# MANAGING LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY IN LITERACY AND LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT: AN ANALYSIS OF TEACHERS' ATTITUDES, SKILLS AND STRATEGIES IN MULTILINGUAL CLASSROOMS IN KENYAN PRIMARY SCHOOLS

**SUSAN KARIGU NYAGA**

**Dissertation presented for the degree of**

**Doctor of Philosophy**

**at**

**Stellenbosch University**

**Supervisor: Prof. Christine Anthonissen**

**March 2013**

# DECLARATION

By submitting this dissertation electronically, I declare that the entirety of the work contained therein is my own, original work, that I am the sole author thereof (save to the extent explicitly otherwise stated), that reproduction and publication thereof by Stellenbosch University will not infringe any third party rights and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it for obtaining any qualification.

Date: March 2013

# DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis to the millions of children around the world today who are struggling to make sense of education delivered in languages they do not speak or understand. I hope that the issues raised in this research report will some day, brighten the faces of some little angels when their linguistic needs are considered in language-in-education policy decisions, as well as the design and delivery of curriculum. Until that happens 'a luta continua'!

# ABSTRACT

This study investigates teachers' language practices in multilingual classrooms with regard to their attitudes, skills and strategies in their management of linguistic diversity among learners in their first year of primary school. Both the critical interpretive theoretical paradigm adopted and the qualitative research approach employed in the execution of the study presupposed gathering rich data, which a case study design of research assured. The data for the study was gathered from four year one classrooms purposively selected based on parameters that were deemed of interest in this study. These included, but were not limited to, the location of the school, the linguistic diversity among learners in the classrooms and the literacy traditions of the first languages spoken by the learners in the target classrooms. Although the specific context provided real input to the study, the findings may be relevant to language-in-education issues in many other African countries, and even in multilingual communities beyond.

The study reveals yawning discrepancies between language policy and practice; between teachers' beliefs about linguistic diversity and their actual language behaviour in the classrooms; and between the definitions of mother tongue provided by the Ministry of Education and teachers' re-interpretations of these definitions in the various contexts studied. The study further indicates that teachers are working in an environment that is not supportive of effective policy implementation. This very limited policy implementation support is reflected in teacher training and preparation, teacher placement criteria, text book production and school examinations.

This study indicates that even a sound understanding of linguistic diversity among teachers and their best intentions to give learners a sound foundation, is only the beginning of literacy development of young learners in Kenya. It recommends a new and incisive look at critical aspects of the education system in an effort to synchronise the different levels at which policy and practice need to meet. Various well-informed choices need to be made in the creation of a supportive environment for effective policy implementation. This should include among other things a change in the language-in-education policy to move away from early-exit to late-exit mother tongue education, and more first language maintenance in bilingual or multilingual classrooms. If learners are to benefit from mother tongue instruction in line with

current research in the field, much needs to be done. Based on the insights gained in this study, a revision of teacher education curricula to include the management of linguistically diverse learners and improved language awareness is suggested, as is flexible curriculum delivery, scrapping of formal examinations in the early years and introduction of alternative assessment methods in these levels. In later years, bilingual (in some cases even multilingual) tests are bound to lower the drop-out rate and produce more understanding and less rote learning. The aim should be to assure multilingual, multiliteracy development and academic achievement for all learners regardless of their particular linguistic backgrounds.

# OPSOMMING

Hierdie studie ondersoek onderwysers se taalpraktyke in veeltalige klaskamers ten opsigte van hulle houdings, vaardighede en strategieë in die hantering van talige diversiteit onder leerders in hulle eerste jaar van primêre onderrig. Sowel die vertolkende teoretiese paradigma wat gevolg word as die kwalitatiewe navorsingsbenadering wat die studie aanneem, het daarop gereken dat ingesamelde data ryk sou wees aan inligting; die navorsingsontwerp, naamlik dié van gevallestudie, verseker die verkryging van sulke data. Die studie is gebasseer op inligting wat ingesamel is in vier klaskamers van leerlinge in die eerste skooljaar. Die betrokke navorsingsterreine is telkens doelbewus gekies op grond van die parameters wat belangrik was vir die studie. Dit sluit in, maar is nie beperk tot, die ligging van die skool, die talige diversiteit van die leerders in die klaskamers en die geletterdheidstradisies van die onderskeie eerstetale van die leerders in die geteikende klaskamers. Alhoewel hierdie spesifieke konteks verseker het dat die studie in 'n werklike situasie geanker is, is die bevindinge waarskynlik relevant tov taal-in-onderrig kwessies in verskeie ander Afrikalande, en selfs ook in veeltalige gemeenskappe elders.

Hierdie studie onthul gapende ongerymdhede in die verhouding tussen taalbeleid en praktyk; tussen onderwysers se oortuigings rakende talige diversiteit en hulle werklike taalgebruik in die klaskamers; en tussen die omskrywings van moedertaal wat deur die Ministerie van Onderwys voorsien word en die onderwysers se herinterpretasie van hierdie omskrywings binne die verskillende kontekste wat ondersoek word. Die studie dui verder daarop dat onderwysers in 'n omgewing werk wat nie die effektiewe implementering van beleid ondersteun nie. Sodanige beperkte ondersteuning in die implementering van die beleid word weerspiëel in die opleiding en voorbereiding van onderwysers, die plasingkriteria van onderwysers, die publikasie van handboeke en skooleksamens.

Hierdie studie toon aan dat selfs 'n goeie begrip van talige diversiteit onder onderwysers en hulle beste voornemens om aan leerders 'n vaste grondslag te bied, net 'n eerste tree is in die geletterdheidsontwikkeling van jong leerders in Kenia. Dit stel 'n nuwe en indringende ondersoek van kritiese aspekte van die onderwyssisteem voor as 'n poging om die verskillende vlakke waar beleid en praktyk mekaar behoort te ontmoet, te sinchroniseer. Verskeie goed ingeligte besluite sal geneem moet word in die skep van 'n omgewing wat

bevorderlik is vir effektiewe beleidimplementering. Dit sou onder andere 'n verandering in die taal-in-onderwys beleid insluit om weg te beweeg van die vroeë wegbeweeg moedertaalonderrig na later wegbeweeg van moedertaalonderrig, sowel as meer instandhouding van die eerstetaal in twee- of veeltalige klaskamers. Vir leerders om baat te vind by moedertaalonderrig in oorstemming met huidige insigte uit navorsing in die veld, moet nog baie gedoen word. Gebaseer op die insigte wat in hierdie studie verkry is, word onder andere hersiening van die onderrigkurrikula vir onderwysers voorgestel sodat die hantering van talig-diverse groepe leerders asook verbeterde taalbewustheid daarby ingesluit is. Dieselfde geld ontwikkeling van buigbare kurrikula, die skrapping van formele eksaminering in die vroeë skooljare en die instelling van alternatiewe assesseringsmetodes op hierdie vlakke. In die later jare sal tweetalige (in sommige gevalle selfs veeltalige) toetse beslis die uitvalsyfer verlaag, asook meer begrip en minder leë memorisering tot gevolg te hê. Die doel moet wees om veeltalige, multi-geletterheidsontwikkeling en akademiese prestasie vir alle leerders te verseker ongeag hulle spesifieke talige agtergrond.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to the many people that have individually or corporately contributed towards the completion of this doctoral study. It will be impractical in this one page to try to fit in all their names. I, however, would like to acknowledge the following people and/or institutions for the roles they have played in this endeavour:

The African Doctoral Academy (ADA) at Stellenbosch University through the Partnership for Africa's Next Generation of Academics (PANGEA), for providing the funds without which this study would not have been possible.

My supervisor, Prof. Christine Anthonissen, for your support and for believing in me. You stirred in me the researcher I did not know I was. Baie dankie.

My MA supervisor and friend, Ms. Lyn Hall of the University of Huddersfield, UK, for acknowledging the academic potential you saw in me and cheering me on towards pursuing a PhD. You have walked with me every step in my academic life since 2005 in ways I cannot enumerate. Thank you from the bottom of my heart.

My parents: my beloved dad, Mzee Germano Nyaga and dear mum, Margaret Kamene, for your unwavering support, prayers and encouragement throughout this study programme and all my academic endeavours. Without your support, I would not have come this far.

My dear friends, the Waisiko family: You know what you have meant to me throughout this study programme. Words fail me to express my indebtedness to you. Thank you for being there for me through thick and thin.

My treasured SU friends: Barnabé Anzuruni Msabah for your constant encouragement and always reminding me that I can do it; Sidney Berman for your fervent prayers and checking how things were going; Merit Kabugo for your timely brotherly counsel; Konosoang Sobane for sharing in the laughter, the tears and all we encountered in this journey.

The five teachers that participated in this study, although you have remained anonymous in this research report, your contribution is immeasurable.

My praying friends scattered in all corners of the earth. You prayed, some individually others corporately, as Bible study groups and as families. God heard and answered your prayers. Thank you from the bottom of my heart.

Above all, I thank the Lord God Almighty, my heavenly Father in Whom I found the strength to face each day with the challenges it brought. When I felt weak, You strengthened me Lord; when I felt discouraged, You cheered me on; when I got stuck (and I did many times), to You I turned and You gave me direction. All glory and honour be unto You Lord!

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADEA: Association for the Development of Education in Africa

AEO:  Area Education Officer

BICS:  Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills

CALP: Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency

CLIL:  Content-Language Integrated Learning

CRE:  Christian Religious Education

CWC:  culture of wider communication

CWCs: cultures of wider communication

DC:  District Commissioner

DEO:  District Education Officer

ECED: Early Childhood Education and Development

ECD:  Early childhood Development

EFA:  Education For All

EL:  Ethnic Language

ESL:  English as a Second Language

FPE:  Free Primary Education

IIEP:  International Institute of Educational Planning

ILO:  International Labour Organisation

ILWC: International Language of Wider Communication

ILWCs: International Languages of Wider Communication

IRF/E: Initiation Response Feedback/Evaluation

KIE:  Kenya Institute of Education

L1:  first language

L2:  second language

L3:  third language

LEPs:  Limited English Proficiency Students

LWC:  Language of Wider Communication

LWCs: Languages of Wider Communication

MLE:  Multilingual Education

MLF:  Matrix Language Framework

MoE:  Ministry of Education

MoI:    Medium of Instruction

MT:    Mother Tongue

MTs:    Mother Tongues

MTBMLE:  Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education

MTE:  Mother Tongue Education

NCST: National Council for Science and Technology

NESB: Non-English Speaking Backgrounds

NGOs: Non-Governmental Organisations

PE:    Physical Education

PNG:  Papua New Guinea

PTA:  Parents-Teachers' Association

RoK:  Republic of Kenya

SA:    South Africa

SACMEQ:    Southern African Consortium for Monitoring Education Quality

SSA:  Sub-Saharan Africa

TSC:  Teachers' Service Commission

TTC:  Teacher Training College

TTCs:  Teacher Training Colleges

UN:    United Nations

UNDP: United Nations Development Programme

UNESCO: United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation

UNLD: United Nations Literacy Decade

USA:  United States of America

ZPD:  Zone of Proximal Development

ZPDs: Zones of Proximal Development

# DEFINITIONS OF KEY TERMS

**Mother tongue** refers to the first language in which a child learns to express himself or herself. In some contexts, besides being the language learnt first, it also includes the language with which one identifies and which others use in identifying one as a native speaker. For many the *mother tongue* is the language best known and most used (see for example UNESCO, 2007). It is often used synonymously with 'first language', 'home language' and 'native language'. In the Kenyan educational context, mother tongue is used in an unconventional way, to refer to autochthonous Kenyan languages, which implies that English and Kiswahili are not viewed as mother tongues per se.

**Home language** is defined as the language spoken in the home. This is often used to contrast a family language with the official language or language used in schooling. The term is often used interchangeably with 'first language', 'mother tongue' and 'native language'.

**Indigenous language** refers to a language spoken by the earliest inhabitants of a region or country. Used synonymously with 'autochthonous language'.

**Autochthonous language** refers to a language that is native to a region and spoken by the indigenous inhabitants of the region.

**Tribal language** refers to the language of a perso''s ancestors or ethnolinguistic group. Used synonymously with 'heritage language' and 'ethnic language'.

**Medium of instruction** generally refers to the language used for teaching the basic curriculum of the education system. Others refer to it as the 'language of instruction' (LoI) while still others call it the 'language of learning and teaching' (LoLT). In this report I mainly use medium of instruction (MoI) except when citing other people's work. The three terms are used interchangeably.

**Multilingualism** refers simply to the ability to use more than two languages. A distinction is usually made between individual and societal multilingualism. Individual multilingualism refers to a person's competence to use more than one language, while societal multilingualism

refers to the use of more than one language in a speech community but does not imply that every speaker in that speech community is proficient in more than one language.

**Multilingual classrooms** refer to learning contexts where learners from different linguistic backgrounds share the same classroom space. Typically, multilingual classrooms accommodate learners who have different and mutually unintelligble first languages. The term is used synonymously with 'linguistically diverse classrooms'.

**Multilingual education** (also sometimes **Bilingual education**) refers to the use of more than one language in the development of knowledge. In the early school years this refers to the use of more than one language for developing literacy and in giving instruction. This ideally begins with the learners L1 development and gradual addition of other languages (see for example UNESCO, 2007:54). Nevertheless, there is a range of different forms of bilingual and multilingual education, in which a major distinction is between "maintenance bilingual education" and "transitional bilingual education" where the former fosters the L1 of minority groups, and the latter fosters the development of the dominant language, often at the cost of the minority language.

**Mother tongue-based multilingual education** refers to an education programme that begins in the learners L1, helps the learners to build fluency and confidence in the L2 or other additional language as required and encourages them to use both the L1 and L2 or additional language to achieve quality education (UNESCO, 2007:54). This is a form of 'maintenance bilingual education'.

**Bilingual education** refers to the use of two languages in education, as media of instruction. In some contexts it is used synonymously with 'multilingual education'.

**Mother Tongue Education** generally refers to the use of learners' mother tongue (first language) as the medium of instruction. Then the L1 is mostly also taught as a subject, in order to develop it as a language for academic development. Mother tongue education is used synonymously with 'mother tongue instruction'.

**Language teaching** refers to teaching a language as a subject, where the grammar, vocabulary and the written and oral forms of the language are developed for use in a variety

of different genres and contexts. This term can refer to teaching of any language, be it the first or second language.

**Linguistic diversity** has been defined broadly as "the variations exhibited by human languages" (Terralingua, 2011). This term is used to refer to the variety encountered in multilingual communities.

**Linguistic landscape** has been used to refer to "the visibility and salience of languages on public and commercial signs in a given territory" (Landry and Bourhis, 1997:23). In this study, the term is used to refer to the representation of different languages in the classrooms context as reflected in the classroom labels and displays.

# LIST OF TABLES

# CHAPTER 1

# INTRODUCTION TO LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY IN MULTILINGUAL EDUCATION

## 1.1  INTRODUCTION

Multilingual education and multilingualism have preoccupied many linguistics and educational studies and conferences around the globe over the last five decades. The debate around the use of a learner's first language in education took centre stage following the 1953 declaration of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) on the Use of Vernacular Languages in Education. The declaration emphasised the benefits (cognitive, social, psychological and educational) associated with such practice (UNESCO, 1953). It was published following a meeting of educational experts held in Paris in 1951, organised by UNESCO, of which the report was published in 1953. The declaration makes a case for mother tongue education (MTE) as ideal while at the same time acknowledging the challenges that may be faced in the pursuit of this ideal.

Similarly, the role of African languages in education and learning has been hotly debated for decades (Kioko et al., 2008). The debate continues to evoke passions, criticisms and counter criticisms from scholars and laymen alike. UNESCO, Save the Children and other international education agencies continue to echo the pedagogical imperative of using the learner's first language as the medium of instruction, at least in the early years of formal schooling (UNESCO, 2003; Save the Children, 2007; 2009). Policy makers weigh the arguments and the costs in an attempt to formulate effective policies while scholars, educational practitioners and government ministers of education continue to re-examine the arguments and the evidence. What has become widely accepted (though not undisputed), is that pedagogically, psychologically, politically and socially, in linguistically diverse communities multilingual education has a great deal to recommend it (Kioko et al., 2008).

The centrality of language in any education system cannot be overemphasised. Wolff (2006:50) sums up this in his simple statement that "language is not everything in education, but without

language everything is nothing in education". Language is the medium of education. Even when the content of education is not language, that content has to be communicated through a language. Cognisant of this unequivocal role of language in education, the question then comes, which language is best to use in education? There are no straight answers to this question, owing to the fact that education in most if not all the countries of the world takes place in multilingual contexts (UNESCO, 2003). In Africa, certainly, there is no country where the multilingualism of the community does not present severe challenges to language-in-education policy and practice.

Studies carried out in different parts of the world (see for example Williams, 1998; Klaus, 2003; Fafunwa et al., 1989; Thomas & Collier, 1997) have repeatedly confirmed that learners who begin their schooling in a language they know well stand a better chance of academic success than those who begin in an unfamiliar language. Learners who start their schooling in a language they know well do not only learn better but also excel in other academic areas because they understand what is taught (Fafunwa et al., 1989; Akinnaso, 1993; Malone, 2003; Lewis, 2006), learn a second language better (Thomas & Collier, 1997; Williams, 1998; Benson, 2002; Malone, 2003; Dutcher, 2004; Bamgbose, 2005) and learn to read faster than otherwise (Eisemon et al., 1989; Bamgbose, 1991; Williams, 1998; Benson, 2000; Baker, 2006; Walter & Trammell, 2010). Despite these convincing findings, statistics show that 221 million school-aged children in the world today are first language (L1) speakers of languages not recognised in the school system (Dutcher, 2004).

In this regard, Africa has been singled out as the only continent in the world where the majority of children begin school in a foreign language medium (Alexander, 2003; UNESCO, 2010) and the only continent where the entire population has to struggle to make "technological or informational progress through the medium of someone else's language" - a second or third language (Kioko et al., 2008:5). It is approximated that over 2500 languages are spoken on the African continent (UNESCO, 2010). Out of these, only 176 languages are used in African education systems and this is mainly in basic education (Gadelii, 2004:28); only 25% of these are used in secondary education and a mere 5% in higher education (Gadelii, 2004:29-30). Although the emphasis on language in education in most African countries is on international languages, statistics show that only between 10 and 15% of the population in Africa are fluent in all these languages put together (UNESCO, 2010). In effect, this creates a serious communication gap between the formal education system and its social environment.

In Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), evidence from research (such as Williams, 1998; Fafunwa et al., 1989) has been followed by calls from different quarters of society to implement mother tongue-based multilingual education (MTBMLE) programmes, which will allow children to begin education in familiar languages while learning the languages of wider communication. However, out of the 2632 languages spoken by 641 million people in SSA, only 13 % of the population access education through their mother tongues (UNDP, 2004). In addition, 22 out of the 39 countries in SSA still use, as medium of instruction (MoI), the language of the former colonial entities (Komarek, 1997), while none uses an African indigenous language for instruction at the university level (Adegbija, 1994). Studies further show that countries that record high dropout rates in early grades are likely to be those with large numbers of languages and a language policy that insists on the exclusive use of a language of instruction unfamiliar to the learners (see for example Save the Children, 2009). In a recent UNESCO study, the language of instruction was found to account for more than 50% of the dropout rate in 26 countries amongst children who did not speak the language of instruction (UNESCO, 2008). This indicates a sutained neglect of learners' first languages in education despite the disadvantages associated with such neglect.

Some of the reasons cited for not implementing multilingual education programmes that support the use of learners' L1s in schools include lack of instructional materials for the different MTs (Bamgbose, 1991; Baker, 1998; Kamwendo, 2000; Stroud, 2001; Baker, 2001); teachers not trained to teach in the MT (Ogechi, 2003; UNESCO, 2003; Muthwii, 2004; Graham, 2009; Jones, 2010), negative attitudes towards the MTs (Bamgbose, 1991; Baker, 1998; Kamwendo, 2000; UNESCO, 2003; Musau, 2004; Muthwii & Kioko, 2004); lack of appropriate terminology in the MTs for educational purposes (Smolicz, 1986; Baker, 1998; Bunyi, 1999; UNESCO, 2003; Bamgbose, 2004); and multiple languages (linguistic diversity) amongst the learners in the classrooms (Rogers, 2004; Kyeyune, 2004; Bamgbose, 2004; Tembe & Norton, 2008; Graham, 2009). These are elaborated in a later section of this chapter (see section 1.5).

In Kenya, studies conducted have amplified the above difficulties in the implementation of the language-in-education policy (see for example Abagi & Cleghorn, 1990; Bunyi, 1999; Muthwii, 2002; Musau, 2003; Ogechi, 2003; Muthwii, 2004; Graham, 2009; Kembo Sure & Ogechi, 2009; Jones, 2010; Jones & Barkhuizen, 2011). Muthwii (2002), for example,

established a direct correlation between stakeholders' interpretation of the language-in-education policy and the availability of teaching/learning materials. Graham (2009) found that although many stakeholders may not be opposed to the language-in-education policy especially the support for the MT, its implementation was being hampered by a number of factors amongst them lack of MT materials, lack of adequately trained teachers, negative attitudes towards the MTs amongst others, as discussed in the preceding paragraphs. Jones and Barkhuizen (2011) study identifies learner composition and hence linguistic diversity as one of the sources of tension for teachers in the implementation of the language-in-education policy amongst the Sabaot teachers they studied.

Whereas many studies have been done and solutions suggested on the identified difficulties of implementing the language-in-education policy, there is a dearth of research relating to managing linguistic diversity in multilingual classroom settings especially in the African resource-poor contexts. Two studies have been carried out in South Africa (Plüddemann et al., 2000) and Bloch (1998), which have looked specifically at teaching/learning in multilingual classrooms, and particularly in early grades, which are the focus of this study. The one study in Kenya that has made an attempt at documenting teachers' coping strategies in multilingual classrooms is by Jones and Barkhuizen (2011). However, since teachers' strategies were not a central focus in their study, these authors only identify code switching as one of the communicative devices which the Sabaot teachers studied used in an effort to become more inclusive in linguistically diverse classrooms. This testifies to the paucity of research on the goings-on in linguistically diverse classrooms in the African contexts. It is this dearth that this research seeks to address as managing linguistic diversity is at its core.

## 1.2    STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In Kenya, at least 60 languages are spoken (Lewis, 2009). The language-in-education policy favours an early-exit transitional bilingual education programme where the mother tongue is used as the MoI for the first three years of schooling (Republic of Kenya, ROK, 1976). For educational purposes, "mother tongue" (MT) has been defined as the "first language that a child learns to express himself/herself in or the language of the school's catchment area" (Kenya Institute of Education, KIE, 2002:150). The language-in-education policy states that the MT should be used as the MoI from Standard 1 to 3, after which English takes over as the MoI from Standard 4 onwards. English, the MT (see definitions of key terms for how this term is used in the Kenyan educational context) and Kiswahili should be taught as subjects in those initial three years, after which the MT

is completely dropped from the curriculum. It is worth noting here that the policy does not make any specific mention of any of the Kenyan indigenous languages but rather uses the umbrella term "mother tongue". This may explain how some language choices are made regarding MT in the actual classrooms.

Although this policy has been in effect since 1976, it has yet to be implemented in many parts of the country and especially in linguistically heterogeneous classrooms. Many schools have shunned the teaching of and in the MT citing as motivation the challenges posed by linguistic diversity in the classrooms (see for example Nyaga, 2005; Jones, 2010). The primary interest of this study is in multilingual education situations where teachers in linguistically diverse classrooms are faced with the dilemma of deciding what languages to teach or teach in, even when the language-in-education policy is in favour of using the MT of the learners. Often teachers may have to instruct minority learners whose languages they may not speak. Teachers may also have to instruct linguistically diverse learners whose languages they (teachers) may speak, but they are not sufficiently equipped with skills on how to deal with all the languages represented in the classrooms. In a recent study on stakeholders' perceptions of the implementation of the language-in-education policy amongst the Pokomo people (a minority language community on the Kenyan coast), Graham (2009) listed linguistic diversity as one of the top concerns held strongly by the stakeholders, that is, which language to use as the MT or MoI in a situation where classes comprise children from different language communities. There is need for an in-depth understanding of how teachers manage linguistic diversity in their classrooms and what informs their decisions as this could illuminate current practice in the development of language and literacy skills and inform future practices in multilingual classrooms.

## 1.3    RESEARCH QUESTION, AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

### 1.3.1   Research Question

This study will seek to answer the following primary and overarching research question: How are the attitudes, skills and strategies of teachers articulated and implemented in their handling of linguistic diversity in language and literacy development amongst year one learners in different kinds of multilingual classrooms in Kenyan primary schools?

### 1.3.2  Research Aims

This study aims to examine teachers' attitudes, skills and strategies in the management of linguistic diversity amongst year one learners in multilingual classrooms in four Kenyan primary schools. An in-depth understanding is required in order to make suggestions for the development of language and literacy skills in the MT as well as other languages of learning, and for laying the foundation of multiliteracy development in such school settings.

### 1.3.3  Research Objectives

In order to achieve the stated aim, the study will seek to meet the following research objectives:

(i)   To determine the understandings that teachers have of linguistic diversity and its effect on learning in multilingual classrooms;

(ii)  To investigate the strategies employed by teachers to accommodate linguistic diversity in multilingual classrooms;

(iii) To describe current practice in literacy and language development in multilingual classrooms;

(iv)  To identify potential barriers to language and literacy development amongst year one learners in multilingual classrooms;

(v)   To make suggestions for language and multiliteracy development in multilingual classrooms.

This study seeks to document how teachers understand the phenomenon of multilingualism in education and to assess whether teachers capitalise on its potential as an educational resource. Hornberger (2002:45), in her discussion of the *Continua of biliteracy,* points out that "what is needed is to find as many ways as possible to open up the implementational spaces for multiple languages, literacies and identities in the classroom". In this regard, a key contribution of this study is to make suggestions for opening up ideological and pedagogical spaces for multiple language and multiliteracy development in multilingual classrooms.

## 1.4    RATIONALE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

My interest in this topic developed over time following my involvement in the implementation of the language-in-education policy amongst the minority language groups in Kenya. Many studies done in multilingual educational communities refer to the resource-endowed countries of the West where there are rarely more than two languages involved. Compared to the conglomeration of languages and language dialects represented in a typical multilingual African classroom, such studies cannot easily be generalised for the African educational context. In doing this research, I wanted to learn from the teachers in the selected classrooms how exactly they went about handling the L1 dilemma in multilingual classrooms and relate this to work already done in the field of multilingual education in Africa. What is needed is improved insight into how this challenge is being addressed in actual classroom settings. Such insights, I believe, may inform how similar challenges may be addressed in other multilingual contexts with the same kinds of distribution of langauges.

Linguistic diversity is a universal phenomenon around the globe today. Multilingual classrooms have become the norm rather than the exception in many schools. Here, Kenya is no exception. This study will be significant to the teachers who are faced daily with the challenge of managing linguistic diversity in their classrooms in that it will consider and document the different strategies used in classrooms where speakers from various language communities are represented. A reflection of teachers' skills, attitudes and strategies in their management of linguistic diversity in multilingual classrooms, can inform the training of teachers for such teaching environments. Further, illuminating teachers' skills and attitudes may inform education policy as well as curriculum decisions for teacher education.

Recently, Kenya has been ranked in the 'highest risk' category together with countries such as Afghanistan, Benin, Bosnia, Mozambique, Nepal, Democratic Republic of Congo to mention a few. According to the analysis conducted by Save the Children in 2009, these countries are at the "greatest risk of negative consequences if they did not take more action to make it possible for children to learn in languages which they use and understand" (Pinnock et al., 2011:10). The findings of and recommendations from this study could contribute towards the actions that the Kenyan government and specifically the Ministry of Education may need to take towards alleviating the negative consequences, that could result from continued use of languages that learners do not understand especially in multilingual classrooms. The aim

eventually is to assure the development of language and literacy skills for all learners, regardless of their particular linguistic backgrounds and identity.

## 1.5     BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

To motivate the particular research question and the objectives given above, this section will give some general background on linguistic diversity in multilingual educational settings required to understand the approach chosen for this study.

### 1.5.1     Multilingual Education perspectives globally

In the declaration referred to earlier, UNESCO (1953) recommends that on educational grounds, that pupils should begin their schooling through the medium of their MT because they understand it best and because beginning their school life in a familiar language would facilitate smooth transition between home and school on the one hand. On the other hand, they propose, the MT be extended to as late a stage in education as possible. Fifty years later, UNESCO published another position paper, in which they reiterated their 1953 adage on the importance of teaching children in their first language when they begin school and extending it to as late a stage in education as possible (see UNESCO, 2003). In this position paper, UNESCO acknowledges its strong commitment to support cultural diversity and its recognition of education as both a tool and a reflection of this diversity. The document also seeks to clarify some of the key concepts and issues surrounding the debate on the use of languages in education.

Following UNESCO, other international agencies such as Save the Children have also published position papers on the role of learners' L1s in not only improving the quality of education but also in the realisation of Education for All (EFA) goals (see for example Save the Children 2007; 2009). Based on evidence from research around the world (see for example, Thomas & Collier, 1997; Williams, 1998; Dutcher, 2004), these position papers emphasise not only the benefits of education in the L1s of the learners but also acknowledge the challenges that are involved in the implementation of language-in-education policies that favour the use of learners home languages and suggest how the challenges can be overcome. The need for multilingual policies in education in a multilingual situation is self-evident in different frameworks and declarations. The EFA *Dakar Framework for Action* for example, identifies language as a possible barrier to access to schooling. It suggests the use of local languages as a key component in determining the quality and relevance of learning and

therefore recommends bilingual education for ethnic minorities and respect of their linguistic identities (UNESCO, 2000). The United Nations' Literacy decade (UNLD, 2003-2012) gives further emphasis to language issues as part of literacy policy formulation, programme design, capacity-building and research, in the context of enhancing relevance and community participation (Robinson, 2004:44). The Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (DESD, 2005-2014) echoes the EFA view of language not only as an important aspect of cultural diversity but also a means of expressing local knowledge and a factor in relevant and effective learning. UNESCO's unwavering endorsement of the use of local languages in education is clearly re-articulated in the 2003 position paper, in which three principles of multilingual education stand out (UNESCO, 2003).

These declarations and position papers concur with international agreements such as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 1966, which outlines the right of persons belonging to minorities to use their own language; and the International Labour Organisation (ILO) Convention on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of 1989, Article 28, which states that, wherever practicable, children are to be taught to read and write in their home language or in the language most commonly used by the group to which they belong (ILO, 1989). Article 28 also states that adequate measures should be taken to ensure that these children from indigenous and tribal communities are afforded the opportunity to attain fluency in either the national language or in one of the official languages of the country (ILO, 1989).

The global debate around multilingualism in education does not only concern itself with whether the MT should be used for early literacy or not, but also with the interpretation of research findings where conflicting paradigms have lingered for a long time. Researchers, politicians and/or language planners "come to diametrically opposing conclusions on the basis of the same research results" (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1986:153). In her discussion of the debate, Skutnabb-Kangas simply characterises the two sides of the debate as proponents and opponents of the mothe tongue education (MTE) for minority language children. She argues that the practical recommendations made by the proponents are different from those of the opponents with each claiming that their recommendations are based on research and each rejecting the findings of the other. This is presumably because different recommendations are needed for different contexts because even the same approaches can have different results depending on the context.

The case internationally is indeed as Robinson (2004:45) summarises it, that:

> *Issues of language, while acknowledged on paper as important, are not therefore thought through with respect to how international initiatives may be realised. Arguments are often accepted in principle, but the implications for ways of doing education and development are not elaborated, perhaps because they are so far-reaching.*

### 1.5.2 Multilingual Education perspectives in Africa

Like in the global arena, the use of African languages in African education systems rages on. It is indeed the case, as Heugh (2006:57-8) points out that, on the one hand, there is consensus on the need for continued development and use of African languages in African education systems and for improved simultaneous provision and teaching of international languages of wider communication (ILWCs). On the other hand, there is lack of consensus on the point at which the medium of instruction (MoI) changes from MT to an international language of wider communication (ILWC); whether the change in MoI is necessary at all if the ILWCs are taught effectively; and whether it is possible to use both MT and ILWC throughout the school system as complimentary MoIs.

The focus of European ex-colonial languages (English, French, Portuguese and Spanish) is a primary characteristic of the education systems in SSA (Alexander, 2003; Wolff, 2003; Kioko et al., 2008). Studies by different scholars on people's perceptions of English reveal that most communities equate this language to education and cannot perceive of education in any other language (see for example Arthur, 1997; Muthwii, 2004; Openjuru, 2005; Williams, 2006; Tembe & Norton, 2008). Openjuru's study, for example, in a rural community in Uganda, reveals that English is perceived as the language of literacy and literacy is generally identified with schooling (Openjuru, 2005). Muthwii's study of the Kalenjin community in Kenya on their perceptions on languages of instruction reveals that learners prefer English because the examinations and school textbooks are in English, while parents prefer English because they felt that children would not take education seriously if it were offered in their MT (Muthwii, 2004). It is generally true that English, like other ex-colonial languages in SSA, have co-existed with African indigenous languages in a diglossic relationship where the ex-colonial languages are taken as the H languages while African languages are the L languages (Kamwangamalu, 2010). This signals a preference for the 'H' languages over the 'L' languages, especially in formal language use domains.

Although colonialism is largely blamed for the dominance of European languages in education systems in Africa, it is important to note that even in a country like Ethiopia which was not colonised, had its own writing system and a long literacy tradition, Western schooling was introduced as "a solution to the failure of Ethiopian indigenous education system to produce elites fit to the modern bureaucracy and literacy" (Mekonnen, 2005:12). In Kenya, despite having a language-in-education policy and a constitution that supports the promotion of autochthonous languages and cultures, English is being seen as the *sine quo non* for national cohesion and integration. This is confirmed in the recently gazetted bill on indigenous languages discussed later in this chapter (see section 1.5.3).

Studies have shown that countries that record high dropout rates in early grades are likely to be those with large numbers of local languages and a language policy that insists on the exclusive use of a language not understood by learners in education (Save the Children, 2009). According to Shaeffer (2009:vi), children who enrol in school but are unable to understand much of what the teacher is saying or cannot read easily what has to be read, drop out. In 1998, the South African Consortium for Monitoring Education Quality (SACMEQ) carried out a study in Kenya and Zimbabwe, to measure the level of mastery of English reading in the 1998 Standard 6 pupils. Considering two levels of mastery (minimum and adequate) found that 75% of learners in Kenya and 66% of those in Zimbabwe failed to achieve the minimum mastery level required for learning in English in Standard 7 (Makau, 2001:12). A similar study done in Uganda among Standard 6 learners in 1999 on their mastery of reading and writing concluded that 98% of the learners fail to achieve the advanced mastery level in English required for access to further education (ibid).

Heugh (2011) with reference to the work of Mothibele (2005) discusses another study, SACMEQ II, conducted between 2000 and 2002, which showed that 44% of learners in 14 countries in Southern and East Africa achieve the minimum level of literacy by Standard six. The study further showed that only 14.6% of the learners achieve national standards for literacy by Standard six. Arguably, most international literacy assessments concentrate on literacy in the LWCs. Thus tests are skewed against those who speak multiple languages and may be literate in other languages or varieties or may even engage in different literacy practices from those included in the measurement scales. However, these statistics highlight the inadequacy of

LWCs in the development of literacy skills among all learners. Languages that are familiar to the learners are likely to achieve better results.

### 1.5.3 Multilingual Education perspectives in Kenya

In Kenya, the debate on languages in education revolves around the use of the MTs, the teaching of Kiswahili (the national language) and the timing of introduction of English (the official language) as the MoI (see definitions fo key terms for how the term "mother tongue" is used in the Kenyan educational context). On the one hand, there are those who are drumming up support for Kiswahili as the unifying official language (as entrenched in the constitution), while others are calling for its scrapping from being a compulsory subject in schools in favour of English as the language of education and advancement. On the other hand, tribalism in Kenya has been redefined and related specifically to speaking one's indigenous/ethnic language; people are branded 'tribalists' on account of speaking their MTs. In the school system although the language-in-education policy is in favour of using the learners' L1s as MoIs, which presupposes teaching them also as subjects of instruction, learning mostly takes place in a different language to the L1s of the learners represented in a classroom.

Another marked dimension in the Kenyan debate on languages in education has to do with the dominance of English, which to Kembo Sure and Ogechi (2009:6) is a "mere continuation of the old colonial arrangement with all the attendant social, economic and political inequalities". English dominates not only in the education system as a MoI but also as the lingua franca in most other formal language use domains since it is the official language (see section 2.6.5 for a detailed discussion).

The debate around language took an even sharper turn in the course of this inquiry. In June 2011, a bill was debated and passed in parliament and later published in the Kenyan gazette, calling for the banning of the use of MTs (Kenyan indigenous languages) in the public offices (Daily Nation, June 8, 2011). This, it was argued, would bring national cohesion. The use of MTs was seen to be a threat to national unity and an impediment to patriotism. According to the draft bill, it would be acceptable for those who have learnt other languages, like French or Chinese, to speak these in the offices even if they are not understood by their colleagues. However, this draft bill would see Kenyans serve jail terms for speaking their 'tribal' languages in public offices. Such legislation would isolate Kenyan indigenous languages

effectively banning their use in most language use domains and relegating them to the family front only. Needless to say, the possibilities of multilingual education in such situations would be extremely grim. Those championing the use of indigenous languages in education would be faced with an uphill task, that of undoing what ill-conceived legislation has imposed.

Notwithstanding such legislative movements, the pedagogical imperative of mother tongue-based multilingual education (MTBMLE) remains. Priority should go to learning that is maximally facilitated by using a familiar language. The multilingual nature of the multilingual education (MLE) pedagogy allows learning objectives to be tailored for a multilingual classroom environment and teachers who are adequately trained for multilingual teaching. This assures the strong and positive impact of using a familiar language for literacy acquisition, which is a reliable indicator of learning achievement and crucial to long term school success (see for example Kioko et al., 2008). For Bamgbose (1991), learners' MTs are an asset that if appropriately recognised in education would provide a sound foundation for learning and the development of knowledge.

Adger (2001:503) points out that the fabric of schooling is, to a large extent, woven of linguistic interaction. In a similar vein, UNESCO (2010) considers language and communication as the two most important factors in the learning process. In the 2005 global monitoring report on Education for All, UNESCO (2005:160) delineates that "the choice of language of instruction and language policy in schools is critical to effective learning" in multilingual societies. In their report on the quality of education in the African continent, the Association for the Development of African Languages in Education (ADEA) identifies language as the strongest determinant of quality of education (ADEA, 2004). Lincoln (2003:163) asserts, that "if education is the key to the future, then language is the vehicle to that future". Given this centrality of language in education, the responsibility of language planners and educators should therefore be that of seeing to it that both majorities and minorities in a country have access to education through enabling and empowering language practices (Lincoln, 2003).

### 1.5.4   Language problems in education

In the introduction for his edited volume, Spolsky (1986:1) has emphasised that the potential conflict when the home languages are dissimilar to the languages used as MoIs is a universal phenomenon. He specifically points out that this is characteristic of challenges in all multilingual educational settings. This problem is amplified by the fact that it is not always

clearly recognised (ibid). Spolsky (1986:1) further observes that proposals for the promotion of effective teaching through the various kinds of MLE are dependent on understanding the underlying problem of languages in education in multilingual settings and representing the various analyses of the best ways in which it can be resolved. This study is intended to deepen the understanding of language use and choices in Kenyan multilingual primary school classrooms in terms of how teachers' perceive linguistic diversity in their classrooms, how they respond to such diversity, how equipped they are in dealing with diverse learners and what is being done and/or needs to be done to make the classrooms more accommodative and inclusive linguistically.

### 1.5.5   Linguistic diversity

The linguistic landscapes in many countries have changed over the years owing to migratory and mass scale movement and settlement of people in different parts of the same country or in a different country. Consequently, more than before individuals are confronted with cultural and linguistic diversity as the world becomes increasingly smaller in a global village (Ng, 2006:159). Indeed, multilingual situations and challenges have been shown to be prevalent even amongst people speaking the same language and dialect but using differing vocabulary depending on gender (see for example Gomes de Matos, 1989). It is for example, estimated that amongst the Karaja community in Brazil, "at least 30% of words in women's speech are different and slightly modified from men's speech" (Gomes de Matos, 1989:21).

In the education domain, Edwards (1982:27) observes that "schools represent the single most important point of contact between speakers of different language varieties". Concurring with Edwards, Goldstein (2003:xiv) observes that, "the impact of growing cultural and linguistic diversity is nowhere more visible than in [our] schools". However, despite the multilingual nature of most countries of the world and the resulting linguistic diversity in classrooms, language-in-education policies seldom reflect this diversity. This is evident in the preference for LWCs/ILWCs in education over indigenous languages, while citing difference reasons for the choices made.

### 1.5.6   Reasons for not using learners' first languages in education

Save the Children (2009:vii) observes that  "a major cause of education failure for many children is the use, in school, of a language that children are not familiar with". A wide variety of reasons have been cited for not implementing  MLE programmes that support the use of learners' L1s in

schools. One of the most commonly cited reasons is the lack of instructional materials for the different MTs (see for example Bamgbose, 1991; Baker, 1998; Kamwendo, 2000; Stroud, 2001; Baker, 2001; UNESCO, 2003; Musau, 2004; Muthwii & Kioko, 2004; Rogers, 2004; Graham, 2009), resulting from the fact that most languages have not yet been developed into a written form (see for example Bamgbose, 1991; UNESCO, 2003). Many commercial publishers are not willing to publish MT materials as they doubt the profitability of such endeavours.

Another commonly cited reason is the lack of appropriately trained teachers to teach in the MTs (see for example Bamgbose, 1991; Bunyi, 1997; Baker, 1998; Kamwendo, 2000; Stroud, 2001; Baker, 2001; Musau, 2003; Ogechi, 2003; UNESCO, 2003; Muthwii, 2004b; Graham, 2009; Jones, 2010). This happens because most teacher training colleges (TTCs) do not provide for the teaching of MTs in the teacher preparation curriculum. As Bamgbose (1991:79) points out, the methodology of teaching L1 is often neglected in teacher education with the assumption that if one can speak a language, one should also be able to teach it. A similar observation is made on Kenya by Bunyi (1997) that teacher training offers language methodology courses only for English and Kiswahili but not the indigenous languages. Another scenario that amplifies the lack of trained teachers is the policy on teacher deployment which in many countries (such as Zambia and Kenya) where teachers can be posted to any region in the country where there is a need and not necessarily their home areas. This creates a situation where teachers are posted in areas where they are unable to  teach the local community language used in the schools they are teaching in (see for example Bamgbose, 1991; Stroud, 2001).

A third reason for using LWCs/ILWCs rather than learners' L1s has to do with resistance from students, parents and even teachers (see for example Bamgbose, 1991; Baker, 1998; Kamwendo, 2000; Baker, 2001; UNESCO, 2003; Musau, 2004; Muthwii & Kioko, 2004). This results from the negative attitudes that communities may have formed towards the use of MTs in education, where MTs are seen as limiting upward mobility and employment opportunities. The prevalent negative attitudes towards African languages in education owing to the hegemony of English and other ILWCs need not be overemphasised. In many African nations, English is synonymous with education and thus parents want their children to speak English from their first day in school as that would be proof that learning is taking place (see for example Williams, 2006; Tembe & Norton, 2008; Kioko et al., 2008). For others, English "represents progress" (Tembe & Norton, 2008:44), and is, to borrow the words of Rubagumya (1994:156), "associated with everything positive". Also, in many countries, MTE is transitory

in that it is only used in the first few years of school and is not even examined at the end of the primary school course. People thus tend to undervalue the MTs, to concentrate on the ILWCs. Although this claim has been refuted in ADEA (2005) in the recent stock-taking of MT use in African countries, there is some truth in it as reported in the above referenced work (see for example Bamgbose, 1991; Baker, 1998; Kamwendo, 2000; Baker, 2001; UNESCO, 2003; Musau, 2004; Muthwii & Kioko, 2004).

Negative attitudes could also result from past practices where speaking the MT was banned in schools and children would be punished for speaking their L1s in school. Roy-Campbell (2006) gives an example of such negative attitude towards the use of African languages in education in South Africa (SA) even after 9 of these languages were declared national languages. She finds that such denial of the value of African languages is related to continued association with the Bantu education experience in the apartheid regime. She further observes that "the policy of racial segregation sought to give Africans a mediocre education by circumscribing to the development of their languages thereby providing through them only the knowledge the apartheid regime wanted them to have access to" (Roy-Campbell, 2006:2). This past experience could be the very reason why the language-in-education policy has not taken root in South Africa, as the speakers of African languages "associate mother tongue instruction with the effort to confine them in a linguistic prison" (Roy-Campbell, 2006:2). Echoing these same sentiments, Hornberger (2002:40) observes that the hegemony of English in South Africa is compounded by "the heritage of the apartheid education which left in its wake a deep suspicion for mother tongue education". Desai (2010:103) finds that colonialism and apartheid in South Africa have led to a negative image of African languages in education where they are associated with inequality and segregation. These remarks reveal a deep seated attitudinal predisposition against education in African languages particularly in the South African context.

Other experiences which could have led to the negative attitudes towards indigenous languages have to do with the false premise that in order for children to learn the second language better, it has to be introduced as MoI from the start (Fasold, 1984), that is "earlier means better" (Bamgbose, 2004:5). Based on this premise, schools may even forbid children from speaking their MTs on the school grounds (see for example Fasold, 1984; Ngugi wa Thiong'o, 1986; Kobia, 2007). Examples of such systems include the Welsh-not used in Wales, where Welsh-speaking children were forbidden to speak their language at school (Baker, 2001), the ban of the use of Gaelic in the Scottish highlands in favour of English (Fasold, 1984), the 'no-Spanish

spoken here' in the USA (Snow, 1990:64), the use of the disk or monitor in Kenya (Ngugi wa Thiong'o, 1986), and the sheltering of English in Tanzanian schools where learners are punished for speaking Kiswahili or vernacular languages but not for speaking English even if it was in a domain where they should have been speaking a language other than English (Rubagumya, 1991).

In the examples given above, children are not allowed to speak the MTs at school. In Kenya for example, each class is given a disk to help monitor all those who speak the 'forbidden' language. The disk is passed on from one pupil to another and at the end of the school day, the teacher tracks all those who held the disk and they are punished for having spoken the 'forbidden' language in the school (Ngugi wa Thiong'o, 1986). Such traumatic experiences are continued when these students become teachers and are in turn unwilling to teach the native languages.

In a similar vein, Stroud (2001:43) notes that the "emphasis of metropolitan languages [LWCs] as languages of instruction at higher levels may negatively influence the attitudes towards the use of local languages at the lower levels". It would, for example, take a lot of effort and convincing to help people (teachers/parents) to see the value of teaching a language which will be dropped from the curriculum quite soon. Commonsense says that it is better to concentrate on the languages used at higher levels, which are also the languages of examinations. It is reported that Kiswahili in Kenya suffered a similar blow (of not being taken seriously by teachers) until it was made an examinable subject at the end of school like other subjects (Musau, 2004:61). Hornberger (2002:40) observes that "the challenge of popular demand for the society language of power ... [one seen to give access to socioeconomic mobility and power] ... is a very real one in contexts all over the world, one that cannot be lightly be dismissed". This study is interested in what teachers do with the multiplicity of languages in their classrooms in a society riddled with such hegemony of an ILWC over indigenous languages.

The lack of appropriate terminology in the MTs for educational purposes (see for example Smolicz, 1986; Bamgbose, 1991; Baker, 1998; Bunyi, 1999; Stroud, 2001; Ogechi, 2003; UNESCO, 2003; Bamgbose, 2004) has also been commonly cited as hindering the implementation of MTBMLE. This may happen, if the language has had no or a short literacy tradition. It could also result from the negative attitudes where people do not see the benefits of developing the MTs and prefer the use of the ILWCs. Smolicz (1986:107), for example, discusses the non-teaching of Cebuano, one of the autochthonous languages in the Philippines, because teachers doubted the "maturity of their home language as a literary language and their

sense of its inadequacy in the learning situation". He finds this to be a consequence of the long period of subordination to the Spanish language in not only education but also administration (1565-1898), and the subsequent imposition of English as the literary language of the Philippines.

A fifth reason has to do with the multiplicity of languages (linguistic diversity) among learners in the classrooms (see for example Bamgbose, 1991; UNESCO, 2003; Muthwii & Kioko, 2004; Rogers, 2004; Kyeyune, 2004; Bamgbose, 2004; Tembe & Norton, 2008; Save the Children, 2009; Graham, 2009). Save the Children (2009:3) for example, points out that "the linguistic diversity of many countries can make educators or policy makers feel it is simpler to have one or two languages in education". UNESCO (2010:8) further observes that linguistic diversity in Africa is perceived as an "inherent problem in matters of communication, governance and education". This coupled with the negative attitudes towards African languages in general results in preferences for ILWCs over indigenous languages in most formal language use domains including education.

## 1.6    OVERVIEW OF RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

The phenomenon under investigation here required in-depth exploration. A qualitative approach was therefore adopted because it allows the collection of rich data in natural settings (such as the classrooms). In turn, this allows the explororation of "the understandings, experiences and imagining of research participants" (Mason, 2002:2). Case study was employed as the research design where four cases were selected purposively and from which data was collected through direct classroom observation, interviews with teachers and documents' analysis. Data was analysed following the analysis procedures of qualitative content analysis (Henning 2010:104). Ethical considerations were adhered to throughout the planning, data collection, data analysis and the writing up of the research report (see chapter 4 for an elaborate exposition of the research methodology).

## 1.7    STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS

The present chapter explains the phenomenon being investigated in the study. The chapter has also given the rationale for the study as well as a detailed background to the study and a brief overview of the research design and methods employed in its execution. Chapter two provides a review of literature relating to language planning and language policy, the sociolinguistic field in which this interdisciplinary study is anchored. Language planning orientations and ideologies as well as mechanisms for controlling language behaviours and

perpetuating these ideologies are discussed. Chapter three discusses research pertaining to teaching and learning in linguistically diverse classrooms in relation to language-in-education policy implementation practices in multilingual classroom environments. Chapter four outlines the research paradigms, research approach and design, methods of data collection and analysis as well as the justifications for the choices made. In chapter five, I present the data and interpretation relating to objective one on teachers' understandings of and attitudes towards linguistic diversity in their classrooms while in chapter six I present and discuss the findings relating to objective two on the responses of teachers to linguistic diversity. Chapter seven, a description of current practices in and barriers to the development of literacy and language skills in multilingual classrooms as relates to objective three and four is presented. A summary of findings, the conclusions made from the preceding arguments and the recommendations for language and multiliteracy development in multilingual classrooms form the eighth and final chapter of this thesis.

In line with the structure outlined in the preceding paragraph, the next chapter discusses issues relating to language planning and language policy as preamble to language-in-education policy implementation in multilingual classrooms.

# CHAPTER 2

# LANGUAGE PLANNING
# AND LANGUAGE POLICY

**INTRODUCTION**

The preceding chapter has explained the problem being investigated in this study. Also discussed in the chapter are the research question, the aims and the objectives for undertaking this study as well as the rationale for the study. The chapter has also given an overview of the research design and methods adopted in the study before closing with how the thesis has been organised. The current chapter focuses on language planning and language policy as preamble to language-in-education policy implementation in actual classrooms, which is the focus of this investigation in multilingual Kenyan primary schools. I introduce Ruíz's language planning orientation model, which provides important in-roads into understanding how decisions on language use are made at both the macro and micro levels in society. Given the wide scope of language planning and language policy as a field of study, the current chapter focuses on the initial procedures leading to policy development. The next chapter will focus on the processes of the actual policy implementation giving special emphasis to language-in-education policy implementation particularly in linguistically diverse classrooms.

**2.1    LANGUAGE PLANNING**

Wright (2004) observes that even though it is a relatively recent development in terms of human history, language planning and consequently language policy making has existed as an informal activity as long as the languages themselves have. Thus, language planning has existed for as long as multilingual societies have. The presence of more than one language in a community presupposes language choices with regard to when one language is used and not the other and with whom. However, according to Wright (2004), language planning and policy as an academic subject of inquiry dates back to the age of nationalism in the 18th and 19th centuries when language was viewed as an integral part of nation building.

### 2.1.1 Definitions of language planning

Language planning has been defined in various ways by different scholars. I highlight a few definitions with the aim of identifying some commonalities amongst them, as the basis for understanding the ideologies and orientations behind such definitions. Christian (1988:197) defines language planning as "an explicit systematic effort to resolve (perceived) language problems and achieve related goals through institutionally organised interventions in the use and usage of language or language varieties".

Cooper (1989:45) sees language planning as referring to the "deliberate efforts to influence the behaviour of others with respect to acquisition, structure or functional allocation of language codes", while for Wardhaugh (2007:357), language planning is "an attempt to interfere deliberately with a language or one of its varieties". Implicit in these two definitions is Wardhaugh's notion of language planning as man's intervention into the natural processes of language change (ibid).

A terse definition of language planning is by Fishman (1973:23-4) who sees it as "an organised pursuit of solutions to language problems, typically at the national level". Fishman goes further to identify four types of language planning problems linked to specific language planning processes. These include code selection which is linked to policy formulation process in language planning, management of regional or sociolinguistic variability linked to stabilisation and codification, addition of new functions to a code linked to the process of elaboration, and the development of functional differentiation between varieties linked to cultivation.

Tollefson (1991:16) defines language planning as "all conscious efforts to affect the structure or functions of language varieties", while Weinstein (1980:56) brings in a government dimension in his definition in which he sees language planning as "a government authorised, long term, sustained and conscious effort to alter a language's function in a society for the purposes of solving communication problems". Implicit in Weinstein's definition is the idea that language planning is a top-down activity.

One feature that is common to all these definitions is the fact that they all see language planning as an organised and conscious effort. Regardless of who is involved, language planning has to be an organised and deliberate effort to address issues relating to language use in multilingual society. The use of the word 'effort' in the definitions by Christian, Cooper

and Tollefson and 'pursuit' in that of Fishman may also imply that language planning is not a conclusive process. It is an on-going process that may require revision and rethinking at any stage in the formulation and the implementation of policies resulting from such planning, a notion that is also captured with the use of the word 'long term' in Weinstein's definition. It also emerges from these definitions that language planning affects different languages in different ways. This is because a language functions differently in any particular domain. For example, a decision to assign one language in a particular domain or make a language or a language variety the official language of a country means that other languages or language varieties may not be used in the domains served by that official language in the country.

## 2.1.2   Types of language planning

Language planners engage in different kinds of activities towards the realisation of language planning goals. These activities are aimed at bringing about the desired change to the languages involved such as their linguistic codes, statuses, spread, usage, image, prestige, and/or influence on people's language behaviours. Based on their goals, the different activities result in different types of language planning.

### 2.1.2.1 Status planning

Status planning has to do with modifications of language function in a society (Kloss, 1969). It incorporates decisions made by a society concerning the roles given to a language should perform in a country (Bamgbose, 1991) or the functions allocated to it (Fishman, 1980). It may also involve making decisions regarding the designation of languages for particular purposes in society (Dogancay-Aktuna, 1997; Wright, 2004), namely official, national, or local purposes (Bamgbose, 1991), "in particular the medium of its institutions" (Wright 2004:43), including the language of instruction (LoI) in schools (Bamgbose, 1991; Wiley, 1996). Status planning is also concerned with the procedures for the implementation of language policies through the mass media and education (Dogancay-Aktuna, 1997).

### 2.1.2.2 Corpus planning

Corpus planning has to do with the steps taken to ensure that a language, that is, its structure, spelling, vocabulary, etc, is modified to conform to the demands made of it by its functions (Bamgbose, 1991). Corpus planning thus involves the modification of the structure of a language (Kloss, 1969). It entails making linguistic decisions concerning the codification and elaboration of a language. According to Cooper (1989), corpus planning has three elements,

namely, harmonisation, which has to do with determining the degree to which a range of varieties can be considered one language; standardisation, which selects a norm and determines its orthography as well as grammar; and elaboration or intellectualisation, which adapts the language for more abstract forms of expression like those needed for school learning. This means that through corpus planning, new forms are created, old ones modified, or selected from alternate forms in a written or spoken code (Cooper, 1989). Corpus planning results in the development of grammars, dictionaries, pronunciation and spelling guides, literacy manuals etc (Lo Bianco, 2004).

### *2.1.2.3 Acquisition planning*

Acquisition planning entails setting the goals for language in the education system that address the totality of language education such as the target languages, the attitudes to be generated, the skills developed as well as the levels of proficiency desired for each of the target languages (Ingram, 1989). Acquisition planning also includes literacy development, minority language development, language teaching, learning in a second language or foreign language, bilingual education and mother tongue education (Jones, 2010).

Language planning orientations play a key role in how decisions of language use are made in a given multilingual society.

## 2.2     LANGUAGE PLANNING ORIENTATIONS MODEL

The language planning orientations model was developed by Ruíz in 1984. The model, whose primary intent is the "promotion of cultural democracy and social justice" (Ruíz, 2010:167), is relevant for this study because it accounts for the role that attitudes play "towards language and its role, and towards languages and their roles in society" (Ruíz, 1984:16), and it's usability in understanding language use and choices in multilingual contexts. According to Ruíz, these dispositions/attitudes may be "pre-rational and unconscious" (ibid). He argues that "orientations are related to language attitudes in that they constitute the framework in which attitudes are formed, [...] and determine what is thinkable about language in society" (Ruíz, 2004:16). He finds that orientations are of two kinds: normative (evaluative) and descriptive (have a particular view of language itself). The three language orientations are language as a problem, language as a right and language as a resource, whose discussion follows.

## 2.2.1    Language as a problem

This orientation sees local languages as problems standing in the way of assimilating cultural and linguistic minority groups in society into the dominant culture and language. It also links language issues with other social problems that characterise such groups such as poverty, low educational achievement, little or lack of social mobility among others (see for example Ruíz, 1984; Hornberger & Ricento, 1996), hence treating language as an underlying problem. This linkage of social problems with language issues often results in misdiagnosis when it comes to formulating language policies in response to minority language needs as shall be discussed in the next chapter of this thesis (see section 3.1).

Some definitions of language planning also reflect the language as problem orientation. For example, the definitions by Christian and Fishman already discussed in the preceding sections see language planning as "an explicit systematic effort to resolve (perceived) language problems [...]" (Christian, 1988:197) and "an organised pursuit of solutions to language problems" (Fishman, 1973:23-4). Such definitions carry within them the notion that linguistic diversity is a problem that demands careful management and possibly containment. It would therefore not be surprising to find that language planners that begin from definitions such as these will already have taken the stance that their language planning efforts are aimed at finding solutions to the problem that is language.

This same view of language as a problem is perpetuated by language planners through the standard language ideology. With reference to the work of Khubchandani, Stroud (2001:20) observes that such language planners "tend to tame linguistic diversity and variety by imposing standard grammars and single styles of language use". Stroud finds that such imposition disregards the "flux and multivalence inherent in grassroots multilingualism" (ibid). As a study investigating how multilingualism is managed in education, this study considers whether linguistic diversity could be said to be "tamed", to borrow the word from Stroud (2001:20), or allowed some space to flourish in educational settings, that is, the classrooms observed in this study.

One of the explanation given for the preponderance of language as a problem orientation is the socio-historical context of multilingual societies (see for example Ruíz, 1984; Hornberger & Ricento, 1996). Thus, under this orientation, multilingualism is viewed as a threat to cohesiveness in society, the same notion that informs the 'one nation one language' ideology (see for example Bamgbose, 1991; Pattanayak, 1986; Hornberger, 2002). It also identifies

unity with uniformity (Fishman, 1978:43), as opposed to unity in diversity as advocated in language as a resource orientation discussed later in this chapter (see section 2.2.3 below). This implies that monolingualism in the dominant language is seen as the ideal for cohesiveness in society, a disposition that undermines diversity. However, contrary to the 'one nation one language' ideology as recipe for national unity and societal cohesiveness, Smolicz (1986:110-115) argues that it is the attempts to impose one language on all groups that is destructive and divisive. He instead argues for pluralism where the adoption of a lingua franca or official language needs not involve the rejection of minority languages. Nevertheless, as Wiley (1996) points out, when language diversity is viewed as a problem, then language shift becomes a goal for language acquisition planning.

Commenting on Africa, Bamgbose (1994:36) notes that "we seem to be obsessed with the number one". Such obsession leads to the mistaken belief that in such oneness (of language and party-referring to political party-back then), he argues, "we would achieve socio-cultural cohesion and political unity in our multiethnic, multilingual and multicultural societies" (ibid). I read in this obsession the view of linguistic diversity as problem standing in the way of political unity and socio-cultural cohesion. It therefore goes without saying, that language planning in an environment that is already hostile towards linguistic diversity may, to a great extent, be informed by the language as a problem orientation. When this happens, Pattanayak (1986) argues, doubts may be continually expressed on not only the ability of many languages to unite different ethno-linguistic groups in a country but also that of the schools to cope with multiple languages that may be represented amongst the learner population. Thus, education planners often justify their choice of one language among many with the argument that all learners and their parents can never be satisfied and therefore view this choice as both logical and practical (Pattanayak, 1986). Skutnabb-Kangas (1988) however argues that the responsibility of education should be that of advocating for the use of indigenous languages as well as offering practical strategies for the realisation of such a goal. These practical strategies for using indigenous languages in multilingual classrooms form a part of this study.

## 2.2.2 Language as a right

According to Ruíz (1984), this orientation tends to view local languages as basic human and civil rights for their speakers, and seeks affirmation of those rights for the cultural and linguistic minority group. Ruíz points out that one of the challenges with this orientation is that even an exhaustive list of language rights is impossible owing to the fact that language

touches on many aspects of social life. He finds that linguistic discrimination is tantamount to discrimination in other aspects of social life touched by language (Ruíz, 1984:22). Ruíz (2010) further argues that unless one acknowledges language as a good thing (a resource), it is impossible to affirm anyone's rights to it. This implies that language as a resource orientation is a pre-condition to language as a right orientation, in the sense that one has to recognise a language as the resource that it is before they can affirm anyone's rights to that language.

### 2.2.3   Language as a resource

A review of literature reveals that the notion of language as a resource has been part of language planning for decades (see for example Ruíz, 2010; García, 2009; Hornberger, 2002; Fishman, 1991). Ruíz (2010) discussing the work of Jernudd, observes that early conceptual work on language planning suggests that language planning is dictated by the recognition of language as a societal resource, as the starting point for such planning. García (2009) observes that as early as 1966, Fishman's work on language maintenance in the USA revolved around the idea of language as a resource.

Language as a resource orientation sees local languages as a resource for both the speakers and the society as whole, that is, a personal and national resource (Baker, 2001:373), whose importance rests on its communicative and identity values attached to it by its speakers (Ruíz, 1984). This orientation  seeks to develop languages as resources in cognisance of the fact that lack of use rather than use of such a resource leads to exhaustion (Hornberger & Ricento, 1996), which is equitable to destruction of "existing resources through mismanagement and repression" (Ruíz, 1984:26).

The language as a resource orientation lends itself to the idea that for language to have any value, it must have some sort of extrinsic utility (Ruíz, 1984), thus a language is seen to have little or no value if it does not facilitate access to social or material goods. According to Baker (2001:373), the language as a resource orientation views languages not only in terms of their "economic bridge building potential [but also] their ability to build social bridges across different groups, bridges for cross fertilization of cultures". This orientation is based on the linguistic pluralism ideology (see section 2.4.2 below) and leads to both language maintenance and language enrichment programmes (Wiley, 1996).

Lo Bianco (2001:4) asserts that "language in its widest sense can be thought of as a social and personal resource and asset". By this logic, he argues, "a society can cultivate and develop its language resource enhancing its social communication and community by ensuring that the many voices of its community can be heard" (ibid). Therefore, as Ruíz (1984:27) maintains, "a fuller development of a resources-oriented approach to language planning could help to reshape attitudes about language and language groups". Such an approach would not only begin with the assumption that "language is a resource to be managed, developed and conserved, [but also would] tend to regard language minority communities as sources of expertise" (Ruíz, 1984:28), to further the course for language learning and multilingualism in multilingual contexts.

Although these three orientations may appear to be competing, they are not incompatible. Ruíz (1984:18) finds that whereas one orientation could be desirable than another in a specific context, having a "repertoire of orientations" from which to draw could be most desirable. Ruíz (1984:28) however cautions that whereas the language as a resource orientation could "contribute to greater social cohesion and cooperation", the language as a problem offers no hope of affording such a benefit while the language as a right orientation has had mixed results. In fact, Baker (2001:373), sees the language as a resource orientation as an alternative orientation to language as a right and language as a problem.

The outcome of language planning is (but not always) the development of a language policy.

## 2.3    LANGUAGE POLICY

According to Baldauf (2005:958) a language policy refers to "a body of ideas, laws, regulations, rules and practices intended to achieve some planned language change". Language policy is therefore viewed as the "primary mechanism for manipulating and imposing language behaviours, as it relates to decisions about languages and their uses in education and society" (Shohamy 2006:47-8), whether implicitly or explicitly. Thus, through language policy, it is argued, decisions are made regarding the "preferred languages to be used, where, when and by whom" (Shohamy, 2006:48).

A distinction is made between covert and overt language policies. Shohamy uses overt language policies to refer to those language policies that are "explicit, formalised, *de jure*, codified and manifest" while covert language policies refers to those that are "implicit, informal, unstated, grassroot and latent" (Shohamy, 2006:50). These distinctions, she argues,

are used to elaborate the differences between the narrow and broader meanings of the term language policy. It should however be noted that the explicitness of a policy does not guarantee that a language policy will be implemented as there are times when language use is in opposition with stated policies. This is evident in the South African language policy, discussed later in this chapter, which even though very well elaborated in the support of functional multilingualism, monolingualism in English seems to be favoured in the implementation of the policy (see section 2.6.4 for a discussion of South Africa's language policy). In fact, Shohamy (2006) argues that often, even language planners themselves are sceptical of the extent to which a declared policy will actually be implemented. Thus, Schiffman (1996) advocates for a study of language policy that incorporates both the overtly declared policies and the covert *de facto* language policies as this would reveal the "cleavages" that occur between the two. By investigating language practices in multilingual Kenyan primary school classrooms, the current study aimed to uncover any discrepancies that may occur between language policy as stated (*de jure*) and language policy as practised (*de facto*) in the implementation process.

Shohamy further distinguishes between the "real" and "declared" language policies and contends that "the true and real language policy needs to be observed, understood and interpreted not through the declared and official documents, but rather through a variety of [...] mechanisms or policy devices that are used to influence, create and perpetuate the actual policies" (Shohamy, 2006:xxiii). Any discrepancies between both the *de jure* versus the *de facto* policies and/or the "real" versus the "declared" policies, could largely be linked to the mechanisms that have been put in place by those in authority to safe guard the ideologies that they seek to propagate and perpetuate through language. Shohamy finds that it is through such mechanisms that policy decisions are made and imposed and through them, ideology is turned into practice. Such mechanisms may include but are not limited to the following: a) language laws; b) Officiality; c) nationalisation; d) standardisation; e) language academies; f) tests; g) language in education policies. Given their direct effects and influences on *de facto* policies, a brief discussion of each of these mechanisms follows here below.

### 2.3.1   Language laws

Language laws refer to the "legal and official devices used by central authorities to perpetuate and impose language behaviours in political and social entities" (Shohamy, 2006:59). Shohamy finds that since language laws are supported by penalties and sanctions for those

who do not abide, they leave people no options but to comply or face the consequences for non-compliance. As a result, she argues, language laws become such powerful mechanisms for imposing language behaviours hence affecting language practices in both the public and private domains. These laws are manifested through avenues such as public signage, language use in education both as subjects and as MoI, and their use in public domains.

Language laws are mostly mandated through parliament. A good example is the language law banning the use of ethnic languages in public offices in Kenya, which was legislated by the parliament in the course of this study (see section 1.5.3 for discussion). Another example is the language law in Quebec, which granted preferred status to French over English, a decision which was accompanied with changes in language choices in the public domains especially in public signage (Shohamy, 2006).

### 2.3.2   Officiality

As a policy device, officiality is used to grant preferences to some language while disempowering others. Although officiality is determined by law, different entities such as schools, hospitals, prisons etc have the onus to decide which languages to use in which domains in public spaces (Shohamy, 2006). Such decisions at the entity or institutional level should however reflect the national policies. Further, Shohamy (2006) points out that officiality may be used to mean different things in different situations. She finds that in some situations, officiality may be used to mean the use of languages in the public space, while at other times, it may be used to refer to how languages are used in official documents, while at other times, it may mean how languages are used in government offices.

### 2.3.3   Standardisation

Standardisation refers to "decisions made by recognised bodies about 'the correct' ways of using language" (Shohamy, 2006:63), through the standard language ideology (Garrett, 2010). Standardisation affects language behaviour in that it imposes uniform and homogenous norms on users of language in total disregard of the fact that how people use language varies from one person to another and from one speech community to another (Shohamy, 2006), and places great emphasis on correctness (Milroy, 2007). The notion of correctness is reinforced by 'the authorities' through the codification for standard forms in dictionaries and grammar books as well as awarding prestige or stigma to language forms (Garrett, 2010). Shohamy finds that the norms imposed are often in sharp contrast to how

people ordinarily use language especially the oral varieties when compared to the imposed written forms. It has however been argued that standardisation is a "political notion with no foundation in real language use [given] the gap between spoken and written languages and the inability of many people to speak the written language" (Shohamy, 2006:65), or as Fairchild and Edwards-Evans (1990:75) view the notion of Standard English in America, "an idealized standard that masks the tremendous regional diversity even within this standard".

### 2.3.4 Nationalisation

According to Shohamy (2006), nationalisation is associated with the notion that a certain language may be seen as representing the ideology of the nation state even where officiality has been granted to other languages. Nationalisation is especially notable in situations where a number of languages have been granted officiality and playing competing or complementing roles with one another. Shohamy argues that nationalisation affects language behaviour in that once a language has been declared the national language, the speakers of that language are empowered over speakers of other languages with the resultant situation that the speakers of the national language become the "public representation of the nation-state" (Shohamy, 2006:65), so that belonging to a particular language community is equated to being a citizen of a country (ibid). The national language therefore becomes the symbol of national identity. Nationalisation can thus be said to perpetuate hegemony and power for speakers of the declared national languages and marginalisation for the speakers of the other language whether they have been granted officiality or not.

### 2.3.5 Language academies

These are bodies that make decisions regarding language use that are to do with the grammar, lexicon, the correct forms of language and decisions on how language should be used (see Shohamy, 2006:65). Shohamy finds that language academies seek to propagate standardisation ideologies hence affecting not only the corpus of languages but also minimally their statuses (ibid). Such bodies are responsible for the introduction of new words into the existing vocabulary of a language while guarding against too much foreign borrowing as well as imposing official language policies. Language academies thus, Shohamy argues, use languages as tools and markers for inclusion and exclusion, where those who master the standardised or the 'pure' variety are included while those who fail to master it are excluded.

### 2.3.6   Citizenship laws

Although the relationship between good citizenship and language proficiency is difficult to establish, language for citizenship is fast becoming a major mechanism for manipulating and imposing language practices and national languages as "symbols of loyalty and identity" (Shohamy, 2006:68). Shohamy observes that language tests for citizenship are used to assess the candidates' intention to assimilate into the nation state. In relation to types of language planning, Shohamy finds that while language academies are used to propagate corpus policy, language for citizenship is used to perpetuate policies that relate to language status, and therefore status planning.

### 2.3.7   Tests

Testing has been described as one of the most powerful mechanisms used covertly to affect and manipulate language behaviours for teachers, parents, students and the whole society (see for example Shohamy, 2001; Broadfoot, 1996). According to Shohamy (2006), tests are considered such powerful policy devices because they affect not only language practices and language priorities but also the criteria of correctness resulting in inclusion and exclusion. Shohamy (2006:93) finds that the power of tests lies in the fact that they are "imposed in all schools, on all students, with no way of resisting them". Thus, given their power in manipulating language behaviour, especially in the prioritisation of specific languages in society and education, it is not surprising to find that "even the very act of testing itself already provides a message as to the importance of some languages over others" (Shohamy, 2006:94). The language of the tests therefore determines which languages will be studied, the content and the methods to be used in studying these languages.

