THE LANGUAGE OF INITIAL LITERACY IN A COSMOPOLITAN ENVIRONMENT: A CASE OF CINYANJA IN LUSAKA DISTRICT.

BY

DAVID SANI MWANZA

A dissertation submitted to the University of Zambia in Partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the Master of Education in Literacy and Learning.

The University of Zambia

Lusaka

2012

COPYRIGHT

DECLARATION

I, David Sani Mwanza, do hereby declare that this piece of work is my own, and that all the work of other persons has been duly acknowledged, and that this work has not been previously presented at this University and indeed at any other Universities for similar purposes.

Name...

Signed...Date:...

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

This dissertation by David Sani Mwanza is approved as fulfilling part of the requirements for the

award of the degree of Master of Education in Literacy and Learning.

Signed...Date...

Signed...Date...

Signed...Date..

ABSTRACT

The language-in-education policy in Zambia is that in grade one, the language of instruction for initial literacy is the familiar local language spoken in an area. From grade two onwards, the language of instruction is English. However, there are regions such as Lusaka which is cosmopolitan; with so many people from different ethnic backgrounds yet Cinyanja is the language of initial literacy based on the assumption that it is the language of play in the district.

It was from this background that a study was conducted. The purpose of the study was to find out if Cinyanja was appropriate for use as a language of initial literacy in Lusaka considering the fact that Lusaka was a cosmopolitan environment.

The research design was a case study. Both qualitative and quantitative methods of data collection were used. Interview guides, lesson observation checklists and a familiar language test were administered.The target population consisted of all the government basic schools in Lusaka District, all the grade one teachers and all the grade one pupils. The sample consisted of 6 basic schools, 6 head teachers, 38 grade one teachers, 120 pupils from the 6 schools were tested and all the grade one pupils in the 6 sampled schools were part of the sample. The data was analysed qualitatively. It was grouped into identified themes according to research objectives.

The findings revealed that Cinyanja was the language of play in high and medium density areas and the dominant language of play in the low density area was English. However, other languages such as Bemba, Tonga and Nsenga were also spoken by children during play. Some

respondents added that Cinyanja was not a language of play to all the children in Lusaka District, neither was it a language of play in all the residential areas in the district

In addition, it was found out that there were a lot of differences between the Cinyanja spoken at play in Lusaka District and the one which was officially recognized in schools. Therefore, there was a mismatch between the Cinyanja spoken by children during play and the one recognized in schools.

Both teachers and pupils were not proficient in Standard Nyanja.

It was also revealed that Standard Nyanja recognized in schools was not appropriate as a sole language of initial literacy in Lusaka district.

In view of the findings, the following recommendations were made:

Cinyanja should not be the sole language of initial literacy in Lusaka District. The District Education Board Secretary's office should be allowed to conduct surveys and decide which languages should be used.

Teachers in Lusaka should not be forced to teach grade one if they do not know how to speak Cinyanja. It is only logical that a teacher of initial literacy should know the language of instruction.

There is need for the Ministry of Education to urgently review the languge of initial literacy in Lusaka.

The Ministry of Education should consult teachers and parents when it comes to the selection of the language of initial literacy in an area.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To my late loved ones: amama: Susan Wanga Cipingo Mwanza and Sister Verenia Kamuzyu Mwanza, you still remain darlings to me.

To my brothers and nephews: Emmanuel, Mathar, Samuel, Reuben, Dinah, Semu, Mathews, Given, Alex, Ezekiel and Ian. I thank you more sincerely for your encouragements, patience, help and criticism. You all mean a lot to me.

To my son; Kelvin David Mwanza, you are the greatest gift i have. The sky is never the limit for you my boy because you are the best and may God be with you always as you imitate my academic footsteps.

There are many people who have touched my life. I may need to write another dissertation full of their names but I will end here.

DEDICATION

I wish to dedicate this dissertation to my late father and mother who would have loved to witness my success as their last born. They worked very hard all their lives to make a better future for their children. It is painful that the fruits of their hard work are ripening when they are in the grave. My mother, Susan Wanga Mwanza, you did not get formally educated but you were still educated. I will always remember and treasure you for your sucrifice and intuitive love for education. My father, Ezekiel Mwanza, you were simply the best. Rest well; I will meet you some day.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION AND RECCOMMENDATIONS

APPENDICES

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ADEA-Association for the Development of Education in Africa

NBTL- New Break Through To Literacy

MOE- Ministry of Education

MOIL- Medium of Initial literacy

LOI- Language of Instruction

LIL- Language of Initial Literacy

DEBS- District Education Board Secretary

SACMEQ- Southern African Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality

FNBE-Finnish National Board of Education

NL- National Language

OF- Official Language

SL- Standard Language

L1- First Language

L2- Second Language

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Overview

This chapter gives the background to the study. It also states the statement of the problem, purpose of study, objectives, and research questions, significance of the study, delimitation as well as limitations of the study and finally, operational definitions.

1.1 Background

"Literacy is generally understood to be the ability to read and write be it in the ordinary alphabet or in Braille. The linking of literacy to the skills of reading and writing suggests or requires that it should be carried out in a language. It is not possible, therefore, to talk about literacy without talking about language because language constitutes the vehicle through which literacy is developed" (Simwinga, 2009:1).

The missionaries who settled in various parts of the country where they set up churches, hospitals and schools used local languages to enhance their mission of evangelism. They used local languages to teach reading, writing and numeracy. As observed by Manchishi (2004:1),

> "…the drive for evangelism proved extremely successful because the missionaries used local languages. The Bible and other Christian literature were translated into local languages. People chanted hymns in the language they understood best i.e. their own local languages, and even in the schools, the medium of instruction was in their own local languages at least up to the fourth grade".

This period is believed to have marked the beginning of a more or less formalized language policy in education involving the use of both English and local languages as media of classroom instruction.

During the colonial period, present day Zambia experienced two types of administration: the first as a territory under the British South African company (BSAC) and the second as a protectorate under Britain. It is important to note that by the time the company relinquished power in 1924, there was only one government school, the Barotse national school where Silozi was being used in the lower grades (Simwinga, 2006).

At the time Northern Rhodesia became a British protectorate in 1924, the British colonial office in London had set up the Phelps Stoke Commission whose purpose was to examine the educational system in its colonies and advise how it could be improved and at this time, it was visiting East and Central Africa. The specific objectives of the Commission were:

> To investigate the educational needs of the people in light of their religious, social, hygienic and economic conditions; to ascertain the extent to which their needs were being met: and to assist in the formulation of plans to meet the educational needs of the native races Snelson (1974) cited in Simwinga (2006:18).

In its report, the Commission made far reaching recommendations on how education could be improved in Northern Rhodesia in general. Specifically, with regard to language, the commission was alive to the complementary roles that English and local languages could play in personal and national development. Consequently, the Commission recommended English to become the official languege in education and government business while local languages were to be used for the preservation of national values and self identity on the part of the Africans (Manchishi, 2004). As a result of the recommendations made by the Phelps Stoke Commission, the

government went further and formally recognized four main local languages; Cibemba, Cinyanja (Cicewa), Citonga and Silozi as regional official languages to be used in the African government schools as media of instruction for the first four years of primary education. This is recorded in the Annual Report on Native education for the year 1927 (p.12) as follows:

> …the Advisory Board on Native education has agreed to the adoption of four principal native languages in this territory for school purposes namely Sikololo (Lozi) for Barotseland; Chitonga-Chila for the rest of North western Rhodesia…

This declaration constituted a landmark in language policy formulation for the territory with regard to medium of classroom instruction and, by extension, to language of wider communication by zone. The declaration gave legal status to and acknowledgement of the role of local indigenous languages in education (Simwinga, 2004).

It is the case, therefore, that as at 1953, there was a three tier language policy for the territory, guided by the principal of complimentarity. As a result, pupils were taught in the mother tongue for the first two years of primary education. Thereafter, the pupil would be taught in the dominant regional official language for another two years and then in English from the fifth year onwards (Kashoki 1978:26). This observation is supported by Africa (1980:153 as quoted in Simwinga (2004) who states that " up to mid 1950's, the mother tongue was used in African schools for the first two years of primary school after which a dominant language was used up to standard V (the seventh year of school). After standard V, the medium was English."

Simwinga (2006) suggests that although the four regional languages continued to be taught beyond the fourth year of education, there was no comprehensive policy in terms of training of teachers, curriculum review or production of teaching and learning materials. This is in agreement with Ansre (1979:12) who observes that although African languages generally served

as the media of education for the first few years of primary school in British colonies in Africa, 'instruction through a local language was invariably seen as a transitional phase prior to instruction in English".

It is important to note that after independence, in 1966, there was a proclamation of English as a sole official language at national level and as a language of classroom instruction from grade one to the highest level of education. Then, the 1977 educational reforms, which though acknowledging the limitations of English as a language of classroom instruction, recommended its continued use while making provisions for the utilization of the seven local official languages where necessary.

A significant development occurred in 1992 which served as a bridge between the 1977 and the 1996 one. The Ministry of Education revisited the issue of language- in- education policy which identified English as the language of instruction from grade 1(MOE, 1992). It was found out that the policy had weaknesses which included: downgrading of local languages, isolation of the school from the community, alienation of the learner from tradition and impairment of children's future learning. Having recognized these weaknesses, the 1992 policy document recommended that the MOE would institute a review of the primary school curriculum in order to establish the main local languages as the basic languages of instruction from grades 1-4. The 1992 recommendation provided the teacher with greater freedom to determine 'the main local language' to be used as language of instruction. Simwinga (2006) observes that by 1992, it had become increasingly clear that the use of English as a language of instruction was not working well particularly at lower primary school level.

Later, the 1996 policy document (Educating Our Future) also retained the use of English as official language of classroom instruction but, in addition, recommended the employment of familiar languages to teach initial literacy in grade one. The policy states:

> '…all pupils will be given an opportunity to learn initial basic skills of reading and writing in a local language... officially, English will be used as a language of instruction but the language used for initial literacy learning in grade one will be one that seems best suited to promote meaningful learning by children'(MOE, 1996:27).

With the recognition of the role that a mother tongue plays in education, it was suggested that the language of initial literacy at grade one be the child's familiar language. A familiar language is a language that has the most influence on the child; it is normally the child's first language. In Lusaka, Cinyanja (Cicewa) is the language of initial Literacy. The then (2010) minister of educatiion through a public adress to the media stated that Cinyanja is a language of initial literacy in Lusaka since it is spoken by the majority of the people and that it is a language of play in the District. She said:

> The local language which is used in teaching writing, reading and numeracy skills is not necessarily a mother tongue but a language that is spoken by a majority of people in a locality; this is often referred to as a language of play.

However, with the growing complex linguistic situation in Lusaka, given its cosmopolitan nature, it was not certain whether Cinyanja was still a dominant familiar language in the District. Since Lusaka is a capital city and it has people from different parts of the country (ethnic groups), people from different ethnic backgrounds come to Lusaka for purposes of employment and other human social endeavours. It was, therefore, important to find out if Cinyanja was still the language of play in Lusaka, and further ascertain if it was an appropriate medium of initial literacy in the district.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The adoption of Cinyanja as a language of initial literacy in Lusaka District invited a number of questions. To begin with, when Nyanja was assigned the status of a familiar language in Lusaka, the language situation then could have been favourable. This is to say that, during and just after independence (1964), Cinyanja was a dominant or familiar language to the majority of Lusaka residents. However, it was not known if the language situation had remained the same as more people had continued to migrate to Lusaka from different language backgrounds. Secondly, the government argued that Nyanja was a language of play in Lusaka, hence a suitable language of initial literacy. Nevertheless, it was not known if Cinyanja was a language of play among all the children in all residences in Lusaka (i.e low density, medium density and high density).

In addition, the school curriculum is standardized. This meant that the teaching aids, materials and teaching points particularly in grade one were standardized. Therefore, there was a standard Cinyanja dialect that was recommended for use in schools. It was not known if the Cinyanja spoken during play or during peer interaction in Lusaka was the same Cinyanja that was used in the classroom in grade one.

In short, the problem was that it was not known if Cinyanja was still a dominant language of play and if it was still appropriate for initial literacy teaching/learning in Lusaka district considering that Lusaka is a cosmopolitan city.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to find out if Nyanja was appropriate for use as a language of initial literacy in Lusaka considering the fact that Lusaka was a cosmopolitan environment.

1.4 Objectives

The study's objectives were to establish:

(a) if Nyanja was a language of play in Lusaka district.

(b) if there were differences between Cinyanja spoken in Lusaka and the standard Nyanja recognized in schools?

(c) the proficience of both teachers and pupils in Standard Nyanja.

(d) the views of the Teachers, Head Teachers and District Education Managers on the use of Cinyanja as a language of initial literacy in Lusaka district.

(e) whether Cinyanja was appropriate for use in initial literacy teaching in Lusaka district.

1.5   Research Questions

(a) What is the language of play in Lusaka District?

(b) Are there differences between Cinyanja spoken in Lusaka and the standard Nyanja recognized in schools?

(c) How proficient are the teachers and pupils in Cinyanja (the language of initial literacy in Lusaka District)?

(d) What are the views of the Teachers, Head Teachers and District Education Managers   on the use of Nyanja as a language of initial Literacy in Lusaka District?

(e) Is Cinyanja appropriate for teaching of initial literacy in Lusaka District?

1.6   Significance of the Study

The study intended to find out if Nyanja was a dominant language of play in Lusaka in all the three classes of residences and establish if it was appropriate for use as a language of

7

initial literacy. It is hoped that the findings will help language planners to understand the current language situation in Lusaka. It may also enable educationists and language planners to know if Cinyanja was appropriate for use as a language of initial literacy. This could in-turn help language policy makers to come up with better options or alternatives on the language of initial literacy or to come up with modalities on how Cinyanja could be made more suitable and relevant as a language of initial literacy if there could be any need. In addition, it was hoped that the findings of this study would contribute to the growth of the body of knowledge in initial literacy.

1.7 Delimitation of the study

The catchment area was Lusaka district. The respondents were drawn from the low density, medium density and high density areas of the district. Lusaka was chosen because as a capital city, it is the most cosmopolitan town in Zambia.

1.8 Limitation of the Study.

Since the study used a case study design, the limitation was that the research findings could not be generalized to other parts of the country.

1.9 Operational Definitions.

Cosmopolitan- A place that has people from many different parts of the country or world with different language backgrounds.

Familiar Language- A language which is well known and commonly used by an individual.

Indigenous Language: An original language/dialect spoken in a place or region as a first language.

Initial Literacy: The official start of learning how to read, write and speaking (Grade 1).

Language of play- A language spoken by the majority of the children in a locality during or for purposes of social interaction/play.

Medium of Instruction- A chosen official language used in teaching and learning.

Medium of Initial Literacy- A chosen regional official language used in teaching and learning initial literacy.

Mother Tongue- The first language a child acquires and is competent in it even before entering school.

Multi-ethnic Class- A class consisting of pupils who belong to different ethnic groups.

Multi lingual class- A class consisting of pupils from different linguistic backgrounds.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

This chapter reviews relevant studies in the field of literacy. It starts with studies conducted outside Africa, followed by those within Africa. Those conducted in Zambia though in Africa are reviewed separately.

1.1   Studies outside Africa

Haugen (1984) link culture to the understanding of all things that are taught. They explain that pupils fail to understand clearly when they learn using second languages because language is part of culture which is identical with the culture of the community that uses the language. This results from the fact that even explaining of things is cultural specific since doing so needs a systematic kind of thinking which can only come from training. Since children are a product of the community, even their understanding of things follows the training that their communities give them. Due to this close link between culture and language, Benjamin Lee Whorf (1961) argued "Unfamiliar languages would inhibit both cognitive and perception abilities in pupils. Therefore, only the first language offers the best thinking and understanding of things. If thinking is restrained by not understanding the language, learning then cannot take place.

The Finnish National Board of Education (2011) conducted a study to find out the factors which contributed to good literacy performance of the Finish Youth. This was after they found out that Finns were among the best readers in the world. The findings revealed that the "shallow orthography" of the Finnish language ("what you say is what you write") gave extra advantage in

the initial phase of learning to read. In addition, the national core curriculum stressed the strategic skills of reading and writing; free choice of methods; supportive assessment of pupils. There was also wide choice of learning materials; the teachers were free to choose the materials they wanted to use. The pupils were involved in choosing the reading materials used in instruction such as youth literature, magazines, and media texts. It was further found out that small number of immigrants' children usually learnt to read in their own mother tongue (including Swedish-speaking minority). In addition, schools and teachers were involved in campaigns to promote reading as a pastime and there were also long-term collaboration with libraries, newspapers and magazines (Finnish National Board of Education, 2011).

