English grammar which is one of the components of English at upper primary school.

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) began in the 1970s after the reaction to the traditional language teaching approaches such as the Audiolingual and Situational Language Teaching inadequacies. It has been argued that the earlier methods focused on grammatical competence without considering the knowledge and skills needed to use grammar in communicative purposes (Richards, 2006). The learners were not helped to use language for communication but encouraged to memorise. According to Vaezia and Abbaspour (2014) 'learners trained by structural syllabi were unable to communicate appropriately in contexts outside the classroom'. CLT was meant to use both the structural and the communicative views as complementary meaning it is meant to focus on both the form and function of language though emphasis is more placed on function. Candlin (1981) and Widdowson (1978) proposed that language teaching should focus more on communicative proficiency rather than mastery of structures. Students did not know how to communicate in the cultures of the other languages. The argument was that using the target language in a meaningful way would help learners develop communicative competence (Thamarana, 2015). Bolkvadse (2023) puts it that there was an increasing demand for effective English teaching methods as English was becoming a globe language. Laksanasut (2020) summarised that CLT was initiated because of the need to supply English proficient workforces in the advent of

economic expansion worldwide and the reason was the demand for effective language teaching approaches.

Communicative Language Teaching has been defined by many writers and many definitions are related. According to Lindsay and Knight (2006), “Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is an approach to the teaching of second and foreign languages that emphasizes communication or interaction as both the means and the ultimate goal of learning a language”. Communicative Language Teaching can also be said to be a systematic way of teaching where both the communicative view as well as structural view are considered side by side. Thamarana (2015), adds that ‘Communicative language teaching is one of the latest humanistic approaches to teaching approaches which gives emphasis to the language use and provides more opportunity to learners to practice the target language in spite of its limitation’. The use of language demands learners to develop communicative skills in all the four language skills, that is speaking, listening, reading, and writing to achieve the intended outcomes. It can be concluded that the two main aspects in the definitions of CLT focus on language and communication stated by Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2011) that the goal of CLT is ‘to enable students to communicate in the target language’.

Apart from its focus on communicative competence, Communicative Language Teaching has many principles which guide teachers. Richard (2006:13) summaries the principles of CLT as follows:

1. Make real communication the focus of language learning.
2. Provide opportunities for learners to experiment and try out what they know.
3. Be tolerant of learners’ errors as they indicate that the learner is building up his or her communicative competence.
4. Provide opportunities for learners to develop both accuracy and fluency.
5. Link the different skills such as speaking, reading, and listening together, since they usually occur so in the real world.
6. Let students induce or discover grammar rules.

The focus of CLT is Communicative Competence. Communicative competence was coined by Dell Hymes (1972). He explained it as having knowledge and know how to use the knowledge to communicate in a particular context. Communicative competence refers to “the underlying systems of knowledge and skill required for communication” (Canale,1983). This means that Communicative competence requires several skills to effectively achieve the intended goal which is communication, and this entails that for learners to communicate effectively in different situations and contexts, there is need to help them to become competent in communication through the development of language skills. For Hymes, according to Whyte (1972), ‘communicative competence thus includes speakers’ knowledge of linguistic and sociolinguistic rules as well as their ability to use this knowledge in interaction’. Canale and Swain (1980:4) define communicative competence in terms of four components namely:

- grammatical competence (knowledge of grammar as well as vocabulary)
- sociolinguistics competence (applying an appropriate thing in a different social context)
- discourse competence (communicating in a cohesive and coherent manner)
- strategic competence (ability to communicate effectively).

Each one of the four components is necessary for one to be competent communicatively and being able to express himself or herself effectively. Communicative language teaching, therefore, takes all the four dimensions of communicative competence by looking at language in its approach to second language teaching and this means that for one to communicate competently, all the four components should be developed. It is therefore important to acknowledge that all four dimensions of communicative competence are central to CLT and therefore there is need to develop them. Rambe (2017) adds that language teaching and learning should include all the components of communicative competence to develop a learner in all aspects of language. To be a competent communicator in the target language, one should be aware that cognitive knowledge about communication based on observing the way language is used, following instructions, and acknowledging that individual, social, and cultural contexts affect competence, and be able to adapt to various social contexts. If a learner can apply language rules to produce grammatically acceptable sentences, perform

language functions according to the context, organise sentences accordingly in a text or expressions and apply strategies to compensate for communication breakdown, then the person is communicatively competent. A language classroom using the CLT methodology should engage learners in activities which would make learners develop their communicative competence.

Communicative Language Teaching approach is used as a teaching methodology in Zambian multilingual Primary Schools to teach English grammar from grade five to seven. One of the functional aspects of teaching English as a second or foreign language is to teach the grammatical concepts of English as well. To learners to be communicatively competent, there is need to develop their grammar. Grammar is a necessary component of language teaching and for learners to have a good command of language and communicate effectively, there is need for them to understand and master the grammar rules and constructions. Chalker and Weiner (1994: 177) defined grammar as: “the entire system of a language, including its syntax, morphology, semantics, and phonology.” Using CLT to teach grammar, teachers need to relate teaching grammatical concepts to both meaning and use, meaning that both form and function should be taught in a communicative way (Hassan, Mohammed, & Almardi, 2018). It is also important to acknowledge the suggestions by Zhong-Guo and Min-yan (2007) that Communicative Language Teaching should be used to teach grammar to help improve both the linguistic and communicative competences of learners. The goal of Communicative Language Teaching is to create an interactive and real-life environment that promotes effective communication. In such learning environment, students are also able to improve their grammatical competence and expand vocabulary (Zhao, 2022). A’yun (2019) therefore recommended that learners should be taught grammar in context, and this could help them to understand the rules and apply them more efficiently in real life situations.

For the learners to communicate competently, the use of their first language as well as translation should be allowed as all the classes are multilingual and there is need to use local familiar language for every child to learn the second language (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). This is supported by Banda and Mwanza (2017) who pointed out that “if the goal of teaching is to enable learners to access learning, then it is imperative that their home languages and literacies are allowed in the classroom as steppingstones to accessing learning”. Judicious use of the students’ native language is permitted in CLT’ (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). This means that the Communicative Language Teaching approach allows teachers to use the

learners' first language when necessary. It is for this reason therefore that this study focuses on how teachers apply Communicative Language teaching in a multilingual classroom.

1.3. Statement of the problem

The language of instruction in Zambia from grade 5 onwards is English (MOE, 2013). However, most of the classrooms in Zambian primary schools are multilingual. And English is taught as a second language in the multilingual classrooms using the Communicative language teaching as the methodology recommended by the Zambia Primary English syllabus to teach all the components of English (MOE, 2013). Since Zambia is a multilingual country, the teaching of English grammar should take into consideration the linguistic diversities in the classroom. In multilingual situations, linguistic and structural differences between the mother tongue and the target language, language knowledge level of the learners, differences in learners' characteristics and learning needs of the learners should also be considered (Tsisana & Dali, 2021). The aspect of using the Communicative language teaching approach in a multilingual classroom to teach English has not been addressed in any studies before. Some studies focused on the teaching of English grammar using CLT (Liu & Deris, 2023), the strategies and practices of teaching multilingual classes (Samalesu and Mwiinga (2024), translanguaging practices used at a University in Zambia (Mungala and Mwanza (2024), the hinderances of teaching English using CLT (Barira, Shabana & Sadia, 2019., Asmari & Radman ,2015., Abongdia and Foncha, 2015). Having looked at the aspects of CLT, stated as a question, the problem is; how do teachers apply the Communicative Language Teaching approach in the teaching of English grammar in multilingual primary classrooms?

1.4. The purpose of the study

The purpose of the study is to analyse how teachers apply the Communicative Language Teaching approach in the teaching of English grammar in multilingual primary schools.

1.5. Objectives

The objectives of this study are to:

- a. Establish teachers' knowledge of the communicative language teaching approach.
- b. Analyse teachers' classroom application of the communicative language teaching approach in English grammar lessons.

- c. Analyse how teachers negotiate learners' multilingual identities through language practice.
- d. Establish challenges faced by teachers when teaching English grammar using the CLT in multilingual classrooms.

1.6. Research questions

- a. How do teachers understand the Communicative Language Teaching approach?
- b. How is the Communicative Language Teaching approach applied in English grammar lessons?
- c. How do teachers negotiate learners' multilingual identities through language practice?
- d. What challenges do teachers face when teaching English grammar using the Communicative Language Teaching approach in multilingual classrooms?

1.7. Significance of the study

The study might help the Ministry of Education realise the need to enforce continuous professional development in institutions to empower teachers with multilingual classroom skills.

The findings of the study might also help teacher educators in colleges of education to train teachers appropriately in teaching methodologies with focus on the syllabus recommendation, that is, CLT.

Teacher educators might also be helped to gain insights on how they can train teachers on how to teach grammar using the CLT methodology in multilingual classroom.

The study findings might help the teachers to interpret the English primary syllabus appropriately and plan in accordance with the requirements such as teaching all the components of the syllabus using CLT.

The study findings might also help teachers to reflect on how they teach English grammar using the aspects of the Communicative Language Teaching approach considering both function and form within the same lesson and what they intend to achieve at the end of the grammar lesson.

Teachers might also be helped to understand Communicative Language Teaching approach and how to use the appropriate strategies in the classroom as well as how to meet the language needs of learners with different languages. Teachers might also be helped to reflect on their roles as well as those of their learners during grammar instructions using the CLT methodology.

1.8. Delimitation of the Study

The study was conducted in Central Province of Zambia. The study was confined to grade 6 teachers in selected primary schools in three districts of Central Province namely Mkushi, Kapiri Mposhi and Serenje.

1.9. Limitations of the Study

The researcher faced challenges because some grade six teachers were not willing to be part of the research and others pulled out at the last minute. This prompted the researcher to include some more schools. Some teachers taught lessons they had taught before. This was evident from the learners' responses, and repeated class exercises in learners' books. The researcher then decided to not include the data from the classes. Some schools have one stream of grade six classes, and this reduced the sample size. The researcher was made to make other appointments with teachers from other schools to replace those who withdrew, and to make up for the schools which only had one grade six class.

With the pronouncement of free education, it was difficult for the researcher to conduct focus group discussion with the pupils in a classroom as all classes were in use and therefore, the discussion was usually held outside the classroom. In some cases the students were distracted by other activities outside of the classroom and this prompted the researcher to repeat questions and spend more time.

Some learners in the focus group discussion took the centre stage and couldn't give their friends a chance to give their opinions and some learners couldn't give their opinions because they appeared uncomfortable discussing in a group. However, the researcher devised a method of allowing everyone to have a say on the question asked and assured them that what was discussed was confidential.

1.10. Operational definitions

The following are some of the operational definitions of concepts to be used in the study.

Communicative competence: Is a term in linguistics which refers to the language user's grammatical knowledge of syntax, morphology, phonology as well as social knowledge about how and when to use utterances appropriately or is the ability to use the language correctly and appropriately to accomplish communication goals.

Code switching: This is alternating the use of two languages in a speech.

Grammar teaching: this is an instructional technique which focuses on teaching learners' grammatical forms or rules of a language so that they can use the language appropriately.

Language of instruction: This is the language used for teaching the basic curriculum of the educational system.

Multilingualism: This is the ability of a society, group and individual to use two or more languages in their day to day lives.

Multilingual classroom: This is a classroom consisting of pupils from different linguistic backgrounds.

Multilingual Education: This is the practice of using 2 or more languages for classroom instructions.

Multiple language practice: This is the use of several languages for classroom instruction.

Syllabus: The curriculum document which gives specifications about the graded levels of linguistic proficiency, expected from learners.

Translanguaging: The utilization of the full linguistic repertoire of the learners through alternation of languages available which are used by the learners.

1.11 Chapter Summary

The first chapter has provided the introduction and background to the study. It has also provided the study purpose, the research objectives, the main research question as well as specific questions, significance of the study, delimitation, limitations, operational definitions, structure of the dissertation and a chapter summary. The next chapter presents a review of related literature.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. Overview

The previous chapter presented the introduction to the study. This chapter presents studies from different parts of the world related to teachers' application of the communicative methodology when teaching English grammar in multilingual classroom. The chapter will begin with discussing the concepts of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), Communicative competence, Multilingualism and Grammar. The chapter will then present literature related to teachers' understanding of the Communicative Language Teaching approach, their classroom application of the Communicative Language Teaching approach in English grammar lessons, how they negotiate learners' multilingual identities through language practice and the challenges they face when teaching English grammar using the CLT in multilingual classrooms and finally a chapter summary will be provided.

2.2. The Communicative Language Teaching Approach

There are several approaches and methods of teaching and learning second or foreign languages that have been in use and one of them is the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). CLT was introduced as an approach to language teaching and learning a second language in many countries in the world in the 1970s after the earlier teaching methods such as Grammar Translation Method (GLT), Direct Method (DM), Audio Lingual Method (ALM), Situational Language Teaching (SLT) among others couldn't yield the desired results (Ansarey, 2012). 'The reformation of pedagogical methodologies in which demand for more effective language teaching approaches from many portions was considered a high priority' (Laksanaut, 2020). The increasing demand for meaningful communication led to the demand for quality English language teaching in the education sector (Richard, 2006). Another reason which led to the shift in pedagogy to CLT was the demand for English proficient workers by the economic sectors as English was spreading globally. CLT was introduced due to the dissatisfaction of the situational and structural approaches to language teaching (Ahmad, Majoka & Fazal, 2017).

CLT is a recognizable approach to second and foreign language teaching in many countries today. Richards and Schmidt (2010) defined CLT as 'an approach to foreign or second

language teaching which emphasizes that the goal of language learning is communicative competence, and which seeks to make meaningful communication and language use a focus of all classroom activities'. CLT is an approach that emphasizes interaction during language learning and teaching of second and foreign languages (Daisy, 2012). This entails that for interaction among learners to take place the teacher should provide activities for learners to practice, thereby acquiring the necessary skills for second language communication in real life situations. Baydikova and Davidenko (2019) added that when it comes to CLT the emphasis is placed on learners acquiring meaningful and real communication from language teaching and add a variety of activities and language aspects which include sociolinguistics, semantics, pragmatics, functional linguistics among others make it possible to achieve Communicative Language Teaching (Zhao, 2022). But Howatt (1984) makes it clear that CLT has two versions and named them the weak version and the strong version. He differentiated the two versions by stating that the weak version requires exposing learners to opportunities which would require them to 'use English for communicative purposes', and the strong version requires that after acquiring language through communication, it should 'stimulate the development of the language system itself' (p. 279).

Yalden (1987: 61) wrote the following about Communicative Language Teaching:

“It is based on the notion of the learners as communicators, naturally endowed with the ability to learn languages. It seeks to provide learners with the target language system. It is assumed that learners will have to prepare to use the target language (orally and in written form) in many predictable and unpredictable acts of communication which arise both in classroom interaction and in real-world situations, whether concurrent with language training or subsequent to it.”

The general principles of Communicative language Teaching as outlined by Nunan (1991) set the basis of the activities which should be used in the classroom. He recognised the following as the five features of Communicative Language Teaching:

- an emphasis on learning to communicate through interaction in the target language.
- the introduction of authentic texts into the learning situation.
- the provision of opportunities for learners to focus, not only on language but also on the learning management process.

- an enhancement of the learners' own personal experiences as important contributing elements to classroom learning.
- an attempt to link classroom language learning with language activities outside the classroom.

Despite being the most popular second and foreign language teaching method globally now, the use of Communicative language teaching has advantages as well as disadvantages. Zhao (2022) discussed the advantages of CLT and stated that the obvious one was that learners can improve their fluency when communicating in the target language. This helps learners to be more confident as they express themselves in the target language. Dos Santos (2020) added another advantage of CLT approach by stating that it embraces student – centered way of teaching and clearly stipulates the teacher's role to be a facilitator and encourage student communication through various activities. This is made possible through the emphasis on student -centered ways of teaching which gives learners an opportunity to interact and use the target language freely leading to improvement in communication. The learner centered way of teaching provides students with insights on how to use English language comprehensively (Richards, 2006) as well as interaction among learners, and between learners and the teacher. This means that learners will be able to improve in how to express themselves whilst talking and confidence in speaking is also guaranteed (Brown, 2001). Another advantage worth noting is that learners are motivated to learn another language because they can learn it through interaction with their friends. This means that language used by learners to interact and explore real life situations in the classroom is further practiced outside the classroom making it easier to relate to real contexts. CLT aims at communicative competence and therefore learners can use language in real life situations which helps to cultivate interest beyond the classroom (Thamarana, 2015).

The Communicative Language Teaching approach has some disadvantages as well. Mirbabayeva (2021) pointed out that CLT focuses more on meaning than form. This means that not much attention is given to the correction of pronunciation and grammatical rules. If what the speaker intends to say is understood by the listener, then communication has taken place. The approach also stresses fluency than accuracy thereby producing fluent but inaccurate learners of a target language. It is also difficult to use the approach in the classroom because of lack of resources and this affects the learner's interaction which is meant to facilitate the use of real language. Zhao (2022) added another disadvantage by

stating that in CLT much time is spent on listening and speaking. This means that reading and writing are somehow ignored or less time is spent on them. He further added that CLT classroom activities require a small class size, but it becomes challenging to a teacher in a large class to engage all the learners in activities and help them individually. This is a disadvantage especially in large class sizes because it becomes difficult to use classroom activities intended to achieve communicative competence and for the teacher to effectively attend to all the learners in the classroom.

The communicative Language Teaching approach has several recommended activities which are used in the classroom to help learners to be competent communicatively. Among the activities, Richards and Rodgers (1986:76) included ‘conversation and discussion sessions, dialogues and role plays, simulations, skits, improvisations, and debates. Other activities include problem solving, information gap, and project-based activities’. All the activities used in the CLT classroom require learners to communicate in the target language and have a varied use of language beyond the classroom. The Zambia Primary English Syllabus (2012) also embraced the same classroom activities based on the communicative approach as the teaching method and emphasizes on the use of a variety of learner centered activities such as:

- Role play
- Drama
- Problem solving
- Information transfer
- Pair or group discussion
- Field trips or project work
- Case studies
- Debate

Communicative Language Teaching activities are meant to help learners to engage and interact which leads to communicative competence (Richards, 2001). However, it should be noted that teachers need to diversify activities, use authentic materials, and engage learners to

help them use the target language as much as possible (Yang & Cheung, 2003). It is through the classroom activities that learners are expected to acquire the target language.

The Communicative Language Teaching Approach is an approach which focuses on engaging learners in the classroom. The teacher as well as learners have roles to play during the teaching and learning process in the classroom. Breen and Candlin (1980) in Coskun (2011) outlined the teacher's roles in connection with CLT as follows:

1. Facilitator of the communication process among all the participants in the classroom and their activities.
2. Independent participant within the learning-teaching group.
3. Organiser of resources and a resource himself or herself.
4. Guide in the context of classroom activities.
5. Researcher and learner.

The two main roles of the teacher when using CLT, are that of a guide and facilitator. The teacher is a facilitator because of being at the centre stage of providing different activities to the learners so that they have opportunities to engage in the learning process among themselves and in the process the teacher assumes the role of being a guide who acts as a monitor or participant in the learning process (Ansary, 2012). However, Mowlaie and Rahimi (2010) added that the teacher's role is first as an organizer of resources and as a resource himself or herself because he or she organises everything which learners are supposed to engage in as they use the target language, and secondly, as a guide within the classroom procedure activities because he or she is supposed to scaffold where and when necessary as learners interact with the resources made available to them. The activities the teacher engages learners in the learning process within the classroom should be applicable outside the classroom. Mowlaie and Rahimi (2010) added that, 'a third role of the teacher can be that of researcher and learner with much to contribute in terms of appropriate knowledge and abilities, actual and observed experience of the nature of learning and organizational capacities. According to Larsen-Freeman (2000), the teacher has the role to facilitate communication in the classroom by coming up with situations which activate communication among the learners. 'During activities, the teacher acts as an advisor, answering students'

questions and monitoring their performance’, (p128). Therefore, the teacher is key in the teaching and learning process and the learners are the focus.

The learner in a CLT classroom has roles to play during the learning process. The CLT lesson should be learner centered and therefore learners are at the centre stage of the lesson, meaning that they are involved throughout the teaching and learning process. Ansary (2012) pointed out that learners assume the role of negotiators because they negotiate among themselves during the learning process as they should all be actively involved. They are independent and complete tasks through communicating among themselves. Breen and Candlin (1980) defined the role of the learner in Communicative Language Teaching as that of negotiating within themselves and with their fellow learners as they complete the classroom tasks. According to Larsen-Freeman (2000), learners are communicators and ‘they are actively engaged in negotiating meaning – in trying to make themselves understood and in understanding others even when their knowledge of the target language is incomplete’ (p129). In so doing, learners can activate their knowledge of the language they are exposed to and build on that knowledge to learn another language. Language is a means of communicating and CLT helps learners to communicate effectively in real life situations thereby improving learners, communicative competence (Thamarana, 2015).

2.2.1. Communicative Competence

The essence of Communicative Language Teaching is communication, and the approach focuses on helping learners develop communicative competence. The focus of CLT is to develop a child who will be able to communicate in different situations even outside the classroom. The language a learner is taught in class should enable him or her to interact in different aspects of the environment. Richards and Rodgers (2001) state that CLT begins with a theory of language as communication, which focuses on developing learners’ communicative competence. For both second and foreign languages, learners’ acquisition of communicative competence should be the desired goal in the teaching and learning process.

Communicative competence was introduced in the 1960s by Dell Hymes who reacted to Chomsky’s use of the term linguistic competence whose focus was on the native speaker’s knowledge of the grammatical rules in his or her language. Hymes (1962) accepted that knowledge of grammar was important, but learners should be taught what was communicatively acceptable in a given situation. Hymes’ communicative competence meant

including knowledge of linguistic rules as well as sociolinguistic rules which speakers can ably use as they interact in different contexts but without neglecting the grammatical rules (Whyte, 2019). In support of Hymes theory of communicative competence, Safranji (2009) explained that a speaker needs to have knowledge of linguistic and sociolinguistic rules as well as grammatical rules to use language appropriately in a speech community thereby embracing communication and culture at the same time. 'Hymes believes that knowledge of language structure and sociocultural rules and the ability to use such knowledge in real life situations are both important in language acquisition. The learner acquires knowledge of language not only as grammatical but also as appropriate' (Ahmed, 2018).

Competence Communicative refers to having knowledge of various appropriate language patterns and using them in different linguistic contexts (Cooley & Roach, 1984). Spitzberg (1988) defined communication competence as "the ability to interact well with others" (p.68). Communicative competence is measured by determining if, and to what degree, the goals of interaction are achieved Hymes (1966). For interaction to be achieved, language conventions should be followed. Hymes divided those conventions into competencies, and they cover a broad range of communication elements namely grammatical (or linguistic) competence, discourse competence, strategic competence, and sociolinguistic competence.

Canale and Swain (1980) introduced their model of communicative competence, which was a developed model of Hymes, and their model is the one which has been in use up to date. Canale and Swain (1980:27-28) discussed that the following principles can guide the development of communicative approach for a second language programme.

1. Communicative competence is composed minimally of grammatical competence, social linguistic competence, and strategic competence.
2. A communicative competence must be based on and respond to the learners' communication needs.
3. The second language learner must have the opportunity to take part in meaningful communicative interaction with highly competent speakers of the language, that is, respond to genuine communicative needs in realistic second language situations.
4. Particularly at the early stages of second language learning, optimal use must be made of those aspects of communicative competence that the learner has developed through

acquisition and use of native language and that are common to those communication skills required in the second language.

5. The primary objective of a communication-oriented second language programme must be to provide the learners with the information, practice and much of the experience needed to meet their communicative needs in the second language.

Canale and Swain focused on the interaction between grammatical competence and sociolinguistic competence and how each is dependent on the other for one to be communicatively competent. Their initial model had three competences that is grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, and strategic competence though a fourth competence, discourse was added (Canale, 1983). The model is considered as the first comprehensive model of communicative competence because it ‘offered practical implications for syllabus design, instructional methodology, teacher education and teaching materials’ which meant that learners were expected to be communicatively competent after being exposed to a functionally organised syllabus (Taş & Khan, 2020).

The first dimension of Communicative Competence is Grammatical Competence. According to Gałajda (2012), based on the work by Canale and Swain (1980), ‘Grammatical competence is the mastery of the language code. It means that speakers know the rules of the language which include vocabulary, word and sentence formation, pronunciation, spelling and linguistic semantics’. It is the knowledge of how to effectively express the meaning of an utterance which can be easily understood by others in a proper way. Savignon (2002) pointed out that grammatical competence does not mean one should theoretically state a rule but that the rule should be used and applied appropriately in the right context. It means not merely having knowledge about the rules but using them in forming words and sentences and interpreting utterances and negotiating meaning for communication to continue and for the participants involved to understand each other. The focus therefore is that a learner should be able to have knowledge and skill on how to use the rule and express oneself accurately. It can be concluded that it means knowing the rules and using them appropriately in the correct context.

The second dimension of Communicative Competence is Sociolinguistics. Canale and Swain (1980) defined the sociolinguistic competence as the ‘sociocultural rules of use and rules of discourse’. It ‘requires an understanding of the social context in which language is used: the

roles of the participants, the information they share, and the function of the interaction' (Savignon, 2002, p.9). Sociolinguistic competence represents how language can be used in different social contexts which means that under CLT learners are supposed to acquire knowledge and skills of how to apply what they learnt in the classroom in different situations outside the classroom. If learners can communicate effectively in different social contexts, then they become communicatively competent. However, Jalilovna (2020) added that the sociocultural conditions and conventions such as generation gaps, social groups rules of politeness and others should be taken into consideration for one to be sociolinguistic competent. According to Canale (1983), it means having knowledge about how language is produced and used among different participants in different sociolinguistic contexts. The learner should have skills on how to use language that matches the social context they find themselves in. The learner should have knowledge about the language culture of the target language which includes which things should be talked about and what should be avoided and generally how language is used.

The third dimension of Communicative Competence is Discourse competence. It is concerned with 'the interconnectedness of a series of utterances or written words or phrases to form a text, a meaningful whole' (Savignon, 2002). It is the appropriate connection of words to make a meaningful sentence which can express meaningful communication (Canale & Swain, 1980). Discourse competence is an important concept of communicative competence because it is meant to help students to make cohesive and coherent sentences meant to achieve unified communication. Cohesion is attained when cohesive devices, such as pronouns and grammatical connectors are used in spoken or written texts (Canale, 1983). This helps to make language appropriate in given situation. The teachers therefore should teach learners discourse patterns such as cohesion and coherence so that they can be applied appropriately as they produce different texts and engage in conversations in different settings to achieve communicative competence.

The fourth dimension of Communicative Competence is Strategic Competence. It is the type of strategy meant to help the learners learn how to use verbal and non-verbal communication in case of the breakdown in communication due to inappropriate use of other competencies (Canale & Swain, 1980). It acts as a filler in situations where a speaker has difficulties in one or two competencies or fails to use the linguistic rules appropriately. Savignon (2002) explained that 'coping strategies that we use in unfamiliar contexts, with constraints arising

from imperfect knowledge of rules, or such impediments to their application as fatigue or distraction, are represented as strategic competence'. Canale (1980) explains that such strategies may be needed for two main reasons: "to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to limiting conditions in actual communication or to insufficient competence in one or more of the other areas of communicative competence, and to enhance the effectiveness of communication" (p. 10). The incorporation of strategic competence helps to keep the conversation flowing instead of breaking it down due limited vocabulary or knowledge of language rules. This also includes the use of non-verbal communication as well (Canale, 1983). Strategic competence helps learners continue with the conversation flow, especially those with limited vocabulary in the target language. It helps to avoid communication breakdown.

However, it should be noted that the four competencies are dependent on each other to make communication competent. A learner needs to be taught that language has rules and for one to be linguistically correct, the rules of the language follow appropriate contexts and are applied situationally but at the same time discourse should be taken into consideration. Though not everyone may have mastered the rules of language, it is important to help the learners understand that they may use both verbal and nonverbal cues to express meaningful communication. According to Canale (1983) all the communicative competence elements should be integrated because they are complementary.

It is worth noting that the focus of CLT is to have learners who are competent in the second language, but it can also be noted that for a learner to be communicatively competent in the second language, he or she should be competent in their first language as it is the steppingstone to learning the second language (Gałajda, 2012). Teachers should also try to help learners understand that the rules of language are not independent but are tied to the situations or contexts. Therefore, it is the duty of the teacher to teach the second language learners how to connect different ideas which would be meaningful. This means that a teacher should teach learners the second language so that they can use the target language in a meaningful way thereby developing communicative competence and use language to integrate socially into society. Communicative Competence is therefore effective and appropriate conversation during communication which should be done in a proper context with appropriate forms depending on the real situation of the social interaction (Muhammed, Umar & Habib, 2017).

2.3. Multilingualism

The world has always been multilingual, and multilingualism has penetrated the various fields and aspects of life. This also includes the education system in which it somehow poses challenges when it comes to teaching foreign and second languages in multilingual classrooms as most of the classes are multilingual. The success of learning and teaching second and foreign languages should be aligned with the multilingual realities of the world. In most parts of the world, children are exposed to one or two languages as they are growing up. And as they grow up and move to other places, they find other languages other than their mother tongue which they must learn. In multilingual classes, learners come from different homes with different native languages and the only language for communication may be the target language which they are supposed to learn (Dali & Tsisana, 2021).

According to Poudel, “Multilingualism refers to the condition in which more than two languages are used in the same setting for similar purposes” (2010, p.121). It can also be defined as the ability of a person or society to use more than one language (Catalano & Hamann, 2016). Multilingualism refers to the presence of more than one language in a geographical area (King, 2018). Kings added that in most African countries, children are multilingual before beginning primary school because they learn one or more languages at home or in the community and when they begin school, they learn another language which may be a language of instruction, and it becomes their second language.

Multilingualism is a common feature in many countries around the world, Zambia inclusive. A multilingual classroom in a primary school comprises of learners whose first languages may be different from each other or a class where several languages are used. In some cases, the language of instruction may also be different from the learners’ first or local languages. This also includes teachers who may not be native speakers of the language used in the region where they teach. They maybe proficient in the language of instruction and their first language and are multilingual because they teach a language that is not their first language (Calafato, 2019). It is important to use a language familiar to the children as a language of instruction because it is easier for children to understand when taught in a language, they are familiar with (UNESCO, 2003). The knowledge and experience of children’s first language is key in learning a second language (Calafato, 2019).

In most countries around the world, learners speak diverse languages, and the language of instruction is English which also is the second language which learners are supposed to learn. This is the case for Zambia upper primary schools who language of instruction is English. Zambia is a multilingual country with about 73 languages (Kashoki, 1978). Although the languages are regionalized, some parts of the country have mixed languages because of the regional migration in search of jobs and favourable weather patterns for farming. This is the main reason causing the problems encountered in all the aspects of teaching a language and hindering the achievement of linguistic as well as skill development goals. But in many countries, the monolingual language-in-education policies are still prevailing which causes a challenge when it comes to learning a second language (Makalela 2018a). However, multilingual practices in the teaching and learning process has helped a lot of learners because they are able to express themselves in languages, they are familiar with (Turner 2017; Vaish & Subhan 2015). This helps the teacher to effectively put across the intended content using the languages which children are familiar with in class to help them attain the required levels of learning. And it gives learners the freedom to seek clarification confidently. However, the teacher should be aware of the different native languages of the classroom as well as different varieties of the same language.

Teaching multilingual classes is a norm in Zambia because many children grow up in areas where they are exposed to more than one language (Iversen & Mkandawire, 2020). Though this may be the case, the education policy favours a monolingual language of instruction policy. Teaching multilingual classes using one language hinders effective learning in the classroom thereby disadvantaging the learners to acquire the content they are supposed to acquire (Mkandawire, 2017). The study by Mwanza and Nyimbili (2017) found out that one of the challenges teachers faced when teaching literacy was the mismatch between language of instruction and dominant learner's familiar language. This challenge was linked to inappropriate zoning of the languages which did not represent the sociolinguistic situation in the zoned areas. However, to overcome challenges associated with language barriers in the classroom, teachers should integrate multiple languages and encourage the use of L1 (Oihana et al 2020). The integration of L1 should be supported in one language ideologies situations because of multilingualism in the learning environment. The first language is the basis of learning a second language (Cummins, 2009). Auerbach (1993) states that L1 provides a sense of security and validates the learners' lived experiences, allowing them to express themselves and transfer the experiences in English as the second language. Auerbach

(1993:21) further suggested that the then learners' first language can be used in the classroom to: negotiate the syllabus and the lesson, record keeping, explain grammar, phonology, morphology, and spelling; discussion of cross-cultural issues, instructions or prompts, explanation of errors; and assessment of comprehension.

The Communicative Language Teaching approach allows the minimal use of the learners' mother tongue in the classroom to emphasise the communicative aspect of the target language such as giving complex instructions that are above the learners' level of proficiency in the target language (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011).

2.4. Grammar

Grammar is essential in the acquisition of communicative skills. Communicative activities are key to language development and there is need to pay attention to grammar because it is necessary for participants to interact and negotiate meaning. Grammar is conceptualised differently by different scholars. Harmer (2001:12) defined grammar as "a description of the ways in which words can change their forms and can be combined into sentences in that language". Grammar can also be viewed as the study of Morphology, which is the study of how words are formed, that is the internal structure of words, out of smaller units; and Syntax which is concerned with the ways in which words can be combined to form phrases and sentences (Radford, 1997:1). The correct word formation and word combination processes entails that certain aspects should be followed for the sentences to be accepted linguistically and used appropriately. According to Mart (2013:124), "grammar is a description of the rules for forming sentences, including an account of the meanings that these forms convey." Similarly, Richards and Schmidt (2010) defined grammar as:

A description of the structure of a language and the way in which linguistic units such as words and phrases are combined to produce sentences in the grammar of language. It usually considers the meanings and functions these sentences have in the overall system of the language. It may or may not include the description of the sounds of a language.

The definitions above all point to the fact that grammar has to do with the rules of a given language though others have included that grammar also focuses on the meaning and use of grammatical structures. These language items have recommended ways in which they can be arranged for a sentence to be meaningful and systematic. According to Burner (2005:17),

“Formal grammarians do not pay so much attention to meaning and context as they do to form and structures; they subject language to a bottom-up analysis, morphemes being the smallest language component they operate with, and the sentence the largest, and in between there are other levels such as word and clause”. Their conceptualisation of grammar does not go beyond syntax and morphology. On the other hand, “we have functional grammarians who deal with language in use. They regard words and sentences not as individual and independent forms, but as part of a whole, getting meaning from their surroundings (either from the rest of the language – semantics, or from the context in which they occur – pragmatics),” (Burner, 2005:17). Therefore, grammar goes beyond rules governing sentence constructions but also the meaning and the use of the constructions. It is important therefore to focus on both the form and function of grammar because “students need to learn how to use grammatical structures accurately, meaningfully, and appropriately” (Thu, 2009:6-7). The teacher should therefore emphasise on both the rules of grammar and their application during teaching and learning. A learner should be able to use appropriate grammatical structures which they may encounter in real life situations.

In their study, Tsisana and Dali (2021) outlined some of the challenges teachers encounter when teaching English grammar as follows:

1. The grammatical structures of the new language, English, may not be understood by all learners because of their different knowledge levels of English.
2. The diverse linguistic backgrounds of the learners make it difficult for the teacher to explain new structures in different languages because learners’ knowledge of their first language structure is important in learning English as a second language.
3. The diverse cultural and social backgrounds of the learners may be different from the social and cultural experiences of all the learners.
4. The lack of participation by the learners is because of having less exposure to the target language and preferring to less participation.

The outlined challenges above point to the fact that for learners to participate in the English grammar, their linguistic backgrounds should be taken into consideration by the teacher through negotiating how to bring different multilingual identities in the class on board during the teaching and learning process.

CLT advocates go beyond teaching grammatical rules of the target language, and propose that, by using the target language in a meaningful way, learners will develop communicative competence.

One of the characteristics of CLT is that Grammar can still be taught, but less systematically, in traditional ways alongside more innovative approaches. Stressing on this, Littlewood says “one of the most characteristic features of communicative language teaching is that it pays systematic attention to functional as well as structural aspects of language” (1981: 1). CLT advocates that in order to develop language, communicative events should focus on form (Thamarana, 2015). Brown (2001) states that “grammatical patterns are matched to particular communicative meanings so that learners can see the connection between form and function.” This means that learners are supposed to be taught how to apply grammatical rules in different linguistic situations for communication to take place. The teaching of grammar in a language lesson should involve presenting and practicing the grammatical structures which the teacher intends to teach the learners (Ellis, 2006).

According to Celik (2014), effective communication cannot take place if the rules of grammar such as punctuation, sentence structure, pronunciation and other aspects of language are not taken into consideration because they are necessary for the achievement of communicative competence. Communicative competence does not mean an absence of grammar instruction but rather grammar instruction that leads to the ability to communicate effectively. A communicative grammar lesson therefore should create opportunities for learners to practice grammar items through different communicative activities (DeKeyser, 1998). Cowan (2008) introduced some applications of the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) activities in grammar classes. He stated that grammar lessons using CLT should involve games, puzzle solving, role plays, storytelling, discussions, point of view, deciding of a course of action and guessing. The activities should be controlled by the learners in groups or pairs and the teacher acts as a facilitator or a guide in cases where learners fail to solve a problem.

2.5. Teachers’ knowledge of the Communicative Language Teaching approach.

This section of literature review provides studies on teachers’ understanding of the Communicative Language Teaching approach. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

has been a methodology in use and adopted in many parts of the world globally and therefore many teachers use the methodology to teach second and foreign languages in schools.

A qualitative study by Abrejo, Sartaj and Memon (2019) was conducted in Pakistan to find out about the attitudes of teachers and learners towards CLT. Semi-structured interviews were used to collect data from eight English teachers who were from different Colleges of Education. The findings were that most of the teachers had not received training in CLT and this affected their language teaching. The teachers believed that if they had received training in CLT, their language teaching would be very effective. The study is related to the current study in that both are dealing with how teachers understand CLT and their attitudes towards it and both studies were qualitative. However, the study confined itself to English teachers in colleges of education, while the current study focused on six teachers and pupils in primary schools. It can also be noted that the study collected data using only one instrument, the interview guide while apart from using the interview guide, the current study used the Focus Group discussion guide and the lesson observation checklist.

According to Richards (2005), teachers who do not have a comprehensive understanding about Communicative Language Teaching can find it difficult to apply it appropriately in the teaching process. Alharbi and Aldaba (2018) conducted a study in Malaysia to explore the Centre for Strategic Education and Training (IIUM CRESCENT) English teachers' understandings and practices of communicative language teaching (CLT) approach in their classrooms as well as identifying the situational constraints which they faced while using CLT in their teaching of English language. The study used a phenomenological qualitative research design. The study used five English language teachers, three international teachers, with 8 to 12 years experience of teaching English and two Malaysian teachers with three and five years of experience in teaching English language. The data was collected through semi-structured interview which consisted of a set of open-ended questions. The findings revealed that teachers had a satisfactory understanding of CLT though it has been implemented alongside other teaching methods. The study by Alharbi and Aldaba is similar to the current study because it also focused on finding out how teachers understood CLT. However, the current study observed teachers teaching while the study by Alharbi and Aldaba only interviewed the teachers.

The study by Pratt (2018) investigated the attitudes of teaching assistants of Spanish towards the Communicative Language Teaching approach by means of an attitude scale. It aimed at

examining the attitudes of the Teaching Assistants (TAs) to ascertain whether they had favourable attitudes towards the approach and how their backgrounds may be influencing their attitudes towards it. The participants were graduate TAs from four universities in the south of the United States who worked for departments where graduate students teach the lower-level Spanish courses and have implemented CLT. They comprised of 7 native speakers and 8 non-native speakers of Spanish. 13 were Ph.D students and 2 masters students. Among the TAs, 1 was majoring in Spanish linguistics, 2 were specializing in Bilingual Education and 12 were studying literature. They were all teaching or had taught college or high school classes. Data was collected using an online survey questionnaire was administered to the participants. The results indicated that the participants had favourable attitudes towards the Communicative Language Teaching Approach but demonstrated lack of knowledge about some of the principles of CLT. The recommendation was that there was need for professional training to enhance TAs skills on CLT principles. The current study sought to find out what teachers knew about CLT and how they practiced it.