Besides being pedagogical tools, tests are also social and political instruments that impact greatly on education and determine social order through the roles that they play in society and especially in education (Shohamy, 2006). According to Shohamy, such roles relate to the effects of tests on test takers, the knowledge created by tests, preparations for test taking, decisions based on tests among others. In her study of a new national reading comprehension test in Israel, Shohamy found that the introduction of the test forced teachers to engage in the teaching of "test-like" materials as reflected in the kinds of texts used and questions they asked in the classroom as opposed to teaching reading in a more integrated manner (Shohamy, 2001). The introduction of an oral English test in grade 12 resulted in teaching "test-like" content with a focus on only the tasks that are included in the tests while ignoring

others. These findings exemplify the power of tests in manipulating language behaviours particularly on the part of teachers.

Shohamy distinguishes three directions in which tests are likely to manipulate language behaviours namely 1) determining the prestige and statuses of languages; 2) standardising and perpetuating language correctness; and 3) suppressing language diversity (Shohamy, 2006:95). In the following sub-sections, I discuss what each of these directions entails.

### 2.3.7.1 Determining the prestige and statuses of languages

Tests are used to determine the status and power of languages in society. When one language is preferred over others as the language of testing, this preference gives that language power and status over other languages not used in testing. Given the power of tests, introducing tests in a specific language reinforces/empowers that language (Shohamy, 2006). As a result, the language of the tests is prioritised over other languages and the other languages may sometimes be completely marginalised. It was interesting in this study to note specifically how the language of examinations influenced how language choices were made in the observed classrooms in the various contexts studied (see section 5.3.3 for a detailed discussion).

### 2.3.7.2 Standardising and perpetuating language correctness

According to Shohamy (2006:96), tests are used to determine and perpetuate language standards and correctness. Given that tests have one criterion of correctness, Shohamy argues, they have the capacity to perpetuate uniformity and standardisation based on this predetermined criterion. This is evident in the fact that most tests ignore and stigmatise the spoken norms while imposing written norms on speech (see for example Milroy & Milroy, 1999:142). Milroy and Milroy find that most tests allow for standardised answers dealing with grammar and lexicon while ignoring all other aspects of language ability.

### 2.3.7.3 Suppressing language diversity

Although the curriculum and policy documents may support multilingualism and diverse knowledge, testing may be used to perpetuate monolingualism and be based on homogenous knowledge (Shohamy, 2004, 2006). The "one-size-fits all" approaches to testing means that the same tests are used for all students in a classrooms regardless of their experiences both linguistic and otherwise, which acts to guarantee the superiority of those whose languages are

the languages of the tests (Shohamy, 2006). Tests therefore may serve to perpetuate *de facto* policies of assimilation in contradiction to the declared multilingual and multicultural policies.

### 2.3.8   Language-in-education policies

Language-in-education policy refers to "mechanism used to create de facto language practices in educational institutions, especially in centralised education systems" (Shohamy, 2006:76). Language-in-education policy involves making decisions on which languages to teach and learn in schools, when to begin teaching these languages, how long they should be taught, by whom and how they should be taught with regard to the methods, the materials and the tests that will demonstrate ones mastery of the languages (Shohamy, 2006:76). She finds that language-in-education policies are mainly initiated from the top and reinforced by teachers, materials, curricula and tests.

According to Shohamy (2006), language-in-education policy is considered a form of imposition and manipulation of language policy as it is used by those in authority to turn ideology into practice through formal education. This is so because, she argues, language-in-education policies are used for carrying out national language policy agendas, in that when an entity grants special priority status to a language in society, this is manifested through the educational system. As a result, that language may be used as the MoI even when it is not the home language of some of the learners in the school system. In this study, the manipulation of language policy is manifest in the language of textbooks and examinations as discussed in the data analysis chapters (see section 5.3.3).

Language-in-education policies can be explicitly stated or implicit. When explicit, the language-in-education policy is legislated through formal documents such as the constitution. It may also specify in accurate terms the exact languages to be learned, the exact number of hours and the methods of instruction to be employed, the specific situations in which these languages should be learnt and the language tests needed to demonstrate knowledge of the language, while at other times these statements may be vague and subtle (Shohamy, 2006:49). When implicit, the policy has to be derived from actual language policies through the examination of textbooks, teaching practices and especially the testing systems (ibid). Thus, an examination of the language-in-education policy, Shohamy argues, would reveal which languages are prioritised in society as reflected in how they are used, taught and

learned. In this study therefore, teachers' language practices were interrogated to reveal which languages were prioritised in their classrooms and why.

### 2.3.8.1 Relationship between language policy and language-in-education policy

Language policy is concerned with decisions governments and big institutions make about languages and their uses in society. Language-in-education policy involves effecting these very decisions in the specific contexts of education, schools and universities, most often in relation to languages which are considered home, foreign or global (Shohamy, 2006:77). In other words, language-in-education policy is an aspect of language policy and as such one of the mechanisms that is used to turn language ideology into practice through the educational system (ibid). Governmental policy on which languages are to be used as languages for educational purposes, is often articulated in the same legislation that provides for the official languages of the country. Therefore, legislation in Kenya that forbids the use of local languages, and prescribes the exclusive use of English and Kiswahili in public offices (see section 1.5.3), necessarily, has implications for the use of these languages in schools.

## 2.4    LANGUAGE POLICY IDEOLOGIES

It has been argued that "no language planning is detached from some aspect of ideology" (Shohamy, 2006:49). It is also the case that language policy and planning "invariably occurs in an environment circumscribed by language ideologies which emerge from specific historical and material circumstances" (Baldauf & Kaplan, 2004:6). Such ideologies may derive from the wider socio-political and historical relations of power. What follows is a discussion of the language policy ideologies but before that, a brief outline of common myths in language policy development, owing to their relevance to this study and their interrelationships with language ideologies.

### 2.4.1   Common myths in language policy development

Though not universal, language ideologies are reflected in the myths surrounding language education owing to the fact that language in education "is the sole mechanism for the instantiation of language policy" (Baldauf & Kaplan, 2004:6). Considering the role that such myths have played in shaping language policies in education especially in Africa, a brief outline of a few that are relevant to the specific context of this study is given below.

a) That there is one and only one 'correct solution' to the choice of language(s) in education and one and only one 'correct solution' to the sequencing of instruction for purposes of initial literacy training and content instruction for all multilingual polities.

b) Anyone who can speak a given language can successfully teach or teach via that language. This may explain why in many African educational systems, teacher preparation does not include the teaching of the mother tongues (Bamgbose, 1991).

c) If a major goal is to develop highest proficiency and subject matter mastery in a language of wider communication, the more time spent educating the child via that language, the better.

d) In multilingual polities [...], it is too expensive to develop materials and to train teachers in a number of different languages. This myth thrives in total disregard of the wastage that is experienced through the education systems every year through drop out, lack of achievement and repetition of grades (Bamgbose, 1991).

e) Autochthonous languages are incapable of dealing with modern concepts and it is therefore necessary to use a language of wider communication [...] as primary vehicle for education (Breton, 2003:211-12).

f) In multilingual polities [...], it is necessary to use a language of wider communication for educational purposes to reduce tribalism and group conflict (Breton, 2003:209).

g) It is important to teach languages of wider communication (especially English) widely in schools as a means of boosting the economy and life chances.

(Source: Kaplan & Baldauf, 2004:6-7)

These myths are inherent in the language policy ideologies and reflected in language policy development.

### 2.4.2 Language policy ideologies

Cobarubbias (1983) describes four typical language ideologies that motivate actual decision-making in language planning in a society: these are

(i) **Linguistic assimilation -** defined as "the belief that everyone, regardless of the origin, should learn the dominant language of the society" in which he/she finds

himself / herself in (Wardhaugh, 1997:358). This ideology in language policy gives exclusive attention to the majority language with the aim of making the immigrant groups adapt to the majority language and culture (Ruíz, 1984; Durgunoğlu & Verhoeven, 1998). Language assimilation ideology presupposes that all speakers of the languages other than the dominant language should be able to speak and function in the dominant language, regardless of their origin (Cobarrubias, 1983). Under this ideology, monolingualism is seen as ideal while multilingualism is treated as an abnormal condition. Linguistic assimilation also informs the one language one nation ideology (Hornberger, 2002), one language only policies (Jeon, 2003), and does not grant equal rights to language minorities (Cobarrubias, 1983). As Jeon (2003:140) observes, this ideology "envisions insecure majorities and minorities under coercive power relations". Linguistic assimilation has been practised in various forms, such as the Hellenization of the Macedonians in Greece and the Russification in the Soviet Union (see for example Stroud, 2001). The French colonial regime also practised some form of linguistic assimilation in their colonies in Africa where people were forced to learn French.

(ii) **Linguistic pluralism -** has to do with the recognition of more than one language which also can be territorially or individually based or a combination of both, complete or partial where all or specific aspects/domains of language use are conducted in more than one language (Wardhaugh, 1997:358). Cobarrubias (1983: 65) defines linguistic pluralism as the "co-existence of different linguistic groups and the rights to maintain and cultivate their languages on an equitable basis". Unlike linguistic assimilation which sees first languages as resources only in the learning of the dominant language, it would appear that this ideology lends itself to both individual and societal bi/multilingualism and would result in a desirable policy in a multilingual society.

(iii) **Vernacularization** - defined as "the restoration or elaboration of an indigenous language and its adoption as an official language" (Wardhaugh, 1997:358). This ideology is also called language maintenance as it refers to the maintenance of the immigrant groups' native language and culture while at the same time participating in the majority language and culture (Cobarrubias, 1983; Durgunoğlu & Verhoeven, 1998). Such policies advocate cultural and linguistic pluralism and every ethnic

group, be it a majority or minority, is considered equivalent (Cobarrubias, 1983). This implies that both majority and minority language groups have the right to learn and to express themselves in their native languages be it orally or in written form, as recognised and supported by international organisations such as UNESCO, UN and European Common Market (ibid). Multilingualism is thus seen as a norm within society and is officially supported (Cobarrubias, 1983). In the words of Jeon (2003:140), this ideology "envisions secure majorities and minorities in collaborative power relations".

Other scholars have termed this ideology language segregation (Durgunoğlu & Verhoeven, 1998). In the context of immigrants' native language maintenance, the term is used in reference to policies that call for exclusive attention to the minority language with the intention of keeping the possibility of remigration open for the minority language group members (Durgunoğlu & Verhoeven, 1998:xv).

(iv) **Internationalism –** which refers to "the adoption of a non-indigenous language of wider communication as an official language or for such purposes as medium of education or trade" (Wardhaugh, 1997:358). This ideology dominates language policies in many countries especially in sub-Saharan Africa where the ex-colonial languages have been given official status and dominance especially in the education domain.

These language policy ideologies inform the typologies of bilingual/multilingual education programmes. Although there are myriad typologies of bilingual/multilingual education based on the nature of the language-in-education policies associated with each typology, in this discussion, I limit myself to two broad typologies under which all other typologies may fall given the context of this study, but before that, a brief introduction to bilingual/multilingual education.

## 2.5     BILINGUAL/MULTILINGUAL EDUCATION

Bilingual education has been described as "a simple label for a complex phenomenon" (Cazden & Snow, 1990:9). This is partly because its meaning is ambiguous and not self-evident. As Baker (1993) observes, the term is sometimes used to refer to the education of learners who are already speakers of two languages while at other times it is used to refer to education of those who are learning additional languages.

The notion of bilingual education is often misunderstood owing the complexities surrounding it with regard to the number of languages involved, the language varieties and the combination of these languages and varieties. Even the very definition of bilingual education is not without contentions. Bilingual education has been defined as education in more than one language, which may also encompass more than two languages (Baker, 2001). García (2009) further adds that bilingual education will always include some form of more than one language in some parts of instruction. Using a language during some parts of instruction implies that for the other part of the school day, other language(s) is/are used.

García (2009:9) defines bilingual education as "any instance in which children's and teachers' communicative practices in school normally include the use of multiple multilingual practices that maximise learning efficacy and communication; and that in so doing, foster and develop tolerance towards linguistic differences, as well as appreciation of languages and bilingual proficiency". García's definition seeks to 'reconceptualise', 'reimagine' and 'expand' (ibid) bilingual education in response to the complex social realities of interactions among learners, teachers and other members of the school community, using two or more languages, in view of the fact that education in most settings takes place in multilingual contexts.

### 2.5.1 Typologies of bilingual/multilingual education programmes

Just like its definition, the typologies of bilingual/multilingual education have generated numerous types depending on the combination of "programme goals, status of the student group [....], the proportion of instruction through each of the languages, the number of languages involved, the sociolinguistic and socio-political situation in the immediate community and the wider society" (Cummins, 2003:5) among other considerations. According to Ball (2011:22), the debates about bilingual/multilingual education models centre largely on the degree to which the child's L1 should be used in curriculum instruction, how and when in the schooling continuum children should learn a second or additional language and the point in the learning process at which instruction is expected to be received in a second language. All these different sides of the bilingual/multilingual education models debates give rise to varying conceptualisations and implementations of bilingual/multilingual education programmes with equally varying goals and in most cases varying results.

In addition, Hornberger (1991) finds that models of bilingual education suffer from conceptual unclarity in the sense that:

(a)  The same label is used in different ways and in different typological frameworks. For example, maintenance models may be used to refer to programmes that emphasise only the preservation of oral skills in a language or to those that attempt to develop literacy skills and cultural competencies in the two languages one of them the MT of the learners (ibid).

(b)  Many different labels are at times used to refer to basically the same model, for example, transitional bilingual education is often referred to as assimilationist or compensatory while maintenance programmes are at times classified under rubric developmental bilingual education or language shelter. ESL [English as Second Language] programmes are also at time classified as compensatory as they involve submersion with withdrawal classes for compensatory English instruction (Edwards, 1984).

(c)  The label of bilingual education is sometimes applied even in situations where strictly speaking the MTs of the educational constituencies are not used, for example, monolingual teaching programmes such as replacement, segregation, submersion and mainstream, structured immersion, English as a second language.

(d)  There is confusion between models that are defined in terms of their goals and those that are defined in terms of their construction/structure and/or contexts in which they take place, for example, maintenance programmes are at times defined in terms of their goals, which is maintenance of ethnic language and culture, and other times in terms of the structure, where the ethnic language is used as the MoI throughout the years of schooling (Hornberger, 1991).

As already observed, bilingual/multilingual education programmes are classified based on different parameters. The type of programmes yielded and how it is defined depends on the parameters used in the classification. For example, the classification based on the linguistic background of the students and the aims of the school results in three types of programmes: transitional, maintenance and enrichment programmes (see for example Cenoz, 2009), while the classification based on the number of languages involved and the outcome of education results in additive and subtractive bilingualism. Hornberger's (1991) classification based on the linguistic goal of the programme, the cultural and social goal had also yielded the same models of bilingual education as those of Cenoz. These classifications are however not

unrelated as the type of bilingualism desired is implied in the type of programme implemented as discussed in the sections that follow.

### 2.5.1.1 Subtractive bilingualism/transitional programmes

Subtractive bilingualism involves learning the second language with the expectation that it will replace the MT, that is, the L1s of the learners (see for example Baker, 1988; 2001; Heugh, 2011). Subtractive bilingualism implies a transitional form of bilingual schooling which only lasts for early years of schooling, with the majority language taking over as MoI once the child has attained some level of proficiency in the second or majority language (Baker, 1988). According to García (2009:124), these programmes are based on the philosophy that views children's language and culture as their greatest assets to build on in education. It is also based on the superiority of the majority language and emphasises the need to teach it well while permitting bilingualism only as a temporary measure (ibid), as the child learns the majority language. García finds that since such programmes usually have no clear language policy, teachers are given charge "to teach the majority language and to use the children's home language to facilitate and speed up the process" (García, 2009:124). When this happens, she argues, learners' L1s only become tools to assist in the acquisition of the majority language.

Edwards (1984) defines transitional bilingual education as one where the learner L1 is used only as an interim medium for school instruction hence compensatory in nature and the aim is proficiency in the majority language. According to him, such programmes are often assimilationist in that they are aimed at assimilating the minority language children into the majority language and culture. Transitional bilingual education programmes can further be divided into early exit or short term transition of two to three years and late-exit or long term transitional of five to six years (see for example Corson, 1990). García (2009:52-4) adds two new dimensions to the additive and subtractive bilingualism namely 1) recursive bilingualism that develops in cases where the language practices of the community have been suppressed and is reconstituted for new functions, and 2) dynamic bilingualism which "highlights multiple language practices and multimodality".

### 2.5.1.2 Additive bilingualism/maintenance programmes

Additive bilingualism refers to a situation where the second language (L2) is acquired with the expectation that the child's MT will continue to be used. Additive bilingualism implies a

maintenance form of bilingual schooling which sets out to use both languages as MoI for much of the child's school career (García, 2009:161). Besides teaching academic subjects through two languages, García (2009:125) observes that such programmes also "reflect community cultural values" and instill a strong bicultural identity in children. In a similar vein, Baker (2001: 192) finds that such programmes attempts to foster the L1 or minority language in the learners thereby strengthening their sense of cultural identity.

It is possible to group all the other typologies such as enrichment, remedial, developmental, immersion etc under the two broad typologies of additive/maintenance and subtractive/transitional programmes. They all aim to either add or subtract a language to or from the learner's linguistic repertoire, implicitly or explicitly. On the whole, García (2009:125) finds that bilingual education, even of a transitional kind, is more beneficial to language minority children than a monolingual education.

### 2.5.1.3 Relationship between language policy ideologies and programme typologies

As the terms suggest, there is a relationship between language ideologies and the typologies of bilingual/multilingual education programmes. On the one hand, the linguistic assimilation ideology presupposes implementation of bilingual education programmes of a subtractive kind. The learner's L1 is viewed as a resource insofar as it facilitates the learning of the second language but the overall goal is to replace that language and assimilate the learner into the dominant language, that is, the L2. On the other hand, maintenance programmes are presupposed by the linguistic pluralism ideology. Such programmes have the goal of developing both the learner's L1 and other additional languages with no intention of replacing one with the other.

### 2.6    LANGUAGE PLANNING IN AFRICA

Language planning in Africa is riddled with the myths already discussed in a previous section (see section 2.4.1 above). Arguably, the language planning and language policies developed in the colonial era appear to provide the backdrop from which language planning in present day Africa can be viewed. For example, the association of English with liberation, democracy, upward mobility (Ricento, 2000) and neutrality (Pattanayak, 1986) has been an important factor in language planning decisions in African countries. As a result, English has been favoured over African indigenous languages in the public domains including education as shall become evident in later sections of this chapter.

Most educational language planning in Africa involves internationalisation which aims at monolingualism in the LWCs, leading to entrenchment of the statuo quo (see for example Rubagumya, 1994:155). In this regard, Phillipson et al. (1986:78) regard it as "axiomatic that over-use of the former colonial language and under-use of mother tongues as media of education reproduce inequality, favour the creation or perpetuation of elites, promote dependency of the culture of wider communication (CWC), and prevent the attainment of high levels of bi- or multilingualism". To counter this inequality and over-dependence on CWCs would require a shift in language planning ideology away from the internationalisation ideology to linguistic pluralism and vernacularisation, where both the African indigenous languages and African multilingualism are recognised as resources (Ruíz, 1984) in language planning decisions.

For many language communities, multilingualism is more a way of life than a problem to be solved. The challenge therefore is for education systems to adapt to the complexities of diversity and provide quality education that takes into consideration the needs of the learners while at the same time balancing these with social, political and cultural demands (UNESCO, 2003). However, in many African countries, although it is the norm that different linguistics groups live together in the same country, the school systems seldom reflect a country's real linguistic diversity (see for example Smits et al., 2008; Save the Children, 2009), as often home languages are not used as MoIs or taught as subjects (Smits et al., 2008). A discussion of language policies in education from a few African countries (Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Malawi and South Africa) will illustrate this state of affairs. The East African countries (Uganda and Tanzania) have been chosen by virtue of being in the same region as Kenya – the context of this research, on the one hand. On the other hand, the Southern African countries have been chosen for their polarised approaches to language planning, where South Africa has been very deliberate about language planning while Malawi has heavily relied on ad-hoc language planning and presidential decrees.

### 2.6.1 Language policy in education in Uganda

Uganda attained independence from Britain in 1962. Despite having attained self governance over the last close to five decades, Uganda has been struggling with the development and implementation of multilingual policy in education that would cater for the 62 languages spoken in the country (Tembe & Norton, 2008) as reflected in the numerous education review commissions, notable among them the Kajubi Education Review Commission of 1989 (Kajubi, 1989).

The Kajubi Education Review Commission, appointed by the government to do a comprehensive analysis of the education system, culminated in the formalisation of the language policy, which was published in the Government White paper (GWP), in 1992, and its subsequent inclusion in the 1995 Constitution of the Republic of Uganda. In the report, the commission recommended a language-in-education policy that distinguished between the rural and urban areas, which form 90% and 10% of the Ugandan population respectively. Notably, although the commission had recommended the use of the MTs as the MoI in the rural areas from primary 1-4, the government replaced the term mother tongue with 'relevant local languages' in the final report, citing the multiplicity of languages represented in the rural areas.

The language-in-education policy proscribes that the MT be used as the MoI in all educational programmes up to primary 4 while English should be taught as a subject from primary 1 in the rural areas. From primary 5 onwards, English becomes the sole MoI (Government of Uganda, 1992). In the urban areas, English should be used as the MoI from primary 1 and be taught as a subject.

### 2.6.2   Language policy in education in Tanzania

Tanzania has been cited widely as a success case in language planning involving an indigenous African language. While agreeing that Tanzania has made a lot of progress in cultivating Kiswahili as a viable national language, Rubagumya finds that in the education field, the success is exaggerated especially by foreigners (Rubagumya, 1990:1). The descriptions of policy developments especially in the education domain exemplify the currents that have rocked the Tanzanian education system since independence. For example (Rajabu & Ngonyani, 1994:6), summarise them as "hasty policies, ill-conceived and executed with great confusion". Brock-Utne (2010:80), citing her earlier work in Tanzania, describes the current language-in-education policy as "confusing, contradictory and ambiguous".

In the education domain, Kiswahili is the MoI in primary schools while English is taught as a language subject at this level. In secondary schools, English takes over from Kiswahili as the MoI while Kiswahili is maintained as a subject. Research on classroom realities however revealed that retaining English as MoI in secondary schools was problematic. Discussing various reports on the effectiveness of English as MoI in Tanzanian school, Rajabu and Ngonyani (1994:11) observe that as early as 1969, Tanzanian policy makers identified the need to change from English to Kiswahili as MoI in secondary and tertiary education.

Although this stand has been declared on several occasions, while studies have continued to show that English as MoI in Tanzanian secondary schools is ineffective, the policy remains what Bamgbose (1991:111) says of language policies in African countries, "declarations without implementation".

Notably, Rubagumya (1991) points out that English is spoken by only 5% of the Tanzanian population, yet the policy on the use of Kiswahili as the MoI in secondary schools has not been implemented in any school. In effect, this means that English, a "majoritised" minority language in the Tanzanian context continues to enjoy a 'sheltered'[1] pride of place as the MoI in secondary schools.

### 2.6.3   Language policy in education in Malawi

13 languages with their numerous dialects are spoken in Malawi. Past and present language planning in the country has been described as "an interesting case study of pervasive, ad hoc and reactive language planning based more on self-interest and political whim than research" (Kayambazinthu, 2004:79). Despite being moderately heterogeneous, and the fact that most of the indigenous languages are mutually intelligible, in that they all belong to the Bantu language family (Kayambazinthu, 2004:79; Williams, 2006:29), language planning in Malawi has continued to demonstrate the "asymmetrical co-existence" (Kayambazinthu, 2004:79). This co-existence entails English as the official language, Chichewa, as the national language, while the other 12 indigenous languages are relegated to the family and community domains of language use, and the early years of primary school (ibid).

According to Kayambazinthu (2004:98), language planning in education is characterised by the dilemma of when to use the MT and when to introduce English. Kayambazinthu notes that the MoI differs depending on the level of education and the type of school, with the government controlling the language policy in government schools and in mission schools that are government-aided, but not in private schools whose medium is English. Also, there is no official language policy regulating language use in pre-schools although a majority teach in MTs while a few adopt a bilingual policy and yet a few others opting for English-only medium (ibid).

The current language-in-education policy states that the vernacular languages (MTs) of the area should be used as languages of teaching from Standard 1 to 4 except for English and Chichewa which are taught as language subjects. From Standard 5 up to the university level, English takes

---

[1] See section 1.5.7 for how this term is used by Rubagumya (1991).

over as the sole MoI while Chichewa is maintained as a subject. A credit in English is a requirement for entry to the university. English is also a compulsory subject in the first year at the university which a student must pass before proceeding to the next year of study (Kayambazinthu, 2004:99). Although it would appear that Malawi adopts a bilingual language-in-education policy involving English and Chichewa, the role of English increases while that of Chichewa decreases as one moves up the academic ladder. This shows the dominance of English in the Malawian education system despite the fact that an approximated 50.2% of the population are L1 speakers of Chichewa (Kayambazinthu, 2004:92; Williams, 2006:27).

### 2.6.4 Language policy in education in South Africa

Selepe (2002:205) classifies language policies in education in South Africa into pre-1994 language policies and post-1994 language policies. These denote language policies in the apartheid and post apartheid South Africa respectively. Pre-1994 language policies curtailed the use of African languages in education and official domains resulting in their underdevelopment as languages of literacy and the consequential diminished social status. Under these policies, African languages were limitedly taught as subjects, and were used as media of instruction only at primary level in the first three years. English and Afrikaans were the only official languages and were compulsory subjects at primary and secondary level. Either of these two languages was used as MoI in secondary school (Selepe, 2002:206). Until 1976 for many learners with an African language as L1, Afrikaans was made the compulsory MoI for certain subjects even if English was their preferred MoI. This resulted in students' protests in the infamous Soweto Uprising of 16th June 1976.

According to Selepe (2002:206), post-1994 language policies showed an ideological shift from the perception of language as a problem to the perception of it as a resource and a potent tool in national reconciliation. By recognising 11 official languages, 9 among them African languages, namely isiZulu, isiXhosa, Tshivenda, Xitsonga, Setswana, Sesotho, Sepedi, siSwati and isiNdebele, South Africa was set on the cutting edge in multilingual policy development. This widely appreciated multilingual policy was however diluted with the addition of the phrase "where reasonably practical" (Mutasa, 1999:92), while stating that its implementation would depend largely on the prevailing conditions, and exact local languages of a particular region (Selepe, 2002:206). This phrase creates loopholes for complicity and lack of implementation of the policy. Such a phrase built into the policy would pass for what Bamgbose (1991:111) characterises as "avoidance" in his discussion of the characteristics of

language-in-education policies in Africa, where an escape clause is deliberately built into the policy.

In his analysis of the language policy in South Africa, Bamgbose (2003) acknowledges four strengths of the language policy as its respect for multilingualism, giving legal underpinnings to the policy, democratisation of policy making and its characteristic serious attention to language planning. These features make the South African language policy laudable internationally. Bamgbose (2003:54-5) however notes that the same negative features characteristic of language policies in other African countries, namely the introduction of escape clauses, the absence of a plan of action, the lack of co-ordination between agents and the lack of political will to enforce agreed policies, also characterise the South African language policy.

It is imperative to note here that although the South African language policy may appear very good in tackling multilingualism in society, the policy remains very much a theoretical ideal (Selepe, 2002). In reference to the language-in-education policy, Neville Alexander, a leading sociolinguist and educationist in South Africa notes that, although *de jure* South African schools should be using the home languages of their students as MoI, the crisis in resources and infrastructure and the lack of political will on the part of the elite stand in the way of the realisation of this policy. The end result is that English becomes the official *de facto* language of teaching and learning. Ironically, it is only the English and Afrikaans-speaking children, who have always been at an advantage in South Africa's history, that have received mother tongue education (Alexander, 2000). Similarly, Kamwangamalu (2004:197) reports a mismatch between the language policy and practice with the former promoting functional multilingualism while the latter shows a trend towards "unilingualism in English in virtually all the higher domains of language use". A mismatch is also reported between the language-in-education policy and curriculum 2005 (Alexander, 2003:30), which further complicates the implementation of the language policy.

In spite of a very liberal and accommodating language policy, since 1994 the use of the indigenous languages as MoI has not been extended beyond year 3. Thus L1 speakers of these official languages largely transfer to English as MoI by the fourth school year. This means that the difficulties of learners who are schooled in an L2, are prevalent among many L1 African language learners in the country (verbatim, Anthonissen, June 2012).

## 2.6.5   Language policy in education in Kenya

Kenya is a multi-ethnic society with three major ethnic groups: Bantu, Nilotes and Cushites. The 2009 Kenya Population Census report observes that 75% of the population speak languages belonging to the Bantu family; about 20% speak Nilo-Saharan languages, while the rest speak Cushitic languages (Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, KNBS, 2010). These ethnic languages serve as languages of group identity at the sub-national level.

Kiswahili is the nation's language of pride and identification and is a co-official language with English in Kenya. It is also the language used for cross-ethnic and cross-border communication in Kenya and generally in East Africa and the language that politicians use for interaction with the public (Musau 2003). Kiswahili being a national language, gives majority of the Kenyans a sense of belonging, national loyalty and common identity. It serves as the language of solidarity because it functions to establish common ground among speakers, a sense of unity as well as some degree closeness (see for example Githiora, 2008).

English is the language of education and the civil service in Kenya (Muthwii 2004). Moreover it is the language of both intra- and inter-ethnic communication. English is also used as the language for international communication. It is the language of the media, parliament, legal system, judiciary and most publications in Kenya. English is also the language that is used in the military and is the language of diplomacy and through which modern styles of life, science and technology are introduced.

Except for Kiswahili, the rest of the indigenous Kenyan languages are mostly confined to domestic, local and traditional non-literate domains. Indigenous languages are for example, used for intra-ethnic communication and for expression of ethnic identity and solidarity. These languages are used as media for the promotion of diverse cultures and through them Kenyans continue to preserve and transmit cultural values of their linguistic groups. Indigenous languages are normally used for communication with family and friends. Some Kenyans however believe that the languages cannot be used for any serious conduct of global, scientific and technological affairs (see for example Okombo, 2001). In the school system, the indigenous languages are used as MoI during the child's first three years of primary education.

The language-in-education policy states that the mother tongue[2] shall be used as the MoI in the first three years of primary school. According to the policy, the MT, English and Kiswahili are all to be taught as subjects in those three years. English takes over as the MoI from Standard 4 and continues to be taught as a subject. Kiswahili is also maintained as a language of study while the MT is completely dropped from the curriculum after the first three years. The pre-school/nursery school is not mentioned in the language-in-education policy. However, because many nursery schools are part of a primary school, the language-in-education policy is applied in the nursery school as it is in the primary school.

As exemplified in the language-in-education policies discussed above, for most African countries, education is submersion for the majority through the medium of the former colonial language and the results are poor both linguistically and academically (Heugh, 2011). According to Phillipson et al. (1986:82), the linguistic goal implicit in such language-in-education policies is dominance/monolingualism in LWC, that is, "English for the elites and dominance for the masses in their mother tongues (or the regional lingua franca), which the school does nothing to develop, and a limited proficiency in English". Even in South Africa where there is a progressive policy on multilingualism, reports show a mismatch between the language policy and the language practices. Kamwangamalu (2004:265) finds that although the language policy supports functional multilingualism, the language practices demonstrate a trend towards English monolingualism in all higher domains of language use.

## 2.7    CONCLUSION

This chapter has discussed issues relating to language planning and language policy with specific focus on sub-Saharan African countries. Both the language planning myths and ideologies have been discussed due to the influence they exert in language policy development especially in post colonial Africa, which forms the broader context of this investigation. The relationships between language planning and language policy on the one hand, and language planning ideologies and the typologies of bilingual/multilingual education on the other, have been explored. While language policy is seen as an outcome of language planning, it is shown that the language planning/policy ideologies are reflected in the typologies of bilingual/multilingual education, with programme names reflecting the ideologies that inform them.

---

[2] Mother tongue as used in the policy refers to the indigenous Kenyan languages. The term is defined in the policy as the first language that a child learns to express himself or herself in or the language of the school's catchment area (KIE, 2002:150).

The discussion of language-in-education policies in the different African countries reveals that language planning and policies developed during the colonial era could be said to provide the backdrop through which language planning in present day Africa can be seen. In fact, some scholars have argued that in order to appreciate the current language and education issues in African countries, one needs to review the language policies that prevailed during the colonial rule (see for example Chimbutane, 2009; Alexander, 2003). Alexander (2003:21) for example, sees these neo-colonial language policies and practices in a majority of African countries as "a consequence of technical, resource-related as well as class factors". Resource-related in relation to the myths discussed earlier and class-related in the sense that African elites want to maintain the status quo and only those policies that favour a few to the detriment of the masses, guarantee them the access to power, are allowed to see the light of day.

Various mechanisms are put in place and therefore used to manipulate language behaviour and perpetuate certain ideologies resulting in *de facto* language policies that are in direct contradiction of the declared policies. Shohamy (2006:55) finds that "it is through these mechanisms that the battles for power and control, visibility and voice [...] take place". Through them, she argues, people's language perceptions and behaviour are affected resulting in *de facto* language policies. To gain an understanding of the "real" language policies therefore requires an examination of indicators beyond language policy documents.

It would appear, that ex-colonial languages are seen in African countries as playing the role of what Pattanayak (1986:5) calls "neutral-mediation" between the many languages spoken in a country. This role of neutral mediation may explain why ILWCs mastered by a minority of the population are preferred over indigenous languages in many formal language use domains. However, as Pattanayak (1986:13) has argued, in a multilingual state, "one among many should not be seen as best solution, [rather] choosing a subset of languages in a particular multilingual setting - the some among many - is also an intriguing alternative". Instead, "given the choice to cope with many mother tongues, the school can not only act as a policy instrument for maintaining multilingualism, but can also create a milieu where use of many languages lead to the fullest co-ordinated and balanced development of human personality" (Pattanayak, 1986:13). Finding such co-ordination and balance in the development of literacy and language skills in multiple language classroom environments is the ultimate aim of conducting this investigation.

Having discussed language planning and policy development, the next chapter focuses on the actual policy implementation practices giving special emphasis to language-in-education policy implementation particularly in linguistically diverse classrooms.

# CHAPTER 3

# TEACHING AND LEARNING IN MULTILINGUAL CLASSROOMS

## INTRODUCTION

In chapter two, I have discussed language planning and language policy and shown their relationships. I have also shown how language planning orientations, myths and ideologies mirror in actual language policy development and the bilingual/multilingual programmes that result from such language ideologies and orientations. The discussion of language policies in education from five African countries given in the previous chapter sets the backdrop for language-in-education policy implementation in multilingual classrooms, which is the key focus of this investigation. To build on that backdrop, this chapter looks at teaching and learning in multilingual classrooms and the strategies that teachers employ to accommodate learners who may not speak the language(s) of classroom instruction. The chapter also looks at the effects of teachers' attitudes and skills in the management of linguistically diverse learners in their classrooms before looking at the early literacy, multiliteracy and language development in such school settings.

It is good to note from the onset that this study does not seek to build on a single theoretical framework but to bring out the different issues that impact on teaching and learning in early grade multilingual classrooms. Since the research is based on the assumption that the development of literacy and language skills happens best in the language that the learner understands, this necessitates a discussion on matters of bilingualism and/or multilingualism, early learning in more than one language, community bilingualism versus individual bilingualism, simultaneous versus successive introduction of two languages which are topical issues around multilingualism in education. To begin with is a discussion of how linguistic diversity is responded to at the policy level especially as it relates to majority versus minority languages.

## 3.1    POLICY RESPONSES TO LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY

As already discussed in the previous chapter (see section 2.2), language orientations impact language planning and language policy in different ways. For example, the language as right

orientation links language issues with other social problems that characterise minority groups such as poverty, low educational achievement and little or lack of social mobility (see for example Ruíz, 1984; Hornberger & Ricento, 1996), hence treating language as an underlying problem. This linking of social problems with language issues often results in misdiagnosis when it comes to formulating language policies in response to minority language needs. Using the six-stage ranking developed by Churchill (1986), I elaborate how such misdiagnosis of language challenges mirrors in policy responses.

According to Churchill (1986), stage 1 (learning deficit) encompasses policies that see minority groups as lacking in the majority language and respond by providing supplementary teaching in the majority language with a rapid transition to use the majority language. Remedial programmes whose aim is to remediate or compensate for presumed deficits in the language capacities that bilingual children bring to school (McLaughlin, 1986), would also fall under stage 1 policies.

Stage 2 (socially linked learning deficit) includes policies where minority groups are seen as being linked to family status and which responds by providing special measures to help minority groups to adjust to the majority society in concert with majority language teaching (Churchill, 1986). An example of programme yielded by such a response would be submersion with withdrawal classes (Edwards, 1984) for majority language instruction for language minority children.

Stage 3 (learning deficit from social/cultural differences) has to do with policies in which minority groups deficit is linked to disparities in esteem between the minority and majority cultures (Churchill, 1986). Such policies respond by including multicultural teaching programmes for all children in order to sensitise teachers and others to minority needs including the revision of textbooks and teaching practices to remove racial or cultural stereotyping (ibid).

Stage 4 (learning deficit from MT deprivation) are policies in which premature loss of MT is seen as prohibiting the learning of the majority language because of cognitive and affective deprivations. The policy response here is to provide transitional study of minority language in schools in the early years (Churchill, 1986). The minority language may also be used as MoI, but only for the first few years of schooling. This stage is characteristic of early-exit

transition programmes which only support the teaching in minority languages in the first few years of learning, while the learners attain proficiency/fluency in the majority language.

Stage 5 (private use language maintenance) encompasses policies where unless supported, the minority language is threatened with extinction, and so the response is to provide minority language as MoI mainly in the early years of schooling (Churchill, 1986). Under this stage, although the minority language is not maintained in school either as a subject or MoI, there is continued private use of the MT by individual learners in their home environment. There is however, the absence of opportunities for learners to develop their L1 outside of school in "linguistically demanding formal contexts" (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1990:18-19), as is the case of Finns in Sweden.

Stage 6 (language equality) has to do with policies where both majority and minority languages are seen as having equal rights in society, and support availed for less viable languages. Policy responds by recognising minority language as official language, providing separate educational institutions for language groups, giving opportunities for children to learn both languages and extending support for the language outside the educational domain (Churchill, 1986:75). This stage caters for such programmes as dual language bilingual education programmes, where the time of instruction is split equally between the two languages.

It is my contention that the first four stages in this ranking are dominated by language as a problem orientation while stage 5 and 6 are dominated by 'language as a resource' and 'language as a right' orientations respectively. Indeed, as Ruíz (1984) maintains, underlying the language as a problem orientation is the ultimate goal of transitional bilingual education as mastery of the dominant language, as exemplified in stage 4 of Churchill's ranking, and a popular notion that bilingual education (BE) is for the poor and the disadvantaged.

Having shown how language planning orientations may reflect in policy responses to linguistic diversity, the next section focuses on teachers' responses to diversity as mirrored in their classrooms practices.

## 3.2    TEACHING AND LEARNING IN LINGUISTICALLY DIVERSE CLASSROOMS

Much scholarly reflection has been published on teaching and learning in an environment where learners from different language communities are taught in one classroom. Some of

these studies refer to the rights and the educational needs of learners from minority groups, such as immigrant children in Melbourne Australia or children from recently nationalised communities such as Spanish L1 learners in Florida or New York (see for example Clyne, 1983; Spolsky, 1986; Molyneux, 2009; García, 2009). Other studies refer to the teaching of learners from various indigenous language communities such as is typically found in Kenya and in South Africa (see for example Jones, 2010; Bloch, 1998; Plüddemann et al., 2000). This study will consider the linguistic diversity of Kenyan primary school classrooms and how teachers respond to this against such existing work, in order to recognise similarities and differences and to gain insights into broader patterns of dealing with multilingualism in education.

David Corson, for example, in his quest for the inclusion of minority language and culture in the education of minority language children, argues from the stand point of social justice. He sees incorporation of "critical approaches to language policy and ideologies of literacy and pedagogy in multilingual societies [....] by giving priority to the pursuit of social justice as an explicit social practice" (Corson, 1993:ix), as both ideal and just. According to him, the basic social justice problem in the education of the minorities lies in deciding where and when to provide a form of language learning and development that will protect the life chances of children who would otherwise have had no access to social contexts where their MTs are used. He finds that on the one hand, there may be very few opportunities for these children to master the varieties, styles and functions of their MTs to allow them to become competent users of those languages. On the other hand, the same children would be put at risk cognitively and academically, if placed in learning situations that require them to use the majority language.

Corson (1993:ix) also identifies three groups that tend to be affected by unfair language policies in education namely, women and girls, minority cultural groups, and minority social groups. According to him, minority cultural groups are those that possess or identify with a language which is not the dominant language of the society and which reflects a different culture from the majority one, while minority social groups possess a non standard variety of the majority language. This study focuses on the latter group in that it looks at how teachers handle speakers of languages that differ from the dominant school language (language of education).

Corson further observes that the legitimate influence of education on language use is clear cut in that education "seeks to capitalise on the central role of language in learning, in understanding and in knowing" (Corson, 1993:7). At the same time, language development is a major goal of schooling and thus language remains the most accessible pedagogy and evaluation available to schools. Corson (1993) finds that education has a major influence on language in terms of its appropriateness, standard or non-standard forms, functions, status, structures etc. Thus, for schools to become places of both learning and justice, a balance has to be struck between a view of language as socially valuable on the one hand, and intellectually valuable on the other. To do this, he argues, schools should put an emphasis on meanings that are dependent upon choices among styles, modes and settings of discourse as opposed to stressing on meaning as signification.

The role of the school in social and cultural reproduction has long been recognised (see for example Fishman, 1980; Apple, 1982). Apple (1982) for example, identifies the major social [and cultural] functions of schools as follows: "selection and certification of workforce, maintaining privilege by taking the form and content of the dominant culture and legitimising it as the knowledge to be passed on, creation and recreation of an effectively dominant culture and legitimising new knowledge, new classes and strata of social personnel". By concentrating on the dominant culture, it could be argued, that schools look after the interests of some social groups better than, if not at the expense of, other social groups and it uses language as the vehicle of its power distribution (Corson, 1993; Hornberger & Ricento, 1996), a practice that results in social injustice and inequalities both in schools and in society. In the Kenyan context, the LWCs seem to be favoured in education to the detriment of the autochthonous languages. This is evident in the implementation of the language-in-education where a little known LWC is the language of examinations and textbooks as shall be revealed in later chapters of this investigation (see chapter 5 for a detailed discussion of the language practices in multilingual classrooms).

## 3.3    LANGUAGE-RELATED BARRIERS IN MULTILINGUAL SETTINGS

Spolsky (1986) discusses four dimensions of language-related barriers in multilingual settings, which are important in situating languages of teaching and learning in multilingual classrooms. The first is the barrier of different languages which is marked by distinct languages, spoken by a group of people with a recognised name. It is indeed the case that

children will converge in a classroom from diverse backgrounds bringing with them their languages, cultures and behaviour of the communities from which they come.

The second is the barrier of different dialects where same or different languages but with different varieties of the same language are represented in the classroom. This could be a result of dialects, defined as "reflections of geographical differences" (Spolsky, 1986:185), and the potential attitudinal effects of dialectical differences; or diglossic situations, where there is existence side by side of two related versions of the same language, but each of the varieties is used in a specific language use domain separate from the other (one formal and the other informal) (Spolsky, 1986:185 discussing Ferguson, 1959). Spolsky finds that diglossic situations would typically lead to an educational pattern where the high (H)/standard variety is taught in school, although the teaching would naturally take place in the Low (L) variety of the language (Spolsky, 1986:185). An example of such diglossic situation is the use of classical Arabic which is the emphasised variety in textbooks and Arabic grammar and yet the actual teaching of Arabic is carried out in the local dialect/low variety.

The third is the barrier of social class dialects, which becomes a challenge as a result of the inherent attribution of value to the social variety resulting in a differential valuation of language varieties (Spolsky, 1986:186). People tend to talk like members of their social class and people whom they deal with. In education, this becomes an attitudinal issue, where as Spolsky observes, some educators will tend to categorise students as either bright or stupid based on their accents (see also Corson 1993:5-6).

The fourth is the barrier of preferred style of verbalisation, which has to do with the culturally and socially determined preference for autonomous verbalisation (Spolsky, 1986:186). Spolsky argues that communication is simpler when there is shared grammar and lexicon, pragmatic rules as well as the physical context between the speaker and listener, and without which communication is hampered. What this means in a classroom context is that teachers and learners may not share such socially valued tendencies and therefore the teacher has to cultivate a style which emphasises verbal communication and consequently increased verbal load for the learners. This, coupled with Westernised education, which emphasises reading and writing, Spolsky argues, places particular problems to learners from certain classes, resulting from the differences in styles of verbalisation encouraged in the home and those demanded by the school (ibid).

Spolsky further observes that solutions to the problems brought about by language barriers in education are far from easy because they involve dealing with some of the most basic issues not only in the school but also in the wider society served by the school. As such, each of the four language barriers discussed above may need potentially different treatments and if not adequately dealt with could lead to "an early mislabelling of pupils as uneducable" (Spolsky, 1986:188). Sounding a similar warning, Fishman (2001:1) points out that "just as the illnesses which have infected so many of the world's languages constitute a very recognised syndrome yet varies in kind and in degree from one infected language to another, so the diagnoses and cures that are required, fundamentally relate though they may well be, must also vary depending on the facts in each case". This echoes the need for different approaches to language problems especially as relates to different contexts. Although all four barriers could be prevalent in Kenya, this study focuses on the barrier of different languages and how it can be managed in order to result to multilingualism and multiliteracy for year one learners in multilingual classrooms.

Kenya, although a highly multilingual country with 60 different languages and a language-in-education policy that supports the use of children's L1s in the early years of schooling, teacher training colleges do not include multilingual teaching in the curriculum. However, Clauss points out that "teaching in multicultural classrooms requires a high level of expertise among teachers" (Clauss-Ehlers, 2006:158).This is because culturally/linguistically diverse learners may have prior learning experiences (linguistic or otherwise) that predispose them to learning in ways that may not be compatible with some methods of instruction in common use in the classroom (ibid). Teachers therefore need to adopt inclusive and flexible approaches to instruction which recognise the heterogeneity of the learners in the classroom.

Valdman (1989:55) points out that "education in a multilingual context must have a dual objective". He finds that such education must, of necessity, respect the dignity of the learners and promote their cultures by raising the status of their native languages. It also must allow learners a certain level of participation in the modern life by giving them some chance of social betterment through access to society's dominant language as well as an LWC (Valdman, 1989). Yet, monolingual traditions have held sway in the school systems for a long time even in very highly multilingual settings. Often minority language speakers and speakers of languages not recognised in the school system may not only be denied the

opportunity to develop their L1 competence, but also the opportunity to become literate in those languages.

Although most, if not all, countries of the world are multilingual, different countries view and respond differently to the educational challenges of minority language groups, as evidenced in Churchill's rankings discussed earlier (see section 3.1.1). Spolsky (1986:187-8) contends that misdiagnosis of language problems in multilingual settings can block access to equal education for children growing up in multilingual contexts. In a similar vein, Corson (1993:1) observes that "education and the discourse practices that it authorises can routinely repress, dominate and disempower language users whose practices differ from the norms that it establishes". In this regard, Corson cautions policy makers of the need to know when the exercise of power through language-in-education policies is "useful and benevolent and when it is harmful" (ibid). It is, for example, harmful to interpret learners' lack of or limited proficiency in the MoI as a learning deficit. Such misdiagnoses will not only lead to wrong responses in terms of measures taken to make up for the deficits but also poor achievement academically for such learners.

Language plays a key role in the life of the classroom in that "educators use language to create space to respond, relate and analyse the verbalisations that the individual reveals" (Clauss-Ehlers, 2006:67). Besides children coming from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds, Clauss-Ehlers finds that educators also bring their own backgrounds and histories to the classroom spaces that they share with linguistically diverse learners. Confronted by a student body of increasing diversity, educators need to respect and attend to differences through responsive and inclusive teaching as key elements to student success in linguistically and culturally diverse classrooms. This may however, depend on individual teacher's orientation towards language and linguistic diversity, that is, whether they perceive language and linguistic diversity as a problem, a resource or a right (see section 2.2 for exposition of language planning orientations).

## 3.4 INCLUSIVE CLASSROOM STRATEGIES

Different scholars have identified inclusive classroom strategies for elementary and middle teachers in linguistically diverse classrooms (see for example Jacob & Mattson, 1990; Whitehead, 1996; Coelho, 1998; Clauss-Ehlers, 2006). These include: classroom predictability and acceptance of all learners linguistically and culturally as individuals and as speakers of a language (Coelho, 1998; Clauss-Ehlers, 2006); instructional activities that

maximise opportunities for language use (Clauss-Ehlers, 2006); and instructional content that utilises students' diversity by integrating cultural and linguistic experiences throughout the curriculum (Clauss-Ehlers, 2006). Other strategies include inclusive displays through the visual environment of the classroom which could give important messages to students about their membership in the classroom community (Coelho, 1998; Curran, 2003); partners and peer tutors (pairing/grouping) to facilitate peer interpretations (Whitehead, 1996; Coelho, 1998; Curran, 2003); cooperative learning using group brainstorming and learning teams (see for example Jacob & Mattson, 1990; Coelho, 1998; Curran, 2003); and offering support for language learning (Coelho, 1998; Clauss-Ehlers, 2006).

On creating a multilingual classroom environment, Coelho (1998:147) points out that "students in multilingual classrooms need teachers who demonstrate positive attitudes towards language and linguistic diversity". This is often communicated implicitly and occurs when the teachers adopt multilingual perspectives in the classroom and establish a multilingual climate for all the learners to participate in. A multilingual climate could be achieved through adjustments in the classroom to include learning some simple expressions in the students' languages as advocated by some scholars (see for example Powell, 1996; Coelho, 1998; Curran, 2003). Children are reported to enjoy instances where the teacher attempts to speak their language because they see this as a validation of themselves. For example, Plüddemann et al. (2000) report an instance in their study in the Western Cape province of South Africa, where the teacher repeated the word doctor in isiXhosa after the children and this brought so much joy to the children. This shows appreciation of diversity, which is further alluded to in a study by Schwarzer et al. (2003) on multiliteracy development in linguistically diverse pre-kindergaten class in Central Texas. The teacher studied made effort to learn phrases in the five different languages represented in her classroom to show her appreciation of diversity in her classroom.

Teachers could adjust for inclusivity by being flexible with grouping arrangements. For example, although the teacher may want learners to work in mixed language groups in order to reflect the diversity of the classroom, he/she could occasionally allow learners to work in pairs or groups based on native language as this makes the learners feel that their languages are respected. Other strategies include providing bilingual support by encouraging children, especially beginners, to write in their L1s, communicating positive attitude towards linguistic diversity. This could be accomplished by incorporating other languages in the classroom and

into the curriculum by creating multilingual displays and signs, comparing how different languages operate, producing dual language versions of projects and assignments and providing multilingual reading materials in classroom as a show of respect for language variety (Coelho, 1998:149).

Having discussed what different scholars suggest as inclusive strategies in multilingual classrooms, I now turn to discussing studies that have been done on managing linguistic diversity to shed light on how teachers employ such strategies when dealing with linguistically diverse learners.

## 3.5    STRATEGIES FOR MANAGING LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY

A review of literature reveals that previous studies on managing linguistically diverse learners in the same classrooms have mainly focused on immigrant children in America (Lynn, 1999; Schwarzer et al., 2003), New Zealand (Harworth, 2003), Australia (Molyneux, 2009), reception classes in the Netherlands and Sweden (Axelsson et al., 1993) among others. A few studies have also been done in South Africa (Bloch, 1998; Plüddemann et al., 2000) on teaching and learning in multilingual classrooms.

Studies show that teachers employ multiple strategies to manage linguistically diverse groups of learners. Some of the key strategies identified include grouping or pairing learners with same native language to facilitate discussion in a familiar language (see for example Lucas & Katz 1994; Schwarzer et al., 2003; Cummins, 2007), involving linguistic minority community members and parents in classroom activities to mediate language barriers (see for example Lucas & Katz, 1994; Plüddemann et al., 2000; Schwarzer et al., 2003) as well as using bilingual children as peer interpreters within the classroom (see for example Hakuta, 1990; Lucas & Katz 1994; Plüddemann et al., 2000; Curran, 2003), cooperative learning (Jacob & Mattson, 1990; Curran, 2003), and code switching (see for example Merritt et al., 1992; Adendorff, 1993; Arthur, 1994; 1996; Ndayipfukamiye, 1994; 1996; Setati, 1998; Rose & van Dulm, 2006; Chimbganda & Mokgwathi, 2012). A discussion of these commonly used strategies follows below.

### 3.5.1    Using bilingual children as peer interpreters

This is a commonly cited strategy in studies (see for example Hakuta, 1990; Lucas & Katz, 1994; Plüddemann et al., 2000; Curran, 2003). In their study of exemplary K-12 programmes with English as the primary language of instruction, Lucas and Katz (1994) found that

students from the same language background were grouped together and assisted by peers who were more fluent in English. This facilitated peer interpretation from learners who were not only more proficient in English but also shared the L1 with the members of the group.

Plüddemann et al. (2000) in their study in Western Cape found that impromptu peer interpreting could have mixed results. They discuss an instance in their study where the peer interpreter helped the other learner to respond to a question correctly. In a different instance, the interpreter went out of his way to not only interpret the question but also gave the answer as well, which Plüddemann et al. (2000:34) viewed as "short circuiting" the process. The same study reports an instance where again another interpreter misunderstood the teacher's instructions (or missed some part of it), which implies the teacher's instruction may have been missed by all the learners that did not speak the language the teacher was using for instruction. Plüddemann et al. (2000) provide a further example on the challenges with peer interpreting where a bilingual child was expected to interpret for the whole group of ten children but lacked the confidence to do so. Instead, he (the interpreter) turned to the boy seated next to him and spoke softly to him something that was inaudible to everyone else in the classroom.

### 3.5.2   Pairing/grouping based on native languages spoken

The role of group work in classroom management need not be overemphasised. In a linguistically diverse classroom, grouping of learners on the basis of shared L1s promotes classroom talk and discussion, when children have the freedom to discuss concepts and share ideas in a language that they are comfortable to speak. Studies show that this strategy has been successfully used even in classes where the teacher does not share the language with the learners (see for example Lucas & Katz, 1994; Cummins, 2007) and promotes cooperative learning (Plüddemann et al., 2000). Coupled with a provision to write in and share stories in learners' L1s, this strategy could have far reaching positive results in a linguistically diverse classroom.

Plüddemann et al. (2000) however, warn that native language groupings should be utilised appropriately and with caution. They point out that minority language speaking children should not be stigmatised by being ghettoised into native language groupings throughout the school day. It would therefore be helpful to explore various other strategies that could be used in combination with native language groupings. A combination of strategies would help to bridge the intractable language-related problems in the classroom.

### 3.5.3    Involving parents and community members

Community members from the learners' language groups could be involved in different classroom activities as language tutors and story tellers (see for example Lucas & Katz, 1994; Whitehead, 1996; Plüddemann et al., 2000; Craig et al., 2001; Schwarzer et al., 2003). Whitehead (1996) for example, points out that adult members of the communities could be used in activities such as telling stories to children, helping children write messages in their native languages, recording rhymes and songs, preparing traditional foods and writing recipes with the children, teaching counting, translating labels to mention but a few. This inclusive classroom strategy is alluded to in the study by Schwarzer et al. (2003:9) in which community members are reported to have been used in the "language experience hour" to translate concepts into native languages, read to children and teach songs in their native languages. In their study, Plüddemann et al. (2000) found that bilingual parents assisted in similar roles to mediate language barriers in multilingual classrooms in the Western Cape province of South Africa.

Studies further show that when parents are involved in decision-making in the learning of their children, they develop confidence and a sense of own efficacy, which impacts positively on students' learning and diminishes the negative stereotyping that teachers often develop (see for example Cummins, 1986; García & Otheguy, 1987; Greenburg, 1989). This means that involving community members, especially parents, in the classrooms would have a dual advantage, that is, it would serve as a strategy for dealing with the language diversity in the classroom and also boosting the achievement of the learners as well as reversing teachers' negative attitudes and stereotypes.

### 3.5.4    Cooperative learning

Another strategy that has been suggested and reported to be successful in different studies in linguistically diverse classrooms is cooperative learning, where students work together in small groups that are positively interdependent (see for example Vogt et al., 1987; Jacob & Mattson, 1990; Curran, 2003). With regard to linguistic diversity management, the groups could be based on native language or level of proficiency in the MoI. Cooperative learning has two primary features namely: cooperative task structures (where two or more people are encouraged to work together to accomplish a task) and cooperative reward structures (where the efforts of any one individual in the group leads to the rewards of all group members) (Jacob & Mattson, 1990).

In a study done in the United States of America on the use of cooperative learning with Limited English Proficiency students (LEPs) in mainstream classrooms, Jacob and Mattson (1990), found that cooperative learning resulted in increased language proficiency, improved academic achievement and improved social relations amongst students. The study also found that students' participation in the classroom had increased, that is, learners talked more, expressed more ideas and generally contributed more to discussions in the classroom.

### 3.5.5   Code switching

The term code switching has been defined in various ways in literature. Kamwangamalu (2010:116), for example, defines code switching as "the intersentential alternating use of two or more languages or varieties of a language in the same speech situation" while Baker (2001:101) defines it as "any switch within the course of a single conversation, whether at the word or sentence level or at the level of blocks of speech". A related term, code mixing has been defined as the "intrasentential use of two or more languages or varieties of a language" (Kamwangamalu, 2010:116). Although code mixing and code switching have traditionally been used as distinct terms, in the recent years, the terms have been used synonymously. Another term, code alternation (Auer, 1995) has also been used to refer to the phenomenon of code switching. In this study, code switching is used interchangeably with code mixing and code alternation for all forms of code alternations be they intra- or inter-sentential, at the level of word, sentence or even blocks of speech.

Other scholars, having studied classroom code switching, have come up with definitions of code switching that reflect its communicative resourcefulness in multilingual education settings. Adendorff (1996:389) for example, defines code switching as "a communicative resource which enables teachers and students to accomplish a considerable range of social and educational objectives". Having studied the phenomenon of code switching in four high schools in Botswana, Chimbganda and Mokgwathi (2012:23) defined code switching as "a communicative strategy of redeploying the linguistic resources available to bilingual speakers in a particular situation in order to enhance meaning and understanding of subject matter".

According to Myers-Scotton (2006:239), code switching is one of the most studied contact phenomena today. Besides, classroom code switching has been a focus of many sociolinguistic studies in the recent years (see for example Merritt et al., 1992; Adendorff, 1993; Arthur, 1994; 1996; Ndayipfukamiye, 1994; 1996; Setati, 1998; Rose & van Dulm, 2006; Uys & van Dulm, 2011; Chimbganda & Mokgwathi, 2012). These studies have focused on the role that code

switching plays in educational settings. For example, in their ethnographic study of four high schools in Botswana, Chimbganda and Mokgwathi (2012:21) found that code switching was used in English as Second Language (ESL) classrooms as a pedagogical resource to clarify the knowledge of the subject matter and to reduce the social distance between the teacher and learners (see also Jones, 2010; Ndayipfukamiye, 1996; Rose & van Dulm, 2006; Uys & van Dulm, 2011). In their ethnographic observation of classroom interaction in three primary schools in Kenya, Merritt et al. (1992) found that code switching was used as an additional resource for meeting classroom communicative needs. Arthur (1996:17) in a study of code switching in Botswana primary school classrooms found that code switching provides "insights into the collusion of teachers and pupils in mutual face-saving over the inadequacy of their classroom interaction for the achievement of teaching and learning" and was used to encourage learner participation. Other functions of classroom code switching revealed in different studies include tension management (see for example Jones & Barkhuizen, 2011), and familiarizing learners with the language of tests (Setati, 1998).

Studies further show that code switching is used consciously by the teachers as a coping mechanism in the management of the language situation in multilingual classrooms (see for example Jones, 2010; Setati, 1998). For example, in a study of code switching in a grade 5 class of second language mathematics learners in South Africa, Setati (1998:36) found that code switching was a conscious effort by the teacher studied to ensure conceptual understanding. The teacher in Setati's study decided when to code switch, for example, when introducing a new topic to the learners and when she felt that the learners gave wrong answers because they had not understood the questions posed in English, she then repeated the question in their L1 and the learners would elicit the correct responses to the question (Setati, 1998).

In studies on classroom code switching, different scholars identify it as a communicative resource that teachers revert to in their management of the challenges posed by use of unfamiliar languages for teaching and learning. Arthur (1997:226) for example, in a study of Botswana teachers' view of the language in education policy identifies classroom code switching as teachers' creative response to the communicative challenges they face in their classrooms. In her study on teaching bilingually in post-colonial Burundi, Ndayipfukamiye (1996:35) found that code switching was used in the classroom as a resource for managing the local communicative demands of the classroom while at the same time reinforcing the social and linguistic order and concludes that code switching is unavoidable given the classroom realities in Burundian schools.

From the preceding discussion, it is evident that teachers of linguistically diverse learners employ a variety of strategies in an attempt to be inclusive and to make the learning content accessible to learners who may not speak the school languages. It is however, instructive to note that studies also show that strategies that work with one group may not necessarily work with all other groups. For example, Vogt et al. (1987) found that whereas vertical grouping seemed to work effectively with native Hawaiian children to promote peer tutoring, it achieved very little among the Navajo children, until the class was regrouped into boys only and girls only groups owing to the separation of sexes that is common in the Navajo culture. This implies that strategies should not be transplanted wholesale from one context to another. Adaptations need to be done which will of necessity involve factoring in certain cultural aspects which if neglected could block learning altogether.

In addition, Coelho (1998) maintains that teaching styles that work with less heterogeneous classrooms are not as effective in more heterogeneous groups. As such, teachers in multilingual classrooms need to adopt more inclusive approaches when working with linguistically diverse groups. They should also adopt what Banks (1993:9) calls the "equity pedagogy", which consists of techniques and teaching methods that facilitate the academic achievement of all students in their classrooms. To do this, teachers must have the right skills for dealing with linguistically diverse learners and an attitudinal predisposition that is positive towards diversity.

## 3.6 TEACHERS' SKILLS IN AND ATTITUDES TOWARDS LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY

> *What educators bring into the classroom reflects their awareness of and orientation to issues of equity and power relations in the wider society, their understanding of language and how it develops in academic contexts among bilingual children and their commitment to educate the whole child rather than just teach the curriculum* (Cummins, 2000a:6).

Undeniably, educating the whole child in a linguistically diverse context will, of necessity, involve challenging the coercive relations of power in the wider society, maintained through language. This would mean that teachers/educators will go out of their way to accommodate diversity even when the curriculum is already predetermined and provides no place for linguistic diversity. This would however have to begin with a language orientation that views linguistic diversity and multilingualism as a resource rather than as a problem to be solved.

### 3.6.1   Teachers' skills in linguistically diverse classrooms

Different scholars have argued that what happens in teacher education institutions has implications for actual classrooms (see for example Cummins, 2000a; Grant & Wong, 2003; Bamgbose, 1991). Cummins (2000a) for example, observes that in North America, in pre-service teacher education programmes, knowledge about linguistic and cultural diversity is regarded as appropriate for additional qualification as opposed to being a part of the core knowledge base that every teacher should possess. Thus, what is observed in linguistically diverse classrooms is, to a large extent, a reflection of the skills and attitudes perpetuated through teacher education programmes.

It is uncommon in many parts of the world for educators to encourage children to use their home languages in school and especially if that language is a non-dominant language. Cummins (2000a:6) relates this to the fact that teacher education programmes (both pre- and in-service) as well as school systems have "consistently ignored issues related to cultural and linguistic diversity, relegating them to "footnote" or "afterthought" status. Grant and Wong (2003:389) note that in the USA for example, many teacher education programmes "do require or have electives to address topics on diversity. [However], far too often, the linguistic difference is nested within the context of multicultural information or even special needs". In this study therefore, teachers' skills and attitudes are investigated in the light of the training that is offered through teacher education programmes as reflected in various studies on teacher preparation in Kenya (see for example Akyeampong et al., 2011; Bunyi, 1997).

Similarly, as Bamgbose (1991) observes concerning most African countries, Kenya included, teacher education programmes do not regard training in MT teaching as a necessary component in teacher education as it is assumed that if one can speak a language, they can also teach it. This lack of regard for knowledge in cultural and linguistic diversity and skills in MT teaching, results in lack of skills and negative attitudes, which is bred by the education system. Such lack of skills and negative attitudes may reflect in actual classroom situations in the form of disregard for linguistic diversity and disvaluing of MTs by teachers. Given that teacher education does not address multilingual teaching in Kenya, this study will seek to document how teachers' skills and attitudes are implemented as they deal with linguistically diverse learners in their classrooms. These will be assessed in the light of teachers' language behaviour and classrooms practices.

A review of previous studies shows that many teachers are not sufficiently equipped to manage linguistic diversity in their classrooms (see for example Bloch, 1998; Kennedy & Dewar, 1997; Brumfit, 1991; Andrew, 1999). In her study on teaching and learning in multilingual Early Childhood Development (ECD) classrooms in South Africa, Bloch (1998:4) points out that "many teachers are not confident that they can provide appropriately - the kind of education they have themselves experienced to teach children who speak a different language from theirs leaves them feeling ill-equipped", to handle linguistically diverse learners. Bloch's findings confirmed those of a previous large-scale study in New Zealand investigating the provisions of Non-English Speaking Background (NESB) students, which found that most teachers learn to cope with linguistically diverse learners through trial and error (Kennedy & Dewer, 1997). This is supported further by Brumfit's (1991) and Andrews' (1999) studies, which describe classroom teachers as professionally ill-equipped to address the needs of linguistically diverse learners.

Studies further show that feelings of professional inadequacy in dealing with linguistically diverse learners prevail in many classrooms. In a study of 59 classroom teachers of linguistically diverse learners in New Zealand, Johnston (1999) reported that teachers felt frustrated and connected this with their inability to communicate effectively with the NESB students in their classrooms. Johnston's findings confirmed those of an earlier survey of 179 classroom teachers of NESB students in New Jersey, Penfield (1987), which found that in most cases, the teachers in mainstream classes had no training whatsoever on how to deal with linguistically diverse learners. Such feelings of professional inadequacy and frustrations over not understanding the language and culture of the learners may generate negative feelings about the presence of NESB learners in the class (Haworth, 2003), which in turn may affect teachers' academic expectations of these language minority students (Byrnes & Cortez, 1996). All these studies attest to the paucity of relevant professional training for classroom teachers in dealing with linguistically diverse learners.

From these studies, one could argue that some form of training in multilingual teaching for teachers of linguistically diverse learners would make a difference in how they handle diversity. Whereas in most studies teachers are reported to feel frustrated about having to deal with diversity in their classrooms (see for example Penfield, 1987; Johnston, 1999; Franson, 1999), a study of teachers in Auckland, where it is reported that there are greater opportunities for teachers' professional development, teachers were reported to be coping

better in managing linguistically diverse learners (Haworth, 2003). Corson (1993) observes that skilled teachers are able to make the content of their lessons relevant to children from linguistic minority groups in linguistically diverse classrooms by interweaving what the children already know with the content of the school curriculum. Thus, training of teachers of culturally and linguistically diverse learners is needed, to equip them with skills on how to adapt and "interweave" the` curriculum content with experiences that children from different cultures bring to class. However, given the findings of various studies on the state of teacher education programmes, a focus question in this study was to find out whether the Kenyan teachers investigated felt that they had received adequate training (if at all), on dealing with multilingualism/linguistic diversity in education, which is a given in multilingual societies such as Kenya.

### 3.6.2   Teachers' attitudes in linguistically diverse classrooms

Attitudes have been defined and characterised in a variety of ways by different scholars (see for example Baker, 1992; Edwards, 1994). Baker (1992:11) finds that the definitions vary from stipulative, operational and metatheoretical to the mathematical definitions. Semantic disagreements and differences about the generality and specificity of the term surround such definitions. According to Agheyisi and Fishman (1970:137), the definitions often reflect the differing theoretical or research interests from which particular studies stem. It is also possible that people can use the same definition but concentrate on different aspects of that definition. Using a term, loaded with multiple definitions and possible interpretations requires that one defines how such a term is being used. Besides, Agheyisi and Fishman (1970:138) observation that how one defines attitude poses methodological questions, underscores the need to provide a definition to clarify how the term is being used.

This study adopts the definition of attitude by Ajzen (1988:4) who defines attitude as "a disposition to respond favourably or unfavourably to an object, person, institution or event". Thus, if the different languages represented in the observed multilingual classrooms are taken as the objects, then whether the participating teachers responded favourably or unfavourably in their classroom practices to language usage will reflect their attitudes towards these L1s in particular and linguistic diversity in general. The definition adopted locates attitude in actual overt behaviour or responses (Bain, 1928:957), which eliminates methodological challenges at the level of analysis because they have been defined in terms of observable data (Agheyisi & Fishman, 1970:138).

### 3.6.2.1 The nature of attitudes and their measurement

In relation to attitude measurement, Baker (1992:10) argues that attitude is a hypothetical construct used to explain the direction and persistence of human behaviour. Human behaviour is explained by reference to relatively stable and enduring dispositions on the one hand, while attitudes are inferred from the direction and persistence of external behaviour on the other (Baker, 1992:10) or as Agheyisi and Fishman (1970:138) put it, from the "subjects' introspection". In this study, teachers' attitudes were inferred from how they handled the multiplicity of languages in their classrooms and their responses to the question on what they felt about having to deal with linguistically diverse learners. The language of classroom displays and labels was also used to gauge how the participating teachers prioritised the different languages in their classrooms. I am aware of the criticisms on measuring attitudes in the selected methods such as the inconsistency between the assessed attitudes and actions presumably related to them (Edwards, 1994:97), in the sense that what people think or say may not always be reflected in what they do (ibid). However, the definition of attitude adopted in the current study eliminates this methodological challenge.

### 3.6.2.2 Studies on teachers' attitudes in linguistically diverse classrooms

Teachers' attitudes have been shown to play a key role in their management of linguistic diversity. In a study done in Western Cape, South Africa, to investigate problems and possibilities in multilingual classrooms, Plüddemann et al. (2000) reveal that teachers have negative attitudes and beliefs about African languages and do not view language diversity as a resource but rather as a problem to be overcome. In addition, Bloch (1998:9) in her study points out that "writings on the wall can […] provide information about teachers' attitudes [be they positive or negative] towards language issues and towards literacy acquisition process", having observed that most of the labels in the classrooms she visited were either in English or Afrikaans. The role of teachers' attitudes is further alluded to in a study by Dong (2007) in New York City schools in which he concludes that teachers' attitudes are central in their handling of linguistically diverse learners. These findings are further supported by Leek (2000) who in a study in Texas of pre-service teachers' attitudes towards linguistic diversity in classrooms, found that language attitudes influence teachers' attitudes towards the learners and this in turn influences their expectations on those learners. In the current study, the attitudes of teachers towards linguistic diversity were investigated from both their language

use with learners as well as the "the writings on [their] walls", to borrow the words of Bloch (1998:9), as reflected in the languages of the labels displayed or used in these classrooms.

Studies further show that teachers' attitudes about language use influence teaching practice (see for example Shafer, 1975; Kelly, 1988; Corson, 1990). In his study, Shafer (1975) found that 50% of teachers held negative stereotyping attitudes towards non-standard English speaking children and especially those from the lower social economic status. Similarly, Kelly (1988) in a study of Vietnamese immigrant children to the USA found that teachers' attitudes significantly affected the content of and interaction around instruction. Kelly's findings are in agreement with Corson's argument that when teachers do not share the language of education with some of the children in their classrooms, they tend to focus on what those children lack rather than what they have and often what they see is the lack of proficiency in the school language and this lack becomes the focus of the schooling offered to such children (Corson, 1990). Commenting on the state of education of Blacks as a social group in mainstream classrooms in the USA, Corson (1990:230) further observes that "teachers' attitudes towards a particular group coupled with other forms of discrimination may raise or depress academic achievement in ways that can modify many of the linguistic advantages or disadvantages that children may possess".