It is important to note that among the contributors to good literacy levels is the fact that every child is free to choose the language of instruction which they are familiar with. This includes even the people who speak the minority languages. This means that even if some of their major cities like Helsinki are cosmopolitan, it does not pose any challenge on initial literacy teaching in terms of the language of instruction since every language is represented. This situation is different from Zambia and Lusaka in particular where Cinyanja is a sole language of initial literacy despite the district being cosmopolitan.

According to the Literacy Watch Committee of Nepal (1999), it reported that the major contributor to low literacy levels in the country was the fact that Nepali language was the sole language of initial lietarcy even when 48 % of the country's population spoke their mother tongue which was not Nepali language. This meant that those whose first language was not Nepali strugled to learn reading and writing as they were taught in the unfamilair language of instruction**.**

A study in the Netherlands by Van der Slik (2006) reported in Cummins (2006) tested whether elementary school pupils' language proficiency, and its development from grades 4 to 6, was affected by multiethnic class composition. It was reported that on average, pupils in classes with high concentrations of ethnic minorities performed worse than pupils in classes with low concentrations of ethnic minorities. Another study which was conducted in the Unied States of America by Gillborn and Gipps (1996), revealed that students from some minority ethnic groups, namely, those from African Caribean, Bangladesh and Pakistan origin, had consistently underachieved in school in relation to their peers (www,ADEAnet.org).

Ricciardelli (1992, 1993) conducted two studies to investigate the influence of bilingualism on the children's cognitive abilities and creativity. The first involved 57 Italian-English bilingual and 55 English monolingual children who were aged five or six at the time of the study. The study found that children who were proficient in both Italian and English performed significantly better than children who were proficient in English only. The second study was conducted in Rome with 35 Italian-English bilingual and 35 Italian monolingual five and six year children. Similarly, those children who were proficiently bilingual in Italian and English performed significantly better than the other group on word reading. The above studies showed that possibilities to perform well in reading were there for pupils to whom the language of instruction was not their first language.

According to Chiappe et al (2002), multi-language classrooms are a norm in the urban areas of United States of America. Students who speak languages other than English are often taught in multiple-language classrooms with some form of sheltered content instruction designed to develop English language while teaching content-area knowledge in reading, numeracy and

language arts (Echevarria & Graves, 2003). Teachers face the daunting task of simultaneously building children's reading and writing ability and enhancing their English-language growth (Gersten & Jim´enez, 1994; Jim´enez & Gersten, 1999). Complicating matters is the fact that many of these students are from families where the adults in the household have varying levels of English-language proficiency and sometimes limited literacy in any language (Graves, Valles, & Rueda, 2000). This can limit the opportunities that are available for practising the English language or for providing assistance with homework and other school activities.

Rahman (1996) quoted in a census report (2001) observed that the use of Urdu language as a language of instruction in urban areas of Pakistan was received with mixed feelings by the people. It was reported that while some people accepted it, others resisted it. The main reason for opposition to Urdu was because Urdu was the symbol of the central rule of the Punjabi ruling elite that it was opposed in the provinces. This suggests that those children who resisted or whose parents resisted Urdu were negatively affected by the use of Urdu as a language of instruction. Closely linked to political reason was the fact that by number, Urdu was a minority language as Rahman (2001) noted that it was spoken by only 5.57 of the country's population. This meant that the rest of the population struggled to learn and understand instruction given through Urdu language.

2.2 Studies within Africa

Yule et al (1985) advised Governments in Africa that language planning was a crucial exercise whereby before choosing a language for educational purpose, the planners must consider how famous the language was in the society that was going to use it, the domains where it would be

used and the purposes for which it would be utilized. Pride (1997:57) reiterated this position when he noted "An analysis of educational needs from the language point of view is valuable for educational planners". Fishman (1968) argued that the challenge facing all literacy consultants is to find the fastest and most affordable way of teaching initial literacy skills to the disadvantaged youths in the world.

Studies have been done in Africa to find out the factors affecting literacy development in multiethnic areas. Mamadou Lamine Traore (2009) conducted a study bone out of the existing language policy where national languages (NL) are used as the media of instruction alongside French in the first cycle of primary school in Mali. Among other things, the study intended to find out the challenges of providing initial literacy through the use of national languages. The findings revealed that the challenges concerned attitudes towards national languages, choice of language in multilingual areas, adaptation of teaching materials to the NL, and teacher's initial training in national languages, which has not yet been introduced. The study recommended that there was need for linguistic and education legislation which will ensure the survival of the reform, funding that would enable the production of teaching and learning materials, regional cooperation in order to harmonise the curricula and the need for appropriate teacher training Traore M.L (2009) cited in Brock-Utne (2009:155).

From the above study, it has been observed that in Mali, one of the biggest challenges they are facing is the choice of language of initial literacy in multilingual areas. In Zambia, multilingual areas were given language of initial literacy based on linguistic zoning.

 In 1999, another study was done in Malagasy by Irene Rabenoro. The island of Malagasy has only one national language –Malagasy. The official variety of Malagasy dominates the other

varieties, while standard French, inherited from colonization, dominates Malagasy, viewed as a set of varieties. Malagasy is officially the language of teaching for the first two years of primary education, whereas French is supposed to play such a role starting from the third grade. The study revealed that in practice, when teachers were appointed to the area they originated from, many of them used the local variety of Malagasy instead of official Malagasy or standard French. The study noted that 'there is then a tremendous gap between the official instructions and reality' (Robenoro, 2009:180). In addition, the study showed that those pupils whose mother tongue were not standard Malagasy struggled to understand the teacher and this was a barrier to effective learning, participation and discussion.

Litteral (1975) did a study in Papua New Guinea. The study sought to find out the implications of the language policy on initial literacy particularly in urban areas. The findings showed that because the urban areas were highly multilingual, the language of instruction for initial literacy was the country's lingual Franca which the majority of the people could understand. This was so because if they chose a specific language, some of the learners in multiethnic and multilingual classes would have been disadvantaged.

Simialrly in South Africa, Carole et al (2011) reported that children's early literacy learning in South Africa, which is a multilingual country, was affected by several factors more especially in urban areas. The study revealed that in the urban areas, large numbers of children were multilingual code-switchers, speaking a hybridmixture of African languages in diverse contexts and for different purposes. They added that English was the language with the most prestige in South Africa, and it appeared as if large numbers of parents in the urban areas had opted for English as the preferred language of early learning and literacy.

Williams (1996) cited in Kumwenda (2011) examined the impact of language of instruction on reading ability in L1 and L2 in Malawi and Zambia. He administered an English reading test and a local language test (Cichewa in Malawi and an almost identical Cichewa in Zambia) to grade five pupils in six schools in each country. The study reported no significant difference in English reading ability between students in each country, despite the huge difference in amount of English instruction, but large differences in favour of Malawi in local language reading ability. The study concluded that the results 'are coonsistent with research on minority groups suggesting that instruction in L1 reading leads to improved results in L1 with no retardation in L2 reading' (Williams, 1996). Cichewa is more or less a national language in Malawi. Zambia has no national language but only 7 official regional languages with Cinyanja as a regional language for Lusaka and Eastern Provinces.

2.3 Studies done in Zambia

The language policy has been a problem issue in Zambia since independence in 1964. One reason is that the country is highly multilingual and multi-ethnic. Simwinga (2005) defines multilingualism as the use of many languages in a given society or country and multi-ethnic is the presence of many tribal groups in a given society or area. Discussing language problems in Zambia, Kashoki and Ohannessia (1978:272) observed "Zambia is a multilingual country. The number of languages is uncertain but some 73 indigenous groups claim to have their own language". Due to this language problem, Nkosha (1999:58-59) observed that "Zambia has no national lingual franca although it uses seven (7) regional languages, which are widely

understood and used in the regions. These are mainly used in the spoken form and have not been vigorously promoted in education." However, Mubanga (2011) noted that these official regional languages may have some negative effects when indiscriminately used even in their linguistic zones because they may disadvantage some pupils and not others.

The Southern African Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality (SACMEQ, 1998) study on reading performance levels of grade six pupils in the Zambian Basic schools revealed that in 1995, out of the 148 grade six pupils in the target population, only 25 % were able to read at defined maximum levels and only 3 % were able to read at desired levels (Nkamba and Kanyika, 1998). One of the possible causes of low reading levels especially in urban areas would have been multilingualism, i.e the presence of many languages particularly in provincial headquarters.

A number of studies have been done in Zambia to look at the language of initial literacy. One of these studies was done is one by Zimba in 2007. He wanted to find out if the use of Nyanja was effective and suitable as a medium of initial literacy in an area that was predominantly Tumbuka. In other words, he wanted to find out if Nyanja was appropriate for use as a language of initial literacy in Lundazi district which is predominantly Tumbuka. He sampled respondents from Katete where Nyanja or Chichewa is the mother tongue for most pupils and Lundazi where Tumbuka is the mother tongue for most pupils.

The research established that Cinyanja was not suitable for teaching initial literacy in Lundazi. The study noted that the new language policy could only be useful in Lundazi if truly a local language was used as medium for teaching initial literacy skills. And this conclusion agreed with the Whorf hypothesis which states that language and thought are inseparable. Pupils in Lundazi consistently performed below expectation in literacy skills because they could not understand

Nyanja which was supposed to be used for thinking in order to understand what to do. Comparatively, most pupils in Katete spoke Cinyanja; hence they understood most of what teachers taught them. Equally, in Lundazi, Tumbuka has the potential of training the minds of pupils to think freely, easily and quickly once used as a medium of teaching initial literacy. (Zimba, 2007).

Similarly, Kumwenda (2011) conducted a study with a view of finding out the initial reading performance levels of pupils to whom Cichewa was not their first langage in comparison with pupils to whom Cichewa was their first language in multiethnic classes in selected Cipata Urban Basic schools. The findings showed that the initial reading performance level of the grade 1 pupils to whom Cichewa was not their first language was lower than that of pupils to whom Cichewa was their first language. This suggested that Cichewa was not a familiar language to them.

Kashoki (1978) conducted a study in which he sought to predict the degree to which speakers of seven officially approved Zambian languages (viz. Bemba, Lozi, Tonga, Cinyanja, Kaonde, Luvale and Lunda) could understand languages other than their own mother tongue, particularly without prior exposure. The findings indicated that most Bantu language groups in Zambia, languages bordering on one another had not had enough time in which to influence each other in any significant manner. The findings then showed that the linguistic relationship between pairs of languages did not mean that intelligibility between pairs of related languages would necessarily be reciprocal (Kashoki, 1970).

Tambulukani and Bus (2009) reported that most of the children were not familiar with the regional languages which were used for initial literacy learning. The findings suggested that the

current one year of grade one spent on developing phonic awareness which is required for the beginning readers to benefit from instruction in a familiar language was inadequate. Tambulukani and Bus's (2009) cited in Kumwenda (2011) suggested that when children lack proficiency in the language of initial literacy instruction, they might experience significant difficulties in developing literacy skills in English. Kotze, Higgins and Tambulukani (1999) noted that children who lacked proficiency in Bemba experienced difficulties learning to read English.

Kalindi (2006) involved 60 grade two poor readers (identified by teachers) from selected schools in Northern Province. According to the study, only 13 % could read two syllable words, and only 8 % could identify 20 letters of the alphabet. The study showed that even with excellent and intensive instructions in place, some children could still fail to make satisfactory progress in reading. The children therefore could need a different institutional approach which could promote reading skills. The reason why pupils were not able to read would include the use of Bemba as a sole language of initial literacy in multi-ethnic classes. This would mean that those pupils to whom Bemba was not their familiar language struggled to learn to read and write.

Kelly (2000) cited in Kumwenda (2011) also reported that grade six pupils performed considerably below the levels expected of those in sixth grade in reading. He found that the reading levels of the same grade six pupils fell within the level expected of grade four and that scores of some garde five pupils in both rural and urban schools fell within the performance band expected of grade three pupils. Similarly, the scores of some grade four pupils in rural and urban school fell within the performance band of grade two pupils.

Miti et al (2009) sought to find out how the teachers were prepared in colleges to teach Zambian languages and to use them as languages of instruction. The findings revealed that one of the challenges faced in the training of teachers of indigenous languages had to do with language of delivery where English was the language of intruction. Since trainee teachers were taught predominantly through the medium of English, it was not easy for them to teach in African languages at primary school level upon their graduation from college. In addition, trainee teachers lacked background knowledge in a particular Zambian language in the province where the college of education was situated. Related to this was the fact that teachers who were posted to regions where the local language used was not their mother tongue could not not teach using that particular language. This study suggests that due to multilingualism, even some of the teachers had problems teaching using Zambian languages because of multilingualism.

Another study that had been done in line with language of initial literacy was the one by Matafwali (2010) who had observed that even if the use of mother language as the initial language of instruction was introduced in 2000, the reading levels of the majority of Zambian children were regrettably still low by 2005 especially in Lusaka Province. Specifically, she wanted to know how lack of proficiency in the language of instruction explains difficulties in becoming a conventional reader in a Zambian language and English. The study further sought to evaluate the progress made by children in Grade One and Two.

The findings revealed that due to the cognitive relationship that exists between language and thought, the NBTL in which children are taught initial literacy in a familiar language could be effective. The study revealed that lack of proficiency in the initial language of instruction was the hallmark for poor reading and writing skills observed in majority of Zambian children. Thus

when deficits in oral language converge with deficits in cognitive skills, children are at substantial risk of developing reading difficulties (Matafwali, 2010). This finding implies that if children in Lusaka district are not proficient in standard Nyanja recognised in schools, they would be experiencing problems in initial literacy learning.

Summary

From the review of the literature above, it has been observed that both within and outside Africa as well as in Zambia, the importance of mother tongue as a medium of instruction for initial literacy is recognised. This is evident from the varrious findings in the studies which have been reviewed in this chapter. This means that every child has the right to his or her language whether or not such is a majority or minority language. In contrast, it has been observed that Zambia only uses seven (7) indigenous languages as languages of initial literacy. This is on the assumption that most if not all the children in each of the language zones speak and understand the language of initial literacy being used in that area. For Lusaka, which according to the official Government policy, is a Nyanja zone, the research sought to establish the valididty of this assumption.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Overview

This chapter discusses the methodology used in the study. It presents and discusses the research design, target population, sample size and sampling techniques, research instruments, data collection procedure, data analysis and the ethical issues.

3.1 Research Design

This study used a case study design. According to Polit and Hungler (1983), Case studies are detailed investigations of individuals, groups, institutions or other social units. A case study has one person, entity, a study of one thing; it is identified as one of the many. A case study may be of one person, class, district, country, continent or a family. With this understanding in mind, it was observed that there were many towns in Zambia that were cosmopolitan such as Ndola, Kitwe, Mansa, Kasama, Solwezi, Chipata and Livingstone but this study looked at the case of Lusaka. Therefore, this was a case study of Lusaka district out of the many cosmopolitan districts in Zambia.

3.2 Target Population

White C.J (2003) defined a population as the universe of units from which the sample is to be selected. In this study, the population included all grade one pupils in government basic schools

in Lusaka district, all the government basic schools in Lusaka district and all the grade one teachers.

3.3 Sample size and Sampling Techniques.

By definition, a sample is the segment of the population that is selected for investigation. (www.survey system.com/design.com.htm). In this study, the sample comprised six basic schools that were drawn from three different residential areas (low density, medium density and high density). Two were from a low density area; two from a medium density while the other two were drawn from the high density area. This was so because of the belief that different residential areas represented different social and economic status of the people, hence the difference in language attitudes and language use. From the six schools, 120 pupils were sampled for tests; 20 pupils from each of the six schools. In addition, all the grade one teachers, Head Teachers from each school were sampled for interviews. In total, 44 staff from the schools were involved in the oral interviews and answering the questionnaires. In addition, the District Education Standard Officers were interviewed.