The study conducted by Adejumo (2020) aimed at researching into how teachers' awareness, knowledge and use of communicative language teaching can help foster communicative competence in learners. The study used a survey research design of correlation type and collected data using two questionnaires and two observation rating scale. 10 public senior secondary schools were purposively selected from Ibadan North Local Government Area. The participants in the study were 10 English teachers and 100 students. The findings revealed that teachers' awareness and knowledge about CLT did not enhance the communicative competence in the students. Teachers' awareness of the principles and techniques of CLT was not enough to improve communicative competence in the students because they did not take it to the practical level. Hence their knowledge ended at theory level. This is in line with what was mentioned by Derakhshan and Torabi (2015) in their review paper which aimed at reporting EFL teachers' attitudes towards Communicative Language Teaching, exploring teachers' reasons for their attitudes, and reporting the discrepancy between teachers' beliefs towards CLT and their practice in the class. They wrote that majority of teachers held positive attitudes toward the principles of CLT, but they had difficulties in implementing them in their classes. They did not put into practice the features of CLT during the teaching and learning process. While the two studies focused on secondary school teachers, the current study focused on finding out how primary school teachers understood CLT.

Mapako and Mareva (2012) conducted a study which focused on how Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is conceptualized by secondary school teachers in Zimbabwe, using Masvingo District as a case study. The inquiry employed a qualitative research design in which data were collected through in-depth interviews with twenty-four (24) purposively sampled secondary school teachers based on being trained teachers of English. The study established that while all the teachers claim to be aware of this approach to language teaching and indeed demonstrate a degree of understanding of what the approach entails, the teachers had a lot of misconception about CLT such as teachers give up their roles since the approach is 'learner centred', abandonment of teaching grammar, the routine of employing group work, pair work, simulation and games in every lesson, placing too much emphasis on the development of speaking and listening skills at the expense of reading and writing with a high probability of teachers ignoring learners' errors in such a situation. Some teachers also argued that teaching and learning materials required to be used with CLT were scarce and expensive. The study by Mapako and Mareva (2012) focused on trained English secondary schools' teachers and only used in-depth interviews to collect data from the teachers who were purposefully sampled, and the focus was only on one district. However, the current study focused on grade six primary school teachers who are trained in all primary school subjects from three different districts. The teachers were observed and interviewed.

In Zambia, Mwanza (2017) sought to establish teachers' understanding and attitudes towards the eclectic method as a recommended method of classroom instruction. The research was conducted in Central Province of Zambia. It was a mixed method research study which used both qualitative and quantitative methods. Face to face interviews were used to collect qualitative data while a questionnaire was used to collect quantitative data. The participants were 90 secondary school teachers of English from 9 secondary schools which were purposively sampled. The findings showed that some teachers had a thorough understanding of the eclectic approach while others had moderate understanding, but others did not know what it meant. It was also revealed that some teachers had positive attitude of the approach because of its flexibility, teacher creativity and accommodation of all learners in the classroom. But other had negative views about it because they thought it required a lot of time, schools had no teaching and learning materials and that it was confusing to learners. The study by Mwanza focused on teachers' understanding of the Eclectic method and used mixed method and was conducted in secondary schools while the current study focused on teachers' understanding of CLT and was qualitative in nature.

Another Zambian study conducted by Zulu (2019) aimed at establishing teachers' understanding and classroom application of the Communicative language approach to English language teaching in selected secondary schools in Mufulira District, Zambia. The study used the qualitative design, and data was collected using the interview guide as interviews were the main method of data collection. 40 secondary school teachers of English were sampled to participate in the study. The findings were that teachers had low to moderate understanding of the Communicative Language Teaching and misconceptions about CLT that it encouraged errors and neglected grammatical correctness of utterances which misguided the teaching and learning process. Though the study by Zulu also focused on secondary school teachers' understanding CLT, it differs with the current study which focuses on primary school teachers' understanding of CLT.

Phiri (2020) conducted a study to assess final year student teachers' preparedness to use the Communicative approach to teach English as a second language. The study was qualitative, and data was collected using face to face interviews, focus group discussions, document analysis and lesson observations from English language student teachers and teacher educators at Nkwame Nkhrumah University in Zambia. It was established that the student teachers were not able to use CLT because they did not fully understand the characteristics of CLT due to inadequate training in the teaching methods. The current study will focus on the serving teachers in primary schools.

Chishipula (2016) conducted a study on factors hindering teachers of English language from implementing communicative language teaching (CLT) approach. The study explored the implementation of CLT in Public Secondary Schools of Chongwe District. The purpose of the study was to establish why teachers of English Language were not implementing CLT. Mixed Method Approach was used and a case study in this regard applied. Data was collected using the questionnaire, interview guide and observation guide. The findings of the study revealed that teachers had scanty ideas about CLT. Forty-one teachers under study could not give a comprehensive theoretical account of CLT, thirty-one teachers held misconceptions while ten could not state what CLT was. CLT was absent in all the lessons observed. All the lessons were organised around teacher centred, whole class pedagogical activities without any noticeable form of communicative activities and CLT instructional procedures. The study used mixed methods and collected data using questionnaire, interviews and observation while the current study used the qualitative approach. However, it was conducted at a secondary

school within the same district. The study focused on the teaching of English language generally while the current study focused specifically on the teaching of English grammar at primary school.

2.6. Teachers' classroom application of the Communicative Language Teaching approach in English grammar lessons.

Communicative Language Teaching has been in use in so many countries around the world to teach second and foreign languages. Its adoption means that it should be used to teach different components in English including grammar. Several studies have been conducted to ascertain the use of Communicative Language Teaching in grammar lessons.

Tianli, Mansor, Ang and Sharmini (2021) conducted a study to investigate the Chinese English teachers' attitudes towards English grammar teaching using the Communicative language Teaching Approach. The aim was to investigate the rationale, the teaching effects and suggestions of English teachers in using CLT in English grammar teaching in China colleges. The study used a qualitative research method and data was collected through an open-response questionnaire from 13 English teachers which included 10 female and 3 male teachers, and each had university teacher qualification certificates of 6 universities in China. Each teacher held rich English teaching experience, the shortest English teaching career was 3 years and the longest was 16 years. The findings were that most teachers held the view that the CLT approach made a positive impact on grammar teaching especially in enhancing communicative competence, motivating their study interest and modifying the classroom atmosphere. Though the focus on using CLT to teach English grammar was the same, the study was conducted in colleges while the current study was conducted in primary schools.

In Thailand, the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach was adopted as a teaching methodology because it helps students to develop their communicative ability and English Language Teaching (ELT), (Pitikornpuangpetch and Suwanarak, 2021). In view of this, Pitikornpuangpetch and Suwanarak (2021) conducted a study to investigate Thai EFL teachers' beliefs regarding Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and their teaching practices in General English (GE) classrooms. The participants were full-time Thai EFL teachers, consisting of seventeen teachers (15 females and 2 males) who took part in semi-structured interviews and nine teachers (7 females and 2 males) who took part in classroom observations in four public Rajabhat universities from four provinces of the lower

northeastern area of Thailand. The findings revealed that the teachers had strong beliefs that were mostly consistent with the CLT principles because of the benefits derived in terms of developing students' communicative competence but some of them did not agree with the importance of grammar teaching using CLT. The teachers applied the CLT approach in their classrooms but adopted only some CLT principles. It was found that the teachers' beliefs were inconsistent with their teaching practices. The study was conducted in universities and separated the participants for interviews and others for classroom observation. The current study was conducted in primary schools and the same participants who were interviewed were observed teaching as well.

Toro, Minuche, Tapia and Paredes (2018) conducted a study on the use of the Communicative Language Teaching Approach to improve students' Oral Skill. The purpose of the study was to determine the use of the Communicative Language Teaching approach in the English classroom and the strategies and resources used by the teachers to improve students' oral skills. The study was conducted in the public elementary schools in Loja city, Ecuador. The participants were 6 English teachers, and 105 students enrolled in the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th grades. A mixed method approach was applied in this study. To collect the data, a questionnaire was given to the English teachers and class observations were carried out. The results obtained throughout this study reveal that modeling, repetition, pair and group work are the main strategies used by teachers to help students develop communicative competences. These strategies were frequently used but still not enough to promote active participation during classes. Additionally, teachers provided different kinds of feedback such as metalinguistic feedback and elicitation as a way to help students improve their oral skills. The study was conducted in one city and cut across three grades, that is, from grade two to four. A mixed method approach was used, and data was collected through lesson observation and questionnaires. The study focused on how teachers CLT to improve the teaching of oral skills. The current study will focus on how teachers use CLT to teach English grammar to grade six pupils and data will be collected through lesson observations, interviews and focus group discussions. Therefore, it will use the qualitative methodology.

Cam (2017) conducted a study in Vietnam aimed at applied the communicative approach in grammar teaching to improve students' communicative competence and enhance their interest in grammar lessons in Vietnam. It was a mixed method approach with qualitative approach as the dominant approach which used the reflective teaching approach, and the quantitative

approach was the supplementary approach. Data was collected using the observation instrument and the questionnaire. Participants were 25 students in the 10th grade consisting of 22 females and 3 males and they were involved in the teaching programme of four trialed grammar implemented in TNH high schools in Vietnam. The findings showed that student's communicative competence and interest in the grammar lessons were significantly enhanced. Though the study is similar to the current study because its focus in grammar teaching, the current study used the qualitative approach and collected data from grade 6 primary school teachers and pupils.

According to Omondi, Barasa and Omulando (2014) the role of the teacher is to be facilitator of his students' learning. Teachers are the managers of classroom activities, and they are charged with the responsibility of establishing situations likely to promote communication. Omondi, Barasa and Omulando (2014) in their study set out to determine if the role of the teacher in a Listening and Speaking class is relevant to the tenets of CLT. The study was conducted in Lugari district in Kenya. The study was qualitative, and a descriptive research design was adopted using direct observation and interview methods for data collection. Note-taking and tape-recording were used to record class proceedings and interviews. A total of twelve secondary schools were selected using stratified and simple random sampling techniques. Fourteen teachers of English were involved. Simple frequency tables were used to highlight the data. The findings revealed that while learners were passive participants in the process of learning the listening and speaking skills, the teacher played a very active role and took a centre stage. The teacher concentrated on instructing the learner, asking questions, demonstrating, giving notes, answering questions, explaining, narrating, describing, responding and even reading extracts. The findings were that the lessons observed were teacher centred and some teachers used two different languages for discussions throughout the lesson at the expense of the recommended language of instruction, English. The study focused on teaching listening and speaking using CLT and it was qualitative although simple frequencies were used. Direct lesson observation was used but the study was conducted in secondary schools based in one district. Though the current study is also qualitative, the focus will be on grade six primary school teachers and pupils and the teaching of English grammar using CLT.

In Vietnam, the design of most textbooks developed by the Ministry of Education and Training (MOET) is based on Communicative Language Teaching. Pham and Nguyen (2014)

conducted a study on the effects of communicative Grammar teaching students' achievements of grammatical knowledge and oral production. They used the term Communicative grammar teaching to mean teaching grammar communicatively. The study was conducted using the 7th graders at Le Hong Phong Junior High School in Vietnam. Since the research was designed to examine whether an intervention of CLT application in grammar teaching towards junior high school students' achievement of grammatical knowledge and oral production would be effective as well as their positive attitudes in relation to the grammar teaching method. To conduct the study, two classes were used one; one class was taught grammar using the grammar translation method and the other class was taught grammar using communicative language teaching. For this purpose, the study followed a quasi-experimental study and collected data using questionnaire and interviews, class observations as well as focus group discussions to find out how teaching apply CLT in English grammar lessons.

Issa (2016) investigated English teachers' perceptions toward the effectiveness of using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in teaching grammar at Al Ain public schools. The study was a survey, and questionnaires was used to collect data from 20 schools by 15 questionnaires to each school. Three hundred questionnaires were distributed randomly to both male and female multilingual and multicultural English teachers. However, data was only collected from 180 English teachers, 95 females and 85 males. The results revealed that the English teachers at Al Ain public schools favoured the use of CLT in the teaching of English grammar because they believed that CLT enhanced learners' use of grammar in speaking and writing leading to the development and improvement of learners' communicative competence. However, the teachers who participated in this study felt CLT would not help learners learn grammar rules inductively. According to Rickheit, Strohner and Vorwerg (2008) an effective conversation requires a proper context with appropriate forms depending on the type of social interaction. This means that the use of CLT in a grammar lesson should enable students use correct forms in real life situations. The study is similar to the current study because the focus is on using CLT in English grammar lessons as well, but the study was survey and used questionnaires to collect data. The study used interviews and lesson observations to collect data from teachers.

Coskun (2011) conducted a qualitative study to reveal whether teachers' classroom practices overlap their attitudes towards some features of the Communicative Language Teaching. Data was collected using an observation checklist and an open-ended questionnaire. Findings were

that there was a discrepancy between the teachers' classroom practices and their attitudes towards CLT features which included pair and group work, fluency and accuracy, error correction and the role of the teacher. The discrepancy included ignoring pair work and groupwork instructions, as they allocated most of their classroom time to lecturing on grammatical structure thereby neglecting fluency. The current study focused on specifically the teaching of English grammar lesson.

In 2012, Wong and Barrea-Marlys conducted a qualitative study at a university in the United States to find out the perceptions and teaching practices of language teachers on explicit grammar in relation to CLT. The study aimed at examining the perceptions of grammar instruction of six college level teachers who spoke Spanish as L2 and at exploring how they implemented grammar instruction in their CLT classrooms. Data was collected using classroom observations and interviews from six teachers who taught Spanish but included both native and non-natives of Spanish with various levels of teaching experiences and background. Documents and record collection were also used to collect data. The findings indicated that there was a mixture of perceptions regarding the inclusion of explicit grammar instruction in a CLT classroom. It was observed that some teachers' perceptions of grammar instruction were greatly impacted by their L2 learning experiences. The findings also demonstrated that there was a link between implementations and teacher beliefs, perceptions, and prior experiences.

The study by Zimba and Tibategeza (2021) was conducted in Mzuzu, Malawi to analyse the application of the Communicative Language Teaching approach strategies used by teachers in teaching English and the challenges teachers and students face when using the strategies in the classroom. Mzuzu was selected because most of the students are multilingual and spoke Chitumbuka, Chichewa and English. The study was conducted in four government schools and the participants were 48 comprising of 40 form four students and 8 English teachers from the four secondary schools. It was a mixed method study which used both qualitative and quantitative approaches. Data was collected using questionnaires, interviews and classroom observation. The findings were that teachers used CLT approaches such as pair work, debates, group discussion, filling in gaps and dramatization in the classroom. The findings also showed that teachers had challenges such as inadequate teaching and learning resources, overcrowded classrooms and failure to assist students with disabilities. The current study is

qualitative and its focus to establish how teachers apply CLT in the teaching of English grammar in multilingual classrooms.

Mwelwa (2020) conducted a study to establish teachers' classroom teaching strategies aimed at developing communicative competence in learners during English grammar lessons in Nakonde, Zambia. The study was qualitative, and data were collected through interview guides and classroom observation guides. The participants in the study were 20 teachers of English and 4 heads of departments. The findings revealed that 14 out of the 20 teachers understood communicative competence because they were able to state its meaning, 4 had misconceptions while 2 others did not know. The findings also revealed that 12 of the 20 teachers were not familiar with the recommended teaching approaches as they failed to state them when they were asked. It was also found that teachers were using group discussions, sentence construction and oral presentations, teacher simulations, brainstorming and story telling strategies when teaching English grammar. Though the study was qualitative like the current study, the focus was on secondary school teachers and developing on communicative competence in English grammar lessons. However, the current study targeted grade 6 primary school teachers and pupils and its focus was on how teachers applied CLT in English grammar lessons.

Munakaampe (2005) conducted a study to establish the level of implementation of the communicative approach to English language teaching and possible constraints expressed by teachers in primary schools. The study focused on four areas, that is, the training that teachers had received, the presence of real-life communication and pupil response during English lessons and the creation of conducive classroom and school environments. Ninety Grade Five class teachers from selected Lusaka basic schools participated in the study. It was a mixed methods research, and data was collected through questionnaires, interviews and observations. The results indicated that regardless of the type and amount of training, teachers were not implementing the communicative approach and that they did not understand the underlying psychological processes of language learning. It was also found that 76% of the teachers did not see it as the best approach to English language teaching at Grade Five. It was further found that there were no communicative exercises in the classrooms, pupils displayed little activity during the English lessons and that the school environments were not conducive for the approach. The study by Munakaampe focused on grade five teachers at primary school in Lusaka while the current study focused on grade six

teachers and pupils in three districts of Central Province. The study employed a mixed methods approach while the current study used the qualitative design.

Chishipula (2016) conducted a study in Chongwe district to establish the factors that were hindering teachers of English to effectively implement the Communicative approach. The participants were 41 teachers of English from six public schools in Chongwe district. It was a mixed method study and data collected using the interview guide, questionnaire and the lesson observation checklist. The findings were that teachers had limited knowledge about CLT, and did not apply CLT as they taught English in their classes, and the implementation of CLT was hindered by challenges teachers experienced such as inadequate pre-service training, insufficient funding to support CLT, large classes, negative attitude of the teacher toward CLT, from-based examinations and pupils' low English proficiency to be among other factors hindering teachers from implementing CLT. The study recommended that teachers of English should be sensitized on the recommended pedagogy and constantly monitored. The current study used the qualitative approach, and the focus was on primary school teachers and the teaching of English grammar.

A study was conducted Mumba and Mwanza (2020) to establish the factors that were affecting the implementation of the Text Based approach by teachers of English. It was a qualitative study, and data was collected using face to face interviews. There were 54 participants, which comprised of five teachers, grade 11 from 9 schools and nine HODs one from each school. The findings were that teachers lacked teaching materials, poor learners' English proficiency, and lack of pupils' self-motivation to learn. The current study focused on the Communicative Language Teaching Approach and its focus was on teachers and pupils in primary schools.

2.7. Teachers' negotiation learners' multilingual identities through language practice.

Many classrooms all over the world are multilingual. As such teacher should use strategies in the classrooms which embrace all the language identities in the classroom. Studies have been conducted to find out how teachers negotiate learners' multilingual identities through language practice in the classroom.

A study was conducted by Chen (2015) to find out about the effects of practicing CLT in a mixed English conversation class. The purpose was to examine if L1 is necessary in CLT classrooms and if its use helped learners to improve their learning attitudes. The study was

action research conducted in Taiwan, whose policy recommends English only instruction from pre-school to higher education and methodological triangulation was used to collect data through observation, oral tests, questionnaires and interviews. The CLT classroom used teaching methods that involved the use of L1 and incorporated visual aids such as pictures, short videos and role playing. The results showed that learners were comfortable with the incorporations of CLT in the class and the use of the mother tongue could reduce learners' anxiety when they are not confident in the CLT classroom. Students showed more positive learning attitudes and became active learners, and their proficiency levels, personality and motivation also improved. Schweers (1999) used his Spanish students and researched teachers and students' feelings about the use of mother tongue. He concluded that a second language can be learnt by comparing with the first language. This can be connected to what Noor (1994) found out in his research that the learner's L1 is very determining of second language acquisition. The L1 is a resource of knowledge because the learner already has a language, and learners will use both positively and negatively to help them connect their first language vocabulary to the target language.

A mixed method study by Ismaili (2015) on methodological strategies that English teachers employ in order to accommodate and facilitate the needs of the students who have been raised and educated in multilingual settings reported that balanced and careful use of L1 in the English classes seem not to affect the students' exposure to the target language. The study was carried out in Southeast European University and was conducted in Basic English Skills classes. The participants were 60 SEEU undergraduate students, male and female between the ages of 18-25. The students were from different ethnic groups namely Macedonian, Albanian, Turks and Roma. The study also included Two Albanian and two Macedonian speaking English teachers and were non-native speakers of English. It was a mixed method research and data was collected from students using a questionnaire and from teachers through classroom observations. They were observed and notes were taken on how much L1 the teachers used during their English classes. The findings were that both students and teachers had a positive attitude towards the use of L1 in the teaching and learning process to explain difficult concepts, check comprehension and elicit words in English. The study was conducted in a university, and it used a mixed method approach and used specific ethnic groups in an English classroom. The current study was qualitative and was conducted in primary school classrooms.

An exploratory study was conducted by Mohammed (2020) to find out how translation helped teaching using Communicative Language Teaching in Saudi Arabia in a department of English at a university. The participants were 20 professors and lecturers who had used Grammar Translation before in their schooling. It was a qualitative study, and data was collected using semi-structured interviews. The findings were that using translation was also logical for the Communicative Language Teaching and it helped to develop the communicative abilities of the learners in Saudi Arabia. However, the study concluded that under CLT, translation should be done judiciously. The study considered translation and if it was appropriate for use under CLT in a university. The current study tried to find out how teachers negotiated the different multilingual identities in the classroom.

The study by Castillejo, Calizo and Maguddayao (2018) aimed to determine the influence of codeswitching on students' performance in English, in the Philippines. It was a mixed method study which used both the qualitative and quantitative research designs. Data was collected using a questionnaire. The participants of the study were 40 grade 10 students. The results were that the students mostly used code switching in the English class and there was a relationship between how often students codeswitched and their levels of English attainment. The current study tried to establish how teachers negotiated different language practice multilingual classrooms.

Wedin (2020) aimed at analysing classroom practices that created spaces for students' identity negotiation, that result from conscious work to develop multilingual policies at the local school level. The research project was conducted in Meadow School, a Swedish Primary School including grades 1-6. The participants were 2 Swedish teachers, and grade 4 and 5 students, in Meadow School were most of the students actively used languages other than Swedish. The research followed a longitudinal, ethnographic approach and was an Action Research project carried out in close collaboration between the researcher and the teachers. The findings were that the teachers were able to support students' language diversity through the inclusion of diverse language resources. Similar to the current study, the project aimed at finding out how teachers negotiated the different multilingual identities of the students in the classroom. However, the difference with the current study is that the focus of the action research was on two teachers and two grades that is 4 and 5 while the current study focused on grade 6 pupils and their teachers.

The article by Omidire and Ayob (2020) reported on the outcome of utilising a multilingual strategy that promoted translanguaging to support primary grade learners and the enablers and constraints of the implementation of such strategies in a classroom. The study sought to gain a comprehensive understanding of how teachers managed translanguaging in their classrooms and how learners in multilingual classrooms learnt by using L1 to facilitate the learning process. The participants were from two selected schools located in Gauteng, South Africa. The schools were selected because of being multilingual, accessible with most learners' first language being IsiZulu and Sepedi, and English as the language of instruction. Grade 5 and 6 classes selected from each school and pupils from two classes per grade were the participants. Therefore, a total of three teachers and 162 learners participated. Learners from both schools came from communities with high levels of poverty and unemployment. Some learners came from neighbouring African countries and these learners, and some teachers had a different L1. The study was qualitative and semi-structured interviews, classroom observations, teachers' observation, feed back sheet and story boards were used as data collection methods. The findings were that the enablers of translanguaging included a nonthreatening and safe environment. And others included teachers' positive attitude, the accessibility of the translated materials and the learners' sense of pride due to acknowledgement and use of their home languages during lessons which created an enabling environment for using multilingual strategies. The constraints included inadequate resources, limited lesson time, complexity of some of the home languages, limited experience of the teachers using a multilingual approach and existing socio-economic factors. The study used two grades, 5 and 6 and two schools to carry out the research and the selection of the participants was based on certain factors. The current study used only grade 6 teachers and pupils.

Bibi et al (2023) conducted a mixed method study aimed at finding out the functions of codeswitching and translanguaging in EFL multilingual classrooms different educational institutions in Quetta, Balochistan. The participants were 247 undergraduate EFL students from different courses from public universities and colleges. Questionnaires and the interview guide were used to collect data. The findings of the study were that learners showed positive attitudes towards the use of codeswitching and translanguaging as it contributed to effective learning because they were able to understand the lessons, maintain communicative and concentration. The study was conducted in colleges and universities to find out how students felt about translanguaging and codeswitching, and using a mixed method design collected

data using a questionnaire and interview guide. The current study however aimed to find out how teachers negotiated multilingual identities in their grade 6 primary classrooms.

Becker's (2024) qualitative study investigated the relationship among identity, language and culture of teachers at a Greek school in Switzerland. The study explored how teachers perceive and negotiate their multilingual identities in the Heritage Language (HL) classroom and how their perceptions and identities impact students' multilingual identity construction and Heritage language. The study used the phenomenological research design with focus on teachers' identity negotiations, perceptions, and lived experiences. Data was collected through in-depth semi-structured interviews conducted in English or German, virtually on MS Teams, Zoom, Skype and over the phone. The participants were six in-service HL teachers comprising of 1 male and 5 females who were Greek nationals, had lived in Switzerland for several years, and had Greek as their first language with advanced knowledge of (at least) English and German. The study found that most teachers did not identify as multilingual despite their competences and daily social practices in multiple languages, but rather base their identifications on their first language, Greek. It also demonstrated that teachers' understanding of their role, responsibility, and position within the HL teaching context, their own migration experiences, and ideologies regarding heritage and local languages and cultures influence their teaching practices and students' construction of their multilingual identity. The study focused on the teachers and how they negotiated their own multilingual identity in classrooms with Heritage Language. The current study however focused on how teachers negotiate the different multilingual identities of the learners in their classrooms.

Kenya has over 40 spoken languages and English is the language of instruction for all subjects except for Kiswahili which is a national language and is taught alongside English (Dhillon and Wanjiru, 2013). Most pupils in Kenya begin school as bilinguals, speaking their mother tongue and Kiswahili (Muthwii, 2004). The study by Dhillon and Wanjiru (2013) was conducted in urban multilingual primary school in Kenya to find out the challenges and strategies for teaching and learning English as a second language. The school was chosen because it had ten different spoken languages by staff, pupils and teachers. It was a mixed method approach and data was collected using questionnaires and semi-structured interviews from 20 teachers and from 10 grade 6 learners' diaries. The findings revealed that teachers had challenges for teaching English as a second language because of the adoption of English

as a language of instruction in schools, interference from regional linguistic heritage languages and an examination-oriented education system. However, to overcome the challenges teachers used different instructional approaches such as total physical response, teaching writing skills, giving English language homework and learners had individual and as well as group ways of teaching themselves. The similar of the study with the current study is that grade six pupils and teachers were the participants although the study used a mixed method while the current study used a qualitative approach.

Schools in Zimbabwe have classrooms with learners who are ethnically and lingual, divergent with varied learning capabilities (Frederickson & Cline, 2015). The study conducted by Nyamayedenga (2022) sought to investigate on implementation of CLT using multilingualism as a classroom resource in the teaching of English as a second language at primary school in Zimbabwe. The study was qualitative and used the interpretivists' constructive view. A single case study design was used to establish how primary schools were implementing CLT using multilingualism in a classroom. Three teachers who taught grades 1 and 2 were purposefully selected from one school in Warren Park Zimbabwe because their learners spoke Shona, Ndebele and any other language as mother tongue and therefore each teacher had 120 learners with different first languages and had different linguistic and social backgrounds. Data was collected through observations, interviews and documents. The study revealed that there was multilingualism present in all the classes as teachers used multilingualism to teach English through codeswitching in the learners' indigenous languages because it assisted learners to interact among themselves thereby implementing CLT. The study is similar to the current study because both targeted primary school teachers and how CLT is implemented in multilingual classroom. However, the study targeted grade 1 and 2 teachers while the current study targeted grade 6 teachers.

The paper by Nalunga (2013) aimed at finding out if code-switching is an asset or a problem in a multilingual classroom. The purpose of the study was to find out what impact code-switching into mother tongue has on the development of the second language and what learning or teaching situations lead to the act of code-switching. The study used mixed method approach. Data was collected through classroom observation, interviews and a questionnaire. The results from the present study show that code-switching is a natural phenomenon in second language (L2) development and that code-switching has a positive impact on L2 development as it fulfils a significant number of functions in the classroom,

including vocabulary and concept development, need for clarification and emphasis, provides a learning strategy for L2 acquisition, and generally helps students maintain and develop their second language. It was also found that teachers preferred code switching into the school's language of instruction and while students preferred code switching into their first language. However, both students and teachers agreed that codeswitching regardless of which language is involved is essential in the developing of the second language. The current study will be on how teachers negotiate multilingual identities in the classroom while the study by Nalunga (2013) focused on the use of codeswitching in a multilingual classroom. It was a mixed method while the current study was qualitative.

Bwalya (2019) conducted a study on the democratisation of the classroom: an analysis of teachers' language practices in selected multilingual classrooms of Chibombo district. The aim of the study was to analyse teachers' language practices in the grade 6 multilingual classrooms of Chibombo District and to determine whether these language practices were democratic or not. The study was a mixed methods approach. Cluster random, simple random and purposive sampling techniques were used to come up with 260 respondents of which 60 were grade 6 teachers and 200 were grade 6 pupils. Data were collected using questionnaires, interviews and classroom observations of lessons. The findings of the study showed that the grade 6 classrooms of Chibombo District were multilingual as teachers and learners were able to speak more than one language. The findings also showed that while some teachers democratised their classrooms through the adoption of translanguaging as a pedagogical language practice, others insisted on monolingual language practices which resulted in symbolic violence. The study further revealed that teachers had communication challenges when using English to teach learners from different linguistic background. The study is similar to the current study because it focused on grade 6 pupils and teachers, but it was conducted in one district and used mixed method approach while the current study was conducted in three districts and used qualitative approach.

Sampa (2019) conducted a case study to find out teachers' experiences in teaching multilingual classes in selected primary schools of Lusaka district of Zambia. The purpose of the study was to find out the beliefs and experiences of teachers in teaching multilingual classes. It was a qualitative study, and an interview guide was used to collect data. The participants were 30 of which 17 were in-service teachers that were teaching grade one to four with varying teaching experiences from 3 to 24 years. The findings were that the use of

Nyanja as a medium of instruction in a multilingual classroom was a challenge because of linguistic diversity in the classroom. Most of the teachers experienced difficulties in teaching multilingual classrooms because they had communication barrier with some pupils. However, to overcome the challenge, teachers used code switching, groupwork, pair work, teaching letter sound relationship and giving homework. The research was conducted within the same district and involved grade one to four teachers. The current study was conducted in three districts and involved grade 6 teachers and pupils only.

Simachenya and Mambwe (2023) conducted a study to interrogate the language practices against the legislative prescription of language(s) to be used in the formal classroom situations in Zambia. The study was conducted in Livingstone urban, and the participants were forty, that is twenty teachers of which ten were from lower primary and ten were from upper primary, and twelve were female while eight were male and twenty pupils of which ten were girls and ten were boys. The participants were drawn from two schools. Data was collected using semi-structured interviews and lesson observations. The findings revealed that most pupils preferred to use Nyanja to seek clarity during teaching and learning and to converse with friends. Some pupils preferred to use English. However, the Zoned languages, that is Tonga and Lozi were mainly used by pupils to converse with those close to them. It was also revealed that most teachers used Nyanja and Tonga for linguistic inclusive and to cover their inadequacy in communicating in Tonga but when it came to explanations and description of concepts, some teachers used Nyanja, English and then Tonga to facilitate teaching. The study was conducted in one district and only two schools were involved. However, the current study was conducted in three districts and focused on grade 6 primary school teachers and pupils.

The study conducted by Mkandawire et al. (2023) sought to establish the instructional strategies multilingual teachers used to help non- speakers of the language of instruction learn initial reading (decoding) skills in diverse classes of Zambia. The participants were twenty-three in-service teachers who were teaching grade one classes in 2018 to 2019 from five multilingual classes selected from five different schools and zones of Lusaka. The study was qualitative in nature, data was collected using lesson observation conducted in five multilingual classes from five different schools, observed two to four times, interviews with 23 in-service Grade One teachers, with Nine (9) of the teachers who also had their literacy lessons observed, and fourteen (14) teachers that taught first grade within the last two years.

The findings revealed that teachers in multilingual classes used multiple pedagogical strategies to help non-speakers of the language of instruction learn reading skills such as translanguaging, bilingual materials, remediation and reading interventions strategies, and parents, multilingual teachers, and bilingual learners as multilingual resources to teach literacy among early graders.

Mungala and Mwanza (2024) conducted a qualitative study to analyse translanguaging practices lecturers at a university in Zambia used. The participants were 25 comprising of 20 students and 5 lecturers teaching literacy and language education. Data was collected using the interview guide and the classroom observation guide. The findings were that lecturers used code switching, and translation between English and Zambian languages, giving examples using local languages, code mixing when explaining concepts in the lecture rooms and allowing students to use their local languages when answering or explaining concepts and content during lessons. The study was conducted in one university among lecturers and students while the current study was conducted in primary schools among grade six teachers and pupils. The same instruments were used in both cases though the focus was different the current study was trying to establish how teachers negotiated different multilingual identities through language practice in the classroom while teaching English grammar while the study by Mungala and Mwanza was trying to analyse translanguaging practices used by university lecturers while teaching Literacy and Language Education.

Samalesu and Mwiinga (2024) conducted a study in Kalumbila District of Zambia to establish the strategies used by teachers to teach English as a second language in multilingual classrooms. The study used a phenomenological descriptive design with a sample size of five primary schools and the participants were 18 teachers. The data were collected through interviews and lesson observations. The findings were that the strategies teachers used in the teaching of English as a second language in multilingual classes were code switching, group work, question and answer, role play, look and say, individual work, and translation. The current study investigated how teachers negotiated multilingual identities in through language practice among grade six primary school learners.

Nyimbili and Mwanza (2021) conducted a study on the challenges faced by grade one teachers and learners in multilingual Literacy classrooms in Zambia. It was a qualitative study and data was collected through in-depth interviews with teachers. The participants were 42 comprising of one grade, one teacher and 41 pupils. The findings of the study were that

there was a mismatch between the language of instruction and the dominant familiar language of the learners, inadequate teaching and learning materials. The current study focused on how grade six teachers negotiate the different multilingual identities in their classroom through language practice.

A study conducted by Mulesu and Mwanza (2024) to analyse the language practices of grade ones upon entry into primary school in Chongwe District. It was a qualitative study, and data was collected through interviews and lesson observations. The participants were 270 comprising of 250 learners and 20 teachers. The findings were that teachers and learners were multilingual, and the common languages were chi Nyanja, Soli, Bemba and English and translanguaging was mainly used to engender epistemic access. Translanguaging was used because many pupils entered school with inadequate proficiency in the regional language and therefore it was meant to link the home and school language. The study was conducted in Chongwe and focused on grade one teachers and pupils' language practices.

2.8. Challenges faced by teachers when teaching English grammar using the CLT in multilingual classrooms.

Since its adoption as a teaching methodology in many countries globally, Communicative Language Approach has a lot of challenges linked to its use in the teaching and learning process. There are several studies conducted to ascertain challenges teachers experience when implementing Communicative Language Teaching in their classrooms.

A study was conducted by Alexio (2003) to investigate the use of CLT in high schools and language institutes in Southern Brazil, the largest Latin American country with Portuguese as one of the languages spoken. The study employed a qualitative research design because the main research question focused on the perceptions of teachers which meant that the research relied mainly on the personal experiences of teachers. The research instruments used to collect data consisted of questionnaires, class observations checklists, and interview guides. The results showed that there were two main problems with CLT use in Brazil. It was found that there were some constraints that existed in the different settings in which teaching occurred. The constraints included the school hours, overcrowded classrooms, teachers' poor oral proficiency level of English and lack of teaching materials. Another constraint related to teachers' awareness of CLT principles, and the lack of training in how to appropriately implement such principles and methodology in the classroom. It was found that the teachers

failed to understand what was required of them as they used CLT in their classrooms. Although many teachers tried to use CLT in their classrooms, they still did not know how to effectively apply it (Dos Santos, 2016a). This study focused on high schools and language institutes in Brazil and employed a questionnaire as well. Although the current study sought to establish teachers' understanding of CLT as well, its focus was on the primary school teachers specifically those who teach grade six. The data was collected using observations, interviews and focus group discussions.

The qualitative study by Coskun (2011) aimed at revealing if teachers' classroom practices overlapped their attitudes. The study was conducted in Turkey. The data was collected using an observation checklist and an open-ended questionnaire. Two male English teachers, one with 2 years working experience as an English teacher and another one with 18 years were observed to analyse their attitudes towards CLT, and if they reflected in their classroom practices. The challenges revealed by both teachers were large class size, traditional grammar-based examinations and the little time to prepare communicative materials and communicative activities. Chani (2011) also explored factors that promote or hinder EFL teachers' implementation of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in Taiwanese college English classes. The participants in this study were eight teachers from two universities in southern Taiwan that integrate CLT into the English curriculum and semi-structured interviews were used to investigate the participants' perceptions and experiences. The findings revealed that teacher training was one of the most important factors influencing the practice of CLT. Most teachers did not receive adequate training in CLT. Other factors revealed were the students' resistance to use English and low-English proficiency by the teachers weakened the teachers' efforts to use CLT. Other challenges which affected the effect implementation of CLT were exam-oriented teaching, limited teaching hours, and large classes. The studies by Coskun and Chani were conducted at universities while the current study was conducted in primary schools.

Ansarey (2012) examined Communicative Language Teaching in English as a Foreign Language Contexts with particular focus to teachers attitudes and perception in Bangladesh. A mixed method research design was used for the study and the participants for this study were 30 teachers of English teaching at primary and secondary levels. These participants were asked to complete the questionnaire, and five teachers were asked to participate in the succeeding interview. It was found out that some teachers had challenges to teach using

Communicative Language Teaching because of their deficiency in spoken English and the other challenge was that they had inadequate training on how to teach using Communicative Language Teaching. Other challenges included the class size, and lack of funding and resources. The size of the classes hindered effective implementation of CLT because teachers failed to observe students' errors in interactions and give feedback because of the number of students in the classroom (Zhao, 2022). The study had participants from both primary and secondary school while the current study had participants only from primary school. The current study collected data from lesson observation while Ansarey's study used questionnaires and interviews only.

Omondi, Barasa and Omulando (2014) conducted a study to investigate the challenges faced by teachers when implementing CLT in teaching listening and speaking in Kenya. It was a qualitative study and data was collected using observation checklist, tape recording, and interview guides. The study was carried out in twelve secondary schools in which fourteen lessons of English were observed and recorded and fourteen teachers interviewed. The findings revealed that teachers faced a lot of challenges when teaching using CLT which included lack of time to involve all learners in communicative activities, pronunciation problems faced by some learners due to mother tongue influence, inadequate and lack of teaching and learning resources, the nature of the students which caused indiscipline and lagging, and language problem and teachers' inadequate expose to CLT. On challenges that English teachers faced when implementing CLT in teaching grammar at Al Ain public schools, Issa (2016) also found revealed some challenges teachers had when implementing CLT in teaching English grammar such as students' low English proficiency, especially in grammar, large classes, heavy teaching workload as the common challenges but other challenges reviewed were resistance to class participation by some students, insufficient communicative grammar exercises included in the textbooks, time spent to prepare communicative activities, difficulty in assessing grammar communicatively, lack of appropriate teaching materials and resources, curriculum change and lack of experience due to inadequate training.

Asmari and Radman (2015) conducted a study to investigate the challenges hindering a proper implementation of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in EFL university context in Saudi Arabia. A quantitative method employing questionnaires was adapted to gather data from 100 English language teachers from Taif University English Language

Centre of which 50 were male and 50 were female. The questionnaire consisted of four parts: Teacher-related difficulties and challenges, student-related difficulties and challenges, difficulties and challenges related to educational system, and CLT-related difficulties and challenges. The findings were that teachers had misconceptions about teaching using CLT like no focus on grammar but only on speaking. The teachers also reported that they had no access to CLT materials, and not being able to prepare CLT activities for their students because of the lengthy syllabus, limited time, and lack of CLT training. Student related challenges included the passive style of learning, less confident and less prepared, lack of motivation for developing communicative competence, low-level English proficiency, and resistance to participate in communicative activities. Other challenges were policy related such as large classes, lack of teaching and learning materials, and no compatibility between the syllabus and the education system. CLT as a teaching methodology was reported to lack effective and efficient materials to assess communicative competence and that it does not consider differences between EFL and ESL teaching contexts. The study was quantitative while the current study was qualitative.