### 3.6.2.3 Relationship between teacher attitudes and learner expectations

A close relationship has been established between teachers' attitudes towards a child's language and the academic expectations especially in language arts (Williams, Whitehead & Miller, 1972) in that teachers' attitudes towards children's language use influence their expectancies for students' academic performance. Commenting on the role of teacher's attitudes as a basic pedagogical principle in relation to home language programmes, Danesi (1989:49) observes that "above all else, teacher's attitude is of paramount importance. An acceptance of the home dialect [or language], will prevent the formation of negative associations with the speaking of non-standard forms of a language". These observations are supported by the findings of a study by Cazden conducted amongst White and Black graduate teachers to explore the role that teachers' culturally-based expectations for literacy-related discourse routines played in student achievement. Cazden (1988) found that White graduate teachers attributed episodic stories to low achieving students with language, family and emotional problem, on the one hand. On the other hand, Black graduate teachers were found to approve both the episodic and topic-centred narrative styles, with an emphasis that the

episodic stories showed interested detail and description characteristic of bright students. The episodic narrative style and the topic-centred narrative style are associated with African American and European American backgrounds respectively. Teachers appear to lean more towards one style of narration depending on their background and this has an effect on the achievement of students who may use the 'not so preferred' narrative style.

Arguably, teachers start their profession with many preconceived attitudes and thoughts, gained experiences as learners and teachers that shape their performance in their classrooms. In Kenya, teachers like other community members, may already have formed certain attitudes towards the use of MTs and multilingual teaching, which in turn could influence their orientation towards linguistic diversity and their perceptions of indigenous languages as vehicles of education and literacy in multilingual classrooms. Teachers' beliefs in education also play a critical role in defining behaviour as well as organising knowledge and information (Pajares, 1992:325). I contend here that if beliefs shape teachers' roles in the classrooms, then this means that even the strategies that they use in the classroom to, for example, manage linguistic diversity, will depend on their perceived practice. For example, a teacher who is generally against the use of group work in his/her instructional practice may find it difficult to utilise group work even in the management of linguistically diverse learners.

Although there are many challenges associated with managing linguistic diversity in classrooms, a few studies reveal that some teachers seem to cope better than others (Cameron & Simpson, 2002). Some teachers are reported to feel frustrated, overwhelmed and unwilling to take on the extra burden of linguistically diverse learners in their classrooms (see for example Penfield, 1987; Conteh, 2007) while others go an extra mile to accommodate diversity in their classrooms (see for example Powell, 1996; Conteh, 2007). As Wigginton (1992:62) maintains, "the popular notion that teachers must be from the same culture as his or her students in order to successfully navigate within and appreciate that culture is [....] wrong". Their attitudinal dispositions towards language influence, to a large extent, their views about diversity and how they respond to it.

From the studies reviewed above, it is clear that teachers' attitudes and skills determine how they deal with diverse learners in their classrooms. For teachers to work effectively in linguistically diverse classrooms, they have to first believe in all their learners, that all students can learn and convey this in what they do in their classrooms (Dong, 2007). Indeed,

as Osborne (1996) observes, even when teachers do not share cultural or linguistic backgrounds with their learners, recognizing their languages and cultures in school plays an important role in their success. This implies that with positive attitudes/orientations towards linguistic diversity and the right skills, teachers of linguistically diverse learners could effectively overcome the language barriers in their classrooms. These sentiments are shared by Lucas and Katz (1994) in their study of nine (9) K-12 programmes in which English was the primary language of instruction. The study found that even though teachers did not speak the languages of some of the learners, there were multiples ways in which the learners' L1 was used in the classrooms. Equipped with inclusive classroom strategies, skills and a positive attitude towards linguistic diversity, teachers of linguistically diverse learners could effectively utilise the rich language resource in multilingual classrooms to facilitate multiple language and multiliteracy development in such contexts.

## 3.7    LANGUAGE AND LITERACY DEVELOPMENT IN EARLY YEARS

Literacy development and levels of literacy among the population has been a growing and frequently debated need by governments, educators, linguists and the general public the world over (see for example Hannon, 1995; Baker, 2001; McKeough et al., 2006). Literacy has also been regarded as an essential component for personal (Hannon, 1995; Baker, 2001), national (Baker, 2001), educational and cultural development (Hannon, 1995). On the one hand, literacy is central to academic success across the curriculum (Hannon, 1995; Baker, 2001). Besides reading for pleasure, building personal confidence and opening up new horizons for the reader, being literate also allows the reader/learner to access the academic curriculum, new information and a variety of life chances which would otherwise not be accessible to a non-literate person (Baker, 2001). On the other hand, illiteracy has long term implications for both the individual and the community in terms of unrealised human potential and productivity resulting in inability to access many of life's opportunities (McKeough et al., 2006; Lundberg, 2006). In a society where literacy impacts on all aspects of life (social, cultural, economic, political, religious), a poor mastery of literacy skills may have severe future consequences and may consequently put the individual in a risky situation (Lundberg, 2006). As McKeough et al. (2006:ix) aptly put it, "limited literacy affects what happens in and beyond the schools".

Educationally, literacy is seen as the key to the rest of the curriculum in that virtually all learning after the first one or two years assumes pupils' literacy (Hannon, 1995:5). Therefore,

the most central concern of education in the early years should be ensuring that children become readers and writers (Bloch, 1998) in that early literacy development in school is very foundational and key in the long-term school success. As Lundberg (2006:14) points out, literacy skills are "vulnerable to poor initial acquisition [and therefore] deserve closer examination as the demands for literacy competence increase dramatically in postmodern society".

Early literacy achievement has implications for future literacy and school achievement. Ng (2006:154), for example, argues that "children achievement at the end of first year in school predicts with alarming accuracy who will succeed and who will fail in school". Supporting this further, is the argument that "children who cannot read grow into adults who cannot read" (Ng, 2006:154), and the costs of low literacy levels can be high not only for the individual but also the society (see for example McGill-Franzen & Allington, 1991; Slavin et al.,1992).

In most of Sub-Saharan Africa, Kenya included, literacy acquisition takes place in formal school context (see for example Bamgbose, 1991; Heugh, 2011; Kioko et al., 2008), an observation that supports Fishman's earlier view of schools as the "crucial literacy imparting institutions" (Fishman, 1980:169). This is perhaps the reason early literacy development is a widely researched area (Durgunoğlu, 1998). If early literacy development is central to academic success, then there is need to get as "many children as possible off to a good start", to borrow the words of Nicholson (2006:33), than try interventions later, which may or may not work. In fact, Nicholson (2006:32-33) argues that once children begin to fail, they lose confidence in themselves, which puts their chances of succeeding in catch-up programmes in jeopardy.

Similarly, language development in the early years of school is very foundational to not only literacy development but also academic achievement. Sulzby (1986) points out that language development during the early years of schooling should take into account the development (linguistic or otherwise) that children bring to school, in that, as Baker (2001) contends, the school is an essential agent in developing the home language. Sharing the same sentiments, Goodman (1973:64) observes that "the learner has a highly developed language, which is his greatest resource in learning to read". Thus, L1 development in school should be formally addressed irrespective of whether the child has reached age-appropriate competency in the home language or not, for the majority and minority language children alike. However, in this

era of globalisation, there is a tendency to ignore autochthonous languages in multilingual societies owing to the hegemony on English globally, and other ILWCs, that are deemed the languages of education, science, technology and consequently development.

Durgunoğlu and Verhoeven (1996:291) contend that, "literacy development in multilingual contexts needs to be viewed and supported within the overall context of political, social and economic forces that affect the use of languages". Agreeing with Durgunoğlu and Verhoeven, Peterson (2004:46) asserts that "in multilingual environments, language and literacy are intertwined [in that] literacy practices need to be examined in the context of the language in which they are taking place". This examination of literacy practices should consider not only the assessment but also the acquisition of literacy.

In an emphatic statement on L1 development in school, Baker (2001:270) maintains that the role of the school should be that of developing/raising the status of the minority language so that it is used on more domains as well as widening the vocabulary, teaching the technical grammar and standardisation thus giving it status, esteem and market value. In a similar vein, Met (1998) points out the need for language in education policies to be explicit in terms of language development aims and goals where the minority languages are taught both as a subject and a strategy for language development across the curriculum. A failure to support and affirm learners' linguistic resource in school amounts to a disregard for the "funds of knowledge" (Moll et al., 2001:133), embodied in those languages. According to Clyne (2005), this squandering of the valuable language resources brought to school by learners is a loss to those students at both personal and societal level. Questions can then be asked as to why such resources are squandered instead of being utilised as springboards to literacy for their speakers? This study aimed to identify ways in which teachers could utilise multiple languages in their classrooms to facilitate multilingualism and multiliteracy development in multilingual classrooms.

Studies on cognitive processes in literacy acquisition show a close relationship between the development of language and literacy skills (Durgunoğlu, 1998). This is because language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) develop concurrently and are interrelated (see for example Stanovich, 1986; Stanovich & Cummingham, 1998; Čok, 2002). This implies that development in any one area influences development in other areas. For example, Teale (1986) finds that engaging in reading is one source of increasing vocabulary and contributes to successful writing experience. In the same vein, Lundberg (2006) observes

that reading and writing (literacy) are primarily language-based skills, whose focus is on linguistic development, while Mercado (2003:166) asserts that literacy is and integral part of language development.

Additionally, Stanovich (1986) and Stanovich and Cummingham (1998) have argued that early success in the development of literacy skills results in cumulative advantage for vocabulary growth and skills development in that, good readers will have opportunities to accumulate good vocabulary. This helps them to read and learn more meanings of words and therefore read even better (ibid). This argument explains the linkage between literacy and language development in that success in literacy development would mean success in language development resulting from extensive reading and vocabulary growth.

Verhoeven and Aarts (1998:112) have argued that "in the initial stage of literacy acquisition, learners draw on the knowledge of oral language". For this reason, "children with inadequate vocabulary - who read slowly without enjoyment - read less and as a result have slower development of vocabulary knowledge, which inhibits further growth in reading ability" (Stanovich, 1986:161). This argument is supported by the findings of a study by Jorgensen and Kristjánsdóttir (1998:192) who observe that "there is a relationship between good oral language skills and successful literacy acquisition", and that "given the continuities between oral and written language, the abilities involved in grammatical and discourse competence constitute basic components of functional literacy" (Verhoeven & Aarts, 1998:112). This interrelationship shows that success in both literacy and language development are essential for academic success across the curriculum.

It is also clear from research evidence that language plays a key role in the development of literacy skills in the early years. Lundberg (2006:14) argues that "accurate representations of the sound structure of the native language start to develop very early in infancy and constitute prerequisites for the development of vocabulary as well as phonological awareness". As such, studies from different parts of the world have shown that individuals develop literacy skills most easily (see for example Williams 1998; Dutcher, 2004; Mutiga et al., 2006a; 2006b) and faster (see for example Axelsson et al., 2002; Mutiga et al., 2006a; 2006b) in a familiar language than in an unfamiliar language. Ashworth (1979:81) further observes that:

> *a child whose first language and culture have been accorded respect within the*
> *school system will have a sense of self worth which will make him easier to teach*
> *as compared to peers who feel ambivalent about their home language*.

This acceptance of the children's L1s in school results in better academic achievement when children draw from richer and larger sources of background schemata embodied in those languages (see for example Cummins, 1980; Hakuta, 1986).

Studies on early literacy development have shown that "small differences in the ability to read in grade one may develop into large differences in academic achievement in later years" (Stanovich, 1986:93). Other studies show that poor readers in early grades continue to be poor readers in later grades and similarly, good readers in early grades continue to be good readers in later grades (see for example Clay, 1991; Ng, 2006). These findings are confirmed in a study by Cassidy and Cassidy (2002), which concludes that failure in early literacy limits school achievement. Thus, early literacy development has implications for future literacy and academic achievement, especially in multilingual classrooms.

### 3.7.1   Literacy instruction approaches

Coelho (1998:159) argues that "a teacher's instruction style is based partly on the individual personality, and partly on the teacher's beliefs, explicit or otherwise, about the goals of education, how children learn, how teachers should organise learning experiences and the role of the teacher". Such experiences and beliefs could result from educational experiences of the teacher but also sometimes from one's world view where they apply commonsense approaches to classroom instruction.

Similarly, Bloch (1998:11), commenting on literacy practices in multilingual ECD classrooms in South Africa observes that "the way that teachers understand the process of becoming literate has consequences for what they understand to be the appropriate teaching strategies in the classroom". This implies that teachers may use different approaches to literacy acquisition based on their beliefs and convictions of what literacy is and how it should be acquired. This has led to different misconceptions about literacy, for example, pre-literacy (pre-reading and pre-writing skills), which must be taught before reading and writing respectively, basic literacy skills be taught before children are allowed to read and write (Whitehead, 1996), while others insist on a linear progression on how literacy skills should be taught, for example, reading before writing.

In her study, Bloch (1998:12) found that there was a mismatch between what teachers saw as "appropriate educational activity for young children and what they believe is appropriate early literacy activity", resulting from misconceptions about literacy learning. These findings

supported those of an earlier study by Michaels (1981) which examined the key classroom activity of "sharing time[3]" combining ethnographic observation and conversational analysis in an ethnically mixed, urban first grade classroom. Michaels found that teachers' responses to children narratives were based on adult notions of literate discourse of sharing (Michaels, 1981:428). The teacher in Michael's study was reported to be more successful in working with white American children and preferred their topic-centred style of narration, than with African American children who used topic-associating or episodic style of narration, which the teacher viewed as illogical and deficient. While with the white American children the teacher provided an adult-like model, he/she had difficulty seeing the point and predicting the speaker's direction with the African American children's narrative style (Michaels, 1981: 428-430).

Supporting Bloch's finding further, Plüddemann et al. (2000) found that teacher's in different schools in Western Cape used different approaches for literacy instruction which included, phonics, part to whole (beginning with vowels followed by consonants then double consonants before teaching whole words), breakthrough method where children form and read their own sentences before reading them, among others. The method adopted depended on each individual teacher's conviction about literacy and what worked best in their view. The study, for example, points out that some of the teachers used stories to quieten the children especially when they could no longer concentrate (Plüddemann et al., 2000). Whereas research findings have identified listening to and telling stories as the single most effective approach for promoting literacy (see for example Bloch, 1998; Whitehead, 1996; Peck, 1989; Craig et al., 2001; Sulzby & Teale, 1991), that potential remains largely unfulfilled in these classrooms (Plüddemann et al., 2000), as teachers use stories for a completely different purpose. These findings are further supported in a study by Willenberg (2004) that investigated classroom literacy environment amongst grade R learners in a disadvantaged community in Western Cape. The study concluded that preschool teachers, as well as those involved in in-service trainings in the community were not adequately equipped to promote children's language and literacy development.

---

[3] Sharing time refers to a recurring activity where children are called upon to describe an object or give a narrative account about some past event to the entire class. The teacher, through questions and comments, tries to help the children to structure and focus their discourse. The activity is therefore aimed at bridging the gap between children's home-based oral discourse and the acquisition of literate discourse required in written communication (Michaels, 1981:423)

### 3.7.1.1 Whole language approach to literacy development

According to Parker (1989:235), this is an "approach which integrates the four modes (listening, speaking, reading and writing) and centres upon communication in the 'real' situation for a real purpose". Parker finds that the maxim for this approach is that "children learn what language is by finding out what language does" (ibid). Further, the approach entails children's active construction of knowledge in learner-centred meaningful lessons and interactions which promote learning (Freeman & Freeman, 1992). Evidence from studies show that the whole language approaches seem to work more effectively with children who have developed good alphabet knowledge by the time they begin school than those who lack such skills at school entry (see for example Ehri et al., 2001).

### 3.7.1.2 Phonics or phonological approach to literacy development

This involves teaching letter and sound associations so as to sound out words in reading (Nicholson, 2006). Also referred to as "the commonsense approach" (Bloch, 1998:38), the phonics approach assumes phonemic awareness (Nicholson, 2006). Research shows that children who do not understand how to recode words phonologically experience difficulties in learning to read (see for example Nicholson, 2006). Critics of this approach, however, argue that knowing the sounds of a word is only a part of reading, which becomes complete reading when the learner knows the meaning of the words that he or she is sounding out (see for example Ng, 2006).

### 3.7.2   Reading development

According to Ng (2006:154), reading remains the "foundation of basic education and the main tool for independent learning the world over". Echoing this indisputable importance, Grant and Wong (2003:387) describe reading achievement as "a measure for school success". Reading research shows that disadvantaged children who failed one or more grades are unlikely to complete high school (see for example Kelly et al., 1964). Ng (2006:154) finds this indicative of the extent to which children's achievement in their first year of school can help predict who will succeed or fail in school.

### 3.7.2.1 Stages of reading development

Gove and Cvelich (2011:5) outline the following as the stages of reading development from the point of view of a literacy community of practice:

a)   **Emergent reading** - control of oral language, relies heavily on pictures in text, pretends to read, recognises rhyme

b)   **Decoding** - becomes aware of sound/symbol relations, focuses on printed symbols, attempts to break code of print, uses decoding to figure out words

c)   **Confirmation and fluency** - develops reading fluency, recognises patterns in words, checks for meaning and sense, knows a stock of sight words

d)   **Learning the new/ single view point** - uses reading as a tool for learning, applies reading strategies, expands reading vocabulary, comprehends from a single point of view

e)   **Multiple viewpoints** - analyses what is read, reacts critically to texts, deals with layers of facts and concepts, comprehends from multiple viewpoints

f)   **A world view** - develops a well rounded view of the world through reading.

This study focuses on the foundational skills for learning to read, that is, stages 'a' and 'b' outlined above. The other stages are concerned with learners using reading as a tool for learning, which happens at a later stage beyond the grade one that is the focus of this study.

### *3.7.2.2 Key reading and literacy areas*

### a)   **Fluency**

Reading fluency has to do with "achieving speed, accuracy and expression in reading" (Gove & Zvelich, 2011:5). According to Allington (1983: 556), oral fluency is considered a necessary feature in defining good reading. Thus, the development of reading fluency becomes an important goal in reading instruction (Rasinski, 1990:147). Studies on developing reading fluency show that repeated readings that focus on reading speed and accuracy achieve better than those that focus on developing automatic word recognition (Dahl & Samuels, 1974).

### b)   **Comprehension knowledge**

Reading research provides evidence that the "ability to recognise isolated words quickly and accurately is necessary for subsequent comprehension of connected text" (Geva & Wade-Woolley, 1998:90). According to Dole et al. (1991:241), "meaning resides in the text" thus making the goal of the reader that of reproducing that meaning. Dole et al. (1991:241) find

that "all readers, [....] use their existing knowledge and a range of cues from the text and the situational contexts" within which the text occurs to construct the meaning of the text. Thus, when the reader possesses the appropriate knowledge for the task and texts presented to him/her, they reproduce the meaning more easily. Dole et al. (1991:241) further observe that the "knowledge the reader brings to the text is paramount for any meaningful comprehension to take place". This emphasises the need to teach beginning readers in languages that they speak and understand well.

**c) Vocabulary development**

There are contrasting views with regard to how children acquire words/develop vocabulary. St. Augustine, for example, viewed as critical in children acquisition of words, the communicative intention of adults through gestures and eye movements towards the object to be named, on the one hand (cited in Lundberg, 2006). Locke (1964) suggested that children acquire new words by associating them with objects pointed out to them or events occurring at the same time as the words are uttered, on the other hand.

Bloom (2000) further argues that there are many ways in which children acquire new words, using both the linguistic and extra-linguistic cues. He specifically emphasises the role of joint attention and what he terms the theory of the mind as important prerequisites to learning new words. According to him, when one learns the meaning of a word, he or she also learns something about the thoughts of the other human beings. Having a joint attention is therefore an important first step in the development towards taking the other person's role.

**d) Alphabet/Print knowledge** – has to do with naming the letters of the alphabet and recognising their symbols in print (Johnston, 2004). Bradley and Stahl (2001:3) point out that alphabet knowledge also includes letter sound knowledge, ability to print letters and rapid letter recognition. According to Johnston (2004), alphabet/print knowledge is one of the most accurate predictors of early reading success. Johnston suggests the teaching of the alphabet in meaningful contexts where learners are encouraged to focus on print in their environment in order to relate it to reading and writing. In a similar vein, Bradley and Stahl (2001: 11) find that teaching alphabet letters in isolation, as is typical of phonics instruction (see section 3.7.1.2 above), may confuse some children with regard to the purpose of such letters in relation to words.

**e) Phonemic awareness**

A phoneme is the smallest distinctive sound unit of a language (Nicholson, 2006:34); or the smallest unit comprising spoken language (Ehri et al., 2001:253). Thus, phonemic awareness can be defined as the "abstract ability to think about sounds of words separately from their spelling and separately from the slight phonemic variations that occur within the structure of phonemes" (Nicholson, 2006:35); or the ability to focus on and manipulate phonemes in spoken language (Liberman et al., 1974 cited in Ehri et al., 2001). Some common phonemic awareness development activities include blending phonemes, phoneme isolation, deleting a phoneme, phoneme identity; phoneme segmentation and phoneme categorisation (see for example Lundberg et al., 1988; Gough et al., 1993; Ehri et al., 2001:253).

Research has shown that phonemic awareness is necessary for success in literacy (see for example Juel & Leavell, 1988; Adams, 1990; Clay, 1998; Ehri et al., 2001). Ehri et al. (2001:254) for example, find that decoding words require blending skills in order to transform graphemes into recognisable words, while reading words requires both the ability to segment and blend phonemes. Similarly, they argue, reading words from memory by sight requires phoneme segmentation skill while storing individual words in memory needs one to match up graphemes to phonemes in words and retain those connection in memory (ibid). A study by Adams (1990) found that children who fail to acquire phonemic awareness "are severely handicapped in their ability to master print". These findings were further supported in the study by Juel and Leavell (1988) who found that children who entered first grade lacking phonemic awareness were unable to make the spelling-sound correspondence even when exposed to print or to benefit from phonemic instruction.

Additionally, studies have demonstrated that it is possible to develop phonemic awareness amongst non-readers without formal instruction (Lundberg, 1991), and amongst preschoolers without using letters and other elements of early reading instruction (Lundberg et al., 1988). The latter argue that phonemic awareness can be developed through explicit guidance of children in their interaction with the implicit segments of language. In this regard, Lundberg's (1994) study amongst preschoolers at high risk of developing reading disability found that the initially at risk children who were exposed to explicit training (guidance) had fairly normal reading and spelling development. In contrast, children in the control group in the study showed poor literacy development.

### f) Phonological awareness

Phonological awareness is identified as one of the meta-linguistic facilitators that enable children to read and write (Durgunoğlu, 1998). It refers to the "ability to identify, reflect on and manipulate sound units of a language" (Anderson & Li, 2006:66). Simply put, it is the awareness that words can be broken into sounds and that sounds can be blended into words (Clay, 1998:64). Thus, phonological awareness subsumes syllable awareness, onset/rime[4] awareness and phoneme awareness (see for example Anderson & Li, 2006; Nicholson, 2006; Lundberg et al., 1988).

Studies show that "children who experience difficulties in learning to read do not know how to decode words phonologically, that is, they do not know how to blend the sounds of letters together to realise the spoken form of the written words" (Lundberg, 2006:34). Lundberg also finds that syntactic ability, vocabulary and world knowledge are necessary dimensions in development of reading comprehension. Phonological awareness has also beed indentified as an important prerequisite for learning to read, and [that] non readers with low levels of phonological awareness at preschool level have high risk of developing reading disability in school (Lundberg, 2006:19). For example, in their intensive examination of the linguistic abilities of Danish kindergarteners, Lundberg et al. (1980) found that the most powerful predictor of later reading and writing were aspects requiring phonological awareness and in particular the ability to manipulate phonemes into words. In this study, poor readers showed no deficiencies in the non-linguistic tasks in the battery of tests that was used. Again this study will seek to understand how this all important prerequisite to learning to read is developed among year one learners in Kenyan multilingual classrooms.

### 3.7.2.3 The Content of reading

Parker (1989:238) postulates four points of reference with regard to cultural focus in the content of reading: 1) cultural identity - where the child recognises his /her own culture represented in the text and finds it acceptable; 2) cultural awareness - where a different culture from the child's own is represented in text, but the child is sympathetic towards it; 3) Acultural - where the representation in the text makes no significant cultural statement (e.g. animal stories); 4) cultural dissonance - where the child recognises the culture depicted in the

---

[4] Onset is the beginning consonant(s) of a syllable, and rime is the remainder of the syllable including the vowel and the optional consonants (Nicholson, 2006).

text but is unsympathetic toward it and even rejects it. On cultural dissonance, which is mostly associated with minority groups, Parker (1989:238) observes that:

> *Very many children, from all kinds of backgrounds and across the spectrum of social class, may become increasingly alienated by the subculture of the school system, seeing schoolbooks themselves as representing an alien culture. They feel that the content of education is not of their choosing and not relevant to their lives. In seeking to create a convergent society, we may be ignoring the reality that the whole is made up of unique individuals.*

What Parker's observation implies is that it is easier to learn to read when the content and the language in which the content is presented are familiar to the learner. Learning to read using unfamiliar content alienates the learner. This observation agrees with Lundberg (2006) argument relating to world knowledge as a necessary component for reading comprehension.

### 3.7.3   Writing development

Research shows that basic skill approaches do not promote writing development, and may even inhibit it (see for example Peyton, 1990). Other studies have shown that students' development as writers depended to a great extent on their teachers expectations of what they do (see for example Edelsky, 1982; Hudelson, 1989). It is shown that where the teacher focused on phonics, spelling and correct writing conventions, children produced neat papers that lacked originality and resembled workbooks, on the one hand. On the other hand, children whose teachers focused on quantity of writing as the mark of writing development were found to write better, more creatively and wrote longer pieces and expressed their thoughts in personal experiences (see for example Edelsky, 1982; Hudelson, 1989).

A different study by Edelsky and Jibert (1985) had also found that focusing on basic skills and correct form in writing instruction could have negative effects on previously developed writing experiences and perceptions, in that when children moved to higher grade and were made to do writing exercises rather than writing to communicate, their writing development/growth stopped. Similar findings were reported by Harste et al. (1984) who found that children who began school with a strong sense of reading and writing as a way of communicating meaning lost this sense when the reading and writing instruction focused on basic metalinguistic skills as opposed to meaning and text creation.

Other studies on literacy development have also shown that children develop some print knowledge before they begin school (see for example Harste et al., 1984). Children make use

of this print knowledge when they are placed in an environment where meaningful writing is encouraged and when there is continued interaction with print by reading books, their own writing and that of their peers (Martin, 1987). Studies also show that in order to learn to read and write successfully, there is a minimum level of both grammar and discourse in a language that one needs to attain (see for example Gudschinsky, 1976; Verhoeven, 1994). This again points to the fact that oral language development is key to both learning to read and to write successfully.

In her study on literacy and effective teaching in diverse classrooms in Alabama, Lynn (1999) found that teachers felt limited in teaching and modelling effective teaching strategies and multiliteracy pedagogical skills connected with writing in such school contexts, resulting from limited professional development and in-service opportunities for the teachers. Following these scholars (Lynn, 1999; Gudschinsky, 1976; Verhoeven, 1994; Edelsky, 1982; Hudelson, 1989; Harste et al., 1984; Edelsky & Jibert, 1985), this study investigated how writing development is handled in multilingual classes in order to shed light on the teachers' pedagogical preparedness in developing writing skills in such school contexts.

### 3.7.4   Classroom interactions and language development

The nature of classroom interaction will either facilitate or impede language development. Lack of conversation or limited conversation due to language barriers in the classrooms impedes language development (Clay, 1998). More talk promotes language development (Whitehead, 1996). Children need to ask questions, explain things and negotiate meaning between themselves and other children, between themselves and adults/teachers, they need to continue their oral language development during school years in order to expand their vocabulary and their control over structures of language, the patterns of sentences etc (Whitehead, 1996). In a multilingual classroom context, the strategy of pairing or grouping based on native language could facilitate more talk as children can interact with each other in a language they are familiar with and that would promote language development .

Halliday (1973:47) commenting on the relationship between language and education achievement points out that "education failure is often, in a very general and rather deep sense, language failure", in that "a child who does not succeed in the school system may be one who is not using language in the ways required by the school". In its simplest interpretation, this might seem to mean thereby that the child cannot read or write or express

himself/herself adequately in speech. This may result from the linguistic mismatch between language competence and the demands made upon children.

### 3.7.5   Storytelling in literacy and language development

Storytelling is widely recognised as viable classroom technique which promotes literacy and language development. It provides an avenue for both learners and teachers to interact (Yolen, 1981), and offers an opportunity for children's growth as language users (Peck, 1989). Storytelling also plays a key role in the development of listening and reading comprehension skills (see for example Peck, 1989; Craig et al., 2001), and in the enhancement of both oral and written expression (see for example Peck, 1989; Craig et al., 2001). Peck finds that this strength of storytelling lies in the fact that it provides learners with two situations: 1) with the teacher as the teller where learners are able to develop effective and critical listening skills; 2) with the learner as the teller, which facilitates the development of both oral and written expression (Peck, 1989:139).

Studies show that children who hear stories develop a sense of story as they are assimilating both the language and the structure of stories, which in turn enables them to read and comprehend more complex stories (Moss & Stott, 1986). In so doing, Peck (1989:140) argues, storytelling promotes the development of both reading and listening skills in that it extends an invitation to the hearer to read what has been told.

### 3.7.6   Biliteracy/multiliteracy development

I found Hornberger and Skilton-Sylvester's (2000) continua of biliteracy useful as a descriptive framework both for understanding and exploring the process of biliteracy/multiliteracy in the multilingual classrooms. Specifically, the model is useful in understanding the weighting of the ends of the different continua by the teachers in the classes observed and how they understand the process of biliteracy/multiliteracy development. My assumption here is that what teachers do in literacy development depends on which end of the continuum they give more weight. For example, a teacher who concentrates on L2 literacy development and pays no attention to the learners' L1s represented in the classroom gives more weight (and power) to the L2 end of the L1-L2 continuum of biliterate development. I further argue that weighting equal power towards both ends of the continuum promotes the view of language as a resource (advocated in this study) in that both autochthonous languages and LWCs and/or majority and minority languages are

valued based on the linguistic pluralism ideology, hence facilitating full biliterate development and secure majority and minority language students. Minority languages are thus maintained, enriched and used in more language use domains including reading and writing.

### *3.7.6.1 The continua of biliteracy model*

This is a comprehensive ecological model for situating research, teaching and language planning in multilingual settings (Hornberger, 2002). The model adopts the notion of "intersecting and nested continua to demonstrate the multiple and complex interrelationships between bilingualism and literacy and the importance of contexts, media and content" (Hornberger & Skilton-Sylvester, 2003:35) in the development of biliteracy. The model advocates the need to "contest power weighting of the continua by paying attention to and granting agency and voice to actors and practices at what have traditionally been the less powerful ends of the continua" (Hornberger & Skilton-Sylvester, 2003:38).

In this framework, Hornberger (1990:213) defines biliteracy as "any and all instances in which communication occurs in two or more languages in and around writing". The model depicts the development of biliteracy along the defining intersecting continua of reception-production, oral-written and first language-second language; through the medium of two or more languages and literacies with similar-dissimilar linguistic features, convergent-divergent scripts through simultaneous-successive exposure to the languages/literacies; within contexts encompassing both macro-micro levels, characterised by varying mixes along the oral-literate and monolingual-bilingual continua with content ranging from majority to minority perspectives and experiences, literary – to vernacular styles and genres, and contextualised-decontextualised language texts (Hornberger & Skilton-Sylvester, 2003).

The very notion of the continuum implies that there are "infinitely many points on the continuum and any single point is inevitably and inextricably linked to other points in the continuum and have more in common than not with each other" (Hornberger, 1989:274-5). A balanced attention on both ends of the continuum and all points in between is also emphasised in the model. The continua model is relevant to other work on language planning orientation because it has recently incorporated the idea of language and power relations as advocated by Corson (1999) and Cummins (2000a). For example, Hornberger (2003) in the continua model argues that where there has been privileging, albeit implicit, of one end of the continuum, that end has been seen to wield more power than the other. The model also allows

focus "on one or selected continua and their dimensions without ignoring the importance of the others" (Hornberger & Skilton-Sylvester, 2003:36) whether for pedagogical, policy or other purposes.

### 3.7.6.1.1    *Context of biliteracy*

It has been argued that "literacy has no meaning apart from the cultural contexts in which it is used" (Gee, 1986:734), and that literacy is not merely learning to read and write but also "applying the knowledge for specific purposes in specific context" (Scribner & Cole, 1981:236). Erickson (1984:529) further contends, literacy is "radically constituted by [its] context of use". This makes context an inalienable dimension in the process of bi-multiliteracy development, as exemplified in the continua of biliteracy model. In fact, Hornberger (1989:289) suggests that the more the learners are allowed to draw on all points along the continua, the greater their chances for full biliteracy development. According to this model, the three defining continua for context are the micro-macro, oral-literate and monolingual-bilingual continua.

### a)  Micro - macro continuum

In relation to levels of linguistic analysis, the micro-macro level analysis would involve an examination of patterns of language use in the context of a situation or speech event. As a defining continuum in the context of biliteracy, this level would involve "the recognition that the bilingual individual keys language choice to characteristics of the situation" (Hornberger, 2003:10). The idea of a continuum allows any instances of biliteracy be they at the micro or macro level, to be defined at one point along that continuum. Hornberger (2003:11) however cautions that "biliteracy often exists in a context of unequal power relations" at the macro level, which may mean that one or another literacy becomes marginalised or acquire special functions.

### b)  Oral - literate continuum

This continuum has to do with the interrelationship between the oral and the literate uses of language. Hornberger (2003:12) argues that "any particular instances of biliteracy may be located within the oral-literate continuum" where familiar literacy events are embedded in oral uses of language in a given community. She therefore suggests that the contexts in which

speakers chose between written media should be emphasised over the supposed differences between the written and oral use of language.

## c) Monolingual - bilingual continuum

This continuum has to do with switch between styles and switch between languages in the same context for the monolingual and bilingual individuals respectively, but for the same functions within the same context. In this continuum, code switching, for example, is interpreted as a response to the contextual factors and "represents highly competent context specific language use" (Hornberger 2003:14), and so is switching between styles in the same language. This implies that bilinguals and monolinguals are more alike than different in that the functions and uses to different language varieties and styles are put in a monolingual individual are the same ones to which different languages are put in a bilingual/multilingual individual or society (ibid).

### 3.7.6.1.2 *Biliterate development*

Communicative competence refers to the "knowledge and ability of individuals to appropriate language use in the communicative events which they find themselves in, in any particular speech community" (Hornberger, 2003:14-15). This means that in order to participate effectively in any given context, individuals have to draw from their communicative repertoire (ibid). This communicative repertoire for any biliterate individual is defined by three continua: reception-production, oral-written and L1-L2 continua.

## a) Reception - production continuum

Contrary to the longstanding assumption that oral language development precedes written language development and that receptive skills precede productive ones, the reception-production continua shares a view that recognises that these skills' "development occurs along a continuum, beginning at any point and proceeding cumulatively or in spurts, in either direction" (Hornberger, 2003:16).

## b) Oral -written continuum

This continuum emphasises the fact that development along the oral language-written language continuum is not unidirectional. According to Hornberger (2003:16), "children learn to read and write through heavy reliance on spoken language". Oral miscues have also

been shown to provide clues for reading development (Goodman, 1982:89-162), while Wilde (1988) observes that children use of invented spelling based on their knowledge of the sounds of the language, aids in their language development.

In this regard, Cahnmann's (2003:192) study among Latino students in the US, found that the students used bilingual oral and literacy norms as they developed standard monolingual Spanish and English literacy skills required in bilingual education programmes. Additionally, Mercado (2003:179), in his study of biliterate development among Latino youths in New York City communities found that "the lived experiences (culture), of learners shaped their written language expression and development". This implies that learners experiment/revert to writing in their L1 as the need arises in the process of biliterate development, and they rely on oral language (as a resource) to accomplish reading and writing tasks.

## c) L1 - L2 transfer continuum

Although it is generally recommended that reading and writing be started in the child's strongest language especially if it is a threatened minority language with immigrants, refugees, indigenous peoples or autochthonous minorities (García, 2009:148), in the L1-L2 transfer continuum of biliterate development, Hornberger (2003:18) maintains that whether or not L2 instruction has negative effects on L1 development "depends substantially on the context in which it occurs", as opposed to language per se, as revealed by studies by Engle (1975) and Dutcher (1982). Biliteracy development thus has to take into account the close connections between the development of one language (L1) and the other language (L2) with regard to the transferability of the literacy skills from one to the other (L1-L2 or L2-L1 or L2-L3). In each case, the one language becomes a useful resource to aid in the learning of the other.

Commenting on errors in biliteracy development, Cahnmann (2003:196-7) observes that a language as a resource perspective views students' errors as "windows of opportunity to appreciate students' rich and varied linguistic backgrounds and the creative problem solving strategies they utilise to negotiate monolingual literacy activities required of them in the school". On the one hand, he finds that effective biliteracy development must "take into account a sociolinguistic communicative competence approach that makes explicit how varieties of standard and vernacular language are used, when, with whom and for what purposes" (Cahnmann, 2003:197). On the other hand, "effective validation of students' norms

must also include an understanding of the relationship between context and power, structured inequality and the opportunities to challenge that structure through individual and group agency" (ibid). These assumptions of the continua of biliteracy are adduced to in the conclusion arrived at in Moll and Dworin (1996) study that there are many paths to biliterate development comprising students' own histories and the social contexts for their learning.

### 3.7.6.1.3    *Media of biliteracy*

In particular context, biliterate individuals communicate through the media of two [or more languages]. It is argued that the three continua that define the relationship of these media have a bearing on the individual development of biliteracy especially the potential to transfer that development between the two or more languages (Hornberger, 2003:22). The three defining continua for media of biliteracy are discussed below.

**a)  Simultaneous - successive exposure continuum**

Literature on bilingualism distinguishes between simultaneous and successive bilingual language acquisition (McLaughlin, 1985); and early[5] and late[6] bilingualism (Lambert, 1985:120). Although there have been contentions relating to the timing and route to bilingualism, it is now increasingly recognised that "the type and degree of bilingualism have more to do with the systematic use of two languages than with the age of acquisition" (Hornberger, 2003:23). Hornberger emphasis here is, that the L1 facilitates in L2 development should not be mistaken to mean delayed introduction of L2 till the L1 is fully developed but the L1 should not be abandoned before it is fully developed regardless of whether the L2 is introduced simultaneously or successively.

**b)  Convergent - divergent scripts continuum**

This continuum has to do with the range of possibilities in biliteracy development that are to do with different writing systems. Such possibilities include two languages with two different writing systems; one language with two different writing systems; or even two languages with one writing system (Hornberger, 2003 discussing Ferguson, 1985). There are implications for this range of possibilities in literacy acquisition. For example, a greater and more immediate potential for transfer of reading skills and strategies is likely where two writing systems share more characteristics (Barnitz, 1982). Other studies have shown that the

---

[5] Early bilinguals is used to refer to those who become bilinguals in infancy (Hornberger, 2003:23)
[6] Late bilinguals refers to those who become bilinguals in adolescent (ibid).

convergence or divergence between biliterate's two writing scripts had little influence on the reading and writing (Hornberger, 2003:25 discussing Fishman et al., 1985).

**c) Similar - dissimilar language structure continuum**

Biliteracy development may involve two distinct languages in a multilingual setting, two different dialects of the same language in multidialectal settings or even pidgin and creole settings (Hornberger, 2003:24). An understanding of the range of possibilities for biliteracy development, even within the same language, ensures that all instances of biliteracy are defined as such.

*3.7.6.1.4       Content of biliteracy*

The content and media of biliteracy are linked in that media of biliteracy continua focus on the forms literacy takes while the content of biliteracy continua focus on the meanings expressed by those forms (Hornberger & Skilton-Sylvester, 2003:50). Through the content continua, Hornberger and Skilton-Sylvester argue, "biliteracy becomes linked to bicultural literacy", where knowing two languages becomes synonymous with knowing two cultures.

**3.7.6.1.5 Relevance of the continua model in multilingual contexts**

Other models of literacy exist namely, the autonomous and the ideological models of literacy (see for example Street, 1984; 2011). On the one hand, the autonomous model of literacy works from the assumption that "literacy in itself – autonomously – will have effects on other social and cognitive practices" (Street 2011:60).  The model, he argues, "disguises the cultural and the ideological assumptions that underpin it" thus making it possible to present them as if they were neutral and universal. On the other hand, the ideological model of literacy posits that literacy is a social practice and therefore "embedded in socially constructed epistemological principles" (Street, 2011:61) rather than a technical and neutral skill.  This view of literacy considers the ways in which people acquire literacy and views them as rooted in their conceptions of knowledge, identity and being. Relating these models to the continua of biliteracy, Street (2011:65) finds that the four intersecting sets continua discussed above, can be linked closely with the attention to social context as advocated in the ideological model of literacy, while the the autonomous model has been challenged by research into social practice.

The biliteracy continua model is cognisant of the fact that implementing multilingual policies poses challenges at both the community and the classroom levels (Hornberger, 2002). Challenges at the classroom level are those to do with the processes of biliteracy development and the context in which this happens. These include confronting the attitudes that favour the language of power and society; the deep seated attitudes that are at odds with the pedagogical imperative that children learn best from the starting point of their own L1s (see for example Hornberger, 2002). She argues that challenges at the classroom level can be viewed as involving media and content of biliteracy. Such challenges include providing materials and classroom interactions in multiple languages, which are not necessarily spoken by all the participants in the classrooms. Indeed as Martin-Jones (2011:11) has argued, the continua model "challenges the narrow, monolingual views of literacy that persists worldwide, in contemporary education, and lays the foundation for a pedagogy aimed at building on the language and literacy resources that all students bring to their learning in school". Laying the foundations for such expanded view of literacy is an explicit aim of this research project, thus making the relevance of the continua model apparent.

## 3.8    CONCLUSION

This chapter has provided a detailed review of literature that was deemed relevant to this study. Issues surrounding the development of language and literacy skills for early graders in multilingual school contexts have been discussed under the assumption that this happens best when done in the learner's L1. Using Hornberger's biliteracy continua, the chapter has also provided a framework for exploring the processes of literacy/biliteracy/multiliteracy development in multilingual classrooms.

I conclude this chapter with the apt words of Steiner and Ladjali (2003:83-4), who observe that:

> *The school is a curious place for language. In it there is the mixture of official, private and school languages, mother tongues, foreign languages, schoolgoers' slang, the slang from the block. When you look at all these languages living together you say to yourself that the school is perhaps the only place where they can find each other in all their diversity and overlappings. But we need to be vigilant and take advantage of this beautiful diversity* [Translated from Spanish by Baetens-Beardsmore, 2009: 137).

I concur with Steiner and Ladjali's observation in that linguistic diversity, when taken positively, has a lot to offer as a resource in multilingual learning situations. As student

populations become increasingly diverse and as different cultures with different beliefs and values on education continue to mingle and share classroom spaces, new instructional demands arise for classroom teachers. A pressing need in this situation becomes that of rethinking teaching, school curriculum and classroom instruction for linguistically diverse learners sharing a classroom, with the aim of celebrating rather than 'mourning' linguistic diversity. This study reflects on how diversity is being addressed in multilingual classrooms in Kenyan primary schools. Whether linguistic diversity is being celebrated or mourned in these classrooms and how is an area of focus in this study. The next chapter discusses the research methodology adopted in this study.

# CHAPTER 4

# RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

## INTRODUCTION

The preceding chapter has looked at teaching and learning in multilingual classrooms by providing a detailed discussion of some of the commonly used strategies in the management of linguistic diversity. It is evident through the literature reviewed that there are inclusive classroom strategies that teachers of linguistically diverse learners use with both the majority and minority language children represented in their classrooms. Also discussed in the chapter is the role of learners' L1 in the development of language and literacy skills in the early years. The chapter also presented multilingualism as a context-specific phenomenon, which should be studied within specific context. Henning (2010:36) contends that the methodology chapter is about "reasoning what the value [of methods] is in a study and why they have been chosen" while Holliday (2007:42) asserts that it is about the "principles underlying how the research will be carried out". The current chapter therefore discusses the theoretical paradigm, the research paradigm, the research design, ethical considerations, data collection methods and data analysis procedures adopted in this study including the rationale and justifications for choices made, since researchers approach their inquiries from certain worldviews or theoretical paradigms.

## 4.1    THEORETICAL PARADIGMS

No research takes place in a theoretical vacuum (Smit, 2010:12). When a researcher sets out to do an inquiry, he/she does so from an informed position. This knowledge is what helps the researcher to frame the inquiry within a particular theory. Silverman (1993:1) defines theories as "statements about how things are connected whose purpose is to explain why things happen as they do". As such, theories help us to "sort out our world, make sense of it and guide us on how to behave in it and predict what may happen next" (Smit, 2010:14).

Smit (2010:15) defines theoretical perspectives as "interrelated sets of assumptions, concepts and propositions that constitute a view of the world". It is however the case that people take different positions depending on the subject matter of their research. In scientific research, there are three positions which assume different views of the world: 1) The position that the

"researcher and the researched are mutually exclusive entities working independently of each other" (Smit, 2010:15). This position assumes that the researcher and the researched constitute a separate and discrete world which can be studied in isolation. 2) The position that the "researcher and the researched work in an interrelated dialogic fashion" hence works under the assumption that the one trying to understand how the other lives in the world is also a part of that world (ibid) and therefore influences how the other lives. 3) The position that "researcher and the researched have a mutual aim in mind regarding research" (Smit, 2010:15). The assumption in this stance, Smit argues, is that both the researcher and the researched "are committed to a form of emancipator role, that of changing the unjust world".

These three stances each presuppose three theoretical paradigms namely; a positivistic/post-positivistic theoretical paradigm, an interpretive/constructivist theoretical paradigm and a critical paradigm for stances one, two and three respectively. According to Smit (2010:16), these three frameworks could also be referred to as different philosophies of knowledge or different epistemologies. She finds that theoretical paradigms inform a specific methodological framework in a logical and coherent way. A brief discussion of these three paradigms follows after which I delve deeper into the specific paradigm that frames this research project.

### 4.1.1 Positivistic/post-positivistic theoretical paradigm

This framework most likely assumes a quantitative research approach. Smit (2010:17) describes positivism as a "rejection of metaphysics" in that it is concerned with finding the absolute truth and proving it empirically. Such a position, she argues, sees the goal of knowledge as that of describing, explaining and predicting the phenomena we experience be it qualitatively or quantitatively and this is limited to what is observable and measurable. Thus, the positivists' view of the world is that science is the way to get at the truth and understand the world well enough to be controlled by the process of prediction, since the world operates by cause and effect laws detectable through scientific methods (ibid).

In this paradigm, knowledge is believed to stem from experience and observation in that once observational data has been verified through our senses, it becomes scientific knowledge and this knowledge is held to be accurate and certain (Smit, 2010:17). Since, as already mentioned, theoretical paradigms inform specific methodological framework, this paradigm implies experiment as the key scientific method where the researcher attempts to discern natural laws through manipulation and observation.

### 4.1.2 Interpretive/constructivist theoretical paradigm

This framework presupposes a discursive qualitative approach. Constructivism denotes a shift away from positivism to studies that capture the lives of research participants in order to understand and interpret their meaning (Smit, 2010:19). In the beginning, this involved descriptive studies but gradually, the role of the researcher as a co-creator of meaning became more important and this resulted in qualitative research taking an interpretive turn. While the positivist believes that the goal of science is to uncover the truth, the constructivist believes that scientific methods can only give us an approximation of the truth (ibid) rather than the complete truth, thus making uncertainty a key principle in this paradigm.

Whereas the positivist limits knowledge to what is observable and measurable, the constructivist sees "measurement as fallible" (Smit, 2010:20), and therefore instead seeks varieties of data from different sources and employs a variety of analysis procedures in an effort to increase validity. Investigating a phenomenon from different viewpoints, Smit argues, is viewed as the construction of the world through the different processes of observation rather than relativism. Understanding of different phenomena is thus facilitated by mental processes of interpretation as the researcher interacts with the social contexts, thus making societal discourses an integral part of an interpretive inquiry. Interpretivists are thus extremely sensitive to the role of context in the meaning making process through interrogating how people make meaning and what meaning they make.

The methodological implications for this sensitivity to context presuppose that an interpretivist collects rich situational information and therefore the inquiry has to be undertaken in natural settings.

### 4.1.3 Critical theoretical paradigm

Just as the interpretive paradigm marked the positivistic turn, the critical paradigm is reminiscent of the interpretive turn. Smit (2010:23) views the critical theoretical paradigm as a "deconstruction of the world in the sense that researchers are no longer satisfied with prediction or deeper understanding of the researched but want also to address the social issues through their research". Citing the work of Giltlin (1993), Smit (2010:23) argues that at best, critical paradigm can be seen as "a contestation of the traditional assumptions about the nature and meaning of research". She therefore finds that an inquiry anchored in the critical paradigm aims at promoting critical awareness (of the masses) and challenging the powers

that be by questioning the social inequalities reproduced by such power structures. A critically minded researcher will for example, explore the manifest discourses in peoples' lives with a view to "foregrounding the power of the discourses to shape people's lives" (Smit, 2010:23). Critical theorists work with three assumptions that shape their inquiries namely; 1) that facts can never be isolated from the ideological inscriptions; 2) events are understood within the social and economic contexts; and 3) that knowledge is constructed in the act of critiquing in a dialectical process of deconstructing and reconstructing the world (ibid). The methodological implications for a critical paradigm, Smit finds, is collaboration between the researcher and the researched, where the researched becomes an equal partner in the research process.

### 4.1.4 Critical interpretive theoretical paradigm

Following previous studies in multilingual classrooms (see for example Heller, 1999; Chimbutane, 2009; Blackeldge & Creese, 2010), this study draws from the second and third stances, that is, the interpretive theoretical paradigm and some aspects of the critical theoretical paradigm. Here, the researcher and researched are seen to work together in the construction of meaning while at the same time challenging the powers that be through a critique of the language-in-education policy implementation. The researcher and the teachers studied in the investigation of multilingualism in education in Kenyan primary school classrooms are involved in co-construction of meaning in the light of the social and economic contexts of language-in-education policy implemenation. On the one hand, the interpretive stance allowed the researcher to observe teachers in their natural settings in an effort to understand their language practices.

In this study, classroom observations were complimented with interviews where teachers were afforded an opportunity to explain why they did things the way they did them, which forms the necessary dialogue in the co-construction of meaning advocated for in the interpretive paradigm. On the other hand, the critical stance allowed the researcher to interrogate teachers' language practices with the aim of assessing the pedagogical effectiveness of such practices in the management of linguistically diverse classrooms. As such, Martin-Jones (2011:7) finds that the critical aspect aims to reveal the "links between the interactional routines of the classrooms and the wider social and ideological order" while Pennycook (2001:5) views it as allowing the "mapping micro and macro relations". In this study, combining the two stances was deemed appropriate in order to uncover the language

behaviour and practices of teachers in multilingual classrooms in the light of the social and economic contexts of their work.

Having discussed the theoretical paradigm under which this study is framed, I now turn to the research paradigm in which the study falls. The choice of a critical interpretive theoretical paradigm presupposed a qualitative approach.

## 4.2    RESEARCH PARADIGM

The research paradigm or worldview or ideology has to do with the basic assumptions that guide the researcher's inquiry as relates to the nature of reality (the ontological issue); the relationship between the researcher and the researched (epistemological issues); the role of values in the study (axiological issue); the process of research (methodological issue) and the language of the research (the rhetorical issue) (Creswell, 1998:75-8). These five issues are interrelated and there has to be a fit amongst the choices made for the research to be credible. For example, it has been argued that methodological choices are grounded in the epistemological position of the researcher (see for example Henning, 2010:31; Smit, 2010:15). In other words, the way in which the research process is carried out has strong bearings on the relationship between the researcher and the researched. In most cases, the researcher feels inclined to specialise and perform when working from an epistemological stand with which they are familiar - a comfortable "epistemological home" to borrow the words of Henning (2010:1).

Additionally, the ontological position of the researcher will influence not only the methodological choices made but also the rhetorical issue. Thus, methods of data collection and the language of reporting used by an inquirer who is inclined towards understanding a phenomenon by indentifying, controlling, reducing or even eliminating variables will of necessity, be different from those used by one who studies and reports the characteristics of the same phenomenon.

This research is undertaken within the qualitative paradigm as presupposed by the theoretical framework under which this study falls as discussed in the preceding section. A qualitative research approach is said to provide a means of accessing unquantifiable facts about a phenomenon (Berg, 2007), it's about investigating the qualities of a phenomenon rather than its quantities (Henning, 2010), it's about finding out what happens, how it happens and why it happens by not only looking at the actions of participants but also trying to find out how their

thoughts and feelings are represented in those actions (Henning, 2010). In this study, I was interested in finding out not only what happens in multilingual classrooms in terms of how teachers deal with the multiplicity of languages in their classrooms but also how their attitudes and skills are reflected in what they did in those classrooms as well as critiquing teachers' language practices. In line with the purpose of this investigation, the choice of qualitative paradigm requires that the researcher gives as detailed an account as possible on these actions and their representations, which are given in the form of a research report.

Denzin and Lincoln (1998:3) define qualitative research as "multi-method in focus, involving and interpretive, naturalistic approach to its subject matter". Additionally, Creswell (1998:15) defines qualitative research as "an inquiry process of understanding based on distinct methodological traditions of inquiry that explore a social or human problem" where the researcher conducts the study in natural setting, builds a complex yet holistic picture through analysis of words and reports in detail the views of the informants. Both Denzin and Lincoln (1998) and Creswell (1998) emphasise that qualitative research involves studying things in their natural settings using multiple sources of data and attempting to make sense of the phenomena in terms of "meanings that people bring to them" (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998:3). This approach was thus chosen because it allowed the researcher to study the participants in the natural setting and share in their understanding and perceptions and to explore how they (participants) structured and gave meaning to the phenomenon under study. Classroom practices (teachers' language choices in this study) can reveal a great deal in terms of the attitudes towards different languages and tell a lot about teachers' skills and strategies in handling linguistic diversity.

Creswell (1998:17-18) highlights eight justifications for choosing to engage in a qualitative research: (i) the nature of the research question; (ii) an exploratory topic; (iii) the need to present a detailed view of the topic; (iv) the need to study individuals in a natural setting; (v) interest in writing in a literary style; (vi) when there is sufficient time and resources for extensive data collection and analysis (vii) if the audiences are receptive to qualitative research (viii) to emphasise the researcher's role as an active learner who tells the story from the participants' view rather than an 'expert' who passes judgement on participants. To these, Leedy and Ormrod (2010) add the suitability of the assumption of the qualitative paradigm with regard to the phenomenon under study and one's organisational ability. In this study, these guidelines were considered and although the time and resources available could not

allow for prolonged periods of data collection and analysis owing to the time lines of the programme under which this study was being carried out, the choice of a qualitative approach met the criteria described by Creswell and Leedy and Ormrod.

Although the positivists, post-positivists and even some naturalistic researchers have argued that any form of researcher presence contaminates the research setting, the progressive qualitative research paradigm recognises that "the presence and the influence of the researcher is unavoidable, and indeed a resource which must be capitalised upon" (Holliday, 2002:145). This implies that the researcher's influence can only be minimised but not eliminated. In view of this, I made at least two visits to each of the classes prior to the commencement of data collection in an effort to not only minimise the Hawthorne effects, that is, improved behaviour due simply to the fact that subjects are being observed (Berg, 2007) but also to build rapport with the participating teachers, which Ryen (2002) describes as a key factor in facilitating valid data collection.

Whereas quantitative research works with few variables and many cases, qualitative research relies on a few cases and many variables, and at times unidentified variables (Creswell, 1998:15-6). In this regard, Holliday (2007:4) finds that qualitative research "invites rather than try to control variables" and "investigates them directly" as opposed to finding ways to reduce their effects because "it is exactly this freedom and natural development of action and representation that we wish to capture" (Henning, 2010:3). This makes qualitative studies open-ended and exploratory hence resulting in research opportunities that may open up the researcher to unforeseen areas of discovery in the lives of the research subjects (Holliday, 2007:5). At the same time, reflexivity, which refers to the "methodical way in which researchers come to terms with and capitalise on the complexities of their presence in the research setting" (Holliday, 2002:146), was adopted. This was accomplished by being sensitive to the nature of the research setting (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983), rather than adopting the so called "non-intrusive, fly-on-the-wall" methodology (Holliday, 2002:146), where the researcher's presence is seen to be of no consequence to the research setting.

## 4.3    RESEARCH DESIGN

Different scholars use different terms to refer to the research design. For example, Mouton (2000) uses the word design type to refer to the way in which the research is conceived, how it is executed and how the findings are reported. Holliday (2002) uses the term genre to refer

to how studies should be classified. I use design in the way Holliday uses it, that is, how studies are classified.

Henning (2010:xi) points out that a researcher, like a designer, has to plan a study with the knowledge of the kind of data that can be gathered using which methods and the method of analysis. Henning further asserts that the "internal coherence and argumentative consistency of a study is dependent on the accommodation of a design in a design logic" (Henning, 2010:x). The argumentative consistency advocated for by Henning is achieved when there is a fit between the methods and the components parts of a research project.

The research design assumes that there are multiple, subjective realities out there, which the researcher seeks to gain an in-depth understanding by observing how teachers in the different contexts dealt with the phenomenon of linguistic diversity in their classrooms. This is done with the aim of understanding how different teachers experience linguistic diversity in terms of their attitudes, awareness and preparedness to deal with linguistically diverse learners. To do this, case study was deemed the appropriate research design for this study.

### 4.3.1   Case study

Case study is defined as "a method involving systematically gathering enough information about a particular person, a social setting or an event or group to permit the researcher to effectively understand how the subjects operate or function" (Berg, 2004:283), the main assumption being that the phenomenon will be studied as a "bounded system" (Stake, 1988:255), "within its real-life context" (Yin, 1994:23), "with the aim of trying to see patterns, relationships and the dynamic that warrants the inquiry" (Henning, 2010:32), and where the boundaries of the case are directed by the units of analysis. Thus, the case, Henning adds, is studied because the researcher suspects that it has something waiting to be unravelled (ibid). In order to understand the phenomenon of multilingualism in education in Kenyan primary schools, this researcher deemed it necessary to gather extremely rich, detailed and in-depth information, which a case study design would sufficiently provide. By concentrating on individual/specific cases, the researcher aimed to uncover the interactions of significant factors characteristic of the phenomenon under investigation in the selected cases. The rich detail characteristic of case study research has the potential to develop insights that may in turn illuminate other multilingual educational settings.

### 4.3.2 Understanding case study

Yin (2003) compares a case study researcher to a detective who has to make inferences from the crime scene after the crime based on convergent evidence from witnesses, physical evidence and unspecifiable element of common sense, as well as inferences from multiple crimes, to determine whether they were committed by the same perpetrator. In a similar fashion, a case study researcher has to use different methods to generate data and where need be, apply the same replication logic through carrying out multiple case studies in order to understand a phenomenon under study. Not only were multiple methods of data collections adopted in this study but also multiple cases, which were varied based on the nature of diversity, that is, minimal, moderate and high diversity, were studied.

Yin (2003:xi) sees case study as appropriate when the investigators desires or is forced by circumstances to 1) define research topic broadly and not narrowly, 2) cover contextual or complex multivariate conditions rather than isolated variables, and 3) rely on multiple rather than single source of evidence or data collection method. Following Yin, the choice of a case study design for this study, was deemed appropriate given the complex and context-specific nature of the phenomenon under investigation and the need to use multiple methods to uncover the manifest interactions in the specific contexts. The context-specific nature of multilingualism in education necessitated the selection of multiple cases, which were studied for better understanding of the phenomenon.

### 4.3.3 Types of case study

Stake (1995:3) distinguishes three types of case studies: 1) intrinsic case study where an investigation is undertaken because the researcher is interested in a better understanding of the particular case, 2) instrumental case study where a specific case is studied in order to give insight into an issue or refine a theory, and 3) collective case study where the instrumental case study is extended to include several other cases in order to learn more about the phenomenon under study. This study adopted the collective case study, also referred to as multiple or comparative case study, where the focus is both within and across the cases (ibid). Insights from one case were extended to the other cases and comparisons made to shed more light on the phenomenon of multilingualism in education in Kenyan primary school classrooms and how teachers dealt with it.

## 4.4 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

According to Booth et al. (2008:275), "research offers every researcher an ethical invitation that [...] if embraced can serve both the best interests of [...] the researcher [...] and the readers". I would like to expand this list to explicitly include the researched. This is because research involves getting information from people (Robson, 2002), and about people (Punch, 2000), whose feelings and rights have to be safeguarded and respected at all costs (Robson, 2002). It is possible that the researched are included among the readers but in this report, owing to the important role that research subjects play in any investigation, I refer to them explicitly.

Like any other social activity, research requires that the researcher adheres to what scholars have identified as the ethics of research which saturate all stages of the research process from the planning stages including the choice of the research topic (Punch, 2000) through to the data collection and even the report writing stages (see for example Booth et al., 2008; Punch, 1994; Fetterman, 1989; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Booth et al. (2008:273) define ethics as the "forging of bonds that make a community and the moral choices we face when we act in that community". To fit in the research community, the researcher has to be aware of and adhere to the values of 'the community' by making moral choices when conducting an inquiry. The entire process of planning and executing this research was conducted in an ethical manner. To begin with, permission had to be sought from the relevant institutions before individual participants could be approached for their participation.

### 4.4.1 Research permit

The permission and authority to conduct research in Kenya is granted by the National Council for Science and technology (NCST), an arm of the Ministry for Higher Education, Science and Technology. In applying for a research permit, certain requirements had to be fulfilled. These included providing an introductory letter from the University where the research was being undertaken (see Appendix I for a copy of this letter). This same letter was also used in my introductory visits to the schools to get the head teachers' written consent, which I needed in order to apply for the research permit. Once the research permit had been issued, I was required by the NCST to drop copies of it to the District Commissioner (DC) and the District Education Officer (DEO) in each of the four districts where the selected schools are situated, which I did prior to the commencement of the study (see copy of research permit in Appendix II). This however did not disallow me from making my intial

visits to the schools since the head teachers of the different schools had already given their written consent.

As a requirement by the NCST, the selection of cases has to precede the research permit application. This is because in the application for the research permit, the applicant is required to indicate the location where the study will be taking place. In keeping with this requirement, access to the school and consequently the selection of the cases had to be negotiated beforehand.

### 4.4.2   Gaining access and selection of cases

Access to the schools had been negotiated months before my arrival back in Kenya to conduct the research. I used colleagues from my work place to visit the schools and share with head teachers my intentions to carry out the research in their schools using the introductory letter in appendix I. There was need to begin thinking about the possible research sites and this necessitated the move to use colleagues to negotiate access on my behalf. Two schools had been chosen purposively for each of the three different scenarios that the research targeted. Care was also taken in the selection of the schools to ensure that they represented different provinces in the country, that is, Nairobi province for the urban school, Central province for the peri-urban school and Eastern province for the two rural schools. Although the research took place in 2011, the composition of the learners in Standard 1 in the year 2010 was used to predict the likely composition, before the schools were confirmed as possible research sites for this study.

As aforementioned, multiple cases were used in this investigation. The cases for the study were purposefully selected as advocated by Creswell (1998:62). Creswell advocates for purposeful selection of cases that show different perspectives on the problem, ordinary cases, accessible cases and unusual cases. In this study, the variation of cases in terms of their location, that is, whether urban, peri-urban or rural, was aimed at bringing about different perspectives in linguistic diversity management depending on whether diversity in each location was perceived to be minimal, moderate, or high as would be anticipated for the rural, peri-urban and urban schools respectively, on the one hand. The level of diversity was deemed to have an effect on how language choices were made in the classrooms, on the other hand. Thus, each case was selected on the basis that it illustrated certain features that were considered of interest (Silverman, 2000) in this study among them location and learners'

linguistic composition in the target class. The following table provides a summary of the key features of each case selected and why it was selected.

**Table 4.1:    Summary of school features that led to its selection for study**

| School code | Location | Linguistic composition of learners | Level of diversity |
|---|---|---|---|
| School W | Urban | 11 languages | • High diversity |
| School X | Peri-urban | 6 languages | • Moderate diversity |
| School Y | Rural | 3 languages | • Minimal diversity<br>• Literacy traditions |
| School Z | Rural | 3 languages | • Minimal diversity<br>• Literacy traditions of the languages involved<br>• Researcher's proficiency in the languages involved |

In addition, care was taken in the selection of the schools to represent what Holliday (2007:8) calls the "judicious balance between taking opportunity to encounter the research setting while maintaining the principles of social science". In this case, the schools were chosen not only because of their location but also because the learner population represented a good mix in terms of multilingualism (rural schools 1 and 2 three languages each, peri-urban school 6 languages and the urban school 11 languages) plus English and Kiswahili (and Sheng in the urban school). The timing of the data collection also corresponded with the start of the school year, when learners in multilingual classrooms are new in the school and can hardly cope with the linguistic expectations in the classrooms, an ideal time to observe how the teacher manages the language challenge given the diversity in the classroom in each of the cases.

### 4.4.2.1 Case one

As stated above, two schools were identified as possible sites for all the three different contexts, that is, urban, peri-urban and rural schools representing high, moderate and minimal diversity respectively. In one of the urban schools, the head teacher declined to provide information on the composition of the learners in the target class citing the absence of the authority to conduct such a research. Following Holliday (2007) access therefore became one

of the factors to use in the choice of the school besides location and the composition of the learners, which was a prerequisite in the identification of the schools. In the second school, the head teacher agreed to provide the preliminary information on the student composition in the target class and since this site met the criterion on composition (high diversity), this became the selected case to represent the urban context.

### 4.4.2.2 Case two

On the peri-urban school choice, again two schools had been chosen purposively based on their location and the possibility that they could have the desired composition of learners. The first school that was visited, the head teacher agreed that I could carry out my research in the school and provided the information on the composition of the learners. The learner composition met the criterion for moderate diversity that was anticipated for this context in that six Kenyan indigenous languages (besides English and Kiswahili) were represented amongst the learner population. On the basis of access and learner composition, this became the choice case for this scenario. Besides access, the class had the desired representation of languages in relation to literacy traditions.

### 4.4.2.3 Case three

The Area Educational Officer (AEO), who I had earlier worked with very closely, helped in the identification of a rural school after I had given him the specifications of what the school should be like. This choice was based on the location and also the literacy traditions of the languages that were represented in the target class. The three languages represented in the target class have differing literacy traditions. One of the languages (Kikamba) has had a long literacy tradition and quite some literature is available. The second language (Kitharaka), had a very recent literacy tradition where the orthography and writing system in the language were developed in the early 90s. Literature is available in the language especially materials for teaching in the lower primary school. The third language (Kimbeere) is yet to be reduced into the written form which implies no literature whatsoever is available in the language in written form.

This choice was also influenced by the fact that the researcher could understand the three languages in question. The depth of this selection was in keeping with what the researcher had earlier proposed that efforts would be made in the selection, to cater for the complexity

of different literacy traditions among Kenyan MTs with a view to including both better and lesser-resourced language communities.

### *4.4.2.4 Case four*

As already mentioned, qualitative research is characterised by an emerging design. Although I had proposed that I would use three schools in this investigation, as the study progressed, it became apparent that a fourth school would be necessary. The criteria for the selection of the fourth school was similar to those of the initial three schools except that the language taught for the subject MT had to be considered. It had to be one represented as a L1 amongst the learner population. Two schools were identified that taught Kitharaka for the subject MT.

In both schools, the head teachers agreed that the study could be carried out in their institutions. However, since I needed one school, some criteria for eliminating one of them had to be sought. The first criterion was the composition of the learners in each of the classes in terms of number of languages. Two languages were represented in the learner population in the target class in one school and three languages in the other, which meant that both classes were viable options since they presented the minimal diversity that was anticipated in this particular context.

The second criterion used had to do with the researcher's familiarity with the languages represented in the classes since she had no intention of using interpreters at this advanced stage in her data collection. Besides, one of the focuses in the observations in this additional case was going to be on the languages that children used in interaction amongst themselves, which prioritises the researcher's ability to understand the languages used. Upon looking closely at the languages represented in both sites, it became apparent that I was unfamiliar with one of the languages in the class where two languages were represented amongst the learner population and thus the class with three languages became the fourth case for this study.

### 4.4.3   Research participants

According to Henning (2010), the criteria for the selection of research participants are informed by the researcher's knowledge of the topic and how the theorising develops as the research progresses. All the participants in this study were selected on the account that they were the Standard 1 teachers in the selected schools at the time the study was executed. Even in the school where there were two teachers assigned to the target class (school W) at the

time of the study, both teachers were allowed to participate since the two taught in turns in the same class and the investigation was aimed at all the lessons taught.

Once the research permit had been issued, and copies dropped off to the respective offices, I formally visited the study sites for an introductory visit where I met with head teacher of each school. At this point, the head teachers then introduced me to the Standard 1 teacher(s) who I was going to be working with. I disclosed the purpose of the study to each of the participating teachers and clarified that their participation was voluntary (informed consent) following Cohen et al. (2000). We together worked through the informed consent form, which I had earlier prepared and had been approved by the University's ethics committee (see appendix III for ethical clearance).

Included in the consent form is information to do with the participants' liberty to withdraw if they felt they did not want to continue taking part in the study, information on how issues of confidentiality and anonymity would be dealt with in the study, where I had proposed to use pseudonyms in place of the teachers' and school names in the written report of this study. There was also information on what the participant will be agreeing to if they chose to take part in the study, that is, they would allow the research to sit in and observe their classes, be interviewed following these observations and that some of their lessons would be audio-recorded for transcription and analysis (see appendix IV for a copy of the informed consent form). The participants were also given an opportunity to ask any questions. Once they agreed to participate in the study, they signed the informed consent forms.

Although my study did not focus on learner resources and behaviour, the participation of learners from various language communities in response to various classroom stimuli was going to be noted. To this end, I had proposed that parents of learners would be given information before and report back afterwards, if they so request through the Heads of the institutions. However, when I was applying for the research permit, I became aware that this was not a requirement from me by the NCST since my study did not directly target the children (see appendix V for a blank copy of research permit application form). Instead, a report back session with the teachers was proposed by the school heads and the participating teachers at the end of the study.

A number of scholars in social science have argued that qualitative research will seldom end up exactly as planned (see for example Creswell, 1998; Yin, 2003; Holliday, 2002; Leedy &

Ormrod, 2010). This researcher concurs with the contention of these scholars in that although I had earlier proposed to use three schools, selection of a fourth school became eminent in the course of my data collection. During data collection, I discovered that although all the schools I had earlier identified had an allocation for the MT subject in their timetables, none of the schools taught any of the indigenous Kenyan languages for the MT subject. They used Kiswahili as the MoI and taught it for the MT subject even though it is not tested in the latter case (Kiswahili as a MT). Aware of the fact that there are differences in the way a language may be used when it is taught as a subject and when used as a MoI, in consultation with my supervisor, I considered identifying a school where an indigenous Kenyan language is taught as a MT subject in a multilingual classroom. For instance, when the teacher is teaching vocabulary in the MT subject, would the teacher refer to other languages spoken by the learners other than the prescribed school MT? Doing this would not only broaden my perspectives on the issue under study but also my base for comparisons.