Both simple random and purposive sampling techniques were used. According to White (2003), simple random technique is a selection technique that provides each population element an equal chance of being included in the sample. De Vos (2000) adds that in this situation, each individual case has an equal chance to be selected for the sample. In this study, simple random sampling was used to come up with the six schools. This was done by getting an inventory of all the basic schools in the category (e.g low density area) and conducted a ruffle draw to come up with two basic schools in each of the three categories (low density, medium density and high density areas

respectively).The same sampling technique was used to come up with the 20 pupils in each school who participated in the test. This meant that all the basic schools in Lusaka District and all the grade one pupils respectively had an equal chance of being included into the sample.

Purposive sampling was used to come up with the grade one NBTL teachers, School Head Teachers and District Education Managers. Singleton et al (1988) noted that this is a type of sampling which is based entirely on the judgment of the researcher, in that a sample is composed of elements which contain the most characteristic, representative of typical attributes of the population. 0n the basis of the researchers' knowledge of the population, a judgment is made about which subjects should be selected to provide the best information to address the purpose of the research. Therefore, the coming up of grade one teachers, School Head Teachers and District Education Standard Officers was because they were directly involved in the implementation of the New Break Through policy (language of initial literacy policy).

3.4 Research Instruments

The instruments that were used to collect data were interview guides, A familiar language test, documents such as books and news papers containing any relevant information and introspection. The interview guides were used to solicit teachers' views on the use of Cinyanja as a language of initial literacy. They had open ended questions. This was done in order to get in-depth data on the subject. In addition, it helped the researcher to ask follow-up questions in order to get detailed clarifications on the subject.

A familiar language test was administered to pupils to assess the type of Cinyanja which they spoke. This also helped to tell whether Cinyanja was their familiar language or not and how familiar it was. This test was first designed and used in 2006 by Adrian Bus and Geofrey

Tambulukani in their attempt to establish children's familiar Language in some selected parts of Zambia. It proved to be a very effective tool to knowing the language with which the child was familiar as it generated the results as the child was asked to practice a particular language. It must be mentioned, however, that in this study, the test was modified in terms of the material used to administer it. It was administered by having twenty pictures with different objects and asked the pupils to name the object on the picture in Nyanja. Field notes were writen during classroom observation as well as during children's interaction in the different playing fields which were visited in Lusaka District. This was very important because it helped the researcher to get first hand information on how teachers and pupils managed to teach and learn. The lesson observations provided a naturalistic way of data collection in which authentic data was collected and the data collected was compared with the data which was collected using other methods and data collection instruments. Readings from the library and other sources helped the researcher analyze and interpret the gathered data. Finally, the researcher's knowledge of Cinyanja was of great help in the analysis of data and further helped him to come up with conclusions.

3.5 Data collection procedure

To begin with, permission was sought from the District Education Board secretary (DEBS) to carry out a research in the respective schools. The researcher later went into the field to conduct lesson observations and took field notes. The purpose of observation was to find out the linguistic performance of both the teachers and the pupils in the use of Nyanja during classroom interaction. A familiar language test based on the NBTL teaching materials was administered to the pupils. The purpose of the test was to find out the familiarity of the pupils with Cinyanja and also to find out if there was any difference between the type of Cinyanja spoken and the standard

one recognized in schools. Later, interviews were carried out with the teachers. During all these activities, the researcher was taking field notes. Interviews and the tests (which were conducted orally) were recorded. This helped the researcher to listen to the respondent's responses at a later time for deeper understanding. Data collection ended with interviews with District Education Standard Officers.

3.6 Data Analysis

The qualitative approach was used to analyze verbal information that was collected from interviews with the teachers, school managers and from observations. The information which was collected was put into identified themes and categories after which, interpretations and discussions were made. In order to attain authenticity, some direct quotations from respondent's responses were included in the text. The lesson observation was transcribed and presented verbatim. This helped to find out the teachers' and the pupils' proficiency, inadequacies including instances of code switching and code shifting. The verbatim presentation of data was very important because it provided authentic data from the respondents on how they used Cinyanja in a classroom situation.

The manual method of data analysis was also used to analyze the data from the test. This was done by carrying an inventory of all the responses which the pupils gave for the respective objects. These responses were then contrasted with the correct names of the objects in standard Nyanja which were already written in another column by the researcher. If among the responses which the pupils gave on a particular object, there was one which corresponded with the correct name of the object in standard Nyanja, it meant that the pupils were familiar with that word. On the other hand, if none of the responses corresponded with the name of the object in standard

Nyanja, it meant that the pupils were not familiar with that particular term. Following this criterion, the responses for all the twenty items were scored in order for the researcher to come up with percentages.

3.7 Ethical Issues

The study took into consideration the possible ethical issues. The researcher sought permission from the District Education authorities, the Head Teachers, the Teachers and all the study participants to allow him conduct the study. Anonymity was accorded to participants because the interest of the study was on the information which they gave and not their names or personal details. Participants who refused to take part in the study were neither forced nor persuaded to change their positions. There was no any name of the respondent or the school of the respondent which was published in the findings.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

Overview

This chapter presents the findings of the study. The data is presented in accordance with the research questions. These were: (1)What is the language/s of play in Lusaka District?, (2)Are there differences between the Cinyanja spoken in Lusaka to the Standard Nyanja used in schools?, (3) How proficient are the teachers and the pupils in the use of Cinyanja as a language of initial literacy in Lusaka District?, (4) What are the views of the teachers, School Managers and District Education Managers on the use of Cinyanja as a language of initial literacy in Lusaka District?, (5) Is Cinyanja appropriate for teaching initial literacy in Lusaka District?

4.1 What is the language of Play in Lusaka District?

With regards to the first question, the data was collected through observations with the aid of a recorder. The data presented below present two sets of data for each of the three different residential areas. There is the data from the play fields outside the school premises and from within the schools. The conversations were recorded and transcribed. In order for non speakers of Cinyanja to get the meaning of the data, the utterances were translated into English as presented in blackets. It must however be mentioned that the English equivalents are not repsentational of the diction, register and structure of the Cinyanja utterances but simply the meaning. The following are the findings:

Findings from children in the High density area

    (a) Outside the school environment

Iwe, iwe, uli kwatu *(you are on our side)*

Awe, tizachaya yochailana one one *(no, we will play in pairs of two)*

Awe, iai , ivo, tizachaya yamapanda *(no, not that, we will play using goal posts)*

Hehe, hee, uyu ali kwathu *(hey !, this one is on our side)*

Awe, Sali kwanu, mailo enze kwathu, tizachaya ve tinachaila mailo *(no, he is not on your side, yesterday, he played with us, we will do it the way we did yesterday)*

Iai, mailo mwenze bakali beka beka *(no, yesterday, you had a team of of only good footballers)*

Loko ankale kwanu, tilibe navo ndaba *(it is fine even if h play in your team)*

Tizaona   *(we will see)*

Ndimwe Makula *(you are bad footballers)*

Makula ni ndani, uyo enzo nama ati amateya na mu team yaku sikulu kansi na ku skulu samayendako *(who are Bad footballers? That one was lying that he plays in the school team but he doesn't even go to school)*

Eee, banamupisha cabe kainge sanalapile *(He was Just chased because He did not pay school fees)*

Ife ku skulu kwathu samapisha *(they do not chase at our school)*

Ok guys, ife tizayambila kulongela uku. Tizankala ve tenzelilimailo *(alright guys, we will start scoring from this side, we will be as we were yesterday)*

Uzankala goal keeper *(you will be a goal keeper)*

Aa, lelo nifuna kuchaya mukati naine *(no, today, I want to play on the pitch)*

Yenda cabe, tizayamba kucinjana *(Just be on the goal, we will changing)*

Ok, nizankala mu panda ndine *(Alright, i will be a goal keeper myself)*

Awe, azankalapo wamene uyu. Saziba kuteya mukati. *(no, this same one will be a goal keeper,He can't play)*

Eee *(yes)*

Boi kuno *(my friend, pass the Ball here)*

Ronaldo

Aaa ba guy

Wele *(it's a goal)*

Wele *(it's a goal)*

One zero

Guys tiyeni tifakeko nzelu *(guys, let us concetrate)*

Iwe uziteya mushe, wanicita *(exercise some fair play, you are injuring me)*

Ine ukanidyaka, nikumenya *(for me, if you injure me, i will beat you)*

Osati vomenyana naimwe *(no issues of fighting here)*

Eee

Sorry ba guy

Wele *(it's a goal)*

Wele

Awe *(no)*

Nicani *(what i sit ?)*

Yapita pa mwamaba maningi, siinalobe *(it is not a goal, it went over the bar)*

One-one

Kulibe siinalobe *(no, it is a goal)*

Kulibe yaloba, ndiye problem yanu, tikuzibani. That's why sitimateya naimwe. *(it is a goal, that is your problem, that is why we normalny dont play with you)*

Aaa, mwaona ka, sapastira uyu have you seen? *(This one doesn't pass the ball)*

Eeee, cross

Wele *(it is agoal)*

Aaa, but goal keeper eee

Bwera unkalepo amene iwe, aaa cani *(what? Be a goal keeper yourself)*

Iwe naiwe aaa *(you also)*

Chaila kusogolo *(kick the ball forward)*

(b) In the school premises

Anga aba niba teacher? *(is this one a teacher?)*

Kapena niba teacher ba new *(maybe, he is a new teacher)*

Bapunzisa ba grade cani? *(what grade doeas he teach?)*

Kaya, benze babwera mu class mwathu *(I don't know, he came in our class)*

Imwe lets go *(you, lets go)*

What's this?

It's a drink

Tea?

No, a drink

Manje why utengela drink mu bottle *(now, why do you carry a drink in a bottle?)*

Ni mazoe kaili *(because it is mazoe drink)*

Me I have tea

Tikasambe mu manja first *(we wash our hands first)*

Wasiya bag *(you have left the bag)*

Its in class

Bazakubela katenge *(they will steal it, go and get it)*

Tizampasako ai *(we will share with him!)*

Eeee, kainge nayeve amatipasako *(yes, since he also shares with us)*

Manje x amatana vake *(now x doesn't share)*

Aaaa, mutitira manzi imwe *(you are splashing the water at us)*

Nshilefwaya ulubuli *(I don't want fighting)*

Bad manners

Ona afipa *(look, he is dirty now)*

Lyonse cabe, amaipisa uniform *(he dirtens his uniform everyday)*

I want to buy

What

Lets go outside, I want to buy crackers

Tikuperekeze *(we will esort you)*

Eee

Its class time

Vala door *(close the door)*

Tiye tigwirilane *(lets hold hands)*

Teacher, teacher

Findings from children in a Medium density area.

 (a) **Outside the school environment.**

Who is this one?

I don't know

He is a teacher?

He wants to chase us

They don't chase

Let's go there

He is following us

Let's run

Anena cani (what is he saying?)

Ok, mutikopa? Niba camera man (are you going to photograph us? He is a camera man)

Ai? ati ndimwe ba camera man? *(are you a camera man?)*

Ok

Iwe nkala uko, iwe bwera kuno *(you, be on that side, you join our team)*

Me I want to be here

Ok, me I will go there

Aaaa, ali na six stars *(He has boots with six stads)*

Azacita nayo bantu *(He will injure people)*

Aaa, ine sinicayako ngati ni so *(I will not play if that is the case)*

Avule *(he should take them off)*

I can't play without shoes

Azatula bola *(he will puncture the ball)*

Niyake *(the ball is his)*

Ok I will not play and am getting my ball

Awe, imwe musiyeni ateye *(no, allow him to play with his boots)*

Guys, lets start

Kuno *(pass the ball here)*

Aa, ayopa *(he is fearing)*

Yacoka *(it is out of play)*

Wele *(it is a goal)*

Yaingila *(it is a goal)*

Ya ya ya *(yes, yes, yes)*

Iwe *(you)*

Eee

Goal

Guys guys guys tamulemaka *(guys, you are not marking)*

Aaa, ine nicokapo pa goal *(I am leaving the goal post)*

Me, me

Aa, you are not passing the ball

Foul, foul

Awe awe, te foul *(no, it is not a foul)*

Penalty

Kulibe

Ni penalty *(it's a penalty)*

Awe, te penalty, mulailishanya lyonsefye *(no, it's not a penalty, you like complaining too much)*

Sinizagwira *(I will not stop the ball)*

Tingenesa nangu ucokepo *(we will score even if you leave the goal post)*

Ninshi yasila *(then, the match is over)*

Iwe gwira cabe, ni ndani uyu? *(Just be on goal, who is this one?)*

Iwe tenga bola yako *(you, get your ball)*

But guys ndimwe ba boyo, tizagula ce yathu na ife bola *(guys, you are fake, we will buy our own ball)*

(b) In the school premises

Aa ici *(this one)*

Ca ndeo *(he is a bully)*

Tiye ku toilet *(let's go to the toilet)*

Tiyeni *(let's go)*

Let's go to the pompi *(lets go to the pump)*

To do what?

To wash hands

Tiye ku ground *(lets go to the playing ground)*

Tisambe mu m'manja first kaili *(let's wash hands first)*

X ali kuti? *(where is x)*

Kaya *(I don't know)*

Aneni *(here you are!)*

Sakamba thank you *(he doesn't say 'thankyou')*

Thankyou

After all acita kukuuza *(after being told !)*

Onani uja eeee *(look at that one)*

Ankala na dothi *(she has become dirty)*

Niwadothi *(she is Just a dirty person)*

Akonda kusebela mumatipa *(she likes playing in mud)*

Tuleyeni, ine nshilefwaya ukubutuka *(let us go, i dont want to run)*

Tiyeni tiziyenda *(let us go, we will walk)*

Ayendo liza belo *(he is going to ring the bell)*

Aaa, ba teacher ba bwela *(the teacher has come)*

Onani baja, ndiye pe bayenda panja *(look at those, this is when they are going outside)*

Eeeee

Nayenda ine *(i am going)*

Butukeni, kanang'ani aka *(run! This one is lazy)*

Iwe, ukamba ndani *(who are you reffering to?)*

Nikamba iwe *(i am reffering to you)*

Iwe, wagwesa pencil *(you, you have dropped the pencil)*

Sembe wamusiya *(you wouldn't have told him)*

Ngati ndiwe so sembe waba *(if it were you, you would have stolen)*

Sembe nadoba *(I would have picked it)*

Wanidyaka aaa *(you have stepped on me)*

Vala door, vala door, john cena *(close the door!, jon cena!)*

Nibauza ba teacher ati muvala door *(I will tell the teacher that you are closing the door)*

Findings from children in a Low density area

   (a) Outside the school environment

Come

You come also

Come and see

There is a snake

Where?

That one

That looks nice

Eee look at those flowers and there is a bridge there

Aa you, is that a snake?

Aaa

That's not a snake. You don't know how snakes look like

I saw that on TV and mummy said it is a snake

You are lying

But mummy said that you should be careful because there is snakes here

Snakes are not here

Where are they

They keep them in a house

I want to do a back summer

No you will hurt yourself

Taishiba ukupama summer ulya *(that one doesn't know how to flip)*

I will do like him, I will not hurt myself

Aaa, that is not a summer

Ok, do it yourself

You need to jump the whole body upside down without touching the ground

Do it kaili (go ahead, do it)

Aaa, I don't know

Me I did not carry clothes for swimming

Where is the swimming pool?

It's that side

Where?

That side aaa

Let's go see

Mummy me am hungry

We will buy food

Where?

There, where we came from

Lets go there

I am dead?

She is dead?

Aa, you! You cant see that she is laughing?

Ha that is bad, me I cant go there

What is that?

