

Analysing Teachers' and Pupils' Classroom Language Choices and Practices in Selected Grade Five Classrooms in Zambia's Chongwe District

JAPHET ANDREW ZULU

The University of Zambia

Abstract

From 2013 up to date, the curriculum framework stipulates that the language of instruction for initial literacy is familiar local language from Grades one to four (1-4) while from grade five (5) onwards, English is the sole medium of instruction. The purpose of this study was to analyse the transitional language practices among the grade five teachers and learners in selected primary schools of Chongwe district. The study adopted a mixed methods design where both qualitative and quantitative data was collected and analysed. 8 primary schools were randomly selected while 40 grade 5 teachers were purposively sampled. Data was collected through classroom lesson observation, interviews with the teachers and questionnaire. The classes which were observed had 216 pupils collectively. Qualitative data was analysed through thematic analysis while quantitative data was analysed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences. The findings showed that the teachers did not have a common way of transitioning as some were using abrupt transitioning while others who are the majority are using gradual transitioning. In the questionnaire, most the teachers indicated that they used both English and local Zambian languages to teach in order to help the learners. However, the lesson observations showed that in fact, some teachers transitioned to English at the expense of the learners

since some learners had not yet broken through to literacy at the beginning of grade five. In view of the findings, it is recommended that primary teachers should be trained on how to transition at grade five.

Key Words: Analysis, Teachers, Pupils, Transitional Language Practices, Grade 5, Zambia

Background

The language policy of Zambia has been strongly shaped by colonialism and its aftermath. Prior to 1899, the first European missionaries used local languages to preach and teach. Things changed, however, with the Phelps-Stokes Commission of 1924 which encouraged the use of local languages for the first four years of education (Muyebaa, 2009) in Gordon (2014).

It is also true that Zambia's language of instruction policy has been fluid in nature in that it has been taking different forms in its quest to finding a lasting solution. Masaiti (2016) looked at the three landmark phases: the 1966 proclamation of English as sole official language at national level and as language of classroom instruction from Grade one to the highest level of education. The 1977 education reforms recommendations which, though acknowledging the limitations of English as language of classroom instruction, recommended its continued use while making provision for the utilisation of seven local official languages where necessary; and the 1996 language-in-education policy which also retains the use of English as official language of classroom instruction but, in addition, recommends the employment of community languages for literacy and numeracy from Grade One to Grade Four. Even so, these changes did not provide the solutions to the poor literacy levels Zambia has been experiencing.

As hinted above., the 30 year period between 1965 and 1995 saw a number of moves to reverse this ‘straight-for-English’ approach. In 1977, the new policy, ‘Educational Reform: Proposals and Recommendations’(MOE), provided that teachers be allowed to explain concepts that might otherwise not be understood through the medium of English, in one of the seven official local languages, provided a majority of pupils in a class could understand this vernacular language. In 1992, another policy called ‘Focus on Learning’, stated that the major Zambian languages would be the basic languages of education from Grades 1 to 4 but this was not implemented (MOE). However with the implementation of the ‘Focus on Learning’ suggestions, the challenges on language of instruction and its intended results, still remained not fully handled.

English medium of instruction policy, however, did not achieve desired results. The learners who had succeeded in generating the competences in reading were very few. A study by Southern African Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality (SACMEQ, 1998) 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) Cited in Mbewe (2015).

In 1998, the Zambia conducted a pilot study in Northern Province where a local language was to be used as a medium of instruction in grade one. Since the results of the pilot proved that the use of a familiar language enhanced literacy teaching and learning, the policy was rolled to the whole country. thus, the use of local languages in grade one went on until 2013 when the policy was revised. The major issue was that literacy levels remained regrettably low even with the use of local languages. Mwanza (2012) explained that the use of local languages was faced with

a number of challenges such as lack of teaching materials, poor language backgrounds of learners and lack of proficiency by teachers in the medium of instruction. Banda and Mwanza (2017) also added that both teachers and pupils could not cope with the official orthography because the language variety they spoke was different from the one recommended in the official orthography. As such, Mwanza (2012) argued that the one year period of using the local language was not adequate as both teachers and pupils needed adequate time to learn the medium of instruction in order for pupils to break through to literacy before they could be transitioned to receiving instruction in English.