I also established during the fieldwork that all teachers in the three schools were females. Having observed all three classes and gathered the data, I felt the need to purposively identify another school (case) where the Standard 1 teacher would be male. However, after consulting with my supervisor and upon looking closely at the representation of males and females in lower primary classes, the issue of teacher's gender was dropped since most lower primary school teachers in Kenya, as elsewhere, are females. In fact in some countries, teaching in the lower primary school classes is a reserve for female teachers. And as (Holliday, 2007:5-7) points out, the strength of qualitative research does not lie in the identification and controlling of variables but in studying them as they are. I therefore went ahead and purposively identified two rural schools from which the fourth research site was selected, that is, another rural school where a Kenyan indigenous language was being taught for the MT subject (see section 4.2.4 and table 1 for the selection criteria for the fourth case in this study).

### 4.4.4   Reporting of findings, acknowledging and referencing sources

As already observed, the ethics of research do not start and stop with the planning of the research and collection of data. Writing up the research report also calls the researcher to make moral choices in their rendering of not only the findings and interpretation chapter(s) but also other chapters in the report. According to Booth et al. (2008), proper acknowledgements and referencing of sources form part of the ethical considerations that one has to make when writing up the research report. In so doing, the researcher is not only acting

in an ethical manner towards those whose work is being cited but also to the readers of the research report (ibid). To this end, this researcher has acknowledged the various sources used and referenced them in full in the reference section of the research report.

Similarly, the findings of this inquiry have been presented faithfully. The transcripts from observations and interviews have also been referenced where these have been cited in the written report. The multiple realities (of the researcher and the researched) have been captured in the interpretation of data. Even where contrasting views have emerged, these have been presented and interpreted accordingly. It has also been argued that "[no] research report is complete until it acknowledges and responds to its readers' predictable questions and disagreements" (Booth et al., 2008:94). In this respect, some of the competing views to the arguments made both in the literature review and the data analysis and interpretation have been highlighted and carefully responded to. Where possible, these competing views have been used to improve the researcher's own views.

## 4.5    DATA COLLECTION METHODS

Methods refer to the road you take to your destination (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010), or as Kvale (1996:4) sees it "a route that leads to a goal". In this regard, if I were to take answering my research question as my goal, then methods would refer to the ways in which I gather the information that I need to do exactly that, that is, the ways in which data for the study was generated, for example, interviews, document analysis and observations. A detailed rendering of the route taken gathering the information needed to answer the research questions provides readers with an 'audit trail' (Henning, 2010; Punch, 2000) by which to judge the inquiry.

Silverman (2000:1) argues that the choice between different methods should depend upon what one is trying to investigate. Creswell (1998:19) observes that "the backbone of qualitative research is extensive data collection, typically from multiple sources of information". In addition, Berg (2007:7) asserts that "no single method of data collection can ever meet the requirements of interaction theory". The implication for this in the choice of methods for data collection is that since different methods reveal a different aspect of empirical reality, a multiple method approach to data collection is to be preferred over single method approach. For instance, although participants' observation would allow for careful recording of situations and selves, it may not offer direct data on the wider spheres on the informal acting of those observed. Combining participant observation with interviews may reveal a lot more than either would if used solely.

According to Silverman (2000:8), the data collection methods used in qualitative research "exemplify a common belief that they can provide a deeper understanding of social phenomena than would be obtained from purely quantitative data". The choice of method should therefore reflect an "overall research strategy" (Mason, 1996:19) since the "methodology shapes which methods are used and how each method is used" (Silverman, 2000:88). Agreeing with Mason and Silverman, Henning (2010:1) points out that the purpose for which the research is being done will have "the most influence" on the methods used for both data collection and analysis.

With due regard to the phenomenon under investigation, this researcher deemed it more enlightening to observe what teachers do in the classrooms than asking them what they think about what happens in the classrooms or what they do. It is possible that how one talks about schooling may not be directly related to what actually happens in schooling (Silverman, 2000:34). As revealed in this study, there are things teachers do in the actual classrooms which they are not even aware they do. Others may say they do certain things in class but a week long observation of the classrooms may reveal something completely different from what they said they do.

In choosing the methods of data collection to use in an inquiry, Silverman (2000:91) advises that one should always question the extent to which the chosen methods will provide valid, reliable and objective data. In this regard, data from observation was corroborated with interview and document data to increase the validity and reliability of the data collected. Collecting data from multiple sources also helped to reveal the different aspects of multilingualism in Kenyan primary school classrooms and how teachers felt, thought and dealt with it.

It has also been argued that in qualitative research, strategies for collecting qualitative data develop in dialogue with the unfolding nature of the social setting within which the research is being carried out (Holliday, 2002). Holliday further observes that one cannot decide before hand the exact kind of data he/she is going to collect. A similar observation is made by Creswell (1998:18) who asserts that a qualitative researcher begins with a general plan because a "detailed plan would not suffice given emerging issues that develop in the field study". Agreeing with Creswell, Leedy and Ormrod (2010) observe that many qualitative studies are characterised by an emerging design. These observations held true for this research in that the study took on new directions as it progressed. For example, although I

had hoped to use three schools in my original proposal and to collect data in the first term of the school year, January to early April, the reality on the ground dictated otherwise. I had to identify a fourth school from which to collect data and as a consequence, data collection spilled over to the second term of the school year (May through July, 2011).

Besides timing, a few issues emerged during the transcriptions and initial analysis of data from the three schools, which guided my observations in the fourth school. For instance, I was keen in the fourth school to find out which languages the children interacted in amongst themselves when they did interact, which was not a main focus in the previous observations, but something that emerged from them. Some of the emerging issues even required me to go back to the individual schools once in a while to either confirm or disconfirm certain observations either through in-class observation or further interviews with the teachers to clarify issues.

Additionally, as I transcribed the recordings from my early class observations and typed the field notes, I began jotting notes (memos) of my initial interpretations of what I was hearing. These guided the kind of data that was subsequently gathered (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). For example, I went back to school Y, four months after the initial data collection to observe the lessons but this time paying close attention to the languages in which the children interacted amongst themselves in the classroom. In addition, these initial impressions and interpretations guided the data that was collected in all subsequent cases and especially so in the fourth case.

### 4.5.1 Triangulation

In research, the term triangulation is underpinned by the assumption that by combining several lines of sight, one obtains a better and more substantive picture of reality, which results in a richer, more complete array of symbols and theoretical concepts and the means of verifying those elements (Berg, 2007:5). Thus the important feature of triangulation is as Fielding and Fielding (1986:31) put it, the attempt to relate the different kinds of data (arising from multiple methods), so as to counteract the threats to validity. Fielding and Fielding however, caution that the use of triangulation should operate according to two ground rules, that is, it should always begin from a theoretical perspective and that the methods of data collection; and the data they generate should give an account of the structure and meaning from within that theoretical perspective.

According to Stake (1995) triangulation also involves asking the same questions to different research participants to get their views on an issue (participant triangulation). In this study, both forms of triangulation were used (methodological and participant triangulation). Besides using multiple data collection methods, the different participants were asked similar questions, where that applied, in the meaning making process. For example, in all the classes observed, a lot of repetition was taking place and thus all teachers were asked why that was the case in order to understand the range of meanings they attached to this particular classroom practice. In this process however, care was taken not to adopt what Hammersley and Atkinson (1983:199) have called "a naively optimistic view that the aggregation of data from different sources will unproblematically add up to produce a more complete picture".

As already stated, multiple methods were used to generate data on the phenomenon under investigation. Observation was the main data generation method in this study, while data from the semi-structured interviews with teachers and document analysis corroborated the observation data.

## 4.5.2  Observation

Observational studies have been fundamental to much qualitative research (Silverman, 2000) over the years. Commenting on choice of data collection methods, Silverman (2000:34) points out that "if we are interested in what happens in the classrooms, [...] to observe what people do there instead of asking them what they think about it" may be preferable. He then cautions that how we talk about schooling may not be directly related to what actually happens in schooling. Following Silverman, observation was preferred as the main data collection method in this study. This researcher deemed it more enlightening to observe what teachers did in classrooms than, for example, asking them what they think about what they do. Classroom studies have actually shown that many teachers are unaware of some of the things they do in class (see for example Pontefract & Hardman, 2005).

The researcher can either observe as relative outsider or as a participant observer as happens in ethnographic studies (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). Whereas observations in quantitative studies are highly structured, observations in qualitative studies are "intentionally unstructured and free flowing" (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010:145). This allows the researcher to shift focus to potentially significant events or objects as they surface. Such an approach to observations has the advantage of flexibility in that the researcher can "take advantage of unforeseen data as they emerge" (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010:147). Since this study was

exploratory, the researcher conducted unstructured observations, which allowed for the desired flexibility in the focus of the observation.

I observed the selected cases for at least a week each. The focus of my observations was on the teacher looking out for any signs of how they handled the multiplicity of languages in their classrooms given the composition of the learners. I specifically observed their use of language in the classroom and how they responded to the language (s) and language varieties used by the learners and in the teaching/learning materials that teachers used including textbooks and classroom labels. I observed not only the language lessons but also the lessons for the content subjects such as Social Studies, Science, Christian Religious Education (CRE) and Arithmetic. This was done with the aim of understanding teachers' classroom practices with regard to language choices, in the development of language and literacy skills of the learners in their classrooms. I observed at least 5 lessons of 30 minutes each day for at least 5 days in each school.

I also observed the teachers and learners outside of the classroom for lessons such as Physical Education (PE) and story-telling sessions which were guided by the teacher. I observed two PE lessons and two story-telling sessions (the only ones that took place during my visits). At least 80 lessons amounting to over 40 hours of observation were done. About three quarters of these lessons were audio-recorded and transcribed and complimented with the field notes and interviews with participating teachers.

Qualitative researchers may combine different methods or sources of data to corroborate each other in some form of methodological triangulation (Mason, 1996). Thus, besides observation, this research also conducted interviews with the participating teachers in an effort to counteract threats to validity.

### 4.5.3    Interviews

Interviews are mainly used to elicit respondents' perceptions (Silverman, 2000:35). Research interviews whether standardised/structured or discursive/unstructured/semi-structured all work with the assumption that an individual's perspective, referring to the perspective of the researched, is an important part in the fabric of any society (Henning, 2010:50). Interviews thus, Henning argues, recognise the reflexive power of ordinary people in the meaning making process (ibid). This makes possible the co-construction of meaning between the

researcher and the researched, as premised in the critical interpretive theoretical paradigm adopted in this investigation.

Interviews were conducted with participating teachers following classroom observations with the aim of seeking clarifications from the teachers for specific actions noted during the observations. The interviews were carried out with the teachers in their respective classes and lasted between 10 and 20 minutes depending on what issues had been noted from the class observations that needed to be picked up in an interview. At least two interviews were conducted in each case. The data generated from observations and interviews was further corroborated with data from documents' analysis.

### 4.5.4   Document analysis

Denscombe (2003) identifies two ways in which documents are used in research: 1) as part of a literature review, where they act as an introduction to research by helping the researcher establish the current state of knowledge and provide information on the theories and principles behind the phenomenon under investigation and 2) as sources of data, where documents act as objects of investigation and are treated as such in their own right.

Although not included as a source of data in the initial research proposal, as the study progressed, it became clear that an analysis of different documents used in the observed classes was unavoidable. Various documents were analysed as sources of data. These included the class attendance registers, which helped in assessing the linguistic composition of the learners in the classes, the textbooks used in the classes, the syllabus and in some instances the learners' exercise books were consulted.

According to Yin (2003), documents as sources of data are likely to be relevant in any case study topic thus making them the object of explicit data collection plans. Yin points out that the most important use of documents in case study research is to "corroborate and augment evidence" from other data sources. This is exactly how data from document analysis was used in this study. For example, when observing lessons in school Z, I noted from the teacher's talk in the classroom that very little was happening with regard to the teaching of MT as a subject. I however needed to confirm this before making conclusions so I requested the teacher for language books from three learners for all three languages taught (English, Kiswahili and Kitharaka/MT). A quick scan through the MT book confirmed what I had earlier noted

through class observations, that MT was seldom taught as a subject in this particular class. In this way, the information from document analysis corroborated the observation data.

While documents are a valuable source of data and do not alter the natural setting as would the presence of a researcher to conduct an interview, Delamont (2002) and Yin (2003) warn that they (documents) must be examined with caution. This is because, documents may be edited to exclude certain information or statistics altered to protect someone's interests. Additionally, certain documents are written for specific purposes and audience, not for the purposes of the researcher analysing them. Although the kinds of documents that I was using such as textbooks, syllabus, education commission reports, learners' exercise books etc may not have been prone to any alterations, caution was exercised in using them as sources of data.

### 4.5.5   Field notes

Detailed field notes were kept by the researcher during data collection. These involved the reflections, critical incidences, memos of the researcher's observations and experiences throughout the data collection period (Patton, 2002). The field notes came in handy during the follow up interviews with teachers and in the initial data analysis stages of this inquiry. This was particularly so in two of the research sites where I had no access to power supply and therefore could not playback the recordings in an attempt to shape the next day's data collection. A look through the field notes gave pointers to the areas of focus in subsequent data collection.

Silverman (2000:35) asserts that "in qualitative research, what happens in the field as one attempts to gather data is in itself a source of data rather than a technical problem in need of a solution". Therefore, what counts as qualitative data is what happens in a particular social setting, that is, in a particular place or amongst a particular group of people. Following Holliday (2000:60), data is used in the singular form in this thesis to signify a "body of experience" rather than seeing data in terms of number of items as happens in quantitative research. The analysis procedures of the data gathered from the different sources are discussed in the sections that follow.

### 4.6   DATA ANALYSIS

Holliday (2002:99) defines data analysis as "the process of making sense, sifting, organising, cataloguing, selecting themes - processing the data". Data analysis has been viewed

differently by various scholars depending on what the process has meant for them. For Henning (2010:103), data analysis process is the "heartbeat of the research", while Yin (2003) equates data analysis to finding one's way in the forest. However, these scholars all agree that data analysis in qualitative research is an on-going process (Berg, 2004; 2007) and occurs simultaneously with data collection (see for example Creswell, 1998; Holliday, 2002; Stake, 1995; Leedy & Ormrod, 2010; Silverman, 2000; Gibbs, 2007) in that the researcher notes important themes throughout the study. Both Creswell (1998) and Stake (1995) point out that data analysis in case study design typically entails five steps: 1) the organisation of details about the case, 2) the categorisation of data, 3) the interpretation of single instances, 4) the identification of patterns, and 5) the synthesis and generalisations. This study follows similar steps which are inherent in both the research design and in the procedure of analysis adopted.

As already stated in the introductory chapter, this study follows the procedure of qualitative content analysis, where the data is first transcribed "verbatim" (Henning, 2010:104). Transcription is then followed by open coding in which the codes are selected according to what the data mean to the researcher (Henning, 2010:104) before invoking the broader context in the categorisation of data. Once the categories have been identified, the researcher is able to see the whole leading to the construction of themes (Henning, 2010:107) which form the basis for the discussion and arguments as text data is merged with literature. Since this study follows an inductive and interpretive approach, getting started did not involve formulating a hypothesis but began with an interest in a problem which then allowed the data to speak for itself.

### 4.6.1   Research Contexts

Arguably, a description of contexts is an important step in qualitative research (see for example Creswell, 1998; Leedy & Ormord, 2010; Stake, 1995). Stake (1995:123) advocates for an extensive narrative description of the context, by presenting "relatively uncontested data", which the readers' of the research report would have made themselves had they been there. With regard to case studies, the research design adopted in this study, Leedy and Ormrod (2010) emphasise the need to describe the context surrounding the case. This involves providing all information and any factors that may have a bearing on the phenomenon being investigated. In so doing, the researcher helps the readers of the research report to draw their own conclusions on the extent to which such findings could be

generalised to other situations (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). Stake (1995:65) finds that a description of context is necessary in order to "develop vicarious experiences for readers [and] give them a sense of being there". Concurring with Creswell, Stake and Leedy and Ormrod, I provide a detailed description of each of the four cases studied in order to give the readers a clear mental picture of these cases and give them "a sense of being there" to borrow the words of Stake (1995:65). This is done in the first data analysis chapter just before the presentation and interpretation to keep the data close to the context from which it was gathered (see section 5.1).

## 4.6.2   Transcription

All interviews and at least three quarters of the classroom observations were audio-recorded. Lessons that were observed when the researcher went back to the schools for follow up during the data analysis were not recorded. Instead detailed field notes were taken during such visits. The recordings were transcribed by the researcher and amounted to over 600 pages of transcripts. The advantage of own transcription is that I was able to begin seeing the emerging patterns in the data, noting reflections and 'memoing' as the transcriptions continued. Henning (2010:105) advocates for own transcriptions because the process allows the researcher to "come and stay close to the data", which in turn facilitates inductive meaning making process that is characteristic of the interpretive paradigm adopted in this study. As such, doing own transcriptions gave me a clearer overview of the data collected from the different contexts while noting any special areas of focus in subsequent data collection. In keeping with the qualitative content analysis procedures, transcriptions were done verbatim but not including the type of detail that is required for the conversation analysis (Henning, 2010:104).

### *4.6.2.1 Coding, categorising and developing themes*

Gibbs (2007) sees coding simply as what the data one is trying to analyse is about while Punch defines coding as the "process of putting tags, names or labels against pieces of the data" (Punch, 2000:204). This assigning of labels to pieces of data is done with the aim of assigning meaning to those pieces of data. Besides meaning, the codes/labels also provide a basis for data storage and retrieval and permits more advanced coding (categorisation and developing of themes) which are part of subsequent analysis (ibid). Although I had transcribed the recordings personally, I followed the procedures of qualitative data analysis step by step. I began with open coding where I read through the entire transcript texts for the

various cases in order to get a "global impression" of their content (Henning, 2010:104). I then read through the texts a second time trying to make sense of what I was reading. If something struck me as I was reading, I would highlight it in on the computer for the entire second reading. These highlighted sections were then coded in the initial stages of data analysis. The following sections provide a detailed discussing of the coding patterns used.

### 4.6.2.2 School codes

In keeping with the promise for confidentiality and anonymity, pseudonyms have been used for all the schools used in this study. The urban school has been coded as school W, while the peri-urban school has been coded as school X. The rural schools have been coded as schools Y and Z for rural school numbers one and two respectively.

### 4.6.2.3 Teacher Codes

All the participating teachers bear the same code as the school code. For example, teacher X refers to the participating teacher from school X while teacher Y is used for the participating teacher from school Y. In school W, where there were two participating teachers, teacher W1 and teacher W2 have been used for the class teacher and the assistant teacher respectively. In addition, T is used for the teacher in the lesson excerpts but in the discussion, the codes for the teachers which match their school codes are used to ensure that it is clear to the reader who exactly is being referred to.

### 4.6.2.4 Learner Codes

In order to maintain the anonymity of the learners, in all the excerpts provided, I use the codes L for one learner in instances where the learner is unnamed by the teacher. Ls is used in the transcripts in reference to the learners where more than one learner was involved in the classroom. Where the teacher uses a named learner, these have been coded using the first letter in the name that the teacher used to address them. For example, if the teacher asks a question and calls out Susan's name asking her to respond to the question, Susan has been coded as learner S both in the transcripts and the transcript excerpts used in this written report. This it is believed is anonymous enough since there are many names for example that begin with the letter S. All excerpts used bare a school code so even where the learners' labels are the same, these can be related to their schools.

### *4.6.2.5 Data codes*

The coding of data was an ongoing process where initial codes were assigned and refined as the analysis of the data progressed. The initial codes were assigned following the initial reading of the transcripts to get an overview or the "global impression" of the text, to borrow the words of Henning (2010:104). These initial codes were assigned to chunks of information that the researcher had already highlighted in a different colour in the transcripts during the initial reading. The codes used at this point only indicated the source of the data with regard to whether the data was from interview or observation transcripts, the school and the page number of the transcript in which that information is found. For example, **OT1 SW. 10** indicated that something had been identified in observation transcript number 1 from school W page number 10, while the code **IT2 SZ. 8** indicated to the researcher that there was a chunk of information in interview transcript number 2 from school Z, on page number 8. Including the page numbers in the initial codes made it easier to retrieve the information considering the huge volumes of transcripts that I was working with. Where field notes have been used in the text, the code of the school from which the notes were taken is shown and the dates when the field notes were taken, again for ease of reference. For example **FN SX 21/01/2011** indicates that the source of information is field notes taken in school X on the 21$^{st}$ of January 2011.

Owing to the amount of data that I was going to be dealing with, observation transcripts from the different study sites were kept separate for manageability purposes. The interview transcripts were fewer and therefore these were merged into one document while maintaining their sources and transcripts numbers. As already mentioned, at least two interviews were conducted in each school and these were mainly follow-ups on the observations made. The inclusion of the school code in the initial codes helped me to know exactly which transcripts were being referred to and saved time during data retrieval process. These codes were assigned as comments on the margins of the transcripts since I was coding the data manually but found that the comments options on word processor would assist in working through the word document as opposed to printing all the transcripts and using marker pens to highlight these chunks of information. The use of the computer to assign the codes, albeit in a manual way, saved me time in the data analysis process. Even when changing the labels/codes assigned to the data was required, doing so on the computer proved less laborious than if it was being done manually on paper. The find option was particularly very helpful when I

needed to search for specific words either in the transcripts or the codes I had assigned in the form of comments.

The transcripts were labelled according to the number of the recordings. All information under one recording was transcribed and assigned the same code except the page numbers. For example, **OT1 SW. 8 and OT1 SW. 12,** both indicate that this was the first recording I did in school W and that there is some useful chunk of data on the phenomenon under investigation found on page 8 and 12 respectively. This did not only facilitate retrieval of information but also meant that if anything was unclear in the transcripts, I could quickly refer back to the recording to verify the information, since I could tell exactly which recording was being referred to in the codes. This level of detail and rigour was necessary in ensuring that I allowed the data to "speak for [itself]" (Henning, 2010:105) and render greater credence in the analysis and interpretation procedures in qualitative research.

### *4.6.2.6 Descriptive codes*

Following the initial coding, I made memos comprising of reflections of what the coded data meant to me as the researcher and in line with the phenomenon under investigation. This reflection proved very useful in the next level of coding which now comprised the initial code plus an additional label showing how the data or chunks of the data had been categorised. For example, to the initial code **OT1 SW. 10,** a label was added to it which showed what the information in this code entailed in relation to the objectives of the study, so that now the code read **OT1 SW. 10. BARR,** which indicates that the information relating to this chunk of data has to do with barriers to the development of literacy and language skills in multiple language classrooms. Miles and Huberman (1994:57) refer to this type of coding as descriptive coding, where the researcher uses single summarising notations for a chunk of information depending on what this means to him/her. These descriptive codes were further refined into categories or pattern codes which proved helpful in deriving the themes (ibid) from the categories as the patterns became clearer. It is however the initial codes that are used in the extracts in this written report. This is done in order to keep the codes simple and friendlier to the readers' eyes. The following table provides a summary of how the codes are used in this research report.

**Table 4.2:    Showing a summary of how codes are used in this research report**

| Code | What it stands for |
|---|---|
| SW | School W – Urban |
| SX | School X - Peri-urban |
| SY | School Y - Rural school no. 1 |
| SZ | School Z- Rural school no. 2 |
| Teacher W1 | The participating teacher in school W - class teacher |
| Teacher W2 | The participating teacher in school W - assistant teacher |
| Teacher X | The participating teacher in school X |
| Teacher Y | The participating teacher in school Y |
| Teacher Z | The participating teacher in school Z |
| T | Used in lesson extracts to denote the teacher's turn in the classroom interaction |
| Ls | Used for learners where more than one learner is involved in the classroom interaction in any school |
| L | Stands for one unnamed learner participating in classroom interaction |
| IT2 SY. 4 | Interview transcript 2, from school Y page 4 |
| IT1 SW | Interview transcript 1, from school W |
| IT1 SX | Interview transcript 1, from School X |
| OT1 SW | Observation transcript 1, from school W |
| OT1 SY | Observation transcript 1, from School Y |
| OT4 SX | Observation transcript 4, from school X |
| OT6 SZ | Observation transcript 6, from school Z |
| FN SW 21/01/2011 | Field notes School W taken on the 21st of January 2011 |
| FN SX | Field notes school X |
| FN SY | Field notes school Y |
| FN SZ | Field notes school Z |
| Learner S | A named learner whose name begins with S |
| Learner M | A named learner whose name begins with M |

According to Holliday (2007:94), the formation of themes in data analysis represents the necessary dialogue between the researcher and the data as he/she tries to make sense of it.

Holliday further observes that themes can be developed from either the formal analysis of data or emerge from what is seen during the data collection. In this study, themes began emerging from the data collection and continued through to formal data analysis. To this end, I began writing memos on the margins of my field notes as I reflected on what I was seeing and hearing in the classrooms. These early reflections on the data were also captured in the interviews with teachers to facilitate the co-construction of meaning that is characteristic of the interpretive theoretical framework which guided this study.

Adler and Adler (1994:381) have argued that:

> *Without subjects' quotes to enrich and confirm researchers' analysis, or inter-observer cross-checking to lend greater credence to their representations, some observers have had difficulty legitimating their work to a scholarly audience.*

To this, Creswell (1998) adds that the incorporation of subjects' quotes in the written report of an investigation provides the participants' perspectives on the study which in turn brings out the co-construction of meaning presumed in an interpretive research paradigm. To guard against the legitimacy difficulty pointed out by Adler and Adler, to lend greater credence to my work, and to provide evidence for the process of the co-creation of meaning as advocated by Creswell, I integrate data analysis and interpretation with direct quotes from the research participants as captured in the field notes, the recordings which have since been transcribed, and responses from individual interviews to support the arguments made.

### 4.6.3   Data interpretation

Henning (2010:103) cautions that the strength of an inquiry is built not only on the variety of data collection methods used, but also in the "use of different approaches to workings of data or building the interpretive text". Erickson (1986) identifies the emphasis on interpretation as the most distinctive characteristic of a qualitative inquiry. This emphasis is on the level of interpretation that involves the researcher observing the workings of the case and examining the meaning that the researched give to their actions. To this, Miles and Huberman (1994:11) add that the "strength of qualitative data rests very centrally on the competence with which the analysis is carried out". Stake (1995) further points out the need for qualitative researchers to preserve the multiple realities (of both the researcher and the researched) in the interpretation of what is happening including the different or even contradictory views that may emerge. To this end, I have made efforts at co-creation of meaning with the researched.

Classroom practices that interested me during the classroom observations were picked up in the interviews with the participating teachers in an effort to construct meaning together with them. A number of approaches have also been employed in workings of data to ensure that the data "speaks for [itself]" (Henning 2010:105), in the building of a coherent interpretive text that is the report of this inquiry.

## 4.7    CRITERIA FOR JUDGING THE STUDY

Silverman (2000) points out that unless a researcher is able to show his/her audience or readers the procedures used to ensure the reliability of the methods used and the validity of the conclusions drawn, there is no point in aiming to conclude a research project. Creswell (1998:17) in his discussion of the reasons for conducting qualitative research observes that when engaging in a form of research that is constantly evolving and changing, there is need to tell others "how one plans to conduct a study and how others might judge it when the study is done". To this Henning (2010:36) adds the need for the researcher to be aware of the existing and "cutting-edge criteria" for judging qualitative research in order to give an informed rendering of their methodological position. Such awareness on the part of the researcher is critical in the rendering of a high quality piece of research.

In this regard, Punch (2000:251) identifies two foundational issues in research evaluation: 1) a disciplined inquiry, which has to do with the capability of the data, the arguments and reasoning to withstand scrutiny from other members of the scientific community, and 2) the fit between the component parts of a research project, which has to do with how well the research design and methods align with the research questions (which in essence is the overall validity of the research). These two criteria are related in that "when the questions, design and methods fit together, the argument is strong and the research has validity" (Punch, 2000:252-3), whereas when the fit is lacking, then the argument is weakened and no validity claims can be made of the research. In this study, these two concepts are expanded into 1) the set up of the research, 2) the empirical procedures used in the research design, 3) the quality of the data, 4) findings and conclusions reached in the research, and 5) the presentation of the research (Punch, 2000), which form the "cutting-edge criteria" referred to by Henning, and by which this research should be judged. What follows is a detailed discussion of these criteria and how they have been dealt with to enhance the overall validity of this study.

### 4.7.1 Set up of the research

This criterion has to do with how well the researcher articulates the ideological stance taken in a study, the clarity of the topic area, the appropriateness of both the research questions and the context in which the research is set (Punch, 2000). As already alluded to in the earlier sections of this chapter, this research is undertaken within the qualitative paradigm as presupposed by the interpretive theoretical framework under which this study falls. This approach was adopted because it was felt that the phenomena of multilingualism in education would be understood best by investigating its qualities rather than its quantities.

Besides the ideological position, another important aspect of evaluation under the set up of the research is the appropriateness of the research questions in relation to the topic. Punch (2000) delineates that the research questions ought to be clear, specific, answerable, interconnected and substantively relevant, which form the evaluation criteria for research questions. I contend here that the research questions in this study are unambiguous and they are specific in that each objective states exactly what will be sought, which presupposes the kind of data that will be expected and to some extent the methods that will yield that kind if data.

The questions are also answerable as each question helped the researcher anticipate the kind of data that was needed. In the initial stages, an alignment of methods to the research objectives was attempted and the interconnectedness of the research questions/objectives was established. This was evident in the fact that the answers to the third and fourth research questions/objectives of this study were going to be drawn from the data from answering questions/objectives one and two. The alignment of the methods with the objectives of the research was presented for input and critique at both the departmental and faculty defence of my research proposal.

The substantive relevance of the research questions is evident in the fact that the questions lead to a better understanding of the phenomenon of multilingualism in education and how it is handled in African-resource poor contexts particularly in multilingual Kenyan primary schools' classrooms. This is the knowledge gap that this research sought to fill by shedding more light into it for better understanding and explanation.

### 4.7.2   The empirical procedures used in the research design

Empirical procedures have to do with the research design, the tools and methods used for data collection and data analysis (Punch, 2000). In a disciplined inquiry, Punch argues, these procedures have to be reported with sufficient detail to allow the readers of the research report to scrutinise and reconstruct the research. Besides a detailed report, there has to be a "goodness of fit" between the design of the study, the methods of data collection and the research questions (Henning, 2010:36). The research design, the instruments and methods of data collection and data analysis should align with the appropriate research questions. In this study, the researcher made effort at the proposal writing stage to align the design, the instruments and the methods with the research objectives. The following table, which was presented to and critiqued by members of the linguistics department, acted as a guide to this researcher in this process.

**Table 4.3:   Showing the matching of objectives to the methods of data generation**

| Research objective | Data generation method | Data source |
|---|---|---|
| Teachers' understanding of linguistic diversity and effects on learning | - In-class observations<br>- Interviews<br>- Document analysis | - Teachers<br>- Learning/classroom environment<br>- Documents |
| Strategies employed to manage linguistic diversity | - Observations<br>- Interviews | - Teachers |
| Potential barriers to literacy and language development in multilingual classrooms | - From objective 1 and 2<br>- Observations | - Learning environment<br>- Teachers<br>- Literature |
| Describe current practice in the development of language and literacy skills in multilingual classrooms | - From objective 1 and 2 | - Teachers<br>- Learning environment<br>- Documents |
| Make suggestions for multiliteracy development in multilingual classrooms | - From findings and literature review | - Findings of the study<br>- Literature |

### 4.7.3  The quality of the data

The quality of the data collected in this study was enhanced by use of the different sources of data available to the researcher. The case study design adopted allowed for the use of different methods to collect the data, the commonest of those being observation, interviews and document analysis. These three methods of data collection were employed in this study, where observation data was corroborated with interview and document data (methodological triangulation). Although Silverman (2000) warns against using methodological triangulation to settle validity questions, I argue here that the methods employed in data collection and the research design had a good fit with the research questions/objectives. Besides, the data collected by use of one method was not taken at face value but was validated using other methods.

### 4.7.4  Validity

Hammersley defines validity as "the extent to which an account accurately represents the social phenomena to which it refers" (Hammersley, 1990:57). In fact, Hammersley further points out that validity is another word for truth. In a similar vein, Holliday (2002) has argued that qualitative research has the potential for rigour which resides in the way in which the research is expressed. In this regard, Holliday points out the need for researchers to be explicit or detailed about their research processes. In this study, the researcher has endeavoured to rigorously 'show the workings' by not only offering a detailed description of the research setting (the cases), the research participants and the rationale for the choices made, but also faithfully documenting the key changes in the research direction as well as sufficient details of how the data was analysed. Such explicitness in conducting and reporting of research processes enables the readers to follow through the audit trail (Punch, 2000; Henning, 2010), which gives them an opportunity to thoroughly examine the research.

As already stated, a few issues emerged during the transcription and initial coding of data from the first three cases which guided data collection in the fourth site. However, some of the emerging issues required the researcher to go back to the individual schools to either confirm or disconfirm certain observations either through in-class observations or further interviews with the teachers to clarify issues. This rigour was employed in an effort to check the validity of the claims being made in the construction of meaning from the data. Even in the writing up stages when I was already back in South Africa, I made phone calls to teacher Y to verify information that was unclear.

In addition, the procedure of data analysis employed (qualitative content analysis) also allowed for thick description which befit the case study design. As already discussed, this fit between the component parts of research validates the research and strengthens the claims made from the data.

### 4.7.5   Reliability

Reliability has been defined as the extent to which findings can be replicated or reproduced by another inquirer (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). Hammersley (1992:67) adds a different dimension to this definition, that of the same inquirer and defines reliability as "the degree of consistency to which instances are assigned to the same category by different observers or the same observer on different occasions". This entails not only providing an accurate interpretation of the transcripts (Silverman, 2000) but also making available the field notes or extended transcripts to allow the readers to formulate their own hunches and perspectives (Bryman, 1988) on the phenomenon being studied. It is also argued that for reliability to be assured/calculated, the researcher has to document his or her procedure (Kirk & Miller, 1986), the audit trail (Punch, 2000; Henning, 2010) or what Holliday (2002:47) refers to as "showing the workings", in order to reveal how the inherent subjectivity in qualitative research has been managed while at the same time maintaining rigour. I have, in this respect endeavoured to explain my workings which are carefully woven throughout the different stages of this study, as a central element in achieving accountability.

### 4.7.6   Findings and conclusions reached in the research

Punch (2000) delineates that the findings have to do with answers to the research question, in this case the research objectives, while the conclusions have to do with the claims that can be made on the basis of the answers to the research questions. He further adds that we should not only answer the research questions but also have confidence in the answers that have been found because it is on the basis of those answers that conclusions will be drawn in the study.

The objectives set out in this study have been met by the findings from the data gathered. The conclusions arrived at in this research are supported by the findings and/or the answers to the research questions. To this end, subjects' quotes have been incorporated in the arguments to "enrich and confirm researcher's analysis" (Adler & Adler, 1994:381) and to lend credence to the claims made. Even where opposing views have been unearthed, these have been faithfully presented and interpreted in the research report. In addition, the researcher does not claim

more than the findings could support. This is evident in the suggestions for further research, where the researcher outlines areas that the research could not lay claim of because the findings from the data collected did not directly address these areas.

### 4.7.7 The presentation of the research

This research is presented in a coherent way and fits into the design logic. This internal argumentative consistency is not possible where there is no fit amongst the research design, the data collection methods and the data analysis tools and procedures adopted in a study (Henning, 2010). Besides argumentative consistency and coherence, the researcher has also provided a detailed description of the research setting, the cases and her workings including the emerging design of the study, which provides the readers with an audit trial by which the research can be reconstructed and explained.

### 4.8 CONCLUSION

This chapter has presented the 'reasoning behind the value of methods' in this study and the justifications for the choices made, in the light of the theoretical paradigm (critical and interpretive) and the research paradigm (qualitative) adopted. Different scholars contend that a qualitative research approach invokes an emerging design in that the study may not end up exactly as planned. This study has served to affirm this claim in that a number of issues emerged in the course of the study which necessitated a shift in the initial plan of research. It is also evident in this chapter that methodology in qualitative research evolves over the course of the investigation as earlier observed by Leedy and Ormrod (2010).

Additionally, as Booth et al. (2008) point out, ethical principles are easily adhered to when the researcher is able to move beyond self-interests and honest pursuit of the truth which inevitably entails finding a balance between what one wants as a researcher and what is good for the researched and/or readers of the written research report. To this end, ethical considerations ranging from those that involve the planning of the research through to the presentation of findings including proper acknowledgements and referencing of sources have been strictly adhered to throughout this study.

To ensure that this study is a high quality piece of research, this researcher has heeded to the calls of other scholars to think ahead and provide the criteria by which a qualitative research shall be judged. The two concepts of a disciplined inquiry and the fit amongst the research

design, the data collection methods and the tools and procedures for data analysis form the basis by which study is to be judged.

The next chapter presents the findings and interpretations reached from the analysis of data relating to the first objective of this study, which has to do with teachers' understandings of linguistic diversity in multilingual classrooms.

# CHAPTER 5

# TEACHERS' UNDERSTANDING OF AND ATTTITUDES TOWARDS LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY IN MULTILINGUAL CLASSROOMS

## INTRODUCTION

In chapter four, I presented the research methodology adopted in this study. The current chapter provides a detailed description of the context of the research. The chapter also presents a step by step analysis and interpretation of the data for the first objective of the study which is: to determine the understandings that teachers have of linguistic diversity and its effect on learning in multilingual classrooms. For better understanding of the rest of this chapter and this research report, the next section gives a detailed description of the contexts of this research.

## 5.1 A DESCRIPTION OF THE CONTEXTS OF RESEARCH

With regard to case studies, Leedy and Ormrod (2010) emphasise the need to describe the context surrounding the case, so that the readers of the report can assess the extent to which findings may be generalised or similar methods may be used in other situations. Concurring with Leedy and Ormrod (2010) and other scholars (see for example Creswell, 1998; Stake, 1995) (see exposition in section 4.6.1), a detailed description of each of the four cases of this study will follow, in order to give the readers a clear mental picture of these cases and to develop "a sense of being there" to borrow the words of Stake (1995:65). In each case, the linguistic composition of the learners in the target classes and the actual classroom environments are specifically described. Teachers' qualifications and teaching experiences are also discussed to allow for consideration of possible connections with the observed classroom practices.

### 5.1.1 Organisation of lower primary school classrooms

The tradition in lower primary classes in Kenya is similar to most other arrangements in early schooling, namely that only one teacher is assigned to a class. The class teacher therefore, teaches all subjects since there are no subject specialists at this level. In lower primary in

Kenya, once assigned to a class, the teacher also moves along with her learners to the next level. Thus, once assigned to Standard 1, the teacher remains the class teacher for the same learners in Standard 2 the following year and Standard 3 the year after. After the third year, as the group progresses to the upper primary phase (Standards 4-8), the teacher becomes the class teacher in a new Standard 1 group. Therefore, when teachers talk about their teaching experience in lower primary in this context, they would most likely be referring to all three levels and not to the Standard 1 level only. In most cases, such teachers will additionally teach one other subject in one upper primary class in the afternoons because ordinarily, lower primary classes run up to 12.35 p.m. It is also the norm in Kenya, as in most other contexts, that male teachers seldom teach lower primary classes and especially Standard 1. This explains why all the Standard 1 teachers observed in this study were females.

In order to maintain anonymity, the schools and teachers that participated in this study, are referred to according to the following set of codes: the four schools are referred to as schools W, X, Y and Z. I use the same codes for the school and the teacher(s) in that school. For example, "teacher X" refers to the teacher from school X, while "teacher Y" refers to the teacher observed in schools Y, and so on. For school W, where I had two teachers participating, I refer to teacher W1 and W2; these were the class teacher and the assistant teacher respectively. This is done in keeping with research ethics procedures as discussed in the previous chapter (see section 4.4.3). In the same way, pseudonyms have been used for the learners where teachers have referred to individual learners and those instances have become a part of this research report. Thus the codes L and Ls have been used to refer to one learner where that learner's name is not mentioned and more than one learner respectively. Where the learner's name is mentioned, that learner has been coded using the first letter in his/her name. For example, John has been coded as learner J with no reference for the school since the transcripts from the schools have been kept separate (see section 4.6.1.3 for learner codes). All other pseudonyms for the learners follow a similar coding pattern.

## 5.1.2 Participating schools

Four schools, one urban, one peri-urban and two rural schools participated in this study. As already discussed, three schools had initially been selected but a fourth school was added in the course of the data collection (see section 4.4.2 for selection criteria). A detailed description of each of the schools is provided in the sections that follow.

### 5.1.2.1 School W (urban)

This is a public[7] primary school which draws a large percentage of its learners from one of the biggest informal settlements in Nairobi. With the introduction of free primary education (FPE) in 2003, the classes were overflowing with children who could not access school earlier due to the costs implications (Teacher W1, personal communication, January 2011). In 2003 alone, when FPE was launched, the Standard 1 class enrolled over 100 children. However, as time went by, the numbers started to go down. The decrease was felt even more after the post-election violence that rocked the country following the disputed presidential elections in 2007. This informal settlement was one of the worst hit by the post-election violence and the effects were marked in the dwindling number of learners enrolled in the school, not only in Standard 1 but also the rest of the classes. Many parents may have opted to transfer their children from this and other schools in areas that had been affected by post-election violence for fear of recurrences in the future.

The current Standard 1 has 32 children, a very low enrolment for any urban public primary school in Kenya. Two teachers were in charge of this class at the time of the study. The pupil enrolment was too low to warrant two separate classes so both teachers assigned to Standard 1 taught in turns in the same class. Again, this is something unheard of in a country where understaffing is the order of the day in public primary schools. The average pupil-teacher ratios are reported to range between 45:1 and 75:1 (Pontefract & Hardman, 2005:96) in most public schools in Kenya. The 32 children in this class represent eleven different L1s. Nine of these are autochthonous Kenyan languages, namely Kikuyu, Kikamba, Dholuo, Luhyia, Teso, Ekegusii, Egekuria, Nubian and Somali. Two other languages, a Southern Sudan language and Kirundi, are indigenous to neighbouring countries, Southern Sudan and Burundi respectively. This indicates the likely migrant status of these speakers' families. English and Kiswahili, the two school languages, and Sheng'; identified as an informal slang mainly spoken in urban areas, are also used in school W. The learners in this classroom thus represent these languages as well as some of their dialects and varieties.

Teacher W1 is a native speaker of Dholuo, one of the languages represented amongst the learner population. She is a graduate from a teacher training college (TTC) and an employee of the Teachers' Service Commission (TSC), the semi-autonomous government agency charged with the recruitment and placement of teachers in Kenya. Teacher W1 also holds a

---

[7] Public here means that the school is state owned, governed and maintained.

diploma in Early Childhood Education and Development (ECED). She has 11 years of teaching experience in the lower primary section.

Teacher W2 is an L1 speaker of Luhyia, employed by the Parents-Teachers' Association (PTA)[8]. She holds a diploma in ECED from one of the Kenyan public Universities. Although teacher W2 quite recently graduated, she has 8 years' teaching experience, all of which she has been teaching in the early years namely in ECD and at lower primary level. She began teaching as an untrained teacher (not uncommon in Africa), and later joined in-service training as she continued teaching. The dialect of Luhyia that teacher W2 speaks, is different to those spoken by the Luhyia-speaking learners in the classroom.

Regarding the linguistic landscape of the Standard 1 classroom in school W, it was noted that three of the four classroom walls are bursting with labels, mostly in English except for those applicable to teaching Kiswahili as a language subject. The front wall, which is largely covered by the chalkboard, has labels squeezed into the little spaces left on either side. The labels are arranged according to subjects; labels that belong to a particular subject are grouped together and displayed side by side.

### 5.1.2.2 School X (peri-urban)

This is also a public school located in the Central province of Kenya, within the grounds of a large multinational agricultural company. The school serves children of the lower cadre staff in the company, who live in residential settlements situated in this area. The school has learners from different economic, social and linguistic backgrounds, since the company draws workers from different parts of the country. The 28 learners in the Standard 1 class at the time of data collection represented six indigenous Kenyan languages, namely Kikamba, Kikuyu, Kimenti, Ekegusii, Dholuo and Luhyia. English and Kiswahili, the school's languages of teaching and learning, are also used in the class. Sheng (an informal urban slang) is also used, albeit minimally, in this context. This is an average-sized class considering the high pupils-teacher ratios one has elsewhere (see for example Pontefract & Hardman, 2005).

---

[8] The PTA in primary schools is the equivalent of a Board of Governors (BOG) in secondary schools. PTAs are charged with the responsibility of running the schools through their own management committees. PTAs in some schools will hire their own teachers to ease the burden of understaffing which is characteristic of many public primary schools in Kenya, as is reflected in the pupils-teacher ratios.

The Standard 1 teacher, teacher X, is an employee of the TSC. She is a graduate of one of the TTCs in Kenya and has been teaching in lower primary for 11 years. Teacher X is an L1 speaker of Kikuyu, which is one of the languages represented in the learner population. Like many primary school teachers in Kenya today, teacher X is currently pursuing a diploma in ECED.

The linguistic landscape of this classroom comprises labels that are displayed according to the subjects. These labels assist in organising the classroom into what the teacher calls "subject corners". The labels and other teaching/learning materials for one subject are all found in that subject's corner. All labels except those for teaching Kiswahili as a language subject are in English. Apart from the classroom walls, there are also labels glued to threads that are tied across the classroom. The classroom is extremely print-rich: even the items that children have supplied to the "shop corner" are labelled. In the front of the class there is a book cabinet where all the textbooks are stored and from where they are distributed to the learners when needed. The cabinet is shared with the class next door.

### 5.1.2.3 School Y (rural school no. 1)

School Y could be referred to as a border school, located near the boundary of three districts, namely Tharaka, Mwingi and Mbeere. As would be expected of a border school, this school draws learners from the three language communities that are dominant in each of these districts. This assures that the classes are multilingual, and therefore of particular interest to this study. The three languages – Kikamba, Kitharaka and Kimbeere – predominantly spoken in the Mwingi, Tharaka and Mbeere districts respectively, are all represented in the Standard 1 learner population of 48. However, Kikamba seems to dominate in a number of domains probably because, in comparison to the other two languages, it has had a long literacy tradition. Kitharaka had not been used in a written form until the late 1980s, while for Kimbeere as yet no written form has been developed. It is also possible that Kikamba is preferred over the other languages because this school, even though a border school, is located on the Mwingi district side in relation to the administrative boundaries. This could also be the reason why teacher Y feels that Kikamba is the language of the school's catchment area even though the other two languages are spoken in the same catchment area. This is an important perception, as the language policy provides for the language of the catchment area to be used as the MoI in the lower primary phase.

Arguably, some children in the school grow up bilingually, or even multilingually, as a result of language contact amongst the three communities of the school's catchment area. A certain degree of mutual intelligibility exists amongst the three languages because they belong to the same language family, but they have been identified as distinct languages in their own rights. Parents and teachers of this community seem not to be particularly aware of the special educational requirements of developing literacy in a community that presents such a unique form of linguistic diversity.

Teacher Y is an L1 speaker of Kikamba, which is also the L1 of majority of the learners in her class. She is proficient in the other two L1s represented in her learner population, thus can understand all the learners and should be able to assist if they do have difficulties adjusting to the dominant language of the classroom. She is an employee of the TSC and a graduate from one of the TTCs in Kenya. Teacher Y has a teaching experience of 29 years most of which has been in lower primary. Like teacher W2, teacher Y also started off as an untrained teacher before joining a TTC for in-service training.

Regarding the linguistic landscape, the classroom walls in school Y bear semblance of the broader environment in which the school is situated; a semi-arid area with hardly any vegetation except on the hill tops. Similarly, the classroom walls in school Y have hardly any labels, except for two A3 size manila cards displayed on the back wall and another on the right hand side of the classroom showing the vowels in Kikamba. Unlike the classes observed in the urban and peri-urban sites, where their walls were bursting with labels arranged according to subject corners, the classroom in school Y is print deprived, in terms of the linguistic landscape. In the front right hand corner of the class, there is a book cabinet where all textbooks are stored to be distributed to the learners when needed.

### 5.1.2.4 School Z (rural school no. 2)

This school can also be classified as a border school, located close to the boundary of Tharaka and Meru central districts. The 44 children in the Standard 1 class represent three indigenous Kenyan languages, namely Kitharaka, Kikuyu and Kimenti. As in all the other classes observed in this study, English and Kiswahili are taught as language subjects. Like the languages in school Y, the three languages represented amongst the learner population in school Z also belong to the same language family and therefore a certain degree of mutual intelligibility exists. Kitharaka is taught, albeit irregularly, as the MT subject in this class presumably because it is the language of majority of the learners in the Standard 1. The other

two languages represented in this classroom and not taught in the slot set aside for MT development, have a longer literacy tradition than Kitharaka. However, Kitharaka is apparently preferred in this setting because school Z is on the Tharaka district side of the administrative boundaries where Kitharaka is the predominant language.

Teacher Z is an L1 speaker of Kiembu, a language not represented in the learner population. Kiembu is predominantly spoken in Embu district, which does not even share an administrative boundary with Tharaka. Although Kiembu is related to the three languages of the learners, and is therefore accessible at least to a few of them, it is regarded by the various communities as different in regional and in social terms. This teacher is a graduate of one of the Kenyan TTCs who is currently also pursuing a degree in ECED. She is an employee of the TSC, and has been teaching in the lower primary section for 10 years, except for one term in her very first year of teaching when she was the class teacher of an upper primary group. She uses Kiembu as the language of teaching, thus introducing a fourth language as the dominant language of the classroom.

Concerning the linguistic landscape, there was not a single label on the walls in teacher Z's classroom at the time of collecting data for this study. The labels had reportedly been removed a few weeks earlier when the learners were writing their end of month examinations. The labels had to be removed to discourage copying because in most classes, the labels represent work that will be asked in the examinations. The labels were tucked away in a box on a desk at the back of the class which I happened to use as my work station during the visit. A look through those labels revealed that, like in all other classes I observed, all the labels were in English except those prepared for language teaching of Kiswahili and Kitharaka.

The following table summarises the linguistic profiles of the learners and the teachers as presented in the preceding discussion.

**Table 5.1:   Showing the linguistic profiles of the learners and teachers in the observed classrooms**

| School | Language of the schools' catchment area | Learners' L1s | Teacher's L1 | Language of classroom labels |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| School W | Kiswahili (given its location) | Kikuyu<br>Kikamba<br>Ekegusii<br>Dholuo<br>Teso<br>Egekuria<br>Luhyia<br>Nubian<br>Somali<br>A Southern Sudan language<br>Kirundi (spoken in Burundi) | Teacher W1 - Dholuo<br><br>Teacher W2 - Luhyia | English except those meant for teaching Kiswahili as a language subject |
| School X | Kiswahili | Kikuyu<br>Kikamba<br>Dholuo<br>Ekegusii<br>Luhyia<br>Kimenti | Kikuyu | English except those labels meant for teaching Kiswahili as a language subject |
| School Y | Kikamba (predominantly spoken language)<br>Kitharaka<br>Kimbeere | Kikamba<br>Kitharaka<br>Kimbeere | Kikamba | Two labels in English and one in Kikamba |
| School Z | Kitharaka (predominantly spoken language)<br>Kimenti<br>Kikuyu | Kitharaka<br>Kimenti<br>Kikuyu | Kiembu | No labels displayed - the tucked away labels were in mainly in English, except those for teaching the Kiswahili as a language subject and two labels in Kitharaka for teaching the MT subject |

Having described the contexts of this research, I now turn to the presentation and analysis of the data gathered for this study. In the following section, I shall present my analysis and interpretation of the data. The analysis will be organised to address each of the objectives set

out in chapter 1 section 1.3.3. Relevant literature will be invoked throughout the analysis and interpretation to shed light on my understanding of data.

## 5.2    THEORETICAL UNDERPINNINGS OF LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY IN A MULTILINGUAL CLASSROOM

One of the objectives of this research project is to determine teachers' understanding of linguistic diversity and its effect on learning in multilingual classrooms (see section 1.3.3). "Understanding" here refers to both the conceptualisation teachers have of linguistic diversity and their understanding of the emotional and cognitive experiences of minority learners who may not speak the language of the classroom. Such understanding of teachers is also evident in their ideas and practices towards supporting minority language learners. Thus, besides teachers' own explication of their insight into 'linguistic diversity', information was required on the training, experience and demonstrated skills teachers have to make their classrooms more inclusive of learners who speak a different language from the "prescribed" language of instruction.

Regarding language planning orientations, Ruíz (1984) observes that communities may have different orientations towards particular languages, their speakers and the role that languages play in society (see section 2.2). The two orientations to language relevant to this study are 'language as a resource' and 'language as a problem'. Thus each of the five participating teachers' awareness and views on multilingual diversity in their classroom, on whether such diversity is perceived as immaterial and negligible, as challenging or annoying, as resourceful or problematic, as enabling and educationally stimulating among other considerations, was sought under this objective.

In a qualitative study on the views of community members as stakeholders in language-in-education policy implementation in Uganda, Tembe and Norton (2008) found that many parents viewed English as a resource. For them, as for many others, it is associated with upward mobility, employment and economic empowerment. The multiplicity of languages in their environment was seen as problematic because it made the school's choice of language of teaching and learning extremely difficult (Tembe & Norton, 2008). On the whole, parents viewed language diversity as a hindrance to the implementation of language-in-education in a multilingual country. An important aim of this study has been to determine whether the participating teachers' have similar or different views on diversity in their own classrooms as those of the stakeholders investigated in the Tembe and Norton study. One of the aims of this study has been to find out what exactly

those views and/or attitudes were. Another aim has been to observe how those views become manifest in the participating teachers' day-to-day use of language in the target classrooms.

Attitudes have been said to play a leading role in both the formulation and implementation of language-in-education policies. Thus, on language use in the education domain, scholars argue that the success of a language policy is dependent on attitudes to the language prescribed for use as MoI (see for example Pattanayak, 1986; Lewis, 1981). Lewis (1981:262) for example, argues that:

> *Any policy for language, especially in the system of education, has to take account of the attitude of those likely to be affected. In the long run, no policy will succeed which does not do one of three things: conform to the expressed attitudes of those involved; persuade those who express negative attitudes about the rightness of the policy; or seek to remove the causes of disagreement. In any case knowledge about attitudes is fundamental to the formulation of a policy as well as to success in its implementation.*

It is clear from Lewis' argument that all stakeholders in education (teachers, parents, learners) play a role in the implementation of a language-in-education policy. This research will not attend to aspects of language attitudes related to all those involved or affected by the language-in-education policy in Kenya. The objective here is to specifically look at the attitudes of one key group of participants in the implementation of Kenya's language-in-education policy in multilingual classrooms, the teachers (see section 1.3.3).

### 5.2.1    Arguments against Mother Tongue Instruction

The choice of language of instruction in multilingual educational settings is fraught with different arguments. Thus, educational planners in such settings are faced with the challenges of not only deciding whether or not to use native language instruction but also "how it should be included, how much native language instruction is optimal and what constitutes the best quality instruction" (Snow, 1990:60). In her discussion of the arguments that have been used against native language instruction in the US, Snow (1990) highlights four categories of arguments namely; the history argument, the ghettoisation argument, the time-on-task argument and the hopeless cause argument. Owing to the relevance of these arguments both in the broader African context as well as the specific Kenyan context, I discuss them briefly in the sections that follow, as such arguments may have a strong bearing on how the language-in-education policy is implemented in the actual classrooms investigated in this study.

### 5.2.1.1 History argument

This argument relates to the successes of the European immigrants to the US in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. These immigrants, it is argued, arrived in the US "knowing no English, who received no bilingual education or special education programmes, and who nonetheless became successful and productive members of the American society" (Snow, 1990:61). In the context of this study, this argument could be equated to the prevalent argument that some learners, including the current crop of elites in Africa, have made it through the education system despite the fact that they have used unfamiliar languages as the MoI. This argument however, ignores the fact that such an education only serves a few at the expense of the masses by reproducing an educated and socio-economically privileged minority and an uneducated and socio-economically marginalised majority (see for example Alexander, 1999; Roy-Campbell, 2001; Heugh, 2006; 2011). Roy-Campbell (2001) for example, observes that the success of the few elites is no guarantee for the overall efficiency of the system, while Heugh (2006:105) finds that language models in Africa "have failed the majority of those children who have had access to the school systems". This leaves no doubt that language models based on the history argument are prevalent in Africa, Kenya included, but as Heugh (2006:106) says of such programme models, they "have never demonstrated a positive return of investment in education, social, economic or development terms" but have instead "created a chasm between the elites and the masses" (Pattanayak, 1986:5), despite funnelling so much resources into them.

### 5.2.1.2 Ghettoisation argument

This argument was based on the fact that native language instruction in the US then was provided through separating learners of languages other than English from mainstream classrooms (Snow, 1990). This, it was argued, provided these learners with a single model of English who may also not have been best model, given that this model may also be an English L2 speaker who shares an L1 with the learners in the class. The results from such an educational arrangement may have the opposite of the intended effects.

In the African context, it is not uncommon to hear comments such as a community will be cut-off if they only learn in their MTs or a country risks being cut-off from the global village if they use indigenous languages in instruction (see for example Rumagumya, 1990). In the Kenyan context, Muthwii (2004) found, parents felt that learners would not take education seriously if it is delivered in the MT. In other words, education requires seriousness and if

learning in the MT does not stir up that seriousness, then lack of seriousness is not a 'desirable effect' on the learners.

In the introduction to his edited volume on *Language in Education in Africa,* Rubagumya (1990:2) alludes to the ghettoisation argument when he observes that in Tanzania, despite cumulative research on classroom practices pointing to the need for change in secondary school to Kiswahili medium, English has continued to be used because, it is claimed, "if English is not used as the medium, Tanzania will be 'left behind' with respect to scientific and technological development". A similar argument is that MTE promotes tribalism and inter-group conflicts (see for example Ryanga, 2002). However, as Ryanga (2002:58) asserts, "the argument that the empowerment of indigenous languages motivates tribal sentiments" should seek its reasons elsewhere but not in linguistic development.

### 5.2.1.3 Time-on-task argument

According to Snow (1990:62), this argument is based on the claim that children learn more if they spend more time on the task and therefore children would learn English better if they spent more time learning it. This claim ignores findings from research that has shown that "children who spend an hour a day in uninterrupted reading instruction make greater gains than children in classes with shorter, less frequent, or less concentrated reading periods" (Snow, 1990:62). Similar findings have been reported from research in Africa (see for example Fafunwa et al., 1989; Williams, 1998), in Nigeria and in Malawi/Zambia respectively, where learners who learnt English only as a subject while receiving instruction in their L1s were found to make better gains in English by the end of year three than those who received instruction in English from their first year of school.

Despite such findings, the time-on-task argument dominates many African classrooms as is evident in the early-exit nature of most language policies that support instruction in the MT (see section 2.6 for a discussion of the language-in-education policies in selected African countries). Arguably, changes in language-in-education policies from MT medium to English medium from the beginning of primary school are often informed by the time-on-task argument. For example, according to Chimbganda and Mokgwathi (2012:21), one of the reasons given for the change in the language-in-education policy in Botswana that saw English replace Setswana as MoI from Standard 1 in the year 2000, was because according to the commission tasked with the review, "learners are exposed to English at a relatively late stage, having received the early education in Setswana", and therefore result to code

switching. Here, introducing English from the beginning as MoI, may be seen to give the learners more exposure to English based on false premise that earlier and therefore "longer means better" (Bamgbose, 2004:4-5). The clamour for English-only education and the mushrooming of English-medium private schools in Kenya, as in many other African countries may, to a large extent, be founded on this same argument.

### 5.2.1.4 Hopeless cause argument

This argument is based on the fact that native languages are not used across generations of immigrants in the US. The question posed under this argument is why resources should be invested into native language instruction if it is only a postponement by a few years of the inevitable loss of the native/minority languages by minority language students once mainstreamed (Snow, 1990:62). In the context of this study, MT instruction has been questioned from the point of view of the fact that learners switch to English medium in Standard 4 (Bamgbose, 2004), while the teaching of the MT subject has been challenged on account that MT is not an examinable subject at the end of primary school (see for example Graham, 2010; Musau, 2003). The preponderance of the hopeless cause argument in the African context is alluded to by Bamgbose (2004) in his discussion of language policy and practice in Africa. He finds this as the argument frequently advanced to justify the early introduction of ex-colonial languages as MoI. The argument here is that the "ultimate medium at higher levels might as well be introduced as early as possible" (Bamgbose, 2004:4).

The practice of banning learners from speaking their L1s in school further motivates the argument that why learn a language or in a language if it is going to be dropped completely from the curriculum after a few years? In other words, why postpone teaching/learning in English only for three years if English is soon going to become the MoI? These and other questions are not uncommon when making language-in-education policy decisions in both the specific and broader contexts of this research.

Teachers, as language-in-education policy implementers, live in social environments that are riddled with such arguments against MT instruction. This study aims to find out how these and other arguments shape teacher's practices in multilingual classrooms. Of importance here is finding out whether the benefits of L1 development propel the teachers beyond these arguments or do the arguments carry the day in language choices and prioritisations in these classrooms.

**5.2.2 Attitudes towards bilingualism/multilingualism**

A review of research shows that attitudes towards bilingualism and multilingualism seem to differ depending on the languages involved. Cummins (1980:23), in reference to bilingualism and multilingualism in Canada, observes that "whereas most educators are willing to accept French-English bilingualism as a worthwhile and attainable educational goal, bilingualism involving languages other than English or French, is still viewed as a threat to cohesion and an educational disadvantage". In this study, the objective of disclosing the understanding that teachers have of linguistic diversity and its effects on learning includes gaining insight into the value teachers assign to L1 proficiency and literacy, specifically in the light of early transfer to English as MoI, and the local use of Kiswahili in the educational context. Therefore in classroom observation and in interviews, I was alert to whether the different L1s represented in the learner population are welcome in the classroom or are they shunned and discouraged? Here, the circumstances under which the L1s of learners are used by the learners themselves, and by the teachers are of particular interest.

Closely linked to language attitudes is 'linguistic nationalism'. In reference to his earlier work, Mazrui (2004:20) defines linguistic nationalism as "that version of nationalism that is concerned about the value of its own language, seeks to defend it against other languages and encourages its use and enrichment". In this regard, Mazrui (2004) finds that Sub-Saharan Africans are rarely resentful of the use of European languages even in domains where indigenous languages have been used before. In fact, as already demonstrated through the language policies from different African countries discussed in an earlier chapter (see section 2.6), African governments, specifically their language planners, introduced the languages of European origin much earlier in the curriculum than was the case under the colonial rule. This detached linguistic nationalism on the part of Africans may partly explain the current hegemony of European languages in many African countries' educational systems in comparison with other multilingual countries such as India, Malaysia and Bangladesh (Mazrui & Mazrui, 1998), where it is argued, strong linguistic nationalism appears to have resulted in the maintenance of autochthonous languages in both formal and informal language use domains (see for example Pattanayak, 1986), including education. In recent studies (see for example Metcalf, 1999; Hatzfield, 2007; Yack, 2012), nationalism is described as a divisive force; particularly in countries with culturally and linguistically diverse communities, emphasis on the link between language and nation can be the cause of much conflict (see for example Metcalf, 1999; Hatzfield, 2007; Yack, 2012). However, this study

aims to ascertain the attitudes of participating teachers as such attitudes are reflected in language choices teachers make in multilingual primary school classrooms. Such an aim needs to bear in mind questions related to the perceived lacking linguistic nationalism of Africans, Kenyans included, coupled with the hegemony of English globally.

Studies show that different countries have responded differently to linguistic diversity. In England in the late 1980s, for example, the increasing linguistic diversity was responded to by increasing the provision for the teaching of English as a second language. This often involved withdrawal of non-English speaking children within the school for intensive English language teaching under the banner of English for immigrants (see for example Edwards, 1984). In the Netherlands and Sweden, the response to the linguistic diversity resulting from the influx of migrants, refugees and asylum seekers, led to the introduction of reception classes where immigrant children could receive instruction that prepared them for entering the regular classrooms (see for example Axlesson et al., 1993). These responses appear to a large extent, to depend on the people's attitudes towards bilingualism/multilingualism at the macro[9] level. It is also possible that language attitudes at the macro level filter through to the micro[10] level. This is because the decisions made for or against the use of certain languages at the level of government, are usually accompanied by allocation of resources to ensure their implementation at other levels, especially in centralised government structures like those of Kenya.

In assessing teachers' understanding and appreciation (or not) of linguistic diversity, the analysis of interview and observation data in this study also tried to gauge what teachers felt about having to teach learners from different linguistic backgrounds and how they reacted to the use of different L1s in the classrooms. A further question is whether the participating teachers' responses to linguistic diversity in these classrooms were unique to the individual teachers or a particular context, or whether they could be identified as more general. The study has an interest in whether teachers find their own ways of dealing with multilingualism among the learners, or whether they are actually prepared and equipped for this in formal teacher education. An understanding of teachers' awareness of and preparedness to deal with linguistically diverse learners in their classroom is necessary in order to comment on their practical responses in teaching in such multilingual contexts.

---

[9] Macro level referring to national level.

[10] Micro level referring to local level (see Ricento, 2000).

**5.3    TEACHERS' UNDERSTANDING OF LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY**

As already stated above (see section 5.2), 'understanding' has been used in this study to refer to the conceptual understanding of teachers of linguistic diversity on the one hand, and to their understanding of the emotional experiences of minority language learners who may not speak the language of the classroom and being able to do something about it, on the other hand. In this study, teachers' understanding of linguistic diversity was given in their interpretations of the language-in-education policy and the definitions of the term 'mother tongue' they adopt in their classrooms. Further, teachers' understanding is given in how they handle the two main areas of interest regarding MT in their classrooms namely, MT as a subject and MT as the MoI, given the Kenyan educational context. To begin with, the definitions of the concept 'mother tongue' and its re-interpretations in the observed classrooms are investigated for how these reflect teachers' understanding of multiple languages in their classrooms after which I discuss how the MT was handled both as MoI and as a subject of study in these classrooms given the language-in-education policy statement. The data being discussed here was collected through direct classroom observations, interviews with teachers and analysis of documents (see section 4.5 for discussion of data collection methods). Lessons and interviews with teachers were audio-recorded and transcribed while detailed field notes were kept throughout the data collection period.

**5.3.1    Definitions and re-interpretations of the term 'mother tongue'**

Classroom practices as well as interviews with teachers in this study have indicated that varying definitions of 'mother tongue' and a number of different interpretations of these definitions have developed. It appears that the complexity of community language diversity in the country is not well reflected in the language-in-education policy. The following sections will indicate this complexity.

*5.3.1.1 Definitions of the term 'mother tongue' in the language-in-education policy*

For educational purposes in Kenya, 'mother tongue' has been defined as (i) "the first language which a child learns to express himself/herself in" or (ii) "the language of the school's catchment area" (Kenya Institute of Education, KIE, 2011:150). Whereas the definition given in (i) may work well in linguistically homogenous classrooms, it poses a challenge in a linguistically diverse classroom, where learners do not all share the same L1. In language-in-education policy, this definition may carry the implication that all the learners in a classroom should be instructed in their L1s, yet no suggestions are given to teachers on how to go about such MT instruction when making

language choices in a multilingual classroom. In the absence of such guidelines, teachers are left to interpret for themselves how the policy intends them to manage such eventuality. My study indicates that there are as many re-interpretations of the term 'mother tongue' in the policy directive as there are teachers themselves as discussed in the next section (see section 5.3.2.1).

Following the language-in-education policy statement which supports teaching the MT (as a language subject) and teaching in the MT (use as MoI) as well as the definition of MT as provided by the Ministry of Education (MoE) through the Kenya Institute of Education (KIE), one would expect that a variety of indigenous languages would be used in a multilingual classroom as MoI and as subjects of study. However, in practice, each school uses no more than one language as MoI but not necessarily the L1s of the learners in the classroom. Thus in classroom discourses in every instance, there were not insignificant numbers of learners who had never experienced education through medium of their L1. Even so, there was still the expectation that every L1 represented among the school's learners would be taught as the subject MT. It emerges in this study, however, that only at one of the four study sites was an indigenous Kenyan language taught as the subject MT, namely in school Z. This is in spite of the fact that there were 11, 6, 3 and 3 different L1s represented in the learner population in schools W, X, Y and Z respectively.

Even in school Z, where Kitharaka, the language of the majority of the learners in the class was taught as the subject MT, it was taught through the medium of Kiembu, the L1 of the teacher, who was not proficient in Kitharaka. In any case, the subject MT was also seldom taught in this school. Only 2 of the 5 timetabled lessons per week were used for this purpose during my one week visit. Looking at a few of the learners' language exercise books, I noticed that English and Kiswahili were consistently taught according to the timetable while across the foregoing 5 months, only 5 Kitharaka lessons had been taught and 2 of those had been during my visit. Learners had written work in the first few pages of their MT subject exercise books, but already in their second exercise book for English and Kiswahili as subjects[11].

The definition of MT given in (ii), which refers to the language of the school's catchment area, poses even greater challenges in the choice of language(s) of instruction in multilingual contexts. The definition assumes that only one language is spoken in a given school's catchment area and therefore does not anticipate what should happen in the likely event that more languages are spoken

---

[11] Care was taken to rule out absenteeism as the possible reason why the learners had done so little in their mother tongue subject exercise books because the books for the three language subjects were from the same learners. The researcher had also asked the teacher to specifically get the exercise books from those learners who were not frequently absent from school.

in a catchment area. As it is, some schools draw children from multiple language catchment areas making it difficult to decide which languages should be used as MoI and taught as MT subject, if not all those represented in a classroom. In developed models of bilingual education, it is not uncommon to use more than one language as MoI in one classroom (dual medium education) (see for example ADEA, 2006:5; Baker, 2001:212-221). However, then there is a policy decision that specifically ratifies the use of more than one language in the classroom, and there are likely to be clear guidelines as to how the various languages will be introduced and the time allocations for each of the languages, usually up to but not more than 50% of daily instruction time for each language (see for example ADEA, 2006:5; Baker, 2001). As has already been observed, in the absence of such guidelines on how to interpret the given definitions in multiple language environments in Kenyan classrooms, teachers come up with their own solutions to the difficulties they face. In so doing, effectively they re-interpret the term 'mother tongue' in the process of making MoI choices, as well as in the selection of which of the many languages to introduce in the MT subject periods in the different contexts.

### 5.3.1.2 Teachers' re-interpretations of the term 'mother tongue'

I found that in some situations, the term 'mother tongue' was re-interpreted simply to mean the language of the majority learners in the classroom. This is the case in the urban and peri-urban schools (W and X), where Kiswahili, which is not the majority L1 but the one language familiar to a majority of the learners, is chosen for the MT subject. Although teachers reported that Kiswahili is the MT, given the schools' catchment area, the period in the timetable where MT subject should be taught, is not used for the designated purpose. In these particular two schools, even as the selected MoI, Kiswahili is rarely used in its academically developed form: in observation I encountered a great deal of code mixing and code switching with English, and in some cases, especially in the urban school, Sheng was also used at times (see section 6.1.1 for detailed discussion of code switching and its functions in the observed classrooms).

In other situations, as in rural school Z, 'mother tongue' was re-interpreted to refer to the language of the teacher. In this case the teacher's L1, Kiembu, which is not the MT of any of the children represented in the classroom, was used as MoI. Not one of the three languages represented as L1s among the learners, was used as the language of teaching and learning, thus no MT instruction was given in this teacher's classroom. It is possible that elsewhere in the school, where the teachers had one of the community languages as L1, the MoI would

have been the L1 of at least some of the learners. In the classroom I observed in school Z, the language selected to be taught in the MT subject slot, was indeed one of the community languages, namely Kitharaka. Thus the Kiembu L1 teacher used a book written in the language of a majority of the children in the class, namely Kitharaka, during the MT periods which she taught - mostly through the medium of Kiembu because she was not proficient in Kitharaka. Effectively, her L1, which is not the language of any of the children in the classroom, becomes the MoI in direct contrast to what the policy says. This emphasises the complexity of implementing a language-in-education policy that propagates MT education in a multilingual context. It became increasingly clear that the multilingual reality in these classrooms is neither sufficiently envisaged and addressed in the policy, nor is there sufficient training of teachers and support for schools to manage the linguistic diversity of the various school environments.