Mushelemuko

Now mushelemuko is going in water *(the slide extends into the water)*

Yes, you climb and you come in water

Nafa *(am dead!)*

I also want

 No, you don't have clothes to change

Lets go back to mummy

Ha, look, monkeys

Those are impalas

Me I want to see the lion and the girraff

    (b) **In the school premises**

Iwe unipushing'a *(you are pushing me)*

Ni wa ndeo uyu *(this one likes fighting)*

Aaa, kaoneni *(look at him!)*

Aa, why unidonsela bag? *(why are you pulling my bag?)*

Wanicita na cibag cako *(you are hurting me with your bag)*

Aaa iwe, ufuna kunibela *(you want to steal from me)*

Ningakubele cani iwe? *(what can I steal from you?)*

Tiye kuseli *(let's go behind)*

Eee, naya, isa *(I have gone, come along!)*

Tiye pa kashop *(let's go at the shop)*

Tiye ku ground *(let's go the playing ground)*

Niyenda ku toilet *(I am going to the toilet)*

Nikonke *(should I follow?)*

Eeee, bwela *(yes, come)*

Tiye tikaziyenda *(we should be walking)*

Ndeufwa imisu *(I m pressed)*

Ndiye cani ico? *(what does that mean?)*

Amvela mitundo *(she is saying that she wants to urinate)*

Nangu kuyenda kunya? *(even going to deficate?)*

Awe, imisu ni mitundo *(no, the word 'imisu' means 'urine')*

Nifuna jiggies *(I want jiggies)*

Iti *(which one?)*

Beef na chicken *(beef with chicken)*

Aneni *(here you are)*

Nifuna yabili *(I want two)*

Ni one pin *(it's going at k1000)*

So iwe suziba *(you mean you don't know!)*

Niziba nifunsa chabe *(I know, I just wanted to ask)*

Ok

Nifunako Tangy *(I want Tangy drink)*

Nifunako Havana cola *(I want Havana cola)*

Yembekeza *(wait)*

Nifuna ya green *(I want the green one)*

Palibe *(we don't have)*

Ok

Imwe tione tiguleko naise *(allow us to also buy)*

Naunyanta! Aaa *(you have stepped on me)*

Naife tigula we *(we also ant to buy)*

Manje mwe mwayambila *(you are taking long)*

Sindife sunaone ati nibaja *(it's not us, didn't you see that it was those people who were taking long)*

Ma crakers

Yangati *(how many)*

Two

Tiyende bonse ayi *(we go together)*

Eee

Mailo munanisiya *(you left me yesterday)*

Sitinakuwone kaili tinaona monga walova *(we didn't see you, we thought that you were absent)*

Ba mummy ba malesa *(my mother doesn't allow)*

Ine ba mummy banakamba ati nga wadwala ungalove *(my mother says that if i am Sick, i can absent myself)*

Ine tabakanya *(with me, they do not disallow me to absent myself from school)*

Ine ku pre school benze nipeleka everyday *(at pre school, they used to take me to school everyday)*

Ine lyonsefye kuti nalofwa *(with me, any time I want, I can absent myself from school)*

Bantu bayenda *(people have gone)*

Tiyendese *(let us hurry)*

Ona kaja, katamangila kupushing'a pa door *(look at that one, He is hurrying t go and close the door)*

Tiyeni titamange *(let's run)*

You are late

Its class time

Eka tipiteko kaili *(lets us pass)*

All of you are late

Cioneni, nikunenera kuli ba teacher. *(look at him, i will report you to the teacher).*

Findings from oral Interviews on Language of Play in Lusaka District.

Most respondents said that Cinyanja was a language of play in Lusaka district. One respondent said "It is the language spoken by the majority of the people. Most of the children come from compounds, so they speak Cinyanja". However, the respondents said that there were a few children who were coming from English speaking homes, hence; their language of play was English. One respondent stated:

> 'Some children come from parents who speak to them in English at home. Again, there are some children who passed through the pre schools where the language of use was English. So to such children, the language of play is English. Some of the children go to Pre School at the age of two and they grow up speaking English; to such pupils, the language of play is English'.

Further, it was found out that almost all the children came from compounds even in schools that were situated in the low density areas. One teacher said:

'the rich people in mayard (high cost areas) take their children to private schools and government schools are like for those people from compounds who do not have money to take their children to private schools. A few grade one pupils who came from mayard are children of house servant's i.e. maids and garden boys and as you know, they are not educated and they can't teach their children English and they can't afford to take their children to private schools'.

Some respondents also emphasised that Cinyanja was the language mostly spoken during peer interaction in Lusaka District regardless of the social status of the area in which the school was situated. One of the respondents said:

'the majority of the pupils in grade one are comfortable with Cinyanja because most of them have grown up in Lusaka, they are in the compounds where Nyanja is mostly spoken, so they know how to speak Nyanja'

The findings show that generally, for high density areas, the most common language of play was Cinyanja while in the medium density area; there was a mixture of Cinyanja and English while English was the dominant language of play in low density areas.

4.2 Are there differences between the Cinyanja Spoken in Lusaka and the Standard Nyanja recognised in Schools?

Another question was to find out if there were any differences between the Cinyanja spoken during peer interaction in Lusaka District and the standard one recognised in schools. In order to do that, interviews and a familiar language test were conducted. The following were the findings from the interviews:

4.2.1 Findings from Oral Interviews on whether there were differences between the Cinyanja spoken at play and the standard one recognised in schools.

The respondents said that there was a very big difference between the Cinyanja used at play and the one recognised in schools. In other words, the respondents revealed that there was a mismatch between the language of play and the classroom one. One of the respondents said:

> 'the Cinyanja in the grade one books is different from the one they are using because even for me as a teacher, I fail to understand some of the words'.

The respondents added that the Cinyanja that was used in schools was actually Chewa and it was very difficult to pronounce and both teachers and pupils failed to understand most of the words.

The respondents also said that the books which they were using to teach literacy had the kind of Cinyanja from Malawi which they said was only suitable for pupils in Eastern province. One teacher said:

> 'they are different. The one (Cinyanja) spoken in Lusaka has many foreign words. In fact, teachers do not use the classroom Nyanja. They use the Lusaka Nyanja which the pupils understand; the only problem is in grade seven where they are supposed to write the exams which are set in standard Nyanja again'.

In addition, another grade one teacher said:

> 'There is a big difference, at home they call it (maize) 'milisi' but here we call it 'cimanga'. In addition, they call it (door) 'door' at home but here we call it 'citseko'. Even when it comes to the word for grass, we call it (grass) 'msipu' in class but here in Lusaka they call it 'mauzu'.

In order to emphasise the point, one of the head teachers who also said that there was a disparity between the Cinyanja spoken in Lusaka during play and the one used in class, gave the following testimony:

> 'for example, I took my child to Katete, I said that since my child speaks Nyanja here in Lusaka well enough, he would fit in well in

She added that her child failed because the Cinyanja which the child learnt in Lusaka was very different from the one used in schools and that her child did not cope with the use of Cinyanja as a language of initial literacy. She ended by saying that the child was transferred to Lusaka before the end of grade one.

The findings also showed that there were few grade one classes compared to grades two and three. The teachers said the situation was like that because most parents in Lusaka took their children to private schools in grade one where they use English for fear of Cinyanja and that when it was time for grade two, they brought back their children knowing very well that at grade two, the medium of instruction was English. In one of the schools which were sampled, there were two grade one classes and three classes for grade two.

4.2.2 Findings from a familiar language test.

SL #	Name of Object in English	Name of Object in Standard Nyanja	Names of Object according to Pupils Responses	Names of Object in Cinyanja which were Mutually intelligible
1	Vehicle	Galimoto	Motoka, kamotoka,cimotoka, mota	√

2	Bird	Mbalame	Kanyoni, nyoni, cinyoni, bird, akoni	X
3	Radio	Wailesi	Cilimba, kalimba, radio, wailesi, icilimba	√
4	Mirror	Kalilole	Mirror,	X
5	Mother	Amai	Mummy, Amai, amummy, ba mummy,	√
6	Teacher	Aphunzitsi	Ateacher, ba teacher, teacher	X
7	Egg	Dzira	Egg, Eggs, amani, ilini	X
8	Pencil	Pensulo	Pencil, a pencil, colembera	√
9	Hoe	Khasu	Kambwiri, hoe, a hoe, colimilako,	X
10	Rat	Khoswe	Koswe, kakoswe, cikoswe, mbeba, kambeba, rat, a rat	√
11	Door	Citseko	Door, a door, i don't know	X
12	Trousers	Buluku	Trousers, Buluku, toloshi, a trousers	√
13	Cat	Cona	Pusi, kapusi, cipusi, pushi, cat, a cat, kit, ka kit	X
14	Girl	Mtsikana	Mkazi, girl, a girl, jelita, misozi	√
15	Water	Madzi	Manzi, water, menda, mezi	√
16	Milk	Mkaka	Milk, cowbell, meleki	X
17	Grass	Msipu	Mauzu, grass, uzu, vimauzu, tumauzu	X
18	Ball	Mpira	Bola, ball, a ball	X
19	Groundnuts	Mtedza	Nshawa, nyemu, groundnuts	X
20	Lion	Mkango	Nkhalamu, lion, i don't know	X

The findings show that there were a lot of differences between the Cinyanja spoken during play and the standard Nyanja recognised in schools. The findings from the test also confirmed this finding.

4.3 How proficient are the teachers and the pupils in Standard Nyanja

Another question sought to find out how proficient both teachers and the pupils were in Standard Nyanja. In order to do so, lesson observations were done in grade one classrooms during literacy lessons. The lessons were recorded and transcribed. The following were the data and note that the words and sentences in bold are instances of code switching and code shifting. In addition, **x** within text stands for name of pupil:

4.3 Findings from School X (located in a high density area):

T:**remove your bag on your table ai!**

Ps:yes

T: ma **bag** muyafake pa table. Mwafaka ma **bag**? *(put the bags at the table. Have you pu the bags?)*

Ps: **yes**

T: ma **pencils, put your pencils on the table (silence) put your pencils on the table**. Nizayamba kuimba ai/ elo mubwere kuno

(I will start singing, and you come here).

T: osabwera na **drinking bottle**, osabwera na Maggie, fyamveka? *(do not come with drinking bottlers, magie, i sit clear?)*

Ps: **yes**

T:tiyeni tione tonse munkale, nifuna mukaziyangana pa bodi ai? *(All of you sit down, i want you to look at the board)*

10. Ps: eee

T: nkalani pansi **bonse** *(sit down all of you)*

T: muli bwanji? *(how are you ?)*

Ps: tili bwino kaya naimwe *(we are fine, how are you?)*

T: awe, ine ndine bwino. Manje nifuna tibelengeko ka **story** kazacoka mu buku. Kazacoka kuti? *(I am fine. I now want us to read a story from the book. Where will it come from?)*

Ps: mu buku *(from the book)*

T:tiyeni tione apa, muonapo cani apa? *(let's look this, what are you seing?)*

Ps: **pencil**

T: aaa, nifuna mu cinyanja osati mu cizungu, ehe, uonapo cani? *(i want you to snswer In Cinyanja not In English, so what did you see?)*

P: tu bantu *(people)*

20. T: tubantu tungati? *(how many?)*

P: tutatu (Three)

T: aa, sinifuna kunyamuna kuboko mu mwamba, ehe, uonapo tubantu tungati? *(i dont want, you put up your hand, yes, what do you see?)*

P: tutatu *(Three)*

T:ooo, nindani anganipezeleko twinangu *(who can find others)*

Ps: ndine ndine *(it's me!)*

T: aaa**, don't shout**, osati muzicita **shout** ai. Iwe*! (do not stout!)*

P: tubantu tutatu *(Three pe ople)*

T: ehe, utu tubantu, nitubamuna teka teka? *(these pe ople, are they All males?)*

Ps: awe *(no)*

30. T: nati osapunda. Nyamula kuboko kumwamba. Tiuzeko, **what is your name**? Ndiwe ndani zina? *(i Said dont stout, put up yu hand. Tell us, what is your name?)*

P: x

T:ehe, so x tiuzeko, tubantu twamene utu, nitubamuna teka teka kapena pali bamuna na bakazi *(ok, tell, are these people all males or they are mixed with girls?)*

P: pali mwamuna umozi na bakazi babili *(there is one males and two females)*

T:ok, nanga iwe uzatiuzako cani? *(what about you, what are you going to tell us?)*

P: pali bakazi babili na mwamuna umozi *(there are two females and one male)*

T:ok, tifuna tibelengeko pa mwamba pali....iwe nikumenya, osayangana panja. So nifuna tibelengeko ka **story** kali pamene ai? *(we want o read on top…I will beat you, don't look outside, so I want us to read a story, ok?)*

Ps: eee *(yes)*

T: (teacher starts reading) uyu ndi masiye *(this is Masiye)*

Onani masie *(look at Masiye)*

40. Masiye ndi uyu *(Masiye is this one)*

Masiye ndi mnyamata *(Masiye is a boy)*

Onani mnyamata uyu *(look at this boy)*

Uyu myamata ndi masie *(this boy is Masiye)*

onani masie *(look at Masiye)*

uyu ndi lozi *(This is Lozi)*

onani lozi *(Look at Lozi)*

Onani mtsikana uyu *(Look at this girl)*

Lozi ndi mtsikana *(Lozi is a girl)*

Msikana uyu ndi lozi *(This girl is Lozi)*

50. Onani mtsikana *(Look at the girl)*

T: ni ndani amene anganiuzeko pali aka ka **story**? *(Who can tell me anything about this story?)*

P: ati uyu ni mwana wa masie *(you Said that this is an orphaned child)*

T: ati uyu ni mwana wa masiye, ehe, iwe. *(.that this is an ophaned child, yes, you)*

P:ati uyu ni mwana wa masie *(that this is an orphaned child)*

T:winangu ni ndani wamene anganiuze *(who else can tell us)*

P: ati uyu ni lozi *(that this is Lozi)*

T:uyu ni lozi, ati uyu ni... *(this is Lozi. This one is …)*

Ps: lozi

T: winangu ni ndani wamene anganiuzeko? *(who else can say something?)*

60. P: ati uyu ni mwana wa masie *(this is an orphaned child)*

T:**bushe** nabelengako va so ine? Mwanimvera nikamba **so**? Iwe *(have i read such? Did you hear me say that?)*

P: uyu ni lozi *(This is Lozi)*

T:ehe, uyu ni lozi *(Thisn is Lozi)*

P: **me teacher, me teacher**

T: **don't say me teacher, just raise up your hand.** Ehe!

P: **This one is masiye**

T:**this is masiye**. Sitikamba cizungu, tikamba cinyanja ai? *(we do not speak English, we speak Cinyaja, ok?)*

Ps:eee *(yes)*

T:**so** nifuna ukambe mucinyanja. Iwe *(I want you to speak in Cinyanja, you…)*

70. P: uyu ni masiye *(this one is Masiye)*

T: uyu ni masiye ai**? Very good. So** tamvelako kuti uyu ndi masiye, uyu ndi lozi. Masiye ni ndani? Ni mwamuna ni mkazi? *(This one is Masiye, we have Heard that this is Masiye, this is Lozi. Who is Masiye? A boy Or a girl?)*

Ps: mwamuna, mukazi *(a boy, girl)*

T:lozi ni ndani?nimwamuna, ni mkazi? *(is Lozi a boy Or a girl?)*

Ps: ni mkazi (a girl)

T: osakamba cabe **so**, kucita kunyamula kwanja. **Ok**, twamvera ai? Kwasila **te**? Masiye ni mwamuna, lozi ni mkazi ai? *(dont Just sapek anyhow, you put up your hand. Have we Heard? Masiye is a bo and Lozi is a girl. Ok?)*

Ps: eee *(yes)*

T: manje vamene tizacita manje apa, nifuna tipunzisaneko kucita bwanji? mwamene tizayamba kulembela, **handwriting** yathu. Mwaona **nashila** tumalaini utu ai? Tuoneka bwanji/ nitwamushe ai? *(now, I want to teach you handwriting. I writing these lines, how do they look, are they good?)*

80. Ps: eee *(yes)*

T: nitwa **straight** ai? *(they are straight, isn't it?)*

Ps: eee *(yes)*

T: niziba kulemba ine. **So** tizapunzilako molembela malembedwe yatu. Iyi ingankale ni **letter** ingankale ni **number**. **Tell me what number is this**? *(I know how to write. So we will learn handwriting. This can be a letter or a number?*

P: o

T: ingankale ni o kapena ingankale ni zero. O nangu zero **fya**mveka? *(this can be o or it can be a zero. Is it clear?)*

Ps: eee *(yes)*

T:mwaniona mwamene nilembela? *(have you seen how I am writing?)*

Ps: eee *(yes)*

T:nafika pa ka **line**. Kaoneka bwanji? *(I have reached the line. How is it looking?)*

Ps: kawama *(it is looking good)*

T: naimwe mungalembe ai? *(you can also write. Cant you?)*

90. Ps: eee *(we can)*

T: nakenangu mwakaona? Kaoneka bwanji? *(have you seen the other one? How is it looking?)*

Ps: bwino *(good)*

T: nakenangu, nikacani kamene aka? *(and another one, what is this ?)*

P: zero

T: winangu, nikacani kamene aka? *(someone else, whatis this?)*

P: 4

T: 4 ai?