The current language of instruction policy recognises the use of familiar Zambian languages as the official languages of instruction in the Pre-Schools and early Grades (Grades 1- 4). All the teaching and learning in all the learning areas at the Lower Primary level will be in familiar Zambian Languages. This is because there is evidence that children learn more easily and successfully through languages that they know and understand well. English will be offered as a subject, beginning at Grade 2. After the children have acquired sufficient literacy skills in the Zambian languages, it will be easier for them to transfer these skills quickly and with ease to Literacy in English at Grade 5 (CDC, 2013). This meant that from grade 5 onwards, English became the sole language of classroom instruction. Therefore, both the teachers and the learners should transition from the familiar language (mother tongue/local language) to English. However, six years after the revised policy, the study was done in order to observe and analyse how both teachers and pupils linguistically transitioned from the use of a regional official language to the exclusive use of English. In other words, the purpose of this study was to analyse the transitional language practices which both teachers and pupils adopted in grade five.

Methods and Materials

The study adopted a mixed methods design where both qualitative and quantitative data was collected and analysed. 8 primary schools were randomly selected while 40 grade 5 teachers were purposively sampled. Data was collected through classroom lesson observation, interviews with the teachers and questionnaire. The classes which were observed had 216 pupils collectively. Qualitative data was analysed through thematic analysis while quantitative data was analysed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences. Reliability and trustworthiness of data was ensured through triangulation of instruments and data types. The study also observed ethical issues. In this case, participation in this study was by informed consent. Both teachers and pupils were informed of the nature and purpose of the study. They were also informed that they had the right to participate and/or withdraw from the study at any time for any reason.

Findings of the Study

The study aimed to establish the transitional language practices in grade 5 classrooms. It was meant to generate data related to teachers' and pupils' language choices and practices in multilingual classrooms. Presented in this section are both quantitative and qualitative data on the classroom language practices of the teachers. In order to achieve this, 3 instruments were used which were class observation, interview guides and questionnaires. The class observation and interviews were for qualitative data while questionnaires were for quantitative data.

Transitional Language Practices by Grade five Teachers and Pupils: Lesson Observation Data

From the 24 lessons observed by the researcher, 21 of them were taught using 2 languages which is gradual transitioning or translanguaging and 20 of the 21 lessons were predominantly in local Zambian languages while 1 used both English and local languages. Below, I present selected lessons out of the 21 which were observed: Note that the codes are not chronological but simply represent classes as they were all coded.

CLASS 2: Subject: English. Topic: Sequencing. From Chongwe district Urban Area. Lesson taught by a male teacher.

Teacher: Today we are learning about sequencing. So nizalembako ma sentences pa board, nifuna muniuze vamene ma sentences aya yafunika kuchitiwa? (I will write some sentences on the board and you shall tell me what we should do about these sentences)

Teacher: **writes sentences on the black board** (it was a wrist watch, his mother bought him a present, Kenny had done very well at school) ok tiyeni tibelenge aya ma sentences yamene nalemba pa board, manje chabwino pali ma sentences aya yamene nalemba yonse yakamba pali ganizo imodzi. Nidani aga tibelegeleko? Yes ndiwe ndani?

Pupil: Mukela

Teacher: Ok Mukela tibelengeleko mukela tione.

Pupil: it was a light/ last wa..

Teacher: Reads (it was a wrist watch). Nkholoko yaku manja. Iwe useka chani? (what are you laughing at?) kaili iwe ubisa vamene uziba. (you don't want to share what you

know). Ok sentence number two? Ireen?

Pupil: His mother bought him a present.

Teacher: (repeats the sentence) Atichani iyi tikaikamba mu chinyanja?

Pupil: Amai bake bana mugulila present.

Teacher: nikuyamula manja!

Pupil: Amai bake anamugulila mphatso.

Teacher: good, number three?

Pupil: can had doing very well at school.

Teacher: Kenny nizina yamunthu aii? Kenny had done very well at school.

Pupils: (chorusing) Kenny had done very well at school.