The re-interpretation of 'mother tongue' as articulated in the class observed in school Z is the result mainly of the procedures of recruiting and posting teachers in Kenya. Teacher postings are decided by the MoE through the TSC, an autonomous government agency charged with the placement of teachers. According to recruitment and placement guidelines of the TSC, a qualified teacher seeking employment can be posted to any part of the country regardless of his/her L1. This shows total disregard of the practical implementation demands of the language-in-education policy. The current placement practice does not consider the L1 of the teacher and the languages he/she is best equipped to use as MoI or teach as MT subject. Thus, the situation I encountered in school Z, where the teacher finds herself in a context where she is expected to teach through the medium of a language she does not know, and also teach such a community language as a subject is hardly an isolated case. The end result is a classroom where the L1 of the teacher becomes the virtual 'mother tongue' hence imposing communicative difficulties on both the learners and the teachers, even where there is a linguistically homogenous learner population.

In yet another kind of circumstance, 'mother tongue' is re-interpreted to mean the unifying language, that is, a lingua franca in a multilingual classroom. In this case, it refers to a language that is not the L1 of any of the learners in the classroom, nor the language of the school's catchment area. This is illustrated in rural school Y where a neutral language, Kiswahili, is chosen for MT subject period to avoid having to make a choice between the local languages and so privilege one group over others. Although Kiswahili is not a L1 of any

of the children in the classroom, the teacher chooses to teach it as the MT subject because, "*parents from the other communities were opposed to the teaching of Kikamba [....] for the subject mother tongue*" (*FN SY 22/02/2011]*. According to the teacher:

(1)     *Sometime ni kama 2005, Watharaka wakaanza translating this Kikamba book into Kitharaka.*

        [Sometime in like 2005, the Tharakas begun translating this Kikamba book into Kitharaka] *[IT1 SY. 10].*

The translation of teaching/learning materials from Kikamba to Kitharaka was a signal of tension between the communities. To avoid such conflicts, the teacher therefore settled on a neutral choice, selecting Kiswahili to be taught as the MT subject, even if it is unfamiliar to most of, if not all, the learners in her class. However the teacher's L1 Kikamba, which was also the language of the majority learners in teacher Y's class was used as MoI, not the neutral language used as MT subject. Some form of MT instruction was thus taking place in this class at least for the Kikamba speaking learners in this particular context.

This was not the only reason the teacher gave for not teaching any of the L1s represented in her classroom as the MT. Other factors within the school also played a part in the language choice for the MT subject in teacher Y's classroom. According to her:

(2)     *Nikauliza mwalimu kuna haja gani nifundishe mother tongue in class*[12] *one kama standard 2 hawasomi wanafunzwa na Mkikuyu, standard 3 wanafundishwa na Mutharaka naye anasema hajui.*

        [I asked the (head) teacher, what is the point of me teaching the mother tongue [Kikamba] in class one if in standard 2 they will not do it because they are taught by a Mkikuyu, Standard 3 they are being taught by a Mutharaka who says she doesn't know – Kikamba] *[IT1 SY. 11].*

The lack of continuity in the teaching of the MT in the successive classes/levels, was another factor that teacher Y cited as motivation for the decision on which language to teach in her classroom as the MT subject as revealed in the above interview excerpt. It is possible that different languages will be used as MoI and taught as MT subject in the lower primary classes in the same school depending on the L1 of the teacher in charge of each class. However, considering the organisation of lower primary school classes in Kenya discussed earlier in this chapter (see section 5.1.1), school Y may have been an isolated case where one teacher is assigned to one level and teaches that level each year. When this happens, it means that different languages will be used as MoI in one school. So, where three languages are

---

[12] Class and Standard are used interchangeably in this report as they are used in the Kenyan educational context.

represented in the learner population in a school, it is possible that three or more languages are represented among the teachers. Then, the L1 of the teacher becomes the MoI default, and in successive years learners can be confronted with a different MoI, when the teacher in one level does not share the L1 with the teacher in the subsequent level.

I interpret the situation in school Y to mean that sometimes even factors outside the classroom, in this case, community members' grievances, attitudes and the lack of continuity of the MT in subsequent levels, influence how language choices are made in the classrooms. Often, when such factors are used to determine how language choices are made in multilingual contexts, the learners' L1s may be compromised, as is the case in school Y. However, considering established research on the benefits of the development of L1 in early education (see for example Thomas & Collier, 1997; Klaus, 2003; Dutcher, 2004), the effects of such a decision cannot be ideal. In this context, one could ask what sense it makes to use Kikamba as the MoI without teaching it also as the MT subject. Also, if different languages can be used in successive years, with only three years of MT education, such circumstances surely defeat the purpose.

In an interview, teacher Z reported that:

> (3)     Sometimes you find that because I am not very conversant with the Kitharaka language, I don't like giving children something which I am not very sure of. So what happens is that I teach in English and Kitharaka, I mix the languages. Then from there, when I ask the questions, they are able to answer. So I know they have got the concept *[IT1 SZ. 3].*

This partly explains why teacher Z does not consistently teach the MT subject in her classroom. She is not proficient in the language and is not confident about what she may be telling the learners as reflected in her words "I do not like giving children something I am not sure about". Although she reports here that she teaches in English and Kitharaka, observing her in class showed that she used her own L1 as the MoI but code switched to English and only minimally to Kitharaka. This finding rendered more credence for my choice of observation as the main data collection method owing to its ability to reveal more than teachers may be aware of.

Kroon and Sturm (1989, 109-10) cite the work of Rosen (1982) who notes that "[i]n some situations, mother tongue seems to be just a 'euphemism' for teaching the national language in its standardised form". He finds that this conceals and enfeebles the pursuit of an alternative, which would offer literacy in the real MT of the learners, which is the real aim of teaching in multilingual education research and curriculum development projects. This use of 'mother tongue' in such a

'euphemistic' way holds true for the multilingual classes observed in this study, thus to refer to a variety of languages that are not the 'real' MTs/L1s of the learners, but have become the default options in multilingual classrooms, where there are no clear guidelines for teachers in the selection of the 'mother tongue'. The ways in which the selection of the specific language to be taught as the MT subject was handled in these classes, give pointers to the difficulties of implementing a language-in-education policy that supports MT without giving clear guidelines on how the policy should be interpreted. The language planners and educational authorities appear to be withholding supportive resources that would assist in implementing a well-intentioned policy that does not sufficiently consider the complex forms of multilingualism in the Kenyan schools.

In his discussion of the sources of confusion over the desirability of MT teaching, Pattanayak (1986:8-9) alludes to a similar situation when he makes a distinction between the 'vernacular mother tongue' and the 'taught mother tongue'. In his elaboration of these concepts, he points out the irony of, for example, "teaching Mandarin to Hokkien speakers in Singapore, French to Tahitians, Italian to Venetian speakers, Dutch to Flemish speakers and Hindi to Maithili speakers, is presumed to be mother tongue teaching" (Pattanayak, 1996:8-9). I find this same irony in the observed classrooms where languages are taught as MT subject and used as MoI in place of the learners' 'real' MTs. Pattanayak (1986:9) warns against the danger of linking the poor performance of learners in such programmes to the failure of MT instruction. He finds that the distance between the two MTs reflects a major variable when measuring the educational attainment of learners in such programmes (ibid).

### 5.3.2   Mother tongue as medium of instruction and as a subject

In studies of language in education in multilingual communities, the distinction between which languages are taught and which languages are used in teaching and learning of subjects other than the language subjects, is of critical importance (see for example Williams, 1998; Bamgbose, 2004; ADEA, 2006; Heugh, 2011; Jones, 2010; Jones & Barkhuizen, 2011).

#### 5.3.2.1 Mother tongue as medium of instruction

The Kenyan language-in-education policy proscribes mother tongue education (MTE) for the first three years of schooling. This means, in the first place, that the MT will be used as the MoI in the first phase of the primary education cycle. Additionally, the language-in-education policy also proscribes that during this phase, three language subjects are to be taught, namely the MT of the learner, English and Kiswahili. In the fourth school year, that is, as from

Standard 4, English takes over as the MoI and Kiswahili continues to be taught as a subject while the MT is dropped from the school curriculum completely. During these first years, the proscribed MoI in the classroom is one of the indigenous languages of Kenya. Even so, barring books used in the Kiswahili language learning classroom, there are hardly any textbooks in any language other than English. English is not only the language of all textbooks, but also the language of the examinations from the very first year of primary school (see further discussion in section 5.3.3 below). This privileging of English in assessment and as MoI after year three, poses a great challenge in the implementation of the language-in-education policy with regard to the MoI of the early years. The end result is ambiguous in that *de jure*[13] the MoI of the first school year should be any one of the 60 MTs recognised as those of indigenous communities, but *de facto*[14] the MoI is very often (and particularly in urban and peri-urban areas) either English or Kiswahili with little regard to what is required *de jure.*

Turning to the four schools that were investigated for this study, the above exposition of complexity in the application of the language-in-education policy is well illustrated. In school W, English was used as the MoI with code switching and translation into Kiswahili. Similarly, in school X, the main MoI was English with code switching and translation into Kiswahili. This was despite the fact that the teachers in both schools had identified Kiswahili as the language of the schools' catchment areas and as such was taught in school X as the MT subject.

In rural school Y in the present study, Kikamba was used as the MoI based on the teacher Y's interpretation of the definition of MT as the language of the schools' catchment area. Kikamba, Kitharaka and Kimbeere are the languages of the local communities; however, considering the numbers of speakers, Kikamba is the language predominantly spoken in the area. Although a border school, the school is also located in the Mwingi side of the administrative boundary where Kikamba is predominantly spoken, hence it is assumed to be the language of the school's catchment area. In teaching however, teacher Y switches amongst four languages, namely Kikamba, English, Kiswahili and irregularly, Kitharaka. The fact that English is the default language of examinations and textbooks dictates the use of English in the classroom. According to the language-in-education policy, more than one language should have been used here, namely the L1s of the learner population. In reality,

---

[13] The term "*de jure* medium of instruction" is used to refer to the language(s) of teaching and learning as prescribed by the law (see Schiffman, 1996).

[14] The term "*de facto* medium of instruction" is used to refer to the actual medium of instruction as practiced, which may not necessarily align with what is prescribed *de jure* (see Schiffman, 1996).

languages that are rarely used locally, namely English and Kiswahili, are used alongside only one of the local languages as MoI. In attempting to make the learning content more accessible and to prepare the learners for the assessment events, teachers often revert to various kinds of code switching, and thus depart from the *de jure* directives.

In rural school Z, similar difficulties in determining which should be the language of the classroom were evident. The MoI here was predominantly Kiembu with code switching and translation into Kiswahili, English and Kitharaka. Although the teacher in the classroom observed in school Z reports that she teaches in English and Kitharaka as shown in (3) above, my observation was that she actually teaches in Kiembu (her L1) and switches to English only for key concepts in the topic of study and to Kitharaka when talking about something that she already knows in that language, since she confesses to not being 'conversant' with Kitharaka.

In all four of the observed schools, lesson notes were given to the learners in English for all the content subjects, as were the exercises that learners did at the end of each lesson. Although *de jure* English is not the MoI, the fact that it is the language of examinations and textbooks assures that it is widely used as such. The default classroom practice in the rural schools is one where oral classroom discourse takes place in an indigenous language, but in using published texts and in written exercises and tests, the language is English. Thus the policy of MTE in the first three school years, in effect, is a form of multilingual education that does not consider the L1s of the learners.

According to the language-in-education policy, the MoI should be the same language as is taught in the slot set aside for the MT as subject. In reality this only very rarely happens in Kenyan primary schools, as will become more evident in the discussion of the languages taught in the MT subject slot (see section 5.3.2.1 below). A similar situation is reported in an ethnographic study of the implementation of the Kenyan language-in-education policy in a Sabaot school, where teachers were found to treat the MT subject as different to the MT used as MoI (Jones & Barkhuizen, 2011:520). According to Jones and Barkhuizen (2011:520), this differential treatment was used as a key way of managing the tensions experienced in language-in-education policy implementation in their context. These findings of Jones and Barkhuizen's study may help to explain why the teachers in the current study used one language as the MoI, and taught another as the MT subject - as was the case in school Y where Kikamba was used as the MoI, but Kiswahili was taught for the MT subject, and in school X where English was the MoI, but Kiswahili was taught as the MT subject (on the few instances when the MT slot was actually used for its assigned purpose).

Although the rural schools accommodate learners' home languages and language varieties in the class (as discussed in section 5.3.3 below), such affirmation of the various MTs is challenged (if not undermined) by the use of English teaching and learning materials and the system of English examinations. Aware of the multilingual variety in their classrooms, and of how young learners unfamiliar with the full repertoire of community languages and school languages need learning support, teachers juggle amongst different languages within their own repertoire in an effort to make the content of education accessible to their learners while preparing them for examinations. The language "gymnastics", as the classroom code switching practices of teachers and learners are referred to by Muthwii (2004:28), are not accessible to learners in the examination rooms. I interpret this as a situation where the practical aspects of language-in-education policy implementation are not synchronised with the examination system.

### 5.3.2.2 Teaching mother tongue as a subject

As mentioned in section 5.3.2.1 above, the language-in-education policy provides not only for MT instruction from the first to the third school year; it also provides for specifically teaching the MT subject. However, the language-in-education policy gives no guidance as to the selection of the specific language which should be taught as MT. The policy seems not to recognise the practical situation of linguistically heterogeneous classrooms. The onus therefore rests on the teacher to decide on the specific language that will fulfil the function of the MT in their classroom (see also Kobia, 2007). Thus teachers make decisions on which languages to teach as MT based on their interpretations of the policy provisions as these are articulated by the MOE. These decisions differ from one teacher to the other, depending on the nature of multilingual context involved. The exposition given below of teaching practices during the period timetabled for MT development in the schools of this study will indicate continued neglect of learners' L1s in their schooling.

The participating teachers in schools W, X and Y responded to the multilingualism of the school population in each school's catchment area by selecting Kiswahili as the MT, even though it was not the L1 of majority of the learners in these classrooms (see discussion in section 5.3.1.2). However, *de facto*, in all these three schools, the Kiswahili as MT lesson is seldom actually taught. In school W the period timetabled for MT is used not for teaching any one of the L1s of the young learners, but in fact to do remedial work in English. In schools X and Y, with similar disregard for the MTs of the learners, during the MT period, Kiswahili is taught as L1 using one textbook; during the Kiswahili period, the same language is taught as L2 using another textbook. Thus rather than

being taught two different languages (MT and Kiswahili) as the language-in-education policy intends, more time is allocated to the development of Kiswahili, and no time or attention is given to any MT reading, writing, grammar, vocabulary, and so on. When the learners are examined, there is only a Kiswahili L2 examination. Thus there is no examination for the MT. This means that the MT period is used to strengthen Kiswahili, and the learners' MT is practically removed from the curriculum.

In school Z, Kitharaka, which is the L1 of majority children in the classroom, is taught as the MT subject. Thus the language selection for the MT period is in line with policy provisions at least for a majority of the learners in this classroom. It is however, taught by a teacher who is not proficient in the language. She therefore teaches Kitharaka through the medium of Kiembu, which is not an L1 of any of the learners in the classroom. This means that according to the school, Kitharaka is being taught, but in practice the teacher's L1 limits what can be achieved. In observation, it was clear that when teacher Z tries to use Kitharaka, she often runs into difficulties, for example, in encountering Kitharaka words unfamiliar to her, and then quickly switches to Kiembu. It is not unheard of that teachers use one language in teaching another – as when L2 English is taught through medium of a learner's and teacher's L1. There is however agreement that learners' progress in acquiring and developing a language in which the teacher has limited proficiency, is likely to be impaired (see for example Williams, 2006). Nevertheless, this school is the only one where the language taught in the MT period, is in fact the dominant L1 of the group of learners. That the particular teacher is not proficient in this language is perhaps incidental - had the teacher been a person from the local community, there would be no gap between policy and practice at least for majority of the learners in the classroom. The remaining difficulty in this school is the lacking provision of MT language development for the Kikuyu and Kimenti L1 learners.

Since the policy states that the MT be taught as a subject and be used as the language of instruction, it would be expected that the language taught as the MT is also the language used as the MoI in the same class. However, in all the cases observed, the language taught in the MT subject period was not the same as the one used as MoI. The table below gives a summary of the distribution of the various languages in their various functions in each of the observed classrooms.

**Table 5.2:  Showing the distribution of learners L1s and the languages chosen as MoI and as mother tongue subject in the different contexts**

| School | Language of the schools' catchment area | Learners' L1s | Medium of Instruction | Mother Tongue subject |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| School W | Kiswahili (given its location) | Kikuyu<br>Kikamba<br>Ekegusii<br>Dholuo<br>Teso<br>Egekuria<br>Luhyia<br>Nubian<br>Somali<br>A Southern Sudan language<br>Kirundi (spoken in Burundi) | English<br>code switching with Kiswahili, and minimally Sheng | Kiswahili selected; de facto English remedial work is taught |
| School X | Kiswahili | Kikuyu<br>Kikamba<br>Dholuo<br>Ekegusii<br>Luhyia<br>Kimenti | English<br>code switching with Kiswahili | Kiswahili selected, thus taught as L1 and as L2 |
| School Y | Kikamba (predominantly spoken language)<br>Kitharaka<br>Kimbeere | Kikamba<br>Kitharaka<br>Kimbeere | Kikamba<br>code switching with Kiswahili, English, Kitharaka | Kiswahili selected, thus taught as L1 and as L2 |
| School Z | Kitharaka (predominantly spoken language)<br>Kimenti<br>Kikuyu | Kitharaka<br>Kimenti<br>Kikuyu | Kiembu<br>code switching with Kiswahili, English, Kitharaka | Kitharaka selected; taught through medium of Kiembu |

### 5.3.3   Language of textbooks and examinations

It was observed that all the textbooks used in all schools and in every subject, except those used for teaching Kiswahili, and those for teaching the MT subject  (Kitharaka in school Z), are all in English. By default all examinations are set in English owing to the commercial nature of examinations in Kenya; examinations, except the national ones, are set and printed by individual businessmen and women who may not necessarily be teachers, then sold to the

schools. The argument that motivates this choice of English as the language of the examinations in virtual defiance of the policy of MTE in the first three years is that once produced, the textbooks and examinations can be bought and used in as many schools in the country as possible. Such a practice ensures uniformity in terms of content and standard of work tested at each level of education. Although the MoE proscribes that examinations should be school-based, this practice continues in total disregard of the *de jure* directives as stated in the language-in-education policy. Any attempts to change the status quo are met with other realities in the schools such as the lack of equipment for the printing of examinations.

In a discussion of the post modern approach to language planning and policy, Pennycook (2007:65) lists examinations, books (textbooks) and other prescribed evaluation systems among the diverse range of instruments which governments use to "regulate language use, actions and thoughts of different people, groups and organisations". The argument that textbooks and examinations become the instruments used, implicitly or explicitly, by the government to regulate language use aptly fits the observations made in the selected classes for this study. Although the language-in-education policy is in support of using the MTs (L1s of learners and the languages of the schools' catchment areas), no resources are allocated towards producing textbooks and other school materials in the languages advocated for by the policy. Instead, materials are published exclusively in English (except those for teaching Kiswahili as a language subject), despite the fact that the recommended MoI for urban schools is Kiswahili and a variety of indigenous languages in the rural areas. Thus government policy may be well-intended in terms of support of early learning through the medium of the MT, but policy implementation is undermined by limited supportive actions beyond the policy rhetoric. Materials for the teaching of indigenous MTs as subjects are a preserve for private individuals and NGOs but only in selected languages. Even indigenous languages that have had literacy traditions and some literature is available, no such literature was used in the observed schools implying that whether the language had a long or short literacy tradition did not determine its choice in the classroom. Instead the language of examinations informed teachers' choices and prioritisations.

Tests have been identified as one of the most powerful mechanisms that are used by those in authority to manipulate language behaviour through creation, imposition and perpetuation of ideological agendas (see for example Shohamy, 2004; 2006; Broadfoot, 1996). Shohamy, for

example, finds that tests have been used to "affect language priorities, language practices and criteria of correctness" (Shohamy, 2006:93), resulting in inclusion for some and exclusion to others. Given their power in determining social order, she argues, those involved have no option but to comply (Shohamy, 2006). I argue here that this compliance may entail prioritising the language of the tests over other languages regardless of what the declared policy says on language use in education. The Kenyan teachers observed in this study seemed to have complied with the power of the tests in their language choices and prioritisations in their classrooms.

From the preceding discussions, it can be concluded that teachers use English as a preparatory precaution for English examinations. Indeed, as Pinnock et al. (2010:12) warn, when examinations are conducted in national and international languages, it becomes difficult to convince teachers to teach in the local language because if they do, then their learners will not be ready for the examinations. The switching amongst different languages therefore happens in recognition of the fact that the learners are not proficient in the language(s) of instruction, which will also be the language(s) of examinations. They thus switch codes to facilitate understanding of what is being taught especially in the content subjects (see discussion in section 6.1.1). Sometimes the teacher may switch to a language that is still 'foreign' to a majority of the learners, for example, when the teacher uses Kiswahili in school Y. This was clearly articulated in the interviews with teachers. The following excerpt from an interview with teacher X to find out why she used English words even though she had to translate them into Kiswahili sheds more light on the regulatory role of examinations in the choice of language in the observed classes:

(4)     I speak in English because ... if it is Science, I cannot give the notes in Kiswahili because they will be tested in English. So I have to write the English words. Because like now, the question will come; "We use nose to ____ (dash)". They will have to be tested in English *[IT1 SX. 2]*

Although teacher X was aware that the learners in her classroom had very low English language proficiency since they had only just been introduced to English, she still used Kiswahili-English code switching and code mixing. The teacher does this because she has the English examinations her learners are due to write in mind. In fact, teacher X states this very categorically when explaining why she had to give the notes in English as illustrated in her words "*if it is Science, I cannot give the notes in Kiswahili because they will be tested in English".* Even when probed further on the use of English, she re-affirms her answer that she does it because the examinations will be in English. She even goes ahead to give an example

of how questions are likely to be phrased in the examinations in English, *"We use the nose to _____ (dash)"*.

When teacher Z was asked why she gave the notes to the learners in English even though she was teaching in Kiembu with minimal switches to Kitharaka, she responded that:

> (5)     They write in English because, most of the exams are done in English. And in fact it's only in Kitharaka, where we find that we can write Kitharaka as a language. I try to teach Kitharaka as a language, but the other information in other subjects, I try to make sure that they get the English concepts for future use **[IT1 SZ. 10].**

Teacher Z's response emphasises the important role that the language of examinations plays in the choice of language use in her classroom. "*Most of the exams are done in English"* therefore, it is only prudent to teach more in English. Unfortunately when this happens, learners' understanding of the content may be compromised. According to teacher Z, she tries to make sure that learners get the concepts in English for future use. This future use is a reference to future examinations, especially those taken at the end of primary school, which will definitely be in English. I relate this choice of language by teacher Z to the hopeless cause argument against MT instruction as discussed in a previous section (see section 5.2.1.4). Various studies have shown that indigenous languages are often neglected in education because they are not used in examinations at the end of primary school, and they are not examined as subjects (see for example Musau, 2003; Graham, 2010; Kioko et al., 2008). Prioritising English for teacher Z therefore goes beyond the examinations that learners will do at this level to even those they will do in future. Teacher Z seems to be unaware of the fact that when learners acquire content knowledge in one language (L1), they are expected to demonstrate content knowledge in the the second language (L2) once they have acquired the language skills in the L2 to express that knowledge as theorised by Cummins (1987).

Besides reliance on the available teaching materials, specifically the textbooks, observation in all classrooms made it clear that teaching is very examination-oriented. This is brought out both in the teaching and the notes given to the learners because teachers make decisions on language use in the classroom based on the language of the examinations. For example, teachers constantly ask learners *"Ikikuja kwa mtihani utakumbuka?"* (If it comes in the examination, will you remember?) *[FN SX 25/01/2011]* or "*If someone asks you, would you remember?" [FN SW 04/02/2011].* When teacher W2 was asked why she referred to examinations in her class so often, her response was:

(6)     *Ukimention mtihani unawashtua, then they will be more serious.*

[When you mention examinations, you shock them, then they will be more serious]
**[IT1 SW. 8]**.

According to teacher W2, the reference to examinations in the classroom is meant to "shock" the learners so that they can be more serious. This further reveals teachers' compliance to the power of examinations. An earlier study on language use in education in Kenya indicated that parents thought that learners would not take their education seriously if it were offered in their MTs; but education in English, they felt, would be taken seriously (Muthwii, 2004). As Muthwii's study suggested that using English would motivate learners, in this study, the mere mention of examinations was assumed to motivate the learners. Hence teachers referred to examinations so often in the classrooms.

Apart from the continuous reference to examinations in the classrooms and the language of the notes given to learners, the exercises given to the learners also reflected this reality of examination-oriented teaching. This was particularly the case in school Z where on a number of occasions the exercises given to the learners at the end of a lesson did not bear any semblance with what had been taught in the lesson. The teacher gave the learners exercises covering areas that would typically be covered in an examination and sometimes in total disregard of the topic she had taught in the lesson. The following exercises excerpted from field notes illustrate this. These exercises were written on the chalkboard in English for the learners to copy into their exercise books and respond to the instructions to, for example, write in small letters, which the teacher read out to them because the learners could not read as yet.

**Exercise at the end of the topic 'days of the week' - English language lesson:**

**Write in small letters**

1.  WEDNESDAY
2.  THURSDAY

**Fill in the missing letters**

3.  S-nd-y
4.  M-nd-y
5.  T-esday

**Add a or an**

6.  __ egg
7.  __ pencil

8. __ orange
9. __ ox
10. __ book *[FN, SZ. 7/06/2011]*

**Exercise after the lesson on 'thanking others' - Christian Religious Studies (CRE) lesson**

1. God created _____ the first man (Adam, Abraham).
2. The wife of Adam was _____ (Eve, Sarah).
3. God created the world in _____ days (2, 6, 4).
4. _____ gave me my body (God, mother) *[FN SZ. 09/06/2011]*.

The exercises given above are in the format typically used for an examination in lower primary school classes in Kenya. Although the teacher had taught learners the names of the days of the week in the English lesson, a relevant exercise would have been something to do with the first, second or whatever day of the week before trying to spell them by filling out blanks spaces. These exercises were given to learners who had not learnt to read very well (in their L1 or any other language) yet, so it is possible that even if they were able to write the words in small letters, because the teacher read out the exercise for them, they would still not have known what they were copying.

It could be argued that writing and spelling the words is related in that it would reinforce the oral work on the days of the week. Even so, these exercises would only limitedly indicate whether the learners had mastered the vocabulary that the teacher had tried to teach. What was unrelated to the lesson, was the addition of an exercise on the articles 'a' and 'an' at the end. One cannot help but wonder what the relationship is between days of the week and articles 'a' and 'an'. What would articles 'a' and 'an' tell the learners about the days of the week they had just learnt? Similarly, the CRE exercise extracted from a lesson taught in Kiembu with code switches to English does not reflect what was taught in the topic of focus in the lesson 'thanking others'. The exercise was written for the learners on the chalkboard in English and the teacher read and translated the exercise but the learners were required to copy the exercise and choose the correct responses from the choices provided.

Shohamy (2001) reports similar findings in her study of a new national reading comprehension test in Israel. She found that the introduction of the test forced teachers to engage in teaching "test-like" materials as reflected in the kinds of texts used and questions they asked in the classroom as opposed to teaching reading in a more integrated manner (Shohamy, 2001). Similarly, the introduction of an oral English test in grade 12 resulted in teaching "test-like" content with a focus on only the tasks that are included in the tests while

ignoring others (ibid). In the current study, this "test-likeness" is reflected in both the teaching and the exercises given to the learners at the end of a lesson as evidenced in the exercises from school Z excerpted above. The fact that teachers give notes in English to learners who cannot yet read in any language is indicative of the kind of control the power of tests has had on teachers' language behaviour and classrooms practices.

The language of examinations and textbooks seems to determine the language choices teachers make as well as how these languages are prioritised. Teachers' thoughts and actions reflect the control that the language of examinations and textbooks have on their way of doing things. In my view as the researcher, the government seems to have successfully used textbooks and examinations to regulate how and which languages are used in the observed multilingual classroom contexts. It was difficult to interpret much of the teachers' actions in the classrooms, in that one could not always determine what they intended to teach in terms of concepts, grammar, vocabulary, reading, writing, spelling, etc and what was being done merely in preparation of future examinations. Closely linked to teachers' language choices is their preparedness in terms of how well they are equipped with the necessary skills to cope in multilingual classrooms.

## 5.4    TEACHERS' SKILLS IN MULTILINGUAL CLASSROOMS

Bennett (1990) has argued that teaching in multilingual classrooms requires a teacher to be fully aware of the differences between the learners and to be flexible enough to cope with the conditions and situations which may be very different from those in linguistically homogenous classrooms. She finds that "what often appears to be effective teaching in relatively homogenous classrooms, [...], is not likely to be effective in multilingual classrooms" (Bennett, 1990:265). This study has considered whether teacher training has equipped teachers for the multilingualism among learners in one classroom, and is interested in the kinds of skills that would illustrate their ability to manage such circumstances. My data analysis indicates that although teachers are aware of the linguistic differences amongst their learners, they lack adequate skills that would aid in their flexibility to the linguistic conditions in their classrooms. All participating teachers reported that they had not received any training in dealing with linguistically diverse learners. The strategies they used to manage the diversity of languages among learners (see elaboration in chapter 6) could therefore be said to be their own mechanisms of coping with the demands of the education system. The strategies teachers had developed and applied illustrated limited skills in the varied contexts,

and were co-determined by the nature of diversity involved. In the following discussion, I refer to instances where I recognised awareness of linguistic diversity and the kinds of skills that teachers demonstrated in each case.

In the last interview I had in school W, teacher W1 was asked whether she had received any training whatsoever on how to deal with linguistically diverse learners. Even though she had been through TTC and had a degree in ECED, she reported that she had not received any training in this line. When given an opportunity to ask questions, she asked the researcher to suggest ways in which the children in her class who did not speak the school language could be assisted. It is possible that seeking help from the researcher was a form of admittance of the inadequacies felt by the teacher concerning how to deal with such learners in her classroom. Although I had entered the field as a non-participant observer, I allowed flexibility and sensitivity on my part to the context in which the data was being generated as advocated by Mason (2002). The teacher had two learners (one Dholuo and the other Luhyia L1 speakers) in her classroom that she was really trying to help (see next paragraph), but wasn't sure whether what she was doing was the right thing. I first affirmed what I had seen her do with them (see 6.1 for discussion of observed strategies) and then shared two other strategies – peer interpretation and native language pairing – which I thought would work well in her context.

The paucity of teachers' skills in dealing with linguistically diverse learners in their classrooms was evident in the observed classrooms. Although teacher W1 for example, responded to the challenge of linguistic diversity by speaking to the learners in their MTs when this involved her own MT, she was not confident that that was what she should be doing. After she had spoken Dholuo to a learner, she quickly turned to me and explained that she had done so because the learner *"had come from the village kabisa*,[15] *so he cannot speak English or Kiswahili" [FN SW 19/01/2011].*

Similarly, in school X, in a Social Studies lesson, the teacher drew a picture of a house, pointed to the roof and asked the learners what the roof was made of without saying in which language the answer should be given. One of the learners gave the name for the 'iron sheets' in Kikuyu '*ifati'*. This led the teacher to ask other learners to say what 'iron sheets' are called in their MTs, which they did. When asked why she had done that in an interview with her

---

[15] "Kabisa"as in "the village kabisa" is a Kiswahili word meaning "deep, far, right inside" - thus in this case: "he had come directly from the village".

after the lesson, teacher X justified her action by saying that *"ni vile nilisikia wengine wakitaja na mother tongue"* [it is because I heard some learners say it in their mother tongues] **[IT1 SX. 1]**. This attempted justification implies that the teacher would not normally ask learners to use their MTs, even though the MT is encouraged by the language-in-education policy. Ruíz (1984) advocates such use of the MT in a language orientations framework, as do other scholars who view learners L1s as resources that should be utilised to their benefit in the learning process (see for example Bamgbose, 1991; Cummins, 2000a; Corson, 1990).

Allowing learners to speak in their L1s or teachers to speak to them in their MTs is a commonly cited inclusive classroom practice. This can be achieved through pairing or grouping of learners based on native languages spoken (see for example Plüddemann et al., 2000). It can also be achieved by the teacher learning a few simple phrases in the languages represented in the classroom (Schwarzer et al., 2003:5), as discussed in the literature review (see section 3.5). However, teachers W and X did not have this kind of information so that even if their intuitive strategies were good, they were not certain whether they were doing the right thing. The responses of these teachers concur with the findings of the study done by Kennedy and Dewer (1997) who found that teachers learn to cope in multilingual classrooms through trial and error. If they had been specifically trained, these teachers would not have felt obliged to justify their actions. This illustrates that teachers try a variety of strategies to see what works. Even when those strategies work, the fact that they are own innovations seem to leave them uncertain that theirs are good enough strategies (see for example Bloch, 1998).

Most of the teachers who participated in this study insisted that their learners could speak the languages that they had chosen as MoI in their classrooms. Teacher X, for example, insisted that all the children could speak Kiswahili; the learners' responses indicated a different thing. Once, when she asked a learner to bring a pencil from the tin of pens on the desk, he brought a red pen. Teacher Y was similarly convinced that all learners understood Kikamba. When asked what she did with the learners who did not speak the MoI, her response was:

(7)     *Wanaelewa Kikamba. Ukifundisha kwa Kikamba wanaelewa, hii lugha ya kuongea.*

        [They understand Kikamba. When you teach in Kikamba they understand, the spoken kind of language] **[IT1SY. 5].**

However, teacher Y contradicts herself later when she says that she speaks Kitharaka or Kimbeere to Kitharaka L1 or Kimbeere L1 learners respectively, to enhance their understanding of what is taught.

In addition, teacher Y brings out her awareness of the differences between Basic Interpersonal Commincative Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) as theorised by Cummins (1980). This is reflected in her words in (7) above. In the teacher's words, children understand Kikamba, *"hii lugha ya kuongea"*. I interpret this phrase *'hii lugha ya kuongea'* to be referring to the level of language which Cummins refers to as the Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS). BICS refers to the skills needed for day-to-day communication. This means that the CALP, which refers to "those aspects of language proficiency which are closely related to the development of literacy skills in the L1 and L2" (Cummins, 1980:177), is lacking amongst the learners. In other words, she finds that the level of language proficiency that children need in school is more advanced and demanding compared to the language used in daily affairs at home. The "spoken language" referred to by the teacher in this class, *'hii lugha ya kuongea'* is therefore her term for BICS which she believes to be inadequate for advanced academic discourse. Although teacher Y uses Kikamba as MoI, it is presumably, this intuitive awareness that leads her to revert to Kitharaka when speaking to Kitharaka L1 speakers in her classroom. The distinctions expressed in the BICS and CALP theory applies not only to the non-Kikamba-speaking but also the Kikamba-speaking learners in teacher Y's classroom in that the proficiency of Kikamba among L1 speakers is only at the BICS level. The difference amongst them lies in the fact that unlike those learners speaking other languages, the Kikamba L1 speakers enjoy continued development of their own L1 in the classroom, when they receive instruction in their L1 even though it is not taught as MT subject.

In school Z, the participating teacher demonstrated some awareness of linguistic diversity in her classroom. On two occasions, when she encountered an object which she knew the non-Kitharaka speakers in her class used a different word from the Kitharaka word for it, she would ask the learners from those other language communities namely, Kikuyu and Kimenti if they knew what the Tharaka word meant or what the word for the object was in their own languages. On the two incidences mentioned above, she came across the word *'ikumbo' (*river bank) in Kitharaka and asked the Kimenti- and Kikuyu-speaking learners if they knew what it meant. When the learners said they did not know what it meant, she took the time to explain

to them what it meant. On the second occasion, teacher Z was talking about '*makome'* (eggs) and asked individual Kikuyu- and Kimenti-speaking learners if they knew what eggs are called in their languages, where the Kikuyu speakers said they used the word '*matumbi'* (eggs), while the Kimenti speakers used '*nkara'* for eggs *[FN SZ. 08/06/2011 and FN SZ. 09/06/2011*, **respectively].** When I picked this up in an interview with teacher Z, she confirmed that she had done this because she was aware that the non-Tharaka speakers used different terms from the Tharakas so she did it to bring those learners "to the same level" as the Tharaka speakers *[IT2 SZ. 10].* This awareness was significant in this study considering that the inclusion of this particular school was motivated by the need to observe a classroom where one of the languages spoken as an L1 by some of the learners represented in the class was taught in the timetable slot for the MT subject. It would appear that in the teaching of MT language subject, the teacher is more alert to the linguistic differences amongst the learners than in the teaching of the content subjects which are not necessarily taught in any of the L1s of the learners represented in the classroom except in school Y.

It was noted that teacher Y is aware that reading in English is dependent on being able to read the local languages (a first language), as theorised by scholars (see for example Cummins, 1979; 1980; Cummins & Swain, 1986), in the interdependency theory. In this theory, Cummins and Swain (1986:87) argue that:

> *To the extent that instruction in Lx is effective in promoting proficiency in Lx, transfer of this proficiency to Ly will occur provided there is adequate exposure to Ly (either in school or environment) and adequate motivation to learn Ly.*

What this theory predicts is the transfer of language skills across languages; where for example, reading instruction in one language not only leads to literacy skills in that language, but also deeper conceptual understanding and linguistic proficiency in the other languages. In this regard, Cummins (2007:233) identifies five major types of cross-lingual transfer which operate in varying ways depending on the sociolinguistic and educational situation involved namely, transfer of conceptual elements, transfer of metacognitive and metalinguistic strategies, transfer of pragmatic aspects of language use, transfer of specific linguistic elements and transfer of phonological awareness. Hakuta (1990:54) in a study amongst L1 Spanish speakers in New Haven, USA, argues for holistic development of native language with the aim that such skills will transfer to the L2, that proceeds not in a step-by-step, or skill-by-skill, from the L1 to the L2 but holistically because transfer does happen.

Teacher Y is intuitively aware of this transfer of some literacy-related skills across languages as she states this very clearly in the excerpt below, which was in response to the question whether in her opinion, having the three languages in the class, makes learning difficult for the learners:

(8)     *Wakijua kusoma Kiswahili, it will be easier for them kusoma Kingereza. Kwa maana, they cannot go straight to reading English when they do not know how to read these local languages, and the local language here is Kikamba.*

[When they learn to read in Kiswahili, it will be easier for them to read in English. Because they cannot go straight to reading English when they do not know how to read these local languages, and the local language here is Kikamba] **[IT1 SY. 5]**.

The teacher recognises that learning to read in the L1 is foundational to learning to read in an L2 and/or L3. Although, she does not teach reading in any of the three L1s represented in her classroom and therefore also the L1s of the learners, according to her, Kiswahili is closer to these languages and would be a better option for teaching learners to read when compared with teaching them to read in English. It is possible to teach reading in multiple languages as theorised in the continua of biliteracy (see for example Hornberger & Skilton-Sylvester, 2000; 2003; Hornberger, 2003). However, this study indicates that most teachers lack the skills to manage multiple languages in their classrooms in a way that would foster multiliteracy development. Without the requisite skills, teachers cannot facilitate the development of non-majority or multiple languages in their classrooms. Therefore, decisions on which of the many languages represented in a linguistically diverse classroom to use for teaching reading, become a challenge and the decision finally taken may not always align even with the teachers' own beliefs about language development. For example, although teacher Y was intuitively aware that teaching learners to read in their L1 would help them in their learning to read English (as an L2 or L3), she was not adequately equipped to handle the situation. Formal development of teachers' skills for the development of basic literacy in a multilingual context would presumably have gone a long way in helping the teacher to deal with the multiplicity of languages in her classrooms for the benefit of all the learners.

Unfortunately, teacher education in Kenya does not address dealing with linguistically diverse learners in a specific and explicit way, so that teachers are left feeling ill-equipped to handle the language issues in their classrooms. Participating teachers' accounts of the absence of training in dealing with linguistic diversity is confirmed in a number of studies that have focused on teacher preparation in Kenya (see for example Akyeampong et al., 2011; Bunyi, 1997). It transpires that the teachers' own orientations towards languages play a role in

what they do when they are confronted with the reality of the multilingualism of learners. Teachers' classroom practices in terms of which language(s) they prioritise in their day-to-day classroom activities reflect not only their understanding of but also their attitudes towards linguistic diversity – which is the topic of the following section.

## 5.5    TEACHERS' ATTITUDES IN MULTILINGUAL CLASSROOMS

As already discussed in the literature review, language attitudes play a key role in the day-to-day practices in a multilingual classroom (see section 3.6). Schwarzer et al. (2003:2) simply summarise teachers' attitudes about native language usage in school settings into four categories, namely a) forbid native language attitudes; b) allow native language attitudes; c) maintain native language attitudes; and d) foster native language attitudes. As the name implies, forbid native languages attitudes have to do with ignoring learners' home languages in classrooms. Allow native language attitudes have to do with allowing learners to use the L1s in selected school settings, for instance, during recess or for purposes of developing the L2, in this case English. Maintain native language attitudes are mostly implemented through after school classes or as extracurricular activities for language minority students. Foster native language attitudes offer two options namely, dual language bilingual programmes, where learners are expected to attain high levels of oral and written proficiency in both the L1 and L2. Where the demographics of the classroom do not allow for dual language education, Scwharzer et al. (2003:3) find that teachers, even monolingual teachers, have the option to foster multiliteracy development using community members in classroom activities. Although Schwarzer et al. (2003) used these terms in the American context, I find these categories appropriate to use in this study in the discussion of the teachers' stated views about learners' L1s in their classrooms and the actual practice as observed. Here, I am particularly keen in this classification on the instances where the learners themselves are allowed to use their MTs as opposed to the teacher using their own L1s and/or other languages.

The attitude in School W could be said to be that of forbid native languages in the classrooms. Although the teacher was observed speaking her L1 to a learner who had recently arrived from the village, she tries to justify her actions. No other instances of the learners using their MT were observed in her classroom. Even the mixing of languages which was prevalent amongst the teachers was not allowed the learners in this particular context. This is discussed in detail in a later chapter of this research report (see section 7.1.2.1)

words, "*May be I was doing it wrong but this week because you are here, I will do it the way it should be done" [FN SX 08/02/2011],* which meant she would teach Kiswahili during the lesson timetabled for MT as opposed to English remedial work.

It has been argued that teachers may sometimes hold negative stereotyping attitudes towards non-standard English speaking children for their lack of proficiency in the school language (Shafer, 1975) and these attitudes may significantly affect the content of and interaction around instruction (Kelly, 1988). This study found that for some teachers', proficiency in the school language was confused for 'smartness' as is evidenced in the words of teachers X and Y *"those who are bright*" in reference to the few learners in their classes who understood Kiswahili. Teacher X also uses the words *"the slow ones"* when referring to those who did not understand Kiswahili as reflected in the following extract:

> (9)     *You notice that they do not know much, but then you have to cover the syllabus. Because you see some of them they know, but those who are bright, you see they can answer, nose to smell, ears to hear* **[IT2 SX. 2].**

This clearly shows that proficiency in the school language is used by these teachers as the key determinant for who is a 'bright' or 'slow' learner in these classrooms. Teacher X also assumes that the learners *"do not know much"* but I suppose this is in reference to what they know in the school languages. We know that children of ages 6 and 7 know pretty much in their home languages, even by the time they enter school. As already discussed in the literature review (see section 3.3), Spolsky (1986) warns that if not addressed appropriately, the problems brought about by language barriers in education, could lead to an early mislabelling of learners "uneducable". I interpret this as one such early mislabelling where teachers X and Y already seem to have decided who is *"bright"* or *"slow"* or *"does not know much"* in their classes based on their proficiency in a school language that had been introduced to the learners not more than three months before this study took place.

Teacher Y could be said to adopt the allow learners' L1s attitude in her classroom. She allowed learners to use all languages in the classroom. She freely allowed learners to use their L1s in class not only in content subjects but also when teaching other language subjects, Kiswahili and English in this context. However, faced with the dilemma of the language of examinations, she had to keep switching to English and Kiswahili every so often to prepare her class for the examinations. The transcript excerpt below from one of her lessons gives

insight into what her attitude was towards the learners' L1s and how she handled the different languages in the classroom.

**Extract 1 - School Y**

(10)    *T:  Kuna umbo la msitatili unaona darasani?*

        *[*Is there something with the shape of a rectangle you see in class?]

(11)    *L:  Darasa*

        [Classroom]

(12)    *Ls:  Nye nye nye*

        [Me or I]

(13)    *T:  Darasa ... umesema darasa?*

        [Classroom, ... did you say classroom?]

(14)    *T:  Sio darasa yote lakini ni^*

        [It's not the whole class but its^]

(15)    *L:  Table*

(16)    *T:  Table ni ... inaitwa aje kwa Kiswaili?*

        [Table is ... what is a table called in Kiswahili?]

(17)    *L:  Meza*

        [Table]

(18)    *T:  Meza. Inaitwa meza. Meza iko na umbo la msitatili. Nini ingine? Learner K*

        [Table ... it is called a table ... a table has a rectangular shape. What else?] Learner K

(19)    *L:  Kiviila.*

        [Chair] - in Kikamba

(20)    *T:  Kiviila kitawa ata na Kiswahili?*

        [What is a chair called in Kiswahili?]

(21)    *Ls  Chair*

(22)    *T:  Chair ni Kizungu na Kiswahili ni^*

        [Chair is English, in Kiswahili it is^]

(23)    *L:  Kiti.*

        [Chair]

(24)    *T:  Kiti ... kwa hivyo kiti kiko na umbo la msitatili*

        [Chair ... so a chair has a rectangular shape] **[OT9 SY. 118].**

Although this was a Kiswahili lesson, teacher Y accepts learners' responses given in English and also Kikamba. When the answer is given in a language other than Kiswahili, she accepts the answer. By repeating the answer the learner has given, the teacher is affirming that what has been said is correct as shown in different studies on Initiation Response Feedback/Evaluation (IRF/E)[16] elicitation sequence in classroom interaction (see for example Cleghorn et al., 1989; Ndayipfukamiye1993; O'Connor & Michaels, 1996; Arthur, 1996; Pontefract & Hardman, 2005). Repeating the learners' responses or what O'Connor and Michaels (1996) call the "revoicing" of learners' lesson contributions has been associated with positive feedback or evaluation. When teacher Y repeats the words *'darasa'* (classroom) 'table', *'meza', 'kiviila',* 'chair' and *'kiti'* in (13), (16), (18), (20), (22) and (24) respectively, she is telling the learners they are right. Whenever she is given the answer in a language other than Kiswahili, she affirms the answer but then probes further to get the Kiswahili word. For example, in the above excerpt teacher Y is probing for the Kiswahili word in turns (16), (20) and (22).

In the above extract, when the teacher gets the word in the desired language, she re-affirms it and moves on to initiate a new sequence. For example, after being given the word 'table' in English in response to the question on what has a rectangular shape in the classroom, the teacher revoices it as the right answer but then probes for the Kiswahili word for table. Once it is given as *meza* in (17)*,* the teacher reaffirms this answer in (18) and immediately initiates the next interaction with the question *"na nini ingine?"* (and what else?), then the lesson continues in this predictable characteristic of IRF/E format, as shown in different studies (see for example Cleghorn et al., 1989; O'Connor & Michaels, 1996; Arthur, 1996; Pontefract & Hardman, 2005).

In school Z, the teacher also allowed learners MTs in her classroom. Like in the other rural school, learners were allowed to make their lesson contributions in any language within their repertoire. It was however noted that the teaching of the MT lesson was very inconsistent. No MT lesson was observed by the end of the second day despite it being in the timetable each day of the week. For the one week that I observed this class, only two lessons were taught. In fact even those two were taught because 'I was there' and the teacher made this clear in her

---

[16] Initiation Response Feedback/Evaluation (IRF/E is used in classroom interaction discourse to refer to the typical structure of teacher-led recitations. According to Pontefract and Hardman (2005), the three moves involve an initiation, which is usually in the form of a teacher's question, a response in which a student attempts to answer the teacher's question, and a follow-up move, in which the teacher provides some form of feedback, which is very often in the form of an evaluation, to the pupil's response.

words 'because you are here, I will teach it but I rarely teach it' *[FN, SZ. 07/06/2011]*, which she repeated on a number of occasions. When asked why this was the case, the teacher replied that she cannot concentrate on it because there is only one MT test. Her exact response was "*it's only in Kitharaka, where we find that we can write Kitharaka as a language in exams*" (see turn (5) above). However, the same treatment is not given to Kiswahili which also has only one test. This reveals more of the teacher's attitude towards the MT, a negative attitude towards the language she had chosen to teach as MT in her classroom.

A look at a few learners' language exercise books confirmed this observation, on how inconsistently the MT was being taught in this school. I asked the teacher to get for me the three language exercise books from three learners who are not frequently absent from school. A look through the three language exercise books revealed that in the five months that these learners had been in this class, they had been taught only five MT lessons and two of them were taught during my visit. In contrast, children were in their second exercise book of the Kiswahili and English language because these were not only taught during the timetabled slots but also during the MT lesson. This teacher's negative attitude towards the MT was evident in her over emphasis on English and Kiswahili at the expense of all the three L1s of the learners represented in her classroom.

In addition, although teacher Z taught in her MT and children could answer questions in their different L1s and language varieties, she did not see the benefits of the MT in the future of these learner's academic development. Her response to the question on the use of English was:

(25) *I try to teach Kitharaka as a language, but the other information I try to give in other subjects, I try to make sure that they get the English concepts for future use [IT1 SZ. 9].*

Evidently, teacher Z sees no use for teaching concepts in the MT because according to her, the learners will only be able to use the concepts in English in the future. Although studies have shown that learning in a familiar language promotes academic achievement and leads to better performance in both language and content subjects (see for example Fafunwa et al., 1989; Thomas & Collier, 1997; Williams, 1998), because learners understand what they are taught, teacher Z seems to be completely ignorant of that fact.

Although the demographics of all the classes observed provided a fertile ground to foster multiliteracy development, this diversity was not capitalised on owing to lack of the requisite skills on the part of teachers for such an undertaking. It was also the case in all classes observed that writing in MT was not encouraged except in school Z where the language of the majority learners was taught as the MT subject. Even in the rural schools in particular where learners were allowed to make lesson contributions in any language within their repertoire, writing only happened in the other school languages, English and minimally Kiswahili, which was done only during the Kiswahili language lessons. The learners L1s were however forbidden in examinations, which were done in English.

Bloch (1998:9) argues that "writings on the wall can […] provide information about teachers' attitudes [be they positive or negative] towards language issues and towards literacy acquisition process". As already mentioned in the description of the contexts of this study, most of the labels in the classrooms were in English except those for teaching Kiswahili as a language subject. One label was also in Kikamba in school Y and two of the tucked away labels in school Z were in Kitharaka. In this study, labels in the classrooms were used to determine the attitudes of teachers towards the different languages represented in their classrooms. The language of the labels in all four classrooms observed in this study showed that English is prioritised over all the other languages, Kiswahili is in the second place in this prioritisation list while the other languages compete for the other positions in contexts where they are accepted. In school W for example, the learners' L1s are in competition with the teacher's L1 while English continues to enjoy the "pride of place", to borrow the words of Bunyi (1999:339), in classrooms where it is not a first or even second language of the learners in those classrooms.

The study further indicates that teachers seemed to cope differently in their multilingual classrooms. It was noted that while some teachers displayed the frustration they felt about the language situation in their classrooms, others seemed to be managing the situation differently. For example, after teaching the 'topic days of the week' and making learners repeat the days, sentences and even spell the names of all the days of the week and recite them, teacher Z poses the following question:

**Extract 2 - School Z**

    (26)    *Now, nuriku ukumbiira the third day is called^. Aya, which is the third day, the third day?*

            [Now who will tell me the third day is called^. Ok, which is the third day, the third day?] **[OT14 SZ. 138].**

The teacher places a lot of emphasis on the word **third** both by repeating it and also stressing the word, to which one learner responds:

    (27)    L:   Seven

And notice the teacher's reaction below:

    (28)    T:   *Ati seven! Ndakuuria ntuku ya ithatu ukambiira i seven! Ndakuria ntuku ya ithatu niriku ukambiira i seven?*

            [Did you say seven! I ask you the third day and you say seven! Which is the third day and you tell me seven?] **[OT14 SZ. 138].**

This excerpt reveals the frustration teachers may at times feel when they have been trying to teach some content but do not seem to be making headways. The tone in teacher Z's voice as well as the expression I observed on her face and the words themselves revealed a level of frustration with the answer that she had received from this learner. As a matter of fact, the use of the word *'ati'* is associated with a feeling of disgust in a given situation. It is possible that many teachers experience this kind of frustration once in a while as a result of the language dilemmas in their classrooms. Another example will demonstrate this further.

In a separate instance, teacher Z goes through the lesson content with the learners and repeats it over and over again. When she was reviewing the lesson, she asks the learners a question and when no right answer was forthcoming, she says this to the learners:

    (29)    *Thugaania na wou! Utikwenda kunoga kiongo indi. Nimesema huyu ni ng'ombe.*

            [You think also. You don't want your heads to work and be tired. I said this is a cow] **[OT4 SZ. 71].**

Again, these words reveal teacher Z's frustration with the language challenge in her classroom. Telling the learners to 'use their heads' shows how she feels about what is happening. Frustrated that the learners are not 'using their heads' but in the real sense, the language barrier is the reason they cannot give the right answers to her questions. However, in her frustration, the teacher seems to forget the fact that the learners have just began learning that language. Kiswahili in her class is a second language to the learners and yet,

language instruction is combined with all other aspects of language and in the context of this excerpt, plurals of not only words but also complete sentences. I interpret this as an expression of the frustrations teachers feel as they try to make themselves understood by learners in a language not mastered by them. A similar situation was observed in school W with teacher W2 as reflected in the excerpt below:

### Extract 3 - School W

(30)  T:  This is /f/, now read this word. This is sound^

(31)  L:  Inaudible

(32)  T:  *Read the word. Hii ni /f/ na hii ni /n/ so read the word*
          [Read the word. This is /f/ and this is /n/, so read the word]

(33)  L:  Inaudible

(34)  T:  *Sasa kama umesema hii ni /f/ na this is /n/ huwezi kusema fun?*
          [Now if you are saying this is /f/ and this is /n/, you cannot say fun?]
          **[OT1 SW. 13]**

As indicated in teacher W2's last turn (34), she cannot understand why the learner could not read the word 'fun' if he/she could already sound out the /f/ and /n/ sounds in the word. This could be indicative of the frustration she feels as she struggles to teach learners to read in an unfamiliar language.

An example from a different lesson here helps to bring out the differences between how teacher W1 handled a similar situation in comparison to teachers Z and W2.

### Extract 4 - School W

(35)  T:  Now, I want you to remind me of the two types of houses that we talked about. The two types of houses were which ones? Don't look at the wall – because there were labels on the walls on the types of houses.

(36)  T:  Tell me one of the houses you talked about

(37)  L:  Sticks

(38)  T:  No, sticks is what you use to make a house

(39)  Ls:  Teacher, teacher, teacher!

(40)  T:  Another person. Yes Learner J

(41)  L:  Inaudible

(42)  T:  We are talking about the types of houses ... the types of houses in our homes. The ones you talked about with teacher W2. Yes Learner B

(43)  L:  Hut

(44)  T:  Very good, one of them is the^

(45)　　Ls:　Hut **[OT2 SW. 30-31].**

In this excerpt, although the learner gives a wrong answer in response to teacher W1's question as indicated in turn (37), we observe a different reaction from her in comparison to those of teachers Z and W2 discussed in the previous excerpts (see excerpts 2 & 3 above). Teacher W1 uses the wrong answer given to provide a scaffold (38) to the learners to help them answer the question correctly. In this instance, when the learner says sticks (37), the teacher uses that to explain that sticks is one of the things used to make a house (38) and goes ahead to remind them that they learnt about the types of houses with teacher W2 (42). The fact that this happens in the urban school where a few children would be expected to understand a bit of English when compared to those in rural school Z reveals how differently teacher W1 is dealing with the language situation in her classroom.

Similarly, teacher X in an English lesson uses the wrong answers that learners give as scaffolds for the learners towards evoking the correct response to the question asked. The following excerpt supports this argument.

**Extract 5 - School X**

(46)　　T:　This girl, what is she doing? The girl is^...
(47)　　L:　Eating
(48)　　T:　Eating. Very good learner G
(49)　　T:　What is the man doing?
(50)　　Ls:　Eating
(51)　　T:　Not eating
(52)　　L:　Walking
(53)　　T:　Not walking
(54)　　L:　Water
(55)　　T:　Doing what water?
(56)　　L:　Drinking
(57)　　T:　Drinking. Very good learner N **[OT1 SX. 9].**

In place of frustration when she is given a noun "water" in turn (54) for an answer when she is actually looking for a verb "drinking", she uses the same noun to guide the learners towards the correct answer by asking the question in (55) "doing what water?" to which the learner gives the correct response 'drinking' in (56). Like teacher W1 in extract 4, teacher X uses what the children know in the school language as building blocks for more learning and vocabulary development in that language.

These findings confirm those of earlier studies that have shown that teachers seem to cope differently in dealing with linguistically diverse learners. Whereas some teachers are reported to feel overwhelmed and frustrated with the language situation (see for example Penfield, 1987; Johnston, 1999), others seem to cope well (Haworth, 2003) (see section 3.6 for exposition). Whereas the other teachers in this study seemed to be coping well with the language needs in their classrooms, teachers Z and W2 seem overwhelmed and frustrated by the lack of proficiency in the school languages amongst the learners especially when they were unable to answer questions correctly owing to the language barrier.

Similarly, Commins and Miramontes (2005) have argued that not all teachers are willing to adapt their educational approaches to the changing needs of their learners. According to them, this reluctance to adapt to the learners changing needs causes frustration and alienation between students and their teachers (ibid). Penfield (1987) and Conteh (2007) both observe that some teachers are more willing to deal with linguistically diverse learners than others. As can be seen from the preceding discussions, teachers in this study coped differently with linguistically diverse learners in their classrooms.

## 5.6    CONCLUSION

It has been argued that the need for learners to develop advanced skills in English need not be done at the expense of their development of cognitive academic language proficiency in languages other than English (see for example Blackledge, 1994; Wong Fillmore, 2000; Cummins, 2001; Clyne, 2001; Lo Bianco, 2002). This means therefore, that the development of advanced literacy skills need to bear in mind the fact that many children enter primary school classrooms with emergent or established oracy and literacy skills in their MTs, a resource that need not be squandered. However, apart from the rural schools, the language as a resource ideology as theorised by Ruíz (1984) seems not to apply in the other two study sites. The learners' L1s are discouraged in the classroom except when the teachers have to "alleviate word finding difficulty" in the matrix language, to borrow the words of Rose and van Dulm (2006:6), as already discussed.

Multilingualism in the classroom contexts could be understood from two different perspectives: a) where more than one language is used with and/or being taught as a subject to the learners; and b) where the learners in the classroom come from diverse linguistics backgrounds. The current study focused more on the second perspective. However, because of the interrelatedness of these two perspectives and their relevance to the Kenyan

multilingual primary school classrooms' contexts, the first perspective shed light to the understanding of the second perspective. The study indicates that decisions on which languages to use in the classrooms depend, to a large extent, on language of the textbooks and the language of examinations as opposed to the languages spoken by the learners in the classrooms. As such, examinations and textbooks were identified as the two main instruments that the Kenyan government through the MoE has successfully used, albeit implicitly, to regulate language use in educational settings. The language choices teachers make as well as how these languages are prioritised in the observed classrooms reflect the control that the language of examinations and textbooks have on both their thoughts and actions.

The study further indicates that the classroom teacher plays a key role in the decision on what language(s) to use for instruction and determines how the term 'mother tongue' is used in their particular contexts. The policy document makes no mention of specific languages to be taught as the MT in any given contexts. As such, the policy only mentions English and Kiswahili while all the other Kenyan indigenous languages are classified together as MT. The onus is on the teachers as policy implementers to determine what languages should be taught as MTs not only in linguistically heterogeneous but also homogeneous classrooms. As a result, teachers settle on teaching one language as a MT even in contexts where a variety of languages would be expected, as implied in the definitions of MT provided by the MoE. It is also the case that the language taught as the MT is seldom used as the MoI, a practice that further contradicts the policy. In a number of other cases, the languages teachers may chose as MoI in multilingual classrooms may even contradict their very beliefs of what is ideal.

According to this study, the definition by the MoE of MT as the language of the schools' catchment area seems to be 'preferred' over that of the language that a child learns to express himself/herself, in all contexts observed. If this was not the case, it would have been expected that a wide variety of languages would be in use in a multilingual classroom as implied in that definition. Although the definition by catchment area would also in some cases imply more than one language, it is the case that the language that is predominantly spoken in the area is chosen over other languages that may be spoken in the same catchment area. There seems to be, according to this study, a general assumption amongst teachers that the language of the school's catchment area refers to the dominantly spoken language in an area. This was, in most cases, found to also be the language of the majority children in a given classroom, which further stifles the chances for the recognition of the other L1s/languages of the

minorities. Except in school Y, where the teacher makes deliberate efforts to recognise Kitharaka, a language of the minority children in her class, but nevertheless one of the languages spoken in the school's catchment area, all the other schools prefer to work with the dominant languages in the classroom.

Given these linguistic preferences and prioritisations in the classrooms as discussed in this chapter, I sought to find out the strategies teachers employed in their multilingual classrooms in response to the linguistic demands in the various contexts observed. The next chapter presents teachers' strategies as responses to linguistic diversity in their classrooms.

# CHAPTER 6

# TEACHERS' RESPONSES TO LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY IN MULTILINGUAL CLASSROOMS

## INTRODUCTION

In the preceding chapter, I have presented the analysis and interpretation of data relating to objective one of the study. Teachers' understandings of linguistic diversity as reflected in their re-interpretation of the term "mother tongue" as well as their language practices in classrooms were discussed. Teachers' attitudes towards and skills regarding linguistic diversity were shown to mirror their language choices and priorities in their classroom practices. The language of examinations and textbooks were shown to co-determine such choices and practices. The current chapter presents the findings relating to objective two of the study, which refers to the strategies teachers revert to in multilingual classrooms (see section 1.3.1), as a response to linguistic diversity.

One of the aims of this study has been to find out which strategies participating teachers use to handle linguistically diverse learners in their classrooms. In the 1953 declaration referred to earlier (see chapter 1 introduction), UNESCO (1953:47) emphasises that "every effort should be made to provide education in the mother tongue". Fifty years later, in their position paper on multilingual education, UNESCO (2003:13) points out that "there is need to take into consideration the specific learning needs of children in relation to the language or languages of the home and those of the school". This study is interested in efforts teachers make to provide education in the MTs to learners in multilingual classrooms. The study is also interested in the ways in which the specific learning needs of learners are taken into consideration in relation to languages. For example, I was keen in classroom observation to find out how often the teachers used any of the other language represented in the classroom besides those proscribed for the specific school's catchment area. The study intended to disclose the reasons for using those other language(s), and in which kinds of interactions, where that happened. An attempt is also made under this objective to interrogate the pedagogical soundness of the strategies employed by teachers in their attempts to be inclusive of linguistically diverse learners in their classrooms.

Classroom observations, and in some instances interviews with teachers, revealed that teachers employ a number of strategies in multilingual classrooms to manage the linguistic needs of learners who speak different L1s. In this chapter, I present the six strategies observed to be the most used in the classrooms, namely code switching, translating and interpreting, using learners' L1s, ritualised participation strategies, repetition and use of scaffolds (both verbal and non-verbal). These strategies are discussed in the remainder of this chapter, and examples are drawn from the data to show how these were employed in actual classroom practices. There are some strategies I came across in all of the study sites and others that are specific to individual teachers. I shall point out which strategies are widely used, and which seem to be specific to a given teacher.

## 6.1    CODE SWITCHING

As already discussed in the literature review (see section 3.5.5), code switching is used in this study to refer to both the "intersentential alternating use of two or more languages or varieties of a language in the same speech situation" and the "intrasentential use of two or more languages or varieties of a language" (Kamwangamalu, 2010:116). The terms code switching, code mixing and code alternation are used interchangeably in this study to refer to all forms of code alternations be they intra- or inter-sentential, at the level of word, sentence or even blocks of speech.

The phenomenon of code switching in the observed classrooms is presented here based on the various functions it was deemed to serve in a given situation. Previous studies have shown that classroom code switching may be used to accomplish a number of functions among which are to clarify knowledge of subject matter presented in an unfamiliar language (see for example Setati, 1998; Chimbganda & Mokgwathi, 2012); to encourage learner participation (see for example Arthur, 1994; 1996; Setati, 1998); to reduce the social distance between the teacher and the learners (see for example Rose & van Dulm, 2006; Chimbganda & Mokgwathi, 2012); to fill lexical gaps in the matrix[17] language (see for example Rose & Van Dulm, 2006); to manage the tension felt in trying to balance the requirements of the school system and the practical needs of learners in multilingual classrooms (see for example Arthur,

---

[17] The Matrix Language Framework (MLF) as theorized by Myers-Scotton has been used in studies of code switching to determine the matrix language. However, the MLF model was not employed in this study in determining the matrix language because this was not a study on code switching per se. Code switching only emerged as one among the many strategies that this study was seeking to document. Instead the term "matrix language" is used here to refer to the language in which the conversation begins, while the language switched to or inserted is referred to as the "embedded language".

1994; 1996; Jones & Barkhuizen, 2011); and to familiarise learners with the language of examinations (Setati, 1998) (see section 3.5.5 for exposition).

In this study, although many forms of code switching emerged due to the varieties of languages involved, code switching was found to have similar functions in these classrooms to those reported in previous studies (see for example Merritt et al., 1992; Arthur, 1994; 1996; Ndayipfukamiye, 1994; 1996; Setati, 1998; Rose & van Dulm, 2006; Jones & Barkhuizen, 2011; Chimbganda & Mokgwathi, 2012). The direction of the switch, for example, whether from English to Kiswahili or Kiswahili to English, was considered important in determining the matrix language and therefore giving leads as to why the switching was done. The functions for which code switching is used are however not mutually exclusive, in that there are times when switching from one language to another may serve more than one function. For example, one instance of code switching may facilitate learner participation as well as support the understanding of what is taught, and at the same time reduce the social distance between the teacher and the learners. A discussion of the functions for which code switching was used in the observed classrooms in this study, is presented in sections that follow.

### 6.1.1   Code switching to facilitate learner understanding of content

Teachers switched from English to Kiswahili (schools W and X), or to Kikamba (school Y) or to Kiembu (school Z), mainly in the translation of content from the language of textbooks to the preferred MoI in their respective contexts. Although not all the learners in school W and X knew Kiswahili, more learners understood Kiswahili than they did English. The same could be said regarding knowledge of English and Kikamba in school Y, where Kikamba was the L1 of a majority of the learners in the classroom. Even in school Z where Kiembu, the teacher's L1, was the MoI and yet not an L1 of any of the learners in the classroom, the MoI was better understood than English. This can be explained by the fact that Kiembu belongs to the same language family as the other three languages represented in the learner population. Code switching from English to the individual teachers' preferred MoI, given their differing contexts, was done to enhance understanding of the content by the learners. Switching from English to the preferred MoI in each context was therefore almost a given for these teachers. The following extracts from the various study sites will illustrate this further:

## Extract 6[18] - School W (Maths Lesson)

(58)    T:    We want to do take away. *Tunataka kutoa.*

(59)    T:    We will use our fingers. *Tutatumia tu vidole zetu.*

(60)    T:    Take away *ni kutoa.*

(61)    T:    Five take away one.

(62)    T:    Every one show me your five fingers. *Kila mtu anionyeshe vidole zake tano.*

(63)    T:    Remove one. *Toa moja.*

(64)    T:    How many remain. *Zimebaki ngapi?* **[OT9 SW. 109-110]**

Teacher W1 switches between English and Kiswahili. English is the matrix language, presumably because it is the language of the mathematics textbook that teacher W2 is using but switches to Kiswahili to make the content more accessible to a majority of her learners in Kiswahili. For everything the teacher says in English, she literally repeats it in Kiswahili. This form of code switching was also used regularly in the teaching of English in school X.

## Extract 7 - School X (English lesson)

(65)    T:    *Nani ataenda pale kwa duka atuletee* object *iko na* colour green*? Very good, Learner B ametuletea* object *iko na* colour^

[Who will go to the shop corner and bring us an object with colour green? Very good, Learner B has brought us an object with colour^]

(66)    Ls:    Green

(67)    T:    What colour is this?

(68)    Ls:    Green

(69)    T:    *Bado* this object*, iko na* colour *ingine ambayo iko hapa.* Which colour is this?

[Still this object, has another colour which is here ...]

(70)    Ls:    Red

(71)    T:    *Leo tutachora* three colours

[Today we shall draw three colours] **[OT2 SX. 31-32].**

In the above lesson extract, teacher X switches between Kiswahili and English even within the same sentence. Since she is teaching the words that name colours, the names for colours, *'green'* in turns (65), (66) and (68); *'red'* in turn (70) and the word *'colour (s)'*, in turns (65), (67), (69) and (71), which are the key concepts in this lesson, are given in English with Kiswahili as the matrix language. Kiswahili is the preferred MoI in this context, but the teacher has to bring in English for purposes of examinations, which will be in English.

---

[18] This particular excerpt gives not a conversation but one teacher's instructions to learners during one lesson, where the learners responded by doing what they were asked to do.

Teachers in the two rural schools (Y & Z) also switched from English or Kiswahili to their preferred MoI in their classrooms (Kikamba and Kiembu respectively) to make the content accessible to their learners, the majority of whom did not know either English or Kiswahili, the school languages. The following excerpt illustrates how teacher X used code switching to negotiate the language challenges in her multilingual classroom and enhance both learner understanding and participation.

**Extract 8 - School Y (English lesson)**

(72)  T:  *Yuu kaano twikeeta Paka* the cat. *Yuu tukakwete twasye this is Paka* the cat.

[Now this one we are calling it Paka the cat. Now as we touch it let us say this is Paka the cat.]

(73)  Ls:  This is Paka the cat

(74)  T:  Ee

(75)  Ls:  This is Paka the cat

(76)  T:  Ee

(77)  Ls:  This is Paka the cat

(78)  T:  *Ii … kabaka kau kaitu twikeeta Paka* the cat

[Yes, that cat of ours we are calling it Paka the cat] **[OT4 SY. 47].**

In this excerpt, the teacher introduces her lesson in Kikamba but switches to English for what is the focus of her lesson of the day. For example, in this lesson, the teacher wanted the learners to learn to say in a sentence, the names of objects that had been drawn. For purposes of learner understanding, she introduces the first part of turn (72) in Kikamba and then switches to English. In the same turn, the teacher also gives instructions to the learners in Kikamba *"Yuu tukakweete twasye"* (Now as we touch it, let us say) in turn (72) because she is aware that if she did so in English, the learners would not respond to whatever it is she would be asking them to do, that is, pointing at or touching the picture. In affirming what the learners have just repeated after her, she again switches back to Kikamba, *"Ii kabaka kau twikeeta"* (Yes, that cat we are calling it) in turn (78) because she wants to be understood at least by a majority of her learners in the classroom. It is only when the learners understand what is required of them that they are able to participate in classroom interactions.

### 6.1.2   Code switching as examination preparatory mechanism

Teachers in this study used code switching for a function that has been linked to the acceptance of the language of power in a given multilingual educational context (Setati, 1998). In switching from their preferred MoI in the individual schools to English because

English is the language of examinations throughout the school system (see section 5.3), teachers acknowledge the power of English for educational promotion. In the urban and peri-urban schools, teachers switched from Kiswahili to English where Kiswahili was the matrix language, but key concepts in the topic of study in content subjects were retained in English, as is the case with the word "colour(s)" and the names of different colours, "green" and "red" in extract 7 used above. This was mainly done as a preparatory precaution for English examinations. Since the examinations were going to be in English, key concepts were often retained in English in otherwise Kiswahili sentences.

Teachers in the rural schools switched from their preferred MoI to English to prepare learners for examination, as illustrated in the excerpt below.