Ps: eee

T: **very good. So** mwaona nalemba nasiyako malo, nalemba nasiyako malo, nalemba nasiyako malo, nalemba nasiyako malo, nalemba nasiyako malo, nalemba nasiyako cani? *(when i write, i leave some space, when i write, whatdo i leave?)*

100. Ps: malo *(space)*

T: **elo,** nilemba pati? *(and where do I write?)*

Ps:pa line *(on the line)*

T:nizajumphapo kuti **work** yatu inkale ya **clean** ai? *(I will skip a line so that our work is presentable, ok?)*

Ps: eee *(yes)*

T: oom, **stop making noise**. Tizalemba ka o katu, nofakako utu ai? Manje tifuna tiyanganeko mu m'mwamba mumwela cabe. Nindani angalembe? *(we will write our 'o'. let's look up, who can write?)*

Ps: **me teacher, me teacher**

T: iwe, lemba tione *(you, write so that we see)*

(pupil writes)

Very good, iwe lemba tione *(you come and write)*

(pupil writes)

T: Very good

Iwe, vyamene nenzolemba apa, nifuna ulembe m'mwamba *(you, write what I was writing here on top)*

(Pupil writes)

Very good. Simungakangiwe kulemba ai? *(you can not fail to write, is that not so?)*

Ps: eee *(yes)*

T: mwaviona ivi ai? *(have you seen these?)*

Ps: eee *(yes)*

T: ivi muzacita **match,** nizalemba pa **board,** imwe muzacita **match** ai? *(you will match these. I will write on the board and you should match them. Ok?)*

Ps: eee *(yes)*

110. T: so, vyamene nizacita manje, imwe amene mwenze mwankala apa ba luangua bwelelani, muzalemba malembedwe aya, mwayaona? *(you who had sat here, the Luangwa group, you will write handwriting. Have you seen?)*

Ps: eee *(yes)*

T: **ok,** nkoyani, aba bamene benze bankala apa bazalemba malembedwe *(you can go. Those who had sat here will write handwriting)*

(pupils start going)

Sibonse, benangu bwelani munkale apa. Mwaviona ivi? Lembani ai? *(not all of you, some of you, come and sit here. Have you seen these? Write, ok?)*

Ps: eee *(yes)*

T: benangu muzalemba ivi *(some of you will write these)*

P: ba **teacher,** tilembe apa? *(teacher, should we write here?)*

T:eee, tengani mabuku muyambe kulemba ai? *(get the books and start writing, ok?)*

Ps:eee *(yes)*

4.3.2 Findings from School Y (Located in a middle density area)

Teacher: imilila *(stand up!)*

(pupils stand)

Teacher: nkala x4 *(sit down)*

T: **goodmorning**

P: **goodmorning mrs x.**

T: **how are you?**

P: **very well, thank you and how are you mrs x?**

T; **thank you, sit down**

P: **thank you mrs x**

T: **just say thank you teacher**

P: **thank you teacher**

(pupils make noise)

T: congoni, congoni, congoni, **hey! Quiet!**

(pupils keep quiet)

T: iwe, nkala apa, iwe naiwe bwera apa, imwe! Awe kusunkana, nkalani cabe bwino bwino pamodzi. Ok, mwaona apa? *(sit here. Do not push each Rother. Sit together. Have you seen here?)*

P: eee (yes)

T: mwaona citunzi? *(have you seen the picture?)*

Ps: eee *(yes)*

T: citunzi ni cani? *(what is a picture?)*

P: ni cinyama *(it is an Animal)*

T: nanga iwe *(what about you)*

P: ni Munchu *(it is a person)*

T: citunzi ni **Picture** *(the nyanja word' cithunzi' means Picture)*

62

P: ni **picture** *(it is a picture)*

T: **so** citunzi ndiye **picture** ai? *(so 'cithunz' is a picture, ok!)*

Ps: eee *(yes)*

P: **Teacher, look at this one**

T: iwe nkala bwino, anzako sibaona *(sit property, your friens are not able to see)*

Ok, **so** ici ndiye citunzitunzi. **So** mwaona cani apa? *(so this is a picture, have you seen?)*

(Pupils speak at once)

Osakamba, kunyumala cabe kwanja. Ati waonapo cani? *(do not sapek anyhow, put up your hand)*

P: **cabbage**

T: Waonapo **cabbage** ai? Mwaonapo cani cinangu? *(you have seen a cabbage, what else have you seen?)*

Ps: **me, me teacher**

T: ehe *(yes!)*

P: **flower**

T: iyi ni **flower** ai? Then iyi ni cani? *(this is a flower, what about this?)*

Ps: ni milisi *(it is maize)*

T: ni milisi ai? Nanga milisi iyi ili kuti? *(it is maize. Where is this maize?)*

63

Ps; **mu garden**

T: ndani apa amalima mu **garden** *(who among you cultivates In the garden?)*

Ps**: me teacher, me teacher**

T: imwe mupanga congo *(you are making noise)*

Kuti inkale na milisi, umacita cani? *(what do you do for this to be maize?)*

Ps: **me teacher, me teacher**

T: iwe *(you)*

P: kutenga tunshele *(we get the grains)*

T: **ok,** kutenga tunshele ka? Iwe *(getting the grains. What about you ?)*

P: tunshele twa milisi *(maiza grain)*

T: iwe *(what about you?)*

P: tu ma**seeds** *(seeds)*

T: **ok, so** nizakulangizani tu ma**seeds** (teacher distribute seeds to pupils), **so** ngati ufuna kushanga milisi, nibyala tu ma**seeds** twa milisi, ngati ufuna kubyala **beens**, nikubyala tu ma**seeds** twa **beens,** ai? Kagwire (referring to a pupil) tione ka nshele ka milisi. *(I will show you the seeds. So if you plant to plant maize, you use maize grain, if you want beans, you get bean grain. Touch it and see)*

Ps: **me teacher, me teacher**

T: **after** ngati kamela, mucita cani? Iwe *(when it germinates, what do you do?)*

P: kulimamo kucosamo mauzu *(weeding)*

T: iwe *(you)*

P: kusakwilamo *(weeding)*

T: **ok, so** taziba tonse ai? **So,** ndiye mwamene alimila, ngati mufuna **cabbage** nangu vili vonse ai? *(so, we all have known. If you want cabbage or anything, this is how it is done, ok?)*

Ps: eee *(yes)*

T: ok, manje tiyende. Sinifuna congo nangu kuyenda yendacabe, mwamvera? **So** muyemde bwino bwino mu ka line *(let's go now. I doon't want noise. Just walk properly in a single line))*

Ps: mu ka line (in a line)

T: eee, muyende mu ka line olo ka mzere. **So** tizayambilako bakazi, bamuna nkalani first. Bakazi imililani (girls stand up and make a line) bamuna imililani (the boys stand up and join the line). Osasobesa ka **seed** ako ai? *(yes, walk in a line. We will start with girls and boys should wait. Stand up girls. Stand up boys)*

Ps: oooo

T: tiyeni (pupils go the garden) *(let's go)*

Aka ni kacani? *(what is this?)*

P: aka ni ka cani? *(what is this?)*

T: aka ni kacani? *(what is this?)*

P: **flower**

T: eee, ka **flower**. Mwaona cani? *(a flower, what have you seen?)*

Ps: milisi *(maize)*

T: milisi na cani? *(maize and what else?)*

Ps: ka **flower**

P**: teacher, teacher**

T: ali na kanshele ka milisi ni ndani? *(who Has a maize seed?)*

Ps: ine, ine, ine *(it is me)*

T: wakaona (pointing at the maize seed) aka kang'ono so? *(have you seen this small one?)*

Ps: eee *(yes)*

T:kukacita cani kuti kankale milisi? *(what do you do i fit is to be a maize?)*

P: nikukatenga, kukafaka pansi nokafakapo madothi, notapilapo manzi *(you put it in the ground and start watering it).*

T: ehe, niocenjera uyu ai? Mutoteleni, mutoteleniko *(yes, you are cleaver. Clap for him!)*

Ps: wakoza, wakhoza inde. *(you have manager, yes you have)*

T: wakamba bwino, ati, watenga aka, **first** nikulima, walima bwino bwino**, then** wakumba kamgodi, elo ngati kulibe mvula, nikutililapo cani? (*you explained vry well. You said that you get the seed, put it in the ground, and if there is no rain, you water it. You water it with what?*)

Ps: manzi *(water)*

T: kutililapo *(watering)*

Ps: manzi *(water)*

T: **elo** ninshi manje kuzayamba kukula pang'ono. **So. What we are going to do is that** mailo, aliyense mailo akabweresekakopo, aliyense azayendo shanga ka **seed** ka milisi or ka **beans.** (*then it will start growing slowly. Tomorrow, everyone should come with a seed and plant it, maize or beans)*

P: ine **teacher**, nizakashanga ka **beans** (*I will plant beans)*

T: ehe, so uzashanga ka **beans** *(ok, you will plant beans)*

P; na kakopo ine, nizakabweresa kakopo (*i will also bring a Tin)*

P: ine kwathu tili nato twa **pawpaw** ine,kakopo nizakabweresa ka **paw paw** (*i will bring a Tin for paw paw)*

P: ine kwathu tili nato twa **paw paw** (*we have fr paw paw at Home)*

T:ehe, iwe, iwe, ndiwe mtundu bwanji iwe? Waciona ico cimwala ico, nikuyenda pang'ono pang'ono. Tiyeni tibwerere mu **class.** *(you! What tribe are you? Have you seen that stone? Walk slowly)*

Ps: aaa, batikopa (referring to the researcher) *(he is photographing us)*

4.3.3 Findings from School Z (Located in the low density area)

T: x, x, niuzeko nzeru imozi yamene dziwa *(tell me one sense that you know)*

P:5

T: aaa, **ok,** atiuza kuti munthu ali na nzeru zingati, zili 5 ai? *(she is saling that a person Has five senses. The senses are fine, isn't it?)*

Ps**: yes**

T:manje, niuzenkoni zamene muziwa *(now, tell me the senses chich you know)*

Ps: **me teacher, me teacher**

T; manje nati muniuzeko nzeru imozi yamene uziwa, nzeru imodzi *(now, I am saying tha you should now menton a type of sense chich you know)*

P; kwatu (ear)

T: **ok,** tiyeni tiyangane pa **board**. Zija zamene bayika paja pa board ndiye nzeru za munthu ai? Zili zingati? *(Let's look at the board. Those which are on the board are the senses of a person. How many are they?)*

Ps: 5

T; ya, **number one** ni nzeru ya bwanji? *(what sense is 1?)*

68

P:**teacher me, me teacher**

T: iwe **number one** ili pa cani? *(you, 1 is which sense?)*

P: pa menso *(on the face)*

T: pa cani? *(on what ?)*

Ps: pa menso *(on the face)*

T: menso timawasewenzesa kucita cani? *(what do we use the face for?)*

Ps: kuonera *(to see)*

T: so ndiye nzeru ya **first** ya munthu kucita cani, kuona *(so the first sense of a person is the sense of sight. To do what?)*

Ps; kuonera *(to see)*

T: **number two** ni nzeru bwanji? *(what sense is number 2?)*

Ps: mphuno *(nose)*

T: imya kwanja. **Number two** x? *(put up your hand)*

P: pa mphuno *(on the nose)*

T: mphuno timaisewenzesa kucita cani? *(what do we use the nose for?)*

P: kupela *(to breath)*

T: na kucita cani? *(what else?)*

P: na kuminira *(and to clear the nose)*

T: kuminira nakucita cani? *(clearing the nose and what else?)*

P: nakupemera *(and to breath)*

T: wakamba kudala kupemela, nifuna cinango *(that Has already been mentioned. I want something else)*

P: pa kamwa *(on the mouth)*

T: nifuna nchito yake ya mphuno *(i want the function of a nose)*

P: kununsha *(to smell)*

T: ehe, kununshira ai? kumvera vinthu mwamene vinunkhira, kapena vinukhira bwino kapena vinuknhira kuipa, timamverera ku cani? *(yes! Smelling whether something smells well or not, e smell using what?)*

Ps: ku mphuno *(the nose)*

T: nanga nzeru ya 3 *(what about the 3rd sense)*

P: kwatu *(ear)*

T: kwatu timaisewenzesa kucita cani? *(what do we use the ear for ?)*

Ps: kumverera *(hearing)*

T: timverera *(we hear)*

Nanga ngati uyenda, uzamvera kuti kumbuyo kubwera motoka, nangu kuli bamene baimba uko, timvera kuti kuli banthu bamene baimba. Timverera kuti? *(when you are wal king, you hear that tere is a car coming, that people are singing there, what do you use to hear?)*

Ps: kumverera vinthu *(hearing things)*

T: nanga ya **number 5** tikamba kuti ni cani? *(what about sense number 5)*

Ps: kwanja *(hand)*

T: takamba kuti kwanja timaisewenzesa kucita cani? X *(we Said that the hand is used for what?)*

P: kugwirira *(to touch)*

T: yagwira cani? *(touching what?)*

Ps: pa mbovu *(on the cheek)*

T: yagwira pa nkhanda ya thupi elo pa nkhanda ndiye pamene timverera so taziona nzeru za munthu? *(it is touching on somone's skin and it is on the skin where we feel something. So, we have seen the senses of a person?)*

Ps: eee *(yes)*

T: **so** manje, nifuna umozi umozi kuti muniuzeko, muimye manja osati kuimba, nifuna umozi umozi.iwe, tiuzeko imozi *(so one by one, i want you to tell us one sense)*

Ps:kuyanganira *(to see)*

T: kuyanganira, **very good. Number two** *(for seing)*

P: kununshila *(to smell)*

T: ehe, kunusha, kucita cani? *(yes, to smell. To do what?)*

Ps: kunusha *(to smell)*

T: nanga ya **number 3** *(what about number 3)*

P: kumvelela *(to hear)*

T: ehe, kumvelela. Nanga ya **number 4** *(yes, to hear, what about number 4)*

P: kumvera *(to feel)*

T: ehe, nzeru yakayena nikumvera ai. Aaa, uko mupanga congo. *(yes, the sense is for feel. Hey there! You are making noise.)*

Nanga ya **number 5** *(what about the sense number 5?)*

P: kumvela *(to taste)*

T: ehe, **so** manje tiyende kulemba nzelu za munthu, kulemba mu mabuku *(yes so we go and write the senses of a person)*

P: (as the pupils go to sit on their desks) aaa, **not kubilima** *(don't be impatient!)*

It is clear from the findings that both teachers and pupils were not proficient in standard Nyanja recognised in schools. The Cinyanja which they both spoke was not Standard Nyanja which was

recognised or taught in schools.The Cinyanja spoken had many borrowed words from English, Bemba and Nsenga.

4.4 The views of the Teachers, Head Teachers and the District Education Managers on the use of Cinyanja as a language of initial Literacy in Lusaka District.

With regard to the fourth question, interviews were conducted in order to find out the views of the Teachers, the school Head Teachers and the District Education Standard Officers.

4.4.1 The Views of the Teachers on the use of Cinyanja as a Language of Initial literacy in Lusaka District.

Almost all the teachers said that Standard Nyanja was very difficult not only for the pupils but also for the teachers. They added that due to the mismatch which exists between the Nyanja of play and the classroom one, when children went to grade one, it was like they were starting afresh to learn the language. One teacher said:

> 'most children in Lusaka start by going to Pre School and go to government schools for grade one where they face very big problems with Nyanja (speaking and understanding). At Pre School, they concentrate more on English than Nyanja. Even their parents speak to them in English at home. So for such a pupil, the language of play becomes English and when they go to grade one, they find it difficult to understand and speak Cinyanja. There is need for the parents to help out". Some added "Parents should start speaking to their children in Cinyanja at home in preparation for grade one'.

Another respondent said:

> 'the pupils who come from Pre School face a lot of problems partly because they are told at Pre School that the language to be spoken at school is English. Hence, we constantly remind them about the use of Cinyanja in school. While others learn, some do not'.