Teacher: good manje paoneka pali nkhani pali Kenny naba Mai bake aii? Eye palichamene china chitika apa. Manje aya ma sentences yatatu aya, kuli mwamene yafunika kunkhalili, kuli yamene iyenela kubwela first, nayamene iyenela kubwela second, nayamene iyenela kubwela third kuti nkhani inveke bwino. So niyiti yamene izayambilila kubwela pali aya ? Aya ma sentences tika yaika pamodzi tinga pange paragraph. Paragraph nima arrangements of sentences yamene ilina idea, same idea. So manje tifuna tiyaike pamodzi aya munshemunshe tipange paragraph, so niyiti yamene izayambilila? Bupe? *(good it seems like we have a story here about and he mother ok? Yes there is something that occurred here. Now these sentences are supposed to be in a certain order, one sentence should come first, then second and third so that the story should make sense. So which one should come first? These sentences when we group them together we can make a paragraph. A*

paragraph is a group of sentences with a similar idea, same idea. So we want to arrange these sentences so well to make a paragraph, now which one should come first? Yes Bupe?)

Pupil: Kenny had done very well at school.

Teacher: yes that's number 1. Kenny anachita bwino kusikulu, so pamene anchita bwino nichani china chitika? So yayenela kukonkhana bwino bwino. So tatengapo ya last ndiye ya number 1, so niyiti yamene ikonkhapo? (Kenny is doing well at school, now that he is doing well at school what happened? Now we have to follow the story accordingly. So having picked the last one as number 1 which sentence is coming next?)

Pupil: number 1.

Teacher: number1? It was a wrist watch. Ahaa! Niyiti yame ibwela? (which one is coming next?)

Pupil: number 2.

Teacher: his mother bought him a present. So ndiye ikonkhapo (teacher reads the sentence together with the pupils and asks them to say it in local language)

Pupils: Amai bake banamugulila mphatso.

Teacher: so mphatso yamene banamugulila yenze chani? (so what present did his mother buy for him?)

Pupil: number 1.

Teacher: yes so na story ndiye mwamene ifunika ku nkhalila. This is what we call sequencing, that's why tafakako ma numbers. So apa tapanga manje paragraph. So tiza yangana mu mabuku tisegule pa page 34 to 35.

The lesson was on sequencing and the subject was English but it was mainly taught in local language (Chinyanja) and the learners'

reading ability was fairly bad, seeing that very few were willing to try and read during the lesson.

Class 3: Subject: English. Topic: punctuations. A lesson taught by a male teacher in urban Chongwe district.

Teacher: Last time, ninakupasani exercise yenzo kamba palichani? Yes

Pupil: ma-punctuations (punctuations)

Teacher: punctuations aii? Can you remind me one of the sentences yamene tina chita punctuate. Yenze sentence yabwanji? Enhee Bupe (yes Bupe)

Pupil: Don't do that.

Teacher: Tinailemba so aii? Demonstrates on the board (dont do that). Nipati pamene kaenela kunkhala aka (') ? (where is this ' supposed to be?)

Pupil: pakati pali n na t. (in between n and t)

Teacher: Apa? (here?) demonstrates (don-t =don't)

Teacher: Aka ' tikaitana ati kachani? (what do we call this ' ?)

Pupils: (*chorusing*) comma, bracket, speech mark, ...

Teacher: Ati chani? (what?)

Pupils: punctuation.

Teacher: Nika punctuation?

Pupils: full stop.

Teacher: Aka nika apostrophe, tizaka kapunzila bwino. (this is an apostrophe, we shall learn about it in good time).

Class 5: Subject: English. Topic: Types of Families. A lesson taught by a female teacher of Chongwe rural.

Teacher: good morning class?

Pupil: good morning Madam

Teacher: Okay, so before you seat you have to tell me something about your family, in English not Ciyanja. Close your books put your pen and pencils down, if you want to seat just answer one simple question and you seat down. How many kinds of families do you know?

Pupil: no response (silence).

Teacher: Okay where you live, at home who do you stay with, yes?

Pupil: my parents.

Teacher: who else lives at your place?

Pupil: my brothers

Teacher: your brothers?

Pupil: and sisters

Teacher: and sisters, that's all?

Pupil: yes

Teacher: okay that's Prescious.

Teacher: Tembo?

Pupil: my father and my uncle.

Teacher: hmmm?

Pupil: my father and mother.

Teacher: your father and mother? But you said uncle, you stay the three of you?

Pupil: no and my cousins.

Teacher: and your cousins, come in front. Prescious come in front as well. Yes?

Pupil: my mother, father and sister.

Teacher: that's all? Okay!

Pupil: my father and mother.

Teacher: that's all, okay others?

Pupil: mother and father.

Teacher: that's all?

Pupil: yes

Teacher: Cathrine you are lying.