### Extract 9 - School Y (Social Studies lesson)

(79)    T:  *Twasyokaa twona nyomba ingi twasya isu ni* semi-permanent. *Twasya ni semi^*
[Then we saw another type of houses which we called semi-permanent. We said they are semi^]

(80)    Ls:  Permanent

(81)    T:  Semi-permanent. *Twona nyomba ingi twasya isu i* permanent. *Na ingi nasyo twasya ni* temporary.
[Semi-permanent. We saw other houses that we called permanent, And other which we said they are temporary] **[OT6 SY. 73].**

In this excerpt, teacher Y switches between Kikamba and English where Kikamba is the matrix language, but key concepts in the topic of study *'semi-permanent', 'permanent' and 'temporary'* are given in English in turns (79) and (81). Social Studies as a subject of study is examined in English like all other content subjects in the observed classrooms. Kikamba is the MoI in this classroom, the L1 of a majority of the children and of the teacher.

### Extract 10 - School Z

(82)    T:  Proteins *ni iria itumbithagia gukura-*to grow-*gukura-* to grow
[Proteins are those foods which help us to grow - to grow - to grow.]

(83)    L:  To grow
[....]

(84)    T:  Carbohydrates - *uga* carbohydrates
[say]

(85)    Ls:  Carbohydrates

(86)    T:  *Kairi*
[Again]

(87)    Ls:  Carbohydrates

(88)  T:  *Twaciitire* carbohydrates. *Na i cio itunenkagira inya* - energy. *Igatunenkera mbi yo?*

[We called them carbohydrates, and they are the ones that give us energy-energy. They give us what?]

(89)  Ls:  Energy

[...]

(90)  T:  *Inu ingi twaciitire* vitamins - *twaciitire ata?*

[The others we called them vitamins ... We called them what?]

(91)  Ls:  Vitamins

[....]

(92)  T:  *Imunthi ndienda twaria mantu ma* clothes ... *nguo.* Basic needs *iria iwitwa* clothes

[Today I want us to talk about clothes ... clothes. The basic needs called clothes] **[OT12 SZ. 152].**

In this excerpt drawn from a Social Studies lesson, teacher Z switches from Kiembu to English when teaching. This she does by giving the key concepts '*proteins, carbohydrates* and vitamins', in turns (82), (84) and (90) respectively, in the topic on food nutrients in English while retaining Kiembu, the preferred MoI in her context, as the matrix language. She then goes ahead to describe the benefits of the different food nutrients in Kiembu but the key words such as *'grow'* in turn (82) and *'energy'* in turn (88) are given in English. The teacher applies this same principle in the topic on basic needs where although she uses her MT as MoI, she switches between English and that MT with key concepts in the topic such as *'basic needs'* and *'clothes'* being retained in English, as reflected in turn (92).

Both teachers Y and Z are aware of their learners' lack of proficiency in English. This explains why they do not use it as MoI in their contexts. However, because they have to prepare their learners for English examinations, they keep juggling between English and their preferred MoIs (Kikamba in school Y and Kiembu in school Z) in their teaching as demonstrated in excerpts 9 and 10 above. This juggling between the two languages reflects the teachers' competing desires, namely the desire to help the learners understand what is being taught, and the desire to prepare them for examinations in English. Similar findings are reported by Setati (1998:37) in a study of code switching in a grade 5 class of second language mathematics learners in a South African school, which found that although the teacher switched from one language to another, especially when she felt a question posed in English was not understood by the learners, the teacher made a point of repeating the

questions in English because the examinations would be in English. Setati interprets this as acceptance on the part of teachers that English is the language of power.

Although all teachers observed switched from English to Kiswahili/Kikamba/Kiembu when they translated the learning content into a language that could be understood by a majority of the learners, they switched back to English for the key concepts and wrote notes for the learners in English. In so doing, they would be preparing learners for examinations. Gal (1989:357) treats code switching as "speakers' symbolic responses to the differing political-economic positions in the long standing system of core-periphery relations". According to the current study, code switching is often the teachers' symbolic response to the differing linguistic demands in terms of the MoI, the linguistic needs of both learners and teachers and the language of examinations in the competing discourses of language-in-education policy implementation.

In the urban and peri-urban sites observed, Kiswahili is the *de facto* MoI. Learners know Kiswahili better than they know English. However, teaching/learning materials are in English and so are examinations. As a result, teachers have to switch between English and Kiswahili. In school Y, there are three languages which are both the L1s of the learner population and the languages of the school's catchment area. However, the teacher switches amongst four different languages, namely Kikamba, Kitharaka, English and Kiswahili. Thus, she works with two of the local languages that she knows and the two school languages. In school Z, there are three languages spoken as L1s by the learner population. *De jure,* these should be used as the MoIs as per the policy statement. Nevertheless, *de facto* Kiembu, Kiswahili and English become the MoIs in response to the pressure exerted by English examinations, teacher Z's own language proficiencies and the location of the school in relation to administrative boundaries.

### 6.1.3   Code switching to fill lexical gaps in the matrix language

Teachers in the observed classrooms often code switched to fill lexical gaps when translating content from one language to another. For instance, teachers code switched using a combination of English and Kiswahili morphology, such as verbs in the present continuous tense. For example, teacher X used forms such as *anawalk* (he/she is walking)*, anarun (*he/she is running), while teacher W1 used words such as *anapoint* (he/she is pointing). The Kiswahili part *'ana'* in these verbs marks both the subject and tense where 'a' is the subject pronoun while the 'na' acts as the tense marker. The English verbs "run", "walk" and "point"

are attached to these Kiswahili affixes. Like the Kiswahili or English to other indigenous language code switches discussed below, teachers in this study used this form of code switching mostly when they could not immediately remember the Kiswahili equivalent of the verb they were explaining.

Other instances of code switching to fill lexical gaps in the matrix languages involved Kiswahili and/or English and the various other MTs within the teacher's linguistic repertoire. Again this happened mostly when the teacher is translating the content from one language to another and could not immediately find the equivalent in the matrix language. For example in school W, when teacher W1 was giving the answer to a riddle, she could not find any English word equivalent to the phrase eating **ugali**[19] **using bare hands** and instead used *kung'wenyo,* which is the Dholuo equivalent of the English phrase. In another instance, the teacher gives Kiswahili translations of various foods but could not find or remember the word for garden peas. She used *minji* instead*,* which is the Kikuyu word for garden peas; interestingly, she was a L1 speaker of Dholuo. Similarly, in a story-telling session, when the same teacher could not find or remember the Kiswahili word for a *spider***,** she used *mbuui,* the Dholuo word for spider. In a different instance, teacher W2 also uses the Kikuyu word *waruu* when explaining or translating the term "Irish potatoes".

In the examples given above, code switching takes the form of nonce borrowing where linguistic items from Dholuo (*kung'wenyo* and *mbuui*) and Kikuyu (*minji* and *waruu*) are used in English discourse without any form of adaptation whatsoever. The borrowing is done to fill the lexical gaps in the teacher's language (Kamwangamalu, 2010), or what Rose and van Dulm (2006:6) have described "to alleviate a word-finding difficulty" [where a word from another language subsititutes a] "momentarily inaccessible word" in the matrix language. In such instances, code switching/mixing could be interpreted as the teacher's 'escape route' or 'cover up' for lack of appropriate vocabulary in the language of instruction or matrix language. This is however a regular practice in all bilingual language use: accessing a word or phrase from one language sooner than the equivalent in the other language the speakers knows.

Code switching to fill lexical gaps in the matrix language is also evident where teacher Z switches to Kiembu when she encounters words that she does not know in Kitharaka because

---

[19] Ugali is the Kiswahili word for a meal made from the mixture of boiling water and maize flour, stirred until it solidifies and forms a kind of a cake. It is a loan word in Kenyan English.

she is not yet proficient in the language. Teacher Z also switches from English (the language of the textbooks) to Kiembu (her mother tongue) when she translates the content to help the learners comprehend what she is teaching but can only do so in a language that she speaks. In this school, code switching to fill lexical gaps took the form of borrowing where the borrowed word was integrated into the structure of the borrowing language, as demonstrated in the following extract:

**Extract 11 - School Z**

    (93)    T:   *Ukiongeera* day. *Ukiongeera mbi yo?*
                  [You add day. You add what?]

    (94)    Ls:  Day

    (95)    T:   *Ukiongeera* day, *na numenyire gu*spell*o day ... tibu?*
                  [You add day, and you already know how to spell day. Isn't it?] **[OT4 S Z. 42].**

The above excerpt from an English lesson illustrates how MT (Kiembu)-English code switching and code mixing is done specifically when Bantu languages are involved. The /gu/ in the word *guspello* in turn (95) is used as a verb marker in the Bantu family of languages to which all the languages represented in this classroom belong (Kitharaka, Kikuyu, Kiembu, Kimenti). The syllable /gu/ or /ku/ is used before the root of a verb to denote 'action'. The choice whether to use /ku/ or /gu/ depends on whether the sound immediately following the vowel marker is voiced or voiceless, with the /gu/ being used with the voiceless sounds and /ku/ with the voiced. The /o/ added after the word 'spell' is added because Bantu languages are closed syllable[20] languages. The nature of code switching in the above instance reflects social integration (Hasselmo, 1972) where the linguistic item borrowed is integrated phonologically, morphologically and syntactically into the grammatical system of the borrowing language. This is clearly evident in the affixation of the Bantu languages' verb marker, /gu/ to the word 'spell' and the suffix /o/ at the end of the word in accordance to the closed syllable rule in Bantu languages. Through this kind of integration, the word *guspello* comes out as if it is part of the vocabulary in the matrix/borrowing language (Kiembu).

Most of the code switches involving Sheng in both school W and X were to fill lexical gaps in the matrix language. The following excerpts illustrate this.

    (96)    *Weka hiyo* box *hapa mtu akimaliza anarudisha pekere*

---

[20] Closed syllable languages are those languages whose syllables and therefore words must end with a vowel. Those that end with either a vowel or consonant and referred to as open syllable languages.

[Put that box here, whoever finishes should return the bottle tops] **[OT7 SW.71].**

(97)   *Halafu msichana wa* spider *mmoja alikuwa mdosi*[21]

[And then one of spider's daughters was rich] **[OT10 SW. 122].**

(98)   *Na ukienda uchaa ... kuna vitu zingine nyingi kwa* home.

[And when you go to the village, there are other things in the home] **[OT1 SX. 19].**

Teacher W1 switches from Kiswahili to English by insertion of the word 'box' , then back to Kiswahili before inserting the Sheng word 'pekere' at the end of turn (96), while in the second excerpt, she switches amongst three languages in the same sentence (97). She begins the sentence in Kiswahili then inserts the English word 'spider' then switches back to Kiswahili before switching to Sheng at the end of the sentence by inserting the word 'mdosi'. In turn (98), teacher X switches amongst three languages, that is, from Kiswahili to Sheng by inserting the word 'uchaa' then back to Kiswahili and then to English at the close of the sentence with the insertion of the word 'home'. In all three instances, the teachers used code switching to fill their own lexical gaps in the matrix languages. These teachers seemed to revert to English and Sheng in all three turns when they could not immediately find a word in the matrix language, Kiswahili in these instances.

### 6.1.4   Code switching to reduce social distance between the teacher and learners

Using a language that the learners in the class do not know creates a communication gap and may distance the teacher from the learners. As already discussed in the literature review (see section 3.5.5), previous studies have shown that teachers use code switching as a multilingual classroom resource to narrow the communication gap and reduce the social distance between them and the learners (Chimbganda & Mokgwathi, 2012). Teachers in the current study were found to use code switching in their classrooms for similar functions. For example, teacher W1 spoke Dholuo to one of the learners in her class who could not speak any of the school languages as shall be discussed later (see section 6.3 below).

Similarly, teacher Y's switching between Kikamba and Kitharaka when speaking directly to a Kitharaka L1 speaking child during the lessons may have been meant to reduce the social distance the learners may feel when the teacher uses an unfamiliar language.

**Extract 12 - School Y**

(99)   T:   *Learner M aathire ku bai?*

---

[21] Mdosi is the Sheng word for a rich or wealthy person.

> [Where did Learner M go?]
>
> (100)  L:  *Naayiirue.*
>
> [He fell sick.]
>
> (101)  T:  *I naayiirue!*
>
> [He fell sick!] **[OT3 SY. 32].**

Here, the teacher speaks Kitharaka to a Tharaka child when inquiring about another learner who is absent from school, even though she would ordinarily speak Kikamba, which is the MoI in her context and also her L1. In so doing, teacher Y is using code switching to create classroom "warmth and friendliness", to borrow the words of Chimbganda and Mokgwathi (2012:21), which in turn may reduce the social distance between her and this particular learner.

### 6.1.5  Code switching to encourage learner participation

Teachers in the observed classes used code switching to encourage learner participation. This particular function went hand in hand with that of alternating codes to make the learning content accessible to the learners. Since most of the learners were not proficient in the school languages, the teachers had to switch amongst different codes within their own repertoire to make themselves understood to the learners. This often happened when they needed the learners to respond to a question or take part in an activity. It is only when the questions asked or the instructions given are understood that the learners are able to participate in classroom interaction. The following excerpt illustrates this.

**Extract 13 (repetition of Extract 8)**

> (102)  T:  *Yuu kaano twikeeta Paka* the cat. *Yuu tukakwete twasye this is Paka* the cat.
>
> [Now this one we are calling it paka the cat. Now as we touch it let us say this is Paka the cat.]
>
> (103)  Ls:  This is Paka the cat
>
> (104)  T:  Ee
>
> (105)  Ls:  This is Paka the cat
>
> (106)  T:  Ee
>
> (107)  Ls:  This is Paka the cat
>
> (108)  T:  *Ii ... kabaka kau kaitu twikeeta Paka* the cat.
>
> [Yes, that cat of ours we are calling it paka the cat] **[OT4 SY. 47].**

In this extract from an English lesson in school Y, the teacher alternates between English and Kikamba to make herself understood by her learners, to facilitate their participation in the

lesson. In turn (102), the teacher gives instructions to the learners in Kikamba *"Yuu tukakweete twasye"* (Now as we touch it, let us say) because she is aware that if she did so in English, the learners would not respond to what they are being asked to do, that is, to touch the picture. It is only when the learners understand what is required of them that they are able to participate by responding appropriately to given instructions.

### 6.1.6   Code switching for tension management

In a study of code switching in Botswana primary school classrooms, Arthur (1996:21) found that teacher operated under "conditions of tension between the institutional pressure to adhere to the language policy" and their professional as well as personal instinct to code switch in response to their learners' communicative needs. Like the Botswana teachers studied by Arthur, the Kenyan teachers I observed taught under conditions of tension which included (i) the pressure to implement the language-in-education policy with regard to the *de jure* MoI given the preferred languages of schools' catchment areas (Kiswahili in schools W & X, Kikamba and Kitharaka in schools Y & Z respectively); (ii) their personal intuition to code switch in response to their own linguistic needs as well as those of their learners; and (iii) the linguistic demands of the examinations and textbooks. For example, although the urban and peri-urban teachers taught in Kiswahili, notes were given to the learners in English. When asked why this was the case in interviews with them after class observations, they explained that they had to give the notes in English because the examinations would be in English. This is done so that children can get used to the key concepts in different topics and subjects in English because that is how they will appear in examinations.

This study indicates that teachers used code switching to manage a special of kind tension: the tension that Kiswahili in school W and X, Kikamba in school Y and Kitharaka/Kiembu in school Z, may get more than their fair share in the allocation of time as reflected in the textbooks and examinations. Kiswahili and other indigenous languages are not given as much time in the timetable or space in textbooks and examinations. Teachers in this study see this as an indication of what languages should be given priority in the classrooms. Besides being the language of all textbooks and examinations except Kiswahili and MT, English as a subject of study is also allocated more time in the timetable. Teachers interpret this to mean that English is the language that is more valued in the education system and therefore give more emphasis to it. English must therefore be seen to enjoy "the pride of place" to borrow

the words on Bunyi (1999:339), accorded to it in the Kenyan education system as reflected in examinations and textbooks.

In an interview, teacher Z was asked why she gave the notes to the learners in English even though she was teaching in Kiembu/Kitharaka and this is what she answered:

> (109) *They write in English because, most of the exams, are done in English. And in fact it is only in Kitharaka, where we find that we can write Kitharaka as a language. I try to teach Kitharaka as a language, but the other information I try to give in other subjects, I try to make sure that they get the English concepts for future use* **[IT1 SZ. 3].**

Here, English exams and future transfer to English as MoI determine the language choice. It is also possible that the future use that teacher Z is referring to here means other future examinations, which I related to the hopeless cause argument in a previous section of this research report (see section 5.3.3).

When the same question was posed to teacher X, her response was:

> (110) *I speak in English because, if it is Science, there I cannot give the notes in Kiswahili because they will be tested in English. So I have to write the English words"* **[IT1 SX. 2]** = ***Turn (110) repetition of turn (4).***

These teachers' responses shed more light on how language choices are made in these classrooms. Teachers' actions and thoughts reflect the role that examinations and textbooks play in making language choices and prioritisations in the multiple language environments observed in this study.

Evidently, teachers are aware of the challenges they face with examinations in English, if they stuck with the stated policy to teach in the MTs. Doing so would mean that when the examinations come in English, their pupils will be highly disadvantaged and this would give rise to another kind of tension relating to performance. They therefore use code switching to manage the tensions brought about by examinations in English, a language that is unfamiliar to most of their learners. This perhaps explains why English words, especially the key concepts in different topics, are sneaked into otherwise Kiswahili/Kikamba/Kitharaka/Kiembu sentences. However, from what studies have shown about learning in an unfamiliar language (see for example Fafunwa et al., 1989; Williams, 1998; Cummins, 2000; Klaus, 2003), it is doubtful that the performance-related tension is being effectively managed or avoided by teaching in English. I interpret this to mean that

English literacy/knowledge is preferred over literacy/knowledge in Kenyan indigenous languages. In fact it would seem that knowing even one word in English is better that knowing many words in ones' L1 even when one does not know what the English word means. This confirms the findings of previous studies (see for example Openjuru, 2005; Tembe & Norton, 2008), where English has been equated to education.

Teacher Y, in this study, seems to be managing an even more unique kind of tension related to her context. As she revealed in an interview with her, parents from one of the non-Kikamba L1 communities represented in her class, were opposed to the teaching of Kikamba to their children as a MT. This led the teacher to settle on Kiswahili to be taught both as L1 and L2 during the lessons timetabled for MT subject and Kiswahili language respectively. Teacher Y however, understood the linguistics needs of her learners, both the Kikamba-, Kitharaka- and Kimbeere-speaking children. The teacher was also aware that because of the language contact amongst the three languages represented in her classroom, some children may be growing up bilingually and may understand a bit of Kikamba.

Teacher Y's awareness of bilingualism amongst her learners is clearly reflected in her words that *"wanaelewa Kikamba, hii lugha ya kuongea"* (they understand Kikamba, the spoken kind of language). This could be one of the reasons why she chose to use Kikamba as the MoI. The other reason, as already discussed, may have to do with the exact location of the school in relation to the administrative boundaries (see section 4.1.3). However, aware of the displeasure of the Tharaka parents in the teaching of Kikamba as MT subject for their children, teacher Y code switches amongst Kikamba/Kiswahili/Kitharaka/English presumably, so that it does not appear that she is teaching only in Kikamba, even after some parents were opposed to it. A related observation is reported in Jones and Barkhuizen's (2011) study on the implementation of the Kenyan language-in-education policy in the Sabaot language community. The Sabaot teachers in Jones and Barkhuizen's study are reported to switch from Sabaot to Kiswahili occasionally, so that they are not seen to discriminate against the non-Sabaot speaking children in their multilingual classrooms by teaching only in their own L1 (see Jones & Barkhuizen, 2011).

### 6.1.7   Pedagogical considerations of code switching

Many studies have been conducted which have looked at the pedagogical soundness of code switching as a language choice or strategy in multilingual classrooms (see for example Rose & van Dulm, 2006; Rubdy, 2007; Kamwangamalu, 2010; Chimbganda & Mokgwathi, 2012).

Although in the past, discussions on code switching in multilingual classrooms rarely referred to it as a resource, recent studies seem to agree that code switching is a valuable communicative resource (see for example Ndayipfukamiye, 1994; Moodley, 2003; Rose & van Dulm, 2006; Rubdy, 2007; Chimbganda & Mokgwathi, 2012) rather than an impediment to learning. I share the opinion of those who see code switching as a valuable resource in multilingual classrooms. This does not mean neglect of the development of good grammatical skills of various languages; it is possible to develop awareness and skills of different languages, but at the same time allow code switching in the development of knowledge. However, code switching as used in the schools observed in this study seems to fall short of an important pre-supposition, namely that a fair level of competence in the various languages is required (see Kamwangamalu, 2010:118). As discussed in section 6.1.2, teachers switch to English from Kiswahili and/or the MTs although learners had no enough English to follow and make sense through English medium at all.

In my view, the pedagogical effectiveness of code switching in the management of linguistically diverse learners may depend on the direction of the switch, that is, whether from unfamiliar to a more unfamiliar language or from an unfamiliar to a familiar or to a vaguely familiar language. The latter direction makes an otherwise inaccessible learning content more accessible to the learners and is therefore more pedagogically effective than the former. Switching from Kiswahili to English or from the MT/L1 to English in any of the contexts observed may not have been aimed at promoting understanding for the learners but probably to prepare the learners for examinations or tension management as is the case for teacher Y (see section 6.1.6 above). This may mean, encouraging classroom code switching for functions that relate to the attainment of educational goals and improvement of learning outcomes.

## 6.2    TRANSLATING AND/OR INTERPRETING

Translating and interpreting is used for instances where the teachers were observed repeating almost exactly what they had said in one language or someone else had said (for learners) into another. In this study, all teachers were found to translate and/or interpret learning content from one language to another. Even though not explicitly used by the teachers, a few instances of peer translation and/or interpretation were also observed. These are discussed in the sections that follow.

### 6.2.1 Teachers translating and interpreting

As already observed, teaching/learning materials are provided in English language making it the *de facto* MoI, albeit with a lot of code switching with other languages. The fact that only a handful of learners have mastered the *de facto* MoI by Standard 1 forces teachers to oscillate between prescribed MT and English as MoI. This places an enormous burden on the teachers as the sole sources of "pedagogical innovations and progress" (Stroud, 2001:44). Teachers have to do ad hoc translations of English terms and concepts in the various subject areas, into Kiswahili in schools W and X, and into Kikamba or Kiembu/Kitharaka in schools Y and Z respectively. Translation is approached in different ways by different teachers. Some teachers will translate each and every word said in English into Kiswahili especially when teaching content subjects. This was for example, observed in school W, where Kiswahili is the selected MoI. The following excerpt from a Mathematics lesson taught by teacher W2 helps to illustrate how this is done.

### Extract 14 - School W

(111)　T:　We want to do take away - *kutoa. Na tutakuwa tunatumia nini? Vidole. Hatutatumia* bottle tops *ama nini.*

[... - to take away. We will be using what? Fingers. We will not be using bottle tops or whatever.]

(112)　T:　We are just going to use our^

(113)　Ls:　(silent)

(114)　T:　Fingers. We are going to use our^

(115)　Ls:　Fingers

(116)　T:　Fingers. *Tutatumia tu vidole zetu.* Take^

[We will use our fingers. ...]

(117)　Ls:　Away

(118)　T:　Take away *ni kutoa.* Ni^

[Is to take away. It is^]

(119)　Ls:　*Kutoa*

[To take away]

(120)　T:　Now, five take away one

(121)　T:　Every one show me your five fingers. *Kila mtu anionyeshe* five fingers. These are your five^

(122)　Ls:　Fingers

(123)　T:　These are your five^

(124)　Ls:　Fingers

(125)  T:  Now remove one - *toa moja tuone inabaki ngapi?*

(126)  L:  Nne

(127)  Ls:  Four

(128)  T:  Ee

(129)  Ls:  Four

(130)  T:  How many fingers remained?

(131)  Ls:  Four

(132)  T:  *Zimebaki ngapi?*

        [How many are remaining?]

(133)  Ls:  Four **[OT9 SW. 103-4].**

This excerpt illustrates how for almost everything the teacher says in English is repeated in Kiswahili. Since Kiswahili is the preferred MoI in this particular context, the teacher could be using English for two reasons. Firstly, because all the materials for teaching content subjects are in English, so the teacher could be finding it easier to directly follow the materials and then translate it into Kiswahili. Secondly, it is also possible that the teacher is using English as a preparatory mechanism for English examinations. Teacher W2 is keenly aware that her learners are not proficient in the language of the textbooks and examinations. So she translates everything she says in English into Kiswahili to enhance learners' understanding of the content, even though not all learners are proficient in Kiswahili either. Teacher X does something similar in her classroom as illustrated in the extract below.

**Extract 15 - School X**

(134)  T:  I want to see my home again *ni kusema nataka kuona nyumbani tena.*

        I want to see my home again [is to say I want to see my home again.]

(135)  T:  This is our home. *Hapa ni kwe^*

        [Here is^]

(136)  Ls:  *Kwetu*

        [Ours]

(137)  T:  *Nyumbani kwetu*

        [Our home]

(138)  T:  Place - *mahali*

(139)  T:  A home is a place - *nyumbani ni mahali*

(140)  T:  A home is a place where we live in - Home *ni mahali ambapo tunakaa*
        **[OT1 SX. 15].**

Again, it is evident in this lesson extract from school X that for everything the teacher says in English, she provides a Kiswahili translation for the learners to enhance their understanding.

Although not all the learners can speak Kiswahili, a majority of the children in her class may have some grasp of Kiswahili.

In other lessons, it was noted that despite their awareness of the learners lacking proficiency in English, sometimes teachers proceeded with the lessons in English completely oblivious of this challenge. I observed a lesson in school W where teacher W1 taught in English for the better part of the lesson and only translated a few words towards the end of the lesson. In her justification for having spoken Dholuo to a learner in her class already discussed in the previous chapter (see section 5.4), teacher W1 explains that the learner does not understand Kiswahili so *"nikitaka aelewe ninamwongelesha Kijaluo"* (when I want him to understand, I speak to him in Dholuo/his L1*) [OT1 SW. 10 / FN SW 19/01/2011]*. This could be interpreted to mean that even when teachers are aware that learners do not understand what they are talking about and want to help out, they may sometimes get overwhelmed by the challenge and just carry on with lessons as if the language barrier was non-existent. The fact that this teacher used translations and code switching as well as explaining content to an individual Dholuo child in Dholuo to enhance understanding, means that she was aware of some of the ways in which she could make her classroom more inclusive, but chose not to use them in certain instances. This observation agrees with the findings of a previous research conducted in Australia which reported that some teachers felt frustrated, overwhelmed and were unwilling to take on the extra burden of linguistically diverse learners in their classrooms (Penfield, 1987).

A similar situation was observed in school Y where although the teacher had reported in an interview that she spoke Kitharaka and Kimbeere to Tharaka and Mbeere children respectively to enhance their understanding, no instances of speaking Kimbeere to Kimbeere L1 speaking children were observed during my time of visit to her classroom. Instead, the teacher taught in Kikamba and switched among all other languages - Kitharaka, Kiswahili and English - but not Kimbeere. What this may mean is that Kimbeere L1 speaking children are less attended to in classroom interaction and may not understand most of what is said in Kikamba, because as the teacher reported, they understand *"hii lugha ya kuongea"* [the spoken form of language]. Having to switch among all the languages represented may overwhelm the teacher even when she has good intentions or one language may completely be forgotten in the process.

The pressure to cover the syllabus may push teachers to proceed unabatedly in a single language in the classroom even if it is limitedly accessible to many learners. It would, for example, take twice as much time to cover a topic, if the teacher were to translate everything he/she said in English to Kiswahili. It would appear therefore that the pressure for syllabus coverage prevails, while that of translation as a strategy, falls off the teachers' balancing act, even if only a few learners will be afloat by the time the syllabus is covered. This is reflected in the words of teacher X in an interview with her: *"they do not know much but then you have to cover the syllabus"* **[IT1 SX. 2].**

### 6.2.2   Learners translating and interpreting

Although indirectly so, some form of peer interpretation or translation appeared to be happening in some of the observed classes. For example in school W, teacher W1 tells a child to add an /s/ in the word 'grass' that she was trying to spell/write on the chalkboard. One learner then tells this learner to *"andika /s/ nyingine"* [write another /s/] (in Kiswahili), which is what the teacher had said in English but had not repeated in Kiswahili. Here, one learner helps the other to do the correct thing by interpreting or translating what the teacher had said in English *[FN SW 31/01/2011].*

Another instance of peer interpretation was observed in school Z.

### Extract 16 - School Z

(141)  T:  *Ibuku namba* six. *Waruta ibuku riaku umbaandikire tariki ithanthatu mweri wa ithanthatu*

[Book number six. Once you have taken out your book you write for me the dates, 6th of June]

(142)  L1:  *N'ibuku namba igana?*

[What is the book number?]

(143)  L2:  *Ithanthatu*

[Six] **[OT2 SZ. 26].**

Again as in school W, teacher Z does not directly encourage peer-interpretation as a strategy, but one learner comes in to help another who may have difficulty with the English word 'six'. It may not be explicitly clear whether the learner asks the book number because he/she did not hear what the teacher had said or whether he/she did not understand what the English word 'six' meant. However, it is likely that many more and less subtle attempts of learners assisting in the inclusion of others in a multilingual classroom would take place.

### 6.2.3   Pedagogical considerations for translating and interpreting

Translations are a good strategy to enhance understanding especially when they are done from a language that is unfamiliar to most learners, to a language that a majority of the learners do understand. However, as Stroud (2001:45) points out, "translations that have not been thought through from a socio-cultural perspective may introduce concepts, [...], explanations and even genres or registers that are non-indigenous to the community". In this study, translations have been found at times to distort the intended meaning or even area of emphasis. An example here supports this claim.

**Extract 17 - School Z**

>   (144)   T:   *Sema maskini punda*
>
>   [Say, the poor donkey]
>
>   (145)   Ls:   *Maskini punda*
>
>   [The poor donkey]
>
>   (146)   T:   *Maskini, maskini ni mtu ambaye hana kitu ... sawa sawa?*
>
>   ['Maskini', 'maskini' is a person who does not have anything - meaning does not own anything] **[OT4 SZ.65].**

In this instance, the teacher explains the Kiswahili word *'maskini'* as 'a person who does not have or own anything' in turn (146). Notice that even though she is talking about an animal (donkey), her definition personifies the donkey, albeit unintentionally. This is not uncommon in ad hoc translation, where if someone is translating words that have more than one meaning. It may happen that if a word has three meanings for example, the translator may activate meaning two of that word, where meaning one should have been used and the message may not be clearly understood by the listeners.

Although a commonly cited strategy in studies of teaching/learning in linguistically diverse classrooms (see for example Lucas & Katz, 1994; Plüddemann et al., 2000; Curran, 2003), peer interpretation seems to be an underutilised strategy in the Kenyan classrooms observed. In fact, when asked, teachers were not even aware of it. Going by the two instances observed, the strategy seemed to work well for the learners for whom the interpretation was being done because they successfully heeded to the instructions the teacher had given and their classmates had conveyed. The interpreter in both cases was self-volunteered, which meant they were confident about their understanding of what the teacher had said. In most cases, when learners are not confident about their own language skills they may shy away from something like that for fear of making mistakes.

In their study in Western Cape in South Africa, Plüddemann et al. (2000:34) warn that impromptu peer interpreting could have mixed results. On the one hand, it could boost understanding of content for the learners experiencing difficulties with the school language, like in the case reported above. On the other hand, the interpreters could, to borrow the words of Plüddemann et al. (2000:34) "short-circuit" the process, where the interpreter could not only interpret the questions but also give the answers. Bearing in mind that even the interpreters could also still be learning the school language, sometimes instructions could be misunderstood by the interpreters and the wrong message passed on to the entire group, as reported by Plüddemann et al. (2000). These limitations are real possibilities though they were not observed in the current study.

## 6.3    USING LEARNERS' FIRST LANGUAGES

### 6.3.1    Using the various mother tongues/first languages

Teachers in this study indicated that they used learners L1s when speaking to those who were struggling with the school languages, where that was applicable. As already discussed in the preceding sections, teacher W1 spoke Dholuo, albeit irregularly, to one of the learners in her class who found the school languages difficult to follow. Although she later tries to justify having spoken to the learner in his L1 which also happens to be her own, it is commendable that teacher W1 made efforts to include a learner who had not mastered the school languages.

In one of my informal discussions with teacher Y, I asked her what she did with the different languages represented in her classroom. She explained that since she could speak all three languages represented in her class, she could easily switch to Kitharaka or Kimbeere whenever there was need to clarify something to a learner who found Kikamba, the MoI difficult to follow. Her response is found in the extract below:

> (147)    I understand and can speak the three languages, so *Mu*[22]*tharaka akikosea namwelezea na Mumbeere akikosea namwelezea kwa lugha yake.*
>
> [I understand and can speak the three language so if a Tharaka-speaking child makes a mistake, I explain and if a Kimbeere-speaking child makes a mistake I explain to him/her in their languages] **[FN SY 21/02/2011].**

---

[22] The prefix [mu] is used in before a place/community name in Bantu languages to denote someone who ails the language spoken in that area and/or who speaks the language spoken in the area. Mutharaka therefore means someone who ails from Tharaka and/or speaks Kitharaka, the language spoken in Tharaka. Mumbeere is used in a similar sense in this report.

Having taken note of her response, I was keen during the class observations to see how she went about this in actual lessons. I confirmed that indeed the teacher switched to Kitharaka once in a while during the lessons, when addressing individual Tharaka children. On several occasions, the teacher switched from Kikamba to Kitharaka when speaking specifically to a Tharaka speaking child.

In one instance, the teacher having been speaking in Kikamba goes up to a Tharaka speaking child and addresses him/her in Kitharaka, enquiring about another learner who was absent from school. In another instance, the teacher asks the learners to draw what they would like to be given as gifts. When she notices a Tharaka child who had not heeded to her instructions, she walks up to her and says in Kitharaka "learner M *atiiyi gucoora*" (learner M does not know how to draw)*,* in a warm non-scolding way.

I noted that the teacher did this not to explain content to the children but mainly when giving instructions to the individual Tharaka learner or asking a question that did not necessarily relate to the lesson. I however, did not observe any instances where the teacher switched to Kimbeere when addressing any of the Kimbeere speaking children in her class. There is a possibility that Kimbeere speaking children interact amongst themselves in their L1 as happens with other languages. I observed an instance where a Kitharaka-speaking learner moved from one desk to another and began a conversation in the MT with the other Kitharaka L1 speakers.

Where the learner involved did not share a language with the teacher, both teacher W1 and teacher Z reported that they used other teachers in the school who spoke same languages as those of the learners concerned to explain things to the learners involved to enhance their understanding. Teacher W1 was however quick to add that she did that outside the classroom not during the lessons. In such situations, teachers as community members, help learners from their own language communities in surmounting the language barrier in the classrooms. This was however not observed in any of the classes for the entire period of data collection.

### 6.3.2 Pedagogical considerations for using the learners' L1s

Whenever this is possible, using the learners' L1 is ideal in both linguistically homogenous as well as linguistically heterogeneous classrooms. Such practice promotes not only understanding of what is learnt but also boost learners self-esteem when they know that they and their languages are valued in school (Cummins, 2000b). Studies have shown that even

where teachers may not speak the language(s) of the learners, using community members to speak to the learners and carry out some classrooms activities in their native tongues has been successful in fostering multiliteracy development (see for example Schwarzer et al., 2003). In fact some studies show that even just learning a few phrases in the learners' languages has been instrumental in boosting learners' self-esteem and in turn academic achievement (Schwarzer et al., 2003)

## 6.4    RITUALISED PARTICIPATION STRATEGIES

As the name suggests, ritualised participation strategies or "ritualised question-and-answer performances" as Arthur (1996:17) refers to them, are aimed at getting the learners to participate in classroom interactions. By their very design, such strategies are meant to keep the learners involved rather than requiring an answer to a question (Pontefract & Hardman, 2005:90) per se. These strategies are marked by a mid or end of sentence rise in the voice intonation acting as "cued elicitation" designed to get a response from the learner (Pontefract & Hardman, 2005:90). According to Pontefract and Hardman, the elicitation is mainly in the form of a repetition, of a word or phrase, or the completion of a sentence or a word taking the form of a question tag that required only an affirmative or negative response.

### 6.4.1    Forms and functions of ritualised participation strategies

Ritualised participation strategies may take various forms. In the classes used in the current study, these strategies took three forms namely cued elicitations, choral spelling, choral responses/choral repetition. Such strategies are used for classroom management through learner participation and establishing shared attention (Pontefract & Hardman, 2005:90). Ritualised participation strategies in the observed classrooms in this study served similar functions regardless of the form, that is, whether they were cued elicitations, choral spelling or choral responses. In my view, the forms of ritualised participation strategies appeared to be more salient than their functions and therefore these are discussed in the sections that follow.

### a)    Cued elicitations

Cued elicitations in this study took three different forms. For example, they could be a direct repetition of the teacher's answer in the completion of a sentence, which is then required of the learners by using the high cueing tone at the end of the sentence (marked with the symbol

[^],²³ in this study. Examples of these drawn from the different classes observed include the following:

**Extract 18 - School Y**

(148)  T:  *Ee hio inakaa kama yai ... na kwa Kiswahili haiitwi oval. Tunaiitwa duara dufu ... kila mtu aseme duara dufu*

[Yes, the one that looks like an egg. In Kiswahili it is nit called 'oval'. We call it *duara dufu*. Everyone say *duara dufu*]

(149)  Ls:  *Duara dufu*

[Oval]

(150)  T:  *Duara dufu*

[Oval]

(151)  Ls:  *Duara dufu*

[Oval]

(152)  T:  Ee

(153)  Ls:  *Duara dufu*

[Oval]

(154)  T:  *Ee duara dufu. Hio ni* **oval.** *Hio ni^*

Yes oval. That is **oval.** That is^]

(155)  Ls:  Oval

(156)  T:  *Hio ni duara dufu. Hio ni^*

[That is oval. That is^]

(157)  Ls:  *Duara dufu*

[Oval] **[OT9 SY. 115].**

In the above example, teacher Y utters the complete sentence *"Hio ni duara dufu"* in turn (154) and (156), then repeats it but omits the last word and by using the high tone cue [^] at the end of the turn *"Hio ni^"*, the teacher motions the learners to complete it. From the above excerpt, the omission and completion strategy is used in the last two turns by the teacher, that is, turns (154) and (156) in this interaction where the teacher requires the learners to repeat the word *'oval'* in turn (155), which she leaves out in her sentence and 'cues' with the high tone and again when she cues for them to repeat the word *'duara dufu'* using the high tone cue in turn (156), which the learners complete as reflected in turn (157). Another example from a different school will demonstrate that this same direct repetition is a commonly used strategy amongst teachers of linguistically diverse learners.

---

²³ [^] This symbol is used to indicate the rising tone usually placed at the end of an incomplete word or sentence and used mainly to evoke response from learners (by completing the word or sentence) when teachers employ 'ritualised participation strategies' in classes.

**Extract 19 - School X**

    (158)   T:   This is a boy. This is a^

    (159)   Ls:  Boy

    (160)   T:   He is wearing clothes. He is wearing^

    (161)   Ls:  Clothes

    (162)   [...]

    (163)   T:   [...] His name is learner J. His name is ^

    (164)   Ls:  Learner J

    (165)   T:   He is wearing socks. He is wearing^

    (166)   Ls:  Socks **[OT3 SX. 26-27].**

The above lesson extract from an English lesson in school X illustrates the same scenario as the one before it. In turn (158), teacher X first says the complete sentence and then repeats it but omits the final word and prompts the learners' response using the rising tone prompt at the end of the turn. Notice here that the rising tone prompt appears in all teacher's turns in this excerpt, that is, turns (158), (160), (163) and (165). It is also clear from the formulation of these sentences in both excerpts 18 and 19 that they are meant to keep the pupils involved rather than requiring an answer to a question per se, since the answer is already given anyway.

The second form in which the participation strategies occur is where the teacher may omit the ultimate or both the penultimate[24] and the ultimate syllable(s) in the last word of an utterance for the learners to complete. This depends on the language being used and being able to complete the words also depends on the learners' proficiency in the language being used. The omission of last word or syllables in the last word seems to be preferred when the teacher is using a language that the learners are more familiar with. For example, in a CRE lesson in school Z, this interaction ensues:

**Extract 20 - School Z**

    (167)   T:   *Ii tukeeraga Murungu ibwega ... tukeeraga Murungu ibwe^*

                  [Yes, we should tell God thank you, we should tell God tha^]

    (168)   Ls:  *Ibwega*

                  [Thank you]

---

[24] The penultimate syllable refers to the second last syllable in a word while the ultimate syllable is the last syllable in a word.

(169)  T:  *Rira wamaama ... rira weenuka wauma cukuru ... waathi wamaama utugu ... akuromba Murungu ukamwira Murungu ndaria bwe^*

[When you sleep ... when you go home from school and night falls, you pray to God and ask to help you to sleep well.]

(170)  Ls:  *Bwega*

[Well]

(171)  T:  *Rira wamaama waukiiira ruukiri ukeera Murungu ibwega nuntu bwa gukuraria naaguukiiria ... tibu? Ukeera Murungu ibwe^*

[When you sleep and wake up in the morning, you tell God thank you because of making you sleep well ... isn't? You tell God tha^]

(172)  Ls:  *Ibwega*

[Thank you]

(173)  T:  *Naawe indi ... riria muciari waku aathi akugurira kaguo, ukamwiraga ibwe^*

[And now, when your parent buys you a cloth, you say to him/her ...^]

(174)  Ls:  *Ibwega*

[Thank you] **[OT2 SZ. 22-23].**

In this excerpt, the teacher says the sentence but leaves out the last syllable in the word *"ibwega"* or its variant "*bwega"* and uses the high cueing tone [^] at the end of her utterance to motion the learners to complete the sentence. Notice that when the word is first used, the teacher says the complete sentence in turn (167) *"Ii tukeeraga ngai ibwega"*, then repeats the sentence *"tukeeraga Ngai ibwe^"* but omits the last syllable for the learners to complete as already hinted. This is followed by incomplete sentences which the learners complete using the last word whose last syllable they have to fill in because it is already a familiar word (see turns (168), (172), (174) and (170) above). This form of the ritualised participation strategy seems to be preferred when the language being used is familiar to the learners.

The third form is where the teacher says a sentence, repeats the last phrase in the sentence but omits the last word in the phrase for the learners to complete by posing it in the form of a question. When this happens, a question mark [?] is used in place of the high tone cueing [^] at the end of the teacher's utterance. The following excerpt from a Kitharaka lesson in school Z illustrates how this form of ritualised participation strategies is practised in the classrooms.

**Extract 21 - School Z**

(175)  T:  *Indi twana tutu tuthatu itu akaraga natu. Itu akaraga na uu?*

[Now, those three children, he was living with them. He was living with who?]

(176)  Ls:  *Natu*

[With them]

(177)  T:  *Na Kibaara ngugi ira aruutaga, aari murimi. Aari mbi yoo?*

[And Kibaara, the work he did, he was a farmer. He was a what?]

(178)  Ls:  *Murimi*

[Farmer]

[...]

(179)  T:  *Murimi arimaga, na agacooka akariithia. Na agacooka akagita ata?*

[A farmer grows crops and rears animals. And does what?]

(180)  Ls:  *Akariithia*

[Rears animals]

(181)  T:  Kwogu *Kibaara aari murimi* umunene *muno, arimiite muunda munene. Waari ikumbo ria muuro. Waari ikumbo ria mbi yoo?*

[So Kibaara was a great farmer, he had a big farm. It was near the shores of a river. It was near the shore of a what?]

(182)  Ls:  *Muuro*

[River] **[OT7 SZ. 106].**

In the above excerpt, teacher Z first says a complete sentence in turn (175). She then picks the last phrase in that turn *itu akaraga natu* (He was living with them), omits the last word in that phrase *'natu'* (them) and poses it in the form of a question *Itu akaraga na uu?* (He was living with who?)*,* to which the learners have to chorally respond using the last word in the phrase (them)*,* as indicated in turn (176)*.* The teacher uses this predictable format for all the other sentences that follow, turning the last phrase into Wh-questions in turns (177), (179) and (181) and the learners give a choral response using the last word in the teachers' sentences as shown in turns (178), (180) and (182).

When the language is one that the learners do not know well, teachers seem to prefer combining the omission and repetition form of the strategy where the teacher provides the word and then requires them to repeat it but by completing using either the penultimate and ultimate or just the ultimate syllables in the word or even the complete last word in a sentence as already demonstrated in extracts 18 and 19 above. This could be for the obvious reason that if the children do not know the word, that is, if it is not part of their linguistic repertoire and/or vocabulary, then they cannot produce it.

Previous studies have also shown that cued elicitations are often elaborate and may involve such processes as pre-formulation, reformulations and other prompts designed to give the learners cues as to how they should respond (see for example French & MacLure, 1979; Edwards & Mercer, 1987). However, as can be seen in the excerpts used in this section, the

learners in the Kenyan classrooms seemed to know from the high-tone cue when to respond and how to respond. A few instances were nevertheless observed where one or two children seemed to complete the words in a different way. One such instance was observed in a story-telling session in school W where teacher W1's cue at the end of the word *'sungura'* meaning 'hare/rabbit' by saying *'sungu^'* and while the rest of the class responded by saying *'sungura',* one of the learners completed the word by just saying *'ra'* which is the last syllable in the word *'sungura',* instead of completing by repeating the whole word. Such instances were however, rare in the observed classes so children may already have mastered the art as they even seemed to use the high tone cue themselves.

**b) Choral spelling**

Teachers often required learners to spell words which they had learned. Choral spelling as practised in the observed classrooms was more of a learner involvement exercise than a learning to spell exercise. This is because in most cases, it involved spelling words which had already been written on the chalkboard and all they needed to do was shout out the letters as they appeared on the chalkboard. There were a few instances when the teacher would write the word on the chalkboard and ask the learners to face the back of the class and spell the word from their memory, which still was more of rote learning than a spelling exercise.

This strategy was mainly used in schools X and Z. The teachers required learners to spell words, over and over again and say them aloud. Sometimes, even words making up whole sentences were spelt chorally by the learners in the classroom. This was practised in both the language and content subjects. Choral spelling of words as practised in these classrooms could be seen as another one of the various kinds of ritualised participation strategies that teachers use to make the learners participate in linguistically diverse classrooms where frontal pedagogical techniques which favour teacher-centred as opposed to learner-centred techniques are preferred. It is one way of getting the entire class to participate in classroom interaction in a system where unfamiliarity with the language of instruction renders the learners passive recipients of knowledge from its custodians (the teachers) as earlier observed by Kembo Sure and Ogechi (2009).

**Extract 22 - School Z**

> (183) T:  Aa ... stand up ... stand up ... *raitha nyuma*. Spell the word seven
> [Face the back of the classroom].

(184)  Ls:  S e v e n -seven

(185)  T:   Again spell the word seven

(186)  Ls:  s e v e n - seven

(187)  T:   Yes sit down. So there are seven days in a week. We have seven days. Now, I want we start learning about the seven days. The first day, *ntuku ya mbere.* Day *tugire i ntuku.* Day *tugire i mbi yo?*

[Yes sit down. So there are seven days in a week. We have seven days. Now, I want we start learning about the seven days. The first day. Day, we said it is 'day'. Day, we said it's what?]

(188)  Ls:  *I ntuku*

[It is day.]

(189)  Ls:  *I ntugu*

[It is day.]

(190)  T:   *I ntugu. Uga* day

[It is day. Say day]

(191)  Ls:  Day

(192)  T:   Spell the word day

(193)  Ls:  D a y - day **[OT4 SZ. 39].**

In the above extract from an English lesson, teacher Z requires the learners to spell the word 'seven' in turns (183) and (185), and the word 'day' in turn (192). The learners shout out the letter names of the letters of the alphabet in the words 'seven' and 'day', before shouting the word out loud. Sometimes it could involve the key concepts learnt in a lesson or just new words that the learners had learnt in the lesson. I even observed an instance where teacher Z required children to spell all the words in the sentence. For Example, in a Kiswahili lesson on domestic animals, the teacher required the learners to spell the whole phrase *wanyama wa nyumbani* meaning domestic animals, while in others, learners were made to spell words making up whole sentences.

At other times, a teacher could ask the learners to spell words even when they had already been written on the chalkboard. This confirms that this strategy was used more as a learner involvement strategy than to help learners know how to spell words. This was done presumably to break the monotony of teacher-domination of all lessons as a result of the language barriers in their classrooms.

The choral spelling strategy was handled differently in different classes. For example, whereas in school Z the learners would shout out the letters of the alphabet in a word and then shout out the word they had just spelled, in school X, learners would shout out the letters

of the alphabet making up a word they had been asked to spell after which the teacher would say "and the word is^", and the learners would then shout out the word they had just spelt. I am using 'shout out' here because I could not call it reading unless the learners knew the meanings of the words they were reading out. Reading involves assigning meaning to print which was not the case for the learners in the observed classrooms.

**c) Choral responses/repetition**

Choral responses/repetition are used in this study to refer to situations where learners respond to questions or heed to teacher's instructions that require a verbal response collectively. These mainly involved repeating collectively what had already been said or completing words or sentences after the teacher (see exposition on repetition in section 6.5). In all the lesson extracts that have been used so far, choral responses are marked by the code 'Ls', denoting learners. Where one learner was involved, a single 'L' for learner is used.

**6.4.2   Pedagogical considerations of ritualised participation strategies**

One of the areas of focus in this research is the development of language and literacy skills in multilingual classrooms. Although there are negative effects of using the ritualised participation strategies such as lack of individualised attention to the learners through choral responses which do not measure individual learner's comprehension and the failure to participate by some learners, the strategy could be said to promote the development of listening skills among the learners. As already discussed in the preceding sections, the strategy requires the learners to repeat or complete the last one or two words/syllables in a sentence uttered by the teacher. In order to do this, they have to listen for the rising tone (^) at the end of the sentence which pre-empts the repetition of words or completion of sentences. As already mentioned, ritualised participation strategies are also used to establish shared attention between the teacher and the learners (Pontefract & Hardman, 2005:90), which relates to the listening skills' development argument raised here.

Additionally, such participation strategies, for example, through the completion of sentences, the repetition of words and choral affirmation of understanding, have been shown to hinder learners from engaging in higher levels of thinking (see for example Pontefract & Hardman, 2005; Kembo Sure & Ogechi, 2009). It is also possible that since the strategies are structured

and regulated in such a way that they evoke short responses of between one and three words and sometimes just the ultimate syllable or the penultimate and ultimate syllable in a word, they may hinder language development in that learners hardly get the opportunity to express themselves fully. Besides the responses being short, they are also mainly choral (ibid) which implies that some learners may not quite participate especially in a large classroom setting, as is typical of many Kenyan classrooms. Both Pontefract and Hardman (2005) and Kembo Sure and Ogechi (2009) studies allude to the fact that learners do not ask questions because they lack the competence to express themselves in the language of instruction, which further confirms the limitation of language development in such school contexts. While I agree with other scholars that teachers teach the way they were taught (see for example Chimbutane, 2009), I would also like to argue that the same language policies that favour the use of unfamiliar languages as MoI, as exemplified in the examples discussed in section 2.6, may have had an effect on how these teachers experienced education as learners. One can therefore not completely rule out the role the choice of language of instruction may have played in teachers' trajectories whether as learners or as teacher trainees.

This study also indicates that sometimes repetition in the whole lesson could involve only one word, which is repeated over and over again either exactly the same or its different forms. For example, in a CRE lesson in school Z, all the completions in the entire lesson involved the word *ibwega* [thank you] or the word *bwega* [good] derived from it (see for example extract 20 above). It may appear like learners are learning a few vocabularies through the repetition but in actual sense, it is only one word they will have learned by the end of the lesson. A similar scenario was witnessed in school Y where teacher's questions required the learners to repeat the word *muthinzyo* [gift] over and over again throughout the lesson **[OT13 SY. 117-118].**

## 6.5     REPETITION

Repetition, often involving fragmented pieces of information is not an uncommon phenomenon in classes where the language of instruction is unfamiliar to the learners. In this study, repetition has been used to refer to those instances where the teacher repeats the same word, phrase or sentence several times and in the same language (to differentiate it from translation). According to classroom discourse analysts, repetition takes a greater part of the daily activities in a classroom where IRF/E is the typical nature of interaction between the teacher and the learners (see for example Pontefract & Hardman, 2005; Adger, 2001).

### 6.5.1   Forms and functions of repetition

Repetition in the observed classes took various forms. As already discussed, all forms of ritualised participation strategies involved some repetition of whole words at the end of an utterance. Teachers in this study also required learners to repeat words or complete sentences over and over again both in content and language subjects. Teachers also varied how they involved the class in repetition. For example, they would ask the whole class to repeat after them, ask individual rows in the class, boys, girls and sometimes just a section of the class not based on gender or sitting arrangement. The following lesson extracts illustrate this:

**Extract 23 – School Z**

(194)   T:   *Now, I want we start learning about the seven days.The first day. Ntuku ya mbere. Uga day*

[Now, I want we start learning about the seven days. The first day. The first day. Say day]

(195)   Ls:   Day

(196)   T:   Spell the word day

[...]

(197)   T:   Yes, so the first day is called Sunday. Say Sunday is the first day

(198)   Ls:   Sunday is the first day

(199)   T:   Sunday is

(200)   Ls:   Sunday is

[...]

(201)   T:   Sunday is

(202)   Ls:   Sunday is

(203)   T:   The first day

(204)   Ls:   The first day

(205)   T:   In a week

(206)   Ls:   In a week

(207)   T:   *N'yo yiitawa **Sunday** ... yiitawa ata?*

[It is called Sunday. It is called what?]

(208)   Ls:   Sunday

(209)   T:   *Yiitawa ata?*

[It is called what?]

(210)   Ls:   Sunday

(211)   T:   So say the first day

(212)   Ls:   The first day

(213)   T:   Is Sunday

(214)  Ls:  Is Sunday

(215)  T:  Ok spell the word sun ... sun **[OT4 SZ. 39-40].**

In the above excerpt from an English lesson, all the interactional turns taken between the learners and the teacher revolve around one sentence 'Sunday is the first day of the week' or its variant 'The first day of the week is Sunday' except for turns (215) where the learners are asked to spell the word 'sun'. This went on with the teacher even asking the learners to spell the same word over and over again. In all other turns, the teacher says the sentence and the learners repeat it after her a number of times. Teacher Z also breaks the sentence down and requires the learners to repeat after her segments of the sentence a number of times as reflected in turns (199) to (206); (211) and (214) (see appendix VI for a detailed version of extract 23).

## Extract 24 - School Y

(216)  T:  *Haya sasa nataka mwenye atanielezea kitabu kiko wapi? Kitabu kiko wapi?*

   [Ok. Now I want someone who will explain to me where the book is. Where is the book?]

(217)  Ls:  *Kitabu kiko wapi?*

   [Where is the book?]

(218)  T:  *Ayie neenda mndavye ibuku yi vaa. Kitabu kiko wapi? Tunasema kitabu kiko juu ya^*

   [No, I want you to tell me where the book is. Where is the book? We say the book is on the^]

(219)  L:  *Kipila*[25]

   [Chair]

(220)  T:  *Juu ya kiti , kitabu kiko juu ya kiti. Kila mtu aseme kitabu kiko juu ya kiti*

   [On the chair, the book is on the chair. Every one say the book is on the chair.]

(221)  Ls:  *Kitabu kiko juu ya kiti*

   [The book is on the chair]

(222)  T:  *Ee^*

(223)  Ls:  *Kitabu kiko juu ya kiti*

   [The book is on the chair]

(224)  T:  *Sio juu wa kiti ... nimesema juu ya kiti*

   [Not on of chair ... I said on the chair]

(225)  Ls:  *Juu ya kiti*

   [On the chair]

---

[25] Kipila is a corrupted Kikamba word that means chair.

(226)    T:    Ee^

(227)    Ls:   *Juu ya kiti*

         [On the chair]

(228)    T:    *Juu ya kiti*

         [On the chair]

(229)    Ls:   *Juu ya kiti*

         [On the chair] **[OT11 SY. 130-131].**

In extract 24 from a Kiswahili lesson, teacher Y follows a similar format in teaching the sentence *'kitabu kiko chini ya kiti'* [the book is under the chair], as that of teacher Z in extract 23, by requiring the learners to repeat it over and over again using prompts such as 'again', 'ee' as reflected in turns (222) and (226). The only difference could be where unlike teacher Z, who in the excerpt before only used choral repetition, teacher Y makes use of both choral repetition and individual learner repetition of the focus sentence. The teacher asks different learners to repeat the same sentence a number of times. In other turns, teacher Y invites the whole class to a choral repetition of the focus sentence. The characteristic breaking down of the focus sentence into smaller segments and having learners repeat the segments after the teacher are also captured in turns (224) to (229).

Like the teachers studied by Pontefract and Hardman (2005:94) who reported that "repetition gets inside their heads ... so that the children don't forget it", teachers in this study had similar reasons for making the learners to repeat things over and over again. In the teachers' own words, in response to the question why they repeated things over and over again, three teachers had the following to say:

(230)    *Ili washike kabisa*

         [So that they get it completely] **[IT2 SW. 8].**

(231)    *So that they can get it right* **[IT2 SX. 2].**

(232)    *That one [referring to repetition] is for the retention in the memory. You see like especially these young ones because their brain is developing. When you do a lot of repetition to them, in fact that thing I find that it sticks"* **[IT1 SZ. 8].**

All three teachers (W1, X & Z) had the same reason for making learners repeat things over and over again in their classes as reflected in their responses in turns (230) (231) and (232). Teachers in other studies had similar reasons for using repetition in their classrooms (see for example Pontefract & Hardman, 2005; Bunyi, 1999). In Bunyi (1999), for example, when asked how they responded to the language problem in their classrooms, the rural school

teachers in Bunyi's study explained that their solution was to repeat things over and over again so that the learners do not forget.

As with other ritualised participation strategies, the learners observed in this study seemed to have mastered the art of repeating. They knew when they are required to repeat. Teachers varied the ways in which they prompted learners to repeat something and the learners seemed to be coping. For example, in some instance the teacher gave a direct instruction to the learners to repeat something after her by using the word '*say'* and the learners would repeat after her. Teachers also used the rising tone intonation [^] at the end of an utterance to prompt learners to repeat a word. Other words that were commonly used include *again, repeat, all of you, ee,* and learners were able to repeat what was required of them (see extract 24 above). The fact that the learners were able to repeat words or sentences every time this was required of them meant that they were learning to listen and respond appropriately, which aids in the development of their listening skills.

## 6.5.2   Pedagogical considerations of repetition

An interrogation of the pedagogical effectiveness of this overused strategy from the data collected, left doubts that repetition actually gets things [knowledge] inside learners' heads so that they do not forget it, as teachers claim. It was observed that even after repeating words over and over again as illustrated here under, when teachers asked questions, they still had to do a lot of cueing to help the children remember the answer which did not always bear fruit.

After teaching days of the week in a lesson the previous day, and repeating the sentence 'Sunday the first day of the week' over and over (see extract 23 above) with the learners in the classroom both individually and 'chorally', the teacher comes to class the following day during the English lesson and asks the following question:

**Extract 25 - School Z**

> (233)   T:   Which is the first day of the week?
> (234)   Ls:  silence

When the learners remain silent, the teacher uses the following cues to try to provoke recall: the teacher uses repetition, emphasis/stresses and demonstrations to help the children understand the question posed to them in English. For example, the teacher:

> a)   **Repeats** the question and **stresses/emphasises** the word **first** in the question

      b) **Shows one finger t**o the learners as show says **'first'** to signify day 1 of the week

      c) **Changes the wording** from 'which is the **first** day of the week' to '**day one** of the week is'? _____ (dash), still in an effort to help them recall what they had repeated so many times the previous day.

Still no answers forthcoming, so the teacher,

d)   **Translates** the question into her mother tongue to say;

      (235)   T:   *Ntugu ya mbere ya kiumia n'iriku?*

               [Which is the first day?]

But she quickly qualifies the translation with the words

      (236)   T:   *Utari mutaurire utimenya?*

               [You cannot answer until it is translated for you?]

And as soon as the teacher gives the translation, learners give the correct response.

      (237)   Ls:  *Ncumapiiri*

               [Sunday] **[OT10 SZ. 132].**

A quick answer to this teacher's qualifying question is children cannot answer her question because they do not understand the language in which the question is being asked. This is evident in the fact that immediately the teacher translates the question, she needed cue no further, the children immediately gave the correct answer to her question. Although the teachers continually insist that repetition *'gets things to stick' -* in their learners' heads' (see turn (232) above), I suppose only what is understood would really stick.

Despite repeating things over and over again and even spelling every day of the week learnt in the previous day's lesson, these learners could not recall what they had been made to 'sing' over and over again. Not even the various cueing steps used by the teacher yielded any fruits until the teacher put the question in a language understood by the learners. In fact, the learners had repeated the sentence 'Sunday is the first day of the week' or its variant 'the first day of the week is Sunday' at least 22 times according the lesson transcript. This clearly demonstrates that the learning of content is absolutely difficult if not impossible in a language that learners do not speak or understand.

Whitehead (1996:24) advocates for increased amount of repetition and rephrasing in early grade classrooms to give children alternative ways of formulating same ideas and messages. However, others have argued that repeating words that one does not know the meaning when

teaching reading is not reading at all, it is repetition (see for example Save the Children, 2009). In a similar vein, I would like to argue here that repeating words, phrases or sentences whose meaning is not known is not learning, it is what it is, repetition. It is however, worth noting that although not an explicit aim of the strategy, to some extent repetition as practised in the observed classroom promotes listening skills development amongst the learners.

## 6.6    USING SCAFFOLDS (VERBAL AND NON-VERBAL)

Scaffolds have been defined as "forms of support provided by the teacher (or another student) to help students to bridge the gap between their current abilities and the intended goal" (Rosenshine & Meister, 1992:26). These could be tools such a cue cards and techniques such as teacher modelling in place of step by step directives (ibid). According to Rosenshine and Meister (1992), the amount of scaffolding done decreases as learners become more proficient and as the learning unfolds. Palincsar and Brown (1984) find that the usefulness of scaffolds is limited within the student's zone of proximal development (ZPD) as theorised by Vygotsky (1978), referring to the area above which the student cannot proceed without guidance from the teacher using scaffolds (Rosenshine & Meister, 1992).

Teachers in the observed classes used scaffolds to help to bridge the linguistic gaps arising from the use of a language as MoI that is not familiar to most of the learners. For example, in school Z, having taught a lesson on days of the week the previous day comes to class and asks the learners 'Which is the first day of the week'? When no response was coming forth from the learners, the teacher employs a series of cues such as repetition, emphasis/stresses and demonstrations to help the learners understand the question posed to them in English, in order to evoke the correct response from the learners:

a)   The teacher repeats the question and stresses/emphasises the word **first** in the question

b)   The teacher shows one finger to the learners as she says **first** to signify day 1 of the week

c)   Teacher then changes the wording from first to "Day 1 (one) of the week is_____ (dash)

d)   The teacher then translates the question into her mother tongue to say *'Ntugu ya mbere ya n'iriku?* [Which is the first day?] and qualifies the translation with the question *Utari mutaurire utimenya?* [You cannot answer until it is translated for you?]

It is only after the translation was provided that the learners were able to respond to the question.

The logic behind the ZPD validates the difficulties experienced by learners in trying to elicit the correct responses even when the teacher tried different ways of asking the same questions and various cues and scaffolds to evoke correct responses from the learners. The fact that the words that the teachers were trying to elicit from the learners were way outside of their learners' ZPDs meant that those words did not exist in their world and therefore could not be elicited.

In school Y, the teacher also used scaffolds to help bridge the linguistic gap as learners attempted to respond to questions. The teacher is aware of her learners' linguistic needs and therefore tries to help them elicit correct responses to questions using verbal cues as scaffolds. For example, in an English lesson where the learners were doing picture reading, the teacher used the pictures to teach the learners to say "My name is ...". The teacher points to the first picture and tells the children in Kikamba, "This boy is called Juma. He is saying my name is Juma". The learners repeat this after the teacher a number of times before moving on to the next picture of a girl named Wambui. The teacher asks the learners, "What is Wambui saying?" When no response is forthcoming, the teacher gives a verbal cue by saying this to the learners:

**Extract 26 - School Y**

> (238)   T:   *Twasya Juma eeasya* "**my name is Juma**". *Naake Wambui easya ata*? *What is Wambui saying?*
>
> [We have said Juma is saying "My name is Juma". And Wambui is saying what? What is Wambui saying?]
>
> (239)   L:   My name is Wambui **[OT8 SY. 47].**

In this excerpt, the teacher uses what the learners had just learnt as a scaffold to help them see the relationship between what Juma is saying and what Wambui is saying in answering the question.

As can be observed from this extract, the scaffold actually works because the learner gives the correct answer upon making the necessary connection from the teacher's verbal cue/scaffold. Although this is currently an underutilised strategy in the observed classrooms, it appears that the use of scaffolds may be more pedagogically sound and effective when compared to repetition and other ritualised participation strategies.

## 6.7    CONCLUSION

The findings discussed in this chapter overall confirmed those of other studies with regard to language use in multilingual classrooms (see for example Cummins & Swain, 1986; Arthur, 1997; Baker, 2001; Jones & Barkhuizen, 2011). Like the study by Jones and Barkhuizen (2011), the current study attests to the complexity of language-in-education policy implementation in multilingual classrooms. Teachers in such classroom settings teach under conditions of pressure as they try to juggle between their ideals of teaching while at the same time trying to prepare learners for an early exit from MT to English and Kiswahili and prepare them for examinations in English. As a result, teachers employ code switching/mixing, frontal classroom techniques which are mainly teacher-centred as opposed to learner-centred, and a variety of other ritualised participation strategies among them choral responses and choral spelling.

The study reveals that code switching took various forms as the teachers made efforts to help learners understand the content of the lessons while at the same time preparing them for the examinations in English. Teachers also used code switching to manage not only their learners' linguistic needs but also their own lexical gaps. However, although in the rural schools children's languages and language varieties are welcomed in the classroom as already discussed, the system of examinations done in English and the teaching and learning materials in English pose a serious challenge. As a result, teachers aware of their learners' limited proficiency in the school languages, juggle amongst different languages within their own repertoires, in an effort to make the content of education accessible to their learners while preparing them for examinations. The language 'gymnastics', to borrow the word from Muthwii (2004:28), performed by the teachers and sometimes the learners in the classrooms during the lessons as is evident in classroom interactions, are not accessible to learners in the examination rooms. I interpret this as a complexity arising from a situation where the practical aspects of language-in-education policy implementation are not synchronised with the examination system.

This study further indicates that most of the teachers are unaware of some of the strategies they use to manage linguistic diversity in their classrooms. For example, of the six different strategies in total that the participating teachers employed, as discussed in earlier sections of the current chapter, they were only able to point out two strategies (translation and speaking to children in their L1s) in the interviews in response to the question on what they did to

include speakers of other languages. Only teacher Z mentioned mixing languages in an interview with her, which I interpreted as code switching. The identification of these additional strategies in the observed classrooms was made possible by the choice of observation as the main data generation method because of its potential to reveal a lot more than the research participants may be aware of.

This chapter has presented a detailed analysis and interpretation of data relating to teachers' responses to linguistic diversity as reflected in their day-to-day language practices in their classrooms. Most of the practices in the observed classrooms have been discussed in the preceding two chapters, in referring to teachers' understandings and reposnes to linguistic diversity. The next chapter presents a description of the current practice with regard to the development of literacy and language skills. The chapter also discusses the barriers to the development of literacy and language skills in such multilingual school contexts.

# CHAPTER 7

# LANGUAGE AND LITERACY SKILLS DEVELOPMENT IN MULTILINGUAL CLASSROOMS

## INTRODUCTION

In chapter 6, towards achieving objective 2 of this study, I presented the strategies that teachers employ in response to linguistic diversity in multilingual classrooms. Teachers in this study were found to employ a variety of strategies in an effort to become inclusive when dealing with linguistically diverse learners. The pedagogical soundness of some of these strategies was also interrogated in the previous chapter. The current chapter presents an analysis and interpretation of data related to objectives 3 and 4 (see section 1.3.3), which are: to describe current practice in the development of language and literacy skills in multilingual classrooms, and to identify potential barriers to the development of language and literacy skills in such school settings. Extracts from the transcription of the recordings made at the different research sites are used to support the arguments made.

## 7.1    A DESCRIPTION OF THE CURRENT PRACTICE

Here, I start with a description of the current practice in the development of literacy and language skills with reference to how the observed teachers handled listening, speaking, reading and writing skills development in their classrooms. This will illuminate the realities as experienced in these classrooms, and will give an understanding of potential barriers to literacy and language development in such school settings, and how they could be mitigated. My discussion will focus on key areas in the development of literacy and language skills, from the perspective of a literacy community of practice namely listening, speaking, reading and writing skills development. These four skills are also stated in the current Kenyan primary school syllabus, as the general objectives for teaching language subjects in lower primary classes as follows:

The learner should acquire:

- *Listening skills to be able to listen, understand and respond to information and instructions appropriately;*

- *Speaking skills to be able to use correct pronunciation, stress and intonation to express needs, feelings, convey information and relate experiences;*

- *Reading skills to be able to read and understand instructions, to read for information and for pleasure, and to develop vocabulary and sentence structure*

- *Writing skills to be able to express own feeling and ideas meaningfully and legibly [...]* Source: KIE (2002:4).

Since much of what happens in practice in these classrooms has been reported in the preceding chapters, I limit myself in this chapter to those areas that have not already been addressed.

### 7.1.1  Listening skills development

The development of listening skills in the observed classrooms was facilitated in three ways, namely classroom interactions, dictation and listening to stories. These three are discussed in the sections that follow.

### *7.1.1.1 Spoken classroom interactions*

In the observed classes, most listening skills development happened implicitly through the ritualised participation strategies adopted in the class. As already discussed in the previous chapter (see section 6.3.5.2), the kind of ritualised participation strategies employed in the classrooms required that learners listen attentively if they were to respond to teachers' questions or to complete the sentences as is expected of them. The kinds of classroom activities and interactions involved the learners in listening to what the teacher was saying in order for them to answer questions and follow prompts, to repeat or spell words, either as individuals or in chorus. These classroom activities and conversations thus facilitate listening skills development on the part of the learners.

### *7.1.1.2 Dictation*

Dictation is a way of testing learner's ability to spell. It is about the relation between sounds of a language and their written form. Dictation exercises may also promote listening skills development in that learners have to discriminate among the sounds, words or units of language that they hear. I observed one dictation lesson in school W, where the teacher taught the spelling of a particular sound [k] and then dictated words which all ended with the focus sound. Although the lesson may have been taught with the objective of testing spelling for the learners, they had to listen in order to spell the words correctly. The following excerpt

illustrates the teacher's instructions to assure learners know that the word-final [k] should be spelt with the symbols '-ck', as in rack, back, rock, stick, stuck, etc.

**Extract 27**

(240)  T:  *Neno lako liwe linamalizia tu na ck ... ukisikia tu /ck/ unaweka hii ck.*

[Your word must end with ck ... you hear /ck/ you just write ck]

[...]

(241)  T:  *Learner J nilisema nini? kila neno ukiandika uhakikishe zimemaliza na ck. Hizi manaeo zako zinamaliza na ck?*

[Learner J what did I say? Every word you write, you ensure that it ends with ck. Are these words of yours ending with ck?]

[...]

(242)  T:  *Number 9 kick. Kila neno lenye nasema limalize na ck*

[... 9 kick. Every word that I say ends with ck] **[OT9 SW. 118-119].**

Although this is a dictation exercise which could help develop the learners' listening skills, the teacher makes it explicit that all the words that she will say will end with [k] and if the learners were to write any one without ending with '-ck', they would be wrong. With very clear instructions regarding the English orthography, these learners are assisted to make the sound-symbol correspondence. It is possible that the learners did not know the meanings of the words they were spelling, which would beat the logic of a dictation exercise.