Some teachers said that they sometimes started teaching grade one without the knowledge of Cinyanja and they started learning from the classroom. One teacher said:

> 'When I was given a grade one class, i did not know. I learnt from the pupils. I told the Head teacher that i do not know how to speak Cinyanja, but he said, 'yes, that is how you are going to learn'. This is now my fifth year and at least, I can speak but I still have problems with reading and pronunciation'.

All the respondents also said that the situation in schools was that both teachers and learners learnt how to speak Standard Nyanja at the same time. They were each other's teacher. One respondent said:

> 'Sometimes I do not know some Nyanja words for certain things, so when a pupil has mentioned it in English, i would fail to correct him or her. For example, up to now, I do not know the word for giraffe, so I just say giraffe and the pupils do not know as well. For some other words which I do not know, i explain in English. Sometimes, I ask some children to explain to their friends. Actually, I was very shocked that a cat in (Standard) Cinyanja is 'Cona', I knew it as 'pusi' even the pupils were surprised'

Almost all the respondents added that the use of Cinyanja as a language of initial literacy was chaotic in Lusaka District. Since the teachers were not fluent in the language of instruction, they were normally not even confident of what they said to the pupils because they were not too sure if they were speaking in the right code.

One teacher said:

'…because of the limitations I have in Cinyanja, I spend much time just explaining one thing for pupils to understand. A teacher can sometimes explain and explain but still, pupils still fail to understand'.

Another respondent said:

'As a teacher, when I first go to a grade one class, I first try to identify what language every pupil speaks and I will interpret what ever I am saying into those languages. However, there are some of the pupils who speak a language which I do not know, so as teachers, we sometimes just speak to ourselves. Now, for us teachers, we loose nothing but pupils who do not know the languages which we use are the ones who miss out'.

Lack of consultation by the Ministry was said to have been the root cause of the problems in schools. One respondent said:

'these people at the head quarters just come up with these programs without consulting us. Sometimes, they start a programme, before it finishes, we just hear that, stop ! there is another programme. They just tell us what to do. We, we are the people who know what is happening and we know the languages which the pupils speak. We are the people who can advise them and the programmes can be going on well. Now, Cinyanja is not a language of play for everyone, us as teachers, it is not our language also, the pupils speak different languages, but we need to use Cinyanja. This is a big problem'

4.4.2 The Views of the Head Teachers on the use of Cinyanja as a language of initial literacy in Lusaka District.

The Education administrators said that the use of Cinyanja was suitable for Lusaka District because it was the language spoken by the majority of the people. They added that in Lusaka, even people who were not Chewa by ethnic grouping still understood Cinyanja.

It was said that most of the children in basic schools understood Cinyanja. One of the respondents said:

> 'You know, even if our school in Z (low residential area), the pupils come from compounds where they speak Cinyanja. You know, these people who stay in these mayard (low residential areas) do not bring their children here. So you find a situation where the school is in Thorn Park, Woodlands, Kabulonga or Rhodespark but the pupils who are found there are the children from shanties. So here, there is no that problem of children speaking English too much because all of them are from compounds just the same as those schools found in the compounds'.

Some respondents said that cinyanja was not a language of play to all the pupils. One head teacher said:

> 'the problem is that we are not consulted when they are coming up with these programmes. We could have told them that some children use Bemba, some they use Tonga and we have many who speak English. These pupils you see some of them do not come here straight. They pass through the pre school first, by the time they come here they speak English like they are whites. So, i don't know why Cinyanja has been given that power. After all, Cinyaja which these pupils speak is different from the one we used to learn ourselves in schools. But now even the teachers do not know the language which they are supposed to use to teach grade ones. That time we had very good teachers". However, on the part of teachers, some respondents said 'the problem of teachers not knowing how to speak cinyanja doeas not take along time because they learn the language after they have taught grade one for one or two years'.

There is lack of teaching materials in schools. The respondent stated:

> 'the big problem we face is teaching materials. The only things we have are those things which were brought when the program just started. Now, those things are finished and they do not come to find out what we have and what we do not have. If we have all the materials, teaching would be easy'.

76

Another respondent added:

> 'teachers can improve their Cinyanja if the school libraries had alot of books in cinyanja so that they read. You know, as they read, they may improve their vocabularly and the pupils may benefit". However, some respondents suggested that the learning of the language should be started at college. "the problem is that at college, they learn in English, but when they come here, we tell them to teach in cinyanja, it is not fair. So for me, teachers should started being taught how to speak in these languages when they asre still at college'

Another one observed:

> 'you have observed the lessons, didn't you? You have seen for yourself. You have talked to the teachers and you have seen what is going on here. This is how the situation is. Me, i don't have anything to say, what you have seen is what it is. At least, parents are now accepting the programme (the use of cinyanja) but there is need for more sensitisation so that most parents are made aware of this program'

4.4.3 Views of District Education Managers on the use of Cinyanja as a language of initial literacy in Lusaka District.

To start with, the education manager began by saying:

> 'the teachers are the ones who have that information because they are the ones who are on the ground. They are the ones who can answer those questions. teaching using cinyanja is not a problem but the challenge we have is that we do not have books. As you know, we don't have Zambian writers who can write books. NBTL was ticking when we had donors who were providing materials but now, NBTL now is just a name just like we had English medium'.

When asked whether grade one classes were given to teachers who had a good command in Cinyanja, the respondent said:

> 'every teacher is trained to teach any class. They are trained, isn't it? Anyone who is trained can teach. So any trained teacher can be given a grade one class'.

On the question of whether Cinyanja was still a dominant language of play in Lusaka, the manager said:

> 'it depends on where you live because we have areas which are compounds, spacely populated. It is a fallacy. It is not true that Cinyanja is a language of play. Go to makeni and outer that Islamic, are you going to find Cinyanja there? No, it is Islamic. It just appears for example, if you come to my house or where I stay (low residential area) children speak English. Because parents can afford to take their children to pre- school, so they speak English. Now, these people who do research, they go to compounds and make it as if Cinyanja is spoken all the time and everywhere. One thing about Lusaka is that shanties are close to town, so Cinyanja looks like a language of play in the whole Lusaka'.

Asked whether cinyanja was an appropriate language of initial literacy in Lusaka District, the respondent said:

> 'as inspector of schools, I do not like what I see, but who I am I ? I have no say: nothing. There are problems in schools. Cinyanja is not a language of play for every child and not in all the places only in shanties. But what can I do?'

From the findings, Cinyanja was not a language of play in all the parts of the district. The Cinyanja spoken in Lusaka was different from the Standard one recognised in schools. In addition, there was lack of materials for initial literacy teaching and that both teachers and pupils were not proficient in standard Nyanja.

4.5 Is Cinyanja appropriate for use as a language of initial Literacy in Lusaka District?

Findings from Oral Interviews

Having looked at several issues concerning the use of Cinyanja as a language of initial literacy, it was important to find out if Cinyanja was appropriate for use as a language of Initial Literacy in Lusaka District. The respondents said that standard Nyanja was not suitable for use as a language of initial literacy in Lusaka. This was so because it was different from the type of Cinyanja which the children spoke during play. One of the respondents said:

> 'Nyanja can only be said to be suitable if 'Lusaka Nyanja' was the one which was given the status of language of initial literacy in Lusaka.'

The respondents suggested that classroom Nyanja needed to be simplified to suit the abilities of the children in Lusaka, because in its current form, it was not suitable for use as a language of initial literacy.

One teacher said:

> 'Bemba would be better for Lusaka because every one understands Bemba as opposed to this Nyanja which is Cichewa from Malawi" while others felt that the language suitable for initial literacy was English'.

Another respondent said:

> 'pupils understand English better than standard Nyanja. So if the language to be used is English, they (children) would easily understand and even us as teachers, we will find it easy to teach literacy'.

In addition, most respondents said that standard Nyanja was very difficult to speak and understand not only for the teachers but also the pupils. They reiterated that both teachers and pupil's books were very difficult to read and understand. One of the respondents said:

> 'the books are difficult, they are in Cichewa, even me as a teacher, and it is difficult unless I go to see the Nyanja people. It is not Nyanja, it is Chewa, you have to read first before you go to teach. Sometimes, you can get stranded in front of the pupils. The teachers sometimes face pronunciation problems which the pupils sometimes correct.'

The findings have shown that there was a mismatch between the cinyanja commonly spoken in Lusaka and the officially recognized one in schools. Standard Nyanja is not appropriate for initial literacy teaching in Lusaka District.

In this chapter, we have presented the findings. In the next chapter, these are discussed.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Overview

This chapter discusses the findings which were presented in chapter four. The discussion is guided by the research objectives. These were:

5.1 To establish if Cinyanja was a dominant language of play in Lusaka District.

The first objective was to establish if Cinyanja was a dominant language of play in Lusaka District. In the play fields away from the school environments, the findings showed that in the high density area, Cinyanja was a dominant language of play. This was despite the Cinyanja being spoken being the diluted one which was characterised by code switching and code mixing. For example, in all the play fields, the children used the word 'bola' to refer to a 'ball' instead of the standard Nyanja equivalent of 'mpira'. This showed how different the Nyanja spoken in Lusaka was different from the standard Nyanja. In addition, the first sentence in the high density area, data collected from outside the classroom, the pupil used the word 'kwatu' instead of 'kwathu'. The omission of aspirated 'h' sound was because of influence of Bemba language. This also showed how the Cinyanja spoken in Lusaka was a mixture of many languages. The data also showed that the pupils had limited vocabulary in Cinyanja. This was evident from the instances of code switching. For example, the children seemed not to know the word for 'goal keeper'; instead they consistently used the English expression of 'goal keeper'. This also showed that English was very prominent in the type of Cinyanja spoken in Lusaka. It was found out that while the peers spoke Cinyanja, some

children consistently spoke Bemba. Hence, while Cinyanja was a dominant language of play, English and Bemba were also commonly spoken.

In the medium density area, Cinyanja and English were dominant languages of play, Bemba being the other notable language spoken. This was evident from the data which was collected both from the play fields, within the school environment and from interviews. Just like in the high density areas, the Cinyanja spoken was the informal one characterised by code switching, code mixing and borrowing. However, during oral interviews with the teachers and a few children found in play fields, the study also revealed that most of the children who played in the medium density areas were mostly from high residential areas. Children from medium density areas were said to be playing in established recreation centres during weekends and that they spent most of their time during the week at school (private schools) and that they mostly spoke English. This meant that the children who were found playing in the medium density areas did not represent the children from the medium density area because most of them were from high density areas. The data from the play fields in the medium density areas showed that there were a few children who consistently spoke English while the majority spoke Cinyanja. It was found out that most of those few were from the medium density areas. It can therefore be argued that both Cinyanja and English were the dominant languages of play in medium density areas. In addition, it was also found out that most of the grade one pupils who were sampled in the schools situated in the medium density areas were from high density areas. This explains why the dominant language of play within the school environment in the medium density area was Cinyanja.

In the low residential areas, the language of play was English. Almost all the children spoke English consistently during play. This presented an irregular pattern in the language of play in Lusaka District. It showed that the language of play in Lusaka district was according to residential areas. It must be added however that because of this scenario, almost all the children in low density areas went to private schools where the language of instruction in grade one was English. This meant that if such pupils were taken to government schools, they would have big problems and probably fail to break through because the language of initial literacy in government schools was a local language. English was a language of play in low density areas despite Cinyanja having been the dominant language of play within the school environment. Almost all the respondents said that the children in government schools situated in low density areas were from high density areas and that the only pupils who came from low density areas were children of house servants such as house maids and gardeners who did not manage to take their children to private schools.

Therefore, Cinyanja was a dominant language of play in high density areas. In medium density areas, both Cinyanja and English were the dominant languages of play while the language of play in low density areas was English.

However, even in compounds, there were children whose language of play was English. These were mostly children who passed through pre- school before they were taken to grade one in public schools. This can be seen from some of the utterances from the data taken from within school premises where some of the pupils consistently spoke English. Apart from pre school influence, there were few homes even in the high residential areas where parents introduced their children to English early in life such that the home language was English.

This partly explains why the Cinyanja spoken in Lusaka has a lot of English words and a lot of instances of code switching and code mixing.

It must also be mentioned that even if Cinyanja and English were the dominant languages of play in the three residential areas, some other languages were also used during play such as Bemba, Tonga, Lozi and Nsenga among some children. Therefore, there was no one language of play in Lusaka District but all the mentioned in this study. This is the reason why there is need to have more than one language of initial literacy in Lusaka District so that all the children are catered for. At present, those whose language of play is not Cinyanja and they do not understand it, they only have access to the grade one classroom but no access to literacy learning. This should be looked at very seriously regardless of the numbers of the pupils who understand and speak Cinyanja in comparison to those who do not. This is so because initial literacy skills are meant to be taught to everyone and not only those who know how to speak and understand Cinyanja. The Zambian situation is different from the Finnish situation. In a study which was conducted by the Finnish National Board of Education (2011) to find out the factors which contributed to high literacy levels, the results showed that one of the factors was that Finland had alot of languages used for initial literacy teaching. It was revealed that even minority languages were also used for initial literacy teaching. This made the country to have very high literacy levels. On the contrary, as it has been observed in this study, the fact that Lusaka is cosmopolitan and only one language is used for initial literacy teaching appears to pose a great challenge both for the teachers and the pupils and literacy development in general.

5.2 To establish if there were differences between the Cinyanja spoken during play and the standard Nyanja recognised in schools.

The second objective was to establish if there were any differences between the Cinyanja of play in Lusaka District and the standard Nyanja recognised in schools. It was clear from the findings that the Cinyanja spoken in Lusaka was different from the one recognised in schools. This was a problem not only for the pupils but also for the teachers. The teachers were unable to understand most of the words in standard Nyanja in books and they also had problems correcting the pupils when they made mistakes since the Cinyanja which both teachers and pupils knew was different from the one officially recognised in school. Hence, it can be said that there was mismatch between the Cinyanja of play and the standard Nyanja officially recognised in schools. This disparity made some of the parents to shun grade one by taking their children to private schools in grade one and took them to government schools in grade two. This was the extent to which the disparity between these two types of Cinyanja affected not only the teachers and the pupils but also the parents.

The data from the familiar language test clearly showed that there was a very big difference between the Nyanja spoken in Lusaka during play and the standard one recognised in schools. For example, for 'vehicle', all the respondents said that it was 'motoka' which is a Nsenga word with only one respondent who said 'mota' which is a Tonga word. The fact that none of the 120 respondents knew the word for vehicle in standard Nyanja was clear indication that the children did not know the Nyanja which was supposed to be used in schools. This was the same with the word for 'a bird'. Most pupils said that it was 'kanyoni' which is also a Nsenga word while a few respondents said it was called 'akoni' which is

Bemba. None of the respondents said that it was 'mbalame' which is the correct word in Standard Nyanja. This agreed with what the respondents said during interviews that both teachers and pupils did not know how to speak standard Nyanja saying that it was not actually Cinyanja, but Cichewa. This situation was unfortunate for a language which was thought to be a language of play. It is interesting to note that the children also had limited vocabulary in Cinyanja. This came out in the way they named some objects. For example, for the words for 'mirror' and 'teacher'. They all called it 'mirror' and 'teacher' respectively. After being reminded that they were supposed to name the object in Cinyanja, they insisted that a mirror in Cinyanja was called 'mirror' instead of 'kalilole' and that teacher was 'ba teacher', 'ateacher' and 'teacher' instead of 'aphunzitsi'. It must be noted that the words pupils gave for 'teacher' were all English words with the first two having prefixes 'ba' and 'a' which denotes honorific in Bemba and Nyanja respectively. This was further proof that there was a clear difference between the Cinyanja spoken in Lusaka and the standard one recognised in schools and that most pupils were not familiar with standard Nyanja which was recognised in schools. Given this as the prevailing situation in Lusaka district, it can be argued that it is difficulty for the children to break through to literacy in grade one because the language used at play is different from the one recognised in schools and in which the instruction books are written.

In addition, the pupils were not able to name 'grass', 'milk', 'groundnuts' 'hoe' and 'ball'. They called them by names in Nsenga, English and Bemba. This simply showed that the cinyanja spoken in Lusaka was a mixture of different languages with most of the words coming from Nsenga and English. The difference between the two types of Cinyanja meant that pupils faced problems comprehending the teacher given an ideal classroom situation.