Pupil: no

Teacher: I mean where you live now not where you came from?

Pupil: yes

Teacher: okay, others. And if you have answered you can seat. Yes?

Pupil: my father and grandfather.

Teacher: good at least someone has mentioned a grandfather aii?
So others you don't have a grandfather?

Pupils: yes

Teacher: okay you have but they don't live with you?

Pupil: yes

Teacher: okay next?

Pupil: my mother and brother.

Teacher: okay come in front.

Pupil: my brother in law and my sister.

Teacher: that's all?

Pupil: yes

Teacher: Are you sure? Others?

Pupils: silent (no response)

Teacher: Okay I want someone to read this passage for me. Who knows how to read very (very) well?

Pupil: a girl read the passage (there are many kinds of families, some children are)

Teacher: okay did you learn anything from the passage? Have we understood the passage?

Pupil: yes

Teacher: what have you heard?

Pupils: silent (no response)

Teacher: you didn't hear any kind of family sure! yes?

Pupil: there are many kinds of families.

Teacher: okay good. There are many kinds of families now after that they talked about kinds of families, I heard three kinds of families in this passage, can you remember them? Yes what do you remember? Victoria?

Pupil: that children lost their parents.

Teacher: okay, some children have lost their parents aii! And they are being raised by?

Pupil: fathers

Teacher: if they have lost their parents they are being raised by who?

Pupil: grandfather

Teacher: okay, grandfather and grandmother are grand-parents aii! Okay what else did we learn from this passage?

Pupils: silent (no response)

Teacher: that's all? Okay who else can help us read? Come. Can you pay attention.

Pupil: reads (there are many kinds of families, some children have lost their parents and live with their grand-parents, other children are being rest (raised) by their mothers or father own their own we call this single parents families who have many members living together including cousins and aunties and grandparents are called extended families, families with two or three children living with their parents are called new-clear (nuclear families).

Teacher: okay now he has helped you how to remember right? Did you hear any types of families?

Pupil: yes

Teacher: even last time you said yes but you are not telling me what they are? Which ones are they? Yes?

Pupil: newclear family

Teacher: yes, nuclear family. Which other one?

Pupils: silent (no response)

Teacher: imwee.. hmmm? If you are just living with your father or mother alone, what kind of family is that?

Pupil: silent (no response)

Teacher: What kind of family is that?

Pupils: silent (no response)

Teacher: Listen you are just living with one parent, either your mother or father, what family is that?

Pupil: (whispering) single parent

Teacher: Okay single parent family aii!

Teacher: divides the class into three groups and asked them to act out the three types of families they have learned.

The lesson was taught exclusively in English and the teacher was strict on the use of the language of instruction. The lesson showed that the learners were not too conversant with the language of instruction (English) but that did not seem to have bothered the teacher. This however, indicates that the teacher used abrupt transitional method. This method leaves no room for the learners who have not yet grasped the basic knowledge of the new language.

From the four lessons above the observations indicated that the first three lessons were conducted in both English and local languages, while the fourth one was conducted exclusively in English. One common notable thing is that the three lessons had two extremes the translanguaging lessons were dominated by local languages which viewed language as a resource while the monolingual one was also done in extreme that the learners were symbolically violated which used language as a problem.

Transitional Language Practices by Grade five Teachers and Pupils: Interview Data

Teachers were interviewed on which language or languages they used to teach the grade 5 classes and their responses were varying as the majority of the teachers indicated that they used two languages while others stated that they used both to help learners of different language abilities to understand. Some teachers further explained that they could continue using both languages for as long as learners were not breaking through to English literacy. See the verbatim below:

Teacher 1: *Both local and English language, I use both because if am to use English alone learners would understand anything.*

Teacher 2: *I use English three quarters of the time and local language for the sake of those who do not understand. I also allow my learners to use local language in my*

class.