### *7.1.1.3 Use of stories*

As discussed in the literature review (see section 3.7.5), storytelling promotes the development of listening and comprehension skills among the learners (see for example Peck, 1989; Craig et al., 2001), and plays a key role in the enhancement of both oral and written expression (see for example Peck, 1989; Craig et al., 2001). Bloch (1997:26), a renowned scholar in the early literacy development field, argues that "the way to a child's heart is through a story", because stories tap into children's imagination which is their strongest tool for learning (ibid). Thus stories are an inalienable aspect in learning especially in early literacy and language development. This study indicates that story-telling is a highly neglected activity in the development of language and literacy skills in the observed multilingual classrooms. For example, in the more than 80 lessons observed, only two lessons were devoted to story-telling and both were observed in a single school, namely school W. Here, teacher W1 did most of the telling and employed the ritualised participation strategies as were discussed in section 6.4 to involve the learners in the sessions. A few learners were

however, allowed to tell their own stories and then following the model of the teacher, they adopted exactly the same style of telling their stories. Not only did they use similar practices of code switching/mixing but also the high tone [^] cues at the end of an incomplete word to motion to the other learners to complete the words. Thus hearing the teacher telling stories provided a model for children's spoken language/own story-telling.

## 7.1.2   Speaking skills development

The Kenyan primary school syllabus supports classroom talk in the development of speaking skills for the learners (KIE, 2002:2). The syllabus states that:

> *The pupils' ability to speak fluently depends on how exposed they are to language. Constructive classroom talk, therefore, should be encouraged. Learners should be given ample opportunities to talk about themselves, express their ideas and opinions, tells stories, discuss events and describe experiences* (KIE, 2002:2).

Ideal as this is, such an objective may be a 'tall order' when classroom affairs are conducted in a language that is unfamiliar to a majority of the learners. In the following sections, I discuss speaking skills development in the observed classrooms in relation to the opportunities that learners' were accorded to speak and the level of classrooms interactions between the teacher and the learners.

### *7.1.2.1 Opportunities to speak*

This study indicates that learners from the rural school tended to use longer phrases/sentences when speaking unlike the learners in the urban and peri-urban sites who used one, two or utmost three word phrases in their talk, that is, "choral few" to borrow the words of Pontefract and Hardman (2005:90), or "chorus of minimal responses" as they are referred to in the work of Arthur (1996:22). This could be attributed to the fact that learners in the rural sites were allowed to speak in any language within their repertoire in the classrooms while those in the urban areas are regulated by teachers in their use of language to English and Kiswahili. Even Sheng (the informal urban slang) which the teachers continuously use is forbidden the learners. The following excerpts illustrate this argument.

In a Kiswahili lesson in school W, teacher W2 asks a question and the learners raise their hands and shout: "teacher, teacher, teacher". Teacher W2 stops them by asking:

(243)   *Saa ya Kiswhaili tunasema nini? Mwalimu. Hatusemi teacher*

[What do we say during the Kiswahili lesson? *Mwalimu*.[26] We do not say teacher] **[OT1 SW. 16]**.

In this same Kiswahili lesson where teacher W2 tells the learners not to say teacher but instead use the Kiswahili word *mwalimu,* she herself uses English words in Kiswahili sentences as shown in the following excerpts:

**Extract 28**

(244)   *Tusome tena. Kila mmoja atakuwa anakuja kutusomea halafu tuandike. Sasa usipoangalia kwa* **blackboard***, hutajua kusoma. Na usilale hivi ... unakaa vizuri na unaangalia kwa ubao.*

[Let us read again. Everyone will come here and read for us and then we write. Now if you don't look at the blackboard, you will not know how to read. And don't sleep like this. You sit properly and look at the blackboard] **[OT1 SW. 18]**.

(245)   *Nangojea learner C aangalie kwa* **blackboard***.*

[I am waiting for learner C to look at the blackboard] **[OT1 SW. 25].**

(246)   *Hii ni ya* **homework** *ama ni ya Kiswahili wewe? ... Nani hana kitabu? Learner M, enda* **page** *nyengine.*

[Is this for homework or for Kiswahili you? [...] Who doesn't have a book? [Learner M, go to another page] **[OT1 SW. 27].**

As can be seen in these extracts, teacher W2 uses the English words 'blackboard', 'homework' and 'page' in Kiswahili sentences. Notice that this is the same lesson in which she had told learners not to use the word 'teacher', when calling out to the teacher to ask them to respond to a question, because "*saa ya Kiswahili tunasema mwalimu-hatusemi teacher"* [during the Kiswahili lesson we say *mwalimu* - we don't say teacher] as indicated in turn (243) above.

A similar incidence was observed with teacher W1 in the same school where she first uses the Sheng word *pekere*[27] but when the learners begin using it, she stops them. The following excerpt demonstrates this:

**Extract 29 – School W (Maths lesson)**

(247)   T:   *Now let me have the boys. Chukua pekere ... Sitaki kusikia sauti ya pekere. Wacha kuguza. ... These ones are called bottle tops. Can you say bottle tops.*

[Now let me have the boys. Take some bottle tops. ... I don't want to hear the noise from the bottle tops. Do not touch. These ones are called bottle tops. ...]

(248)   Ls:  Tops

(249)   T:   Do you know what a bottle is?

(250)   L:   Yes

---

[26] *Mwalimu* is the Kiswahili word for teacher.

[27] *Pekere* is the Sheng (informal urban slang) word for bottle tops.

(251)  T:  *Hii ni kifuniko ya chu^*

[This is the lid of a bo^]

(252)  Ls:  *Pekere*

[Bottle tops]

(253)  T:  *Chupa. Wacha kusema pekere. Zinaitwa bottle tops. Bottle^*

[Bottle. Stop saying pekere. They are called bottle tops. Bottle^]

(254)  Ls:  Tops **[OT7 SW.62].**

Notice in this interaction, that it is actually the teacher who introduced the word *pekere* to the learners in (247). But somewhere along the way, she disallows the learners' use of it and instead tells them to instead use the phrase 'bottle tops' in (253). However, it was observed that although teacher W1 would not allow children to use the Sheng word for *pekere*, she continued using it herself as shown in the following interaction that followed the previous one in the same lesson.

**Extract 30 – School W (Maths lesson)**

(255)  T:  *Now nikiwapatia kazi kwa take away, na niseme utumie bottle tops mtafanya? Unaandika, unahesabu **pekere** na unaandika, mtafanya?*

[Now, if I give you work on take away and I tell you to use bottle tops, will you do? You write, you count the bottle tops and write, will you do it?]

(256)  Ls:  Yes

(257)  T:  *Weka hiyo box hapa mtu akimaliza anarudisha **pekere**.*

[Put that box here, and anyone who finishes should return the bottle tops there] **[OT7 SW. 65].**

It is evident from these excerpts that although teachers themselves continuously code mix and code switch between Kiswahili, English and minimally Sheng, they are not very comfortable when learners do the same as is shown in this instance. As previously indicated in the work of Muthwii (2004), teachers in the present study seem to have the freedom to mix and switch codes, but this is denied the learners even in multilingual context as the one referred to above. Similar observations were made by Arthur (1996:17) in the Botswana primary school classrooms studied where learners were not free to switch from English, the proscribed language of the instruction, to Setswana. Arthur links this to the asymmetrical roles of teachers and learners in classroom interactions. I interpret it to mean that teachers in the observed classrooms revert to code switching as a resource to fill linguistic gaps they have in the matrix language but the same resource is denied the learners in expressing themselves both in the classrooms and in examinations.

An example from school Y will help bring out the contrast between the language practices and urban as opposed to the rural schools. In all lessons, when the teacher asked a question, the learners would raise their hands and shout "*nye,*[28] *nye, nye"* (me, me, me – as they call out to the teacher to ask them to answer). Here, the teacher does not restrict the use of the Kikamba word '*nye*' even in the English and Kiswahili lessons.

The following two excerpts from two different lessons in school Y illustrate this further:

**Extract 31 – School Y (Kiswahili lesson)**

(258)   T:   *Haya namba tano ... hapo tuko na nini na nini ingine?*
        [Ok, number five, there we have what and what?]

(259)   L:   *Nyomba*
        [House]

(260)   T:   *Nyumba na nini ingine?*
        [House and what else?]

(261)   Ls:  Tree

(262)   T:   *Tree ni Kingereza ... na kwa Kiswahili inaitwa mti. Inaitwa^*
        [Tree is English, in Kiswahili it is called 'mti'. It is called^]

(263)   Ls:  *Mti*
        [Tree] **[OT11 SY. 153].**

Here, the teacher accepts and affirms the answer *nyomba* in (259) which is given in Kikamba by immediately giving the Kiswahili equivalent *nyumba* in (260) while in the second case, she affirms the answer 'tree' in (262) given in English before probing the learners further for the answer in the desired language, given that this is a Kiswahili lesson.

In a different instance, the teacher draws a circle on the chalkboard and the conversation below ensues:

**Extract 32 – School Y (Kiswahili lesson)**

(264)   Ls:  Circle

(265)   T:   *Hiyo kwa Kingereza tuliita circle. Tuliita^*
        [That one, in English we called it circle. We called it^]

(266)   Ls:  Circle

(267)   T:   *Tuliita circle lakini kwa Kiswahili tunaiita duara. Kwa Kiswahili tunaiita^*
        [We called it circle but in Kiswahili we call it 'duara'. In Kiswahili we call it^]

---

[28] 'nye' is the Kikamba equivalent of me or I.

(268)  Ls:  *Duara*

[Circle]

(269)  T:  *Ee, kwa Kiswahili circle inaitwa duara. Inaitwa nini?*

[Yes, in Kiswahili a circle is called what?]

(270)  Ls:  *Duara*

[Circle]

(271)  T:  *Duara*

[Circle]

(272)  Ls:  *Duara*

[Circle] **[OT9 SY. 113].**

The teacher in this rural classroom was more accommodative of the learners' use of different languages (including their L1s) when compared to those from the urban setting. Although she still seeks the answer in the desired language, like she had done with 'tree' in (262) in the previous extract, she first acknowledges that 'tree' is correct before probing for the Kiswahili word. The same acknowledgement is brought out in extract 32 with the word 'circle' which the learners say in English in turn (264) and the teacher acknowledges that it is correct in (265) before telling them the word for circle in Kiswahili, *duara* in (267). Similar observations were made in school Z where the learners' L1s and language varieties were allowed during classroom interactions as shown in the following excerpt.

**Extract 33 – School Z (Kiswahili lesson)**

(273)  T:  *Mnyama mwingine?*

[Another animal- domestic?]

(274)  L:  Goat

(275)  T:  *Goat anaitwaje kwa Kiswahili?*

[What is a goat called in Kiswahili?]

(276)  L:  *Mbuzi*

[Goat]

(277)  T:  *Anaitwa mbuzi. Goat ni Kingereza. Mbuzi ni Kiswahili. Sawa sawa learner K?*

[It is called 'mbuzi'. Goat is English. Mbuzi is Kiswahili. Ok learner K?]

(278)  T:  *Aaya, nani anafahamu mnyama mwingine?*

[Ok. Who knows another animal?]

(279)  L:  *Ng'ondu*

[Sheep]

(280)  T:  *Ng'ondu, ng'ondu anaitwaje kwa Kiswahili?*

[Sheep, what is a sheep in Kiswahili?]

(281)  L:  Inaudible

(282)  T:  *Anaitwa kondoo. Learner E, ng'ondu anaitwa^*

[It is called a sheep. Learner E a sheep is called^]

(283)  L:  *Kondoo*

[Sheep]

(284)  T:  *Mnyama mwingine?*

[Another animal?]

(285)  L:  *Ing'ooi*

[Donkey]

(286)  T:  *Ing'ooi anaitwaje kwa Kiswahili, learner A?*

[What is a donkey called in Kiswahili, learner A?]

(287)  L:  Donkey

(288)  T:  Donkey *kwa Kiingereza. T: Na kwa Kiswhahili?*

[Donkey is English. How about in Kiswahili?]

(289)  L:  Cow

(290)  T:  *Cow ni ng'ombe. Ing'ooi, anaitwaje kwa Kiswahili?*

[Cow is a 'ng'ombe'. What is a donkey called in Kiswahili?]

(291)  L:  *Punda*

[Donkey]

(292)  T:  *Vizuri sana. Anaitwa punda.*

[Very good. It is called donkey] **[OT4 SZ. 58].**

In the above excerpt, it is observable that teacher Z, like teacher Y, affirms her learners' answers even when they are in a different language from the one she has asked the question in. For instance, although this is a Kiswahili lesson, the learners gave the names of domestic animals in whichever languages they knew them in. Some learners gave the answers in their MTs as can be seen in turns (279) and (285) and others in English as shown in turn (274). More English names came up as the teacher probed the learners for the Kiswahili names for the different animals as reflected in turns (287) and (289).

As already discussed in the previous chapter under teachers' strategies in multilingual classrooms (see section 6.3), revoicing the learners answers is a way of affirming those answers in the IRF/E format of classroom interaction. Teacher Z consistently affirms the learners' answers in the above lesson extract by repeating the words goat, *ng'ondu*, *ing'ooi*, donkey, cow and *punda* in turns (275), (280), (286), (288), (290) and (292) respectively. Affirming learners' responses even when they are given in their L1s, in English or in Kiswahili communicates to learners that thei languages are welcome in the classroom and

therefore learners will have more freedom to use them even in their learner-learner interaction. Denying learners' usage of their L1s in class would communicate to them that their languages are not sutiable for learning in the school. Then the learners may shy away from using them even amongst themselves. In fact Cummins (2000b) equates the rejection of learners' languages in school to rejection of the learners themselves, which affects not only their language development but also academic development and self-esteem as they leave a large part of who they are, at the school house door, where they are forced to leave their languages. The excerpts from the rual schools demonstrate how three languages can be used at the same time and play mutually supportive roles as is typical of multilingual situations. The challenge in the rural schools studied here lies in the fact that examinations are done only in English even though teaching and learning takes place in a variety of languages.

### 7.1.2.2 Level of classroom interactions

Observations of classroom interactions indicated that when learners are allowed to freely express themselves in a language they know well, they are more participatory than when pressured to use an unfamiliar language. This was evident in the rural schools when compared to the urban and peri-urban schools. Although teachers Y and Z used the language of majority of the learners and own L1 respectively as MoI in their classrooms, they also allowed learners to respond to questions in languages and dialects represented in their classrooms. For example, as already discussed in the preceding paragraphs, even when teacher Y wanted the answer in a specific language, she would accept the answer if given in a different language or dialect and then probe further for the answer in the desired language. My observation confirmed more participation in classroom interaction in the rural schools when compared to the other two sites. Whereas learners in all the contexts studied spoke in responding to teachers' questions, only those in schools Y and Z were seen to ask questions. This ability and confidence of the learners may be attributed to the fact that learners in these sites were allowed to express themselves in languages and dialects of their local coomunities.

The following extract was drawn from a recording done during a Math lesson in school Y. After teaching learners how to use counters to do additions, she wrote some sums on the chalkboard for them to copy and use their counters to fill in the answers to the problems. During the writing exercise, done mainly in silence, different learners reported different things to the teacher as shown below.

**Extract 34 – School Y**

(293)   L:   *Mwalimu learner N nuumaamye*

[Teacher learner N is sleeping]

(294)   T:   *Undu utalila andu monthe wee? Mundu atale akiliite*

[Are you counting for everyone? You count silently]

(295)   L1:   *Inaamiina mwalimu*

[I have finished teacher]

(296)   L2:   *Ona nye inaamina*

[Me too, I have finished]

(297)   L3:   *Inaamiina*

[I have finished]

(298)   L4:   *Mwalimu learner G ndakwandika*

[Teacher, learner G is not writing]

(299)   L5:   *Ena kalamu na nuuleile kwandika*

[He/she has a pen and has refused to write]

[...].

(300)   T:   *Aya, andika kii kingi nakyo* (writes another sum)

[Ok, write this other one]

(301)   L1:   *Kiiku?*

[Which one?]

(302)   T:   *Kii ngukwandikya vaa*

[This one that I am writing for you here]

(303)   L2:   *Inaamiina*

[I have finished]

(304)   L3:   *Inaamina*

[I have finshed]

(305)   T:   *Nuu uu, imulonzye muno*

[That's all, you are making too much noise]

(306)   L4:   *Inaamiina mwalimu*

[Teacher I have finished]

(307)   L5:   *Mwalimu utaamaakia*

[Teacher you have not marked for me]

(308)   L6:   *Mwalimu utamaakia*

[Teacher you have not marked for me] **[OT8 SY. 112].**

In the above extract, learners report what the other learners are doing in (293), (298) and (299). They tell the teacher when they have finished so that she can mark their work as shown

in (295), (296), (297), (303), (304) and (306). One learner asks a question seeking clarification from the teacher as reflected in (301). And they remind the teacher that she has not marked their work in (307) and (308). This extract reveals a level of classroom interaction where learners use spoken language in ways that are not limited to the ritualised participation patterns so often observed. The following two extracts from rural school Z will demonstrate this further. Both excerpts 35 and 36 are drawn from the same lesson, one when the learners are preparing for the writing exercise while the other one is during the actual writing.

In extract 35, teacher Z had asked the learners to take out their exercise books so that they can do a writing exercise at the end of a CRE lesson. Here again, we see different learners engaging the teacher by asking questions mostly seeking clarifications on what she wants them to write and which book[29] they should be writing on. Notice that in extract 35, the teacher does not immediately respond to the learners' questions because she was busy on the chalkboard writing the questions the learners should be copying into their books but she later responded to them (learners).

**Extract 35 – School Z**

    (309)   L1: *Twandike mbi mwarimu?*

                [What are we writing teacher?]

    (310)   L2: *Nibuku namba igana?*

                [What book number?]

    (311)   L1: *Twinthe mwarimu?*

                [Is it all if us teacher?]

    (312)   L2: *Ibukuuni wa rira tukwandikagira mwarimu?*

                [Is it in the same book that we have been writing in teacher?] **[OT2 SZ. 31].**

                [...]

    (313)   L3: *I wariri nkwandikagira?*

                [Is it the same book we have been writing in?] **[OT2 SZ. 34].**

In extract 36, the teacher had written five multiple choice questions on the chalkboard which the learners were required to copy in their exercise books and choose one answer from the two choices given for each number. Since the learners could not yet read, the teacher had to

---

[29] Because most of the learners could not read as yet, teachers number the learners' exercise books. For example, instead of writing the subject Maths or English on the learners' exercise books, they would for example write numbers 1 and 2 to stand for Maths and English exercise books respectively. According to the teachers, the numbers are easier for the learners to recognise than words like Maths, English, Kiswahili, etc and would help them to avoid mixing work for the different subjects in one book. This is the reason the learner in excerpt 35 asks what book number they should be looking for to write in.

read the questions for the learners in English and translate them into her MT. As expected, all learners could not write at the same pace so those who missed the first round of reading and translations for any of the questions sought help from the teacher.

**Extract 36 – School Z**

(314)  L:  *I namba* five*?*

[What about number five?]

(315)  T:  *Namba* five*? Nuriku akuneenkeere mwiri uyu waku? I* God ... *I* God *kana ni ...*

[Who gave you your body? Is it God or is it ...]

(316)  L:  Mother

(317)  T:  *Kana ni* mother*?*

[Or is it mother?]

(318)  L:  *I namba* four*?*

[What about number four?]

(319)  T:  *Namba* four *ikauria atiri, Murungu aumbire nthinguru na into bionthe na ntuku igana?*

[Number four asks, God created the world and all the things in it in how many days?]

(320)  L:  *I namba* two*?*

[What about number two?]

(321)  T:  *Namba* two ... *muntu uria aumbirwe mbere eetawa atia?*

[Number two, who was the first man to be created?]

(322)  L:  *I namba* three*?*

[What about number three?]

(323)  T:  *Namba* three*, mwekuru wa Adamu eetawa ata? Eetawa* Eve *kana ni* Sarah*?*

*[*Number three, the wife of Adam was called __? Was she called Eve or Sarah?]
**[OT3 SZ. 36-37]**

In these instances, the learners seek clarifications from the teacher by asking questions when they do not understand the teachers' instructions in turns (309), (310), (311), (312), (313), (314), (318), (320) and (322). These learners are able to do this presumably because they are allowed to speak in languages that they know. I did not observe this happening in the other two study sites (schools W & X) where the language(s) the learners used to respond to teachers' questions were restricted to the proscribed school languages. It could be argued that learners in these sites did not find anything unclear that would have required them to seek clarifications from the teachers, but this is unlikely. The level of classroom interaction illustrated in extracts 34, 35 and 36 could only be attributed to the fact that learners in schools

Y and Z were at liberty to use the languages and dialects of their choice in the classroom. This made it possible for them to construct questions, which would have been hampered if it was to be done in a language they do not know well.

Previous studies have shown that the use in education of a language that the learners know results in more classroom participation (see for example Mutiga et al., 2006a, 2006b; Chimbutane, 2009; Nomlomo, 2010; Alidou & Brock-Utne, 2011), in that learners are able to ask questions and seek clarifications when they do not understand. The language barrier related to the linguistic demands in their particular school contexts could be a possible reason why the urban and peri-urban learners were not able to do this in my study. Arthur (1994:69-70) reported similar findings in a study of the functions and constraints of English in two Standard 6 classrooms in two Botswana primary schools where "virtually no pupils were observed in these classrooms putting questions to their teachers". Arthur finds this indicative of the "rarity, if not the absence, of English use by the learners in teacher-learner interactions" (ibid). In the classrooms observed in the current study, insistence on the use of the school languages (English and Kiswahili), and not being allowed to use their L1s, means that learners do not get the opportunities to express themselves fully. This is a barrier to their language development. Such limitations are discussed in detail in a later section of this chapter (see section 7.2.3.2).

### 7.1.3   Reading skills development

Reading has been identified as a foundational skill for other learning activities in the classroom and a fundamental ability for higher learning (see for example Gove & Cvelich, 2011; Ng, 2006). Reading is also seen to undergird the entire learning experience of a child and needs to be the foundation for any educational enterprise (Gove & Zvelich, 2011:vii). Elsewhere, reading achievement is seen as a measure for school success (Grant & Wong, 2003) and a gauge of education quality (Gove & Zvelich, 2011). As discussed earlier in the literature review (see section 3.4), studies show that children who are poor readers in early grades, remain poor readers in later grades (see for example Clay, 1991; Cassidy & Cassidy, 2002; Ng, 2006). This makes reading development in early grades important in order to provide early interventions that may avert possible handicaps to future learning.

The development of reading skills in both linguistically homogenous and heterogeneous classrooms in Kenya, like in many other African countries, is faced by a myriad of challenges ranging from the scarcity of reading materials (see for example Stroud, 2001; Baker, 2001;

UNESCO, 2003; Musau, 2004; Muthwii & Kioko, 2004), which form the bedrock for reading development, to the teachers' lack of skills in teaching reading apart from language instruction (Gove & Cvelich, 2011; Akyeampong et al., 2011). Even where materials are available, they are mainly in a language that is unfamiliar to a majority of the learners who are expected to be reading them. The following section discusses the observations made in the classrooms studied to shed more light on the situation in relation to teaching reading versus language teaching.

### 7.1.3.1 Reading versus language teaching/ learning

Learning a language and learning to read seem not to be clearly distinguished as separate assignments. All teachers in the observed classes seemed to miss this important disticntion. In most cases when these two are confused, it is reading that is neglected. This is because teachers employ strategies like repetition where children are made to repeat words or phrases without even seeing them in their written form (rote learning). In most cases, this ends up as language teaching where children are developing language proficiency as opposed to learning to read.

Similar observations have been made by Akyeampong et al. (2011) who in their study of teacher preparation in six African countries, among them Kenya, found that reading instruction was in most cases an attempt at teaching L2. The study revealed that even the tutors responsible for training teachers had little or no knowledge of reading instruction (Akyeampong et al., 2011:29). The study also found that most teacher preparation in the coutries studied concentrated on the teaching of subject content with methods of teaching reading being relegated only to the weeks leading up to the practicum (ibid). Consequently, similar approaches are reflected in the classrooms where "reading rate, fluency, acquisition of vocabulary and comprehension" are not viewed as major parts in teachers' models of reading (Akyeampong et al., 2011:30). Gove and Cvelich (2011) concur with Akyeampong et al. (2011) that teachers are not trained to teach reading.

Save the Children (2009:3) observes that "education has a better chance of success when it is based on how children learn and develop, that is, mentally, physically, socially". In this regard, I needed some insight on the pedagogical approaches the teachers in the observed classrooms used for the development of language and literacy skills in such multilingual classrooms. I was interested in the pedagogical soundness of these approaches, based on current thinking on the development of early literacy and language skills with regard to reading, writing, listening and speaking amongst young learners. This meant investigating also the materials used by the teachers in this process and attention to the environment in which teaching/learning took

place. These aspects, namely teaching/pedagogical approaches, materials used and reference to classroom labels and displays are discussed in the next three sections of this report.

### 7.1.3.2 Teaching methodologies

Nomlomo (2010:129) argues that although the use of learners' L1s promotes teacher-learner interaction and better understanding of what is taught, it does not necessarily represent learner-centred teaching. However, in practice the use of an LWC, which is often mastered by only a handful of pupils, if any, does certainly represent a teacher-centred approach. This is built around rote learning and regulated learner participation through ritualised strategies. Teachers adhere rigidly to "frontal pedagogical techniques" (Stroud, 2001:69), which diminishes classroom interaction while promoting almost thoughtless rote repetition, a classroom practice which has been linked to teaching in a language that most learners do not speak (see for example Stroud, 2001; Arthur, 1996; Williams, 2004). Child/learner-centred education remains elusive in such classrooms because as Williams (2004:35) observes, "the child's language – the very tool which allows one to 'centre' on the child – is set aside".

Similar observations are made in a study by Kembo Sure and Ogechi (2009) whose aim was to identify the linguistic and pedagogical challenges experienced by both teachers and learners in Kenyan primary schools where English is used as the MoI. Like the study by Pontefract and Hardman (2005), Kembo Sure and Ogechi's study alludes to the "frontal pedagogical techniques", to borrow the words of Stroud (2001:69), where the teacher becomes the dominant participant in classroom exchanges with learners' participation being relegated to minimal verbal responses. Teachers' questions were answered in choral form which does not indicate a creative individual learning process. What I observed in these classes could be summarised simply as a serious amalgamation of approaches and strategies in teaching which were adjusted, albeit minimally, from one subject to another as teachers endeavoured to make the learning content accessible to their learners.

### 7.1.3.3 Materials used

The textbooks used in the observed classrooms differed to some degree. This was not unexpected since the schools make their own decisions on what books they should buy following the recommendations of the textbook committees. As long as the books have been approved by the KIE and listed in the MoE's catalogue, then those books can be purchased and used in the schools. The onus is therefore on each school, through their text book committees, to decide

which books of which publishers, they would like to use. Where there are two or more different textbooks for the same subject in the same level/class, the onus is on the teacher to decide which of the books will become the coursebook and which one(s) will be the supplementary or reference material(s). In my observation, the coursebooks are followed from cover to cover, page by page. Even though these books are mostly not organised in the order in which the curriculum content is meant to be covered, the coursebooks become the teachers' schemes of work. I found that teachers scheme with coursebooks as the guide as opposed to the syllabus guidelines. Ndayipfukamiye (1994:84) makes similar observations in a study of code switching in Burundi primary classrooms which found that "teachers tended to follow strictly the steps set out in the textbooks". In many cases, this undermines the aims and directives of the curriculum.

Teachers' choices on the coursebooks vary depending on what they think they want to achieve in a particular subject. For example, in school X and Y, two textbooks had been supplied for Kiswahili; *Kiswahili Mufti* ['Excellent' Kiswahili] and *Msingi wa Kiswahili* [Foundation for Kiswahili]. In both cases, the teachers decided that one of the books would be used for teaching Kiswahili language subject while the other would be used for teaching Kiswahili as MT subject. Each of the teachers had a reason as to why she chose which book for teaching which subject. For example, when I asked teacher X how she decided which of the books she would use for which subject, she told me that the book which had many pictures was meant for teaching Kiswahili vocabulary, which she then assigned to teaching Kiswahili as a language subject.

In school Z, it was noted that the teacher was teaching the MT subject with a book that is meant for adult literacy classes even though there are materials which have been evaluated and approved by KIE for the particular language she was teaching and are listed in the MoE's catalogue. This coupled with the fact that only 5 MT subject lessons had been taught across the five months in this Standard 1 class, cast a lot of doubt that any serious teaching of the learners' MT was actually happening in teacher Z's classroom. This is quite telling if one considers the difficulties and contradictory practices of selecting a MT in a class where quite a number of MTs are represented.

It was further noted that although most of the languages represented as MTs of the learners in the classrooms had long literacy traditions, and that materials are available in these languages, none of the teachers used any materials written in any other language than the school languages and/or the languages chosen for the MT subject in their respective classrooms. My study indicates that the literacy traditions of the different L1s represented in the observed classes did not determine how these languages were used. Some of the L1s of the learners in these schools had long literacy

traditions and literature available but no such materials were used in the observed classes. It was only in school Y where the teacher showed me a book written in Kikamba, which would have ideally been used for teaching Kikamba MT subject had she chosen to teach it as MT in her context. It is possible that the number of languages represented in the urban, and to some extent, peri-urban sites presents a big challenge in terms of sourcing materials in all those languages. However, for the rural schools where the learner population represents fewer languages, some form of multiliteracy development in the three local languages would reasonably be expected, in addition to English and Kiswahili. The lack of preparation, through teacher education, to deal with multiple languages in the classroom left teachers feeling ill-equipped to deal with diversity in their contexts.

A review of current literature on reading development points to the role of print rich environments (see for example Snow et al., 1989; Commins & Miramontes, 2006) as catalysts to reading development. In this regard, it became apparent that the description of current practices in developing language and literacy skills needs to include an assessment of the learning environments, specifically in relation to the display and reference to classrooms labels in the observed classes. A discussion of these forms the next section of this research report.

### *7.1.3.4 Display and reference to classrooms labels*

In chapter five, I discussed the contexts of the study in relation to the four classrooms that were observed (see section 5.1 for a detailed description of each of the research sites). The observed classrooms differed greatly in terms of the learning environment or linguistic landscapes. As already discussed, in schools W and X, many labels were displayed in the classrooms. The labels were prepared for specific subjects and displayed in various subject corners in the classrooms. The concept of 'subject corners' entails that labels made for teaching different topics are put close together in the same corner grouped per subject. For example, labels for teaching all topics in Science were displayed side by side in the so-called 'Science corner'. The picture below illustrates one such subject corner as used in the schools.

*Picture 1: Showing a section of the Mathematics corner in school X*

School Y and Z had very little to show in terms of labels in the classrooms. In school Y, there were only three labels in the classroom, two in the back wall of the classroom and one on the right hand side of the classroom. In school Z, not even one label was displayed in the classroom at the time of the study (see section 5.1.2.4 for explanation). As can be observed in the picture above, labels are made for the different topics in a given subject, which means that one can easily get answers to examination questions by merely looking at the labels.

During the observations, I noted that the labels were hardly referred to in the teaching. Apart from school X where the teacher made reference to the labels consistently, the teachers in school W (the only other site where there were labels), rarely referred to the labels. Similar findings were reported in the study by Plüddemann et al. (2000:55), which found that although the print environment in the classrooms they investigated in South Africa's Western Cape Province seemed proportional to the socio-economic status of the school community, "teachers seldom refer to what was on their walls". Instead, they observe, "teachers across the board appear to regard posters and charts as decoration than as learning support materials" (ibid).

I noted in my study that some of the labels were displayed too high for the young learners to use them even if they had an opportunity to. Some were hanged across the roof especially in school

X while others were displayed high up on the wall just below the roof as shown in the picture below.



*Picture 2: Showing classroom labels displayed high up on the wall almost touching the roof in school X*

When labels are placed high up as shown in picture 2 above, it becomes difficult for the little learners to use them because they may not see them clearly and may also not point at what they are trying to read out.

### 7.1.4    Writing skills development

Williams (2004:35) points out that formal education in most African primary school classrooms "amounts to an incomprehensible daily routine of choral repetition and copying from the blackboard". Williams' words, to a large extent, describe the experiences of learners in the classrooms selected as cases for this inquiry. In all the observed classes, the writing experiences of the learners could be summed up in one word, copying. This ranged from copying into their exercise books what the teacher had already written for them on the chalkboard, copying from textbooks as well as copying drawings that had already been drawn for them. Of the over 80 lessons observed in all four schools, only one instance of not copying was noted in rural school Y. In this particular lesson, after teaching about giving gifts to friends, teacher Y asked the

learners to draw a picture of what they would like to be given as a gift by their friends. This, the learners did from their imagination which promotes creativity and cognitive development.

Teachers in the observed classrooms seemed to have a very narrow and fixed view of writing, that is, writing as copying and could not see it any other way. This view of writing could explain for example, why teacher Z asked learners who she thought were writing:

> (324)   *Kiria bukwandika i mbi yoo na gutiri gintu mbaandikiite kibauuni.*
>
> [What are you writing and I have not written anything on the chalkboard?] **[OT12 SZ. 158]**

According to this teacher, learners can only write what has already been written for them. To her, as it was for the other teachers observed, writing is merely copying letters not learning to put ideas in text/print.

An important observation of this study was that writing development was done simultaneously in all the languages used in the classroom, that is, English and Kiswahili and for some schools the MT was used as well. Learners therefore have to master writing conventions in all two or three languages at the same time. According to the continua of biliteracy development, both simultaneous and/or successive exposure may lead to the same results as long as the development of literacy in one language is not promoted at the expense of the other.

I also found that the expectation in Standard 1 is that by the time the learners leave pre-school, they will have mastered letter formation so that they can already copy letters and numbers from the chalkboard. In most cases, if a learner is found not to have mastered these, they are made to repeat pre-school so that they can perfect their letter formation before joining Standard 1. The focus on writing skills development at this level had mainly to do with handwriting, that is, accuracy and neatness in writing as shall be demonstrated a later section in this chapter (see section 7.2.1.1 below).

Having presented what the practices in the development of language and literacy skills are in multilingual classrooms, I shall now evaluate these practices in order to identify potential barriers to the development of language and literacy skills in such school settings. An awareness of such barriers, it is hoped, will go a long way in helping to improve the practice and consequently learner achievement in multilingual classrooms.

## 7.2 BARRIERS TO LITERACY AND LANGUAGE SKILLS DEVELOPMENT IN MULTILINGUAL CLASSROOMS

Hornberger (2002:44) quoting Stein argues that "issues of literacy are at the heart of educational success in schools". In addition, Ball (2011:11) observes that the key to the effectiveness of teaching and learning methods is communication, hence "how languages are used in the classroom can hinder or facilitate communication and learning". Thus, language use in the classroom can either empower or disempower the learners in that speaking a L1 that differs from the MoI of the local education curriculum is one of the risk factors in literacy development (see for example Duncan & Seymour, 2000; Catts et al., 2001; Justice et al., 2002; Cavanaugh et al., 2004). Considering the centrality of language use in multilingual contexts like those studied here, it was deemed important in this study to identify any barriers to the development of literacy and language skills in multilingual classrooms. This was done following the classroom observations and the findings from objectives 1 and 2 already presented in the preceding two chapters. It would not have been sufficient to merely document what is happening in the classrooms. Illuminating potential barriers to the development of language and literacy skills would go a long way in informing teachers in such contexts and hopefully improving success rates through more effective teaching and learning methods in such school settings. For this reason, the observed barriers to the development of language and literacy skills in multilingual classrooms are discussed in this research report.

Nine categories of barriers emerged from the interrogation of data relating to barriers to the effective development of literacy and language skills in multilingual classrooms. Further interrogation of these categories in search for themes amongst these yielded three broad themes namely teacher-related barriers, language-related barriers and methodology-related barriers. This categorisation should help to ensure that the suggestions made are addressed in the right places, for instance, through teacher preparation if they are teacher-related or through policy adjustment if they are language-related.

### 7.2.1 Teacher-related barriers

This theme was used for barriers that directly related to teachers' ways of doing things in the classroom that could hinder language and literacy skills development. These barriers mainly had to do with teachers' own beliefs about literacy and language development.

### *7.2.1.1 Emphasis on neatness and accuracy*

A number of studies have shown that overdue attention to correct form in writing instruction could have negative effects on writing experiences and perceptions of learners (see for example Edelsky & Jibert, 1985). I noted an overemphasis on accuracy and correct form of the letters in all four classes observed. As in the South African schools studied by Bloch (1998:19) where she found that children are introduced to writing as a mechanical task where neatness is emphasised, in the Kenyan classes I observed, all emphasis is on copying and neat and/or accurate letter formation. The following extracts illustrate this.

**Extract 37 – School W (Maths lesson)**

(325)  T:  *Write the date na kazi iwe sa^?*

[Write the dates and your work should be neat]

(326)  Ls:  *Safi*

[Neat]

(327)  T:  *Five iende kwa* box *yake four kwa* box *yake.* I want you to write neat work. You just write neat work. *Upange kazi yako vizuri*

[Five in its own box, four in its own box. ... Arrange your work neatly] **[OT4 SW. 49]**

Evidently, teacher W2 is very emphatic on 'neat work' and goes ahead to describe what that neatness would entail. For her, neat work entails putting each letter in its own box in the squared books that are used for Mathematics exercises.

On several occasions, the teacher openly criticised children's handwriting. For example in school W, Teacher W2 says this to two different learners while checking their work:

(328)  *Mwandishi mbaya learner S ... mwandiko mbaya.*

[Very bad handwriting learner S - bad handwriting] **[OT8 SW. 95]**

(329)  *Unaandika bila namba kwa nini? [...]. Nawe unaandika kazi mbaya chafu. Kila namba kwa* box *yake.*

[Why are you writing without numbering? [...]. You are writing bad dirty work. Every number in its own box] **[OT9 SW. 112**]

In another instance in the same classroom, teacher W2 says this to a learner in reference to how he/she writes number '5':

(330)  *Learner R, hii* five *yako inaakaa /s/. Nenda uniandikie hapa* five *mingi. Hivi, hivi harafu hivi.. unaona? Enda uniandikie* five *nyingi hapa.*

> [Learner R, your 5 looks like /s/. Go and write for me many 5s. Like this, and then like this, and then like this, you see? - demonstrating how he/she should write them. Go and write for me many 5s here] **[OT9 SW. 114]**.

Here teacher W2 criticises the learner's handwriting and demonstrates how the number in question should be written. She then requires the learner to write many more 5s to show that he/she had mastered the task. However, as Bloch (1997:38) observes, such remedial measures involving a "repetitious exercise of the 'faulty' letters in isolation" have been criticised for their ability to deter learners from experiencing the relationship between letters, harms self-esteem, motivation and confidence and may distract them from attempting to make sense of their writing (Bloch, 1997:38). Similar observations were made in all the other sites used in this study.

According to Bloch (1997:34) teaching methods that value neatness and accuracy over creativity and communication do not produce ardent readers and writers. This is especially so for children who have already developed some concepts of written language by the time they enter school. My observations were that children are not allowed any space for initiative, their own construction of meaning or emergent writing (Holdaway, 1979). An alternative approach to writing development would focus on writing as expression of meaning rather than accuracy, and the writings may have meaning for the writer but not necessarily for the reader. In a multilingual context, this is as important, if not more so, as elsewhere.

Further interrogation of the approach to writing in the observed classes indicates that these practices go against current thinking on writing development. Copying what has already been written as a learning strategy does not fit in any of the four learning theories namely developmental by Jean Paiget, Schema by R.C. Anderson, social learning theory by Albert Bandura and socio-cultural learning theory by Lev Vygotsky. Current thinking seems to favour the social approaches to learning (Malone, 2001) but teachers in the observed classes seemed to move away from it. In fact, of the over 80 lessons observed, there was only one instance where children worked in pairs in the urban school class and this was during a lesson where learners were reading for recognition of syllables.

In my view, the extent to which the copying and repetition strategy are used in the observed classes disregards other preferred ways of learning. For example, according to the developmental learning theory advanced by Piaget, during the pre-operational stage (ages 2-7), learning takes place through experimentation (Davis, 1991:4). However, in the classes

observed, teacher-centred approaches to learning, also learning to write, seemed to dominate all classroom activities. This can be ascribed, atleast in part, to the use of languages that are not familiar to the learners as MoI. Even in contexts where the MoI was the language of the majority of the children in the class, for example school Y, the reality of English examinations dictated that English was widely used hence the prevalence of teacher-centred approaches to learning.

My contribution, following Ferreiro and Teberosky (1982:277) is that learners should be allowed the space to find out for themselves what written language can do for them in order to move from their unconventional writing to the conventional one. It is only by allowing them to write for meaning that they learn to use written language for what it can do for them. The aim after all is to develop users of written language both as readers and writers.

### 7.2.1.2 Teachers as learners' linguistic models

Chaudron (1995) has argued that teachers of English are the learners' linguistic models. I would like to argue here that the same applies to teachers' use of other languages. Teachers are indeed the learners' role models when it comes to the use of language. This is reflected in the fact that children use the same kinds of code switching and mixing as teachers in the observed classes. Some children even use ritualised participation strategies exactly similar to those used their teachers. It was observed that teachers do not always use the standardised forms of the language especially Kiswahili, when teaching content subjects. This was the case in all the classrooms observed. Conventionalised Kiswahili grammar rules are only followed in these classrooms when Kiswahili is taught as a language subject, but not when content is translated from English to Kiswahili or when Kiswahili is used as the MoI. This was especially marked in the urban and peri-urban sites where Kiswahili is used a lot more than in the rural schools Y and Z. The following excerpts from school W and Y illustrate this observation:

(331)  *Simameni hapa na vitabu **zenu*** instead of *simameni hapa na vitabu **vyenu**.*
       [Stand here with your books] **[OT1 SW. 14].**

(332)  *Harafu jina yote itakuwa ni^* instead of *harafu jina lote litakuwa ni^*.
       [And the whole word will be^] **[OT6 SY. 23].**

Since teachers are the key linguistic models that their learners have, they should ideally themselves use the grammatically correct forms of Kiswahili in interacting with the learners. Teachers make an attempt to teach the grammatical Kiswahili when teaching Kiswahili as a

language subject but they do not do this consistently when using it as MoI or when they translate content from English into Kiswahili.

There are obvious challenges when a learner hears something said in one way during a specific lesson and hears it said in another way in a second lesson. The same rules that are taught during the Kiswahili language lesson and are supposed to be applied when speaking Kiswahili are broken by the teachers when teaching content subjects. For instance, in a Kiswahili language lesson, one of the lessons children learn is noun classes in Kiswahili. They learn about classes such as the **ki-vi** noun class for singular and plural nouns respectively. Here, learners are taught about the subject-verb agreement rule when it comes to these noun classes. However, you will find that in a content subject, the teacher pays no attention to the subject -verb agreement as illustrated in the following excerpt:

**Extract 38 – School W (Maths Lesson)**

(333)  T:  Again, show me your five fingers

(334)  T:  *Kila mtu anionyeshe vidole **za**ke tano instead of kila mtu anionyeshe vidole **vya**ke vitano*

[Everyone show me your five fingers]

(335)  T:  Remove two ... toa mbili

(336)  T:  *Kunja mbili uone **zi**nabaki ngapi instead of kunja **vi**wili uone **vi**nabaki **vi**ngapi*

[Fold two fingers and count how many will remain]

(337)  T:  ***Zimebaki ngapi*** *instead of **vimebaki vingapi**?*

[How many have remained?]

(338)  Ls:  Three **[OT9 SW. 111].**

As can be observed from the above excerpt, the teacher breaks the subject-verb agreement when she says *'zake'* instead of *'vyake'* and *'tano'* instead of *'vitano'* in (334); *'zinabaki* instead of *'vinabaki'*, *'mbili'* instead of *'viwili'* in (336); and *'zimebaki ngapi?'* instead of *'vimebaki vingapi?'* in (337). Although the teacher may be doing this unconsciously, the challenge comes when the learners are tested in Kiswahili and the forms that they hear their teachers using on a daily basis are not accepted in the examinations. In the examinations, the learners have to adhere to the rules. In fact, they are tested on such grammatical aspects as subject-verb agreement.

With the exception of teacher Z, all teachers used grammatically incorrect forms of Kiswahili in class especially when teaching content subjects or addressing the learners directly, for example when giving directions. This affects how they learn Kiswahili as a language subject.

The fact that children repeat what the teacher says, even when it changes the meaning of the sentence, shows that they largely echo whatever the teacher says without necessarily understanding what they are saying. The learners are so used to repeating exactly what the teacher says as a result of the ritualised participation strategies of the teachers, which makes them prone to repeating anything as it is said without questioning the grammatical forms. It is clear that a majority of the children do not have good grasp of the languages used in the classes, so they simply repeat what is said even when they do not know what it means.

The effect of teachers' language on children's language development was witnessed in the two story-telling sessions observed in school W. Learners used language in exactly the same way their teacher did. For example, when telling their own stories, the learners employed both code switching and the ritualised participation strategies that their teacher had used. Like their teachers, they switched amongst the different languages within their repertoire to make up for the linguistic gaps in the matrix languages. Some of the learners were able to use even the rising intonation (^) at the end of an incomplete word as a way of motioning response from the listeners in the same way their teachers used the rising tone to evoke responses from the learners. This further emphasises the role of teachers as linguistic models for their learners. This being the case, the teachers W, X and Y could be modelling the use of ungrammatical Kiswahili sentences and phrases to their learners since these learners seem to pick up the linguistic behaviours or mannerisms of their teachers.

It is however the case that many teachers are not very proficient in Kiswahili even though they are entrusted with teaching using Kiswahili as a MoI in multilingual classrooms in urban and peri-urban settings where it is considered to be the language of the schools' catchment areas. This may also explain why the teachers in the urban and peri-urban classes observed opted for English as MoI even though they identified Kiswahili as the language of their schools' catchment areas. Considering that the teachers are L2 speakers of Kiswahili, these errors need to be seen as typical of lingua franca use in multilingual contexts.

### 7.2.1.3 Writing-punishment association

In all the classes observed, those who had not finished their writing exercises before the next activity or before the break, would be told by the teacher not to go out for break or participate in the next activity until they have finished. Thus writing was used as a form of punishment for the learners. This could cause learners to associate writing with punishment so that they may not enjoy or develop their writing skills effectively. When they view writing as a

punishment, they may hate it and may not want anything to do with it beyond the classroom walls. This in turn hinders writing skills development on the part of the learners.

**Extract 39 – School Z**

(339)   T:   *Aaya nuriku uyu utirathiria?*

[Okey, who has not finished?]

[...]

(340)   T:   *Umenye ura atirathiria atiina karwimbo.*

[You know the one who has not finished will not sing the song.]

(341)   T:   *I nintanga ibuku riaku.*

[Bring your book quickly.]

(342)   T:   *Kuri muntu atekwina karwimbo ... nuriku uria?*

[Someone will not sing the song ... who is it?] **[OT1 SZ. 8].**

In this instance, teacher Z uses writing as the basis for denying some learners to take part in the singing because they have not finished copying what she had written for them on the chalkboard as indicated in (340) and (342) above. Again this may make writing to be viewed as a punishment by those who are denied the opportunity to take part in the activities that other learners are involved in on the account that they have not finished writing their work. It could be argued that rewarding writing with breaks and singing as exemplified in the instance above could work to positively reinforce those who have finished, but these are in most cases in the minority. A greater percentage of the learners at this level are those who could not write/copy as fast as the teacher expected them to. Requiring them to sit and finish their writing/copying while others are out playing or singing may have a negative effect on them in terms of their writing development if they learn to associate writing with punishment as implied in the teachers' actions.

### 7.2.1.4 The learner-learner interaction ban

My observation was that that learner-learner interaction was 'demonised' in the observed classrooms over and over again. I find that learners may take this negatively and eventually not like to talk at all. Teachers could devise better ways of silencing their learners in class when they want them quiet. Interaction amongst children helps them as they develop their speaking and other related expression skills. If they hear talking being criticised and presented as bad behaviour over and over again, they may want to avoid it if they can. The following excerpt illustrates how learner-learner interaction is viewed by the teacher.

**Extract 40 – School W**

(343)   T:   Mimi sijawahi ona watu wakiandika na mdomo. *Watu wanandika na mkono na mdomo unafunga.*

        [I have never seen people writing with their mouths. People write with their hands while the mouths are shut.]

        [...]

(344)   T:   *Andika, na yule anaongea ata andiki vizuri kwa sababu yeye anaongea mpaka anasahau chenye anataka kuandika.*

        [Write and the one who is talking is not even writing correctly because you talk and forget what you are supposed to be writing.]

(345)   T:   *Sitaki kusikia sauti nataka kuona tu watu wakifanya kazi.*

        [I don't want t hear any sounds/voices ... I want people to work.]

(346)   T:   If I get you talking *tutakosana.*

              [we will differ.]

(347)   T:   *Nyamazeni, mwenye amemaliza alale kwa* desk.

        [Keep quiet, those who have finished sleep on your desks] **[OT1 SW. 10].**

In this excerpt, teacher W1 communicates to the learners that talking makes one not write properly because they forget what they are to be writing in (344), so they should write with their mouths shut as indicated in her words in (345). In (346), the teacher makes it clear to the learners that if she finds anyone talking, they will differ and finally in (347) declares that she would rather have the learners sleep on their desks when they have finished writing than talk to each other. I observed similarities regarding these practices across the different study sites in how learner-learner interaction was viewed. In the following extract, I demonstrate that some learners have actually internalised this to further support the argument made here.

**Extract 41**

(348)   T:   *Muntu uyu ukwaria nakuumbitiria.*

        [Whoever is talking is offending me]

(349)   T:   *Muntu uyu ukwaria ti mucoore wa mwarimu.*

        [Whoever is talking is not a friend of the teacher]

(350)   L:   *Na ti mwega.*

        [And is not a good person]

(351)   T:   *Ii, na ti mwega.*

        [Yes, and is not a good person] **[OT6 SZ. 115].**

Notice here that in turn (349), when the teacher says 'whoever is talking is not a friend of the teacher', it is actually a learner who adds *"na ti mwega"* (he/she is not good) as shown in turn

(350). This may mean that these learners have already internalised these associations. They may therefore want to keep quiet even when they should be talking if only to avoid being seen as 'not good', which may in turn hurt their language development.

One of the big questions I could not help asking as I observed these classes was: When will they develop their expression skills if they cannot be allowed to speak to each other in the class? The break time when they can talk to each other is about 35 - 50 minutes per day. This is the only time in the school day that they get to speak besides responding to a few questions from the teacher. This is not sufficient for the language development and consequently literacy skills development. Group work, which is another avenue through which children could be allowed to interact with each other during the classroom time, is underutilised. Except for two instances of learners working in pairs in schools W and Y, no group work time was observed in any of the classrooms during the entire period of field work, that is, over 80 lessons in total.

According to Malone (2001:10), one of the basic tenets of the socio-cultural learning theory, is that thought is aided by speech and not the reverse. Teachers in the observed classes seemed to be unaware of this relationship. The strictness with which they banned learner-learner interactions reveals that they do not think such interactions are beneficial to the learners' thought processes. On the contrary, teachers believe that talking slows them down and makes them forget what they are supposed to be writing as reflected in (344) above and the further exemplified below.

> (352)   *Nuriku ukwandika na kanyua. Muntu ura akwandika na kanyua amenye nike ukathiria arigiitie. Na atiithirwa aandikiite bwega.*
>
> [Who is writing with their mouth? Whoever is writing with their mouth should know that they will finish last. And they will not have written well or correctly]
> **[OT4 SZ. 52].**

Certainly, teacher Z is completely oblivious of the role that  plays in aiding the thought processes amongst young learners. According to her, those who talk are bound to finish last which could be interpreted to mean that talking slows them down as reflected in the teacher's words in (436) that *"muntu ura ukwandika na kanyua amenye nike ukathiria arigiitie"* (whoever is writing with their mouth should know that they will finish last).

I argue here that such misconceptions about child-talk, whether it is the inner speech or learner-learner interactions, could hinder the development of language and literacy skills for

these learners. Since talking is associated with inability to write fast, writing badly or wrongly, children may tend to suppress their inner speech for fear of not writing properly or wrongly and finishing last. Suppressing their inner speech is tantamount to suppressing their thought processes, which will definitely have negative effects on not only their language and literacy skills development but also their cognitive skills development.

At two of the study sites, there were learners who sang as they wrote. This could be equated to the "inner speech", which is vital to the process of trying to accomplish a task (Malone, 2001 discussing Vygotsky). Sometimes the talk that the teacher discourages could be the inner speech that learners are involved in as they try to accomplish a task not necessarily talking to each other or making noise as perceived by teacher. In fact, according to Malone (2001:11), Vygotsky considers this kind of talk a feature of a child's thinking process which may continue well into adulthood. Although repetition is encouraged in socio-cultural learning theory, the emphasis is not on verbal but action-related repetition. Verbal repetition needs to be accompanied by actions or demonstrations especially in a language learning situation, which was not observed in the research sites used in this study.

In his discussion of the socio-cultural learning theory, Malone (2001:12) highlights three implications of the theory, which could be relevant in educational settings and especially in the early years: a) If knowledge is socially constructed, then it is very important for learners to be allowed to converse, to exchange ideas, to interact with their mentors and fellow learners; b) If thought develops as people use speech, then the act of speaking is as important as the act of listening for learning new information/concepts/skills shared by others; and c) The role of the teacher/facilitator, then, is to provide opportunities for learners to dialogue (ibid). All three aspects were totally disregarded in the schools observed in this study.

Another emphasis of the socio-cultural learning theory is on the fact that thought is aided by speech (Malone, 2011 disucssing Vygotsky). However, instances of talking are very minimal in class especially in the urban school observed. For example, teacher W1 in the urban school tells the children, *"if you are tired sleep and wait for the break*," instead of talking to each other in the class. In one instance, the teacher asks the learners, *"are you in baby class? You sit down and keep quiet because you are in class one"*. To this teacher, talking/learner-learner interaction is not part of learning. It could also be deduced from this statement that talking in class is a reserve of those in baby class presumably because those are the ones still learning to talk. So since these ones already 'know how to talk' (they are in class one) they should remain

quiet. This same restriction is exerted on the learners even during Physical Education (PE) lessons that were observed out in the field.

Arguably, language develops through use. Thus, if a learner's L1 is not used in education, it may not become fully developed for more abstract and academic use, the CALP, as theorised by Cummins (1979). Very little interaction happens in the classroom especially in the urban and peri-urban sites where there are restrictions in terms of language use. Arthur (1996:24) observes that allowing the learners to use a familiar language affords them much greater possibilities for self expression, a possibility which was found to be undermined by insistence on using the little known or understood proscribed school language as is the case in school W and X in the current study. Learners from these sites do not enjoy the same kind of freedom that those from the rural schools seemed to enjoy in their use of language.

In contrast, the rural classes appeared to be more lively and interactive because children were free to use the languages they are comfortable to speak. Learners were observed interacting in their different MTs. In one of the rural classes, one learner was observed moving from his desk to another desk to join other learners who shared the same MT with hime/her. This is a natural social pattern that can be allowed even if elsewhere other languages are being developed. As already discussed, the teacher in school Y seemed to encourage children to respond to her questions in whichever language(s) they felt comfortable to speak. This shows an interesting and positive form of multilingualism. Since language develops through use, and lack or limited conversation/interaction inhibits language development, then this could mean that the restriction in terms of language choices especially in the urban and peri-urban school set up may hinder language development for the learners.

## 7.2.2   Methodology-related barriers

This theme was used for those barriers that could be directly linked to the teaching approaches that teachers adopted in the multilingual classrooms regardless of whether these approaches were influenced by the languages used or other factors.

### 7.2.2.1 Inadequate teaching approaches

Scholars have argued that "learning to read and write in an unfamiliar language works against literacy in that when a child doesn't already know the idea expressed by a word, learning to write and say that word is not literacy but repetition" (Save the Children, 2009:8). Benson (2000:150) argues that "teaching beginning literacy in the child's L1 helps him/her to make connection

between meaningful speech and written language, rather than struggling to decode a language which he/she does not command". If this is true, then it is the case that very little reading and writing development is happening in the observed classes as learners are expected to copy and recite words from the chalkboard and the textbooks whose meanings they do not know. In fact for the entire period of data collection, at no point were the learners allowed to do any free or creative writing. All writing exercises in all the observed classes were limited to either copying from the chalkboard what had already been written for them by the teacher or copying from the textbooks. Even when they copied, it was words and concepts whose meanings they could hardly have known or understood.

It may be worth noting here that teachers seem to adopt the methodologies advocated by the authors of the textbooks they use. A careful documentary analysis to try to ascertain if this was indeed the case, confirmed what had been observed. A good example is this direct quote from the preface of one of the textbooks *'Sound and Read'* where the author had the following instruction to the teachers, and which seemed to be followed to the letter by the teachers that used this particular book:

> *The reader might not know the meanings of certain words in this book; he/she will be free to consult with his / her helper or teacher* **only** *after learning how to read and spell the words* **perfectly** [italics and bold added].

This shows a belief that there is only one particular way of doing things; that things must be done in a certain order which must be rigidly followed and the emphasis on perfection seemingly unaware of the fact that reading without meaning is not reading. Critics of phonics approach argue that knowing the sounds of a word is only a part of reading, which becomes complete reading when the learner knows the meaning of the words that he/she is sounding out (Ng, 2006).

Supporting this argument, Stroud (2001:51) contends that "[t]eaching reading is more effective when teachers' emphasise understanding what is read". Williams (2004:35) further observes that the concern with "access to schooling" is misguided when the "schooling is to be accessed without meaning". In the observed classes, the meaning of what is read is de-emphasised by the teachers as it is in the materials they use, confirming that teachers follow the methodologies that the textbook authors advocate (see also ADEA, 2006). Thus, selection of textbooks determines the teaching methods, with no interrogation of what is appropriate.

### 7.2.2.2 Learner pairing and/or grouping underutilised

Although the socio-cultural learning theory emphasises learning as a socially constructed process (Malone, 2001), learner pairing and/grouping was underutilised in the observed classrooms. Of all the lessons observed, only two instances of learner pairing were observed, one in school W and the other in school Y, while no instances of group work were observed throughout the data collection period. In school W, the teacher paired learners so that they could try sounding out syllables (in pairs) while she marked their work. In school Y, the teacher paired learners during an English lesson so that one learner could ask the question 'What is your name? ', to which the other learner would be expected to respond.

Again this is to say that the concentration on and/or over-emphasis of one strategy overlooks other likely successful strategies in the classroom. Similar observations are reported in a study of the functions and constraints of English as MoI in Botswana schools (Arthur, 1994). Arthur (1994:70) reports that "relatively little instructional time is devoted to co-operative group-work". Where this happens, Arthur argues, teachers have very few opportunities to support learners through exploratory work.

### 7.2.3   Language-related barriers

These barriers had to do with the teaching approaches that teachers adopt in their classrooms as a result of having to use as MoI, a language that is not familiar to the learners.

### 7.2.3.1 The regularised features of classroom discourse

It has been argued that "the nature of classroom talk and the participation opportunities given to learners usually determine the nature of output of the learning process" (Nomlomo, 2010:129). The learning output referred to here includes the development of literacy and language skills. As already discussed in chapter six (see section 6.3), the typical structure of classroom discourse in the classes observed, followed the IRF/E format as theorised by Synclair and Coulthard (1975). This nature of classroom interaction is initiated by the teacher usually in the form of a question which learners get to answer in only a word or a short phrase (see for example Pontefract & Hardman, 2005; Arthur, 1996; Adger, 2001). This means that learners in such classrooms do not often get opportunities to express themselves or speak at length. Instead, they spend most of their time in the classrooms repeating words, phrases or sentences after the teacher as revealed in previous studies (see for example Arthur,

1994; Cleghorn et al., 1989; Ndayipfukamiye, 1993). This lack of opportunities to express oneself fully and freely could be a real barrier to the development of both speaking and writing skills in such classrooms.

### 7.2.3.2 Choice of language of teaching and learning

Leading scholars in the field of BE/MLE agree that children's L1 is the most effective language for early literacy and content area instruction (see for example Benson, 2002; Thomas & Collier, 1997; Klaus, 2003; Cummins, 2000b). Grimes (2009:1) sees it as axiomatic that the "first language is the language of learning". This means that when there is a mismatch between this language of learning (the L1) and the language of instruction, difficulties are bound to occur. In their 11 years' longitudinal research of 42,000 minority language children in the USA, Thomas and Collier (1997:53) report that "[t]he most powerful factor in predicting education success for minority language children is the amount of schooling they received in their L1". The World Bank (2005:1) observes that "[f]ifty percent of the world's out-of-school children live in communities where the language of schooling is rarely, if ever, used at home", which further underscores the difficulties that result from a mismatch in education of the MoI and the learners' L1s.

The use of a language that children understand allows teachers to use more interactive and more effective teaching methods (Save the Children, 2009), which are learner-centred, when compared to teacher-centred approaches that are adopted when an unfamiliar language is used. Additionally, teaching in L1 has been linked to better acquisition of literacy skills that also bridge over to the second or national language (see for example Fafunwa et al., 1989; Williams, 1998). Learning to read in an unfamiliar language has been shown to have long term negative consequences on academic achievement (see for example Collier, 1987; Collier & Thomas, 1988). This affirms how probable it is that the use as MoI, a language that is unfamiliar to the learners hinders the development of literacy and language skills.

In all the observed classes, it could be said that there was a mismatch between the languages classroom teachers chose as MoI and the L1s the learners represented in their classrooms. In school W and X, 11 and 6 languages respectively, were represented in the Standard 1 class but Kiswahili, which was an L1 of minority children (if any), was chosen as MoI. In school Y, the learner population represented 3 different languages but only one of these languages was chosen as the MoI. Three different languages were also represented amongst the learner population in school Z. Kiembu, which was teacher Z's L1, was used as the MoI. In all these

classes, even the 'preferred' MoI was seldom used exclusively as code switching amongst all languages within the teachers' linguistic repertoires, prevailed both in the teaching of languages and well as the content subjects (see table 4.1 for a summary of language distribution in the observed classrooms).

This analysis of the language situation in the observed classes reveals a mismatch between the languages spoken as L1s by the learners and the languages that teachers chose as MoI. As a result, learners who are not L1 speakers of the languages preferred as MoI, are bound to experience difficulties in both the development of literacy and language skills in unfamiliar languages. Teachers are also forced to revert to frontal teaching methodologies which are teacher-centred and less effective when compared to learner-centred methodologies, with the latter being facilitated by the use as MoI, a language that is familiar to the learners.

### 7.2.3.3 Unbalanced introduction of L2 and/or L3

Closely linked to the unfamiliar language barrier is the unbalanced[30] simultaneous introduction of the L2 and L3 in multilingual classrooms both as subjects and as MoI. Research supports the gradual introduction of the L2 first orally (Malone, 2007) and as a subject of study (Ball, 2011), and the subsequent use of the L2 as MoI. It has been established by leading scholars in the BE/MLE field that it takes at least six years of learning a language as a subject before the learner can cope with that language as a MoI in a well resourced system, while it takes eight to nine years in less resourced schools (Heugh, 2005; 2011:120). In all the observed classes, both English and Kiswahili are introduced at the same time as the MT and in some cases (W and X), used as MoI simultaneously as they are introduced as subjects of study. For example, in school W as already discussed, although the teachers translated the content from English to Kiswahili, there were times when the teachers ignored the language barrier and taught purely in English meaning that in such instances, English was the MoI. This was happening despite the fact that children had been introduced to English language as a subject of study barely a month before this research took place.

A review of scientific literature on factors that influence cross-linguistic comparison of reading results reveals that children attain reading fluency at different rates depending on complexity[31] of the language(s) involved. For example, if instructed well, children learning languages with simple

---

[30] Unbalanced here is used to refer to the concentration on one end of the L1-L2 continuum as theorised in the biliteracy continua (Hornberger, 2003).

[31] The complexity of a language is determined by among others the visual transparency of the script, consistency of spelling and word length (See Gove & Cvelich, 2011).

and consistent links between letter and sounds (transparent scripts) such as Italian and Spanish, are able to recognise familiar words and decode new ones with near perfect accuracy by the end of grade one (Gove & Cvelich, 2011:6). In contrast, it takes two and half years of schooling for children learning opaque languages such as English, which has many irregularities, to attain similar reading fluency (ibid) (see also Abadzi, 2006).

If it takes this long for learners of English, who are also L1 speakers of English, and who encounter the language in their environment all along, to attain near reading fluency, it is unreasonable of an educational system to expect learners for whom English is neither their L1 nor L2, to be able to read in English after a few months in school. This demand on the learners is evident in the fact that teachers write notes for the learners in English. When asked why this is the case, there was an almost unanimous response from the teachers; that when the learners get used to seeing the words written, they may recognise their form, when they encounter them in examinations. However, recognising the form of the words does not mean that the learners understand what those words mean. English is also the language of the textbooks that the learners are provided with and are expected to read, and as already discussed in an earlier chapter, the language of examinations (see section 5.3.3 for a discussion on language of textbooks and examinations).

## 7.3    CONCLUSION

This chapter has provided a summarised description of the current practices in language and literacy development in the multilingual classrooms studied. The observed barriers to literacy and language development in such school settings have also been discussed. Although there is no agreement amongst scholars as to which methodologies give the best learning outcomes, pointers to good practice indicate that learner-centred approaches are to be preferred over teacher-centred ones. Due to the language dilemma in the observed classrooms, teachers are forced to revert to a frontal pedagogy, which is teacher-centred and promotes rote learning. Consequently there is a mismatch between teachers' own beliefs about learning and their actual classroom behaviour.

In the next chapter, I present a summary of the findings of this study, the conclusions that can be made based on these findings and the recommendations for improving practice and hopefully learning in multilingual classrooms. Pointers are also given as to how this study could be extended.

# CHAPTER 8

# SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

*Language is a social action that defines individuals as well as communities. ... Only through understanding the complexities involved can teachers begin to change the language of literacy from one of exclusion to one of inclusion* (Williams & Snipper, 1990:12).

## INTRODUCTION

In chapter seven, I have presented an analysis and interpretation of data relating to the development of language and literacy skills in the observed multilingual classrooms. This included an overview of the materials used in the observed classrooms, the use of stories in the development of language and literacy skills as well as an assessment of the learning environments for print richness or "deprivedness". A discussion of the barriers to the development of language and literacy skills in such school settings has also been provided anchored on the data generated. In this final chapter of this thesis, I summarise the main findings of the study along with the implications and recommendations for language-in-education policy planning and implementation in the specific context of this research, which could hopefully also relate to similar multilingual contexts. Suggestions for further research are made in acknowledgement of the fact that more research is needed in relation to the language practices in multilingual classroom contexts.

## 8.1    SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Three chapters (5-7) in this research report have presented the data I worked with and given an elaborate discussion of how what was observed and otherwise collected, relate to the objectives of this study and assist in answering the specific questions. In chapter five I presented the findings that relate to the first objective of the study, that deals with teachers' understandings of linguistic diversity in relation to their own skills, attitudes and their interpretations of the language-in-education policy they implement in their classrooms. In chapter six I presented the responses of teachers to linguistic diversity in multilingual classrooms as these relate to the second objective of the study. In chapter seven I presented and discussed the data relating to the third and fourth objectives of the study, that deal with literacy and language development in multilingual

classrooms. A summary of the main findings follows below. For easy reference, I insert the research question (section 1.3.1) as well as the research objectives (section 1.3.3) before I give the summary of findings. I shall attend here not only to the direct answers to various aspects of the research question, and to the outcome of considering specific aims; but also give the insights gained on other pertinent aspects of the research problem, such as on aspects of the Kenyan language-in-eduction policy more generally. Finally, this chapter will also address objective (v), which is to make suggestions, on the basis of the outcomes of this study, as to the use of languages in multilingual classrooms with the goal of multiliteracy development in such school settings.

**Guiding research question**: How are the attitudes, skills and strategies of teachers articulated and implemented in their handling of linguistic diversity in language and literacy development amongst year one learners in different kinds of multilingual classrooms in Kenyan primary schools**?**

**Objectives of the study**:

(i)     To determine the understandings that teachers have of linguistic diversity and its effect on learning in multilingual classrooms;

(ii)    To investigate the strategies employed by teachers to accommodate linguistic diversity in multilingual classrooms;

(iii)   To describe current practice in literacy and language development in multilingual classrooms;

(iv)    To identify potential barriers to language and literacy development amongst year one learners in multilingual classrooms;

(v)     To make suggestions for language and multiliteracy development in multilingual classrooms.

### 8.1.1   Teachers' understanding of multilingualism in their classrooms

In this study, the ways in which teachers understand the nature of the linguistic diversity in their classrooms, were specifically linked to how they understood the term "mother tongue", particularly as the term is used in the Kenyan educational context. Here, considering the work

set out in chapter 5, I shall consider some of the insights this study has developed regarding the definitions and re-interpretations of the term "mother tongue".

Clarity of educational policy objectives, especially with respect to the implementation guidelines, has been identified as a key determinant to successful implementation of language-in-education policies (see for example Bamgbose, 1991; International Institute of Educational Planning, IIEP, 1997). Unclear objectives have been shown to lead to random and often varying interpretations of the policy especially in the implementation stages (IIEP, 1997). The varying definitions and re-interpretations of the term "mother tongue" by the participating teachers as brought out in this study could thus be viewed as a consequence of unclear policy statement. The variations are indicative of the competing discourses that persist not only on the macro level of e.g. language planning, but also on the micro levels as e.g among colleagues on the same teaching level when they act as policy implementers in schools. This study reveals that even within the same school, competing discourses may prevail in the decisions on which languages should count as "mother tongue" and thus be used as MoI on the one hand, and/or be taught as MT subject on the other hand. This is evidenced in the fact that even within the same school, different languages may be used as MoI, and again different languages may be taught as the MT subject in successive levels. This is often decided not on principled grounds of how the local "mother tongue" in a multilingual community is to be identified and used according to the policy, but rather on accidental circumstantial eventualities of e.g. an individual teachers' L1, the teachers' preferences or the insistence of the parents.

### 8.1.2   Teachers' attitudes regarding linguistic diversity

This study reveals a range in teachers' attitudes towards linguistic diversity in their classrooms, from forbid the use of L1s by the learners in the classrooms as is the case in the urban and peri-urban to accommodative tolerance of L1s in classrooms interactions as was the case in the rural schools. However, even where the learners' L1s were tolerated in the classroom, learners had to write their examinations in English. The same liberty to use their L1s in the classrooms was not afforded them in the examination rooms, which brings in a different level of attitude in the range namely, forbid L1s in examinations. As a result, teachers' expressed desires about language use in their classrooms did not necessarily match their actual classroom behaviours. Although understanding of content is a goal in their

teaching, what they did sometimes did not reflect that belief. Instead, examinations in English became the implicit overriding goal as reflected in their language practices.

Commenting on Tanzanian learners' expressed desire to be taught in English even though they understood Kiswahili better, Roy-Campbell (1992) views it as indicative of the perception of where power is located in society. Yates (1995) sees the anomaly of preference of little understood languages as MoI over familiar languages as indicative that language preference is not simply a matter of pedagogical effectiveness but sees it as linked to the wider political and social political factors amongst them the perceived status of different languages. In the Kenyan classrooms studied, the power of English over other languages is evident in teachers' classroom practices, the examinations and the textbooks used. The perceived economic utility of English in the broader social political context mirrors in the classrooms as what I would like to call here the 'perceived examination utility' of English. This perceived examination utility of English in the observed classrooms is reflected in the language choices and prioritisations teachers make in their classrooms. The continuous reference to examinations and teaching of "test-like" content, to borrow the words of Shohamy (2006:94), are indicative of this perceived utility.

### 8.1.3   Teachers' skills regarding responses to linguistic diversity

Like previous studies that have reported on the skills of teachers of linguistically diverse learners (see for example Penfield, 1987; Haworth, 2003; Graham, 2009; Jones, 2010), this study has confirmed the participating teachers' paucity of skills in dealing with linguistic diversity in their classrooms. This has been linked to the fact that even though Kenya is a multilingual country and linguistic diversity is a given in most if not all classrooms, teacher preparation does not include dealing with multilingualism in education. As a result, teachers revert to their own coping mechanisms in their classrooms in trying to address the communicative challenges posed by use in education of languages not yet mastered by their learners. A challenge however lies in the fact that even when such mechanisms work, teachers do not feel confident about their use in the classroom and would seek to justify their actions when accorded an opportunity.