A qualitative study by Rasheed, Zeeshan, and Zaidi, (2017) aimed to explore the challenges faced by the secondary school female teachers while teaching English language in their multilingual classrooms in Pakistan. The participants were 10 government secondary school female teachers. The data was collected through a semi-structured interview protocol and classroom observation checklist. The findings of the study were that teaching English language in a multilingual context is an enormous challenge for the English teachers due to linguistic diversity in the classrooms. The students in the multilingual classrooms lacked confidence to use English language because they hesitated to commit mistakes. The curriculum was inappropriate for helping students to improve their English proficiency. In the multilingual classrooms hence the use of code-switching by the teachers to instruct the students. The focus on multilingual classroom is similar to the current study though the current study focused on primary schools and teaching of English grammar using the CLT methodology.

The study by Barira, Shabana and Sadia (2019) explored various hinderances which affect the effective implementation of CLT by English language teachers in their classes in public sector colleges of Hyderabad, Pakistan. The study was qualitative and used semi-structured interviews to collect data from eight male and female English language teachers selected

from different colleges. Almost all the participants said they had challenges implementing CLT because they had not received any training in CLT. Other challenges revealed were large classes which hindered the successful implementation of CLT, lack of resources such as speakers, laptops, textbooks and multimedia, and shortage of time to apply CLT. The study was conducted in colleges of education while the current study was conducted in primary schools. Though both of them were qualitative in nature, the current study observed teachers teaching apart from interviewing them.

The study by Liu and Deris (2023) conducted in China aimed to explore the effectiveness of Communicative Language Teaching in English grammar teaching in three public secondary schools. It was a qualitative study which used semi-structured interviews to collect data from teachers. The findings revealed that the CLT methodology did not achieve the expected educational results. Teachers' past learning experiences, the uneven distribution of teaching faculty and disparities in students' English proficiency, the only unified textbook, students' preference for grammar knowledge than communication, the lack of a systematic set of standard speaking tests and rating criteria, and the EFL English learning environment were the causes. Although the current study focused on using CLT in English grammar lessons as well, the focus was on teachers and pupils in primary schools and lesson observation was also utilised to collect data.

Nam (2023) aimed to investigate the external challenges that were beyond the teachers' power and internal challenges in the implementation of CLT. The study was meant to analyse both teacher and non-teacher related factors said to affect the implementation of CLT. The participants were 95 in-service English teachers who participated in the study and they 27 Koreans, 20 North Americans, 42 Chinese, and 6 Uzbeks who had been teaching at primary schools, secondary schools, and colleges/universities in EFL contexts for between 1 year and 30 years. A questionnaire was used to collect data from teachers who were within Korea and for those who were outside Korea an online survey was conducted to investigate the relation between the alleged problems and their influence on CLT. Non – teacher related external factors such as policy, class size, classroom layout, learners' English proficiency, and learners' motivation were found not to be challenges in the implementation of CLT. However, among the teacher related internal factors such as teachers' oral and written proficiency, training in instructional methodology, teacher's motivation to teach, years in service and teachers' competence, only teachers' competence was found to be a challenge to the

implementation of CLT. The study was conducted in four different countries while the current study was conducted within Zambia and only in primary schools.

Abongdia and Foncha (2015) carried out a study to analyze the challenges faced by pre-service English teachers, teaching English in East London, South Africa. The participants of the study were 8 pre-service English teachers. The study was qualitative, and it focused on the problems faced by the student teachers while teaching English language. The study emphasized on learners' discipline, resources, classroom management, supervision and observations. The results of the study suggested that teaching practice prepares the student teachers for their classes and that placing the student teachers at the end of the year at schools is not a good proposal because it is a critical time for both the students and teachers. The study focused on pre-service teachers' challenges while teaching English language, but the current study will focus on in-service teachers and specifically on the teaching of English grammar using CLT in multilingual classrooms.

Studies have been conducted in Zambia as well to find out challenges affecting teachers on the use of CLT in English grammar lessons. Chishipula (2016) conducted a study on factors hindering teachers of English language from implementing Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach. The study explored the implementation of CLT in Public Secondary Schools of Chongwe District. The purpose of the study was to establish why teachers of English Language were not implementing CLT. Mixed method approach was used, and data was collected using the questionnaire, interview guide and observation guide. The study showed that the text-based course books used in the schools under study to teach English Language were pedagogical in nature and no authentic materials were used in all the lessons observed. Other factors such as inadequate pre-service training, insufficient funding to support CLT, large classes, negative attitude of the teacher toward CLT, from-based examinations and pupils' low English proficiency were among factors hindering teachers from implementing CLT. The study used mixed methods, and it was conducted at a secondary school within the same district while current study focused on the teaching of English language in primary schools, and it is a qualitative study.

2.9. Summary of the chapter

This chapter has provided some literature on the studies based on the teachers' application of the communicative methodology in the teaching of English grammar in multilingual classroom. Communicative language teaching, communicative competence, multilingualism, grammar was defined and explained. Literature was reviewed according to the objectives of the study. A lot of studies have been conducted on the use of the Communicative Language Teaching methodology in teaching English as a second language and English as a foreign language. Other studies have looked at challenges on the implementation of CLT and the application of CLT in English grammar lessons with particular focus on secondary schools and universities. The studies reviewed showed that there were gaps in terms of methods, study sites, data collection instruments, participants and the focus. However, the major knowledge gap with the current study is that no study has been conducted on the teaching of English grammar using CLT in multilingual classroom with particular focus on grade 6 primary school teachers and pupils.

CHAPTER THREE

THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

3.0. Overview

The previous chapter presented review of related literature. This chapter presents the theoretical framework. The study was guided by two theories which helped to analyse the study, that is the Expertise Theory and the Translanguaging theory. The theories helped the researcher to unfold how the expert performance of the teachers in the classrooms can help to meet the diverse linguistic practices of the learners to create conducive multilingual learning environments in primary schools. The two theories were used to link the classroom practices of teaching English grammar in a multilingual classroom using CLT as the recommended teaching methodology in primary schools,

3.1. The Expertise Theory

The Expertise theory was developed by Anders Ericsson, a Professor at Florida State University, in the United States of America. He is the leading figure in the expertise theory although many others like Richard Clark, Benjamin Bloom, Malcolm Gladwell among others are associated with it as well. His interest was studying how an expert can be developed. He established that the development of a career depends on acquisition of skills and knowledge of a particular field through training and constant practice. He added that an exposure to a standardised and quality curriculum, training and guidance by a qualified person helps one to become an expert (Ericsson, 1996; Ericsson & Smith, 1991). This entails that the trainer or coach should have the appropriate skills to transfer to the trainee so that he or she would become an expert in a specific field. Johnson (2010) described an expert as ‘someone who is particularly skilled in a specific area’.

According to Ericsson (1996), for someone to develop expertise, there is need to be engaged in cognitive activities which require one to think about what they are doing and why they are doing it. This means that if one is engaged in an activity, he or she should gain something out of the activity. It means that a person will gain a skill in a particular activity he or she is involved in. According to Johnson (2010), the study of expertise ‘looks at what characteristics experts possess, what procedures they follow and how they differ from non-experts’. To become an expert performer, Ericsson and Harvell (2019), introduced the term

‘deliberate practice’ which was first used in music to show how one attained expertise but later it was used in other domains. In the domain of teaching, they described deliberate practice as activities that expert teachers ‘might engage in to keep improving their teaching performance throughout their career’ (p4). In relation to this study, it means that apart from the initial training teaching attained, teachers need to engage in other activities for them to perfect their skills. They need to keep on learning about pedagogy for them to be effective in their teaching. However, despite the introduction of deliberate practice in the need to attain expertise, other types of practices were added.

3.1.1. Types of Practices

The types of practice activities proposed by Ericsson and Pool (2016) and Huttermann et al (2014) include the following.

3.1.1.1. Deliberate Practice

This is the type of practice activity designed by a teacher for a pupil and the pupil practices with an intention of improving a skill and receives immediate feedback and correction.

3.1.1.2. Purposeful Practice

This is the type of practice activity in which an individual engages in solitary practice to improve some aspects of their performance without regular guidance or evaluation from the teacher or the coach.

3.1.1.3. Structured Practice

This is the type of practice activity which is conducted to train a large group of students but guided by the teacher. The students are engaged in group activities, but individual level of skill attainment is not taken into consideration and there is less feedback which results in challenges for some and benefits for others.

3.1.1.4. Novice Practice

This is the type of practice activity which is performed for a goal and not developing a skill as it is mainly related to job on training and therefore does not lead to expert performance.

Deliberate practice, purposeful practice and structured practice all help an individual to become an expert especially if they are used together but novice practice does not help one to become an expert in a particular area. Because for one to become an expert, there is need to develop and master all the necessary skills and knowledge in the domain as well as interact with others to gain more knowledge and skills, and receive feedback (Ericsson and Charness, 1994). The types of practices discussed above show that teacher educators, teachers and learners all need practice to perfect their skills in terms of teaching and learning..

According to the Expertise theory, practice is needed to achieve the highest level in a domain, and this can only be possible if one works with skilled personnel and observes to learn more if mistakes are committed. It means that while a teacher is undergoing training, the teacher educators should work with them constantly and closely so that the necessary skills are imparted in them. Richards and Farrell (2005) suggested that an individual should strive to develop and be an expert in their profession through self-monitoring, teaching journals, teaching portfolios, analysing critical incidents, case analysis and action research and with others through workshops, support groups, peer observation and coaching, and team teaching. An individual should have the desire to learn more from skilled personnel. Involvement in professional development activities grow an expert because learning is continuous and therefore one must be fully engaged in their career path to enhance their skills. Ericsson, Krampe, and Tesch-Romer (1993:365) added that ‘the domain-specific nature of experts’ superior performance implies that acquired knowledge and skill are important to the attainment of expert performance’.

However, Tsui (2003) pointed out that for expertise to be maintained in an individual, the individual needs to interact with the context in which they operate. This means that an individual needs to be constantly interacting with the knowledge in the specific domain and practice to gain skills relevant to develop expertise. Although some expertise studies recommend experience as a condition for expertise, Tsui (2003) argues that it is not a necessary condition but that a person needs to work beyond competence to develop expertise because it is a process and not a state. Therefore, processes that support improvement from experience to competence enroute to expertise should be accounted for (Ericsson and Smith, 1991).

Tsui (2003) pointed out that;

the development of expertise is characterized by constant engagement in experimentation and exploration, in problematizing the unproblematic and in responding to and looking for challenges, thereby engaging in the kind of learning that extends one's competence. The development of expertise requires engagement with domain-related activities which are situated in teachers' specific contexts of work for an extended period. Such engagements need to be supported by reflection, conscious deliberation and theorization.

To be an expert, learning should continue even if one meets challenges. Trying to overcome challenges enhances one's skills leading to becoming an expert.

3.1.2. Expertise in teaching

The Expertise theory can be applied in education particularly in teaching as teachers are supposed to be experts in this area. Teachers are surrounded by learners, policy makers and the curriculum and therefore for them to become experts they need to take all the necessary factors into consideration. To become experts means to improve their teaching pedagogy and teaching strategies. This means that they should have the knowledge, skills and judgement required in the classroom to interpret the curriculum, use appropriate methodology and strategies in the classroom for teaching and learning to take place (Stigler and Miller, 2018).

3.1.2.1. Knowledge

To teach effectively, teachers should have knowledge and Shulman (1987:8) categorised the types of knowledge teachers should possess which include:

- content knowledge.
- general pedagogical knowledge, with special reference to those broad principles and strategies of classroom management and organization that appear to transcend subject matter.
- curriculum knowledge, with grasp of the materials and programs that serve as “tools of the trade” for teachers.

- pedagogical content knowledge, that special amalgam of content and pedagogy that is uniquely the province of teachers, their own special form of professional understanding.
- knowledge of learners and their characteristics.
- knowledge of educational contexts, ranging from the workings of the group or classroom, the governance and financing of school districts, to the character of communities and cultures.
- knowledge of educational ends, purposes, and values, and their philosophical and historical grounds.

However, Shulman (1987) pointed out that one of the most important types of knowledge to have is the pedagogical content knowledge because it is a combination of both content and knowledge and helps the teacher to understand, ‘how particular topics, problems or issues are organised, represented and adapted to the diverse interests and abilities of learners and presented for instruction’ (p8). The pedagogical content knowledge is key to every teacher and should therefore be developed for a teacher to become an expert in the of teaching field and in a particular subject as well. Apart from the pedagogical content knowledge, teachers should also have the curriculum knowledge and knowledge of the learners they teach so that they can formulate outcomes in relative to the levels of attainment of the learners they teach.

3.1.2.2. Skill

Although knowledge is an important aspect of teachers, they also need to have skills in teaching. Skills implementation helps to create a conducive environment in the classroom which would enhance teaching as well as learning. ‘It’s not enough to just know what to do, but you also need to be able to do it well in a variety of situations’ (Stigler & Miller,2018).

3.1.2.3. Judgement

Apart from having the knowledge and skills, the teacher should be able to decide which strategies would work in the classroom to achieve the objectives. An expert teacher must make decisions on when and how they apply the knowledge and skills through reading situations as they are presented in the classroom and then use strategies and routines that can help achieve the intended goals (Stigler & Miller, 2018).

An expert teacher should be knowledgeable and apply the necessary skills in appropriate contexts and situations. He or she should be read the classroom environment to modify their teaching according to the challenges presented by the learners in the classroom. The other important point to note is that teachers should be able to manage the relationship between the content and the learners in such a way that the teachers must relate to the learners to make it easy for them interact with the content. Chi, Glaser and Farr (1988) pointed out that an expert is an expert because he or she has more knowledge about and skills within a specific domain but investing time, practice and commitment helps to enhance expertise.

Figure 3.1: A model of expertise in teaching



Adapted from Stigler and Miller (2018)

The figure above shows the model of expertise in teaching and what is required for one to become an expert teacher. An expert teacher should know why they want to teach what they want to teach. To teach what they want to teach, they should know how they will teach what they want to teach and how they intend to help learners grasp the content of the lesson. During the teaching and learning process, the teacher should monitor the progress of the learners to assist them or modify teaching to help them attain the required level of comprehension.

In this study, the Expertise theory was used to frame the study on how teachers apply the CLT in the teaching of English grammar in multilingual classes. Practicing teachers in primary schools are expected to be experts in the way they teach English grammar using the specified methodology in the Zambian English syllabus which is the Communicative methodology.

Tsui's (2003) study of expertise in teaching characterizes teacher knowledge as highly personal, grounded in personal experiences and reflection that 'cannot be separated into distinct knowledge domains' (p.65). In the first-place teacher knowledge begins to be developed as one undergoes training to become a teacher. Teaching expertise is both the 'management of learning and the enactment of the curriculum' and is constituted differently in different contexts so that expertise involves coming to new understandings of experience (p.66). This entails that as much as one is an expert in a particular field, learning continues leading to growth in expertise. In this view of teaching expertise, teachers are expected to develop their profession continuously to improve their teaching experience and handle different situations they find themselves in as they teach in class. In case of this study, a teacher may be faced with a multilingual classroom and being an expert demands the teacher to cognitively negotiate teaching and learning in such situations so that all the learners are brought on board. An expert teacher is expected to use strategies that would help negotiate teaching and learning to guide all learners appropriately. Ericsson (1996) claims that deliberate practice is the primary mechanism responsible for expert performance. In this view of expertise, it is important that learners are attended to by a person who can provide and document adequately a complete learning support service to help them gain expertise in concepts exposed to them. Expertise requires someone to uphold the lead down curriculum but find ways of working through the content for everyone to gain. Experts are required to be open and accommodate divergent views of learners and respond to them according to situations so that they don't lose confidence. However, teachers who believe passionately in a particular methodology, or in aspects of their own character or teaching style, may find this kind of approach difficult (Farmer et al. 2006). This means that flexibility is required in the field of expertise, that is why learning and accommodating other people's views should be considered.

In CLT one of the roles of the learners is to choose appropriate forms to negotiate meaning of the required structure and apply it in correct situations. This can only be achieved when the teacher as a facilitator is open to divergent views of learners and allows learners to express themselves. The expertise theory will therefore help to unfold how learners can acquire and refine skills necessary for practicing the tasks given, their rate of acquisition and retention of learning experiences. An expert teacher will therefore notice individual differences in learners and apply expertise for each level. The role of the teacher is to observe the performance of the learners and advise on areas of improvement and then use activities which will help the

learner improve through interaction. In this study therefore, an expert teacher is expected to come up with strategies to teach English grammar in a multilingual classroom using the Communicative Language Teaching approach. A multilingual classroom is made up of pupils with different multilingual identities and the teacher is expected to use his or her expertise to teach English grammar using CLT to all learners in the classroom.

3.2. Translanguaging Theory

The Translanguaging theory also guided this study. The term translanguaging was developed by the Welsh educationalist Cen Williams (1994). It was originally coined as a Welsh word (*trawsieithu*) in reference to a pedagogical practice which deliberately switched the language mode of input and output in multilingual classrooms (Lewis et al., 2012). The initial research of translanguaging was conducted in a Welsh classroom to find out if one language would be used to reinforce another one so that participation in the classroom as well as understanding of the content could be enhanced. The languages involved were Welsh and English and students were allowed to alternate them during lessons so that they could understand the two languages thereby building their confidence (Guan, 2023). Translanguaging was therefore used to describe how bilinguals or multilinguals naturally used language daily (Marrero-Colón, 2021). It meant applying the first language to help in the acquisition of the second language.

Translanguaging has been defined by several scholars. Baker (2011:39) defined translanguaging as ‘the process of making meaning, shaping experiences, gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages.’ Hornberger and Link, (2012:262) also defined translanguaging as, ‘the purposeful pedagogical alternation of language in spoken and written, receptive and productive modes.’ Garcia (2009a: 41) developed the term further by referring translanguaging to “the use of children’s full linguistic repertoire to make meaning without thinking of the fact that they have one language that is different from the other.” In a similar way, Canagarajah (2011: 401) defined Translanguaging as “the ability of multilingual speakers to shuttle between languages, treating the diverse languages that form their repertoire as an integrated system.” All the definitions outline that for translanguaging to be used there should be a situation of two or more people with different linguistic backgrounds trying to communicate or share information. The term translanguaging is now used as a pedagogical practice. It can be applied in a multilingual classroom set up with learners coming from different linguistic

backgrounds to come to a common understanding when acquiring knowledge. Therefore, the study used translanguaging as a theory.

3.2.1. Translanguaging in the classroom

In most parts of the world, children grow up in homes acquiring a language around them and find another language in school which they are supposed to learn, or it may be the language of instruction. This facilitates the engagement of translanguaging which helps the learners make sense of their multilingual worlds (Garcia,2009). Translanguaging has been in use in the field of education for some years now. It has been recognised by many countries around the world especially those that consider the learners first languages as an instrumental aspect in the teaching and learning process (Marrero-Colon, 2021). Many classrooms are made up of learners with diverse language experiences and proficiencies and may be exposed to a different language of instruction and encounter teachers who may speak other languages. It can also be noted that the classroom may be affected by the mismatch between the local and regional languages and limited second language proficiency by teachers and students which may also affect the progress of the learners (Chamberlain, Rodriguez-Leon & Woodward, 2022). In education, translanguaging has been described as the use of one language to strengthen another language to help learners comprehend the content and academically interact among themselves using the languages they know (Miwa, 2020). According to Lewis et al (2012) the focus of Translanguaging in Welsh classrooms was the learner's use of two languages and not the teacher, though the teacher was instrumental in developing of the second language by using the first language. Even if the policy stipulates the use of a second language during instruction, learners still use their first languages with peers and this calls for teachers to embrace translanguaging for teaching and learning to take place. Garcia and Lin (2017) pointed out that that the use of translanguaging enables learners to use two different processes with cognitive engagement in the bilingual. Garcia and Wei (2014) described translanguaging as a means of constructing meaning between individuals and it therefore helps to transform learners' bilingualism and multilingualism as learning resources thereby achieving educational goals.

The use of translanguaging in the classroom helps learners to gain understanding and knowledge and Baker (2001) added some more benefits of translanguaging in education as follows.

- It may promote a deeper and fuller understanding of the subject matter and concepts.
- It may help the development of the less dominant language.
- It may facilitate home-school connections and cooperation ease of switching between languages.
- It allows the integration and collaboration of language learners from all proficiency levels, from advanced or native multilingual speakers to those who are in the earlier stages of second language acquisition.

Naeem and Ghulam (2023) pointed out some of the disadvantages of translanguaging. They stated that the use of translanguaging in a classroom may affect learners who are from low socio-economic background and the slow learners. Consideration of many languages in a lesson may hinder the flow of the lesson. It was also discovered that competence levels of the teachers in the languages of the learners may affect the usage of translanguaging. One other factor added by Chamberlain et al (2022) was that the official language policies, in most cases do not align with the actual classroom situations making it difficult for teachers to implement translanguaging in some cases.

When learners from different linguistic backgrounds are in the same classroom, multiple languages are likely to be used during instruction to facilitate teaching and learning. To avoid language and content to be separate systems, there should be a connection between them so that learners can be helped to master the content (Cummins 2017; Garcia & Lin, 2017). To facilitate such interconnectedness, methodologies such as translanguaging are used. According to Naeem and Ghulam (2023:359), in a multilingual academic background, ‘the technique of translanguaging has developed a prospective instructional approach to increase the impact of language learning and generate an inclusive classroom’. Therefore, translanguaging includes the use of many languages in a classroom during instruction thereby allowing the learners to use their languages to understand content and learn other language (García & Wei, 2014).

Translanguaging in an English as a Second Language (ESL) classroom helps learners to understand the new language while using their first language. This can be made possible by grouping learners with the same first language so that they interact with the lesson content in their first language and help each other to understand the concepts in the second language

(Marrero-Colon, 2021). Translanguaging has therefore proven to be effective way of teaching multilingual classroom so that they can gain understanding of the subject matter. Translanguaging has become a useful theory in the field of teaching and learning English as a second language. Translanguaging theory is intended to be transformative of learning by disrupting socially constructed language hierarchies and restrictive language policies in most countries such as the English only language of instruction that have contributed to the low levels of attainment in cases where learners learn English as a second language (Otheguy et al., 2015). Therefore, the translanguaging theory can support learners' literacy and language development as well as deepen their understanding of texts (García & Kleifgen, 2019). Moreover, introducing translanguaging can initiate ideological shifts, resulting in changes to classroom, schools and educational language policies (Menken & Sánchez, 2019; Viesca & Teemant, 2019).

This study used translanguaging as a theory to explain how teachers negotiate the teaching of grammar in multilingual classrooms as it requires the use of two or more languages inside one lesson which may help the learners to learn and understand concepts through interactional communication with the teacher and peers (Shifidi, 2014). The theory also helped to explain how teachers who teach English as a second language using the Communicative Language Teaching methodology could use and recognise the diverse cultures and linguistic experiences students bring to the language learning classrooms. One important aspect to be noted is that learners already have a language from home, and they can use what they already know about language to help them navigate a new linguistic system and the teacher should create opportunities for such experiences in order to enhance teaching and learning of the second language. Translanguaging allows students to use their full linguistic repertoire to communicate. Recognizing that students enter the classroom with linguistic skills that they can tap into to make meaning constructs a powerful counter-narrative to deficit discourses concerning English language learners. However, teachers can create a space for translanguaging by purposefully designing and implementing opportunities for using the languages of choice (Wei, 2018).

Hassan and Ahmed (2015) explained that translanguaging enables certain concepts to be reinforced through repetition in several languages and clarified in much more detail as opposed to using one language. This should be done to accommodate learners from different linguistic backgrounds. In a multilingual classroom, translanguaging may involve “students

listening to information in one language and explaining the gist of it orally in another or reading a text in one language and talk about it in another” (Open University, 2015: 15). It is also important to note that in a multilingual classroom, translanguaging implies any pedagogical language practice of alternation between languages viewed not as separate entities but as a single unit and as a meaning making resource. Communicative language teaching recognizes the use of a variety of activities in a classroom for the learners to acquire the skills necessary for learning the second language, thereby accommodating all the learners. Therefore, translanguaging theory supports the complete, unitary linguistic systems that students bring to classrooms and teachers who create opportunities in their classrooms for translanguaging communicate to students that their full linguistic repertoire can be used for learning and communicating. Perez (2004) asserts that when a student learns to read, write, and think in their home language those skills not only transfer to the new language but also reinforce a better understanding of the purpose, function and process involved in learning. Learners will use a word from their home language as a placeholder in their conversations until they can obtain the English term from a peer or a teacher (Pierson, Clark & Brady, 2021).

In summary, it should be noted that English language is taught as a second language to learners in Zambia and Zambia being a multilingual country, diverse languages are experienced among learners in the classrooms. The teacher’s role is to try and find ways of putting across the intended concepts to all the learners regardless of their linguistic backgrounds. Therefore, the expertise theory and translanguaging theory will be used to inform the study and analyse how teachers apply CLT in multilingual classrooms to teach English Grammar.

3.3. Summary of the chapter

The chapter presented the theories that guided the study. The two theories are the Expertise theory and the Translanguaging theory. The next chapter presents the Methodology of the study.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.0. Overview

The previous chapter discussed literature review. This chapter outlines the methodology that was used in the study. The chapter begins by discussing the concepts the research paradigm and research design which were used in this study and explain how they were used. The target population, sample size, sampling procedure, research instruments, data collection procedure as well as data analysis will also be presented and explained. Furthermore, the chapter presents, ethical considerations, and an explanation of the validity and reliability of the instruments used in the study and ends with a summary.

4.1. Research paradigm

‘Researchers use different paradigms depending on the purposes of research and the positions they carry in their research’ (Pervin & Mokhtar, 2022). The term research paradigm has been defined differently by different scholars. Rehman and Alharthi (2016) defined a paradigm as a ‘way of understanding the reality of the world and studying it’. It is the way of gathering information from understanding reality and using it to build knowledge (Tracy, 2013). It is the main angle that guides the research process and influences it (Leavy, 2014). A research paradigm is therefore a set of ideas within which theories can be used. It is the lens through which a researcher examines the world and helps to determine the research methods that will be used and how the data will be analysed (Kivunja & Kuyini, (2017)). Research designs are therefore research plans that help a researcher to properly execute the research from general expectations to detailed methods of data collection and analysis (Creswel, 2009). It is the structure or framework of scientific and academic ideas and beliefs, values and assumptions. According to Adu and Okeke (2022) paradigms assist researchers in identifying what and how should be studied and how the results of the study should be interpreted.

According to Deshpande (1983), as cited in Yong, Husin and Kamarudin (2021) a paradigm helps a researcher in the following ways.

- First, it guides researchers as it indicates important issues challenging any discipline.

- Second, it allows for the development of models and theories that enable researchers to solve these issues.
- Third, it establishes the criteria for the research tools required such as the methodology, type of instruments, and data collection that would allow for the issues to be solved.
- Forth, it provides the principles, procedures, and methods to be considered when similar problems reappear

A paradigm is a basic belief system which comprises of four elements, namely, epistemology, ontology, methodology and axiology and paradigms differ depending on ‘ontology (the nature of reality), epistemology (the nature of knowledge), axiology (the values associated with the areas of research and theorising), or methodology (strategies for gathering, collecting and analysing data) (Tracy, 2013; Rehman & Alharthi, 2016). Ontology is a branch of philosophy which is concerned with the assumptions about the reality of something or the nature of the social phenomenon under investigation (Scotland, 2012). ‘It is the philosophical study of the nature of existence or reality, of being or becoming, as well as the basic categories of things that exist and their relations’ (Kivunja & Kuyini, 2017). Ontology helps to examine the basic belief system of the researcher and to conceptualise the form and nature of reality, how it exists and what can be known about it (Kivunja & Kuyini (2017; Rehman & Alharthi, 2016). Ontology leads the researcher to inquire about what kind of reality exists (Rehman & Alharthi, 2016). Ontology enables the researcher to examine your underlying belief system and philosophical assumptions as a researcher, about the nature of being, existence and reality. Philosophical assumptions about the nature of reality are crucial to understanding how the researcher can make meaning of the data gathered. These assumptions, concepts or propositions help to orientate the researcher’s thinking about the research problem, its significance, and how he or she might approach it to answer the research question, understand the problem investigated and contribute to its solution (Kivunja & Kuyini, 2017). Ontology therefore focuses on the reality out there.

The other element of a paradigm is Epistemology. Epistemology refers to “the branch of philosophy that studies the nature of knowledge and the process by which knowledge is acquired and validated” (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003, p. 13). Epistemology is how the truth and reality is known. It is concerned with the nature and form of knowledge, and it can be

acquired. It helps researchers to comprehend knowledge necessary for deep understanding of the research work. Schwandt (1997) defines it as the study of the nature of knowledge and justification. Epistemology is important because it helps the researcher to prove the data in the research and it also helps to uncover knowledge in the social context of the research (Kiyunja & Kuyini, 2017). It is the process of the study of knowing or how we know what we know. It examines how knowledge is gained and the relationship between the researcher and the world (Leavy, 2014). Epistemology therefore focuses on knowing about the reality in the world.

Axiology is concerned with how values and assumptions of the researcher influence the scientific process, as well as what actions the researcher takes with the research produced (Lincoln et al., 2013). It examines the place of emotions, expectations and values of the researcher in the research process and how they can be prevented from influencing the participants and the results in the research process (Leavy, 2014). Axiology takes into consideration the ethical issues in the research process which includes aspects of making valuable and right decisions (Finnis, 1980). It also considers the values attached to the research process which includes the participants, the data as well as the results. Axiology therefore includes aspects of values attached to conduct, participants, culture and social morals during the research process (Kivunja & Kuyini, 2017) and focuses on how the values and rights of human beings can be respected and protected.

Methodology refers to the well-planned research design, methods, approaches and procedures used in research to find out something (Keeves, 1997). It is a strategy that informs one's choice of research methods such as data gathering, participants, instruments used, and data analysis. It guides the researcher on the choice of the right data to be used for the study and which tools would be appropriate to collect the data thereby guiding the researcher on how the world should be studied (Rehman & Alharthi, 2016). Methodology guides the researcher on collecting the right data, knowledge and comprehension that would help the researcher to answer the research question. It focuses on how knowledge in the world can be acquired.

Research paradigms reveal the beliefs about the world people live in and want to live in. The choice of a research paradigm by a researcher depends on the purpose of the research being conducted and the reason behind (Pervin & Mokhtar, 2022). Research paradigms include positivism, pragmatism, and interpretivism (constructivism) among others (Yong, Husin & Kamarudin, 2021).

4.1.1. Interpretivist (constructivist) paradigm

The study used interpretivism as the research paradigm. According to Adu and Okeke (2022), interpretivists strive for understanding because the research orientation allows all the participants in the research to contribute to the research process their own interpretations. According to Thanh and Thanh (2015) interpretivism is inclusive because it accepts multiple viewpoints from different individuals on the same subject matter thereby discovering realities from the participants views, their own background and experiences

Pervin and Mokhtar (2022) described interpretive research as a research paradigm as based on the principle that human experience in society shape social reality which makes it possible to research on human behaviour within the social cultural context. However, according to the interpretivist also called as constructivist, reality is not something which a researcher can just explain and describe but it should be something constructed and reproduced through interaction, practice and communication (Tracy, 2013). Therefore, Interpretive methodology requires that social phenomena be understood “through the eyes of the participants rather than the researcher” (Cohen et al., 2007, p. 21). It can also be concluded that understanding the world should be from the subjective experiences of the individuals who are participants in research, and this can be achieved through the use of meaning oriented methodologies such as interviewing, observation, field notes, documents, and focus group discussions in which the researcher is engaged and discerns meaning from the activities in the specified context (Rehman & Alharthi, 2016).

According to Kivunja and Kuyini (2017), the main aim of the interpretivist paradigm is to understand the subject world of human experience through trying to understand the meaning and interpretation an individual makes of the context in the world around. This qualifies the main principle of the interpretivist paradigm that reality is socially constructed.

According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), and Morgan, (2007), as cited in Kivunja and Kuyini (2017) research conducted under the Interpretivist paradigm usually exhibits the following characteristics:

1. The admission that the social world cannot be understood from the standpoint of an individual.
2. The belief that realities are multiple and socially constructed.

3. The acceptance that there is inevitable interaction between the researcher and his or her research participants.
4. The acceptance that context is vital for knowledge and knowing.
5. The belief that knowledge is created by the findings, can be value laden and the values need to be made explicit.
6. The need to understand the individual rather than universal laws.
7. The belief that causes and effects are mutually interdependent.
8. The belief that contextual factors need to be taken into consideration in any systematic pursuit of understanding.

The individual perception ontologically is key in interpretivism because there are many realities and reality is said to be subjective and socially constructed by individuals based on their experiences as well as interactions. The study gathered data through interviewing individual teachers and each one of them answered the questions according to how they experience teaching English grammar using CLT in a multilingual classroom. Epistemologically, the focus is on how individuals experience and interpret their realities leading to the interconnection between research and the researcher (Turin, Raihan and Chowdhury, 2024). The individual experiences shared by the teachers were combined to come up the findings on the different questions asked. It is therefore the focus of interpretivism to work with the meanings already existing in the world and understand and use them as stepping stones to new ideas (Goldkuhl, 2012).

Interpretivist research use methods that generate qualitative data. For research conducted under the Interpretivist paradigm (in Kivunja & Kuyini (2017), researchers have a wide choice of methodologies including

- Naturalist methodology
- Narrative inquiry methodology
- Case study methodology
- Grounded theory methodology

- Phenomenology methodology
- Hermeneutics methodology
- Ethnography methodology
- Phenomenography methodology
- Action research methodology
- Heuristic inquiry methodology

The qualitative research is normally interpretivist because it aims to understand the social world through the interpretations of the people in it and the best way to collect data according to the interpretivist researcher is to follow the participant in their social environment and observe their actions and interview them (Bryman & Bell, 2019). The interpretivist is concerned with the individual to understand the subject world of human experience through trying to understand the phenomena being investigated from within (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2018). The current study was conducted in schools because that was social environment of the participants and observation was used to collect data on how teachers conduct lessons as well as interact with the pupils. The teachers were then interviewed to find out how they applied CLT when teaching English grammar in multilingual classrooms and if their responses were in line with how they conducted the lessons.

4.2. Research Method/Approach

Crewel (2014) defined research approaches as plans and the procedures for research that include all the stages from the broad assumptions to detailed methods of data collection, analysis and interpretation. The common types of research methods are the quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods research approaches. Adu and Okeke (2022) described a quantitative research approach as an approach which examines the relationships among variables to test theories deductively and objectively to produce numerical data which is analysed statistically. They also described qualitative approach as an approach which tries to understand how individuals or groups ascribe to problems affecting them while mixed method is an approach which involves both quantitative and qualitative research methods in a study to make use of each approach's strengths.

According to Adu and Okeke (2022:94), ‘the choice of the research approach depends on... the research paradigm and the philosophical assumptions, research problem, research questions, audience and personal experience. This means that the choice of the research approach should be informed by the research problem and how the research questions are framed (Adu & Okeke, 2022). The study used a qualitative research design. Ary, Jacobs, Irvine and Walker (2019) defined qualitative research as research that ‘seeks a deeper understanding of by focusing on the total picture rather than breaking it down variables and analysing it numerically’. This means that a qualitative researcher strives for deeper comprehension of the research problem by concentrating on a single entity. According to Anderson (2010) Qualitative research involves the “collection, analysis, and interpretation of data that are not easily reduced to numbers”. The data specifically is a representation of the social world and the concepts and characteristics of the people under study. The process of research involves emerging questions and procedures, data typically collected in the participant’s natural setting, data analysis inductively building from particulars to general themes, and the researcher making interpretations of the meaning of the data (Creswell, 2007). It is concerned with discovering patterns in the research data, understanding and explaining them (Yong, Husin & Kamarudin, 2021). It is a way of learning about social reality because it can be used across disciplines to study different topics (Leavy, 2014). It is worthwhile to note that a good qualitative approach helps to understand the world and provide knowledge about society problems and serve humankind (Tracy, 2013). Qualitative researchers believe that meaning should be constructed by participants in an environment where they are involved. The researcher should be involved in the research by following the participant and the participants should provide information as experienced in their environment.

Ary, Jacobs, Irvine and Walker (2019) outlined the following characteristics of qualitative research;

1. It shows concern for context and meaning.
2. It takes place in a naturally occurring setting.
3. The human investigator is the primary instrument for gathering and analysing data.
4. It deals with descriptive data.

5. It specifies aspects of the design before beginning to study which continues to emerge as the study progresses.
6. It is a process of inductive data analysis.

Qualitative approach helps to comprehend educational problems and adds to how the teaching and learning perspectives in different contexts can be understood (Anderson, 2010). Qualitative research is used within education to help understand education problems and how to handle different teaching and learning situations. However, it should be noted that the type of approach a researcher chooses determines the type of data to be collected as well as the methods, analysis and how the data will be presented (Msabila & Nalaila, 2013). Qualitative research was used in the study because the researcher's focus was on the participants (in this case, teachers and pupils) their experiences in teaching and learning of English grammar using the Communicative Language Methodology as well as the way they constructed their knowledge. It involved the use of interviews, observations and focus group discussions which shows that data was triangulated. Interviews were used to get an in-depth understanding of how teachers used communicative language methodology when teaching English grammar. The interviews were also used to understand how teachers negotiated the different multilingual identities in their classrooms. Using the qualitative interview also helped the researcher to hear teachers' voices regarding CLT and multilingualism through interviews and how they applied them during teaching. Lesson observations were also conducted to observe how teachers put theory into practice and to find out how they applied the approach in the teaching of grammar in a multilingual classroom. Focus group discussions were conducted in each classroom observed and this was meant to find out if what the teacher stated was in line with the experiences of the learners. The participants were experts in the field of research and the research was conducted in the natural and social setting, which were the schools and classrooms. Qualitative research was used to enable the researcher to focus on the whole process of teaching and learning and the outcome to conclusively analyse the data through the viewpoints and practices of the participants in this case, teachers and pupils, in great depth. It was also used to

4.3. Research design

Research designs are plans and procedures for research that help a researcher to systematically outline the broad assumptions to detailed and specific methods of data

collection, analysis and interpretation. 'It is used to structure the research, to show how all the major parts of the research project work together to try to address the central research questions,' (Kombo & Tromp, 2006). It includes how data will be collected, what instruments will be used and how they will be used and data analysis (Msabila & Nalaila, 2013). Research design 'involves the intersection of philosophy, strategies of inquiry, and specific methods,' (Creswell, 2007). It includes all the procedures and conditions in methodology. Adu and Okeke (2022) defines a research design as 'a plan for particular research'. They further describe it as a plan that directs how data will be collected, analysed and interpreted to have clear findings.

Adu and Okeke (2022) outlined some of the functions of the research design as follows;

1. It helps a researcher to have a clear focus for the research.
2. It enables a researcher to generate answerable research questions.
3. It helps the researcher in collecting the appropriate data for the study.
4. It determines the appropriate method for the study.

The study used a case study. Adu and Okeke (2022) defined a case study as, 'a research design targeting at collecting detailed information from a subject or smaller group of subjects'. It is the type of qualitative study that seeks to give a detailed description and understanding of a particular single unit to have rich and holistic data of it through using different methods to collect data such as interviews, observations, documents and discussions (Ary, Jacobs, Irvine & Walker, 2019). The characteristics of a case study as outlined by Ary, Jacobs, Irvine and Walker (2019) include the following;

1. Has multidisciplinary roots (business, law, medicine).
2. Focuses on a single unit.
3. Produces an in-depth description.
4. Is anchored in real life.
5. Uses multiple data collection techniques.
6. Provides a rich holistic description of context.