Teacher 4: *I use both languages English and local to accommodate the other learners who don't understand.*

Teacher 5: *I use both English and local language to help learners understand. I can go on using both languages up to grade 7, if I see the need to do so.*

Teacher 7: *I use English but sometimes I use local language just to help those who may not be clear.*

Teacher 17: *I use two languages which are English and Cinyanja, I use both just to give the learners a balance.*

The verbatim above looked at the teachers who used translanguaging of 2 languages so as to accommodate the learners who had not yet broken through to literacy at the time of transitioning. Apart from just using 2 languages some teachers indicated that they used the abrupt transitioning which utilizes the monolingual approach, where they used English only as a language of instruction. They had reasons such as; it would help the learners to catch up fast and simply doing what the policy requires, while some said it was the language they were comfortable to use when teaching. See the verbatim below:

Teacher 3: *I use English only because that is what the policy demands.*

Teacher 30: *I use English language, because I want them pick up and get better fast.*

Teacher 14: *I use English alone because a good number of my pupils can understand and are able to use it*

Teacher 26: *I use English to teach for my own seek as it is the language and comfortable with.*

From the interviews, some teachers indicated that they still used

both languages to teach their learners while some teachers who stated that they were using English only to teach the grade 5s as that was what the policy demanded.

Transitional Language Practices by Grade five Teachers and Pupils: Questionnaire Data

From the questionnaires, the teachers were asked if they used 2 languages to teach their grade 5 learners in order to assist them to understand and surprisingly they all agreed to use 2 languages. As shown in the table below:

I use both English and Zambian languages when teaching grade 5 in order to help pupils understand

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Agree	26	65.0	65.0	65.0
Strongly Agree	14	35.0	35.0	100.0
Total	40	100.0	100.0	

The statistics show that 26 agreed and 14 strongly agreed. In percentage 65% agreed and 35% strongly agreed and none disagreed or strongly disagreed. In short, all the teachers stated that they used more than one language when teaching.

Almost a similar question was presented to the teachers but in a different way. They were asked if they used one language which is English to teach their grade 5 learners. Interestingly 1 teacher agreed while the others maintained their position on using both.

I only use English when teaching grade 5 pupils

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	1	2.5	2.5	2.5
	Disagree	28	70.0	70.0	72.5
	Strongly Disagree	11	27.5	27.5	100.0
	Total	40	100.0	100.0	

The statistics above show that 1 strongly agreed, 28 disagreed and 11 strongly disagreed. In terms of percentage 2.5% strongly agreed, 70% disagreed and 27.5% strongly disagreed.

In trying to find out how the teachers intended to work around the transitioning process, the researcher wanted to find out how the teachers were using the language or languages. The teachers were asked to indicate if the used more of local languages when teaching their grade 5 learners. Here are the responses:

I use more of Zambian languages than I use English

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	7	17.5	17.5	17.5
	Strongly Agree	2	5.0	5.0	22.5
	Disagree	29	72.5	72.5	95.0
	Strongly Disagree	2	5.0	5.0	100.0
	Total	40	100.0	100.0	

On this question, teachers' responses were, 7 agreed, 2 strongly agreed, 29 disagreed and 2 strongly disagreed. In percentages 17.5% agreed, 5.0% strongly agreed, 72.5% disagreed and 5.0% strongly disagreed.

Discussion of Findings

The next section present a discussion of data on teachers and pupils' transitional language choices and practices in grade five following the revised language of initial literacy teaching policy in Zambia.

The study found that the majority of the learners had not broken through to literacy (in English) hence, making it challenging for them to receive educational instructions exclusively in English. Thus, some teachers resorted to translanguaging which is the gradual transitioning where two or more languages are used just to ensure that all learners are receiving educational instructions, while others still switched to English solely since policy demanded so. In this case, the adoption of monolingual language practices resulted into symbolic violence as those who had not yet breakthrough to literacy in English were barred from epistemic access (See also Cummins, 2009).

From the lessons observed, the majority of the teachers were using translanguaging so as to accommodate all the learners in the lesson. And it was further revealed that more teachers were using much of local languages as opposed to English at grade 5. Even so, some teachers adopted the abrupt transitioning or the monolingual approach where English only was used as a language of instruction even when the findings indicate that not all learners have English proficiency. Lesson 5 above showed that the learners were not too conversant with the language of instruction (English) but that did not seem to have bothered the teacher. This language practice leaves no room for the learners who have not yet grasped the basic knowledge of the new language. It is in agreement with Miti (2007) who stated that language can be used both for inclusion and exclusion. In this case, language can either be used to exclude learners who have not broken through to literacy in English when the teacher used abrupt transitioning or it

can be used inclusively when the teacher uses translanguaging. It can also be said that language was seen as a problem and not as a resource or a right as postulated by Ruiz (1984).