This scenario seemed not to support the purpose of New Break Through to Literacy in which it was assumed that children would easily learn how to read and write if instructions in grade one were in the language of play. This is so because, as it has been observed above, the Cinyanja of play in Lusaka district was different from the standard Nyanja recognised in schools.

The data collected during interviews agreed with the familiar language test results. For example, one respondent said "there is a big difference, at home they call it (maize) 'milisi' but here we call it 'cimanga'. In addition, they call it (door) 'door' at home but here we call it 'citseko'. Even when it comes to the word for grass, we call it (grass) 'msipu' in class but here in Lusaka they call it 'mauzu'." The examples the respondent gave support the test results and further confirmed the difference which existed between the cinyanja spoken in Lusaka during play and the standard one recognised in schools. It is important to note that this was not a problem with the pupils alone but also the teachers. This implied that initial literacy learning in Lusaka was very ineffective because of language barrier both on the part of the teachers and the pupils. When Matafwali (2010) did a study to determine how lack of proficiency in the language of instruction explains difficulties in learning to read, it was revealed that children were not proficient and this negatively impacted their literacy development. This study revealed that children in Lusaka District did not only lack proficiency in Cinyanja but that the Cinyanja which they spoke; in which they were not proficient, was actually different from the Cinyanja which was officially recognized in schools. In addition, the children did not know how to speak the standard Nyanja recognized in schools. The findings in this study seem to explain why Matafwali (2010) observed that

reading levels of Zambian Children were still remarkably low despite profound reform in the language policy.

It can be summed up that there were differences between the Cinyanja used at play in Lusaka district and the standard one recognised in schools. In other words, there was a mismatch between the language of play and recommended language of initial literacy in Lusaka District and this appears to be one of the major root causes for poor reading levels at the end of grade one in Lusaka District as noted by Matafwali (Ibid).

5.3 To establish the proficience of both Teachers and Pupils in standard Nyanja.

The third objective was to establish the proficience of both teachers and pupils in standard Nyanja which was the language of initial literacy in Lusaka District. The data showed that teachers were not fluent in Cinyanja and, as observed above, the type of Cinyanja they spoke was not the standard Nyanja recognised in schools. According to the data presented in chapter four, there were a lot of instances of code switching and code mixing. For example, in school X, the teacher started the lesson with a statement in English and the pupils responded in English as well. In the teacher's second sentence, the teacher spoke in Cinyanja with two instances of code switching. Interestingly, in the teacher's third sentence, she got back to English. This clearly showed that the teacher was not proficient in Cinyanja. It was evident through out the lesson that whenever the teacher had problems expressing herself in Cinyanja, she resorted to English. The same scenario is observed in school Y where the teacher only asked the pupils to stand and sit down in Cinyanja and later greeted them in English. The greetings went on for some time before the teacher went back to Cinyanja. Strikingly, even the pupils were able to understand and speak to the teacher in English. It

appeared that teachers were more comfortable with English but only taught in Cinyanja because the policy demanded them to do so. In all the three schools, when the teachers felt that the pupils did not understand them, they resorted to speaking in English. Therefore, English in Lusaka seemed to be one of the most preferred languages of communication both by the teachers and the pupils. This explains why during interviews, most respondents said that they were better off teaching initial literacy in English as opposed to Cinyanja.

In addition, the teachers mispronounced most of the words in Cinyanja. This was mostly due to mother tongue influence on the part of the teachers. It was observed that most words that have aspirated /p/ marked by consonant cluster 'ph' as in kuphunzisa dropped the /h/ in pronunciation. This was also observed in 'tikhale' which was pronounced as tinkale' by the teacher. To be specific, the teacher pronounced Cinyanja words as if they were Bemba words. It must be noted that in Bantu languages, there is a one to one correspondence between pronunciation and spelling. In other words, the way a word is pronounced is the way it is written. By implication, this means that the grade one teachers misled the pupils when they mispronounced the words because the pupils would eventually learn the wrong spelling which would, strictly speaking, become a different word to a native speaker of the language. This would not only have a negative impact on the pupils but the teachers themselves as they wrote the same words on the board. These weaknesses on the part of the teachers meant that literacy acquisition on the part of the learners was negatively impacted as the orthography was also compromised.

In addition, it also appears that both teachers and pupils lacked enough vocabulary to speak fluently in Cinyanja. This was seen from all the three schools. For example, in school X, the

teacher did not know the word for 'match' –'kuyanjanitsa', in school Y, the teacher did not know the Nyanja word for flower (luwa/maluwa) while in School Z, the teacher did not know the word for number (numeri/nambala). These are just a few examples to show how limited the teachers were in Cinyanja. In all these instances, the teachers used English. All the teachers in all the three lessons did not know how to say 'very good', 'correct' and 'ok', instead, they used English equivalents. While it can be argued that 'Lusaka Nyanja is a mixture of languages', it must also be noted that it is mixed in such a way that it makes one wonder whether it is a language or just a slang or lingua franca. This is in agreement with most respondent's observation that the Cinyanja spoken in Lusaka had a lot of borrowed words. This finding is in line with Miti and Monaka (2009) who reported that because of multilingualism, when teachers were recruited to go and teach at primary school, some were taken to regions where the language of intruction was not their mother tongue and they failed to teach initial literacy using the recommended Zambian language in the region. They also reported that due to lack of strong background of their mother tongue, most teachers had problems handling grade ones in the era of New Break through To Literacy.

It was also observed that it was not only the teachers who were not proficient in Cinyanja recognised in schools but also the pupils. While the pupils could understand the teachers when they spoke in 'Lusaka Nyanja', almost all the pupils were not able to understand when the teacher gave instruction in standard Nyanja. For example, in school X situated in a high density area, there was a stage in the lesson when a teacher was teaching using pictures. She read sentences from a grade one book and later asked the pupils to explain what they got from the read sentences. The sentences were 'uyu ndi masiye (this is Masiye), Masiye ndi mnyamata (Masiye is a boy), uyu mnyamata ndi masiye (this boy is Masiye). In answering

the teacher's question, the pupil said "mwakamba ati, uyu ni mwana wa Masiye (you said that this is an orphaned child). Even after the teacher disapproved the answer, another pupil raised the hand and said the same thing. This showed that pupils were not familiar or proficient with standard Nyanja recognised in schools and which was also in grade one content books. In the above scenario, what appeared to have confused the pupils were conjuction 'ndi' and the word 'mnyamata' which are not commonly used in the type of Cinyanja spoken in Lusaka. If the word mnyamata was removed and conjuction 'ni' was used in the place of 'ndi', the pupils would have understood the meaning of the read sentences. In addition, the failure by the pupils to understand the meaning of the read sentences above showed that they did not know the culture of the Cinyanja language. Wakumelo (2006) noted that language is a vehicle of culture. This implies that effective use and understanding of a language depends on the knowledge of the culture of the first speakers of the language. This means that if the pupils knew the Chewa culture, they would have known that the word 'Masiye' is also a name of a person among the Chewa and Nsenga people. However, due to their limitation, they thought that the word 'Masiye' only denote the state of being an orphan. It was unfortunate that not even the syntax of the sentence would help them understand the meaning of the statement. This clearly showed that while the pupils were able to speak and understand the Cinyanja spoken in Lusaka, almost all of them were not able to speak and understand the standard Nyanja recognised in schools.

Cunning et al, 1997; and Snow et al, 1991) noted that language at entry into kindergarten showed substantial and increasing power to predict reading skills during early to middle primary school years. This observation suggest that with the prevailing language suituation in Luska District as discussed above, literacy development is suffering a major setback. This

91

argument agrees with the Whorf hypothesis (1960s) which stated that language and thought are inseparable. Pupils in Lusaka district are likely to continue performing below expectation in literacy skills because they could not understand Cinyanja which was supposed to be used for thinking in order to understand what to do.

5.4 **To establish the views of the Teachers, Head Teachers and the District Education Managers on the use of Cinyanja as a Language of initial literacy in Lusaka District.**

The fourth objective was to establish the views of the grade one Teachers, Head Teachers and District Education Managers on the use of Cinyanja as a language of initial literacy in Lusaka District. It was found out that in schools, children spoke and understood Cinyanja. This was so because the pupils who went to government schools were those from high residential areas where the dominant language of play was Cinyanja. However, the Nyanja they spoke was different from standard Nyanja recognised in schools. It was observed that teachers were not comfortable with the use of Standard Nyanja recognised in schools saying that it was very difficult to understand. They only spoke and understood 'Lusaka Nyanja' and also used it to teach initial literacy and not the officially recognised one. This means that there was a variation between what the policy recommended and what was being implemented. The teachers confirmed that they did not actually use the Cinyanja recognised in schools. They attributed this to lack of consultation by the policy makers. Teachers, School Managers and District Education Managers believed that policy planners at the Ministry of Education head offices should have consulted them on the language situation in

Lusaka District. If this had been done, policy makers would have been advised on which language or languages would have been suitable for Lusaka district. This was true because as things stood, teachers were mandated to teach in Cinyanja even when they did not have the ability to do so. As a result, they resorted to a type of Cinyanja which they were able to speak. Unfortunately, the Cinyanja they used was not standardised and there was not known orthography for it. This situation was pathetic and it may not be surprising that pupils in Lusaka district have problems breaking through to literacy by the end of grade one.

Since most teachers had a language limitation, they failed to explain certain things to the pupils and the situation was so bad that both teachers and pupils were learning standard Nyanja at the same time as they taught and learnt. In other words, the process of teaching literacy was the process of learning a language. In some cases, teachers were assigned to teach grade one even when they did not know how to speak the language with the view of learning it in the course of teaching Initial Literacy. This meant that the years they spent teaching grade one before they learnt how to speak Cinyanja were fruitless on the part of the pupils. A teacher of initial literacy should be one who knows the language in which the pupils should know how to read and write. Hence, if a teacher will take three years to learn how to speak Cinyanja, it means that three grade one classes will pass without proper learning. This is worse when one considers the fact that even the pupils neither spoke nor understood standard Nyanja recognised in schools.

In addition, the fact that teachers did not know how to speak Standard Nyanja recognised in schools made them fail to correct the pupils if they used a wrong word and this further made it difficult for the teachers to be confident. It can be reiterated that this presents a very

unfortunate situation where a teacher did not know the language of instruction. Moreover, it must be noted that two of the qualities of a good teacher are self confidence and good command of the subject matter. However, in this situation, teachers admitted that they were not confident of themselves while teaching because they did not know the language of instruction. In this kind of situation, teachers lacked two of the most essential qualities- confidence and knowledge of the subject matter. This finding is in line with Miti et al (2009) who reported that because of multilingualism and only using the seven regional official languages in initial literacy teaching, when teachers were recruited in Zambia, some were taken to regions where the language of intruction was not their mother tongue, and those teachers failed to teach using a Zambian language. They added that most of the teachers had a poor language background in Zambian languages and this affected their effectiveness and efficiency in teaching initial literacy.

Teachers faced a lot of problems with children who passed through Pre-School because the language of play to most of these children was English. Almost all the respondents wondered why Cinyanja was given the status of a sole language of initial literacy in Lusaka District. They thought that English would have been given the status of a language of initial literacy in some schools, and that this would have catered for those pupils who passed through the Pre-School and those whose home language was English. This would have been a favourable situation given the principle behind the new break through to literacy policy: that a child will easily learn how to read and write if initial instruction is done in the language which the child is familiar with. Therefore, since there were children whose language of play was either English or Bemba, it would have been appropriate if there were grade one classes offering instruction in English, Cinyanja and Bemba, respectively. This would have catered for almost

all the children other than assuming that Cinyanja is a dominant language of play for everyone and in all the residential areas because this study revealed otherwise.

The inability by the children to speak and understand standard Cinyanja made some parents to take their children to private schools in grade one and transfered them to government schools in grade two. They did this to avoid Cinyanja in grade one and brought them because they knew that in grade two, the language of instruction was English. This suggested that some parents would prefer English to be the language of instruction in grade one. As a result, the study revealed that in most government schools, there were fewer grade one classes than grade two.

From the findings, Cinyanja was the dominant language of play in high density areas and that the language of play in middle and low density areas was English. This was the reason why people residing in medium and low density areas took their children to private schools where the medium of initial literacy was English and the government schools were for the people who came from high density areas regardless of where the school was situated. District Education Managers recognised that Cinyanja was not a language of play in all the areas and that even if Cinyanja was dominant in high density areas, there were still exceptional cases of children whose language of play was English, Bemba and other languages.

5.5 To establish whether Cinyanja was Appropriate for use as a Language of Initial Literacy in Lusaka District.

Given all the data above, the fifth objective was to establish if Cinyanja was an appropriate language of initial literacy in Lusaka District. From the findings presented in chapter four, it was clear that there was a mismatch between the Cinyanja spoken during play in Lusaka and

the officially recognized one in schools. Both teachers and pupils did not speak the standard Nyanja and resorted to using a different type of Cinyanja. Further, Cinyanja was not a dominant language of play in all the residential areas, and this made some people take their children to private schools during grade one to avoid the use of Cinyanja because their children were not familiar with it. According to the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (1995:789) language is defined as "a system of communication by written or spoken words which is used by people of a particular area". Following this definition, it can be argued that the language of play in Lusaka is 'Lusaka Nyanja'; and it must be added that this type of Cinyanja was different from the standard Nyanja recognised in schools. It can therefore be concluded that standard Nyanja which is officially recognized in schools, is not suitable for use as a language of instruction in Lusaka District.

The above conclusion is similar to Zimba's findings (2007). He wanted to establish if Cinyanja was effective and suitable as a medium of initial literacy in an area that was predominantly Tumbuka. In other words, he wanted to find out if Cinyanja was appropriate for use as a language of initial literacy in Lundazi district where most of the people spoke Tumbuka. People in Lundazi felt that government was mistaken to consider Cinyanja as a language of initial literacy in the area. To be a local language, people in the concerned area must use it as a medium of communication in their daily lives, which was not the case with Cinyanja in Lundazi. Almost all the pupils could not make rhymes, use words in appropriate contexts or even make use of figurative language such as proverbs and riddles (Zimba, 2007). Therefore, like in Lundazi, Standard Nyanja is not suitable for Lusaka district because almost all the children did not speak it. The Cinyanja which they spoke was different from Standard Nyanja and there were children who did not speak any type of Cinyanja at all. It is imperative therefore that the language of

initial literacy in Lusaka District should be revisited if it is to be both teacher and learner friendly.

In this chapter, we have discussed the findings of the study. In the next chapter, we present the conclusion and recommendations.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSIONS AND RECCOMENDATIONS

Overview

This chapter summarizes the research findings. It must be reiterated that this study intended to find out if Cinyanja was still a dominant language of play and if it was appropriate to be used as the language of initial literacy in Lusaka district considering the fact that Lusaka is a cosmopolitan environment. The chapter ends with recommendations and implications for further research.

6.1 Conclusion.

To start with, it was observed that Cinyanja was the language of play in high and medium density areas and the dominant language of play in the low density area was English. However, Bemba, Tonga, Nsenga and Lozi were among the other languages children used during play. It can, therefore, be argued that Cinyanja was not still the dominant language of play in Lusaka District. Its dominance is area specific.

The study revealed that there were a lot of differences between the Cinyanja spoken at play in Lusaka District and the one which was officially recognized in schools. The differences ranged from diction, syntax, semantics and morphology. Cinyanja spoken in Lusaka was a mixture of different languages and was characterized by code switching, code mixing and code shifting. Therefore, there was a mismatch between the Cinyanja spoken by children during play and the one recognized in schools.

Both teachers and pupils were not proficient in Standard Nyanja. In fact, it is important to note that the Cinyanja spoken in Lusaka was different from the Standard Nyanja recognized in schools, but still, they were not proficient. The study revealed that both teachers and pupils did not know how to speak Standard Nyanja and they did not use it in the classroom.

The Teachers, School Head Teachers and District Education Managers revealed that Cinyanja was not a language of play to all the children in Lusaka District, neither was it a language of play in all the residential areas in the district. Both teachers and pupils were not conversant with Standard Nyanja and the situation was such that, they both learnt standard Nyanja at the same time as they were teaching and learning it respectively. This situation had negatively affected the effectiveness and successful implementation of the NBTL policy. Schools lacked resource books which would help them improve their abilities to speak and understand Cinyanja.