7. Time spent examining the unit is important.

The study used the multisite case study which is used to investigate a phenomenon that is common to two or more natural settings. It helps to have a richer and deeper understanding of a phenomenon (Mills, Durepos & Wiebe, 2010). The focus the study was on a group, in this case teachers and pupils, and on a particular situation to develop an insight on the teaching of English grammar in a multilingual classroom, with particular focus of using the Communicative Language Teaching methodology. Therefore, the case was the experiences of the teachers and learners teaching and learning English grammar using CLT in a multilingual classroom. In order to gain full insight of the situation and deeper understanding, the study was conducted in different sites. The teachers were observed teaching English grammar with particular interest on how they used the communicative methodology in the lesson and classroom with learners from different linguistic background. The pupils were observed on how they participated and responded in the lesson and later they were asked about their experiences as they learnt English grammar having different linguistic backgrounds.

4.4. Study Population

A study population is a complete set of elements (persons or objects) that possess some common characteristic defined by the sampling criteria established by the researcher (Msabila & Nalaila, 2013). White (2003) defined a population as the universe of units from which the sample is to be selected. Burns and Groove (1993) stated that a population is defined as all elements (individuals, objects and events) that meet the sample criteria for inclusion in the study. This shows that a research population should have elements that have some common characteristics (Msabila & Nalaila, 2014). Kombo and Tromp (2006) defined population as the larger group of individuals, objects or items from which the sample is taken. It can be concluded that a study or research population consists of objects of the same type in the same environment at the time of research. It includes all the elements with similar characteristics and of particular interest to the study.

The population of the study comprised of all grade six teachers and all grade six pupils in all primary schools in Central Province of Zambia. The target population for the study was drawn from three districts of Central Province of Zambia namely Kapiri Mposhi, Mkushi and Serenje. Central province was selected because of its centrality and the use of Bemba as a language of instruction in lower grades (1-4) in primary schools despite having different local

languages. The other reason was because the province had good road network which facilitated for reaching some remote schools as well. The districts were selected for differentiation purpose as Kapiri Mposhi is peri-urban while Mkushi and Serenje are rural districts. This population helped to gain insightful ideas about the topic under investigation and therefore was appropriate for the researcher to get the right information for the study. The grade six pupils were used because according to Zambia Primary School English Syllabus, this is the level when grammar is taught as an independent component of English as compared to other grades when grammar is taught as an infused component in English as a subject. The other reason for choosing grade six pupils was because at this level they could have broken through in learning using English. The teachers were part of the population because they taught grade six classes using the recommended Zambian primary school syllabus and were trained primary school teachers.

4.5. Study sample

A sample is defined by Sidhu (2014), as a small proportion of a population selected for observation and analysis. It can also be defined as a set of respondents chosen from a larger group for the purpose of a survey (Kombo & Tromp, 2006). Since a sample is taken from the population, it is very important that the selected sample is representative of the population from which it is taken. However, Adu and Okeke (2022) explained that factors such as population size, random process and nature of elements in the population determine the sample size.

The sample for the study was drawn from three districts in Central Province. The sample comprised of 18 primary schools, 20 grade six teachers and grade six pupils in selected primary schools. The teachers were important in this study because they are the implementers of government educational policies and teach the required content in multilingual classrooms. The teachers had also undergone training on how to teach English at primary schools and how different methodologies were supposed to be used in a lesson. Therefore, they helped answer the following research questions through an interview: How do teachers understand the communicative language approach? What challenges do teachers face when teaching English grammar using the communicative language teaching approach in multilingual classrooms? The teachers were observed for the following questions to be answered, and the grade six pupils also helped to answer the same questions through the classroom activities. How is the Communicative Language Teaching approach applied in English grammar

lessons? How do teachers negotiate learners' multilingual identities through language practice? The grade six pupils were important because they were at level when they were expected to break through from the being taught English grammar as an independent component in grade five. They helped in the analysis of the use of communicative activities in a grammar lesson since they come from different linguistic backgrounds, and it was their second year of being taught using English as a language of instruction. They shared their experiences and expectations when learning English grammar. They also helped to qualify some responses from teachers on the way they conducted their grammar lessons using CLT in a multilingual classroom.

4.6. Sampling Techniques

Blanch, et al (2006) defined sampling as a process of selecting research participants from an entire population, and involves decisions about which people, settings, events, behaviors and social processes to observe. "It is the procedure a researcher uses to gather people, places or things to study" (Kombo & Tromp, 2006). It refers to the selection of a subset of the total population as participants for research. The two types of sampling techniques are Probability and Non- probability. Adu and Okeke (2022) described probability sampling as the type that gives each element in the population chance to be included in the sample. It involves random selection of elements. But non-probability sampling technique is the type of sampling that does not give all the elements in the population equal chances of being selected. Non-probability sampling is done based on accessibility or purposive personal judgement of the researcher ((Msabila & Nalaila, 2013). This study used a non-probability sampling technique which is the type that does not give individuals in the population equal chances of being selected in the study.

Non-probability sampling techniques include purposive sampling, quota sampling, snowball sampling and convenience sampling. The sampling technique which was employed to select districts, schools and teachers was purposive sampling. Msabila and Nalaila (2013) described purposive sampling as a technique in which the researcher selects individuals to be part of the sample size from the population. The purposive sampling technique is the type which targets the people who are necessary for the study (Kombo & Tromp, 2006). The idea was to purposefully select informants, who would best answer the research questions and who are "information rich" (Patton, 1990, p. 169) persons. Purposive sampling involves searching for the right participants who would give the rich information on the topic under study (Bryman

& Bell, 2019). When developing a purposive sample, researchers use their special knowledge or expertise to select subjects from a group or population. In some instances, purposive samples are selected after field investigations on some group, to ensure that certain types of individuals or persons displaying certain attributes are included in the study (Berg,2001). This means that the cases to be included in the sample should possess particular characteristics being sought so that knowledgeable people are accessed. The selection of the districts and schools was based on their accessibility as well as having the required setting for the study. The schools were also selected because of being government primary schools and using the prescribed Zambia Primary School syllabus. The teachers were selected because of their role in executing the prescribed Zambian primary school syllabus in the classroom and using the prescribed language policy, English, in multilingual classrooms and teaching grade 6 pupils and having undergone training as primary school teachers. Pupils were selected based on being in grade six in government primary schools. The technique was of great use as it gave the researcher the right individuals to provide the best data for the study because they had experience in teaching and learning using CLT in English grammar lessons amidst multilingualism.

4.7. Data collection Methods and instruments

Research instruments are fact finding materials and tools for data collection. Kasonde (2014) stated that research instruments are tools that are used by the researcher to collect data. They are tools used to obtain information from research participants relevant to the research topic and proper selection of data involves using the research instruments (Adu & Okeke, 2022). In the three types of research approaches namely quantitative, qualitative and mixed method, the research instruments used are questionnaires, interviews guides/schedules, observations guides, experiments, and Focus group discussions guides and document analysis (Terre & Blancheetal, 2006). In this study, which was qualitative, the data collection instruments that were used to collect data included observation guides or checklist, focus group discussions guides and interview guides. Lesson observations were conducted first, followed by interviews and then focus group discussions. The use of different data collection instruments or methods (triangulation) in the research study helped to validate the research data thereby increasing the credibility and validity of the results.

4.7.1. Interviews

Interviews are meant to conduct face to face interactions with the participants through questions to gain insights from the participants and best understand their experiences. It is an interaction between the interviewer and interviewee with the view of collecting important data to help answer the research questions (Adu & Okeke, 2022). Ghosh (2011) defined interviews as a systematic way by which a researcher enters imaginatively into a life of a comparative stranger who has the data that the researcher requires. Interviews are techniques of gathering information using a set of pre-planned questions. They are very productive because they help the interviewer to pursue specific issues that are meant to bring out focused and constructive information (Shneiderman & Plaisant, 2005). Interviews are useful because they provide information on issues that cannot be observed, and they help the interviewee to gain insight into the research questions through explanations and justification of their actions or opinions (Tracy, 2013).

The value of qualitative interviews as outlined by Tracy (2013) include the following;

1. Provide opportunities for mutual discovery, understanding, reflection, and explanation via a path that is organic, adaptive, and oftentimes energizing.
2. Elucidate subjectively lived experiences and viewpoints from the respondents' perspective.
3. Enable the researcher to stumble upon and further explore complex phenomena that may otherwise be hidden or unseen.
4. Respondents can provide their opinion, motivation, and experiences.
5. Participants can provide accounts or rationales, explanations, and justifications for their actions and opinions.
6. Help the researcher to acquire information that is left out of formal documents or omitted from sanitized histories, which reflect power holders' points of view.
7. Valuable for strengthening and complicating other data.

However, though interviews may be popular data collection instruments in qualitative research, they have disadvantages as well as advantages. Alamri (2019) outlined the Strengths and weaknesses of using interviews in research as follows;

Strengths

- Practices controlled data collection procedure.
- Provides more comprehensive understanding through triangulation.
- Enables the researcher to introspect and reflect on the collected data.
- The preplanning of the interviews helps the interviewer to guide the session.
- Promotes the researcher to clarify any misgivings related an answer.
- Better iteration by interaction among the participants and interviewer.

Weaknesses

- Interviewer presence affects the participant's behaviour and answers.
- Intervention promotes biases among the participants.
- Less reliable data.
- Time-consuming in terms of data analysis.
- Time-consuming in terms of data transcribing.
- Recalling the previous events or situations.

Burns and Grove (2003:58) state that “interviewing refers to structured, semi-structured or unstructured verbal communication between the researcher and the participants in which information is presented to the researcher”. It is the face-to-face verbal exchange of views about a subject or topic of mutual interest between the parties involved. Structured, semi-structured and unstructured are the different types of interviews used depending on the needs of the interview (Adu & Okeke, 2022).

Interviews in the semi structured format are mostly used with qualitative interviewing (Warren, 2002). They are probably also the most widespread form of interviews in the human and social sciences and are sometimes the only format given attention to in textbooks on qualitative research (Flick, 2002). Semi-structured interviews are defined as interviews meant to collect information about the world of the interviewee to interpret the meaning of the described phenomena (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2008). Semi structured interviews can make better use of the knowledge-producing potentials of dialogues by allowing much more flexibility for following up on whatever angles are deemed important by the interviewee. Semi-structured interviews have open ended questions which help the interviewer to discuss the topic in depth by asking follow up questions in case of clarity (Brinkman & Kvale, 2005). This means that as the interview progresses, the interviewee is given the opportunity to provide more relevant information if the interviewer demands so. This is in line with what Bryman and Bell (2019) wrote that in semi-structured interviews, the researcher has questions on what he wants to cover though they may not follow the guide because some questions may come up after the interviewee had answered but the interviewer feels the interviewee needs to add more information.

A structured interview is a type that has formal questions meant to ask the interviewee but lacks depth. These are the types of interviews which require the interviewer to ask questions exactly as written on the interview guide without providing any other information (Brinkmann, 2013). Structured interviews are ordered and planned and usually in a standardised manner requiring the interviewer to strictly follow the interview schedule (Tracy, 2013). Unstructured interview are in-depth interviews that give room to the interviewer to collect as much information as possible with a particular purpose (Adu & Okeke, 2022). Unstructured interviews have flexible questions meant to stimulate a conversation and may take place in an informal setting (Tracy, 2013). They are like conversations though they are meant to investigate a topic through allowing the interviewee to respond to a question by providing as much needed information as possible through probes from the interviewer (Tracy, 2013).

Therefore, in this study, semi-structured interviews were used. The interview guide consisted of both open ended and closed ended questions (Appendix 1). The interview guide was used to collect data from the teachers through face-to-face interview thereby answering the following research questions; How do teachers understand the communicative language

approach? What challenges do teachers face when teaching English grammar using the communicative language teaching approach in multilingual classrooms? The teachers were able to share their understanding of the communicative language teaching approach and the challenges they faced when using CLT in multilingual classes especially that they taught multilingual classes.

Interviews were used in the study to collect more information from the teachers after they were observed teaching. They were semi-structured interviews which allowed the researcher to seek clarifications from the participants in cases where information was not clear. However, the interviewer also acquired more knowledge from the interview itself as well. The focus of the interview was on issues that were deemed as important in relation to the research. The choice of the type of interview depends on the purpose of the study and the resources available. The semi-structured interviews were used in the study because the researcher wanted to have all the responses from the interviewees clarified in the responses which seemed incomplete and lacked deep explanations. The semi-structured interviews also helped the researcher to focus on the issues which were relevant to the research. They were mainly used to gather data on the experiences of the teachers and to get an insight into their experiences by probing them to give more information to clarify certain issues necessary for the research. And the teachers were able to explain why they did what they did during teaching. Therefore, the semi-structured interviews helped to follow up responses from the interviewee in order to collect in-depth data from the teachers as experts in the classroom.

4.7.2. Observation

According to Kombo and Tromp (2006), an observation is, ‘a tool that provides information about actual behavior.’ An observation is a data collecting technique that involves the researcher monitoring the participants in their natural environment (Adu and Okeke, 2022). It is ‘looking (often systematically) and noting systematically people, events, behaviours, settings, artefacts, routines, ...’ (Cohen, Manion & Morrision, 2018, p542). Qualitative observations are those in which the researcher takes field notes and detailed relevant descriptions on the behavior and activities of individuals in a natural setting. In the field notes, the researcher records, in an unstructured or semi - structured way the information which he or she is interested in. Qualitative observers may also engage in roles varying from a non-participant to a complete participant. (Creswell, 2007). This method requires careful

attention to participants' activities and behaviors as well as characteristics and social interactions to gather data (Creswell, 2014).

Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2018) outlined some of the features of observation that it gives an opportunity to the researcher to collect rich contextual first-hand information in a naturally occurring situation. It helps the researcher to gather valid data from interactions in the social context which helps to complement other data forms collected using other instruments like interviews. Adu and okeke (2022) outlined the advantages and disadvantages of observations as follows;

Advantages

1. Easy to administer.
2. Results tend to be more accurate.
3. It is a universally acceptable practice.
4. It is appropriate for certain situations.

Disadvantages

1. Some phenomena are not open to observation.
2. It cannot be relied on.
3. Bias may arise
4. It is expensive to administer.
5. Its validity cannot be predicted accurately.

In the study, the researcher was a complete observer, and the lesson observation checklist (Appendix 3) was used to record information as it occurred during the lessons from the teachers teaching English grammar using the communicative language teaching method to grade six pupils. The observation sheet was used to take notes about the different activities and strategies applied by teachers in the classroom and the different implications to the study. One teacher was targeted for observation per day.

Apart from recording using the checklist, lessons were video recorded. It was important to observe lessons because it helped the researcher to gather enough data on how the teachers implemented CLT when teaching English grammar in multilingual classes. And how they negotiated learners' multilingual identities through language practice since all classrooms are multilingual. It also helped the researcher to triangulate the results as the same teachers were interviewed after lesson observations. The video recorded lessons also helped to verify information which was not clearly recorded using the lesson observation checklist.

4.7.3 Focus group discussion

Focus group discussion is usually used in a qualitative approach to gain an in-depth understanding of the subject matter and social issues from the participants. The method aims to obtain data from a purposely selected group of individuals under study (Nyumba et al, 2018). Adu and Okeke (2022:127) described Focus groups as 'the process through which a researcher acquires data from a large sample/group of people concurrently, with the assistance of a moderator'. Eeuwijk and Angehrn (2017) defined Focus Group Discussion as a data collection technique which involves a group of people chosen to discuss a topic extensively with the guide of a skilled moderator. The selected group of people should have similar experiences, knowledge, practices, background, or perceptions and should share and discuss issues through interacting in a focus group discussion. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) involves small groups of people sharing common interests, similar backgrounds and experiences and are required to answer specific questions through a discussion (Gundumogula, 2020). Tracy (2013:167) described FGD as 'a group interview with 3 to 12 participants and marked by guided group discussion, question and answer, interactive dialogue, and other activities. FGDs are usually held in a controlled setting and are meant to obtain information from a group of people but taking into consideration individual opinions. Therefore, the aim of the Focus Group Discussion is to get different views on a research topic from a group of people in the same specific timeframe and same environment through interactive discussion which allows members to provide checks and balances allowing correct information to be recorded (Hennink, 2014). The discussions are meant to bring out as much information as possible from a group at the same time.

Focus group discussions have several characteristics. However, Hennink (2014) outlined the following characteristics.

- Focus groups typically consist of 6 to 8 participants but can be anywhere between 5 and 10 depending on the purpose of the study.
- Participants are preselected and have similar backgrounds or shared experiences related to the research issues (e.g., experience of an illness, multiple birth, divorce, and so forth).
- The discussion is focused on a specific topic or limited number of issues, to allow sufficient time to discuss each issue in detail.
- The aim is not to reach consensus on the issues discussed, but to uncover a range of perspectives and experiences.
- Discussion between participants is essential to gather the type of data unique to this method of data collection.
- The group is led by a trained moderator who facilitates the discussion to gain breadth and depth from participants' responses.
- Questions asked by the moderator are carefully designed to stimulate discussion, and moderators are trained to effectively probe group participants to identify a broad range of views.
- A permissive, non-threatening group environment is essential so that participants feel comfortable to share their views without the fear of judgment from others.

Focus group discussions just like any other data collection instrument have advantages as well as disadvantages. The following are some of the advantages of FGDs.

1. Participants interact making it possible to collect the best data from a well organised setting (Creswell, 2007).
2. They are flexible in terms of transacting in that they can be structured or unstructured depending on the researcher and the type of data he or she wants to collect and can be used to collect data in a variety of topics in various settings and populations (Mihretab, 2019).

3. Participants are given a chance to explore the issue at hand with little interference from the moderator. Participants can give their views, build on other participants' views, and debate thereby bringing out as much quality data as possible for the benefit of the researcher (Nyumba, et al 2018).
4. The researcher gains a lot of information with varying opinions and experiences within a period, and this makes it a low-cost research as well (Nyumba, et al 2018).

However, despite having several advantages, FGDs has several disadvantages as well. Some of the disadvantages include;

1. An inactive discussion especially when there is a low level of involvement by some members leads to the researcher collecting inadequate and poor data. And a larger group may involve some constantly talking without giving chance to others, leading to lose of interest and being distracted (Hennink, 2014).
2. Focus group discussions are not cheap in the sense that the researcher needs to put in a lot of work in terms of planning, recruitment, and execution of the activity and time spent to collect, manage, and analyse data is also costly. (Anthea, 2020).
3. Some participants may not be free to openly talk about certain topics or express their opinions and feelings brought forth in the discussion. Differences in social cultural beliefs, educational level, occupation, and social status may affect the interaction leading to some people opting to remain quiet (Anthea, 2020).
4. Some participants selected for the FGD may be incompetent to contribute to the discussion, then the validity of the results is compromised because participants are supposed to provide a variety of answers during the discussion which in turn makes the data reliable (Hennink,2014)
5. Lack of moderator skills may also lead to moderator biasness and if the moderator does not stimulate the discussion but controls it then the results will not be reliable.
6. Lack of time management and inappropriate environment may lead to in flow of data resulting in compromising the validity and reliability of the research (Hennink, 2014).

7. Selecting participants with different linguistic backgrounds and cultures may affect data collect as some topics may be sensitive to some participants of the participants and the moderator may need a translator which affect the natural flow of information. (Hennink, 2014).
8. Transcribing as the data is bulky and therefore consumes a lot of time (Gundumogula, 2020).
9. Translating, if the language used is different from the language of the researcher's project, then it may take time as well and may lead to under or over presentation thereby distorting the data. And the researcher should further use the concept of member checking which requires presenting the findings to the participants to valid of the results (Bromley et al. 2003).

Focus groups are like interviews but involve multiple participants at once. They are another route to obtaining responses and making interview observations. In this study, the focus group discussion guide (Appendix 2) was used to collect data from some pupils in grade six classes in primary schools under study. The number of pupils in each focus group was 10. And pupils from each observed class were engaged in a focus group discussion. This helped to gain an insight on how teachers apply CLT when teaching grammar as well as how they negotiate the different multilingual identities in the classroom. Focus group discussions also helped to gather data from the learners on their feelings about how English grammar lessons were conducted by the teacher and how they felt when teachers used languages they were familiar with. 'Focus groups can be used alone or in conjunction with other methods, such as interviews or observations, and can therefore help to confirm, extend, or enrich understanding and provide alternative insights' (Gill & Baillie, 2018). The focus group discussion helped to triangulate data from interviews and lesson observations which results in gaining deeper understanding of the research topic (Carter et al, 2014).

4.8. Data Collection Procedure

Consent and clearance were sought from the University of Zambia, School of Education and the Directorate of Research and Graduate Studies. The study was approved by the University of Zambia Humanities and Social Sciences Ethical Committee and permission was granted to go ahead with the research. A letter was gotten from the School of Education, Assistant Dean Postgraduate which served as an introductory letter and permission to go for data collection.

The District Education Board Secretaries (DEBS) in the sampled districts in Central Province granted permission to collect data in the sampled schools. Thereafter, permission was obtained from the head teachers in the sampled schools to observe and interview teachers and have focus group discussions with the grade six pupils. Teachers in schools were briefed and appointments were made for lesson observations, interviews and focus group discussions. In each of the selected schools, a teacher was observed teaching English grammar to grade six pupils, and the observation checklist was used to record the observations in line with the research objectives. The lessons were also video recorded. After the lesson observation, an interview session was conducted with the observed teacher. The last session involved conducting a focus group discussion with 10 pupils from each observed class.

4.9. Data Analysis

According to Kombo and Tromp (2006), data analysis refers to examining what has been collected in a survey or experiment and making deductions and inferences. Silverman (2019) as cited in Adu and Okeke (2022) defines data analysis as describing and summarising data, identifying relationships and differences between variables, comparing variables and forecasting outcomes. The process of collecting and interpreting data in the research process is to acquire the most relevant information and to make accurate conclusions after analysing the data (Adu & Okeke, 2022). However, the determinants of data analysis and interpretations include the researcher's paradigm, the theoretical framework, the availability of the data that responds to the research questions, and the participants who provide the information. Qualitative data analysis is concerned with emerging meaning from the given data in a descriptive way and the analysis focuses on the 'in-depth, context-specific, rich subjective data and meanings provided by the participants in the situation with the researchers themselves as the principal research instrument (Adu & Okeke, 2022). The sources of qualitative data are many depending on the type of research. However, the sources of qualitative data for the current study include interviews, lesson observation, field notes, video recordings and focus group discussions.

Data was presented according to the research questions. The data collected from the interviews and Focus group discussion was analysed thematically. The collected data was read through and aligned to the objectives of the study. Then the common trends emphasised by the participants were grouped as themes. The exact quotations were then presented under related themes and interpreted. Data collected through lesson observation was presented as

observed and interpreted under the specific objective. Some of the data from the interviews, lesson observations and focus group discussion was integrated under one objective if they were answering the same research question. This was done to conform findings from different instruments. The video recorded lessons were transcribed and presented as they were recorded in the classroom and the responses and activities were presented exactly as they happened. This was done to add authenticity to the study.

4.10. Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness refers to ‘the degree to which research is transformative and emancipatory for the people studied and society at large (Bryman and Bell, 2019). Trustworthiness is key in qualitative research because it makes the research acceptable in the academic world (Zia Ul Haq et al. (2023). The degree for trustworthiness in qualitative research is measured by ensuring the credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability of the research design, process and action (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2018).

4.10.1. Credibility

Credibility is the accuracy and truthfulness of the findings, and it involves how well the researcher has established confidence in the findings based on the research design, participants and context. To ensure credibility in qualitative research, the researcher should stay long at the in the study location, thoroughly observe the activities and use more than one instrument to collect data. (Zia Ul Haq et al. ,2023). This means that the researcher should follow proper research procedures. The study used interviews, observations and focus group discussions as data sources and the findings were credible because data collected from lesson observations confirmed most of the data from the teacher interviews as well as the focus group discussions held with pupils and the responses from participants asked at different times were similar. Therefore, there was data triangulation and method triangulation. The researcher took time to collect data in a particular school.

4.10.2. Transferability

Transferability is the degree to which the findings of a qualitative study can be applied to other contexts or to other individuals or groups. This requires the researcher to provide accurate, rich, detailed, thick and complete descriptions of the context and participants to help other readers in making transferability (Bryman and Bell, 2019). Transferability can be

enhanced by the researcher if all the necessary details of the participants experiences are thoroughly explained in the research which can help other people transfer the same information to their studies. The participants of the study were primary school teachers and pupils, and the researcher tried to include all the necessary data collected from the interviews, lesson observation and focus group discussion in in order give a detailed and thick description of the participants, context and methods.

4.10.3. Dependability

Dependability is the extent to which the same results would occur with different sets of people in different settings and time periods (Bryman and Bell, 2019). It is like reliability in quantitative research. It is the consistency of data over similar contexts (Zia U Haq et al. (2023). It demands record keeping and accessibility of the research records. The study was conducted in different locations and the findings were similar when teachers were interviewed and observed which made the results dependable.

4.10.4. Confirmability

Confirmability is the degree to which findings in the study be corroborated by others investigating the same situation. The responses from the participants should be free from biases and reflect original responses from the participants. In the study, method triangulation and data triangulation was able to enhance confirmability. The results obtained from the observations were used to confirm and compare the information obtained from the teachers during interviews and from pupils during focus group discussions.

4.11. Ethical consideration

The importance of Research ethics as outlined by Adu and Okeke (2022:172) is that it promotes ethical values, accountability and public trust, and social responsibility. According to Ary, Jacobs, Irvine and Walker (2019), ethical issues related to qualitative research include ‘getting permission to conduct research, unanticipated situations due to the flexibility of qualitative research, the potential for bias due to the close relationship with participants that can occur, and issues related to confidentiality and anonymity’. Therefore, researchers should use the best form of interacting with participants to gather accurate information though the participants have the right to choose what type of information they can share with the participants and opt out any point during the data collection (Collins and Hussey, 2014).

Ethical considerations such as anonymity, privacy, confidentiality, voluntary participation and option to opt out guide the researcher to systematically adhere to data collection approaches that yield valid results in qualitative data collection using interviews.

4.11.1. Anonymity

Anonymity means that the researcher cannot identify the respondent or setting. The researcher should not associate individuals' names with the information obtained from them (Ary, Jacobs, Irvine and Walker ,2019). This means that the information collected should not have personal information about the respondent that would lead to easy identification of the participant. Such was taken care of in the current research as details of the participants were not included to protect their privacy.

4.11.2. Confidentiality

This means that the researcher must not share what he knows with others because he or she promised not to do so. The information obtained from the participants is private and confidential and no one should have access to the raw data unless the respondent allows it (Laryeafio and Ogbewe, 2023). All the information collected during the current study was not shared with anyone else apart from the participant themselves when they were asked to check if what was recorded was what they said.

4.11.3. Voluntary participation

Participants should not be forced to take part in the research investigation as doing so may lead to collecting false information. Voluntary participation means that participants should be made to understand the research and accept to engage in the research process which would help collect correct information (Mumford et al, 2021). All the participants involved were taken through the essence of the research and willingly agreed to take part.

4.11.4. Option to opt out

The rights of the participants should be respected, and no one should be forced to be part of the programme if they decide not to be part of the research investigation (Laryeafio and Ogbewe, 2023). In the current research, one teacher agreed to be part of the research in the early stages of preparation and an appointment was made for lesson observation and interview. However, the teacher decided not to be part of the research investigation the actual

day of the observation. Her rights were respected, and the teacher was not forced to be observed or interviewed.

4.12. Summary of the chapter

In this chapter, the research paradigm, research design, target population, sample size, sampling procedure, research instruments, data collection procedure as well as data analysis for the research to be undertaken have been discussed. Validity and ethical consideration have also been discussed. The next chapter presents the findings of the study.

CHAPTER FIVE

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

5.0 Overview

The previous chapter explained the methodology which was used to collect data for this study. This chapter presents the findings of the study. The findings are based on the data collected using lesson observation, interviews, and focus group discussions. The chapter will present findings using the following research questions.

1. How do teachers understand the Communicative Language Approach?
2. How is the communicative language teaching approach applied in English grammar lessons?
3. How do teachers negotiate learners' multilingual identities through language practice?
4. What challenges do teachers face when teaching English grammar using the communicative language teaching approach in multilingual classrooms?

The findings presented were collected using different data collection instruments to gather data in more depth and address different aspects of the research problem as well as test validity of data from different sources. Data was presented using research questions in the study.

The following table represents teachers' demographic information.

Demographics	Details	No of participants
Gender	Male	5
	Female	15
Experience teaching grade 6	6 months	8
	1 year	3
	2 years	3
	3 years	1
	4 years	2
	5 years and above	3
Teachers' First language	Bemba	14
	Tumbuka	2
	Tonga	2
	Mambwe	1
	Kaonde	1

Table 5.1: Teachers' demographic information

The table above shows the total number of participants in the study were 20 with five male and fifteen females. The teaching experiences of teaching grade 6 ranged from six months to 5 years. The dominant first language of the teachers was Bemba.

5.1 Teachers' knowledge of the Communicative Language Approach.

The first objective sought to find out teachers' understanding of the Communicative Language Teaching approach. The Communicative Language Teaching method is the recommended method for the teaching of English IN primary school. Therefore, this study was intended to establish if teachers understood the meaning of the recommended methodology and its important features. Data was collected from 20 teachers using semi-structured interviews. The themes and sub-themes which emerged from the research question 1 were as follows;

5.1.1. Teachers' understanding of the English syllabus's recommended methodology for teaching English at primary school.

Teachers were asked to state the methodology currently recommended to use when teaching English grammar. This question was meant to establish whether teachers knew the recommended methodology in the syllabus to use when teaching English grammar. This question was important because teachers were expected to be knowledgeable about the syllabus demands and the education policy about teaching English at upper primary level. The following were the responses from the interviews conducted.

It is groupwork and discussion that are supposed to be used (Teacher 1)

I think discussion, inquiry and groupwork (Teacher 3)

I feel it is important to use teacher exposition so that learners can understand and add inquiry or discussion (Teacher 4)

Discussion, question and answer, individual are normally used (Teacher 5)

The use of question and answer, discussion, teacher exposition (Teacher 6)

Discussion, question, and answer, groupwork, pair work (Teacher 7)

Discussion, question and answer, demonstration (Teacher 8)

I explain then demonstrate, and use question and answer to find out if learners are following (Teacher 9)

Mainly it is teacher exposition, groupwork, question and answer, and whole class sometimes (Teacher 10)

It depends.... Discussion sometimes (Teacher 11)

Learner centered because learners are supposed to learner from each other (Teacher 14)

Fluency, vocabulary, spelling, comprehension (Teacher 15)

From the responses above, most of the teachers said that the recommended methodology was groupwork, discussion, question and answer, and pair work. Inquiry, whole class and teacher exposition were also mentioned as the recommended methodologies by some teachers. However, one teacher said it was learner centered while another mentioned fluency, vocabulary, spelling and comprehension.

5.1.2. Teachers' knowledge of Communicative Language Teaching Methodology

Teachers were asked to explain what they understood by Communicative Language Teaching. This was meant to establish if teachers understood what CLT is as it is the current recommended methodology for teaching English in schools. The responses were presented in themes as follows.

Themes	Sub-themes
Knowledge of CLT	Communication between teachers and learners
	Use of familiar language
	Interaction between the teacher and learners
	Learner centered

Table 5.2: Teachers' knowledge of CLT

5.1.2.1. CLT is Communication between teachers and learners

The following responses were from teachers who understood Communication Language Teaching as communication between the teacher and learners in the classroom.

It is reciprocal teach and get the response then communication has taken place (Teacher 4)

It is whereby you as a teacher you are using methods to communicate with learners as you teach them. It should involve teacher to pupil interaction (Teacher 5)

Teaching where you communicate with the learners, and you allow them to communicate with each other (Teacher 6)

Where you are communicating with children easily and they participate in the lesson (Teacher 8)

This is where you communicate with the learner (Teacher 10)

Communicative Language Teaching enhances effective use of English.... enhances effective communication. Teaching whereby you are able to communicate with learners and learners are able to communicate among themselves (Teacher 12)

One communicates using the familiar language which everyone understands (Teacher 19)

It improves communication skills and encourages participation. It is the oral aspect of language grammar teaching. (Teacher 1)

5.1.2.2. Use of familiar Language to teach

Some teachers understood Communicative Language Teaching as teaching using a language which is understood by learners in a classroom. The following were the responses.

CLT is using language that learners can understand, and this facilitates communication between the teacher and the learners. Interaction, rapport, Feedback are features of Communicative Language Teaching (Teacher 2)

It is using a language which is closer to understanding of the learners whereby they are understanding what they are learning (Teacher 9)

Language which cannot create bias between the teacher and the learner (Teacher 14)

It is language where you are exchanging ideas and words with pupils (Teacher 17)

It the exchange of words in any language between the listener and the one speaking, in this case the teacher and the learners (Teacher 18)

It is the way of teaching using language learners are familiar with (Teacher 20)

5.1.2.3. Interaction between the teacher and pupils

Other teachers understood Communicative language Teaching as classroom interaction between the teachers and the pupils. The following were the responses.

It is when you are interacting with learners during teaching and learning (Teacher 3)

It is the interactive way of learning; learner understands you and you understand the learner.... meaning there is communication (Teacher 13)

It is one way of relating with learners (Teacher 15)

It is a comfortable way of teaching comfortable because you can understand, and the learners can understand (Teacher 16)

5.1.2.4. Learner centered

It is learner centered, learners get the concept (Teacher 7)

5.1.2.5. Lack of knowledge of CLT

However, one teacher stated that she did not have any idea about what Communicative Language Teaching is. Below was the response given.

Hmmm..... no idea (Teacher 11)

The findings on teachers' understanding of the Communicative Language Teaching methodology showed that some of the teachers understood Communicative Language Teaching as communication between the teacher and the learners in the classroom while others understood Communicative Language Teaching as teaching using language understood

by learners in the classroom. However, few described it as classroom interaction between the teacher and the learners during the teaching and learning process. One teacher did not know what it meant.

5.2. Application of Communicative Language Teaching in English grammar Lessons

The second objective sought to find out how teachers were applying Communicative Language Teaching in English grammar lessons to grade 6 pupils, their understanding of grammar and its activities, and how they used CLT to teach English grammar. The data collected is important to the study because it would help to find out if teachers used appropriate activities with the CLT methodology. Teachers were also observed teaching English grammar using the communicative language teaching methodology in multilingual grade 6 classrooms in different schools. The teachers were observed so that the data of what happened in the classroom is recorded for easy cross checking with the responses given during interviews and to gather enough data about how they use CLT when teaching English grammar in a multilingual classroom. Data was collected through the semi-structured interviews as well the observation checklist and recorded lessons.

5.2.1. Teachers' understanding of grammar.

Teachers were asked to state what they understood by grammar. This was meant to find out if teachers knew what they were supposed to focus on as they taught English grammar. The responses were categorised in themes as follows.

5.2.1.1. Grammar is language

Some teachers understood grammar as language itself. The following were the responses.

It is use of the language, way we use language, way we communicate ... way we use different phrases (Teacher 3)

Grammar is language itself (Teacher 4)

Grammar is the use of language (Teacher 5)

It is the way of using language according to your understanding (Teacher 6)

Grammar general use of language (Teacher 7)

Grammar is how you speak English words or any other language (Teacher 8)

It is the arrangement of words or way language is supposed to be spoken or written (Teacher 9)

It is use of language (Teacher 10)

Grammar language it is language itself (Teacher 16)

Its the language which involves the nature of speaking (Teacher 17)

It is Language (Teacher 20)

5.2.1.2. Grammar is pronunciation of words

The other teachers interviewed described grammar as pronunciation of words. The following were the responses.

Grammar the way we pronounce some words (Teacher 11)

It is the way one vocalises in a certain manner... the way one can come out (Teacher 13)

Grammar is the way one speaks (Teacher 14)

It is something to do with the way you arrive at the words ... pronunciation. (Teacher 19)

5.2.1.3. Grammar is the structure of English

Another set of teachers understood grammar in terms of the structure of English. The following were the responses.

Grammar improving vocabulary (Teacher 1)

Series or order how the structure of English follows for example nouns, verbs (Teacher 12)

It is the way we come out with English, pupils might have challenges if they don't learn (Teacher 15)

It is the set of rules of words (Teacher 18)

5.2.1.4. Uncertain

One teacher however did not know what grammar is and responded as follows

Hmmm.... No idea (Teacher 2)

The findings show that some teachers understood grammar as language while others understood it as pronunciation of words and the structure of English. However, one teacher did not give any description of grammar.

5.2.2. Application of CLT when teaching English grammar

Teachers were asked to state how they use CLT to teach English grammar. The question was meant to find out if at all teachers were using CLT as they taught English grammar. The emerging themes were as follows:

Themes	Sub-themes
Application of Communicative Language Teaching	Explaining concepts
	Use of techniques and activities
	Use of familiar language

Table 5.3: Application of CLT

The responses from the interviews under each theme have been explained below.

5.2.2.1 Through explaining the concepts

Some teachers used CLT during grammar lessons through explaining to the learners the main concepts of the lesson. The following were the responses.

Yes, through pupil-to-pupil interaction and teacher to pupil communication I explain how to construct sentences and then I allow them to work in groups or pairs, then they explain to their friends and then write an exercise individually which I mark (Teacher 3)

It is used. You communicate to the learners. Explain what they are supposed to do by giving them examples. I also give them work to practice on their own in groups and present (Teacher 8)

Yes, they should listen to my explanations first and follow instructions and then write the exercise. After marking they make corrections when I go through with them (Teacher 18)

Yes, I do. I introduce the lesson by teaching vocabulary first, if there are words that are challenging to learners and then I explain how to go about constructing the sentences through examples (Teacher 19)

5.2.2.2. Using different techniques and activities

Other teachers used different CLT techniques and activities to involve learners in the lesson. The following were some of the responses.

Yes, involving learners in groups after teaching them. I give them work to discuss. Then later they write individually (Teacher 1)

First, I teach them, group them, and use games as well (Teacher 4)

CLT can be used through activities after teaching them. Learners are able to participate fully (Teacher 12)

Yes, through debate and role play (Teacher 17)

5.2.2.3. Using a familiar language

Other teachers used familiar language when teaching English grammar using CLT. The responses were as follows.

I do through engaging learners when teaching them and using language they are familiar with. Codeswitching is used because of the challenges with language by learners. (Teacher 2)

I use CLT through making sure learners participate through speaking and constructing sentences. First, I teach the structure and allow them to participate in their familiar language as well because some of them don't know English (Teacher 7)

Yes I teach them through examples and i normally use common language when emphasising and I allow them to interact mostly using strategies like group work, games, project, role play. (Teacher 10)

Yes, repeating in their language to communicate and for them to understand i normally do this after i have explained everything and given examples (Teacher 13)

I use CLT when I am teaching than when I feel that learners have not understood, I use body language and other forms like using the language they know (Teacher 20)

5.2.2.4. No explanation given

However, some teachers failed to give an explanation on how they use CLT in English Grammar lessons.

Yes hmmm ... (Teacher 5)

Sometimes Hmmmm(Teacher 6)

Hmmm (Teacher 9)

Hmmmm not sure (Teacher 11)

Not sure (Teacher 14 and Teacher 15)

Yes, not sure (Teacher 16)

The findings show that that some teachers taught English grammar using CLT through explaining the main concepts of the lesson and other teachers taught using different activities and techniques like debate, groupwork and role play. Other teachers used learners' familiar language to help them understand what was being taught. However, other teachers couldn't give any explanations.

5.2.3. Teachers' classroom application of the Communicative Language Teaching methodology: Classroom Observation data

Teachers were observed as they taught English Grammar lessons. This was done to ascertain whether they use CLT as they teach English grammar. The presentation below is the data collected using the observation checklist and the recorded lessons.