The study found that there was no consistence in the manner which the teachers were transitioning. The teachers transitioned mainly in two different ways which were the abrupt transitioning and gradual transitioning. The abrupt transitioning followed the monolingual approach where English only was the language used to teach the grade 5s. This approach limited the learners participation in class as it sidelines those who are have not yet broken through to literacy in English. While the gradual transitioning approach employed the translanguaging approach which allows the use of more than two languages to help the learners understand, it treats language as a resource by allowing the multiple of language to accommodate all the learners. The different ways in which teachers transitioned might be because each of the teachers were teaching a different class with different language abilities among learners. Thus, being context sensitive in this case mean that teachers plan and deliver lessons differently according to their own classrooms. It can therefore be argued that as context sensitive teachers, their taching did not primarily serve the policy but the pupils (Mwanza, 2016). On the other hand, the differences between teachers might be because teachers did not undergo training on how to implement the policy. As Manchishi and Mwanza (2013) and Manchishi and Mwanza (2016) put it, there is need for teachers to be adequately trained in order for them to successfully interpret and implement the curriculum or syllabus.

Although they were inconsistencies in the transitional manner, the majority of the lessons were taught predominantly in local languages which indicated that either the teachers' understood their learners' language proficiency or literacy level. From the lesson observations, it was found that most teachers were using the gradual transitioning approach (translanguaging) even in

subjects such as English itself. The first two lessons on sequencing and punctuations and from the transcribed lessons, it clearly showed that the teachers were struggling to make the learners understand when in the actual sense it was expected that the lessons in the subject English should be taught at least predominately in English as it was introduced as early as grade 2. The teachers and the learners were both mixing the languages, which implied that the teachers were using gradual transitioning from local language to English though there was so much use of the local language mostly in the second lesson.

From the interviews some teachers indicated that they used both local and English languages to teach their learners while others stated that they used English only to teach the grade 5s as that is what the policy demanded. The teacher responses showed that the policy has not given the clear cut guidelines on how the transitional language practices should be conducted. As a result the teachers were kept guessing on what to do and what not to. As a result of the lack of clear guidelines on how teachers and pupils needed to transition, teachers understood the transitioning in different ways and implemented it in different ways.

Teachers were asked if at all they had received any kind of training or workshop on how to handle the transitional practices and their answers were varying from teacher to teacher. The majority of them said that they had not undergone any kind of training. The responses confirmed the inconsistencies of the transitional manners and why certain teachers could abruptly transition even at the expense of the learners. When they were further asked on their knowledge of the transitional policy some stated that they knew that they are supposed to transition but did not know how to handle the situation. Teachers were merely acting according to what they hear from their friends and colleagues without fully understanding the procedures as a result it is the learners that suffers. Others indicated that they do not know much about the

policy therefore, they only use common sense. From the foregoing, it can be argued that some teachers held misconceptions about the transitioning process while other did not understand it at all. This is the reason why it is important to train teachers at the start of every policy in order to avoid teachers' ignorance or misconceptions because as Mwanza (2017) argues, teachers' misconceptions about a policy or curriculum recommendations may lead to lack of implementation or failure of implementations among the implementers. It is for this reason that this paper argues for the training of teachers in order to increase the chances of curriculum success. The implication of not understanding the policy is that the learners may be deprived of the right to education as the teachers could transition in any way they may deem right which may affect the learning process.

Lesson 5 presented an interesting scenario. The teacher predominantly taught in English. This was despite the fact that the majority of pupils could not speak English. As discussed above, this can be explained in a number of ways. Firstly, lack of teacher training and sensitisation led to teachers implement the policy even in classrooms where the sociolinguistic context did not provide for the exclusive use of English. Secondly, this can also be viewed in terms of teachers' attitudes towards local languages and translanguaging in general. Thus, there is need to sensitise teachers and engage them into attitudinal changes where teachers should view different languages as resources for meaning making during classroom interaction. Teacher attitude is one area where policy makers should work on because as Mwanza (2017) puts it, teachers' positive attitudes towards local languages have a bearing on whether or not pupils will access learning or not and teacher attitudes may explain why teachers do what they do and why they don't do what they don't.

Conclusion

It can be reiterated that even after extending the period from one year of using a local language as medium of instruction to four years, teachers and pupils still had challenges. Further, since teachers were not properly trained on how to interpret and implement the policy, their classroom transitioning practices were not uniform. As mentioned in the paper, this might be because of the different linguistic contexts in the classroom or because of lack of induction on the part of the teachers.