Since Cinyanja which was used at play was different from the Cinyanja which was officially recognized in schools; and that both teachers and pupils were not proficient in Standard Nyanja, Standard Nyanja recognized in schools was not appropriate as a sole language of initial literacy in Lusaka district.

6.2 Recommendations.

In view of these findings, the following recommendations were made:

●Cinyanja should not be the sole language of initial literacy in Lusaka District. The District Education Board Secretary's office should be allowed to conduct surveys and decide which languages should be used.

●Teachers should not be forced to teach grade one if they do not know how to speak Cinyanja. It is only logical that a teacher of initial literacy should know the language of instruction.

●There is need for the Ministry of Education to urgently review the langue of initial literacy in Lusaka.

●The Ministry of Education should consult teachers when it comes to the selection of the language of initial literacy in an area.

● In cosmopolitan areas, the Ministry of Education should allow the seven regional official languages to be used as languages of nitial literacy in all the schools.

6.3 Implications for Future Research.

For future studies, the following are being recommended:

● Need to find out the views of the pupils and their parents on the use of Cinyanja as a language of initial literacy in Lusaka District.

● Studies to establish mutual intelligibility levels between the Cinyanja spoken in Lusaka and the standard Nyanja which is recognized in schools.

● Studies to find out the differences in the reading performance between the pupils who were taught by a non Nyanja teacher and a native speaker of Cinyanja.

REFRENCES

Ansre, G (1977) **A case for African Languages'** in ZANGO; Zambia Journal of Contemporary Issues. Number 3, Lusaka: University f Zambia.

Brock-Utne B. And Kofi H.R (EDS) (2005). **Language of Instruction for Africa emancipation: Focus on postcolonial contexts and Considerations.** Dar-es Salam: Mkuki na Nyota.

Brock-Utne, Birgit (2000). **Whose Education for All? The Re-colonisation of the African Mind:** New York/London. Falmer Press.

Bus A.G, Van Ijzendoorn, M.H, and Pellegin, A.D. (1995). **Phonological Awareness and early reading: Ameta-analysis of experimental training studies.** Journal o Educational Psychology. New York

Carole et al (2011) **Progress Report on Children's Early Literacy Learning (CELL) research project in South Africa.**University of Cape Town. South Africa.

Chiappe, P., Siegel, L. S., & Wade-Woolsey, L. (2002). **Linguistic diversity**

and the development of reading skills: A longitudinal study. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 6*(4), 369–400.

Cummins, J ((1979). **Cognitive/Academic Languages Proficiency, Linguistic Interdependence; the otional Age Question and some other Matters.** Working Paper on Bilingualism.

Cummins, J (1980). **The Cross-Linguistic Dimension of Language Proficiency: Implications for Bilingual Education and the Optional Isssue**, TESOL quarterly.

Cummins, J (2006). **Language, Power and Pedagogy. Bilingual Children in the Crossfire: Multilingual Matters,** New York: Clevedon.

Duncan, K (1995). **The Molteno Programme for teaching initial literacy in the mothe tongue:** Molteno Project.

Echevarria, J., & Graves, A. (2003). *Sheltered content instruction: Teaching*

English-language learners with diverse abilities (2nd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Finnish Board of Education (2011) **Factors Behind the good literacy performance of the Finnish Youths.** PISA: Finland.

Fishman (1968) **A sociolinguistic Typology for Describing National Multilingualim.** Cambridge University: UK

Fasold, Ralph(1984) *The Sociolinguistics of Society.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Gersten, R., & Baker, S. (2000). **What we know about effective instructional**

practices for English-language learners. *Exceptional Children, 66,* 454–

Gersten, R.,&Baker, S. (2003). **English-language learners with learning disabilities.** In H. L.Swanson, K. R. Harris,&S. Graham (Eds.), Handbook of learning disabilities (pp. 94–109). New York: Guilford.

Gersten, R., Baker, S., Haager,D.,&Graves, A. (in press). **Exploring the role of teacher quality in predicting reading outcomes for first grade English learners: An observational study. Remedial & Special Education.** 272 special series: reading risk and intervention for young el

Gillborn and Gipps (1996) **Analysis of 1995 Key Stage, GCSE and London Reading Test Results.** London. UK

Gipps et al (1996) **An evalution of the quality of teacher feedback to students.** London: UK

Haager, D., Gersten, R., Baker, S., & Graves, A. (2003). **The English language learner observation instrument for beginning readers.** In S.Vaughn & K. L. Briggs (Eds.), Reading in the classroom: Systems for the observation of teaching and learning. Baltimore, MD: Brookes.

Haager, D., & Windmueller, M. (2001). **Early literacy intervention for English language learners at-risk for learning disabilities:** Student and teacher outcomes in an urban school. Learning Disability Quarterly,

Haugen, E (1984) **Dialect, Language and Nation** n J.B Pride and Jane Holmes (eds) Sociolinguistics, 97-111. London: Penguin.

Higgins, C (2000). **Report on the Evaluation of New Breakthrough To Literacy**. October,2000.

Kalindi, S (2006). **The Impact of the New Primary Reading Program (PRP) on the poor performance on the poor readers:** Master Disertation**.** University of Zambia (unpublished).

Kanyika, J (2002**). Reading Comes: Follow-Up on Baseline Reading Stuy**. Lusaka: Ministry of Education.

Kanyika, J (2004). **National Assesment: Preliminary Results**. A paper presented to the National Assesment Steering Committee: February, 2004.

Kashoki M E (1990) **The Factor of Language in Zambia**. London: Kenneth Kaunda Foundation.

Kashoki M .E and Ohannesian, S (eds) (1978) **Language in Zambia**. London: International Africa Institute.

Kashoki, M (1978) **The Language Situation in Zambia,** in Ohannesian (eds) Language in Zambia. London: International Africa Institute.

Kelly M .J (1999) **The Origins and Development of Education**. Lusaka: Image Publishers Ltd.

Kotz, H. And Higgin, C (1999). **Breakthrough to Icibemba pilot project: An evaluation**. Lusaka: MoE.

Kumwenda , B (2011**) Initial Reading Performance in Nyanja in Multi- ethnic Classes: A Case of Selected Schools in Chipata Urban.** UNZA.

Literacy Watch Committee of Napal (1999) **Introduction of Technologies in Literacy Programmes.** Bulletin Number 12.

Litteral, Robert (1975) **A proposal for the use of Tok Pisin in Papua New Guinea's education system, in McElhanon**, Ken, ed. 1975. *Tok Pisin i go we?* Port Moresby: Linguistic Society of Papua New Guinea. pp. 155-165.

Malone, Susan (ed.) 1987. *Developing Tokples Education Programs in Papua New Guinea.* Ukarumpa: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

McElhanon, Ken, ed.(1975) *Tok Pisin i go we?* **Port Moresby:** Linguistic Society of Papua New Guinea.

Manchishi, P.C (2004). **The Status of the Indigenous Languages in Institutions of Learning in Zambia: Past, present and Future. The African Symposium**, Volume number

Mamadou, L.T (2009) **The Use of National Languages in Mali's Educational System, history and Challenges and Perspectives in** Brock-Utne (eds) Language and Education in Africa. Bristol. UK

Matafwali. B (2010) **The Role of Oral Language in the Acquisition of Early Literacy Skills. A Case of Zambian Languages and English.** A Ph.D Thesis. Lusaka: University of Zambia.

Miti et al (2009) **The trainng of Teachers of African Languages in Southern Africa with special reference to Botswana and Zambia** in Brock-Utne (eds) Languages and Education in Africa. Bristol: UK

MOE (2002) .**Literacy and Language Education**. Module2. Lusaka: Longman Zambia.

MOE (1976) **Education for Development**. Lusaka: Government Printers.

MOE (1977**) Education Reforms**. Lusaka. Government Printers.

MOE (1995) **Policy Document: Language Policy in School- The Place of Readings**. Lusaka. Ministry of Education.

MOE (1992**) Focus on Learning**. Lusaka. Ministry of Education.

MOE (1996**) Educating Our Future**. Lusaka: ZEPH.

MOE (1997) **Policy Document ME/101/7/130.Language Policy in Schools-The Place of Reading**. Lusaka: MOE.

MOE (2001) **Zambia New Break To Literacy**. Lusaka: Ministry of Education.

Mubanga, V (2011) **The effects of using Cinyanja as a Language of Initial Literacy in a Predominantly Soli Speaking Area of Lwimba in Chongwe District.** Lusaka: Zambia.

Nkamba, Massassah and Kanyika, Joe (1998): **The quality of education: Some policy suggestions Based on a survey of schools.** SACMEQ Report. No.5, LIEP. UNESCO. Lusaka ,1998.

Nkosha, D.C (1999) **A Paper subbmitted to the Ministry of Education, MOE. A Case for Zambian Languages in our School**s. Lusaka: UNZA.

Nkosha, D. C (1999) **Parents Attitudes Towards the Use of Indegenous Languages as Media of Instruction in Primary Schools.** In Nherera, C.M (ed).

Ohannesian. S (1972) **The Language Problems of American Indian Children.** In Rowley (ed). Mass: Newbury House.

UNESCO (1953) *The Use of Vernacular Languages in Education*, **Monographs on Fundamental Education.** Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO-UNICEF (1990) **African Thoughts on the prospects of Education For All**. Selections from papers commisioned for the regional Consulation on Education For All.

Rabenoro (2009) **Nationl Language Teaching as a tool for Malagasy Learners. Integration into Globalisation, 175** in Brock-Utne (eds) Language and Education in Africa. Bristol: UK

Riciardelli, L.A (1992). **Bilingualism and cognitive development in relation to threshhold theory.** Journal of Psycholinguistics Resdearch.

Riciardelli, L.A (1993). **An investugation of the cognitive development of Italian: 'English biliinguals and Italian monolinguals from Rome'**. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural education.

Romaines. S (1994) **Language and Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics.** New York. OUP.

Piper. T ((1993) **Language for all our Children.** New York: Mac Millan.

Prah. K.K (1995) **African Languages for Mass Education of Africans.** Bonn. German Foundation for International Development.

Pride et al (1984) **Sociolinguistics.** London: Penguin.

Simwinga.J (2004) **E 941 Study Material**: Lusaka: UNZA.

Simmwinga, J (2006) **The Impact of Language Policy on the Use of Minority Languages in Zambia with special rference to Tumbuka and Nkoya**. Ph.D Thesis. Lusaka: UNZA.

Simwinga. J (2009) **Study Material: LSE 5341.** Batch 1. Lusaka: UNZA.

Snelson , P.D (1974) **Education Development in Nothern Rhodeesia: 1883-1945**. Lusaka NECZAM.

Tambulukani, G.K., and Bus .A.G (2009**). Does teaching Reading in a Familiar Language Force a Breakhrough to Literacy?** A paper on a familiar language (unpublished). Lusaka. UNZA.

Wade-Woolley, L., & Siegel, L. S. (1997). **The spelling performance of ESL and native speakers of English as a function of reading skill.** *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 9*(5–6), 387–406.

Williams, E (1998). **Investigating Bilingual Literacy: Evidence from Malawi and Zambia.** Department of International Development.

White C.J (2003) **Research Methods and Techniques.** Pretoria: Mustung. Road 44.

Zimba. S (2007) **The Effect of Nyanja as a Language of Initial Literacy in a Predominanatly Tumbuka Speaking Area: The Case of Lumezi District:** M.A Dissertation. Lusaka: UNZA.

APPENDICES

Appendix A. **Interview Guide to Grade one Teachers**

THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGE AND SOCIAL S CIENCES EDUCATION

Title of Research: **The Language of Initial Literacy in a Cosmopolitan Environment: A Case of Nyanja Language in Lusaka District of Zambia?**

Dear Respondent,

You have purposively been selected to take part in this study because you are directly involved in the implementation of the New Break Through to Literacy Program. Be as free and truthful as you can as you respond to the questions in this interview.

1. What ethnic group do you belong to?

2. What is your first language?

3. When did you start teaching grade one NBTL classes in Lusaka District?

4. From your experience, is Nyanja suitable as a language of initial literacy in Lusaka District?

5. Are pupils comfortable with the use of Nyanja as a language of initial literacy in Lusaka District?

6. What language do pupils speak when playing?

7. Are there any difficulties (when teaching grade ones) that associated with the use of Nyanja as a language of initial literacy in Lusaka district?

8. Is there any difference between the Nyanja that pupils use at play with the one used during classroom interaction?

9. How proficient are you and the pupils in Standard Nyanja recognized in schools?

10. What do you think is the Suitable local language that can be used as a language of initial literacy in Lusaka Disrict?

11. What are your final remarks?

THE END

THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGE AND SOCIAL S CIENCES EDUCATION

Title of Research: **The Language of Initial Literacy in a Cosmopolitan Environment: A Case of Nyanja Language in Lusaka District of Zambia?**

Dear Respondent,

You have purposively been selected to take part in this study because you are directly involved in the implementation of the New Break Through to Literacy Program. Be as free and truthful as you can as you respond to the questions in this interview.

1. Which ethnic group do you belong to?

2. How long have you been Head Teacher at this school?

3. What is the dominant language of play in Lusaka?

4. How proficient are the teachers who teach grade one in Standard Nyanja?

5. What are the criteria for coming up with a grade one teacher?

6. Are there any differences between the cinyanja which the pupils speak during play and the one recognized in schools?

7. Is cinyanja appropriate for use as a language of initial literacy in Lusaka District?

8. What is your impression of the use of Cinyanja as a language of initia;l literacy in Lusaka District?

9. Any final remarks?

Thank you!

Appendix C. Interview Guide to the District Education Managers

THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGE AND SOCIAL S CIENCES EDUCATION

Title of Research: **The Language of Initial Literacy in a Cosmopolitan Environment: A Case of Nyanja Language in Lusaka District of Zambia?**

Dear Respondent,

You have purposively been selected to take part in this study because you are directly involved in the implementation of the New Break Through to Literacy Program. Be as free and truthful as you can as you respond to the questions in this interview.

1. How long have you been working in your capacity?

2. What is the dominant language of play in Lusaka District?

3. How proficient are the teachers and the pupils in Standard Nyanja recognized in schools?

4. Are there any differences between the Cinyanja spoken in Lusaka and the standard one recognized in schools?

4. In your opinion, what is the appropriate language of initial literacy in Lusaka District?

5. Since Lusaka is a cosmopolitan city, what mechanisms are in place to cater for the grade one

pupils who do not speak Cinyanja?

6. Any remarks?

Appendix D. Familiar Language test to the Grade one Pupils

THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGE AND SOCIAL S CIENCES EDUCATION

SL NUMBER	NAME OF OBJECT IN ENGLISH	NAME OF OBJECT IN STANDARD NYANJA	NAME OF OBJECT ACCORDING TO PUPIL	COMMENT

1	Vehicle	Galimoto		
2	Bird	Mbalame		
3	Radio	Wailesi		
4	Mirror	Kalilole		
5	Pot	M'phika		
6	Teacher	Aphunzitsi		
7	Egg	Dzira		
8	Pencil	Pensulo		
9	hoe	Khasu		
10	Rat	Khoswe		
11	Door	Citseko		
12	Trousers	Buluku		
13	Cat	Cona		
14	Girl	Mtsikana		
15	Water	Madzi		
16	Milk	Mkaka/meleki		

17	Grass	Msipu		
18	Ball	M'pira		
19	Groundnuts	Mtedza		
20	Lion	Mkango		

Appendix D. Familiar Language test to the Grade one Pupils

THE UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGE AND SOCIAL S CIENCES EDUCATION

SL #	NAME OF OBJECT IN ENGLISH	NAME OF OBJECT IN STANDARD NYANJA	NAME OF OBJECT ACCORDING TO PUPIL	COMMENT
1	Vehicle	Galimoto		
2	Bird	Mbalame		
3	Radio	Wailesi		
4	Mirror	Kalilole		
5	Pot	M'phika		
6	Teacher	Aphunzitsi		

7	Egg	Dzira		
8	Pencil	Pensulo		
9	hoe	Khasu		
10	Rat	Khoswe		
11	Door	Citseko		
12	Trousers	Buluku		
13	Cat	Cona		
14	Girl	Mtsikana		
15	Water	Madzi		
16	Milk	Mkaka/me leki		
17	Grass	Msipu		
18	Ball	M'pira		
19	Groundnuts	Mtedza		
20	Lion	Mkango		