LESSON 1, SCHOOL 2, TEACHER 2

The grade six class had 50 pupils, that is 23 boys and 27 girls. The languages represented in the classroom were Nyanja, English, Bemba, Tonga and French. The teacher's first language was Tumbuka. The lesson was on Homographs.

Teacher: (shows two books to pupils) What is the difference?

Pupil 1: Limo nalikavika (Bemba-one is covered) elo limbi talikavike (Bemba-the other one is not covered).

Teacher: Who can say it in English?

Pupil 2: That one is covered, and the other one is not covered.

Teacher: Who can write the word covered on the board? (pupil writes). Today we are going to learn about homographs. Who can tell me, what are Homographs?

Pupils: (silent)

Teacher: These are words spelt the same but have different meaning. (tries to explain in Bemba as well) ama words aya palana but yakwata meaning yimbi). So, the word cover is a homograph because it has two meanings, one is cover a book and two is cover a distance. ...Now who can give an example of such words?

Pupil 3: Push ... one kusunka (Bemba-push) elo two kapushi (Bemba-cat)

Teacher: No. babimbi? (Bemba-who else)

Pupil 4: grass (iyafyani) (Bemba) na glass (iye gilassi)(Bemba)

Teacher: No. (then writes Well on the board). What does well mean?

Pupil 5: iye sabi (Bemba-for fish) na iya chishima (Bemba-well for water)

Teacher: No, one is wrong. For fish it has a different spelling which is Whale.

Pupil 6: Well for feeling okey.

Teacher: Good. I want you to make two sentences in groups using same spelt word with two meanings. (goes round checking what learners are doing but continues guiding using English and some Bemba and encourages pupils to explain to their friends who couldn't understand English and Bemba).

Group 1: sink - ukwibila paka mana (Bemba-sinking in a river) na apakusukila imbale (Bemba-sink in the house for washing dishes).

Group 2: date – iyo mulebele pa board na date iya ku datinga umwanakashi (date written on the board and date for dating a girl)

Group 3: exercise – ukubutuka na filya nga mwatweba ukulemba (exercise – running and exercise- writing work)

Teacher: (gives learners a class exercise). Complete sentences using live, rock, wave.

End of lesson

LESSON 2, SCHOOL 4, TEACHER 4

The grade 6 class had 62 learners, 37 boys and 25 girls. The ethnicity of the teacher was Tonga, and the languages represented in the classroom were Bemba, Namwanga, Lala and English. The lesson was on Adverbs.

Teacher: Who can tell me what a verb is.

Pupil 1: A verb is a doing word.

Teacher: can you give me examples of verbs? Ma verbs nshi eyo mwaishiba? (bemba- Which verbs do you know?)

Pupil 2: Jumping, running.

Pupil 3: Dance, walk.

Teacher: Good (writes word adverb on the board) Bonse tubelenge – (Bemba)
Adverbs (Everyone to read)

Pupils: Adverbs

Teacher: What is an adverb? An adverb is a word that describes a verb and an adjective. So today we will discuss adverbs of manner and place. So ‘slow’ add ‘ly’, yalaba word nshi? (Bemba-what word will it be) We are making adverbs of manner. Elo ama words where something took place, ka word akale palefye place (Bemba- a word which is showing place). Where is the place located? nikwisa? Ninshi ni (Bemba-then it is) adverb of place. Example, where is the clinic? near the school so near ni adverb of place. Who can use beyond in a sentence?

Pupil 4: inga bakwipusha ati (Bemba-when you are asked); where is Malcolm Moffat? kwasuka ati (Bemba-answer); beyond the police post.

Teacher: Yes, kutanshi. (Bemba-in front). Now tell me which ones are adverbs of place and manner from the following; inside, softly, well, below, usually, carefully

Pupils: (discuss in pairs usually local language). Teachers encourages to use local language as they discuss but write in English. (examples of adverbs of place) inside, below and (adverbs of manner) softly, well, carefully, softly

Teacher: I want you to write whether the words on the chart are adverbs of manner of place (near, happily, swiftly, middle)

End of lesson

LESSON 3, SCHOOL 7, TEACHER 7

The grade 6 class had 56 pupils, 26 girls and 20 boys. The teacher’s first language was Bemba. The languages represented in the classroom were Bemba, Tonga and Lala. The lesson was on Adjectives (comparative)

Teacher: Can you read these words (beautiful, better, strong, tall). These words are called adjectives. What are adjectives? (Bemba-bushe adjectives ninshi?) Adjectives are words that talk more about nouns. Unga panga umuseela ukubomfya ‘beautiful’(Bemba-who can make a sentence using ‘beautiful’)

Pupil 1: Sharon is beautiful.

Teacher: Good. kwaliba ama classes yama adjectives (Bemba-There are classes of adjectives). One is comparative. (calls two pupils in front) Umutali ninani? (Bemba – who is taller between the two?) (showed pupils two sticks) Akatali ni kesa? (which one is longer)

Pupil 2: Moses mutali pali Joseph (Bemba-Moses is taller than Joseph) elo akakufesti katali pakulasti (Bemba- The first stick is longer than the last one)

Teacher: (Teacher puts up a chart with sentences). Niyesa ama comparative adjectives muma sentences. (Bemba-which ones are comparative adjectives in the sentences)

Pupil 3: stronger

Pupil 5: taller

Pupil 6: shorter

Pupil 7: Beautiful

Teacher: Bushe taller, shorter na stronger fipalena shani? (Bemba- what is similar in the words taller, shorter, and stronger).

Pupils: (chorus) er

Teacher: All comparative adjectives are followed by ‘than’. Beautiful, intelligent we add more. Aya kuti yaba shani (Bemba-how can these be), long, weight, cold, intelligent.

Pupil 8: long-longer

Pupil 9: weight- weighter

Pupil 10: cold- colder

Pupil 11: intelligent -intelligenter

Teacher: Only two are correct, Longer, and colder. (gives a class exercise)

End of the lesson

LESSON 4, SCHOOL 9, TEACHER 9

The grade 6 class had 72 pupils, 38 girls and 34 boys. The teacher's first language was Bemba and the language varieties in the classroom were Tonga, Swaka, Bemba and English. The Lesson was on Homographs.

Teacher: (Writes words on the board) can you read the words I have written?

Pupils: (chorusing) Bank, Permit, Close, Rock

Teacher: Can you tell me the meaning of the words? Bank, Permit

Pupil 1: Bank – where people put money.

Teacher: So, if you put money in a tin, then it is a bank.

Pupil 2: Permit – do something.

Pupil 3: Permit - someone near to you.

Teacher: Homographs are words that have more than one meaning. They are words that are spelt the same but with different meanings. For example: **bank** is an institution which deals with money, and it can also mean side of the river, **close** – when not open and near something. Can you give examples of Homographs? Then writes the word 'covered' on the board.

Pupil 4: covered – to put something on top.

Pupil 5: covered – to travel a distance.

Teacher: Alright. (teacher demonstrates covered). Now, I want you write the following in your books. (gives an exercise with sentences requiring learners to fill in the blanks)

End of the lesson

LESSON 5, SCHOOL 13, TEACHER 13

The grade 6 class had 63 pupils, 38 boys and 33 girls. The teacher's first language was Tumbuka and the language varieties in the classroom were Lala, Tonga, Swaka, Bemba, Nyanja, and Namwanga. The lesson was on Conjunctions.

Teacher: What do you think are Conjunctions?

Pupils: (silent)

Teacher: Conjunctions are words used to join words and sentences and ideas. (writes definition on the board and pupils copy). Then writes a sentence on the board: 1. Give me that fruit which is ripe and sweet. 2. It is not Mary but John who failed the test. Which ones are conjunctions in the sentence?

Pupil 1: (goes to underline) and, but

Teacher: Do you know what ripe means?

Pupil 2: icapya.

Teacher: okey (gives an exercise). Underline conjunctions in the sentences given.

End of the lesson

LESSON 6, SCHOOL 15, TEACHER 15

The grade 6 class had 70 pupils, 36 girls and 34 boys. The teacher's first language was Bemba and the language varieties in the classroom were Tonga, Lozi, Lala, and Nyanja. The lesson was on interrogatives.

Teacher: Read the following words- **how, what, when, whom, who** and make sentences using the words.

Pupils: (read) How, What, When, Whom, Who

Pupil 1: How did you find me?

Teacher: Who can make a word using what?

Pupil 2: What can i help you?

Teacher: Who can correct him?

Pupil 3: What are you talk about?

Teacher: tried but who else can correct him

Pupil 4: What are you talking about?

Pupil 5: When did it happen?

Teacher: Who can make a sentence using 'whom'?

Pupil 6: Whom are you?

Pupil 7: No, whom did I see you with yesterday?

Teacher: The lesson is on interrogatives. What are Interrogatives? They are words which are in form of questions. What are these words in form of questions? (pupils – whom, who, where, what, when, which). In groups, write sentences which have interrogatives.

Group 1: When was the accident happen?

Group 2: Who are you?

Group 3: What are you doing?

Group 4: Whom is the owner of the bag?

Teacher: (puts up a chart) Read the sentences and write the exercise in your books by putting the correct interrogative.

End of the lesson

LESSON 7, SCHOOL 19, TEACHER 19

The grade 6 class had 44 pupils, 24 boys and 20 girls. The teacher's first language was Bemba and the language varieties in the classroom were Bemba, Swaka and Lala. The lesson was on tenses (changing from present to past tenses).

Teacher: Nga twalanda ati present tense ninshi twalanda pali finshi? (Bemba-when we say present tense what are we taking about)

Pupil 1: ifya pitile (Bemba-past)

Pupil 2: ifilechitika (Bemba-things happening)

Teacher: nga past tense (Bemba-what about past tense)

Pupil 3: ifya pita (Bemba-past)

Teacher: change the following from present to past. Elo mupeleko ama examples yenu (Bemba-and the give me your own examples) wait, shout, go. yambi kubika ed elo yambi yala chinja (Bemba-some you just add ed and for others they change completely)

Pupil 4: wait – waited, shout - shouted, go-went.

Teacher: Who can give me an example of a sentence changing from present to past?

Pupil 5: She is sad. (present). She was sad. (past)

Teacher: so iyi sentence yafuma mu present yaba nombamba mu past. (Bemba- so the sentence has changed from present to past). Nombamba babili babili chinjeni ama sentences from present to past (Bemba-in pairs change the following sentences from present to past) 1. We see him going to the market. 2. They learn English.

Pupils: (discuss in local language, Bemba/Lala) 1. We saw him going to the market. 2. They learned English.

Teacher: Learnt not learned. (gives a class exercise)

Pupil: Madam niyisa iyilecinja. (Bemba-madam which one should we change)

Teacher: lembenifye (Bemba- just write)

End of the lesson

5.2.4. Summary of the findings on the second research question

The second research question was teachers' application on the Communicative Language Teaching in English grammar lessons. Teachers were asked about their understanding of grammar. The findings were that some teachers described grammar as language while others understood it as pronunciation of words and the structure of English. However, one teacher did not give a description of grammar. Most teachers agreed that they used the CLT methodology to teach English grammar but failed to explain how they did it. From the lessons observed, some teachers used Bemba and English to explain concepts and allowed the learners to use Bemba as well, but others just used English through out the lesson.

5.3. Teachers' negotiation of learners' multilingual identities through language practice

To find out how teachers negotiate learners' multilingual identities through language practice, teachers were asked to state the languages they speak, the dominant language in their classroom, the language varieties in their classroom, and if they were trained to teach multilingual classrooms. Teachers were also asked how they make sure children who don't fluently speak English and understand it are helped to participate in the lesson. The data was collected from teachers through semi-structured interviews.

5.3.1. Teachers' familiar languages

The teachers were asked to state their first languages and other languages which they spoke. The responses were as follows.

5.3.1.1. Bilingual teachers

My first language is Bemba and the other language I speak is English. I grew up in Northern province and I was trained there as well (Teacher 5)

I speak Bemba and the only other language I speak is English. I have never been exposed to other languages (Teacher 16).

5.3.1.2. Multilingual teachers

My first language is Bemba. I speak English and Nyanja fluently. I learnt Nyanja in Lusaka because I grew up from there (Teacher 1).

My first language is Tumbuka, but I speak English and Nyanja, and some Bemba as well though I can't say I speak Bemba, but I do understand some words (Teacher 2).

I have two first languages., Bemba and Tonga but I also speak Nyanja. and of course, English My Mother used to speak to us in Tonga and My father used to speak in Bemba. So I learnt both languages (Teacher 3).

Tonga is my first language though I speak Bemba and English as well. (Teacher 4)

I am Bemba but I also speak Tonga and English. I learnt Tonga from my husband (Teacher 6.)

My first Language is Bemba though I am fluent in Nyanja and English as well (Teacher 7).

I am Kaonde but I speak Lamba because I grow up in Lamba land. I also speak Bemba fluently (Teacher 8.)

My first language is Bemba, but I also speak English, Tonga, Swahili, and Nyanja. I just have interest of learning languages (Teacher 9).

My first language is Mambwe. I can also speak English, Nyanja, and Tonga. I spent some years in Southern Province, and I was trained there (Teacher 10).

Apart from Bemba which is my first language, I also speak Lunda and English as well (Teacher 11).

I am Bemba by tribe, but I also speak Kaonde, English, Lunda, and Swahili. This is because I have stayed in many parts of the country since childhood (Teacher 12).

My first language is Tumbuka. I speak English, some Bemba, and Some Tonga. I say some because I am not fluent, but I can speak some words (Teacher 13)

I was born in a Bemba speaking family, but I can also speak English and the Lusaka town Nyanja (Teacher 14).

I speak Bemba as my first language, but I also speak English and Nyanja fluently (Teacher 15).

My first language is Bemba. I also speak Namwanga, English and some Lala (Teacher 17).

My first language is icibemba. I can also speak English, Mambwe, Namwanga, Lala and Swaka (Teacher 18)

My first language is Bemba. In addition, I speak Tonga (because my Husband is Tonga) and I also speak Nyanja and English (Teacher 19)

My first language is Bemba. I speak some Lala (learnt it through interaction with pupils) and English (Teacher 20)

The findings show that the first language for 14 teachers was Bemba, 2 Tumbuka, 2 Tonga, 1 Mambwe and 1 Kaonde. When teachers were asked to state which other languages they spoke, the responses showed that all teachers were able to speak English, two teachers whose first languages were Kaonde and Tonga teacher were able to speak Bemba as well. Out of the 14 teachers whose first language was Bemba. 9 were able to speak Nyanja, 4 were able to speak Tonga, 2 were able to speak Lunda and 2 were able to speak Lala. Other additional languages teacher spoke were Lamba, Namwanga, Mambwe and Swahili.

5.3.2. Language varieties and dominant Language in the classroom

The interviewed grade 6 teachers were asked to state the language varieties in their classrooms. They were also asked to state the dominant language used by the pupils. The responses were as follows.

My pupils speak Bemba and English although the dominant language is Bemba (Teacher 1).

Language varieties include Bemba, Nyanja, English, Tonga and French are common, but Bemba is used mostly (Teacher 2).

They speak mostly Nyanja and Bemba, and both are common (Teacher 3).

My pupils use Bemba, Namwanga, English and Lala. The dominant one is Bemba (Teacher 4).

It is Lala, Bemba, Namwanga and Ngoni but Bemba is common (Teacher 5).

There is Bemba and English but common is Bemba (Teacher 6).

Bemba, lala and Tonga are common in my class but most of them use Lala (Teacher 7).

Mostly they use Bemba and English throughout the class activities (Teacher 8).

The common languages are Bemba, Swaka, Lala and Tonga but mostly used is Lala (Teacher 9).

Bemba and English though Bemba is very common especially when contributing in class. Pupils find it easy to speak Bemba (Teacher 10).

My learners only use Bemba even if they are answering questions asked in English. It is the only language used in class (Teacher 11).

In my class, some pupils use Tonga, others Lala, Swaka or Lenje but the Lala is mainly used especially when they are interacting among themselves and when answering questions (Teacher12).

Lala, Swaka, Bemba, Tonga, Nyanja and Namwanga languages are spoken and used in my class, but Bemba and Lala are common ones used (Teacher 13).

Pupils in my class speak Bemba, Nyanja and English though Bemba is dominant (Teacher 14).

I have pupils who speak Tonga, Lala, Lozi, Nyanja and others English. But what is common is Bemba because they use it to talk to each other and to answer me though sometimes Lala dominates (Teacher 15).

Bemba and Lala are used in class though Lala is mostly used, and pupils express themselves freely (Teacher 16).

There are four common languages in my class, Lala, English, Bemba, Tonga. But pupils mostly use Lala to interact and respond to questions (Teacher 17).

English, Bemba and Lala. Many pupils use Lala in my class (Teacher 18).

I have Bemba, Swaka and Lala pupils. Lala is common and used throughout the lesson (Teacher 19).

Bemba and Lala but many pupils usually use Lala to interact and participates in class (Teacher 20).

The findings were that out of the 20 teachers, 4 responded that English and Bemba were the only languages in the classroom, 5 responded that their pupils only used Bemba and Lala although the fifth added some English, 4 had some Nyanja speaking pupils and 4 had pupils speaking Tonga as well. It was established that among the language varieties in the grade 6 classes, Bemba was common followed by Lala. It was also established that English, Tonga, Lala, Nyanja, Swaka and Namwanga were also present in some classrooms with few classes which had pupils who spoke Lozi, Ngoni and Lenje.

5.3.3. Teachers' preparedness to teach English as a second language in multilingual classrooms.

The grade 6 teachers were also asked whether they were trained to teach multilingual classrooms. The responses from the teachers were as follows.

5.3.3.1. Trained to teach multilingual classrooms

We were trained to teach all pupils, but the lecturers always gave examples in Bemba and not any other language, maybe it was because he was Bemba. sometimes, I use what I learnt (Teacher 2).

Yes. Examples were always given on us, in a class with many languages and different languages were made to give examples. I help my pupils as well (Teacher 3).

Yes, although we mainly focused on Tonga because of where our college was (Teacher 4).

I was trained in Northwestern and the focus was on three dominant languages there, but we were given skills on how to teach such classes (Teacher 8).

5.3.3.2. Partially trained to teach multilingual classrooms

I remember the lecturer always asking us to give examples in different languages. I think yes, we were trained though we were not just guided (Teacher 5).

We were somehow prepared to meet multilingual classrooms because of the different activities we were engaged in during our training. I allow learners to explain to their friends in different languages (Teacher 7).

I was trained though not very much. These are classes which have pupils who speak different languages (Teacher 10).

The training I received was general, but I think everything was handled right there. The problem was that it wasn't explained as multilingual (Teacher 13).

Multilingual classrooms? Hmmm I think I was trained (Teacher 14).

5.3.3.3. Not trained to teach multilingual classrooms

I wasn't trained and I don't know what it is (Teacher 15).

No. No one mentioned it during my training (Teacher 16).

I don't remember anything about multilingual classrooms (Teacher 17).

Lecturers used to mention about such classes but nothing much was done (Teacher 18).

I did not receive any training. Classes with many languages right... (Teacher 19).

I wasn't trained and I have no idea about multilingual classrooms (Teacher 11).

No. I did not receive in training in such (Teacher 12).

I was never trained to teach multilingual classrooms and i don't know what is involved (Teacher 9).

I wasn't trained to teach such classes (Teacher 20).

5.3.3.4. Uncertain

We were just taught in English so I don't know and can't remember anything about multilingual teaching (Teacher 1).

I don't remember being trained to teach multilingual classrooms (Teacher 6).

The findings revealed that some teachers were trained to teach multilingual classes though many of them stated that they were not trained. Others said they were partially trained with two who were uncertain.

5.3.4. How teachers accommodate multilingualism in their classrooms

Teachers were also asked how they helped learners who don't fluently speak and understand English so that they can understand the content and participate in class. The emerging themes are in the table below:

Themes	Sub-themes
Negotiation of classroom multilingual identities	Translation and interpretation
	Translanguaging
	Codeswitching
	Homework
	Peer instruction
	Use of familiar language
	Simple language

Table 5. 4: Accommodation of multilingualism

The responses from the teachers during interviews were as follows.

5.3.4.1. Translation and interpretation

I usually translate in Bemba, ask friends good in English to help translate because I feel they usually get concepts from their friends faster (Teacher 2).

Language is mixed the language is translated into Bemba or Tonga by those who know the languages.... the class is good (Teacher 3).

I use Bemba, translate words from English to Bemba but not all words, only the main ones (Teacher 11)

I interpret in their local language certain words (Teacher 18).

5.3.4.2. Translanguaging

I usually blend by explaining in Bemba though I am not so fluent, but some pupils help me when I am stuck (Teacher 1).

I incorporate different languages ... during English I make it a must to use English and I don't allow them to use any other language (Teacher 14).

5.3.4.3. Codeswitching

I code switch (Teacher 5).

Codeswitching is used though some pupils don't even understand Bemba, so I ask some of their friends to explain to them. Some of my pupils use Tonga (Teacher 7).

I repeat in their own language though it is difficult because i don't know it much ask learners who know to help (Teacher 13)

I switch to a local language in order for them to understand (Teacher 20).

5.3.4.4. Homework

I usually give them homework that suits their ability and i expect people at home to help them (Teacher 6).

5.3.4.5. Peer instruction

Codeswitching is used though some pupils don't even understand Bemba, so I ask some of their friends to explain to them. Some of my pupils use Tonga (Teacher 7).

I explain in local language Bemba, those who don't know Bemba, their friends help (Teacher 17).

5.3.4.6. Use of familiar language

I explain in a local language, that is, Bemba though I am not good in Bemba, but I try (Teacher 4).

I partly use Bemba so that they understand the meaning in Bemba if it is in English (Teacher 8).

I explain some difficult terms in local language usually Bemba though not all the time because I want them to learn English (Teacher 9).

I use their mother tongue the common is Bemba (Teacher 10).

I use Bemba to help them understand difficult work only (Teacher 15).

I use local language but not throughout (Teacher 16)

I use their mother tongue, their familiar language (Teacher 19).

5.3.4.7. Using language at the level of the learners

I use simple words which I know they can understand, and they can relate them in their language (Teacher 12).

The findings revealed that most of the teachers used codeswitching, translation, translanguaging, and interpreting, and using peer assistants. Other ways teachers used were using familiar language, and simple words at the level of the learners and repeating content to help them understand. Homework was another strategy used to assist the learners.

5.3.5. Grade 6 pupils' views on classroom language practices by their teachers

To triangulate the responses from teachers, grade 6 pupils were asked questions on the languages they use in the classroom and in the community and how teachers use language in the classroom. Data was collected using the focus group discussion. Some of the responses from the focus group discussions with 10 grade 6 pupils from each class were as follows.

5.3.5.1. Exclusive use of English language

She uses English and some of us usually use it at home. It can help us to speak it faster, it can help us when we grow up (Focus Group 3)

She mostly uses English (Focus Group 5)

She uses English throughout and some of our friends don't understand (Focus Group 9)

The teacher uses English only, but it helps us to learn English (Focus Group 14)

She uses English only, but we learn more how to use English (Focus Group 15)

The teacher just uses English, but others don't understand (Focus Group 18)

5.3.5.2. Exclusive use of Bemba language

She explains in Bemba, and it is good because others do not understand English easy to understand what the teacher is teaching (Focus Group 2)

The teacher uses Bemba, and we feel nice because it is the language we speak, if we don't understand then it's our problem (Focus Group 11)

Bemba is used to teach but it doesn't look nice because the subject is English (Focus Group 12)

He uses Nyanja and Bemba, but we only enjoy when he tries to use Bemba although he doesn't know it very much, but we understand since it is our language (Focus Group 13)

The teacher uses Bemba, and we like it because we understand because English is difficult to understand (Focus Group 19)

She uses Bemba and we understand and know a lot of things she teaches (Focus Group 20)

5.3.5.3. Use of both English and Bemba languages

The teacher uses English to teach but explains some things in Bemba. Some of us like it because we understand things more (Focus Group 1)

We like it because she teaches us how to speak and write English because we can learn faster but uses Bemba sometimes (Focus Group 4)

He uses English but uses Bemba when we don't understand (Focus Group 6)

She uses both English and Bemba but we like it because most of us don't understand English (Focus Group 7)

The teacher uses both English and Bemba. We are comfortable because it is easy to understand (Focus Group 8)

He uses both English and Bemba and he explains very well (Focus Group 16)

The findings revealed that most of the teachers used English to teach but explained some concepts in a local language especially Bemba. There were some few exceptions of English only.

The pupils were then asked if they were allowed to use their first language in class. The responses were as follows.

5.3.5.4. Teachers permit learners to translanguage

Yes. She allows us to use Bemba (Focus Group 1).

No, allows both English and Bemba, stops us from using other languages but only allows us when we want to help our friends understand (Focus Group 2).

Yes, she accepts both English and Bemba but when we use Bemba too much, she feels bad sometimes (Focus Group 4)

She is okay with Bemba but not too much (Focus Group 5)

She allows both English and Bemba but when you say something in Bemba she will tell you to try and say it in English (Focus Group 7)

She does not allow us to use Bemba (Focus Group 12)

If it is English, the teacher uses but allows bemba sometimes to explain. we only use Bemba when we are permitted (Focus Group 13).

Sometimes Bemba but always reminds us to use English but allows other students to help (Focus Group 15)

Allows bemba but he says if it is English time, we are supposed to use English and not any other language (Focus Group 16).

She allows bemba but sometimes tells us to use English (Focus Group 18)

Bemba is allowed though she tells us to use English as well (Focus Group 19)

5.3.5.5. Teachers do not permit learners to translanguage

No, the teacher only allows English, she gets upset when one uses local language and sometimes shouts at us (Focus Group 3).

She does not allow any other language apart from English (Focus Group 6)

The teacher tells us to speak in English when you use your mother tongue (Focus Group 8)

No, teacher translates in English if one answers in a local language and encourages us to use English so that we can understand (Focus Group 9)

When she asks in English, most of us answer in Bemba and she says it in English (Focus Group 11)

We are only allowed to use English but if you use any other language, he usually asks another student to say it in English (Focus Group 14)

He only allows English, does not allow using bemba. He asks you to stop (Focus Group 20)

The findings showed that while some teachers allowed learners to use local language in the classroom while learning English grammar, while others did not. Some teachers did not allow their learners to use any other language apart from English.

5.3.6. Pupils' ideologies about translanguaging ideologies

Pupils were asked to state how they felt when the teacher used the language they were familiar with. The responses were as follows.

5.3.6.1. Translanguaging promotes inclusion and learning

We feel comfortable and everyone participates (Focus group 3)

It helps us to learn a lot of things, and we are able to participate when the teacher asks questions (Focus Group 13)

We feel good because we understand what we learn (Focus Group 12)

All those who don't understand English understand meaning we all learn (Focus Group 14).

It feels good because we are familiar with the language, and we learn more (Focus Group 15)

We enjoy because everyone learns and participates (Focus Group 18)

We learn a lot because the teacher uses the language we know (Focus Group 19)

It is easy for us to remember because the teacher is using the language we know (Focus Group 20)

5.3.6.2. Translanguaging aids understanding

We feel good because we are able to understand everything (Focus Group 1).

We feel good because it helps to understand everything, helps to be clear the teacher explains in the language we know very well (Focus Group 2)

It feels nice because everything is clear and we ask the teacher when we don't understand (Focus Group 4)

Happy because some of us understand better (Focus Group 5)

We feel happy because we are able to understand everything she is explaining and teaching (Focus Group 6)

We understand what he says better, we feel happy to use our language, and those who don't understand English can understand (Focus Group 7)

We feel good because we understand everything (Focus Group 9).

We like it because that is the language most of us use even at home (Focus Group 11)

5.3.6.3. Translanguaging is not a good practice

It feels strange but also good. We understand what the teacher explains if a word is difficult, explains it in Bemba to help us understand (Focus Group 8).

We are not comfortable because not everyone understands Bemba (Focus Group 16)

Some of our friends don't understand Bemba. So they don't understand what the teacher says when she uses Bemba (Focus Group 17)

The findings revealed that most of the pupils felt happy if the teacher used a language familiar when teaching English because it helped them understand better and learn more. However, some pupils responded that using a local language disadvantaged those who were not familiar with the language used.

5.3.7 Summary on the findings Teachers' negotiation of learners' multilingual identities through language practice

The findings on the third objective revealed that the first language for most of the teachers interviewed was Bemba and a few were Tonga, Tumbuka, Mambwe, Kaonde and Namwanga. In their classrooms, teachers revealed that Bemba was the dominant language although there were other language varieties like Lala, Nyanja, Tonga, Namwanga, Lozi and Swaka. It was also revealed that most of the teachers were not trained to teach multilingual classrooms but with a variety of languages in their classrooms they codeswitched, translanguaged and

translated. The findings from the focus group discussions with the pupils revealed that although teachers insisted on the use of English during the teaching and learning process of English grammar, they used local language to explain some concepts.

5.4. Challenges teachers face when teaching English grammar using the Communicative Language Teaching approach in multilingual classrooms.

The fourth objective sought to establish challenges teachers faced when teaching English grammar using the Communicative Language Teaching approach in multilingual classrooms. Data was collected through semi- structured interviews from teachers. The themes that emerged are presented in the table below:

Theme	Sub-themes
Challenges	Poor learner proficiency in the English Language
	Low classroom participation by learners
	Teachers' lack of proficiency in the dominant local languages spoken by learners
	Teachers' judgement of multilingualism as a problem
	Teaching and learning materials.
	Poor teacher-pupil ratio

Table 5.5: Challenges

5.4.1. Poor learner proficiency in the English Language

The first challenge was that most of the pupils had difficult with English language in terms of understanding reading, writing, and speaking. It was revealed that some pupils were able to understand English but failed to read and write. The responses were as follows.

Most of the learners don't understand English and others fail to express themselves but may understand. So, it becomes difficult to teach everything in English because pupils will just be looking at you (Teacher 1).

Some children are not fluent in English. They fail to construct sentences and express themselves in English (Teacher 2).

Some pupils are not able to understand English. I am forced to use the language they understand. ... speak English then interpret it (Teacher 3).

Most learners don't know how to read and write so I incorporate local language especially when explaining things to them so that they understand. (Teacher 4).

Most of the learners don't know how to read English. So, I say some words in Bemba as well I teach them which takes a lot of time (Teacher 5).

I have challenges with learners who can read but understanding what they read is a challenge. When they are given an exercise, they fail to answer (Teacher 6).

Learners don't understand English, if you just concentrate using English you find that only few understand (Teacher 10).

Most of the learners do not understand English. Many pupils have reading difficulties..... language of instruction as English is not fair because of the location ... some parents are illiterate (Teacher 11).

When learners move from lower (using local language) to upper (using English) it becomes difficult for them to start using English They are still struggling with English language (Teacher 12).

Understanding of the learners since everything is in English especially since they used local language from grade 1 to 4 (Teacher 18).

5.4.2. Low classroom participation by learners

Teachers were asked if pupils participated in during English grammar lessons in class. The responses were that only few did.

If you ask questions which require one word answer then some will answer but questions which require sentences, then the same pupils will participate (Teacher 6).

Some learners do not participate much, learners not familiar with the dominate language fail to participate (Teacher 7).

It is a problem..... only those who understand some English participate (Teacher 10).

I have the same pupils participating in class especially when using English (Teacher 14).

5.4.3. Teachers' lack of proficiency in the dominant local languages spoken by learners

Although the language of instruction for upper primary is English, teachers stated that it was challenging to use English throughout the English grammar lessons. Therefore, teachers were forced to use local language though for some it was again challenging because of their unfamiliarity with the local language of the pupils and the communities where they taught. Some of them had never been exposed to the languages they found in areas where they were deployed. Some of the responses were as follows.

It is also difficult for me to help them in local language since I am not fluent in Bemba or Lala (Teacher 1).

Sometimes I continue using local language even as they write even asking some their friends to explain to them with words I don't know since I am not fluent in Bemba (Teacher 4).

Language barrier Being Tumbuka and brought up in Eastern province. I fail to help the pupils because I don't know Bemba. Most of the learners do not know English (Teacher 13).

Language barrier... you cannot teach throughout using English, you have to use Bemba or Lala but I find myself in a situation where I don't know some of the words in local language (Teacher 20).

5.4.4. Teachers' judgement of multilingualism as a problem

Apart from the teachers' language barriers, others stated that another challenge was the presence of other languages in the classroom.

Some learners do not participate much learners not familiar with dominate language fail to participate. When I use Bemba to help them, some learners do not understand because they are Tonga. We have received a lot of Tonga families here because of farming (Teacher 7).

We have Namwanga communities who don't like using other languages. The pupils from these communities give me challenges especially when it comes to pronunciation and use of language (Teacher 11).

You introduce words and learners are blank, then you are forced to use local language. But again, some pupils may not understand the language you are using (Teacher 17).

5.4.5. Teaching and learning materials.

The other challenges teachers brought out were lack of teaching and learning materials. It was revealed that it was difficult to implement certain activities in the classroom when teaching English grammar because materials were not provided by the school.

Not enough books, some pupils don't know how to read I read for them ... (Teacher 14)

I have ten books for my class of 70. Sharing becomes difficult.... I can't manage to write everything on the board.... No manila papers and markers to write some work before class... it is challenging (Teacher 16)

Sharing of book does not help, grouping learners to use one book is even worse because they end up fighting for it. So, we need books.... Many books (Teacher 18)

5.4.6. Poor teacher-pupil ratio

The other challenge was the large number of pupils in the classrooms. Most teachers said that it was difficult to know learning challenges which pupils had. Some of the responses were.

The high number of pupils.... Plus, time. When you try to attend to individual needs it doesn't work (Teacher 6)

Large classes make it difficult to help pupils with other languages. I end up just using the common one though not good for others (Teacher 13).

High enrolment levels making it difficult to attend to each one of the pupils (Teacher 14).

Learner centered teaching does not work. I mostly lecture in English and some Bemba and just use question and answer (Teacher 17).

I don't group my learners because they are many and there is no space in the classroom. Its whole class for me regardless of language barriers (Teacher 18).

5.4.7. Summary on the findings on challenges faced by teachers.

The findings on the fourth objective on the challenges faced by teachers when teaching English grammar using CLT revealed that most of the learners had problems understanding, reading, and writing English. The other challenges were that some teachers had language barriers because they lacked proficiency in the familiar language and some of the pupils also were not familiar with the local language. Other challenges included lack of teaching and learning materials and large class sizes which made it difficult for them as well as the pupils to effectively teach and learn English grammar.

5.5. Summary of Chapter five

The chapter presented the findings on teachers' application of the Communicative Methodology in the teaching of English grammar in multilingual classrooms. The focus of the study was grade 6 teachers and pupils in three districts, that is Kapiri Mposhi, Mkushi and Serenje. The findings revealed that most teachers did not fully understand the methodology currently recommended to use when teaching English grammar. The teacher had limited understanding of the Communicative Language Teaching approach. It was also revealed that teachers had inadequate knowledge on English grammar and how it should be taught using the communicative methodology. However, to accommodate pupils with different multilingual identities many teachers used translation and interpretation, code switching, translanguaging, learners' familiar, homework and simple language. This was because of the challenges teachers encountered in their classrooms such as pupils' failure to speak, read, write, and understand English. It was also revealed that teachers faced other challenges such as lack of proficiency in the local languages of the communities, teachers' judgement of multilingualism as a problem and unfamiliarity with some learners' languages. Other challenges revealed were lack of teaching and learning materials, low classroom participation and over-enrolment.

CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

6.0. Overview

The previous chapter presented the findings of the study on teachers' application of the Communicative methodology in the teaching of English grammar in multilingual classrooms. This chapter will present the discussion of the findings with reference to the literature reviewed and theories presented earlier in the previous chapters to highlight and confirm the findings in relation to the existing knowledge on the use of CLT to teach English grammar in multilingual classes. The analyses and discussions will be presented under each research objective.

6.1. Teachers understanding of the Communicative Language Teaching approach

The Zambia Primary English syllabus recommends the Communicative Language Teaching approach as the teaching methodology teachers are supposed to use when teaching all the English language components which include listening, speaking, reading, writing and grammar/structure. To find out if teachers knew and understood CLT, they were first asked to mention the recommended methodology in the syllabus to find out if they were using CLT and then they were asked to explain what they understood by the Communicative Language Teaching approach.

6.1.1. Teachers' knowledge of the recommended methodology for ESL Teaching

The study established that teachers presented groupwork (teacher 1,3,7,10), discussion (teacher 1,3,4,5,6,7,11), question and answer (teacher 5,6,8,9,10), inquiry (teacher 3 and 4), whole class (teacher 10), teacher exposition (teacher 4,6,10), demonstration (teacher 8 and 9), learner centered (teacher 14) and fluency, vocabulary, spellings and comprehension as the recommended methodologies in the Zambia Primary English Syllabus. The findings showed that the teachers had less knowledge about the methodology recommended in the syllabus to teach English grammar though the syllabus clearly stated it. The Zambia English Primary Syllabus recommends the Communicative approach as the teaching methodology currently in use to teach English and then role play, drama, problem solving information transfer, pair or group discussion, field trips and debate as techniques which the teacher would engage

learners into as much as possible to enable them to interact and communicate among themselves and with the teacher in the teaching and learning process (CDC, 2012). In so doing learners are expected to acquire the second language which in this case is English. Teachers mentioned the techniques used when teaching English grammar instead of the teaching methodology which is CLT. This showed that some of the teachers were teaching using some of the techniques under CLT even though they could not state the recommended methodology while others were mentioning the skills which were supposed to be enhanced such as fluency, vocabulary, spelling and comprehension after using the techniques recommended when teaching using CLT. This showed that although teachers were able to use some recommended techniques in the syllabus, they did not fully understand how they were supposed to teach English grammar using CLT and they couldn't differentiate between a methodology and technique. This could be attributed to their failure to fully interpret the Zambia Primary English syllabus despite having been exposed to it, and teaching at primary schools for some time. Further analysis revealed that some teachers were not abreast with the syllabus recommendations.

According to the expertise theory, teachers need to interact with all the materials related to their profession such as the curriculum, syllabus, and textbooks to gain the necessary knowledge and skills required for them to effectively implement teaching and learning in the classroom using the appropriate methodology and strategies (Stigler and Miller, 2018). Teacher expertise begins to be developed as one undergoes training through the interpretation of the curriculum. This is so because the teacher needs to plan the lessons according to the recommended methodology and interact with the content within the syllabus so that it is delivered within the specified context (Tsui, 2003). Constant practice of the required strategies and exposure to the curriculum are key to becoming an expert in a particular field. But once the teacher fails to interpret the syllabus, then the teaching and learning process would be affected because the teacher will not be able to follow what is expected during lesson delivery thereby disadvantaging learners.

6.1.2. Teachers' understanding of Communicative Language Teaching

The study also established through interviews that teachers had limited understanding of CLT. Teachers described CLT as communication, use of familiar language, interaction between the teacher and the learners and learner centered way of teaching. The recorded responses from the 20 teachers who were interviewed revealed that eight teachers described CLT as

communication between teachers and learners (Teachers 1,4,5,6,8,10,12,19). Although CLT aims to improve the communicative competence of the learners through recognising the link between language and communication, it cannot be described merely as communication because a lot of aspects are involved for communication to take place. It appears that the misunderstanding that the Communicative Language Teaching method is about communication is widely held by teachers in many contexts. For example, Abrejo et al (2019) also found that the respondents in his study viewed CLT as being all about communication among students, but this does not fully describe what it is.

Some teachers described CLT as the use of familiar language to teach (teachers 2,9,14,17,18 and 20). The teachers explained that the use of a language known by the learners facilitates communication leading to learning because the learners can easily understand what the teacher is teaching. But Communicative Language Teaching advocates for the judicious use of the local language to help learners learn the second language effectively. The use of learners' familiar language is one of the features of CLT and can be used to facilitate learning. This is because language diversity in the classroom gives room for the teacher to help learners connect the unfamiliar language to the familiar language and CLT requires teachers to use necessary strategies to manage diversity in the classroom and facilitate second language learning (Engelbrecht, 2016). Thus, explaining the communicative language teaching as being the use of local languages is not accurate description of the method but merely a feature of the CLT.