References

- Banda, F and Mwanza, D. S. (2017). Language-in-education policy and linguistic diversity in Zambia: An alternative explanation to low reading levels among primary school pupils. In Banja, Madalitso Khulupirika (ed.). *Selected readings in education*, 109-132. Lusaka: University of Zambia Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Cummins, J. (1980). *The Cross-Linguistic Dimension of Language Proficiency: Implications for Bilingual Education and the Optional Issue*, TESOL quarterly.
- Cummins, J. (1979). *Cognitive/Academic Language Proficiency, Linguistic Interdependence, the Optimal Age Question and Some Other Matters*. Working paper on Bilingualism, 19, 197-205.
- Cummins, J. (1986). *Empowering minority students: a framework for intervention*. Harvard Educational Review, 56 (1), 18-36.
- Curriculum Development Centre (2013). *Zambia Curriculum development framework*. Lusaka: Curriculum development centre.
- Gordon, R. (2014). *Language of Education Planning in Zambia*. Volume 3 Article 6, Linguistic portfolios: St. Cloud State

- University. [http:// repository. Stcloudstate. Edu/stcloud-ling/vol3/iss 1/6](http://repository.Stcloudstate.Edu/stcloud-ling/vol3/iss1/6).
- Manchishi, P. C. and Mwanza, D.S. (2016). Teacher Preparation at the University of Zambia.: Is Peer Teaching Still a Useful Strategy? *International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences Educations (IJHSSE)* 3 (11): 88 – 100.
- Manchishi, P.C and Mwanza, D.S. (2013). The University of Zambia School Teaching Experience: Is It Effective? *Excellence in Higher Education.* 4 (2), 61-77.
- Mbewe, G. E. (2015). *An Investigation of Teachers', Pupils' and Parents' perceptions towards the use of Chinyanja as a medium of instruction at lower primary schools: A case of selected primary schools in Lusaka District, Zambia.* UNZA Ministry of Education. (1976). *Education for development.* Lusaka: Government Printers.
- Ministry of Education. (1977). *Education Reforms.* Lusaka: Government Printers.
- Ministry of Eduaction. (1996). *Educating our future.* Lusaka: Curriculum Development Centre.
- Ministry of Education. (2001). *Zambia New Breakthrough to Literacy.* Lusaka: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education. (2003). *Step In To English, Activity Book Grade 2, Pathway to English: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge, United Kingdom.*
- 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.
- Mwanza, D.S. (2012). *The language of Initial Literacy in a Cosmopolitan Environment: A Case of Cinyanja in Lusaka District.* Unpublished Masters Dissertation, School of Education, University of Zambia.
- Mwanza, D. S. (2016). *A Critical Reflection on Eclecticism in*

- the Teaching of English Grammar at Selected Zambian Secondary Schools*. Unpublished PhD Thesis: University of Western Cape, South Africa.
- Mwanza, D.S. (2017). Implications of Teachers' Attitudes towards Unofficial languages on English Language Teaching in Multilingual Zambia. *Zambian Journal of Language Studies*, 1 (1): 101 - 124.
- Mwanza, D.S. (2017). The Eclectic Approach to Language Teaching: Its Conceptualisation and Misconceptions. *International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education (IJHSSE)*. 4 (2): 53-67.
- Ruiz, R. (1984). *Orientation in language planning*. NABE journal, 8, 15-34.
- Ruiz, R. (2010). *Reorienting language-as-resource*. In J.E. Petrovic (Ed.), *International perspectives on bilingual education: Policy, practice, and controversy* (pp. 155-172). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Schroeder, L. (2004). *Mother tongue Education in Kenya. Some hidden beneficiaries*: *Language Matters*, volume 35 (2). 2004.
- Sibanda, J. and Baxen, J. (2016). *Determining ESL learners Vocabulary needs from a textbook corpus: Challenges and prospects*, *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*. 34:1, 57-70, DOI: <https://doi.org/>
- UNESCO (2005). *Advocacy brief on mother tongue-based teaching and education for girls*. Bangkok: UNESCO.
- Zimba, S. (2007). *The Effect of Nyanja as a Language of Initial Literacy in a Predominantly Tumbuka Speaking Area: The Case of Lumezi District*. M.A Dissertation. Lusaka: UNZA.