Four teachers described CLT as an interaction between the teacher and the learners (3,13,15,16). One of the characteristics of CLT advocates for interaction between the teacher and the learners as well as among the learners. The description of CLT as interaction between the teacher and the pupils did not fully explain what CLT was but rather mentioned one of its characteristics showing that teachers had some ideas in connection to CLT. Another response that was given was by Teacher 7 that CLT was a learner centered way of teaching language which was true as an feature of CLT but not as an explanation of what CLT was.

This shows that even though teachers were using the syllabus with CLT as the stipulated teaching methodology, they couldn't define, explain or describe what CLT is although their responses showed that they knew some of the activities related to teaching using CLT meaning they lacked in-depth understanding of it. None of them could give a comprehensive explanation of CLT. Many of them gave bits of what CLT was. And it showed that they had

been using the syllabus and teaching without understanding what CLT is. But if teachers did not understand CLT comprehensively, it would be challenging for them to apply it appropriately and comprehensively in the teaching process (Richards, 2005). Consistent with the findings, Pratt (2018) who conducted an online survey on Teaching Assistants (TAs) who taught Spanish using CLT also reported that even though the graduate assistants under study had positive attitude towards the use of CLT, they were not knowledgeable about all the principles of CLT. Equally, Chishipula (2016) who conducted the study in public secondary schools in Chongwe district reported that teachers had failed to describe CLT, and they had a lot of misconceptions such as CLT should not be used to teach grammar, tolerance of errors when teaching, and that the focus was on listening and speaking only. Some teachers revealed that they were not trained in CLT methodology and therefore had no idea about it though the syllabus recommended its use.

Theoretically, for a teacher to be an expert in their field they need to have curriculum as well as pedagogical content knowledge about a particular subject matter which would help them develop their professional understanding (Shulman, 1987). Mapako and Mareva (2012) whose study focused on how Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is conceptualized by secondary school teachers in Zimbabwe reported that though teachers demonstrated understanding of CLT, they had a lot of misconceptions about it which included neglecting grammar teaching and focus on just listening and speaking skills when CLT covers all the language skills. According to Shulman (1987) for a teacher to be an expert they should aim at developing their pedagogical content knowledge in a particular subject area. This means that apart from the teacher having knowledge about what they are supposed to teach, they are also supposed to have knowledge on how they are supposed to teach. Without pedagogy, it would be difficult to deliver content. For teachers to develop professionally, they need to enhance their practices theoretically and practically. The development of their skills needs a lot of support within the school environment as well as from policy makers so that teacher learning continues even after training (Savignon, 2002). Therefore, teachers need to be abreast with any development in their career for effective delivery in the teaching and learning process. It can therefore be concluded that most teachers did not know the methodology they were supposed to use and couldn't even describe what it is. However, the syllabus clearly spells out the methodology teachers were supposed to use when teaching of the components of English to grade six learners.

The findings show that teachers had limited understanding of CLT as a methodology they were supposed to use to teach English grammar. Since CLT advocates for linguistic as well as communicative competence among learners, it can be inferred that the failure by teachers to describe and explain CLT affects teaching and learning in their classes as well which leads to poor language and literacy levels among learners in Zambia. The teacher should be able to understand what works in the classroom when teaching English grammar using the skills attained during training. But some teachers could have limited knowledge about pedagogy because they may have received inadequate training. Teacher education at all levels should strive to educate teachers on pedagogy as much as possible as it is an important component besides content because for them to deliver content, they need to know how to do it. To overcome teachers' pedagogical inadequacy, teachers should be encouraged to upgrade, for example from a primary diploma holder to a primary degree holder because some methodologies are taught in detail at certain levels of education, and it might help increase the knowledge on some aspects of pedagogy. It is also important to use human resources within the schools through Continuous Professional Development (CPD) workshops to help teachers be abreast with the recommended pedagogy and to improve educational quality. However, the effectiveness of CPDs depends on the leadership of an institution. Some teachers may not be available for CPD meetings and may continue using outdated methodologies thereby creating gaps in the knowledge and skills of teaching (Phiri, 2022).

In summary, it can be stated that also teachers couldn't mention the recommended English grammar teaching methodology in the syllabus as well as explain what CLT was but rather mentioned some characteristics of CLT which weren't enough to reveal their understanding. This showed that teachers had limited understanding of the Communicative Language Teaching approach. In view of expertise, it is important that learners are attended to by a teacher who is knowledgeable in a particular field so that they gain content knowledge (Ericsson, 1996).

6.2. Teachers' classroom application of the Communicative Language Teaching approach in English grammar lessons.

The second objective of this study was aimed at analysing how teachers applied the Communicative Language Teaching approach when teaching English in primary school multilingual classrooms. To respond to this objective, the first part of the analysis focuses on the concept of grammar. This is so because this topic is about the use of CLT to teach

grammar. Thus, it is critically important to establish how teachers understand grammar before delving into the centrality of the objective which is the application of the CLT in the classroom. Thus, section 6.2.1 below will be on teachers' conceptualization of grammar after which, teachers' application of CLT will be discussed in detail.

6.2.1. Teachers' Conceptualization of Grammar

The study revealed that some teachers understood grammar as language, pronunciation of words, as the structure of English and others were not certain. Below, each of the themes will be discussed.

6.2.1.1. Grammar is language

Some respondents understand grammar to be language itself. This is mainly based on the idea that grammar is central to the functionality of language and that without grammar, language as it is known would be difficult to use in daily communication. Thus, those who understand grammar as language appear to believe that correct grammatical sentences and phrases make it easier to communicate and understand what others say, speak or write (Teachers 3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,16,17 and 20). The teachers indicated that grammar is language itself because it involves interaction which is meant to understand each other. The revelation can be related to the findings by Thu (2009) who wrote that to help learners acquire grammar meaningfully and appropriately, they should be taught the form and function of grammar. Once learners are exposed to the form and function of grammar, then they can use language. Every language has its own grammar which forms the structure and meaning of a language (Hassan et al, 2018). It should be observed that relating grammar directly to language does not make it language, but part of it. Grammar is the basis of language, and it requires putting words together to speak a language (Brumfit, 2000). It must also be noted that in the broader scope of communicative competence, there are four domains which make language complete. These are grammatical, sociolinguistic, strategic and discourse. This means that in the conceptualisation of language, grammar is just a part of it. Therefore, for one to equate grammar to language is not just an exaggeration but figurative because in truth, grammar is part of language but not language itself.

6.2.1.2. Grammar is pronunciation of words

Some teachers understood grammar as pronunciation of words. Teachers 11,13,14 and 19 described it as a way of pronouncing words and how each person speaks and comes up with words to use. The pronunciation of words can't be linked to grammar because it falls under Phonetics and Phonology though for sentences to be grammatically correct words should be pronounced correctly. Pronunciation is a set of habits of producing sounds repeatedly. It is a sub-skill of speaking just like grammar, vocabulary and pragmatics (Toçi, 2020). This means that both grammar and pronunciation are skills for enhancing effective speaking and therefore one cannot be the other.

6.2.1.3. Grammar is the structure of English

It was revealed that some teachers described grammar as the structure of English which includes the way words are ordered in a sentence and the rules of arranging words (Teachers 1,12, 15 and 18). This showed that teachers had ideas about what grammar is. According to Hassan et al (2018) grammar is the study of language which deals with the forms and structures of sentences, words and meanings. This somehow resonates with Celik (2014) who wrote that the rules of grammar such as punctuation, pronunciation and sentence structure are essential to achieve communicative competence. According to Cummins (2018) grammar examines the word and sentence structure of a language and the phonology and semantic aspect are also part of grammar. Grammar supports the acquisition of language and therefore it is language itself. Grammar is a language system that determines the correctness of sentences orally or written. It is taught to present learners with the way language is created and how it should be correctly use. Grammar is an important aspect of language and if learners fail to comprehend the rules of grammar, then they will fail to communicate effectively in a language (Yusob, 2018). This shows that when teaching English grammar using CLT, teachers are supposed to teaching it with the real-life situations and using the recommended activities so that there can be a balance between the communicative activities with the targeted language structures. Therefore, teachers who described grammar as language had ideas about what grammar is.

6.2.2. Application of Communicative language Teaching Method when teaching English grammar to grade 6 learners

The findings of the study on how teachers applied CLT when teaching English grammar to grade 6 learners showed that teachers were able to apply some CLT activities in English grammar lessons. During lesson observations, the CLT activities teachers used were groupwork (teacher 2 and 15), pair work (teacher 4 and 19), and discussion (teacher 7, 9, 15 and 19). However, during interviews teachers (4 and 17) also revealed that they used games and role play to teach English grammar using CLT. But during lesson observations none of the teachers used them. The study by Toro et al. (2019) found out that even though teachers revealed that they were using modelling, repetition, pair and groupwork in teaching, learners were not actively participating and therefore communicative competence was not achieved as expected. This could be attributed to teachers' inadequate training on how to implement some of the activities in the classroom. According to Souisa and Yanuarius (2020), the teaching of grammar should be done through strategies that would help the learners to figure out the rules of the language and apply them in a different situation appropriately. Similarly, Hassan et al. (2018) stated that the teaching of grammar should include activities such as groupwork, pair work, role play, games, simulations, information gaps and problem solving to help learners develop their communication and acquire the grammar rules communicatively. But according to Coskun (2011), some teachers prefer engaging learners in question-and-answer techniques disregarding the curriculum guidelines which stipulates activities that would enhance learner to learner interaction to help them learn and develop the second language. This may be due to lack of knowledge on the CLT activities, and how they can be used in teaching English grammar.

It was revealed also through lesson observations that some teachers used real life situations and real materials to teach English grammar. To introduce the lesson on homographs teacher 2 used two books, a covered one and one which was not covered. The essence was to introduce the word 'cover' as a homograph. Learners were asked to differentiate the two books and one pupil responded that one was covered, and the other was not. Teacher 4 introduced Adverbs of place by using the position of the school to that of the clinic when she used 'near' to relate the school to the clinic. After explaining that near is an adverb of place she went on to ask the learners to use 'beyond' and one learner was able to relate the college to the police post using 'beyond' correctly. Teacher 7 introduced the lesson on 'comparative'

by using two sticks with different lengths to introduce the comparative 'longer' and used two pupils with different heights to introduce the comparative 'taller'. Teachers 2, 4 and 7 related their lessons to real life communication so that it could be easier for the learners to use the learnt language in real conversations outside the classroom. Teacher 15 used a chart as a teaching aid. According to Richards (2006:13), one of the principles of CLT is to 'make real communication the focus of language teaching'. Therefore, the three teachers applied the principle of using real materials and situations but did not extend the use of real materials in the other stages of the lesson but opted to explain other concepts orally. This showed that the importance of using authentic materials when teaching English grammar using CLT was neglected by teachers maybe due to lack of knowledge on how to go about it or lack of preparation. Out of the number of lessons observed it can be concluded that most of the teachers did not relate their lessons to real life situations to prepare learners for encounters outside the classroom. The other teachers did not use any teaching and learning materials. This could be linked to the challenges which most of the teachers revealed during interviews when they said that it was difficult to teach grammar using CLT because of lack of teaching and learning materials. The teachers were expecting all the materials to be provided by the schools, but it also showed that they were not innovative and resourceful. The findings by Chani's (2011) study showed that one of the factors that hindered the effective implementation of CLT was the lack of teaching resources such as books, authentic materials, textbooks and teacher manuals, thereby denying the effective practice of language by the learners. Communicative Language Teaching advocates the use of a variety of teaching and learning materials to facilitate learning of a second language. According to Richards (2001), teaching and learning materials whether provided by the school or made by the teacher are important because they help learners practice the target language as they are interacting with them. This shows that through interacting with teaching and learning materials learners improve their communication skills and language structures and motivate them to learn more. Using grammar instructions in real communicative situations helps learners to understand how to use grammatical structures outside the classroom in real life situations. This means that once teachers use teaching and learning materials and interact with them, then learners will use the learnt structures once they meet the same structures in real life but if the teacher is theoretical, it would become difficult for the learners to apply the structures outside the classroom.

It was also observed that all the teachers used learner-centered in their English grammar lessons. But the levels of engagement were different. Teachers 2, 4, 7, 9 and 19 engaged the learners at every stage of the lesson and demanded for their contributions before proceeding. However, teachers 13 and 15 partially engaged the learners and they rushed through the lesson without giving the learners enough time to think about the questions and what they were supposed to do. It should be noted that most of the lessons engaged the learners through question and answer, but the learners were supposed to be fully engaged to make meaning out of the content shared with them, among themselves. According to Zhao (2022), CLT is a learner centred approach and therefore the learners should take an active role in the classroom even though their language proficient levels may be low, and the teacher should facilitate the language items the students need to interact with and give the learners more opportunities to interact with each other during lessons to facilitate learning. It can be noted that the teachers practiced learner centered way of teaching which was in accordance with CLT because it encourages interaction and active participation of the learners in the teaching process. Allowing learners to interact among themselves helps them to practice grammar rules through their peers by using the familiar language to negotiate meaning and learn from each other especially that most of the classes are multilingual. This assertion is supported by Qasserras (2023) who wrote that learner centered approach encourages learners to be responsible for their own learning as the teacher's role is only that of a guide and this enables them the freedom of interaction that enhances their critical thinking and problem-solving skills.

The study also established that some teachers (2,4,7,19) taught English grammar using the learners' familiar language while using the CLT approach. The teachers used familiar language and allowed the students to use familiar language as well because they had challenges expressing themselves in English. Teachers 2 and 4 used the local language sparingly but Teachers 7 and 19 used the local language throughout the lesson. All the teachers (2,4,7,19) encouraged learners to use local language as they interacted in pairs or groups. It can be difficult to manage a class with various languages because a teacher would need to select activities and materials which would meet the diverse linguistic needs of the learners as well as enhance learners. CLT requires a teacher who can speak the familiar language spoken by the learners because it has so many different techniques which may require using languages learners are familiar with so that they can understand the content (Brown, 2007). But if the teacher cannot speak the familiar language, he or she should allow

the learners to use it but with control. The first language aids in the learning of a second language (Calafato, 2019). Therefore, incorporating some aspects of the learners' familiar language would help learners to learn the second language quickly. One of the challenges noted by Tsisana and Dali (2021) was that learners failed to understand the grammatical structures of English because of lack of knowledge about it. The low proficiency levels of learners in English leads to the use of local language by some teachers. Communicative Language teaching advocates for the use of the target language of instruction but allows translation and the use of the local language when need arises (Larsen, 2000). Teachers may use the local language to give guidance on difficult concepts and aspects in classwork (Thamarana, 2015). It encourages the use of learners' familiar language judiciously to facilitate learning and as a bridge for learners to grasp concepts, but teachers should strategically incorporate the familiar language without hindering English for communication and its development (Qasserras). The communication skills developed in the first language are helpful in the development of a second language. According to the translanguaging theory, instruction in the classroom should accommodate all the learners from diverse linguistic background and therefore despite the subject at hand being English grammar, the teacher should try to incorporate the learners' familiar language as well as other languages to help understand the subject matter and promote other less dominant languages as well.

The findings from the lesson observations on how teachers applied CLT in the teaching of English grammar in multilingual classes revealed that all teachers taught English grammar as a separate component and each of them taught it differently. Teaching grammar using CLT should improve communicative competences of the learners (Zhong-Guo and Min-yan, 2007). Teacher 15 did not even confirm some answers given by learners one of which was on the wrong use of 'whom' and which could have led to the learners' failure to understand the topic though using CLT helps the learners to realise mistakes on their own and correct them. However, teacher 7 was able to give feedback to the learners though she did not explicitly explain the rules governing comparative adjectives but on showed the learners the 'pattern' at the of each sentence, 'er'. Teacher 15 corrected the learners through their friends to encourage accuracy in the formation of sentences, which is an important aspect in the teaching of grammar using CLT. Learners were able to infer the rule from the examples which qualifies one of the principles of CLT which is inductive. Teacher 15 involved learners in the construction of sentences using interrogatives before explaining briefly what they were. The learners were able to use the interrogatives and formulate questions by relating to the

teachers's questions. Grammar leads to effective communication and therefore teachers are expected to teach it inductively when using CLT methodology by giving learners examples and allowing them to come up with rules themselves and construct similar sentences by relating to the teacher's examples (Weng, 2018).

From the lessons observed, some teachers tried to incorporate the principles of CLT in the teaching of grammar lessons but also recognised the language diversity in their classroom which affected the way they taught. Other teachers couldn't teach the grammar lessons as expected due to lack of pedagogical knowledge. In their study, Petraki and Hill (2011) found out that the teachers lacked teaching methods on the teaching of grammar and therefore were less confident teaching it. This shows that the lack of grammar teaching skills affected the teaching and learning process thereby denying the learners the acquisition of grammar skills. However, the expertise theory places emphasis on someone being an expert in the domain in which they operate and involvement in other activities related to one's professional helps to grow an expert because learning is continuous (Richards and Farrell, 2005). However, Makhathini and Mncwango (2020) reported that some teachers they interviewed as they conducted their study admitted that they did not have adequate knowledge on the teaching of English grammar, and language learning theories because of inadequate training. Because of the gap created in teacher training, the result was that the teachers failed to deliver grammar lessons following the expected guidelines.

Therefore, the application of CLT in most English grammar lessons was not effectively done as most of the aspects of CLT to teach English grammar were not applied and some teachers did not help learners to induce the rules of the grammar lessons. It was difficult for most teachers to activate learning during the lessons. It should be noted that CLT advocates for learner centered teaching, use of authentic texts and application of language in real contexts to facilitate real communication whilst developing their critical and problem-solving skills. An expert teacher is supposed to notice the different levels of attainment in his or her class and attend to the learners differently.

6.3. Teachers' negotiation of learners' multilingual identities in ESL Classrooms.

The third objective aimed at establishing how teachers negotiated the learners' multilingual identities in their classes. But before discussing negotiation, it was important to establish the linguistic profiles of the teachers as well as how prepared they were to teach multilingual

classes. Then how they negotiated the different multilingual identities in their classes will be discussed.

6.3.1. Teachers' Linguistic profiles

The study established through face-to-face interviews that most of the teachers were multilingual (Teacher 1, 2,3,4,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,17,18,19 and 20) while others were bilingual (Teacher 5 and 16). It was revealed that those who were bilingual were just able to speak English and their first language which was Bemba although one added that they were able understand a few words from some common languages. Multilingual teachers revealed that they were able to speak more than two languages. The first language for 14 out of 20 teachers was Bemba, then 2 were Tumbuka, 2 Tonga, 1 Mambwe and 1 Kaonde. Other additional languages which teachers were able to speak included Lamba, Namwanga, Mambwe and Swahili. Among the pupils, it was also found that apart from Bemba and Lala, which were the two common languages in the classrooms observed, Tonga, Nyanja, Swaka, Namwanga, Lozi, Ngoni and Lenje were other languages with an addition of French. The findings showed that most of the teachers observed were able to speak Bemba. This helped them to relate concepts which helped the learners in their classroom to learn with less difficulties.

6.3.2. Teachers' preparedness to teach multilingual classes

The findings show that some teachers were trained to teach multilingual classes while others were not. From the interviews, four out of twenty teachers (Teachers 2, 3,4 and 8) admitted having received training on how to teach multilingual classes. Teacher 2 revealed that the lecturer always gave examples in Bemba which was his first language and never incorporated any other languages. Teacher 3 revealed that their lecturer gave examples on how to teacher a multilingual class by incorporating many languages and teacher 4 revealed that their lecturers mainly focused on the use of Tonga because of the location of the college while teacher 8 who was trained in North Western province revealed that their lecturers mainly exemplified using Kaonde, Lunda and Luvale but they learnt all the skills needed to teach a multilingual class through examples. The four teachers were guided during their pre-service training on how to teach multilingual classes and this means that they were ready to teach the grade six classes despite the linguistic diversities encountered. It was also established that five teachers (Teachers 5,7,10,13,14) were not fully trained and therefore did not acquire the necessary

skills on how to handle a multilingual class. Teacher 5 and 7 revealed that the lecturers used to ask them to exemplify concepts in local languages and engage them in different activities, but no explanation was given thereafter on why they engaged in such activities. Teachers 10 was able to describe a multilingual class though more information about what goes on was not taught by their lectures but teacher 14 mentioned with doubts that somehow, she was trained though she received general training and nothing was explained on multilingual classes. The knowledge gap on how to teach a multilingual classroom revealed the teachers had limited skills on multilingual classes and therefore it affected the way they taught in class. Teachers 9, 11,12,15,16, 18, 19 and 20 maintained that they were not trained to handle multilingual classes and among them others admitted hearing the word for the first time and two teachers (1 and 6) were uncertain. The lack of knowledge on how to handle a multilingual class by some teachers adversely affects their teaching and the input by learners is compromised because inclusivity in terms of language diversity is not taken into consideration.

From the findings few teachers were trained in how to teach multilingual classes, but most of the teachers were not trained. But despite lack of training in teaching multilingual classes, all the teachers were teaching English grammar in their multilingual classes. It is challenging for teachers for teachers who were trained in monolingual practices to use multilingual language practices in their classes because of lack of knowledge on how to handle multilingual classes when teaching English grammar (Nagy, 2018). Additionally, Garcia and Sylvan (2011) argued that teachers in multilingual classes should focus on negotiating different language practices to present challenging content to the learners to make communication and learning possible rather than siding with the monolingual ideology. This creates an enabling environment where students can learn from each other and from the teacher and the teacher can learn from students as well. It is unavoidable to switch languages in multilingual classes though others argue that the use of the students first language in a multilingual class affects the learning of the second language negatively (Bibi, et al., 2023). However, a well-trained teacher can handle a multilingual class more effectively and efficiently than an untrained teacher because of the skills acquired that are necessary to handle and accommodate learners with diverse languages (Rasheed, Zeehan & Zaidi, 2017; Mubita and Mwanza, 2020; Mwanza, 2020).

6.3.3. Negotiation of different multilingual identities

The teachers were asked during interviews how they negotiated the different multilingual identities in their classes to facilitate teaching and learning of English grammar using the CLT methodology. The teachers were asked the question because the classes they were teaching had learners with diverse languages. The study revealed that teachers used translation and interpretation, translanguaging, codeswitching, peer instruction, use of familiar language, repetition, giving homework and using simple language to accommodate multilingualism in their classrooms.

6.3.3 1. Translation and interpretation

The findings revealed that four out of twenty teachers (teachers 2, 3, 11 and 18) stated that they used translation and interpretation to negotiate the different multilingual identities of the learners in their classes during the teaching and learning of English grammar. According to Lin (2008: 17) translation involves “expressing the sense of words or text in another language”. When translation is used the exact content should be conveyed (Thomas, et al., 2022). Translation involves converting information from one language to another while retaining the same information from the first language. Teacher 2 whose first language was Tumbuka and whose grade six class comprised of learners with diverse linguistic backgrounds which included Bemba, Nyanja, English, Tonga and French revealed that while teaching English grammar in her class, she translated concepts that seemed difficult for learners to understand from English to Bemba which was the dominant language and asked learners who were proficient in English to translate into Bemba and for their friends who couldn't understand Bemba as they were working in groups. From the lesson observation, Teacher 2 from the lesson observation the teacher tried to help learners understand the word Homograph by translating from English to Bemba. Learners were encouraged to explain concepts in Bemba to their friends as well while discussing in groups and the teacher also allowed the learners to even present their English concepts in Bemba. Teacher 3 stated that she translated into either Bemba or Tonga which were the dominant languages in class while teacher 11 maintained that only the main words were translated from English to Bemba. But teacher 18 revealed that interpretation was used only for certain words during the teaching and learning process so as to help learners get the concepts. The current study agrees with the findings of Bwalya (2019) who also revealed that teachers used translation and interpretation in their multilingual classroom as pedagogical practices that could help the teaching and

learning process and added that it helped to create a good learning environment and encouraged participation in the classroom. Mungala and Mwanza (2024) whose study was conducted in a university in Zambia also found out that lecturers used translation during lessons to help students understand difficult English concepts. Similarly, the findings by Mohammed (2020), whose study was conducted in Saudi Arabia revealed that it is difficult for learners to learn a foreign language unless translation is used though it should be used judiciously especially when used with the Communicative Language Teaching approach which advocates for the use of the target language as the language of instruction.

6.3.3.2. Translanguaging

The study also revealed that some teachers used translanguaging as a pedagogical language practice to negotiate linguistic diversities in multilingual classes. The teachers mentioned that they used translanguaging to help learners with different languages understand the content of the English grammar lesson (teacher 1 and 14). Translanguaging as a classroom pedagogy helps to achieve language equity in the schooling system (Poza, 2017). It recognises learners' already existing linguistic system so that they are helped to understand and navigate a new linguistic system. Because according to Thomas et al (2017) translanguaging involves alternating languages which requires the teacher to input a language and then learners to use other languages in their activities. It is used to aid understanding of the content by learners in the languages used (Lewis, Jones & Baker, 2012b). Translanguaging allows multilinguals to move among the different linguistic resources to make meaning in communication and enhance inclusion and engagement of everyone despite their different languages (Erling, Adinolfi & Hultgren, 2017). It involves switching between languages to negotiate and create meaning through interaction. Teacher 1 revealed that she used translanguaging to negotiate the different multilingual identities in the classroom through explaining in the common language though it was not her first language but asked learners to help explain to their friends who did not understand the common language. Teacher 14 said that she used translanguaging by incorporating the different languages particularly Bemba, Nyanja and English while teaching other subjects but when it came to teaching English grammar she taught it exclusively in English. This shows that the teacher negotiated different multilingual identities when teaching other subjects though the focus of the study was on English grammar. This can be confirmed from FG 14 when learners revealed that the teacher exclusively used English when teaching and were not permitted to use any local language.

However, most teachers made use of the learners' language diversities to help each one of them participate in the teaching and learning process.

According to Thomas et al (2022), translanguaging is a pedagogical practice used by teachers in the classroom which involves receiving information in one language and using it in another language. It helps bilingual and multilingual pupils comprehend the English lesson content which they can discuss in their mother tongues to deepen their participation and comprehend the lesson fully (Vogel & Garcia, 2017). A similar argument by Nagy (2023) was that translanguaging is a shift from monolingual methods that allows the learners to use their linguistic and competence experiences in other languages to make meaning in the second language. The findings by Mkandawire et al (2023) revealed that most teachers were using translanguaging as an instructional strategy when teaching initial reading in multilingual classes because it helped to break the multilingual boundaries in the classes and helped students to acquire the lesson content without any language barriers. However, Bwalya's (2019) findings revealed that what the teachers were using was what he called semi-translanguaging because the principles of translanguaging were not followed as some teachers just used one language in the lesson. Omidire and Ayob's (2020) study was meant to find out how teachers were using translanguaging in classrooms and reported that it was a success because teachers had accepted it as a pedagogy, translated materials were made available and learners were participating because of using their languages. But one of the constraints in the utilising of translanguaging in multilingual classrooms was that some teachers had limited experience in handling different linguistic diversities in the classroom and other languages were too complex for the teachers to understand and therefore it become difficult to help some learners with difficult languages (Omidire & Ayob, 2020). This also increases participation in the classroom because of the use of students' first language in which they can confidently express themselves and therefore create meaning through interaction.

6.3.3.3. Codeswitching

The study also established that some teachers used codeswitching to negotiate the different multilingual identities in their classes. Garcia and Wei (2014) explained codeswitching as a process which involves alternating between two monolingual codes. It involves alternating from one language to another which the parties involved can understand. In the classroom situation, it helps to clarify, explain and give examples to facilitate understanding (Erling,

Adinolfi & Hultgren, 2017). Codeswitching aids in effective communication and interaction between classroom participants of different languages which leads to learner centred teaching because of learners' engagement (Cook, 2013). Out of the twenty teachers, teachers 5, 7, 13 and 20 revealed during interviews that they used codeswitching to negotiate the different multilingual identities in their classes when teaching English grammar. The teachers said that they switched to a local language when teaching multilingual classes in order to help learners understand the content. According to Calafato (2019) using the knowledge of the other languages to learn a new language is important for multilingual students. It also helps them to notice the linguistic patterns of different languages and they can help students to learn a new language (Tiche et al 2019). The findings of the current study agree with the findings of Nyamayedenga (2022) who reported that teachers taught English through codeswitching due to the presence of multilingualism in their classes and it helped to implement CLT. The paper by Nalunga (2013) though closely related to the current study aimed at finding out if code-switching into mother tongue had an impact on the development of the second language and what learning or teaching situations lead to the act of code-switching in multilingual classrooms. It was revealed that codeswitching from L1 had a great impact on the development of the second language as it helps the students to develop vocabulary and seek clarifications. To overcome communication barriers in multilingual classes, the study by Sampa (2019) revealed that teachers opted to use codeswitching and other pedagogical strategies to teach multilingual classes to help learners who were not proficient in Nyanja. Bibi et al (2023) who conducted a study to find out the opinions of students on the use of codeswitching and translanguaging as teaching strategies in language learning classrooms in multilingual contexts found out that students showed positive attitude in the classroom because they were able to understand, communicate and concentrate during the teaching and learning process. According to Kings (2018) codeswitching when used as a pedagogical approach in the teaching and learning of a new language accommodates the bilingualism of the students which benefits them in terms of understanding the lesson content because elements of both languages are used.

6.3.3.4. Peer assistants

Some teachers revealed that they used peer assistants to negotiate the different multilingual identities in the classroom through language practice (Teacher 1, 2, 3, 7, 17). When interviewed some teachers stated that it was difficult for them to know all the languages in

their classes, and this prompted them to ask other learners to explain to their friends in cases where some learners did not understand English or were not able to speak or understand the local familiar language. The students who assist the teachers in language were either bilingual or multilingual learners. This was also done due to teachers' lack of proficiency in the local language of the area as well as other languages in the classroom. Teacher 2 revealed that translation and interpretation were used during the teaching and learning process of English grammar, the teacher also added that she used learners as well to translate because it was easier for some pupils to understand from their friends. Teacher 7 also revealed that some of the learners in the classroom are Tonga, but he doesn't speak Tonga, so he asks pupils who know Tonga to explain to the other learners. Teacher 17 revealed that he uses Bemba but for the pupils who don't understand Bemba, he asks other pupils to help explain in the language they understand. Similarly, teacher 1 who revealed using translanguaging also used peer instruction as well because of poor proficiency in the common language which was Bemba

The notion of the language of instruction seemed problematic in multilingual classes prompting the use of common local languages which also seem not to favour of learners hence the need to take into consideration all the languages present. However, the use of some local languages depends on the proficiency levels of teachers while the use of English language in a multilingual class favour those who are proficient in English and makes it difficult for others whose English proficient level is low (Al-Khamisi & Sinha, 2022). Dhillon and Wanjiru (2013) whose study was conducted in a school with ten different languages reported that had challenges when teaching using English as well as some regional linguistic languages but opted to allow learners to teach themselves so that learning could take place because the teachers revealed that there were so many languages for them to know all and assist all the learners at once.

6.3.3.5. Use of familiar language

Another revelation was that some teachers simply used the learners' familiar language and others simply used words which they thought could help the learners to understand. Teachers 4, 8,9,10,15,16 and 19 revealed that they used the familiar language of the area to negotiate different multilingual identities in their classes. This was done mainly to explain difficult concepts and terms which were difficult for learners to understand. The study by Chen (2015) in an English only policy found that the use of the first language in a CLT classroom improved the learners' learning attitudes, proficiency and participation levels and reduced

their anxiety because they were comfortable with the use of the language they were familiar with. The first language determines the learning of the second language (Noor 1994; Schwers 1999). Simachenya and Mambwe (2023) in their study revealed that most pupils preferred to use Nyanja to seek clarity during teaching and learning and to converse with friends. The use of the learners first language helps them to explain concepts and relate them to English thereby improving their comprehension (Ismaili, 2015). Because of the use of the learners' familiar language, it helps to monitor their learning and motivate them to transfer the language skills from the local language to the target, making mastering of the second language possible. According to the translanguaging theory, classes are usually affected by the mismatch between the language of instruction and diverse languages in the classroom and the teacher therefore has the power to bridge the gap.

6.3.3.6. Homework

To negotiate the different multilingual identities in the classroom teacher 6 revealed that homework was given to pupils so that the language gaps experienced in the classroom could be filled in at home. In this case the teacher said that parents and other family members would be used to help teachers negotiate the language gap experienced by learners in the classroom. In this way the struggling learners are helped (Mkandawire, et al 2017). The findings are similar to the findings of Dhillon and Wanjiru (2013) who conducted a study on the challenges and strategies for teachers and learners of English as a second language and found out that among the strategies that teachers used was giving English home work to learners so that parents and siblings would help narrow the gap between the language of instruction and the first language of the learners and the diverse linguistic identities in the classroom.

6.3.3.8. Use of simple language

The teachers used translation and interpretation, translanguaging, codeswitching and peer instruction strategies to negotiate different multilingual identities of the learners although some of them were exclusively using English. Teacher 12 revealed that simple English language words were used in the classroom to help learners understand the concepts and help them relate to their own language.

6.3.4. Grade 6 pupils views of the language practices of their teachers

The revelations from the Focus group discussions on the language practices of grade six teachers were that some teachers used English throughout the English grammar lessons, others used Bemba while others mixed English and Bemba. The findings are further discussed below.

6.3.4.1. Exclusive use of English

It was revealed from Focus Groups (FGs) that some teachers only used English as they were teaching English grammar in multilingual classes (FGs 3, 5, 9, 14, 15, 18). The learners said that the use of English was good for those who understood it especially those who were even using it at home, but it was difficult for others to understand what the teacher was teaching because they were meeting the language for the first time in school. Though some teachers taught English grammar exclusively in English, they allowed the learners in the classroom to use a local language sparingly and encouraged them to use English and help their friends were not able to understand English very much (FGs 5, 15, 18). But some teachers did not allow their learners to use any local language during the teaching and learning process of English grammar and allowed translation in English if one used local language and asked other learners to translate (FGs 3, 9, 14). The maximum use of English as the medium of instruction is challenging to the learners because learners come from different linguistic backgrounds and their attainment levels are different

6.3.4.2. Exclusive use of Bemba

It was also revealed FGs that some teachers taught English grammar using a local language, that is Bemba throughout the lesson (FGs 2, 11, 12, 13, 19, 20). Some groups revealed that it was good for them because it helped those who had difficulty understanding English to understand the concepts better. Other groups felt the exclusive use of Bemba denied them the chance to learn English and it felt awkward learning English in Bemba. It was confirmed from the teachers 2 and 19 that they mostly used the local to teach the learners English grammar using CLT. It was also revealed that though some teachers taught exclusively in Bemba, sometimes they allowed their learners to use English whenever they wanted but others did not allow the learners to use any other languages apart from Bemba. According to Nagy (2018), allowing learners to use their first languages motivates full class participation and builds confidence. However, the revelation by the learners on the teacher's use of Bemba

was that it only favoured those who were able to speak and understand Bemba but the other learners who were not proficient in Bemba were disadvantaged leading to gaps in the learning process. It is also worth noting that CLT does not favour the use of the first language as the language of instruction but rather allows the judicious use of it.

6.3.4.3. Use of both English and Bemba

It was also revealed that some teachers used both English and Bemba to teach English grammar in multilingual classes (FGs 1, 4, 6, 7,8, 19). The findings were that the learners appreciated the teachers' use of the two languages because it helped them to relate concepts leading to better understanding. According to Bibi et al., (2023) using both the learners' local familiar language and the second or target language is unavoidable, and it helps learners who are not proficient in the second language to learn the language by relating concepts from one language to the other. It is important to use learners' prior languages because all the learners are included in the teaching and learning process (Källkvist, et al., 2017). However, the challenge comes when some learners are not familiar with the local language adopted to help them acquire a second language. Such learners may not move at the same space as others as they may be struggling to make sense of two unfamiliar languages exposed to them.

6.3.5. Pupils' ideologies about translanguaging

It was established from FGs that the use of a language they were familiar with by teachers when learning English grammar promoted inclusion and learning and aided their understanding though others said it was not a good practice. It was revealed by some FGs that translanguaging promoted inclusion and learning (FGs 3, 12,13, 14, 15, 18, 19 and 20). The learners said that when the teacher used the common languages in the classroom, the learning included all the languages which enabled participation in the classroom as everyone was free to express themselves in a language they were comfortable with. According to Hassan and Ahmed (2015), alternative use of languages enables reinforcement of concepts learnt when the teacher repeats in other languages. It helps learners to easily grasp the concept and learn the subject matter presented to them. FGs also revealed that the teacher allowed them to explain concepts to their friends in other languages so they could move at the same pace. Other FGs revealed that translanguaging aided their understanding as all the concepts were clarified in the languages they knew and used at home (1,2,4,5,6,7,9,11). They added that concepts were clear as explained by the teacher and it was easy for them to seek clarification.

According to Nagy (2018), embracing translanguaging practices in the classroom creates a conducive learning atmosphere and enhances academic freedom of negotiating learning together. However, other groups stated that translanguaging is not a good practice because usually the teacher used Bemba which some of the learners could not understand and the use of the local language hindered them to learn English faster (FGs 8, 16, 17). This is true especially in areas where the teacher decides to use only one local language, neglecting the other languages. The

6.4. Challenges faced by teachers when teaching English grammar using the CLT in multilingual classrooms.

There were several challenges which teachers revealed they faced when teaching English Grammar using Communicative Language Teaching approach to grade six multilingual classes. The teachers revealed the challenges during the face-to-face interviews and most of them were confirmed as they were being observed.

6.4.1. Learners' poor proficiency in English Language

The first challenge that most teachers revealed was that learners had poor proficiency in English language. English is the language of instruction from grade 5 to tertiary education in Zambia and therefore lessons are supposed to be conducted in English according to what the policy stipulates. The Communicative Language teaching approach recommends teaching English using the second language, but the local language can be used judiciously and as the strategic competence also guides the teacher to usual strategies that would enhance the learning of the second language. However, teachers revealed that most of the learners had low command of English language and therefore it was difficult for them to use English throughout the English grammar lessons. In this study the findings from teachers 1,3,10 and 11 revealed that some learners did not understand English while others understood English but couldn't construct sentences in English and express themselves. It was also revealed by teacher 4, 5 and 6 that some learners were able to read but couldn't understand what they were reading while others were not able to read and write English. Some teachers attributed this to the fact that most of the learners were used to local language as the language of instruction at lower primary and despite introducing them to English as a language of instruction at grade five they had not yet broken through in grade six (teachers 12 and 18). During lesson observations, it was also noted that some learners couldn't respond to the

teacher in English but used the local language instead (lesson 1 and 7). Other factors which contributed to low proficiency levels in English were the locality of the some of the schools such as the rural set up with none or few role models using English around the learners. The findings of the current study were in line with the findings of some previous studies that were conducted. Issa (2016) who after conducting a study in Al Ain public schools, United Arab Emirates reported that the main challenge that affected the implementation of CLT in public schools was the low English proficiency levels of the students especially in grammar which hindered English teachers' efforts to apply CLT in grammar lessons. Similarly, Chishipula (2016) also found that the disparities in the students' English proficiency affected the teaching of English grammar using CLT. But the findings by Liu and Deris (2023) whose study was conducted in different cities partially agree with the current study about low English proficiency of learners as a challenge to the teaching of English grammar because one of their findings points to the fact that in some areas it is not a challenge because children are exposed to English at an early stage but in some areas learners come into contact with English at school therefore making it difficult for teachers to engage learners. One of the findings by Makhathini and Mncwango (2020) was that learners had difficulties in their grammar lessons because they couldn't translate isiZulu, their first language, into English because they had not yet developed the target language which was English. However, the study conducted by Nam (2023) disagrees with the findings of the current study by revealing that learners' low English proficiency was not an obstacle in the implementation of CLT. It was argued that it should not be considered as a challenge because teachers can easily find ways of overcoming it. The argument brought by Nam (2023) resonates well with the expertise theory which states that to enhance expertise, the teacher is supposed to engage in experimenting and exploring to overcome challenges in the classroom and to be able to gain more insight in their profession (Tsui, 2003). It can be concluded that low English proficiency levels was a challenge revealed by many teachers during interviews, and it made teaching English grammar difficult because learners were not competent orally thereby making it difficult for teachers to engage them in CLT activities which affected learning. The translanguaging theory can also be applied as it reveals that for a learner to develop a second language, they need to use their knowledge of the first language. Therefore, teachers were supposed to incorporate the local language to help learners understand the content and participate in class.

6.4.2. Learners' low classroom participation

The challenge of low English proficiency in the teaching of English grammar using CLT in multilingual classrooms posed another challenge which teacher revealed during interviews as low classroom participation by learners. It was revealed that some learners could only answer questions which required them to provide one word as an answer but only a few pupils could answer if the question required them to construct a sentence (Teacher 6). During lesson observations, there was low participation observed from lessons 4 and 5 because teachers used English during teaching. In their study, Rasheed, Zeeshan, and Zaidi (2017) found that the students were not participating in the English Language lessons because they lacked the confidence to use English and opted to keep quiet to avoid making mistakes. Some learners refused to participate during English lessons because they couldn't express themselves in English when they were tasked to do some communicative activities and therefore decided to resist participation in the classroom (Issa, 2016; Asmari & Radman, 2015). Apart from having low proficiency in English Teacher 7 added that some pupils had low proficient levels in the dominant local familiar language, and this hindered their participation as well. This led to inactive participation in the classroom because some learners were avoiding making grammatical errors and opted to keep quiet. This posed a challenge because the participation of learners leads to better classroom performance but if pupils are not able to participate, then it is difficult for the teacher to assess how much content they have grasped. Considering how CLT is supposed to be taught, the lack of English proficiency among learners made it difficult for most teachers to effectively utilize CLT activities because learners were not able to understand English and express themselves as expected. But Paudel (2020) added that multilingual classes require skillful teachers who should strive to engage learners in the classroom by using strategies which would link the home language with the second language so that learners are motivated and participate freely. Theoretically, an expert teacher should read the classroom environment and modify their teaching accordingly. To enhance participation, the teacher should strive to make sure there is a connection between language and content so that the learners master the content and learn a language according to the translanguaging theory.

6.4.3. Teachers' lack of proficiency in the learners' dominant local language

The study through interviews also found that some teachers lacked proficiency in the dominant local languages spoken by the learners. This posed a challenge because it was

difficult for the teachers to explain difficult concepts in the learners' local language to help them understand. This led to another challenge which was brought about by linguistic diversity in the classrooms. Learners in the classroom had different linguistic backgrounds and some of the learners did not speak or understand other languages which made it difficult for the teachers to explain certain concepts in a local language to help all learners understand. Teachers also had challenges because they did not know how to speak some languages spoken by some pupils and in some cases the teacher was only able to speak English and his or her first language. Teacher 2 was bilingual and was only able to speak Tumbuka and English fluently. The languages in his class included Bemba, Tonga, English and French. The dominant language was Bemba. Although he was able to use a few isolated words in the local language, it was not enough to guide learners in the classroom during the teaching of English grammar. Teacher 5 and teacher 6 whose first languages was Bemba were fluent in English as well. The class for teacher 5 had Bemba, Lala, Ngoni and Namwanga speaking pupils though the common language was Bemba. It was challenging for the teacher to explain certain concepts to some learners because of the language differences especially to the Namwanga learners. The findings are in line with what Rasheed, Zeeshan, and Zaidi (2017) found out in their study of female teachers teaching English in multilingual classrooms secondary schools that linguistic diversity posed a challenge to both teachers and pupils and teachers resorted to using codeswitching when teaching. But on the contrary, some studies reported that teachers were finding it difficult to teach using CLT because they had poor oral proficiency level of English (Alexio, 2003; Chani, 2011). This shows that even though CLT is used to teach learners the second language, there is need for the teachers to be proficient in the learners' first language as well as the target language. The use of learners' languages increases their interest in learning and participation. Without language proficiency in the two languages, it becomes difficult to teach and help learners understand. The findings from the FGD 15 confirmed that their teacher only used English throughout the lesson. But when asked how they would feel if the teacher used a local language, they responded that they would participate freely. Some teachers' negative attitudes towards the use of local languages are tailored towards the monolingual language policy that favours the use of English from grade 5 onwards (Mwanza, 2016). This shows that only learners who were proficient in English benefited during the lesson. The study by Becker's (2024) revealed that due to some teachers' lack of proficiency in some students' languages, their teaching practices was affected, and it was recommended that teachers training programmes should prepare teachers for such occurrences. The translanguaging theory advocates for the use of the learners already

existing linguistic resources to build the new language through reinforcing the main concepts in several languages for learning to take place. However, according to Makhathini and Mncwango (2020), apart from the teacher being proficient in most of the learners' first languages and the target language, the teacher should also be knowledgeable and competent in English grammar.

6.4.4. Lack of teaching and learning materials

It was also found that inadequate and lack of teaching and learning materials was a challenge encountered by teachers as they taught multilingual classrooms. Teaching and learning materials help the teacher to deliver content and supports learning. Teachers failed to implement some activities when teaching English grammar in multilingual classrooms using CLT because schools were not able to provide teaching and learning materials required when using CLT methodology. Teacher 16 and 18 cited few books against a lot of pupils and lack of materials such as manilla paper and markers to prepare activities before class and these were lacking in most schools. The results of the study agree with the findings of Alexio (2003) who found out that lack of teaching materials hindered the effective implementation of CLT by teachers in their classrooms. Though the study by Asmari and Radman (2015) was investigating the challenges that hindered proper implementation of CLT in EFL, they also reported that teachers had no access to CLT materials which resulted in ineffective implementation of CLT in classroom which were learning English as a foreign language. Similarly, Barira, Shabana and Sadia (2019) who explored various hinderances which affected the effective implementation of CLT by English language teachers also reported the lack of resources like speakers, laptops, textbooks and multimedia among other challenges. Chishipula (2016) study showed that the text-based course books used in the schools under study to teach English Language were pedagogical in nature and no authentic materials were used in all the lessons observed. Equally the study by Makhathini and Mncwango (2020) cited the lack of resources to teach and assess language as contributing to failure to effectively teach English in bilingual classrooms. From the lesson observations, most of the teachers did not have any teaching and learning materials and those who had textbooks made a lot of pupils share on which was not effective.

6.4.5. Teacher to pupil ratio

The other challenge which teacher revealed was the teacher - pupil ratio. Most of the grade six classes had a high number of pupils. Teacher 9 had 72 pupils while teacher 15 had 70 pupils. Such high enrolment levels made it difficult for the teachers to successfully teach English grammar using CLT because most of the CLT activities demanded active engagement of the pupils through discussions, role play, information gap (Richards & Rodgers, 1986) and the teacher's role was that of a facilitator and a guide. But high number of pupils made it difficult for teachers to engage the learners in most of the activities and they revealed that they also failed to attend to individual problems some learners were facing such as language barriers it required a lot of time. Large classes meant a lot of languages in the classroom and most teachers revealed that it was challenging to consider all the languages, and some teachers ended up just using the most common language disadvantaging those who couldn't understand it. Teacher 7 also revealed that due to large classes, it was difficult to use learner centered methods a characteristic of CLT and they ended up lecturing and using question and answer technique and when using groupwork, they did not consider the rules concerning the number of pupils per group which according to the expertise theory, most of them used structured practice which does not take individual skill attainment into consideration. Some teachers also revealed that they did not bother about the linguistic barriers in their classes because of the numbers (Teacher 13 and 18). The study findings agree with the findings of Coskun (2011) and Chani (2011) who reported that large classes proved to be a challenge in the implementation of CLT because there was no individual attention given to learners and it was difficult to engage learners in CLT activities. Nam (2023) reported that large class sizes affected the classroom arrangement which was not conducive for CLT and therefore the implementation of CLT was not done according to the lead down principles. Time factor to involve learners in communicative activities was affected by the number of pupils in the classes (Omondi, Barasa and Omulando, 2014). Because of large classes, adjusting furniture to accommodate CLT activities becomes a challenge and there is little space for the teacher to move around and guide learners which limits how the learning is conducted.

6.4.6. Learners' linguistic diversities in the classrooms

The other challenge that teachers brought out that some teachers considered the linguistic diversities in their classes as a challenge. This Teacher 7 revealed that when she used English throughout the English grammar lesson, some learners could not understand but the use of the

common local language also disadvantaged other learners who were not familiar with it especially those whose first language was Tonga. This made it difficult to give attention to multilingualism in the classroom and therefore teachers considered multilingualism as a problem. Teacher 11 also revealed that there were some learners who couldn't embrace other languages and opted to communicate among themselves using the same language which became a barrier to the teacher to facilitate learning. But according to the expertise theory, teachers should have knowledge about their learners and characteristics and have the skill of approaching teaching in different situations as well as use strategies that can help achieve the set objectives. Although the study by Omondi, Barasa and Omulando (2014) focused on the teaching of listening and speaking using CLT, they also reported that it was difficult to use CLT because of language problems and failure to pronounce words correctly by learners. The study by Paudel (2020) also revealed that teachers were facing an obstacle of diverse linguistic backgrounds to teach English in their classes as most of the time learners were found talking in their own languages instead of using English. Therefore, multilingualism was considered a problem and not embraced as expected. From the classroom observation, it was established that in some classrooms, some teachers followed the monolingual ideology by using English throughout when teaching English grammar in a multilingual classroom. From the lesson observation teachers 9, 13 and 15 taught English grammar exclusively in English. When asked about how their teachers taught them English grammar, learners answered that their teachers taught exclusively in English (FGDs 3,5,9,14,15 and 20) and it was also revealed that some teachers did not allow them to translanguaging (FGDs 3,6,8,9,11,14 and 20). However, though some pupils welcomed translanguaging, others felt it was not a good practice because it hindered their acquisition of the second language, English in this case. The findings of Madonsela (2014) were that the use of a foreign language in the classroom by a teacher causes mental strain on the learners because it becomes difficult for them to communicate thereby compromising learning. This is because the language used is new to them and if they are expected to use it without any reference to their familiar language, then it would have an impact on their mental state. According to the translanguaging theory, the teacher needs to make use of the learners' languages in the classroom to help them make meaning.

6.5. Chapter Summary

The chapter has presented the discussion of findings in relation to the literature and the theories that informed the study and was presented in the previous chapters. The study has revealed that most teachers had scanty ideas about the Communicative Language Teaching methodology and instead described the methodology by giving examples of language techniques and strategies. Through lesson observation, it was revealed that some teachers were able to teach English grammar using codeswitching, translation and translanguaging as well as just integrating the learners' familiar language in the teaching and learning of English grammar in multilingual classes. It was also observed the teachers mostly used groupwork, pair work and discussion to teach English grammar. Some teachers taught grammar by incorporating the learners' familiar language while others taught English grammar exclusively in English using CLT in multilingual though the revelation from the learners was positive for some because they added that they were supposed to learn English and negative for others who stated that it was difficult for them to understand what the teaching was teaching if English was used throughout. Challenges that were brought out affecting the teaching of English grammar using the Communicative Language Teaching methodology and they included pupil teacher ratio, lack of English proficiency by some learners, lack of proficiency in the learners' familiar language by some teachers, low classroom participation by learners as well as lack of teaching and learning materials. It can therefore be concluded that teaching English grammar in a Multilingual class requires a teacher to be innovative and be able to interpret the curriculum to bring all learners on board as an expert in the field of teaching.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.0. Overview

The previous chapter presented the analysis and discussion of findings. This chapter presents the conclusions and recommendations on teachers' application of the Communicative Language Teaching approach in the teaching of English grammar in multilingual classes in primary schools. The chapter will also highlight how the study will contribute to the body of knowledge. Lastly, the chapter will give suggestions for future research and interventions.

7.1. Conclusion

The study was informed by four objectives as outlined below and the conclusions will be drawn in line with each of the objectives.

- a. Establish teachers' understanding of the Communicative language teaching approach.
- b. Analyse teachers' classroom application of the Communicative language teaching approach in English grammar lessons.
- c. Analyse how teachers negotiate learners' multilingual identities through language practice.
- d. Identify challenges faced by teachers when teaching English grammar using the CLT in multilingual classrooms.

7.1.1. Teachers' knowledge of the Communicative language teaching approach.

The first objective sought to find out how teachers understood the Communicative Language Teaching Approach. The question was answered through face-to-face interviews with 20 grade six teachers from different schools. Although the Zambia Primary School English Syllabus clearly stipulates the recommended teaching methodology as Communicative Language Teaching, teachers failed to mention the recommended methodology but instead mentioned activities recommended to use within the methodology such as groupwork, discussion, pair work, games, role play and inquiry as methodologies recommended to use when teaching English grammar. The findings also showed that most teachers failed to describe CLT but they, however, mentioned some aspects which were closely related to CLT

such as the use of familiar language, communication between the teacher and the learners, interaction between the teacher and the learners and among the learners, and learner centered teaching. This shows that the teachers had limited knowledge about the recommended methodology they could use to teach English grammar using CLT to grade six learners, and this could be attributed to inadequate teacher training, failure to interact with the teaching documents and negative attitude towards pedagogical change.

7.1.2. Teachers' classroom application of the Communicative language teaching approach in English grammar lessons.

The second objective sought to find out how teachers applied the Communicative language teaching approach in English grammar lessons. From the interviews, the findings were that teachers described grammar as language, pronunciation of words and as the structure of English. All the descriptions were merely part of what grammar is and could not suffice for the explanation of what grammar is. It can be noted that all the languages have grammar, and some aspects of correct grammar includes correct pronunciation of words and proper arrangement of words in sentences following rules of a particular language. It was also established from the interviews that teachers applied CLT in English grammar lessons using different techniques and activities such as games, groupwork, pair work, debate, discussions and role play though they couldn't explain when and how the activities were applied. It was also revealed that some teachers used learners' familiar language to help learners understand the concepts, relate the local language to the target language and enhance interaction and participation in the classroom. Other teachers explained that they taught English grammar to their graded six classes by explaining the main lesson concepts to the learners which was against the principles of CLT that encourages the inductive way of teaching as well as learner centeredness.

Teachers were also observed teaching English grammar to their grade six classes using Communicative Language Teaching Methodology. The teachers taught grammar lessons differently. Some of the teachers taught the lessons well. They used authentic materials to relate to real life situations and help the learners grasp the concept easily. Most of the teachers engaged the learners in group work to discuss tasks that were given though some of the groups were too large, and some teachers did not take time to guide their classes in group work. Other CLT techniques were not used by teachers which showed that teachers were not well vested in CLT. In some classes the teacher took the centre stage, and the learners were

just listening to the teacher teaching. It showed that while some teachers tried to teach English grammar using CLT, others failed to apply the CLT principles in their lessons. Some teachers used the local language throughout the lesson ignoring the principle of CLT which advocates for the judicious use of the local language despite teaching a multilingual class because the focus is helping learners communicate in the second language.

7.1.3. Teachers' negotiation of learners' multilingual identities through language practice

The research objective was to find out how teachers negotiated the different multilingual identities in their classes through language practice. Through interviews with the grade six teachers, it was established that all the classes were multilingual as the classes had learners with diverse languages. It was also established that some teachers were bilingual, and others were multilingual. The bilingual teachers were mostly able to speak English and their first language, and it was established that this affected the teaching and learning process because the teachers relied mainly on learners to explain some concepts to their friends in situations where most of the learners' English proficiency was low. It was also established that most of the teachers were not trained to teach multilingual classes, which affected their lesson delivery but revealed that they negotiated the different multilingual identities in their classroom through translation and interpretation, translanguaging, codeswitching, simplifying language, giving homework so that family members could help, and use the learner's familiar language. From the lesson observation most of the teachers used translation and codeswitching. However, some teachers exclusively taught English grammar using English language because they were not familiar with the learners' languages. However, the monolingual ideology adversely affected some learners as revelations from the FGs indicated that some learners had difficulty comprehending the lesson if it was taught in English throughout. Other revelations from FGs were that some learners commended the teachers' use of the familiar language because it promoted inclusion, participation and understanding although it was again a challenge to their friends who couldn't understand the language used.

7.1.4. Challenges faced by teachers when teaching English grammar using CLT in multilingual classrooms.

The research objective was meant to find out the challenges teachers faced when teaching English grammar using the Communicative Language Teaching in multilingual classrooms.

The respondents through interviews mentioned that learners had poor proficiency in English language. Although this was very common in schools which were in rural areas, the teachers in the peri-urban and urban schools also revealed it as a challenge. It was observed during lesson observation that most of the learners were responding and asking teachers questions in the local language. Few learners were able to use English in class. Lack of English proficiency led to another challenge which was low participation in class. Most pupils preferred to keep quite especially when teachers were exclusively using English when teaching English grammar because according to teachers, they felt embarrassed when they made mistakes or were just shy to use English because they lacked confidence and were not proficient in it. This also prompted some teachers to use the local language at all the stages of the lessons. Another challenge that was revealed was that some teachers were not proficient in the dominant local language which forced some of them to use English through. It was also revealed that because of the linguistic diversities in the classes among the learners, it was challenging for teachers to explain difficult concepts in different languages but rather used English or a dominant local language if they knew it. But some learners were disadvantaged either way. It was also revealed that lack of teaching and learning materials in schools was another challenge which teachers faced when teaching English grammar in multilingual classrooms using CLT. Since the Communicative Language Teaching approach emphasises, learner centered strategy as well as the use of authentic materials, teachers failed to teach as stipulated because the schools lacked teaching and learning materials. This affected the teachers, especially in rural set-ups where even the use of locally available materials was a challenge because they could not source materials to make teaching and learning aids from the surrounding areas easily. This led to failure by some teachers to implement some activities in the classroom that could aid learning of the second language using CLT in English grammar lessons. The other challenge that teachers faced was the teacher to pupil ratio in the classrooms. Most of the classes observed had a high number of pupils such that it was difficult for the teachers to implement some activities such as groupwork, role play and discussions in the classroom to aid teaching and learning and active engagement of learners. Some teachers could not even go round the classroom to guide learners because of lack of space created by overpopulated classrooms. Guidance was also not given as expected because time was limited to attend to every group. The overpopulated classes also affected teachers' classroom management in some cases.

7.2. The contribution of this study to the Body of knowledge

The study aimed to establish teachers' application of the Communicative Language Teaching approach in the teaching of English grammar in multilingual classrooms. Through the objectives of the study, the findings of this study have contributed to the body of knowledge in the field of teaching specially the teaching of English grammar using Communicative Language teaching approach in multilingual classes.

Firstly, no study has been conducted in Zambia to establish teachers' application of the Communicative Language Teaching approach in multilingual primary classes. The findings of the study will be significant to the Ministry of Education, teacher educators, primary school administrators and teachers regarding the teaching of English grammar using CLT in primary multilingual classes and the challenges faced by teachers in the teaching and learning process.

The study sought to establish how teachers understood the Communicative language teaching approach. This will contribute to the body of knowledge by informing the Ministry of Education, the school administrators and teacher educators on how teachers understand or misunderstand CLT and how teacher training can be improved through imparting pedagogical skills in pre-service and in-service teachers.

The other contribution to the body of knowledge is that the study will inform teacher educators on the need to train teachers on how to handle and teach English grammar in multilingual classes because most of the classes in Zambia are multilingual and therefore, they should be prepared to teach classes with linguistic diversity.

The study used the Expertise theory, and its use will add a new dimension to use of CLT in Zambia especially in line with curriculum interpretation and implementation including teacher education.

The use of the translanguaging theory also adds new theoretical lenses to how CLT in this study has been looked at from the translanguaging lens in which it interrogated how learners' multilingual identities are recognised and mis-recognised in the classroom.

The study also adds to the discourses around multilingual education and second language teaching using context.

7.3. Recommendations

The following recommendations were proposed based on the findings.

- a. The Ministry of Education need to consider deploying teachers in areas where they are familiar with the local languages even if it is not their first language so that many learners would be helped to bridge the gap of lack of language proficiency.
- b. There is a need to engage teachers in in-service training like seminars, workshops and Continuous Professional Development (CPD) activities, especially in pedagogy so that they can continuously be exposed to the curriculum and its demands and become conversant with the methods, techniques and procedures of implementing CLT approach. Teachers' practices should be observed, and professional development activities should be consistent.
- c. There is need for colleges and universities to train pre-service and in-service teachers intensely in pedagogy as it is an important component which they need in their profession to effectively teach in primary schools. The training should also impart skills of teaching multilingual classes. Therefore, the training package for pre-service teachers should be re-addressed so that they are fully equipped with the best way to utilize techniques and strategies in ESL classes using CLT.
- d. The Ministry of Education through the Curriculum Development Centre (CDC) should provide enough teaching and learning materials such as textbooks to cater for the large classes and help the teachers to implement CLT activities.

7.4. Suggestions for Further Research

- a. There is need to carry out a study on how to teach a different language component (listening, speaking, reading or writing) using CLT in multilingual classes.
- b. There is need to carry out a study on how bilingual teachers negotiate linguistic diversities in their classes.

REFERENCES

- A'yun, I, L, Q. (2019). Teaching and Learning English Grammar through Discourse for EFL Students. *Journal Of Development Research*, 3 (2), November 2019, Page 89-98 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.28926/jdr.v3i2.83>
- Abongdia, J.F.A. (2014). The Impact of a Monolingual Medium of Instruction in a Multilingual University in South Africa. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences Vol 5 No 13*
- Abrejo, B., Sartaj, S. and Memon, S. (2019). English Language Teaching through Communicative Approach: A Qualitative Study of Public Sector Colleges of Hyderabad, Sindh. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies, ALLS 10(5):43-49. Published by Australian International Academic Centre PTY.LTD.*
- Adejumo, M.I. (2020). *Teachers' Awareness, Knowledge and Use of Communicative Language Teaching Approach and Students' Oral Communicative Competence in English in Ibadan North Local Government Area.* DO - 10.13140/RG.2.2.24712.34562
- Adom, D., Attah, Y and Ankrah, (2016). Constructivism Philosophical Paradigm: Implication For Research, Teaching and Learning. *Global Journal of Arts Humanities and Social Sciences Vol 4, No.10, pp.1-9, October 2016.*
- Adu, E.O. and Okeke, C.I.O. (Eds). (2022). *Fundamentals of Research in Humanities, Social Sciences and Science Education.* Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.
- Ahmad, M., Majoka, M.I. and Fazal, S. (2017). *Integration of Grammar Translation Method with Communicative Approach: A Research Synthesis.*
- Ahmed, S. (2013). The current practices of teaching grammar in CLT at secondary school level in Bangladesh: Problems and probable solutions. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(8), 1328–1334. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.8.1328-1334>.
- Akshaya.R (2020). Classroom Activities to Enhance ESL Learner's Communicative Competence. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts (IJCRT).* | Volume 8, Issue 5 May 2020.

- Al Shara'h N, Abu Nabaah A., and Khzouz A. (2011). Jordanian EFL Teachers' Perceptions of Communicative Language Evaluation. *Dirasat, Educational Sciences*, 38, 2470-2482.
- Alamri, W.A. (2019). Effectiveness of Qualitative Research Methods: Interviews and Diaries. *International Journal of English and Cultural Studies Vol. 2, No. 1; May 2019*
- Aleixo, M. B, (2003). "Teachers' perceptions of communicative language teaching use in Brazil" *Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports*. <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd/719>
- Alharbi, J.M. and Aldaba: A.M. (2018). Exploration of English Teachers' Understandings and Practices of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) at Pre-University Level of Islamic Tertiary Educational Organization. *international Journal of Asian Social Science*, 8(7), 320–331. <https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.1.2018.87.320.331>
- Al-Khamisi, K. M., and Sinha, Y. K. (2022). Communicative Language Teaching Methodologies in Omani EFL Context. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 12, 481-503. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2022.124035>
- Andersen, E. and Schiano, B. (2014). *Teaching with cases: A practical guide*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press Book
- Anderson, C. (2010). Presenting and Evaluating Qualitative Research. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education 2010; 74 (8) Article 141*.
- Ansary, D., (2012). Communicative language teaching in EFL context: Teacher's attitude and perception in Bangladesh. *ASA University Review*, 6(1): 61-78.
- Araki, M. (2021). Four Components of Expertise (March 16, 2021). <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3806101>
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C., Irvine, C.K.S and Walker, D.A (2019). *Introduction to research in education* (10th ed). Bosten: CENGAGE
- Atkinson, D. "The mother tongue in the classroom: A neglected resource?" *ELT journal* 41, no. 4 (1987): 241-247.

- Atkinson, D. (1993). *Teaching monolingual classes*. London: Longman
- Auerbach, C.F. and Silverstein, L.B. (2023). *Qualitative Data: An Introduction to Coding and Analysis*. New York: New York University Press.
- Auerbach, E. R. "Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom." *Tesol Quarterly* 27, no. 1 (1993): 9-32
- Azimova, S. (2019). The Communicative Approach in English Language Teaching. *Bulletin of Science and Practice*, 5(4), 471-475. <https://doi.org/10.33619/2414-2948/41/70>
- Badilla, D. C. and Chacon, G. (2013). Communicative Grammar: An Effective Tool to Teach a Second Language in Today's Classes. *Remsta De Lenguas Modernas*, 18, 267-283.
- Banda, F and Mwanza, D. S. (2017). Language-in-education policy and linguistic diversity in Zambia: An alternative explanation to low reading levels among primary school pupils. In Banja, Madalitso Khulupirika (ed.). *Selected readings in education*, 109-132. Lusaka: University of Zambia Press.
- Barira A., Shabana. S, Sadia, M. (2019). English Language Teaching through Communicative Approach: A Qualitative Study of Public Sector Colleges of Hyderabad, Sindh. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*. Volume: 10 Issue: 5 Advance access: October 2019
- Basta, J. (2011). The Role of Communicative Approach and Cooperative Learning in Higher Education. *Facta Universitatis Series: Linguistics and Literature* 9 (2) 125–143
- Baydikova, N. L., and Davidenko, Y. S. (2019). Teaching communicative grammar to technical University EFL learners. *Paper presented at the IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*.
- Becker, A. (2024) 'I'm also trying to figure out the identity of my students.'– teachers' multilingual identity negotiation in the heritage language classroom, *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 21:1, 574-587, DOI: 10.1080/14790718.2022.2078328

- Berliner, D. C. (1988). *The Development of Expertise in Pedagogy*. Washington, D.C: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Bibi, Z., Rasool, G., Shakoor, A., Rahimmudin, S., and Azhar, M.A. (2023). The Dilemma of Translanguaging and Code-Switching in Multilingual EFL Classrooms -- *Palarch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology* 20(1), 697-712.
- Bikowski D. (2018). "Technology for Teaching Grammar, 2018, p.1 https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326689342_Technology_for_Teaching_Grammar
- Blackledge, A and Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: A critical perspective*. London: Continuum.
- Bolkvadze, L. (2023). Translanguaging as EFL Teaching Method. *Creative Education*, 14, 270-287. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2023.142019>
- Bowman, S. L. (2010). *The Functions of Role-Playing Games: How Participants Create Community Solve Problems and Explore Identity*. Jefferson, N.C, McFarland & Co
- Brinkmann, S. (2013). *Qualitative interviewing*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Brookfield, S. D, and Preskill, S. (2005). *Discussion as a Way of Teaching: Tools and Techniques for Democratic Classrooms (2nd)*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Pearson Longman.
- Brown, H.D. (1994). *Teaching by Principles. An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Brumfit, C. J. (1984). *Communicative methodology in language teaching: The Roles of Fluency and Accuracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Brumfit, C. J. (2000). *The communicative approach to language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bryman, A. and Bell, E. (2019). *Social Research Methods (5th ed)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Bwalya, V. (2019). *Democratisation of the Classroom: An Analysis of Teachers' Language Practices in Selected Multilingual Classrooms of Chibombo District*. Unpublished.
- Calafato, R. (2019). The non-native speaker teacher as proficient multilingual: A critical review of research from 2009–2018. *Lingua*, 227, 102700. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2019.06.001>
- Calafato, R. (2020). Language teacher multilingualism in Norway and Russia: Identity and beliefs. *European Journal of Education published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd. Eur J Educ.* 2020;55:602–617.
- Cam, K, T, H. (2017). Communicative English Grammar Teaching to High School Learners in Vietnam. *Ho Chi Minh City Open University Journal of Science*, 7 (1), 3-20
- Canale, M., and Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/1.1.1>
- Carter, N., Lukosius, B.D., DiCenso, A., Blythe, J., and Neville, A.J (2014). The Use of Triangulation in Qualitative Research. *Oncology Nursing Forum*.Vol. 41, No. 5, September 2014
- Castillejo, F.T., Calizo, R.M., and Maguddayao, R.N. (2018). Code Switching and Students' Performance in English. *International Journal of English and Education*, Volume:7, Issue:4, October 2018
- Catalano, T and Hamann, E, T. "Multilingual pedagogies and pre-service teachers: Implementing "language as a resource" orientations in teacher education programs" (2016). Faculty Publications: Department of Teaching, Learning and Teacher Education. 224.
- Çelik, S. (2014). Communicative language teaching. In S. Çelik (Ed.), Approaches and principles in English as a foreign language (EFL). *Education (pp. 183-199)*. Eğiten.
- Central Statistics Office (2010) *2010 National Census Report*. Lusaka: Government Printers.

- Çerkez Y, Altınay Z, Altınay F, and Bashirova, E. (2012). Drama and Role Playing in Teaching Practice: The Role of Group Works. *Journal of Education and Learning 1 (2)*
- Chalker, S. and Weiner, E. (1994). *Oxford Dictionary of English Grammar*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chamberlain, L., Rodriguez-Leon, L and Woodward, C. (2022). Disrupting language of instruction policy at a classroom level: oracy examples from South Africa and Zambia. *Literacy Volume 56 Number 3 September 2022*
- Chang, M. (2011). Factors affecting the implementation of Communicative Language Teaching in Taiwanese College English Classes. *English Language Teaching Vol. 4, No. 2; June 2011. Doi:10.5539/elt.v4n2p3*
- Chen, W. (2015). A case study of action research on communicative language teaching. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Mathematics, 18(6), 705-71*
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09720502.2015.1108075>
- Chi, M. T. H., Glaser, R., and Farr, M. J. (1988). *The Nature of Expertise*. Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Chishipula, J. (2016) *Factors hindering teachers of English language from implementing communicative language teaching (CLT) approach: a case of selected secondary schools in Chongwe district, Zambia*. Unpublished Dissertation
- Cook, V. (2013). *Second language learning and language teaching*. Routledge.
- Cook, V. J. (2001). Using the First Language in the Classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 57, 402-423. https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.57.3.402*
- Cooley, R. E., and Deborah A. Roach, "A Conceptual Framework," in *Competence in Communication: A Multidisciplinary Approach*, ed. Robert N. Bostrom (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1984), 25.
- Coskun, A. (2011). Investigation of the Application of Communicative Language Teaching in the English Language Classroom A Case Study on Teachers' Attitudes in Turkey. *Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching Volume 2 (2011) Issue 1*.

- Costello, Lori M. and Rutherford, Tracy (2019) "Expert? What does that mean? Describing the Term "Expert" in Agricultural Communications, Education, Extension, and Leadership Research," *Journal of Applied Communications: Vol. 103: Iss. 1.* <https://doi.org/10.4148/1051-0834.2211>
- Creswell, J.W and Plano Clark, V.L. (2007). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Creswell, J.W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J.W. (2014). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (4th ed)*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Crow, G and Wiles, R. (2008), "Managing anonymity and confidentiality in social research: the case of visual data in community research", ESRC National centre for research methods
- Cummings, L. (2018). *Working with English Grammar: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cummins, J. (2009). Multilingualism in the English-language classroom: Pedagogical considerations. *Tesol Quarterly* 43(2). 317–321.
- Daisy. (2012). Communicative Language Teaching - A Comprehensive Approach to English Language Teaching. *Language in India. Vol. 12 Issue 2, pp.249-265*.
- Derakhshan, A and Torabi, M. (2015). The Implications of Communicative Language Teaching: Teachers' Perceptions in the Spotlight. *International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies, 2015, 4(4): 203-211*
- Desai, A.A. (2015). Characteristics and Principles of Communicative Language Teaching. *International Journal of Research in Humanities & Soc. Sciences, Vol. 3, Issue: 7, July:2015*
- Dhillon, J.K. and Wanjiru, J. (2013.) Challenges and Strategies for Teachers and Learners of English as a Second Language: The Case of an Urban Primary School in Kenya. *International Journal of English Linguistics; Vol. 3, No. 2; 2013*

- Diallo, I. (2014) English in education policy shift in Senegal: From traditional pedagogies to communicative language teaching, *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 9:2, 142-151, DOI: 10.1080/18334105.2014.11082027
- Dos Santos, L. M. (2016a). Foreign language teachers' professional development through peer observation programme. *English Language Teaching*, 9(10), 39-46. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n10p39>.
- Dos Santos, L.M. (2020). The Discussion of Communicative Language Teaching Approach in Language Classrooms. *Journal of Education and e-Learning Research*, 7(2): 104-109.
- Dufva, H., Salo, O.-P., Suni, M., and Aro, M. (2011). Languages as objects of learning: Language learning as a case of multilingualism. *Apples - Journal of Applied Language Studies*. (5.1), 109-124
- El-Kelani, M. (2011). *EFL Teachers' Perceptions and Implementation of CLT (a case study of some public and private schools in KSA)*. Nile Valley University.
- Ellis, G. (1996). How culturally appropriate is the communicative approach? *ELT Journal*, 50(3), 213-218. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/50.3.213>.
- Ellis, R. (2006). *Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar: An SLA Perspective*. TESOL Quarterly, 40.
- Engelbrecht, D. (2016). *Communicative Language Teaching Strategies: A South African Perspective*. Johannesburg: University of Johannesburg
- Ericsson, K., Krampe, R and Tesch-Romer, C. (1993). The Role of Deliberate Practice in the Acquisition of Expert Performance. *American Psychological Association, Inc. Vol. 100. No. 3, 363-406*
- Ericsson, K and Charness, N. (1994). Expert Performance: Its Structure and Acquisition. August 1994, *American Psychologist Vol. 49, No. 8, 725-747*
- Ericsson. K.A. and Harvell, K.W. (2019). Deliberate Practice and Proposed Limits on the Effects of Practice on the Acquisition of Expert Performance: Why the Original Definition Matters and Recommendations for Future Research. *Educational Psychology, Volume 10 - 2019* | <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02396>

- Erling, E.J., Adinolfi, L., and Hultgren, A.K. (2017). *Multilingual classrooms: opportunities and challenges for English medium instruction in low- and middle-income context*. London: The British Council.
- Evdokimova M, Baydikova N, and Davidenko, Y .(2018). Assigning Group Work Roles to EFL Students in Accordance with their Personality Type. *In: Proceedings of INTED2018 Conference pp 2161–2167* (Valencia, Spain)
- Farmer, F. (2006). *Professionalism in ELT*. Mexico: Plaza y Valdés.
- Farmer, F., M.E. Llaven Nucamendi and A. Novelo Granados. (2006). Profesionalismo en la enseñanza del idioma inglés (ELT): resultados preliminares de un estudio etnográfico. *Teoría y Praxis* 2/2. 33-86.
- Ferrer, V. "The mother tongue in the classroom: Cross-linguistic comparisons, noticing and explicit knowledge." *Teach English Worldwide*. Retrieved on 19 (2011)
- Fujiwara, Y. The Role of Grammar Instruction in Japanese EFL context: Towards Communicative Language Teaching. *Journal of the Academic Society for Quality of Life (JAS4QoL)* 2018, 4(4) 1:1-11
- Gałajda, D. (2012). *The concept of communicative competence in language learning*. W: D. Gabryś-Barker (red.), " *Readings in second language acquisition*" (s. 143-160). Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- García, O (2011). In: *Translanguaging: A CUNY-NYSIEB guide for educators*. www.nysieb.ws.gc.cuny.edu/files/2012/06/FINAL-Translanguaging-Guide-With-Cover-1.
- García, O and Sylvan, C.E. (2011). Pedagogies and Practices in Multilingual Classrooms: Singularities in Pluralities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95, iii, (2011) DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011. 01208.x
- García, O and Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. London: Palgrave Macmillan
- García, O. (2009). Education, Multilingualism and Translanguaging in the 21st Century. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas, Phillipson, R. Mohanty, A.K and Panda, M. (Eds.). *Social Justice through Multilingual Education* (pp. 140-158). Multilingual Matters.

- García, O. and Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- García, O., and Kleifgen, J. A. (2019). Translanguaging and Literacies. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55(4), 553–571.
- García, O. and Sylvan, C.E. (2011). *Pedagogies and practices in multilingual classrooms: Singularities in pluralities*. *Mod. Lang. J.* 2011, 95, 385–400.
- García, O., and Kleyn, T. (2016). Translanguaging theory in education. In *Translanguaging with multilingual students* (pp. 23-47). Routledge.
- García, O., and Lin, A. M. Y. (2016). Translanguaging in bilingual education. In O. García, & A. M. Y. Lin (Eds.), *Bilingual and Multilingual Education (Encyclopedia of Language and Education, Vol. 5)*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- García, O., and Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave: Macmillan.
- García, O., Flores, N., Seltzer, K., Wei, L., Otheguy, R. and Jonathan, R. (2021) Rejecting abyssal thinking in the language and education of racialized bilinguals: A manifesto, *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 18:3, 203-228, DOI: 10.1080/15427587.2021.1935957
- García, O., and Lingam.(2017).Translanguaging in bilingual education. *Bilingual and multilingual education*, 117-130.
- García-Mateus, S.,and Palmer, D. (2017). Translanguaging pedagogies for positive identities in two-way dual language bilingual education. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 16(4), 245-255.
- Gay,L.R. and Mills,E,G. (2019). *Educational Research. Competencies for analysis and Application (12th ed)*. Newyork: Pearson.
- Gibbs, G. R. (2007). Analyzing qualitative data. In U. Flick (Ed.), *The Sage qualitative research kit*. London: Sage.
- Gill, P and Baillie, J (2018). Interviews and focus groups in qualitative research: An update for the digital age. *British dental journal official journal of the British Dental Association: BDJ online* 225(7) DOI:10.1038/sj.bdj.2018.815

- Goldkuhl, G. Pragmatism vs interpretivism in qualitative information systems research, 2012, *European Journal of Information Systems*, (21), 2, 135-146. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/ejis.2011.54>
- Gordon, R. (2014) "Language of Education Planning in Zambia," *Linguistic Portfolios: Vol. 3*, Article 6. Available at: https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/stcloud_ling/vol3/iss1/6
- Guan, X. (2023). Translanguaging as a Theoretical Lens in Language Learning and Its Pedagogical Functions in Multilingual Classrooms. *ASSEHR* 726, pp. 245–254, 2023. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-494069-97-8_31
- Gundumogula, M. (2020). Importance of Focus Groups in Qualitative Research. *The International Journal of Humanities and Social Studies*, Vol 8 Issue 11, November 2020. DOI No.: 10.24940/theijhss/2020/v8/i11/HS2011-082
- Hall, G. (2011). *Exploring English language teaching: Language in action*. New York: Routledge.
- Hassan, N and Ahmed, K. (2015). Exploring translanguaging: A case study of a madrasah in Tower Hamlets. *Research in Teacher Education* 5(2): 23–28
- Hassan, S.E.M.E., Mohammed, A.O., and Almardi, A.M. (2018). The Implementation of CLT Method in Teaching Grammar at Secondary School Levels. *International Journal of Novel Research in Education and Learning* Vol. 5, Issue 5, pp: (55-70), Month: September - October 2018
- Haukas, A. (2016). Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism and a multilingual pedagogical approach. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 13(1), 1-18. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2016.1041960>
- Hennink, M.M. (2014). *Focus Group Discussions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Herling, R. W. (2000). Operational definitions of expertise and competence. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 2(1), 8–21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/152342230000200103>
- Holliday, A. (1994). *Appropriate Methodology and Social Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hossen, M. F. (2008). *Communicative Language Teaching: Teachers' Perceptions in Bangladesh (Secondary Level)*. BRAC University.
- Howatt, A. P. R. (1984). *A History of English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hult, F. M. (2017). More than a lingua franca: Functions of English in a globalized educational language policy. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 3, 265-282
- Hymes, D (1972). 'On communicative competence' in J.B pride and J. Holmes (ed) sociolinguistics:selected readings. Harmondworth: *Penguin*, pp 269- 99. *IN: Phi Delta Kappa.International Journal of Educational Development*, 30: 396-404.
- Ismaili, M. (2015). "Teaching English in a multilingual setting" *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 199, p. 190, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.505>
- Issa, B.T.A.S. (2016) "English Teachers' Perceptions Toward The Effectiveness of Using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) In Teaching Grammar at Al Ain Public Schools" (2016). *Theses*. 352. https://scholarworks.uaeu.ac.ae/all_theses/352
- Iversena,J.Y., Mundena, J. and Nambao, M. (2023). Stories and early literacy education in Zambia: donor-initiated projects, educational policy and teacher beliefs. *Language and education* .<https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2023.2265905>.
- Jafari S., Shokrpour N., and Gutterman, T. (2015). A Mixed Methods Study of Teachers' Perceptions of Communicative Language Teaching in Iranian High Schools. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5,707-718.
- Jalolova,N.J. (2020). Communicative Competence and It Implication for Teaching and Learning. *International Journal of Engineering and Information Systems (IJEAIS)*. Vol. 4 Issue 12, December - 2020, Pages: 88-91
- Johnson, K and Morrow, K. (1981). *Communication in the Classroom*. London: Longman

- Johnson, K. (2010). Expertise in language learning and teaching. *E LT Journal Volume 64/2 April 2010*; doi:10.1093/elt/ccp104
- Johnson, R.B and Onwuegbuzie, A.J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Research*, 33(7), 14-26.
- Källkvist, M., Gyllstad, H., Sandlund, E., and Sundqvist, P. (2017) English Only in Multilingual Classrooms? *LMS: Lingua*, (4): 27-31
- Karim, K. (2004). *Teachers' Perceptions, Attitudes, and Expectations about Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in Post-secondary education in Bangladesh*. University of Victoria.
- Kashoki, M.E. (2003) Language Policy Formulation in Multilingual Southern Africa. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 24:3, 184-194, DOI: 10.1080/01434630308666497
- Kasumi, H. (2015). Communicative Language Teaching and Its Impact on Students' Performance. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*. Vol. 5 No.1 S1 April 2015
- Khadka,S.(2017).*EffectivenessofCommunicativeLanguageTeachinginTeachingCommunicative Functions* (Doctoral dissertation).
- King, L. (2017). *The Impact of Multilingualism on Global Education and Language Learning*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Kivunja, C and Kuyini, A.B. (2017). Understanding and Applying Research Paradigms in Educational Contexts. *International Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 6, No. 5; 2017.
- KLAUS, B. (2021). *Communicative Language Teaching in Action. Putting Principles to Work (2nd)*. San Diego: Cognella,Inc.
- Klimova, I. I., Klimova, G., & Dubinka, S. (2019). Students' communicative competence in the context of intercultural business communication. *XLinguae*, 12(1), 207-218. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.18355/xl.2019.12.01.16>.
- Kombe, C and Mwanza, D.S. (2019). The 2014 Zambian Revised Literacy Policy in Primary Schools: Were Teachers Prepared to Implement it? *International Journal*

- Kombo, D.K. and Tromp, D. L. (2006). *Proposal and Thesis writing: An introduction*. Nairobi: Paulines Publications Africa.
- Kombo, D.K. and Tromp, D. L. (2006). *Proposal and Thesis writing: An introduction*. Nairobi: Paulines Publications Africa.
- Kong, Q. Y. (2016). *A comparative study of communicative and grammar translation methods: Exemplified with the English modal verbs teaching in junior middle schools*. Master thesis, Shanxi Normal University, China.
- Laksanasut, S (2020). Communicative Language Teaching (CLT): Rationale, Theory of Language and Learning, Types of Learning and Teaching Activities, Learner and Teacher Roles, The Role of Instructional Materials, and Discussion on Thailand Context. *OEC Journal*
- Larsen – Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching (2nd ed)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Larsen-Freeman, D and Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques & Principles in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Laryeafio, M, N. and Omoruyi, C. O. (2023). Ethical consideration dilemma: systematic review of ethics in qualitative data collection through interviews. *Published in Journal of Ethics in Entrepreneurship and Technology. Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 94-110. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEET-09-2022-0014>*
- Lashgari, M., Jamail, F and Yousofi, N. (2014). Investigating EFL Teachers' Attitudes toward CLT. *International Journal of Basic Sciences & Applied Research. Vol., 3 (3), 160-164, 2014*
- Leavy, P. (2014). *The Oxford Handbook of Qualitative Research*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Lewis, G., Jones, B and Baker, C. (2012): Translanguaging: origins and development from school to street and beyond, *Educational Research and Evaluation: An International Journal on Theory and Practice*, DOI:10.1080/13803611.2012.718488
- Lindsay, C. and Knight, P. (2006). *Learning and teaching English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Little wood, W. (2000). *Communicative Language Teaching: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Littlewood, W. (2007). Communicative and Task-Based Teaching in East Asian Classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 40, 243-249. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004363>
- Liu, K., and Deris, F. D. (2023). Teachers' Perceptions of Communicative Language Teaching Approach in English Grammar Teaching. *Arab World English Journal*, 14 (3) 124-136. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol14no3.8>
- López, J., Rama, G. And Agulló, L. (2012). The role of grammar Teaching: from communicative approaches To The common european framework of reference for languages. volumen 7 año 2012
- Madonsela, S. (2014). Monolingualism When Practised in a Multilingual Classroom Can Become a Source of Stress to Learners. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol 5 No 9 May 2014, MCSER Publishing, Rome-Italy.
- Mai Ngoc, K. and N. Iwashita, 2012. A comparison of learners and teachers' attitudes toward communicative language teaching at two universities of Vietnam. *University of Sydney Papers in TESOL*, 7: 25-49.
- Makalela, L. (2015b). Breaking African language boundaries: Student teachers' reflections on translanguaging practices. *Language Matters* 46(2). 275–292.
- Makhathini, F.N, and Mncwango, E, M. (2020). Challenges with the Teaching and Learning of English Language in a Bilingual Classroom LWATI: *A Journal of Contemporary Research*, 17(2), 71-85, 2020

- Mammadova, T. (2016). Two approaches to the teaching of grammar and their implications. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 10(1), 49-70. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1797581469>
- Mandyata, J. et al.(2023). Theory, policy, and practice: bridging the gap between teacher training and classroom practice in language of instruction in Zambia. *Language and education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2023.2221213>
- Mareva, R. and Mapako, F.P. (2012). Secondary School Teachers' Conception of Communicative Language Teaching: A Case for Masvingo District – Zimbabwe. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 1(3), 16–28.
- Marrero-Colón, M.B. (2021). *CAL Commentary: Translanguaging: Theory, Concept, Practice, Stance... or All of the Above?* Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Mart, C. T. (2013). Teaching Grammar in Context: Why and How? Theory and Practice in Language Studies. Vol. 3, No 1, pp. 125-126. Academy Publisher. Finland. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.1.124-129>
- Marten, L., and Kula, N. C. (2007). Zambia: 'One Zambia, one nation, many languages. In A. Simpson (Ed.), *Language and national identity in Africa* (pp. 291-313). Oxford: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from <http://privatewww.essex.ac.uk/~nckula/Zambia.pdf>
- Maryslessor, A., Barasa, P. L., and Omulando, C. A. (2012). Challenges Teachers Face in the Use of the Communicative Language Teaching Approach in the Teaching of Listening and Speaking Lessons in Lugerari District, Kenya. *International Journal of Science and Research*. 3(9) 83-92.
- Mayhew, J. (1999). Theory, practice and the psychology of expertise. *Social Work Education*, 18:2, 195-206, DOI: 10.1080/02615479911220191
- McMillan, B. and Rivers, D. (2011). The Practice of Policy: Teacher Attitudes toward "English Only". *System*, 39, 251-263.

- Menken, K., and Sánchez, M. T. (2019). Translanguaging in English-only schools: From pedagogy to stance in the disruption of monolingual policies and practices. *TESOL Quarterly*, 53(3), 741–767
- Mgijima, V. D and Makalela, L. (2016). The effects of translanguaging on the biliterate inferencing strategies of fourth grade learners. *Perspectives in Education* 34(3). 86–93.
- Mills, A.J., Durepos, G.& Wiebe, E. (Eds.) (2010). Multisite case study. *Encyclopedia of case study research* (pp. 588-591). SAGE Publications, Inc., <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412957397>
- Ministry of Education (2012). *Zambia Primary School English Syllabus, Grade 2-7*. Lusaka: Curriculum Development Centre.
- Ministry of Education (2023). 2023 Zambia Education Curriculum Framework. Lusaka: Curriculum Development Centre.
- Ministry of Education. (1977). *Education Reforms*. Lusaka: Government Printers.
- Ministry of Education. (1992). *Focus on Learning: Strategies for the Development of Schools in Zambia*. Lusaka: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education. (1996). *Educating our Future*. Lusaka: ZEPH Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education. (2013). *Zambia Education Curriculum Framework 2013*. Lusaka: Curriculum Development Centre.
- Ministry of Education. (2015). Effective Practices for transitioning from literacy in Zambian languages to literacy in English. *USAID/Zambia Read to Succeed Project*. Lusaka.
- Mirbabayeva, Z. (2021). Merits and Demerits of Communicative Language Teaching Approach. *Scientific Progress, Volume 2 | Issue 2 | 2021*
- Miwa, R. (2020). *Exploring the effective use of translanguaging in Communicative Language Classrooms. Final Action Research Report 2020*
- Mkandawire, S.B. (2017). Familiar Language Based Instruction Versus Unfamiliar Language for the Teaching of Reading and Writing Literacy Skills: A Focus on

Zambian Languages and English at Two Primary School in Lusaka.
Zambia Journal of Language Studies Volume 1, Issue 1, 2017

- Mkandawire, S.B., Zuilkowski, S.S., Mwansa, J.M. and Manchishi, P.C. (2023). Instructional strategies used by teachers in multilingual classes to help non-speakers of the language of instruction learn initial reading skills in Zambia, *International Multilingual Research Journal*, DOI: 10.1080/19313152.2023.2255777
- Mohammad, A. (2020). Exploring the Role of Translation in Communicative Language Teaching or the Communicative Approach. *SAGE Open*, April-June 2020: 1–10.
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA:
- Mowlaiea, B and Rahimib, A. (2010). The effect of teachers' attitude about communicative language teaching on their practice: Do they practice what they preach? *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 9 (2010) 1524–1528.
- Mubita, W.S., & Mwanza, D.S. (2020). Factors Contributing to Pupils' Poor Performance in Literature in English. *International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education (IJHSSE)*, 7 (3), 55-65.
- Mulesu, S. and Mwanza, D.S. (2024). "An Analysis of Classroom Language Practices among First Graders upon Entry into Grade One in a Cosmopolitan Chongwe Urban District," *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS)*, vol. 8(6), pages 62-76, June.
- Mumba, C. and Mwanza, D.S. (2020). Factors Affecting the Application of the Text Based Integrated Approach in the Teaching of English in Zambia. *Multidisciplinary Journal of Language and Social Sciences Education / Volume 3, No. 1*.
- Mumford, M.D., Higgs, C. and Gujar, Y. (2021), "Ethics in coercive environments: ensuring voluntary participation in research", in Panicker, S. and Stanley, B. (Eds), *Handbook of Research Ethics in Psychological Science*, American Psychological Association, pp. 113-123

- Munakaampe, Y. H. (2005). *A Critical Appraisal of the Communicative Approach in Selected Lusaka Basic Schools*. Master Thesis. University of Zambia.
- Mungala, R and Mwanza, D.S. (2024). Translanguaging practices lecturers use when teaching literacy and language in multilingual classrooms at a selected university in Zambia. *International Journal of Education Humanities and Social Science, Vol. 7, No. 03; 2024*.
- Mwanza, D.S (2016). *A critical Reflection on eclecticism in the teaching of English grammar*. unpublished PhD Thesis. Western Cape: South Africa.
- Mwanza, D.S. (2020). In search of High Literacy Levels in Zambian Primary Schools: Does Duration of Mother Tongue Instruction before Transitioning into a Second Language Matter? *International Journal of Education and Research, 8(2)*, 119-134.
- Mwanza, D.S. and Nyimbili, F. (2021) “Translanguaging Challenges faced by Teachers and Learners in First Grade Multilingual Literacy Classrooms in Zambia” *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL), vol 9, no. 3, 2021, pp. 20-31. doi: https://doi.org/10.20431/2347_3134.0903003*.
- Mwelwa, W, (2020). *Teachers’ classroom Strategies Aimed at Developing Communicative Competence in Learners During English Grammar Lessons In Selected Secondary Schools In Nakonde District*: unpublished
- Naeem, F. and Ghulam, M. (2023). Translanguaging in Teaching Grammar to Elementary Students. *Sustainable Business and Society in Emerging Economies, 5 (3)*, 359-372.
- Nagy, T. (2018). On Translanguaging and Its Role in Foreign Language Teaching. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica, 10, 2 (2018) 41–53*
- Nam, H. (2023). Challenges and constraints of implementing communicative language teaching: Teacher-related vs. non-teacher-related factors. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network, 16(1)*, 75-96.
- Ndulila, E, S. and Msuya, A.E. (2017). Tanzanian EFL Teachers’ Perceptions and Attitudes towards Communicative Language Teaching (CLT): A Case Study of

Secondary Schools in Morogoro Municipality, Tanzania. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)* Volume 5, Issue 9, September 2017, PP 60-69

Nguyen, C.T. and Thanh, T.L. (2015) The Interconnection Between Interpretivist Paradigm and Qualitative Methods in Education. *American Journal of Educational Science* Vol. 1, No. 2, 2015, pp. 24-27

Nunan, D. (1991). Communicative Tasks and the Language Curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(2), 279-295. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3587464>

Nunan, D. (1998). Teaching grammar in context. *ELT Journal*, Vol. 52, No 2, p. 103. Oxford University Press.

Nyamayedenga, M. S. (2022). Multilingualism as a Classroom Resource for Communicative Language Teaching: A Case of a Primary School in Warren Park, Zimbabwe. *East African Journal of Education and Social Sciences* 3(2),91-101. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.46606/eajess2022v03i02.0163>.

Nyamayedenga, S.M. (2020). Teachers' Beliefs of the Implementation of Communicative Language Teaching at Primary School Level In Zimbabwe. *September 2020. Per Linguam* 36(1). DOI:10.5785/36-1-888

Nyimbili, F. and Mwanza, D.S. (2021). Translanguaging Challenges faced by Teachers and Learners in First Grade Multilingual Literacy Classrooms in Zambia. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)*, Volume 9, Issue 3, March 2021, PP 20-31

Nyumba, T.O., Wilson, K., Derrick, C.J and Mukherjee, N .(2018). *The use of focus group discussion methodology: Insights from two decades of application in conservation*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12860>

Oihana, L, Cenoz, J and Gorter, D. (2020). Developing morphological awareness across languages: Translanguaging pedagogies in third language acquisition. *Language Awareness* 29(1). 41–59.

Omidire, M. F. (2019b). Embracing multilingualism as a reality in classrooms: An introduction. In M. F. Omidire (ed.), *Multilingualism in the classroom: Teaching and learning in a challenging context*. Cape Town: Juta & Co.

- Omidire, M.F. and Ayob, S. (2020). *The utilisation of translanguaging for learning and teaching in multilingual primary classrooms*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2020-0072> Received April 29, 2020; accepted December 7, 2020; published online December 24, 2020
- Omondi, M.A., Barasa, P.L., and Omulando, C.A. (2014). Challenges Teachers Face in the Use of the Communicative Language Teaching Approach in the Teaching Listening and Speaking Lessons in Lugrari District, Kenya. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, Volume 3 Issue 9, September 2014.
- Otheguy, R., García, O. and Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(3), 281–307
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Paudel, P. (2020). Teaching English in Multilingual Contexts: Teachers' Perspectives. *Prithvi Academic Journal*, Volume 3; May 2020
- Perez, B. (2004). Literacy, diversity and programmatic responses. In B. Perez. (ed). *Sociocultural contexts of language and literacy*. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Pervin, N., and Mokhtar, M. (2022). The Interpretivist Research Paradigm: A Subjective Notion of a Social Context. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 11(2), 419–428.
- Petraki, E. and Hill, D. (2011). Effective grammar teaching: Lessons from confident grammar teachers. *TESOL in Context*, Volume 21, No.2, pp. 34-51
- Pham, V.P.H and Nguyen, T.B. (2014). The effects of Communicative Grammar Teaching on students' achievement of grammatical knowledge and oral production. *English Language Teaching: Vol 7, No.6*.
- Phiri, A. (2020). *Final year student teachers' preparedness to use the Communicative Approach to teach English as a second language at Nkrumah University, Zambia*. Unpublished.

- Phiri, N. (2019). *The Efficacy of Continuing Professional Development Through Lesson Study for Teachers of English in Selected Secondary Schools of Lusaka District*. Unpublished
- Pierson A. E., Clark D. B., and Brady, C. E. (2021). Scientific modeling and translanguaging: A multilingual and multimodal approach to support science learning and engagement. *Science Education*, 105, 776–813. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21622>
- Pitikornpuangpetch, C. and Suwanarak, K. Teachers' beliefs and teaching practices about communicative language teaching (CLT) in a Thai EFL context. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 14(2), 1-27.
- Poudel, P. P. (2010). Teaching English in Multilingual Classrooms of Higher Education: The Present Scenario. *Journal of NELTA*, Vol. 15, 1-2:121.
- Poza, L (2017). Translanguaging: Definitions, Implications, and Further Needs in Burgeoning Inquiry. *Berkeley Review of Education*, Vol. 6 No. 2, pp. 101–128
- Pratt, C. (2018). Spanish Teaching Assistants' Attitudes towards Communicative Language Teaching. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* Vol. 8 No. 12 December 2018 doi:10.30845/ijhss.v8n12p1
- Qasserras, L. (2023). Systematic Review of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in Language Education: A Balanced Perspective. *European Journal of Education and Pedagogy*, 4(6), 17–23. <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejedu.2023.4.6.763>
- Qing-Xue and Jin-fang (2007). An Analysis of Language Teaching Approaches and Methods —Effectiveness and Weakness. *Volume 4, No.1 (Serial No.26)*
- Rahman, A and Asmari, A.A. (2015). Communicative Language Teaching in EFL University Context: Challenges for Teachers. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol. 6, No. 5, pp. 976-984, September 2015 DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0605.09>

- Rahman, A. (2017). Emerging Factors of Communicative Language Teaching and its Application in Indonesian English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Classrooms. *Langkawi, Vol. 3 No. 2, September 2017*
- Rahman, M. M., Pandian, A., and Kaur, M. (2018). Factors Affecting Teachers' Implementation of Communicative Language Teaching Curriculum in Secondary Schools in Bangladesh. *The Qualitative Report, 23(5), 1104-1126. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol23/iss5/6>*
- Rambe, S.S. (2017). Communicative Language Teaching. *English Education Vol. 05 No. 2.*
- Ranjit, R. (2022). Classroom Challenges of Secondary Level English Teachers at Remote Government Schools in Nepal. *Journal of Education, Language Innovation, and Applied Linguistics Volume 1, Number 1, January 2022, pp. 10-25.*
- Rasheed, S., Zeeshan, M., & Zaidi, N. A. (2017). Challenges of teaching English language in a multilingual setting: An investigation at Government girls Secondary school of Quetta, Baluchistan, Pakistan. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 7(4), 149-157*
- Rehman, A.A. and Alharthi, K. (2016). An Introduction to Research Paradigms. *International Journal of Educational Investigations 2016 (October), Vol.3, No.8: 51-59*
- Richards, J. and Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. and Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J., and Rogers, T. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J.C. and Farrell, T. (2005). *Professional Development for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Richards, J.C. and Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* (4th ed). London. Pearson Education Limited.

- Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rickheit, G., Strohner, H., & Vorweg, C. (2008). The Concept of Communicative Competence. In G. Rickheit, & H. Strohner, *Handbook of Communication Competence* (pp. 15-64). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Roeder, R., Araujo-Jones, D & Miller, E.R. (2020). Grammar in Communicative Language Teaching: Teacher Beliefs About Theory Versus Practice. *International Journal of English Language Teaching* Vol.8, No.4, pp.45-64, June 2020
- Roeder, R., Araujo-Jones, D., and Miller, E.R. (2020). Grammar in Communicative Language Teaching: Teacher beliefs about Theory versus Practice. *International Journal of English Language Teaching* Vol.8, No.4, pp.45-64, June 2020. Published by ECRTD-Uk
- Msabila, D.T. and Nalaila, S.G. (2013). *Research Proposal and Dissertation Writing: Principles and Practice*. Dar-es-salaam: Nyambari Nyangwine Publishers.
- Sabri, T. S. A. (2018). Communicative Competence in English as a Foreign Language: Its Meaning and the Pedagogical Applications for its development. *International Journal of English Language Teaching* Vol.6, No.9, pp.27-33, December 2018
- Šafranč, J. (2009). *Students' Communicative Competence*. DOI: 10.2298/ZIPI0901180S
- Samalesu, G. and Mwiinga, C. (2024) Strategies of Teaching English as A Second Language in Multilingual Classrooms in Meheba Refugee Settlement in Kalumbila District of Zambia, *British Journal of Multidisciplinary and Advanced Studies: English Lang., Teaching, Literature, Linguistics & Communication*, 5(1),79-89.
- Sampa, C. (2019). *Teachers' Experiences in Teaching Multilingual Classes in Selected Primary Schools of Lusaka District of Zambia*. Unpublished
- Sanderson, M. (2013). *Attitudes toward Communicative Language Teaching. The Case of EFL Teachers in Iquiqu*. Chile: University of Washington.

- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., and Thornhill, A. (2012). *Research methods for business students*. Pearson.
- Saunders, B., Kitzinger, J. and Kitzinger, C. (2015), “*Anonymising interview data: challenges and compromise in practice*”, *Qualitative Research*, Vol. 15 No. 5, pp. 616-632.
- Savignon, S.J. (2006). Beyond communicative language teaching: What’s ahead? *Journal of Pragmatics* 39 (2007) 207–220
- Savignon, S.J. (ed). (2002). *Communicative Language Teaching: contexts and concerns in teacher education*. London: Yale University Press
- Savignon, S.J. (2018). Communicative competence. *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching*, 1-7.
- Schweers Jr, C. W. (1999). "Using L1 in the L2 classroom." *In English Teaching Forum*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 6-9. 1999.
- Sharma, K. (2006). (2006). "Mother tongue use in English classroom." *Journal of NELTA* 11, no. 1-2 (2006): 80-87.
- Sidhu, S.K. (1984). *Methodology of Research in Education*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers PVT.
- Sim, J and Waterfeld, J. (2019). Focus group methodology: some ethical challenges. *Quality & Quantity* (2019) 53:3003–3022. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-019-00914-5>
- Simacheya, M and Mambwe, K. (2023) Language Practices in Multilingual Classrooms of Selected Primary Schools in Livingstone – Zambia. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Innovation*, Vol. 3 No. 4 (2023).
- Simungala, G. and Jimaima, H. (2021). Multilingual Realities of Language Contact at the University of Zambia. *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 2021, Vol. 56(7) 1644–1657
- Simwinga, J. (2007) Forty Years of Language Policy Formulation in Zambia: Greater Prospects for Mother Tongue Education? In Chondoka, Y, B.J. Phiri and

C.M. Chabatama (eds.) *Zambia: Forty Years after Independence 1964-2004*. Department of History: University of Zambia

Simwinga, J. (2013). *The impact of language policy on the use of minority languages in Zambia with special reference to Tumbuka and Nkoya*. Unpublished.

Simwinga, J. (2014) "From Languages in Competition to Languages in Complementarity: Accounting for Language-in-Education Policy Formulation and Implementation in Zambia 1964 - 2014", *Journal of Law and Social Sciences*, 2(1), pp. 1-20. doi: <https://doi.org/10.53974/unza.jlss.2.1.436>.

Sindh, B.A., Shabana, S, and Sadia, M. (2019) English Language Teaching through Communicative Approach: A Qualitative Study of Public Sector Colleges of Hyderabad, *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*. Vol 10 Issue 5

Singh, R. (2011). Controversies in Teaching English Grammar. *Academic Voices: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 1(1), 56-60.

Songbatumis, A.M. (2017). Challenges in Teaching English Faced by English Teachers at MTsN Taliwang, Indonesia. *In a Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Learning* Vol 2, No. 2 July 2017: 54-67.

Souisa, T.R. and Yanuarius, L. (2020). Teachers' strategies on teaching grammar: Facts and expectations of senior high school teachers at Ambon. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, Vol. 9, No 4, p.1123, ISSN: 2252- 8822, <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v9i4.20643>

Sternberg, J. R. (2001) Giftedness as Developing Expertise: A theory of the interface between high abilities and achieved excellence. *High Ability Studies*, 12:2, 159-179, DOI: 10.1080/13598130120084311

Stigler, J.W. and Miller, K.F. (2018). Expertise and Expert Performance in Teaching. In: Ericsson, K.A., Hoffman, R.R., Kozbelt, A. and Williams AM, (eds). *The Cambridge Handbook of Expertise and Expert Performance (2nd ed)*. *Cambridge Handbooks in Psychology*, 2018:431-452. Cambridge University Press.

- Subramaniam, R. and Khan, M. (2013). Explicit grammar instruction in communicative language teaching: A study of the use of quantifiers. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, 9(1), 43–73. *Malaysian English Language Teaching Association*. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1428261623/>
- Swan, M. (1985). A critical look at the Communicative Approach (2). *English Language Teaching Journal*, 39(2), 76–87.
- Tarvin, D.L. (2014). *Communicative Competence: Its Definition, Connection to Teaching, and Relationship with Interactional Competence*: University of Missouri: Unpublished
- Thamarana, S. (2015). A Critical Overview of Communicative Language Teaching. *International Journal of English Language, Literature and Humanities*. Volume 111, Issue V, July 2015.
- Thomas, E. M., Siôn, C. G., Jones. B., Dafydd, M., Lloyd-Williams, S. W., Tomos, Rh., Lowri Jones, L. M., Jones, D., Maelor, G., Evans, Rh. a Caulfield, G. (2022). *Translanguaging: A quick reference guide for educators*. *National Collaborative Resources*: Aberystwyth University and Bangor University.
- Tianli, Z., Mansor, N.S., Ang, L, H., and Sharmini, S. (2021) Practicing Communicative Language Teaching Approach of English Grammar Teaching: Teachers’ Perspectives in China Colleges. *International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, 2021, 10(3): 247-259
- Toçi, A. (2020). Problems with pronunciation among students of English language And Literature-*SEEU Review Volume 15 Issue 2*
- Toro, V., Camacho-Minuche, G., Pinza-Tapia, E and Paredes, F. (2018). The Use of the Communicative Language Teaching Approach to Improve Students’ Oral Skills. *English Language Teaching; Vol. 12, No. 1; 2019. doi: 10.5539/elt.v12n1p110*.
- Tracy, S.J. (2013). *Qualitative Research Methods*. Oxford: Wiley- Blackwell
- Tsisana, G and Dali, S. (2021). Teaching grammar in context and multilingual environment: *International Journal of Multilingual Education*, #19, pp. 112-118. DOI: 10.22333/ijme.2021.190013

- Tsui, A. (2003). *Understanding Expertise in Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tunay, T. and Özlem, K. (2020). On the Models of Communicative Competence. Proceedings of GLOBETS.online: *International Conference on Education, Technology and Science (June 5-6, 2020)*.
- Turin, T.C., Raihan, M.M.H. and Chowdhury, N.A. (2024). Paradigms of approaches to research. *Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujib Medical University Journal* 2024;17(2): e73973
- UNICEF. (2017). *The Impact of Language Policy and Practice on Children's Learning in Zambia*. Paris: UNICEF.
- Ur, P. (1988). *Grammar Practice Activities*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Vaezia, S and Abbaspourb, E. (2014). Implementing CLT in the Iranian Context: “Reality” versus Theory. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 98 (2014) 1905 – 1911
- Vaish, V. and Subhan, A. (2015). Translanguaging in a reading class. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 12(3). 338–357.
- Van Viegen, S. and Zappa-Hollman, S. (2020). Plurilingual pedagogies at the post-secondary level: Possibilities for intentional engagement with students’ diverse linguistic repertoires. *Lang. Cult. Curric.* 2020, 33, 172–187.
- Viesca, K. M., and Teemant, A. (2019). Preparing content teachers to work with multilingual students. *The handbook of TESOL in K–12* (pp. 371–385). John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Vogel, S. and Garcia, O. (2017). Translanguaging. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. DOI: 10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.181
- Wedin, A. (2020). Negotiating identities through multilingual writing: Local school policy that opens up spaces for students’ diverse languages. *Linguistics and Education* 55 (2020) 100775

- Wei, L. (2017). Translanguage as a practical theory of language. *Applied linguistics*, 39, 9-30.
 Children's Literature, Cited in Ada, A. F. (2002). *I Love Saturdays y domingos*. New York: Atheneum books for young readers.
- Wellington, J., and Szczerbinski, M. (2007). *Research methods for the social sciences*. London: Continuum
- Welsh, S.K. (2024). Deliberate Practice and the Acquisition of Military Expertise. *Military Review. The Professional Journal of the US Army. March-April 2024*
- Weng, Y. (2018). On English Grammar Teaching with Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). *Case Studies Journal, Volume 7, Issue 10–Oct-2018*.
- Whong, M. (2011). *Language Teaching; Linguistic Theory in Practice*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Whyte, S. (2019). Revisiting Communicative Competence in the Teaching and Assessment of Language for Specific Purposes. *Language Education and Assessment, 2019, 2 (1), pp.1-19*.
- Widdowson, H. (1978). *Teaching language as communication*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Wong, C.C.Y and Barrea-Marlysi, M. (2012). The Role of Grammar in Communicative Language Teaching: An Exploration of Second Language Teachers' Perceptions and Classroom Practices. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching 2012, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 61–67*
- Wong, Y.C. (2012). A Case Study of College Level Second Language Teachers' Perceptions and Implementations of Communicative Language Teaching. *The Professional Educator, Volume 36, No. 2*.
- Xhaferi, B. (2012) "Teacher's perceptions of multilingual education and teaching in a multilingual classroom-the case of the Republic of Macedonia." *Jezikoslovlje 13.2 (2012): 679-696*.
- Yang, A. and Cheung, C. (2003). Adapting textbook activities for communicative Teaching and cooperative learning. *Forum. 41, 3, 16-20*.

- Yong, W.K., Husin, M and Kamarudin, S (2021). Understanding Research Paradigms: A Scientific Guide. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business and Government* Vol. 27, No. 2,2021 <https://cibg.org.au/>
- Yusob, K.F. (2018). Challenges of Teaching Grammar at Tertiary level: Learning from English Lecturers' insights. *e-Academia Journal, Volume 7 Issue 1 2018, 149-158.*
- Zangoie, A. and Derakhshan, A. (2014). The relationship between EFL teachers' preference of corrective feedback and their attitudes towards. *CLT. IJALEL, 3(5): 82-90.*
- Zeeshan, M. (2013). *Pakistani Government Secondary School Teachers' Attitudes towards Communicative Language Teaching and Grammar Translation in Quetta. Balochistan: California State University.*
- Zhao, Y. (2022). An Analysis of Communicative Language Teaching Approach Based on the International Research. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, volume 673.*
- Zhong-Guo, L., and Min-yan, S. (2007). The relationship between traditional English grammar teaching and communicative language teaching. *Online Submission, 4(1), 62-65.*
- Zimba, M.M and Tibategeza, E.R. (). Communicative Approach Strategies for English Language Teaching. *Studies in Linguistics and Literature, Vol. 5, No. 2, 2021.*
- Zulu, P.M. (2019). Teachers' Understanding and Attitudes towards Communicative Language Teaching Method in ESL Classrooms of Zambia. *International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education (IJHSSE) Volume 6, Issue 6, June 2019, PP 1-13.*

APPENDICES

THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA

Appendix 1: Teachers' interview guide

Title of the Research: Teachers' application of the Communicative Methodology in the teaching of English grammar at selected multilingual Primary Schools in Central Province of Zambia.

QUESTIONS

1. How long have you been teaching grade 6?
2. What is your first language?
3. Which other language(s) do you speak?
4. Which teaching methodology is recommended to use when teaching English grammar?
5. What do you understand by Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)?
6. What are the important features CLT?
7. What do you understand by grammar?
8. What type of activities do you engage learners into as you teach English grammar?
9. Do you use CLT when teaching English grammar? If so, how?
10. What language varieties are present in your classroom?
11. Which is the dominant language in your classroom?
12. Were you trained to teach multilingual classrooms?
13. How do you ensure that learners who don't fluently speak and understand English also understand the content you are teaching and participate in the lesson?
14. What challenges do you face when teaching English grammar using CLT?

THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA

Appendix 2: Pupils Focus Group Discussion guide

Title of the Research: Teachers' application of the Communicative Methodology in the teaching of English grammar at selected multilingual Primary Schools in Central Province of Zambia.

QUESTIONS

1. What languages do you speak at home, community and in the classroom?
2. Does your teacher use any other language apart from English when teaching English grammar? Are you comfortable with the language used? If So why?
3. Does your teacher allow you to contribute using your language? If so, which language is acceptable? And how does the teacher react when you use your mother tongue?
4. How do you help your fellow pupils in class who are not good at speaking or understanding English so that they also understand?
5. How do you feel when the teacher uses the language you are familiar with?
6. Does the teacher use any activities when teaching you English?

Appendix 3: Lesson Observation Checklist

OBSERVATION	COMMENT
Does the teacher use the following CLT activities during the teaching process?	
• Games	
• Role play	
• Discussions	
• Dialogues	
Does the teacher emphasis on:	
• Fluency	
• Accuracy	
Does the teacher teach English grammar using Contexts or real-life situations?	
Which language does the teacher use to explain concepts when teaching English grammar using CLT?	
Which local language does the teacher mostly use to emphasise points during the English grammar lessons using the CLT methodology?	
Which language do learners mostly use of during English grammar lessons.	
Which language do learners use to ask and answer questions during English grammar lessons?	
Does the teacher encourage the learners to use a local language during English grammar instruction using the CLT methodology?	
Which language is mostly used by learners when interacting among themselves during English grammar lessons?	
Is the teacher fluent in the learners' local languages?	
Does the teacher explain the rules governing the structure? Is the explanation correct?	
Does the teacher teach language beyond the sentence? Has he given activities where learners use or analyse the structure beyond the	

sentence?	
Does the teacher explain and give examples of how the structure can be used appropriately context by context?	
Does the teacher use a variety of teaching aids in the lesson?	
Were there both reading and writing activities?	
Were there speaking and listening activities?	

Appendix 4: Ethical Approval Letter



THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA DIRECTORATE OF RESEARCH AND GRADUATE STUDIES

Great East Road Campus | P.O. Box 32379 | Lusaka 10101 | Tel: +260-290 258/291 777
Fax: (+260) 211 290 258/253 952 | Email: director.drgrs@unza.zm | Website: www.unza.zm

APPROVAL OF STUDY

IORG No. 0005376
HSSREC IRB No. 00006464

16th February, 2023,

REF NO. HSSREC:-2023- JAN -011

Ms. Gwen Mutolwa,
School of Education,
P.O.BOX,
LUSAKA.

Dear, Ms. Mutolwa,

**RE: "TEACHERS' APPLICATION OF COMMUNICATIVE METHODOLOGY IN THE
TEACHING OF ENGLISH GRAMMAR IN SELECTED MULTILINGUAL PRIMARY
SCHOOLS IN CENTRAL PROVINCE OF ZAMBIA"**

Reference is made to your submission of the protocol captioned above. The HSSREC resolved to approve this study and your participation as Principal Investigator for a period of one year.

REVIEW TYPE	ORDINARY REVIEW	APPROVAL NO. HSSREC:-2023- JAN-011
Approval and Expiry Date	Approval Date: 16 th February 2023	Expiry Date: 15 th February, 2024
Protocol Version and Date	Version - Nil.	15 th February, 2024
Information Sheet, Consent Forms and Dates	<input type="checkbox"/> English.	To be provided
Consent form ID and Date	Version - Nil	To be provided
Recruitment Materials	Nil	Nil
Other Study Documents	Questionnaire.	
Number of Participants Approved for Study		

Towards Improving Service and Excellence in High Education Beyond Fifty Years

Specific conditions will apply to this approval. As Principal Investigator it is your responsibility to ensure that the contents of this letter are adhered to. If these are not adhered to, the approval may be suspended. Should the study be suspended, study sponsors and other regulatory authorities will be informed.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

- No participant may be involved in any study procedure prior to the study approval or after the expiration date.
- All unanticipated or Serious Adverse Events (SAEs) must be reported to HSSREC within 5 days.
- All protocol modifications must be approved by HSSREC prior to implementation unless they are intended to reduce risk (but must still be reported for approval). Modifications will include any change of investigator/s or site address.
- All protocol deviations must be reported to HSSREC within 5 working days.
- All recruitment materials must be approved by HSSREC prior to being used.
- Principal investigators are responsible for initiating Continuing Review proceedings. HSSREC will only approve a study for a period of 12 months.
- It is the responsibility of the PI to renew his/her ethics approval through a renewal application to HSSREC.
- Where the PI desires to extend the study after expiry of the study period, documents for study extension must be received by HSSREC at least 30 days before the expiry date. This is for the purpose of facilitating the review process. Documents received within 30 days after expiry will be labelled "late submissions" and will incur a penalty fee of K500.00. No study shall be renewed whose documents are submitted for renewal 30 days after expiry of the certificate.
- Every 6 (six) months a progress report form supplied by The University of Zambia Humanities and Social Sciences Research Ethics Committee as an IRB must be filled in and submitted to us. There is a penalty of K500.00 for failure to submit the report.
- When closing a project, the PI is responsible for notifying, in writing or using the Research Ethics and Management Online (REMO), both HSSREC and the National Health Research Authority (NHRA) when ethics certification is no longer required for a project.
- In order to close an approved study, a Closing Report must be submitted in writing or through the REMO system. A Closing Report should be filed when data collection has ended and the study team will no longer be using human participants or animals or secondary data or have any direct or indirect contact with the research participants or animals for the study.
- Filing a closing report (rather than just letting your approval lapse) is important as it assists HSSREC in efficiently tracking and reporting on projects. Note that some funding agencies and sponsors require a notice of closure from the IRB which had approved the study and can only be generated after the Closing Report has been filed.

- A reprint of this letter shall be done at a fee.
- All protocol modifications must be approved by HSSREC by way of an application for an amendment prior to implementation unless they are intended to reduce risk (but must still be reported for approval). Modifications will include any change of investigator/s or site address or methodology and methods. Many modifications entail minimal risk adjustments to a protocol and/or consent form and can be made on an Expedited basis (via the IRB Chair). Some examples are: format changes, correcting spelling errors, adding key personnel, minor changes to questionnaires, recruiting and changes, and so forth. Other, more substantive changes, especially those that may alter the risk-benefit ratio, may require Full Board review. In all cases, except where noted above regarding subject safety, any changes to any protocol document or procedure must first be approved by HSSREC before they can be implemented.

Should you have any questions regarding anything indicated in this letter, please do not hesitate to get in touch with us at the above indicated address.

On behalf of HSSREC, we would like to wish you all the success as you carry out your study.

Yours faithfully,



Dr. J. I. Ziwa
DR. J. I. Ziwa

**ACTING CHAIRPERSON
THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA HUMANITIES AND
SOCIAL SCIENCES RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE - IRB**

cc: Director, Directorate of Research and Graduate Studies
Assistant Director (Research), Directorate of Research and Graduate Studies
Assistant Registrar (Research), Directorate of Research and Graduate Studies