### 8.1.4   Teachers' responses to linguistic diversity in their classrooms

Even though teachers in the observed classrooms had not received any training in the preparation on dealing with linguistically diverse learners, through their own intuition, had developed coping strategies for managing the communicative challenges posed by use as MoI, a language that is

unfamiliar to a majority of the learners. These included code switching, translating and interpreting, using learners L1s, repetition and a variety of other forms of ritualised participation strategies. My study indicates that teachers are not aware of some of the strategies they employ, which implies that some of these mechanisms may not be consciously or deliberately employed. However, using direct classroom observation as the main data collection method allowed me to see more than the teachers were aware of.

### 8.1.5   Literacy and language development in a multilingual context

This study indicates that the development of language and literacy skills in multilingual classrooms is faced by myriad barriers, some systemic, others linguistic, and still others may be pedagogical. In relation to the continua of biliteracy model, literacy and language development in the observed classes could be said to weight more power on the ends of the different continua that have been traditionally viewed to wield more power, especially as relates to the context, content and development of biliteracy. For example, as the data discussed in chapter 7 indicates, the production, written and L2 ends of the continua in the development of biliteracy were emphasised at the expense of the reception, oral and L1 ends of the continua. More specifically, the speaking and writing of L2 and L3 were emphasised over the L1 even in contexts where the learners' L1s were tolerated. It is also the case that production of L2 and/or L3 is emphasised over reception in the sense that learners are engaged in rote repetition of words and sentences after the teacher even without understanding what they are repeating, again showing which end of the continuum is weighted over the other.

### 8.2   RECOMMENDATIONS

The main findings of this study point to systemic concerns that impede the implementation of the language- in-education policy. Unless teachers are supported with a conducive environment for successful policy implementation, their own attempts will fail. The recommendations of this study therefore mainly focus on changes that must happen within the different levels in the education system in order to create an enabling environment for teachers to effectively implement the language-in-education policy for the benefit of the learners. The recommendations are presented based on the level within the education system that is targeted by the recommended change.

### 8.2.1   Language-in-education policy

Although not implemented, the current language-in-education policy in Kenya supports an early-exit form of multilingual education. Cumulative research in bilingual/multilingual education demonstrates that the longer a child is allowed to learn in his/her L1, while learning the L2 in a cognitively demanding way, the better the chances of success after elementary school (see for example Ramirez et al., 1991; Dutcher & Tucker, 1996; Thomas & Collier, 1997; Heugh, 2011). Studies further show that early-exit to L2-medium is insufficiently effective in terms of academic achievement when compared to late-exit and maintenance models of bilingual/multilingual education (see for example Ramirez et al., 1991; Dutcher & Tucker, 1996; Thomas & Collier, 1997; Heugh, 2011; Benson et al., 2010). Thomas and Collier (1997), for example, in their study of different types of bilingual education programmes in the USA established a direct link between the duration of L1 instruction and the average percentile rank in national standardised test, after 11 years of schooling, based on the type of programme. Their findings were that those who received L1 instruction for five to six years performed better than those who had L1 instruction for one to three years.

Ramirez (1992:1), in reference to their earlier work, Ramirez et al. (1991), a longitudinal study involving over 2300 Spanish speaking students in 554 Kindergarten to sixth grade in New York, New Jersey, Florida, Texas and California, asserts that giving language minority learners instruction in their home language:

> *does not interfere with or delay their acquisition of English language skills, but helps them to 'catch up' to their English speaking peers in English language arts, English reading and math. In contrast, providing LEP [limited English proficient] students with almost exclusive instruction in English does not accelerate their acquisition of English language arts, reading or math [...]. The data suggest that by Grade 6, students provided with English-only instruction may actually fall further behind their English speaking peers. Data also document that learning a second language will take six or more years.*

Ramirez's observation provides further evidence that language policies that support late-exit models of bilingual/multilingual education are to be preferred over early-exit and transitional ones. In fact, it is argued that the results of early-exit models, like one supported by the current language-in-education policy in Kenya, show little difference with submersion models (see for example Baker, 2001). My argument here is that if early exit shows poor results in an environment where learners experience the school language outside of school, like English in the USA, then even worse results can be expected where the learners only

encounter the school language in school, like is the case of English for many learners in the African context in general, and the Kenyan context in particular. This implies that in such contexts, more time would be required in which to teach English as a language subject before it can be used effectively as MoI.

In this regard, Heugh (2011:120) finds that in the African context, six to eight years of learning the L2 as a subject are required before it can be used effectively as a MoI. Studies show that in most African countries, most children only manage to learn about 500-600 words in L2 by the end of grade three (see for example Heugh, 2005; 2011). She finds that for a child to understand the whole curriculum from grade 4, s/he needs active knowledge of 5000-7000 words, again pointing to the fact that three years of MT instruction as advocated in the current language-in-education policy in Kenya is not sufficient. According to UNESCO (2008:3), "children normally require about 5 to 7 years of L2 learning before they can learn academic subjects through this language exclusively." In their study of the MoI in primary schools of Ethiopia, Benson et al. (2010) report that children taught through their MT for six years or longer show correspondingly more substantial gains, particularly in Mathematics and Science subjects.

As of 2010, and I believe to date, Heugh (2011:124-5) emphatically observes that there is:

> no internationally-acknowledged second language acquisition expert who suggests that transition to the second language by the end of the third year of primary school will serve most children well. No acknowledged expert in psycholinguistics and second language acquisition will suggest that children in developing countries and minority or poor communities can switch from mother-tongue education by the end of the third year (or grade) to the second language and achieve well across the curriculum by the second half of primary school or in secondary school. There is no internationally-recognised or validated research that shows that this is possible.

Here, Heugh brings out the need for policy makers to keep abreast with current research and review language-in-education policies in line with current thinking and trends. This calls for a critical appraisal and review of research evidence by policy makers, which requires adjustments in their thinking to accommodate new evidence.

Based on these strong evidence-based propositions, I suggest a change in the Kenyan language-in-education policy from early-exit to late-exit model of bilingual/multilingual education if the real benefits of L1-medium have to be realised through increased academic

achievement. The national language-in-education policy should include clear implementation guidelines, which permit educational decisions to be made at the local and regional levels, taking into account the local conditions and needs, to assure successful implementation, in what has been termed bottom-up approaches to policy implementation. Such approaches to language-in-education policy implementation have been shown to be successful in Peru (see for example Jacobsen & Forero, 2010), and in Ethiopia (see for example Benson et al., 2010). In Ethipia for example, the nine autonomous regions of the country have been empowered to make decisions to do with which community languages to use as MoI and for how long in school system, with very positive results.

Congruent with the other changes necessitated by the recommended change in the language-in-education policy, the definition of the term "mother tongue" needs unpacking. Such unpacking should include but not be limited to a clear delineation of the criteria for determining the "mother tongue" in linguistically diverse classrooms. This will not only minimise the discrepancies that currently persist in the interpretations of the policy and the language choices made but will also ensure that language is viewed as a resource in multilingual classrooms both at the macro and micro levels, the policy planning and implementation levels respectively. Unless the views about language at both levels are synchronised, the practice in terms of language-in-education policy implementation are likely to continue to differ from the stated policy.

The definition of "mother tongue" should also consider current debates relating to disinventing and reconstituting languages (see for example Makoni & Pennycook, 2007) that see language not as countable entities per se and seek to instead reflect on people's use of language as opposed to people as language users (García, 2007). This would mean that in the urban and peri-urban contexts, like those studied here, instead of confronting the complexity of identifying the learners' mother tongues, urban vernaculars which are largely spoken by most learners (García, 2007) could be adopted as the mother tongues and consequently used as the MoI in a late-exit model of multilingual education proposed above. In the rural areas, where linguistic diversity has been shown to be minimal, the 'real' mother tongues of the learners should be encouraged.

### 8.2.2 Teacher preparation and education

The negative effects of inadequately or ill-prepared teachers on language-in-education policy implementation has been documented in a number of studies (see for example Zappa-

Hollman, 2007; Bloch, 1998; Pluddeman et al., 2000). Although all teachers in the current study were graduates from accredited TTCs in Kenya, they all reported that they had not received any training in particular on how to deal with linguistically diverse learners. It has also been documented elsewhere that the TTC curriculum does not directly address the teaching of MTs as it is assumed that anyone who can speak a language can also teach it (see for example Bamgbose, 1991; Musau, 2003). In other contexts, teachers are expected to transfer the methodologies for teaching English into the teaching of the various MTs (see for example Bamgbose, 1991).

Byrnes et al. (1997:642) assert that "the most obvious avenue for more effectively preparing teachers to work with language minority students is through formal training". According to them, formal training in teaching linguistically diverse learners should include "carefully planned presentations and field experiences that focus on attitudes necessary to understand and appreciate language development and cultural diversity" (Byrnes et al., 1997:642). The findings of this study point to the need for restructuring the teacher education curriculum to include aspects of language awareness such as psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, language planning as well as language and education. This would give teachers a broader basis from which to make language choices in their classrooms. In addition, teachers should be encouraged to conduct their own or even become collaborators in research projects. This will expose them to issues of language learning and teaching as this would encourage their reflections on own practices in order to improve their teaching.

Furthermore, teachers in the current study have been shown to lack requisite skills for dealing with linguistic diversity in their classrooms. For effective policy implementation to be assured, congruence between the MoI supported by the policy for the different levels and the MoI used in teacher education is imperative. Teachers cannot be taught in one language and be expected to teach in another effectively. Therefore the recommended policy changes should be followed by changes in the teacher education curriculum so that the languages that teachers are expected to teach in at the different levels are effectively made the MoI in their respective regions in a decentralised education system or atleast accorded some instruction time in teacher training programmes.

More specifically, as already reported in the preceding chapter, language instruction and teaching reading seem to be confused in the observed classrooms. Often language instruction is emphasised to the detriment of reading. Studies have further shown that most teachers in

SSA do not receive any training on teaching reading (see for example Akyeampong et al., 2011; UNESCO, 2010; Bamgbose, 1991). Based on the findings from my study, which are supported by these other scholars, it is recommended that reading instruction becomes a part of the initial teacher preparation. In-service training could be organised for serving teachers if the current reading instruction deficit is to be adequately addressed. Additionally, the timetable in tandem with the curriculum should explicitly provide for reading instruction time where the teacher dedicates time to teaching reading while the learners practice reading on a daily basis. Consequently, reading practice will require reading materials which have to be factored in the school budgets. A similar allocation should be provided for writing development where learners learn to write by writing to communicate as advocated by studies on writing development (see for example Peyton, 1990; Bloch, 1998).

Heugh (2006:119) observes that:

> *Literacy development and language learning do not only take place in the language subject class, they occur (or should occur) in every lesson and in every subject of the day. Language and literacy development therefore, needs to be enhanced across the curriculum. This requires direct attention of all the teachers not just language subject teachers.*

An ideal such as that advocated by Heugh in her observation remains elusive unless teacher education programmes are tailored to meet the ever changing demands of the classrooms. Pennycook (2010:81) points out that the changing linguistic landscapes coupled with "the location of classrooms within global transcultural flows, [...], implies that classrooms can no longer be considered as bounded sites with students entering from fixed locations, with identities drawing on local traditions, with curricular as static bodies of knowledge". In a similar vein, Powell (1996:60) suggests that "as students in classrooms continue to become increasingly diverse, [...], new instructional demands have come to the forefront of classroom teaching". This calls teachers to be ever vigilant in their attempts to be inclusive of learners who come from diverse as opposed to bounded systems. Commensurate with teachers' vigilance is the need for teacher education programmes to acknowledge this changing nature of the classroom and adapt their programmes accordingly so that teachers are equipped with the requisite skills for dealing with multiple language learning environments, which are now the norm rather than the exception everywhere. Changes to the teacher education curriculum and structure are necessary but not sufficient to assure effective policy implementation; teacher placement needs to be addressed.

### 8.2.3   Teacher placement

This study found that some teachers are placed in classrooms where they do not speak the L1s of the learners they are expected to teach, as a result of the teacher recruitment and placement guidelines. This makes it difficult for the teacher to teach in the learners' L1s even in the now rare linguistically homogenous classroom. Therefore as part of the process of aligning the educational system for effective implementation of the 'new' language-in-education policy, a revision of the current criteria for the recruitment and placement of teachers is imperative. This move will ensure that schools are staffed with teachers that speak the L1s of the learners in their classrooms particularly in the foundational years of primary education. Such enabling environments must be assured for successful policy implementation. Teacher placement is necessary but still not sufficient as further changes are needed in the curriculum design and delivery.

### 8.2.4   Curriculum design and delivery

It has been argued that education systems often presuppose the possession by learners of a linguistic competence resulting in a great deal of inefficiency in the pedagogical transmission when the learners are unable to grasp what the teachers are trying to teach them (see for example Akinasso, 1993; Klaus, 2003). Thus, Stroud (2001:42) finds that "the effects that power imbalances between languages may exert [...] can be seen in the ways in which the curricula are formulated, in what languages are chosen for what purposes, in the teaching methodology embraced and in the manner in which material production is accomplished". In this regard, the current systemic 'one-size-fits-all' approaches to curriculum development and delivery needs addressing. Such curriculum and textbooks' approaches to the development of literacy and language skills, which assume that all children are within the same ZPD, are to be discouraged.

A flexible curriculum approach would be more appropriate in not only linguistically diverse but also linguistically homogenous classrooms. Malone (2004:41) advocates for a collaborative effort in curriculum development between the centre (central government) and the local communities. She finds that a "centrally produced but flexible curriculum framework helps local teachers organise their instructional plans but gives them freedom to insert local knowledge and culturally familiar content into the lessons" (Malone, 2004:41). This study therefore recommends a move away from pre-determined one-size-fits-all approaches to language and literacy development as evidenced in the curriculum guides and

textbooks' content to the adoption of approaches that will allow teachers to work with their learners at their stages of development (Peyton, 1990).

On curriculum delivery, Arthur (1994:76) observes that "classroom interaction is at the heart of any educational process, constituting the curriculum in actions". In the same vein, Clay (1998:27) highlights two areas in classroom interactions that I find relevant in improving the practice in multilingual classrooms, namely planning more opportunities to talk, and improving the quality of interactions that do occur. Teachers need to make deliberate efforts when planning their lessons to provide learners more opportunities to talk. The current frontal pedagogical strategies adopted in the classrooms allow teachers to do the talking while children do the copying. However, as Clay (1998:28) emphasises,

> *Children need to ask the questions, explain things to other children, and negotiate meanings between themselves and other children, and between themselves and adults, they need to continue their oral language development during [early] school years to expand their vocabulary and their control over the structures of language.*

In a similar vein, Malone (2003:344) observes that "current trends in formal education towards learner-centred and activity-based methodologies require languages of instruction that the children speak and understand". Malone therefore advises that formal education systems facing the challenge of providing such learner-centred education to their multilingual student populations "should look outward to academic communities, to interested NGOs, to the [ethnic language] EL communities themselves - to find the human resources with whom they can collaborate for the benefit of their most underserved student". In the context of this study, collaboration with the MoE is encouraged amongst the different stakeholders interested in promoting multiliteracy development and bilingual/multilingual education. The MoE cannot and will not do it alone, nor will the top-down approaches that are prevalent in the education system. Malone points us to the need for collaboration amongst different stakeholders in education to mobilise the resources both at the community and other levels with the aim of providing learner-centred education to all learners in MoIs that they speak and understand.

### 8.2.5 Teaching/learning materials

Availing teaching/learning materials in English and testing in English, while teaching and learning is expected to happen in the L1s of the learners, forces teacher to comply to the power of exams with the resultant situation that English becomes the *de facto* language of teaching, which is, to to borrow the words of Cerrón-Palomino (1989:27) a "natural consequence of the struggle

between unequally equipped languages". The decentralisation of education (as discussed in section 8.2.1 above) should include allowing the regional and local education offices to adapt the national curriculum to suit the local needs of the communities they serve and to train teachers as the need arises. The local and regional levels should also be given the mandate for the design and publication of culturally appropriate teaching/learning materials. Although the costs of such a venture may appear prohibitive, cumulative research indicates that the long term benefits of providing MTE and/or instruction far outweigh the initial costs incurred in the provision of teaching/learning materials and teacher training (see for example Grin, 2005; IIEP, 1997; UNESCO, 2010). Studies show that Ethiopia, one of the poorest countries of the world, has in less than 10 years managed to develop 22 of its autochthonous languages for use as MoI in a late-exit bilingual/multilingual education model (see for example Heugh et al., 2007; Benson et al., 2010; Heugh, 2011). Papua New Guinea (PNG), another poor country in Asia, is implementing MLE programmes in over 400 of its 850 autochthonous languages (see for example Klaus, 2003).

### 8.2.6   Assessment methods in the early years

This study shows that decisions on which languages to use in the classrooms depend, to a large extent, on language of the textbooks and the language of examinations as opposed to the language spoken by the learners in the classroom. This implies that such language choices and prioritisations are not based on pedagogical effectiveness. To assure successful policy implementations and pedagogical considerations in language choices in the classroom, a review of the assessment methods in early grades is recommended. Such review should include the scrapping of examinations at least in the first three years of primary schooling. Instead, other assessment methods should be used with learners. Testing in the subsequent levels should be school-based, which then will require the government to allocate resources to allow teachers to set, print and administer examinations in their schools.

In what she calls "critical testing" Shohamy (2005:108) emphasises the need to develop critical strategies to examine the uses and the consequences of tests, control their power, minimise their detrimental forces, reveal their misuses and empower test takers. Shohamy calls on teachers to become more aware of and be involved in interactive models of assessment. In the context of this study, this could be accomplished by resistance to one-size-fits-all approaches to testing that are currently in force.

### 8.2.7   Awareness raising/Advocacy

In chapter 5, I referred to Lewis' observation with regard to language-in-education policy implementation in which he points out that no policy of language, especially in the education system will succeed, "which does not do one of three things: conform to the expressed attitudes of those involved; persuade those who express negative attitudes about the rightness of the policy; or seek to remove the causes of disagreement" (Lewis, 1981:262). This includes the 'new' language-in-education policy that has been suggested following the findings of this study. In the light of the preceding discussions, it is clear that many people, among them Kenyans, hold negative attitudes towards education in the MTs. It is also evident that these negative attitudes present a major cause of disagreement in policy implementation. However, convinced of the benefits that accrue to learners who begin schooling in languages they know well, there will be need to persuade teachers, parents and other education stakeholders about the rightness of this 'new' policy. Thus, while the education system is being synchronised for effective policy implementation, advocacy fora should be organised both at the local and national levels to raise stakeholders' awareness on the benefits of MT instruction and the need to support the new policy. Such engagements with the public on policy implementation will require to be factored in the budgetary allocations for the MoE.

### 8.3    SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

What this research has done is to shed light on the phenomenon of multilingualism in the Kenyan context but certain areas have been illuminated which further research would be needed in order to continually improve the practice in these classrooms. In acknowledgement of the fact that more research is needed in relation to the language practices in multilingual classrooms contexts, I make suggestions on ways in which this research could be extended. This study has served to shed some light on translation as a pedagogical strategy in multilingual classrooms. From the few instances observed when the message is distorted through ad hoc translations, it would be interesting to investigate the practice further in order to know exactly how much of this happens in these classrooms. Such a research would make suggestions for the inclusion of translation principles in teacher education programmes as this would equip them to face their classrooms realities with confidence.

## 8.4    CONCLUSION

This study has painted a grim picture of the current state of affairs with regard to language choices and prioritisations in the development of language and literacy skills in selected multilingual Kenyan primary school classrooms. It would appear that the linguistic needs of the learners, their literacy and language development, their educational attainment and ultimate personal advancement are presently, to borrow the words of Smolicz (1986:109), "being sacrificed on the altar" of a poorly implemented language-in-education policy, inadequately trained teachers and one-size-fits-all curriculum that disregards the learners' ZPDs, be they linguistic or otherwise. It is however noteworthy, that in this context the teacher is as much a victim of the system as the learner.

Despite the negative attitudes towards African languages, owing to the hegemony of English in a globalising world, evidence has shown that children benefit from greater participation in classroom interaction with receptive and productive use of their L1s afforded them. In her foreword to Baker's book *Foundations for Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, García (1993:vii) observes that "the greatest failure of contemporary education has been precisely its inability to help teachers understand the ethnolinguistic complexity of children, classrooms, speech communities and society in such a way as to enable them make informed decisions about language and culture in the classroom". As such, this study sought to document and help teachers understand the phenomenon of multilingualism in education and how to capitalise on its potential as a resource to enable them manage multilingual learning environments more effectively.

Although teachers report that linguistic diversity is a challenge and therefore a problem that they have to encounter in their classrooms on a daily basis, this study indicates that these teachers exploit the multiplicity of languages within their own repertoire as resources both in their communication with the learners and the teaching of curriculum content. This is evident in the amount of code switching that goes on in the classrooms amongst the different languages within the teachers' repertoire. Commenting on learners' language use in Danish schools, Jorgensen (2005:394) asserts that "people with access to different languages are perfectly capable of using these at the same time when this is appropriate, and perfectly capable of using only one at a time when the situation requires this". What this means in an educational context is that as long as learners and teachers have access to different languages,

they are likely to employ them in particular situations, in the same way that bilingual speakers switch back and forth amongst the languages within their repertoire when communicating with other multilingual speakers. Commensurate with linguistic repertoires of multilingual speakers, I am of the view that language use in multilingual classrooms should not be mutually exclusive. The different languages in the teachers' and learners' repertoires should instead be allowed to play mutually supportive roles where the learners' L1s are exploited as the resources they are to aid in the understanding of L2 and of content presented in the L2 or an unfamiliar language. Bilingual and/or multilingual examinations should become a deliberate goal in multiliteracy development.

Although code switching is regarded as problematic by many educators, the pervasiveness with which it is employed in the classrooms may be indicative of the need to give it official recognition. Ndayipfukamiye (1994:83) describes code switching as a powerful reflection of the ways both teachers and learners mediate the communicative demands they face in the implementation of the curriculum. Van der Walt et al. (2001:177) in their study of code switching and translation in Science, Mathematics and Biology classes in South African schools advocate for what they have termed "responsible code switching" as a didactic tool to improve learning and develop technical terms in other languages, and suggest ways in which that could be accomplished. My contribution, following Ndayipfukamiye (1994:91) and Van der Walt et al. (2001) is that code switching needs to be accounted for in teacher preparation/education and in language-in-education policies, as a communicative resource for both teachers and learners. This should be extended not only to oral language use in the classrooms but also in the writing of examinations.

My reflections on teachers' practices in the multilingual classrooms and the possibility for multiliteracy development in such classrooms point me to the concept of "impact belief" as theorised by De Houwer (1999). De Houwer uses "impact belief" to describe the extent to which parents believe they can have a direct control over their children's language use. According to De Houwer, parents with strong "impact beliefs" make every effort to provide particular language experiences to their children while those with weak "impact beliefs" take a passive approach to their children's early language experiences. Instead, such parents see the wider environment as determining whether their children acquire one language or another. Commensurate with parents' "impact beliefs", teachers' "impact beliefs" will determine the level of control that those teachers will have in their classrooms in terms of

language and learning experiences regardless of the external factors such as examinations and textbooks. Teachers with strong "impact beliefs" will set own goals based on their learners' needs, linguistic or otherwise, and make every effort to achieve them.

Kenneth King (2004:10) asserts that " [w]hatever the research shows, there will also need to be strong national political and financial commitment, as well as powerful local commitment at the local and community level, if ther is ever to be education in local languages at all levels in formal education". In the context of this study, such strong commitment is needed from all levels within the education system, if education in the MTs is to become a reality in multiple language school environments. Concurring with King, I call on those interested in improving education in multilingual classrooms, in Kenya and elsewhere to take cognisance of research based on present classroom realities and move from the question of what is happening to what is not happening in these classrooms and why it is not happening. A proactive engagement of all stakeholders with classroom realities is inevitable. Only then will the congruence between the policy and practice be enhanced.

Linda King (2004:39) observes that in plurilingual societies, multilingualism is viewed more as a way of life than a problem to be solved. She finds that in such societies, people have somehow "developed an ethos which balances and respects the use of different languages in the daily life" of the community. According to her, the challenge is for education systems to adapt these complex realities of language use in these societies in order to provide quality education where there is a balance between the learners' needs, and the social, political and cultural demands of the society. In my view, a critical question here would therefore be; what is in the community that enables community members to manage their multilingualism so well, which schools could borrow to facilitate positively tapping into linguistic diversity as a resource as opposed to seeing it as a problem? In the answer to this question lies the solution to managing linguistic diversity in multilingual learning environments, which is certainly another way of extending this research. This interrogation and engagement with community's multilingual practices is necessary in the creation of an enabling environment for multiliteracy development, which should be a deliberate aim of any education system in any multilingual context. Only in such an environment can linguistic diversity be exploited and/or harnessed to assure academic development and advancement of all learners regardless of their linguistic backgrounds in both the specific context of this research and other similar contexts.

# REFERENCES

Abadzi, H. (2006). Efficient learning for the poor: Insights from the Frontier of Cognitive Neuroscience. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Adams, M.J. (1990). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

ADEA (2004). *The Quest for Quality: Learning from the African experience.* Proceedings of the ADEA Biennial Meeting (Grand Baie, Mauritius, December 3-6, 2003). Available: www.adeanet.org [accessed 15/11/2009].

ADEA (2005). Learning but in which languages? ADEA Newsletter, 17(2).

ADEA (2006). Optimizing learning and education in Africa – the language factor: a stock-taking research on mother tongue and bilingual education in Sub-Saharan Africa. Paris: International Institute for Education Planning.

Adegbija, E. (1994). *Language attitudes in Sub-Saharan African: A sociolinguistic overview.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Adendorff, R. (1993). Code switching amongst Zulu-speaking teachers and their pupils: Its functions and implications for teacher education. *Language and Education* 7(3):141-162.

Adger, C.T. (2001). Discourse in educational settings. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen & H. Hamilton (Eds.). *The handbook of discourse analysis,* pp. 503-517. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Adler, P.A. & Adler, P. (1994). Observational techniques. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.). *A handbook of qualitative research,* pp. 377-392. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Agheyisi, R. & Fishman, J. (1970). Language attitude studies: A brief survey of methodological approaches. *Anthropological Lingusitics,* 12:137-157. *http://www.jstor.org/stable/30029244* [accessed May 3 2012].

Ajzen, I. (1988). *Attitudes, personality and behaviour.* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Akinnaso, F.N. (1993). Policy and experiment in mother tongue literacy in Nigeria. *International Review of Educaiton,* 39(4):255-285.

Akyeampong, K., Pryor, J., Westbrook, J. & Lussier, K. (2011). The Teacher preparation and continuing professional development in Africa (TPA): Learning to teach reading and Mathematics. Sussex: University of Sussex Centre for International Education. http://www.sussex.ac.uk/cie/documents/tpa-synthesis-report-july2011.pdf. [accessed 24/05/2012].

Alexander, N. (2000). Where English can serve but not empower. Guardian weekly, learning English, December 14-20, 3.

Alexander, N. (2003). The African renaissance, African languages and African education with special reference to South Africa. In E. Wolff (Ed.). *Tied Tongues: The African Renaissance as a challenge for language planning,* pp. 21-37. London: Transaction Publishers.

Alidou, H. & Brock-Utne, B. (2011). Teaching practices - teaching in a familiar language. In A. Ouane & C. Glanz (Eds.). *Optimizing learning and education in Africa – the language factor: A stock-taking research on mother tongue and bilingual education in Sub-Saharan Africa,* pp. 159-185. Available: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0021/002126/212602e.pdf [accessed 03/05/2012].

Allington, R.L. (1983). Fluency: The neglected reading goal. *The Reading Teacher,* 36(6):556-561. Available: http://www.jstor.org/stable/20198272?seq=1 [accessed 10/08/2012].

Anderson, R.C. & Li, W. (2006). A cross-language perspective on learning to read. In A. McKeough, A.L. Phillips, V. Timmons & J.L. Lupart (Eds.). *Understanding literacy development: A global perspective,* pp. 65-91. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Andrews, S. (1991). Why do L2 teachers need to know about language? Teacher metalinguistic awareness and input for learning. *Language and Education,* 13(3):161-177.

Apple, M. (1982). *Education and power.* London: Routledge.

Arthur, J. (1994). English in Botswana primary classrooms: Functions and constraints. In C.M. Rubagumya (Ed.). *Teaching and researching languages in African classrooms,* pp. 63-78. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Arthur, J. (1996). Code switching and collusion: Classroom interaction in Botswana primary schools. *Linguistics and Education,* 8, pp. 17-33. Available: http://ac.els-cdn.com/S0898589896900042/1-s2.0-S0898589896900042-main.pdf?_tid=8513160a574f5ec3823357bfca70f132&acdnat=1336751622_16286883 69dcc41111fa150b8f9b8dd8 [accessed 11 /05/2012].

Arthur, J. (1997). "There must be something undiscovered which prevents us from doing our work well": Botswana primary teachers' views on education language policy. *Language and Education,* 11(4):225-241.

Ashworth, M. (1979). More than one language. In K.A. McLeod (Ed.). *Multiculturarism, bilingualism and Canadian institutions,* pp. 80-88. Toronto: Faculty of Education, University of Toronto.

Auer, P. (1995). The pragmatics of code switching: A sequential approach. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.). *One speaker two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code switching,* pp. 115-135. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Axelsson, M., Bulthuis, F. & Ostergren, G. (2002). Literacy development in a second language. In V. Sollars (Ed.). *Issues in multiliteracy,* pp. 81-133. Graz: Council of European publishing. Available: http://archive.ecml.at/documents/pub115E2002.pdf [accessed 27/07/2012].

Baetens-Beardsmore, H. (2009). Langauge promotion by European supra-national institutions. In O. García (with Baetens-Beardsmore). *Bilingual education in the 21*st *century,* pp. 197-217. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Bain, R. (1928). An attitude on attitude research. *American Journal of Sociology,* 33:940-957. Available: http://www.brocku.ca/MeadProject/Bain/Bain_1928.html [accessed 27/07/2012].

Baker, C. (1988). *Key issues in bilingualism and bilingual education.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Baker, C. (1992). *Attitudes and language.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Baker, C. (1993). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Baker, C. (1999). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (2nd edition). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (3rd edition). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (4th edition). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Baker, V. (1998). Literacy in developing societies: Native language versus national language literacy. In A.Y. Durgunoğlu & L. Verhoeven (Eds.). *Literacy development in a multilingual context: A cross-cultural perspective,* pp. 21-35. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Baldauf, R.B. Jr. (2005). Language planning and policy research: An overview. In E. Hinkel (Ed.). *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning,* pp. 957-970. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Elbaum.

Baldauf, R.B. Jr. & Kaplan, R.B. (2004). Language Policy and planning in Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique and South Africa: some Common issues. In R.B. Jr. Baldauf & R.B. Kaplan (Eds.). *Language planning and policy: Africa, Vol. 1, Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique & South Africa.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Ball, J. (2011). Enhancing learning of children from diverse language backgrounds: Mother tongue-based bilingual or multilingual education in the early years. An analytical review commissioned by the UNESCO education sector. Paris: UNESCO.

Bamgbose, A. (1991). *Language and the Nation: The Language Question in Sub-Saharan Africa.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Bamgbose, A. (1994). Pride and prejudice in multilingualism and development. In R. Fardon & G. Furniss (Eds.). *African languages, development and state,* pp. 33-54. London: SAGE.

Bamgbose, A. (2003). Language and the African renaissance: Lessons from the South African experience. In E.H. Wolff (Ed.). *Tied Tongues: The African Renaissance as a challenge for language planning,* pp. 39-60. London: Transaction Publishers.

Bamgbose, A. (2004). *Language of instruction policy and practice in Africa.* New York: UNESCO. http://www.unesco.org/education/languages_2004/languageinstruction_africa.pdf [accessed 22/05/2012].

Bamgbose, A. (2005). Mother tongue Education: Lessons from the Yoruba experience. In B. Brock-Utne & R.K. Hopson (Eds.). *Languages of instruction for African emancipation: Focus on post colonial contexts and considerations,* pp. 231-257. Cape Town: CASAS.

Banks, J.A. (1993). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions and practice. In L.D. Hammond (Ed.). *Review of Research in Education,* pp. 3-49. Washington, DC: American Education Research Association.

Barnitz, J.G. (1982). Orthographies, bilingualism and learning to read English as a second language. *Reading Teacher,* 35(5):560-567.

Bennet, C.I. (1990). *Comprehensive multicultural education: Theory and practice* (2nd edition). Massachusetts: Allen & Bacon.

Benson, C. (2000). The primary bilingual experiment in Mozambique, 1993-1997. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism,* 3(3):149-166.

Benson, C. (2002). Real and potential benefits of bilingual programmes in developing countries. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism,* 5(6):303-317.

Benson, C., Heugh, K., Bogale, B. & Yohannes, M. (2010). The medium of instruction in the primary schools of Ethiopia: A study and its implications for multilingual education. In K. Heugh & T. Skutnabb-Kangas (Eds.). *Multilingual education works: From the periphery to the centre,* pp. 40-83. Hyderabad, India: Orient Black Swan Private Ltd.

Berg, B. (2004). *Qualitative research methods in social sciences* (5th edition). New York: Pearson Education Inc.

Berg, B. (2007). *Qualitative research methods in social sciences* (7th edition). New York: Pearson Education Inc.

Blackledge, A. (1994). 'We can't tell our stories in English': Language, story and culture in the primary school. In A. Blackledge (Ed.). *Teaching bilingual children,* pp. 43-59. Stock-on-Trent: Trantham books.

Blackledge, A. & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism.* London: Continuum.

Bloch, C. (1997). *Chloe's story: First steps into literacy.* Cape Town: Juta & Co Ltd.

Bloch, C. (1998). Literacy in the early years: teaching and learning in multilingual early childhood classrooms. Unpublished PRAESA Occasional Paper No. 1.

Bloom, P. (2000). *How children learn the meaning of words.* Cambridge, MA: MIT press.

Booth, W.C., Colomb, G.G. & Williams, J.M. (2008). *The Craft of research* (3rd edition). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Bradley, B.A. & Stahl, S.A. (2001) Learning the Alphabet. Available: http://www.ciera.org/library/presos/2001/2001nrc/01nrcstahl/01nrcsta.pdf [accessed 12/08/2012].

Breton, R. (2003). Sub-Saharan Africa. In J. Marauis & M.A. Morris (Eds.). *Language in a globalising world,* pp. 203-216. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Broadfoot, P. (1996). *Education, assessment and society: A sociological analysis.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Brock-Utne, B. (2010). Policy on the language of instruction in Africa - a spotlight on South Africa and Tanzania. In Z. Desai, M. Qorro & B. Brock-Utne (Eds.). *Educational challenges in multilingual societies,* pp. 74-101. LOITASA Phase Two Research. Cape Town: African Minds.

Brumfit, C. (1991). Language awareness in teacher education. In C. James & P. Garrett (Eds.). *Language awareness in the classroom,* pp. 24-39. Harlow: Longman.

Bryman, A. (1988). *Quantity and Quality in Social Research.* London: Unwin Hyman.

Bunyi, G.W. (1997). Multilingualism and discourse in primary mathematics in Kenya. *Language, Culture and Curriculum,* 10(1):52-65.

Bunyi, G.W. (1999). Rethinking the place of African indigenous languages in African education. *International Journal of Educational Development,* 19(4):337-350.

Byrnes, D.A. & Cortez, D. (1996). Language diversity in the classroom. In D.A. Byrnes & G. Kiger (Eds.). *Common bonds: Anti-bias teaching in a diverse society* (2nd edition), pp. 65-78. Wheaton, MD: Association for Childhood Education International.

Byrnes, D.A., Kiger, G., & Manning, M.L. (1997). Teachers' attitudes about language diversity. *Teaching and T*eacher *Education,* 13(6):637-644.

Cameron, S. & Simpson, J. (2002). ESOL teachers' perspectives on the provision for DLE students in Hamilton and Auckland secondary schools. *Many Voices,* 19:16-23.

Canhmann, M. (2003). To correct or not bilingual students' errors is a question of continuing reimagination. In N. Hornberger (Ed.). *Continua of Biliteracy: An ecological framework for educational policy, research and practice in multilingual classrooms,* pp. 187-204. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Cassidy, J. & Cassidy, D. (2002). What's hot, what's not for 2002*. Reading Today,* 19(1):18-19.

Catts, H.W., Fey, M.E., Zhang, X. & Tomblin, J.B. (2001). Estimating the risk of future reading difficulties in kindergarten children: A research-based model and its clinical implementation. *Language, Speech and Hearing Services in Schools,* 32(1):38- 48.

Cavanaugh, C.L., Kim, A., Wanzek, J. & Vaughn, S. (2004). Kindergarten reading interventions for at-risk students: Twenty years of research. *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal,* 2(1):9-21.

Cazden, C. (1988). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Cazden, C.B. & Snow, C.E. (1990). Preface to C.B. Cazden & C.E. Snow (Eds.). *English plus: Issues in bilingual education.* London: Sage.

Cenoz, J. (2009). *Towards multicultural education: Basque educational research from an international perspective.* Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Cerrón-Palomino, R. (1989). Language policy in Peru: a historical overview. *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, 77:11-35.

Chaudron, C. (1995). *Second language classroom: Research on teaching and learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chimbganda, A.B. & Mokgwathi, T.S. (2012). Code switching in Botswana ESL classrooms: A paradox of linguistic policy in education. *International Journal of English Linguistics,* 2(2):21-32. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v2n2p21 [accessed 11/05/2012].

Chimbutane, F.S. (2009). The purpose and value of bilingual education: a critical, linguistic ethnographic study of two rural primary schools in Mozambique. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Birmingham, UK. URL: http://etheses.bham.ac.uk/667/1/Chimbutane09PhD.pdf [accessed 03/05/2012].

Christian, D. (1988). Language planning: the view from linguistics. In F.J. Newmeyer (Ed.). *Linguistics: The Cambridge survey, vol. 4: Language: The socio-cultural context*. pp. 193-209. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Churchill, S. (1986). *The Education of cultural minorities in OECD countries.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Clauss-Ehlers, C.S. (2006). *Diversity training for classroom teaching: A manual for students and educators.* New York: Springer.

Clay, M. (1998). *By different paths to common outcomes.* York: Stenhouse Publishers.

Clay, M.M. (1991). *Becoming literate: The construction of inner control.* Auckland: Heinemann Education.

Cleghorn, A., Merritt, M. & Abagi, J.O. (1989). Language policy and Science Instruction in Kenyan Primary Schools. *Comparative Education Review*, 33(1):211-239.

Clyne, M. (1983). Bilingual Education as a Model for Community Languages in Primary Schools. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 4(2):12-22.

Clyne, M. (2001). Can the shift from immigrant language be reversed in Australia? In J.A. Fishman (Ed.). *Can threatened languages be saved? Reversing language shift: A 21st Century perspective,* pp. 364-390. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Clyne, M. (2005). Australia's language potential. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.

Cobarrubias, J. (1983). Ethical issues in status planning. In J. Cobarrubias (Ed.). *Language planning,* pp. 41-48. Berlin: Mouton.

Coelho, E. (1998). *Teaching and learning in multicultural schools.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education* (5th edition). London: Routledge.

Čok, L. (2002). Foreword: Literacy as correspondence - of skills and values. In V. Sollars (Ed.). *Issues in Multiliteracy,* pp. 5-6. Graz: Council of Europe publishing. Available: http://archive.ecml.at/documents/pub115E2002.pdf [accessed 27/07/2012].

Collier, V.P. (1987). Age and rate of acquisition of second language for academic purposes. *TESOL Quarterly,* 21:617-641.

Collier, V.P. & Thomas, W.P. (1988). Acquisition of the cognitive-academic second-language proficiency: A six year study. Paper presented at AERA, New Orleans, LA.

Commins, N.L. & Miramontes, O.B. (2005). *Linguistic diversity and teaching.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum

Commins, N.L. & Miramontes, O.B. (2006). Addressing linguistic diversity from the outset. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 57(3):240-246. Available http://jte.sagepub.com/content/57/3/240 [accessed 18/07/2012].

Conteh, J. (2007). Opening doors to success in multilingual classrooms: Bilingualism, code switching and the professional identities of ethnic minority primary teachers. *Language and Education,* 21(6):457-472. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.2167/le711.0 [accessed 27/07/2012].

Cooper, R. (1989). *Language planning and social change.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cope, B. & Kalantzis, M. (2000). *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures.* New York: Routledge.

Corson, D. (1990). *Language Policy Across the Curriculum.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Corson, D. (1993). *Language, minority education & gender: Linking social justice to power.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Corson, D. (1999). *Language policy in schools: A resource for teachers and administrators.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Craig, S., Hull, K., Haggart, A.G. & Crowder, E. (2001). Story telling: addressing the literacy needs of diverse learners. *Teaching Exceptional Children,* 33:46-51. http://web.ebscohost.com.ez.sun.ac.za/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=3&hid=104&sid=30ddfcb8-cd95-46b2-9f47-105980d1b3d1%40sessionmgr115 [accessed 27/07/2012].

Creswell, J.W. (1998). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among five approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic Interdependence and the educational development of Bilingual children. *Review of Educational Research,* 49(2):222-251. Available: Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1169960 [accessed 20/07/2012].

Cummins, J. (1980). The cross-lingual dimensions of language proficiency: Implications for bilingual education and optimal age issue. *TESOL Quarterly,* 14(2):175-187. Available: http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/3586312 [accessed 20/07/2012].

Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review,* 56:18-36.

Cummins, J. (1987). Bilingualism, language proficiency, and metalinguistic development. In P. Homel, M. Palij & D. Aaronson (Eds.). *Childhood Bilingualism: Aspects of linguistic, cognitive and social development,* pp. 57-73. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cummins, J. (2000a). *Language, Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual children in a cross fire.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Cummins, J. (2000b). Minority children's mother tongue: Why is it important? Sprogforum, 7(19), 15-20. Available: http://www.iteachilearn.com/cummins/mother.htm [accessed 12/08/2012].

Cummins, J. (2001). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society* (2nd edition). Los Angeles: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Cummins, J. (2003). Bilingual Education. In E. Reid & J. Bourne (Eds.). *Language Education,* pp.3-19. London: Kogan page.

Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics,* 10(2):221-240. Available: http://www.aclacaal.org/Revue/vol-10-no2-art-cummins.pdf [accessed 27/07/2012].

Cummins, J. & Swain, M. (1986). *Bilingualism in Education: Aspects of theory, research and practice.* London: Longman.

Curran, M. (2003). Linguistic diversity and classroom management. *Theory into Practice,* 42(4):334-340. http://faculty.weber.edu/rwong/edu3200/articles/ELLClassMgt.pdf [accessed 20/07/2012].

Dahl, P.R. & Samuels, S.J. (1974). A mastery based experimental program for teaching poor readers high speed word recognition skills. Unpublished paper. University of Minneapolis.

Daily Nation (June 8, 2011) Mps Move to ban vernacular in public offices. http://www.nation.co.ke/News/politics/MPs+move+to+ban+vernacular+in+public+offi ces+/-/1064/1177070/-/rmyy5sz/-/index.html [accessed 07/08/2012].

Danesi, M. (1989). Ancestral language training and the development of biliteracy: A Canadian perspective. In E.Z. Sonino (Ed.). *Literacy in School and Society: Multidisciplinary perspectives,* pp. 41-53. New York & London: Plenum press.

Davis, P.M. (1991). *Cognition and Learning: A review of literature with reference to ethnolinguistic minorities.* Dallas, TX: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

De Houwer, A. (1999). Environmental factors in early bilingual development: The role of parental beliefs and attitudes. In E.Guus & L. Verhoeven (Eds.). *Bilingualism and Migration,* pp. 75-95. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

De Matos, F.G. (1989). Issues and trends in early bilingual literacy in Brazil. In E.Z. Sonino (Ed.). *Literacy in School and Society: Multidisciplinary perspectives,* pp. 15-24. New York & London: Plenum Press.

Delamont, S. (2002). *Fieldwork in educational settings: Methods, pitfalls and perspectives* (2nd edition). London: Routledge.

Denscombe, M. (2003). *The good research guide for small-scale social research projects.* Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.

Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.). (1998). *A handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Desai, Z. (2010). Laissez-faire approaches to language education do not work in South Africa. In Z. Desai, M. Qorro & B. Brock-Utne (Eds.). *Educational challenges in multilingual societies,* pp. 102-112. LOITASA Phase Two Research. Cape Town: African Minds.

Dogancay-Aktuna, S. (1997). Language planning. In N.H. Hornberger & D. Corson (Eds.). *Encyclopedia of language and education, vol* 8, pp. 15-24. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.

Dole, J.A., Duffy, G.G., Roehler, L.R. & Pearson, P.D. (1991). From the Old to the New: Research on Reading Comprehension Instruction. *Review of Educational Research,* 61(2):239-264. Available: http://www.jstor.org.ez.sun.ac.za/stable/1170536 [accessed 10/08/2012].

Dong, R. (2007). Integrating language and content: How three biology teachers work with non-English speaking students. In O. García & C. Baker. *Bilingual Education: An introductory reader.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Duncan, L.G. & Seymour, P.H.K. (2000). Socio-economic differences in foundation level literacy. *British Journal of Psychology*, 91:145-166.

Durgunoğlu, A.Y. (1998). Acquiring literacy in English and Spanish in the United States. In A.Y. Durgunoğlu & L. Verhoeven (Eds.). *Literacy development in a multilingual context: A cross-cultural perspective,* pp. 135-146. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Durgunoğlu, A.Y. & Verhoeven, L. (1998). Epilogue: Multilingualism and literacy development across different cultures. In A.Y. Durgunoğlu & L. Verhoeven (Eds.). *Literacy development in a multilingual context: A cross-cultural perspective,* pp. 289-298. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Dutcher, N. (1982). The use of first and second language in primary education: Selected case studies (World Bank staff working paper 504). Washington, DC: World Bank.

Dutcher, N. (2004). *Expanding educational opportunity in linguistically diverse societies* (2nd edition). Washington DC: Centre for Applied Linguistics (CAL).

Dutcher, N. & Tucker, G.R. (1996) The Use of first languages in education: Pacific Islands discussion paper, 1, East Asia and Pacific Region. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Edelsky, C. (1982). Writing in a bilingual program: The realtion of L1 and L2 texts. *TESOL Quarterly,* 16 (2): 211-228. Available: http://www.jstor.org/stable/3586793 [accessed 12/08/2012]

Edelsky, C. & Jilbert, K. (1985). Bilingual children and writing: Lessons for all of us. *Volta Review,* 85(5):57-72.

Edwards, D. & Mercer, N. (1987). *Common knowledge: The development of understanding in the classroom.* London: Methuen.

Edwards, J. (1982). Language attitudes and their implications amongst English speakers. In E.B. Ryan & H. Giles (Eds.). *Multilingualism,* pp. 20-33. London: Routledge.

Edwards, J. (1994). *Multilingualism.* London: Penguin Books.

Edwards, V. (1984). *Language policy in multicultural Britain.* London: Academic Press.

Ehri, L., Nunes, S.R., Willows, D.M., Schuster, B.V., Yaghoub-Zadeh, Z., & Shanahan, T. (2001). Phonemic awareness instruction helps children to learn to read: Evidence from National Reading Panel's meta-analysis. *Reading Research Quarterly,* 36:250-287. Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/748111 [accessed 12/08/2012].

Eisemon, T.O., Schwille, J., Prouty, R., Ukobizoba, F., Kana, D. & Manirabona, G. (1993). *Providing quality education when resources are scarce: strategies for increasing primary school effectiveness in Burundi*. In H.M. Levin & M.L. Lockheed (Eds.). *Effective schools in developing countries,* pp. 130-157. London: Falmer Press.

Engle, P.L. (1975). *The use of vernacular languages in education: Language medium in early school years for minority language groups.* Washington, DC: Centre for Applied Linguistics.

Erickson, F. (1984). School literacy, reasoning, and civility: An anthropologist's perspective. *Review of Educational Research,* 54(4):525-546.

Fafunwa, A., Macauley, J. & Sokoya, J. (Eds.). (1989). *Education in mother tongue: The Ife primary education research project (1970-1978).* Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.

Fairchild, H.H. & Edwards-Evans, S. (1990). African American dialects in schooling: A review. In A.M. Padilla, H.H. Fairchild & C.M. Valadez (Eds.). *Bilingual education: Issues and strategies,* pp. 75-86. London: SAGE.

Fasold, R. (1984). *The Sociolinguistics of society.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Ferreiro, E. & Teberosky, A. (1982). *Literacy before schooling.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Fetterman, D.M. (1989). *Ethnography Step by Step.* Newbury Park. CA: Sage publications.

Fielding, N. & Fielding, J. (1986). *Linking Data.* London: SAGE Publications.

Fishman, J.A. (1973). Language modernization and planning in comparison with other types of national modernization and planning. *Language in Society,* 2:23-42.

Fishman, J.A. (1978). Positive bilingualism: some overlooked rationales and forefathers. In J.E. Alatis (Ed.). *Georgetown University Round table on languages and Linguistics,* pp. 42-52. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

Fishman, J.A. (1980). Bilingual education, language planning and English. *English World-Wide,* 1(1):11-24.

Fishman, J.A. (1991). *Reversing Language Shift: theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Fishman, J.A. (Ed.). (2001). *Can Threatened Languages be Saved?* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Franson, C. (1999). Mainstreaming learners of English as an additional language: The class teacher's perspective. *Language, Culture & Curriculum,* 12(1):59-71.

Freeman, Y. & Freeman, D. (1992). *Whole Language for Second Language Learners.* London: Heinemann Educational Books.

French, P. & Maclure, M. (1979). Getting the right answer and getting the answer right. *Research in Education,* 22:1-23.

Gadelii, K.E. (2004). *Annotated statistics on linguistic policies and practices in Africa.* Availbale: http://www.sprak.gu.se/digitalAssets/1310/1310354_annotated-statistics.pdf [accessed July 5 2012].

Gal, S. (1989). Language and political economy. *Annual Review in Anthropology,* 18:345-367. Available: http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/2155896 [accessed 27/07/2012].

García, O. (1993) Foreword: In C. Baker (Ed.). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism.* Clevedon: Multilingual matters.

García, O. (2007). Foreword. In S. Makoni & A. Pennycook (Eds.). *Disinventing and reconstituting languages,* pp. xi-xv. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

García, O. (2009) (with Baetens-Beardsmore). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

García, O. & Otheguy, R. (1987). The bilingual education of Cuban-American children in Dade County's ethnic schools. *Language and Education,* 1:83-95.

Garrett, P. (2010). *Attitudes to language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gee, J.P. (1986). Orality and literacy: from the savage mind to ways with words. *TESOL Quarterly,* 20(4):719-746. Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/3586522 [accessed 12/08/2012].

Geva, E. & Wade-Woolley, L. (1998). Components of becoming English-Hebrew biliterate. In A.Y. Durgunoğlu & L. Verhoeven (Eds.). *Literacy development in a multilingual context: A cross-cultural perspective,* pp. 85-110. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Gibbs, G. (2007). *Analysing qualitative data.* London: SAGE Publications.

Githiora, C. 2008. Language and the search for a coherent national identity. In A. Simpson (Ed.). *Language and national identity in Africa*, pp. 235-251. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goldstein, T. (2003). *Teaching and learning in a multilingual School: Choices, risks and dilemmas.* London: Lawrence ERLBAUM Associate Publishers.

Goodman, K. (1982). *Literacy and language: The selected writings of Kenneth S. Goodman* (volumes 1 & 11). Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Goodman, K.S. (1973). Miscues: Windows on reading process. In F.V. Gollasch (Ed.). *Language and literacy: The collected writings of Kenneth S. Goodman, vol.1: Process, theory and research,* pp. 93-101. Boston, MA: Routledge.

Gough, P.B., Larson, K. & Yopp, H. (1993). The structure of phonemic awareness. Paper presented to the international society for the study of behavioural development, Recife, Brazil. Available: http://www.psy.utexas.edu/psy/klarson/recife.html [accessed 07/08/2011].

Gove, A. & Cvelich, P. (2011). *Early Reading: Igniting education for all. A Report on the Early Grade Learning Community of Practice* (revised edition). Research Triangle Park, NC: Research Triangle Institute. Available: http://www.rti.org/pubs/early-reading-report-revised.pdf [accessed 02/03/2012]

Government of Uganda. (1992). Government White Paper on the Implementation of the Recommendation of the Report of Education Review Commission, Education, Ed. Kampala: Uganda Government.

Graham, B.E. (2009). Pokomo mother tongue education in Kenya: Implementations and Evaluations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Reading, UK.

Graham, B.E. (2010). Mother tongue education: Necessary? Possible? Sustainable? *Language and Education,* 24(4):309-321. Available http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09500781003678696 [accessed 27/07/2012].

Grant, R.A. & Wong, S.D. (2003). Barriers to literacy for language minority learners: An argument for change of in the literacy education profession. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy,* 46(5):386-394.

Greenberg, P. (1989). Parents as partners in young children's development and education: A new American fad? Why does it matter? *Young Children,* 44:61-75.

Grimes, C.E. (2009). Indigenous languages in education: What the research actually shows. Available: http://ausil.org.au/sites/ausil/files/2009%20Grimes-Indig%20Lgs%20in%20Ed-AuSIL-web.pdf [accessed 10/08/2012].

Grin, F. (2005). Linguistic human rights as a source of policy guidelines: A critical assessment. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 9(3):448-460.

Gudschinsky, S.C. (1976). *Literacy: The growing interest of linguistics.* Amsterdam: Mouton.

Hakuta, K. (1986). *Mirror of language: The debate on bilingualism.* New York: Basic books.

Hakuta, K. (1990). Language and cognition in bilingual children. In A.M. Padilla, H.H. Fairchild & C.M. Valadez (Eds.). *Bilingual education: issues and strategies,* pp. 47-59. London: SAGE.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1973). *Explorations in the functions of language*. London: Edward Arnold Publishers.

Hammersley, M. (1990). *Reading Ethnographic Research: A critical guide.* London: Longman.

Hammersley, M. (1992). *What's wrong with Ethnography? Methodological explorations.* London: Routledge.

Hammersley, M. & Atkinson, P. (1983). *Ethnography: Principles in practice.* London: Tavistock.

Hannon, P. (1995). *Literacy, Home and the School: Research and practice in teaching literacy with parents.* London: The Falmer Press.

Harste, J., Woodward, V. & Burke, C. (1984). *Language stories and literacy lessons.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Hasselmo, N. (1972). Code switching as ordered selection. In E.S. Firchow (Ed.). *Studies for Einar Haugen,* pp. 261-280. The Hague: Mouton.

Hatzfeld, J. (2007). *Life laid bare: The survivors in Rwanda speak.* New York: Random House. [Translator: Linda Coverdale]

Haworth, P. (2003). Students from diverse language backgrounds in the primary classroom. In R. Barnard & T. Glynn (Eds.). *Bilingual children's language and literacy development,* pp. 136-165. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Heller, M. (1988). *Code switching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Heller, M. (1999). *Linguistics minorities and modernity: A Sociolinguistic ethnography.* London: Longman.

Henning, E. (2010). With Rensburg, W. & Smit, B. *Finding your way in qualitative research.* Pretoria: Van Schalk Publishers.

Heugh, K. (2005). Mother tongue education is best. *HSRC Review,* 3 (3), September 2005, South Africa: Human Sciences Research Council, available at http://www.hrsc,ac.az/HRSC_Review_Article-14.phtml.

Heugh, K. (2006). Theory and practice – Language education models in Africa: Research, design, decision-making and outcomes. In H. Alidou, A. Boly, B. Brocke-Utne, Y. Satina, K. Heugh & E.H. Wolff (Eds.). *Optimizing learning and education in Sub-Saharan Africa,* pp. 56-84. ADEA, UNESCO Institute for Education, Deutsche Gesellschaft fur Technishe Zusammenarbeit. Working document for ADEA Biennial 2006, Libreville, Gabon, March 27-31.

Heugh, K. (2011). Theory and Practice - Language in education models in Africa: Research, design, decision-making and outcomes. In A. Ouane & C. Glanz (Eds.). *Optimizing learning and education in Africa - the language factor: A stock-taking research on mother tongue and bilingual education in Sub-Saharan Africa,* pp. 103-156. Available: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0021/002126/212602e.pdf [Accessed May 3 2012].

Heugh, K., Benson, C., Bogale, B. & Yohannes, M. (2007). *Final Report: Study on medium of instruction in primary schools in Ethiopia.* Ministry of Education, Ethiopia. Available: http://intranet.hsrc.ac.za/research/output/outputDocuments/4379_Heugh_Studyonmediumofinstruction.pdf [accessed 27/07/2012].

Holdaway, D. (1979). *The foundations of literacy.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Holliday, A. (2002). *Doing and writing up qualitative research.* London: Sage Publications.

Holliday, A. (2007). *Doing and writing up qualitative research* (2nd edition). London: Sage Publications.

Hornberger, N. H. & Ricento, T. (1996). Unpeeling the Onion: Language Planning and Policy and the ELT Professional. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(3): 401-427. *Language Planning and Policy*. URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/3587691 [accessed 23/09/2010].

Hornberger, N.H. (1989). Continua of biliteracy. *Review of Educational Research,* 59(3):271-296.

Hornberger, N.H. (1990). Creating successful learning contexts for bilingual literacy. *Teachers College Record,* 92(2):212-229.

Hornberger, N.H. (1991). Extending enrichment bilingual education: Revisiting typologies and redirecting policy. In O. García (Ed.). *Bilingual education: Focusschrift in honour of Joshua A. Fishman on the occasion of his 65*[th] *birthday,* pp. 215-234. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishers.

Hornberger, N.H. (2002). Multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy: an ecological approach. *Language policy*, 1:27-51.

Hornberger, N.H. (2003). Continua of biliteracy. In N.H. Hornberger (Ed.). *Continua of Biliteracy: An ecological framework for educational policy, research, and practice in multilingual settings,* pp. 3-34. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Hornberger, N.H. & Skilton-Sylvester, E. (2000). Revisiting the continua of biliteracy. *Language and Education: An International Journal,* 14 (6): 96-122.

Hornberger, N.H. & Skilton-Sylvester, E. (2003). Revisiting the continua of biliteracy: International and critical perspectives. In N.H. Hornberger (Ed.). *Continua of Biliteracy: An ecological framework for educational policy, research, and practice in multilingual settings,* pp. 35-67. Clevedon: Multilingual matters Ltd.

Huberman, A.M. & Miles M.B. (1994). Data management and analysis methods. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research,* pp. 428-444. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Hudelson, S. (1989). A tale of two children: Individual differences in ESL children's writing. In D.M. Johnson & D.H. Roen (Eds.). *Richness in writing: Empowering ESL students,* pp. 84-89. New York: Longman.

Ingram, D. E. (1989). Language-in-education planning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics,* 10:53-78.

International Institute for Educational Planning, IIEP (1997). *Languages of Instruction: Policy implications for education in Africa.* Canada: International Development research centre. Available online: http://www.idrc.ca/books/focus.html [Accessed 08/08/2012].

International Labour Organisation, ILO (1989). ILO Convention on Indigenous and Tribal peoples. http://www.ilo.org/ilolex/cgi-lex/convde.pl?C169 [accessed 10/05/2012].

Jacob, E. & Mattson, B. (1990). Cooperative learning: Instructing Limited-English-Proficient students in heterogeneous classes. In A.M. Padilla, H.H. Fairchild & C.M. Valadez (Eds.). *Bilingual education: Issues and strategies,* pp. 219-229. London: SAGE.

Jeon, M. (2003). Searching for a comprehensive rationale for two-way immersion. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.). *Continua of Biliteracy: An ecological framework for educational policy, research and practice in multilingual settings,* pp. 122-144. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Johnston, F.R. (2004). Phonics, phonological awareness and the alphabet. Available: http://www.epsbooks.com/downloads/articles/phonological_Awareness.pdf [accessed 12/08/2012].

Johnston, M. (1999). The regular teacher's perspective of non-English speaking background students in secondary schools. *Many Voices,* 14:19-24.

Jones, M.J. (2010). An Ethnographic inquiry into the implementation of the Kenyan language-in-education policy (mother tongue as a subject and medium of instruction) in the Sabaot language group. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Auckland, New Zealand.

Jones, M.J. & Barkhuizen, G. (2011). "It's a too way traffic": Teachers' tension in the implementation of the Kenyan language-in-education policy. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism,* 14(5):513-530. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2010.532540 [accessed 15/09/2011].

Jorgensen, J.N. (2005). Plurilingual conversations among bilingual adolescents. *Journal of pragmatics,* 37:391-402. Available: http://ac.els-cdn.com/S0378216604002206/1-s2.0-S0378216604002206-main.pdf?_tid=2626c6a0-097d-11e2-8d76-00000aacb35d&acdnat=1348844569_8e721195eb10bff88fbe242af1864b8c [accessed 28/09/2012].

Jorgensen, J.N. & Kristjánsdóttir, B.S. (1998). Acquisition of literacy in multilingual contexts in Danish schools. In A.Y. Durgunoğlu & L. Verhoeven (Eds.). *Literacy development in a multilingual context: A cross-cultural perspective,* pp. 185-202. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Juel, C. & Leavell, J.A. (1988). Retention and non-retention of at-risk readers in first grade and their subsequent reading achievement. *Journal of Learning Disabilities,* 21:571-580.

Justice, L.M., Invernizzi, M.A. & Meier, J.D. (2002). Designing and Implementing and Early Literacy Screening Protocol: Suggestions for the Speech-Language Pathologist. *Language, Speech and Hearing Services in Schools,* 33:84-101.

Kajubi, W.S. (1989). Education for National Integration and Development: Report of the Education Policy Review Commission. Kampala, Uganda: Ministry of Education.

Kamwangamalu, N.M (2004). The language planning situation in South Africa. In R.B. Baldauf & R.B. Kaplan (Eds.). *Language planning and policy: Africa Vol. 1 Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique and South Africa,* pp. 197-281. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Kamwangamalu, N.M. (2010). Multilingualism and Code switching in Education. In N.H. Hornberger & S.L. McKay (Eds.). *Sociolinguistics and language education,* pp. 116-142. Bristol: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Kamwendo, G. (2000). Interfacing Language Research with Policy: The Case of Language in Education in Malawi. *Nordic Journal of African Studies,* 9(2):1-10. Availbale: http://www.njas.helsinki.fi/pdf-files/vol9num2/kamwendo.pdf [Accessed 27/07/2012].

Kayambazinthu, E. (2004). The language planning situation in Malawi. In R.B. Baldauf & R.B. Kaplan (Eds.). *Language planning and policy: Africa Vol. 1 Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique and South Africa,* pp. 79-149. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Kelly, F.J., Veldman, D.J. & McGuire, C. (1964). Multiple discrimination prediction of delinquency and school dropouts. *Educational and Psychological Measurement,* 24:535-544.

Kelly, G.P. (1988). The schooling of Vietnamese immigrants. In P.S. Rothberg (Ed.). *Racism and Sexism: An integrated study*, pp. 312-323. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Kembo Sure, E. & Ogechi, N.O. (2009). *Linguistic human rights and language policy in the Kenyan education system.* Addis Ababa: Organisation for Social Science Research in Eastern and Southern Africa, OSSREA.

Kennedy, S. & Dewar, S. (1997). *Non-English speaking background students: A study of programmes and support in New Zealand schools.* Wellington: Ministry of Education, research and international section, Research unit.

Kenya Institute of Education, KIE (2011). *The Kenya Primary School Syllabus, vol. 2* (3rd edition). Nairobi: Kenya Institute of Education.

Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, KNBS (2010). 2009 *Kenya population and housing census: Population distribution by age, sex, and administrative units (Volume 1 c)* Nairobi: Government Press.

King, K. (2004). Taking a stand on language. In K. King & B. Trudell (Eds.). Language politics and the politics of language in education. *Network for Policy Research Reviews and Advice on Education and Training (NORRAG) NEWS* 34, pp. 8-11. Available: http://www.norrag.org/issues/34/en/language-politics-and-the-politics-of-language-%28in-education%29.html [accessed July 6 2012].

King, L. (2004). Education in a multilingual world: UNESCO's position. In K. King & B. Trudell (Eds.). Language politics and the politics of language in education. *Network for Policy Research Reviews and Advice on Education and Training (NORRAG) NEWS* 34, pp. 39-40. Available: http://www.norrag.org/issues/34/en/language-politics-and-the-politics-of-language-%28in-education%29.html [accessed July 6 2012].

Kioko, A., Mutiga, J., Muthwii, M.J., Schroeder, L., Inyega, H. & Trudell, B. (2008). *Language and education in Africa: A discussion paper on multilingual education.* Nairobi: UNESCO.

Kirk, J. & Miller, M. 1986). *Reliability and validity in qualitative research*. London: SAGE.

Klaus, D. (2003). The use of indigenous languages in early basic education in Papua New Guinea: A model for elsewhere. *Language and Education,* 17(2):105-111.

Kloss, H. (1969). *Research possibilities on group bilingualism: A report*. Quebec, Canada: International Centre for Research on Bilingualism.

Kobia, J.M. (2007). The challenge of mother tongue education in Kenya. *LWATI: A Journal of Contemporary Research,* 4:30-48. http://www.ajol.info/index.php/lwati/article/viewFile/36824/37561 [accessed 04/04/2012].

Komarek, K. (1997). *Mother Tongue Education in Sub-Saharan Countries: Conceptual and strategic considerations*. Bildungsreport nr. 74. Eschborn: GTZ.

Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An Introduction to qualitative research interviewing.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Kyeyune, R. (2003). Challenges of using English as a medium of instruction in multilingual contexts: A view from Ugandan classrooms. *Language, Culture and Curriculum,* 16(2):173-184.

Lambert, M. (1985). How do teachers manage to teach? Perspectives on problems in practice. *Havard Educational Review,* 55(2):178-194.

Landry, R. & Bourhis, R.Y. (1997). Linguistic landscape and ethnolinguistic vitality: An empirical study. *Journal of language and Social Psychology,* vol. 16 (1) 23-49.

Leedy, P.D. & Ormrod, J.E. (2010). *Practical research: Planning and design* (9th edition). Boston: Pearson Education Publishers.

Leek, P.A. (2000). Pre-service teachers' attitudes toward language diversity. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas, USA. Available: http://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc2629/m2/1/high_res_d/Dissertation.pdf [accessed 12/08/2012]

Lewis, E.G. (1981). *Bilingualism and bilingual education*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Lewis, M.P. (2009). (Ed.). *Ethnologue: Languages of the World* (16th edition). Dallas: SIL International. Online version: http://www.ethnologue.com/.

Lincoln, F. (2003). Language education planning and policy in Middle America: students' voices. In N. Hornberger (Ed.). *Continua of Biliteracy: An ecological framework for educational policy, research and practice in multilingual settings,* pp. 147-165. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Lo Bianco, J. (2001). *Language and literacy policy in Scotland.* Stirling, Scotland: University of Stirling, Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research.

Lo Bianco, J. (2002). ESL in a time of literacy: A challenge for policy and for teaching. *TESOL in Context,* 12(1):3-9.

Lo Bianco, J. (2004). Language planning as applied linguistics. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.). *The handbook of applied linguistics,* pp. 738-762. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Locke, J. (1964). *An essay concerning human understanding.* Cleveland: Meridian.

Loyd, D.N. (1978). Prediction of school failure from third-grade data. *Educational and Psychological Measurement,* 38:448-461.

Lucas, T. & Katz, A. (1994). Reframing the debate: the role of native languages in English-only programmes for language minority students. *TESOL Quarterly,* 28:537-562. Available: http://www.jstor.org/stable/3587307 [accessed 19/06/2012].

Lundberg, I. (1991). Phonemic awareness can be developed without reading instruction. In S.A. Brady & D.P. Shankweiler (Eds.). *Phonological processes in literacy: A tribute to Isabelle Y. Liberman,* pp. 47-53. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lundberg, I. (1994). Reading difficulties can be predicted and prevented: A Scandinavian perspective on phonological awareness in reading. In C. Hulme & M. Snowling (Eds.). *Reading development and Dyslexia,* pp. 180-199. London: Whurr.

Lundberg, I. (2006). The child's route into literacy. In A. McKeough, A.L. Phillips, V. Timmons & J.L. Lupart (Eds.). *Understanding literacy development: A global perspective,* pp. 13-30. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate Publishers.

Lundberg, I., Frost, J. & Peterson, O.P. (1988). Effects of an extensive programme for stimulating phonological awareness in pre-school children. *Reading Research Quarterly,* 33:263-284.

Lundberg, I., Olofsson, A. & Wall, S. (1980). Reading and spelling skills in the first school years predicted from phonemic awareness skills in kindergarten. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology,* 21:159-173.

Lynn, D. (1999). Literacy and effective teaching in diverse classrooms. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association. Point Clear, AL, Nov 17-19. Available: http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED436500.pdf [accessed 27/07/2012].

Makau, B.M. (2001). Improving primary school pupils' literacy in English in Kenya, Uganda and Zimbabwe - a concept paper. Unpublished paper presented at a Rockefeller foundation workshop.

Makoni, S. & Pennycook, A. (2007). Disinventing and reconstituting languages. In S. Makoni & A. Pennycook (Eds.). *Disinventing and reconstituting languages,* pp.1-41. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Malone, D.L. (2001). Summary of learning theories. Unpublished manuscript.

Malone, D.L. (2003). Developing curriculum materials for endangered language education: lessons from the field. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism,* 6(5):332-348. *Available:* http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050308667790 [accessed 06/06/2012].

Malone, S. (2004). Language policy for successful multilingual education: what does it take? In K. King & B. Trudell (Eds.). Language politics and the politics of language in education. *Network for Policy Research Reviews and Advice on Education and Training (NORRAG) NEWS* 34, pp. 40-42. Available: http://www.norrag.org/issues/34/en/language-politics-and-the-politics-of-language-%28in-education%29.html [accessed 06/07/ 2012].

Malone, S. (2007). Developing curriculum and instructional materials for Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education programs: Resources for supporting the process. Paper presented at the India Multilingual Education conference, February 2008, New Delhi.

Martin-Jones, M. (2011). Thematic Overview 1: Language policies, multilingual classrooms: Resonances across continents. In Hult, F.M &King, K.A. (Eds). *Educational linguistics in practice: Applying the local globally and the global locally,* pp. 3-15. Bristol: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Martin, N. (1987). What writers! What readers! What thinkers! *Language Arts,* 63(2):170-176.

Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative researching.* London: Sage.

Mazrui, A.A. & Mazrui, A.M. (1998). *The power of Babel: Language and governance in the African experience.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mazrui, A.M. (2004). Media of instruction in African education: The continuing paradox of dependency. In K. King & B. Trudell (Eds.). Language politics and the politics of language in education. *Network for Policy Research Reviews and Advice on Education and Training (NORRAG) NEWS,* 34, 20-21. Available: http://www.norrag.org/issues/34/en/language-politics-and-the-politics-of-language-%28in-education%29.html [accessed July 6 2012].

McGill-Franzen, A. & Allington, R.L. (1991). Every child's right: Literacy. *Reading Teacher,* 45(2):86-90.

McKeough, A., Phillips, A.L., Timmins, V. & Lupart. J.L. (2006). Preface. In A. McKeough, A.L. Phillips, V. Timmons & J.L. Lupart (Eds.). *Understanding literacy development: A global perspective,* pp. ix-xii. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

McLaughlin, B. (1985). *Second language acquisition in childhood: Vol. 2, school-age children.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

McLaughlin, B. (1986). Multilingual Education: Theory East and West. In B. Spolsky (Ed.). *Language and education in multilingual settings*, pp. 32-52. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Mekonen, A.G. (2005). Multilingualism in Ethiopia: Socio-cultural and pedagogical implications of mother tongue education in a multilingual and multiethnic society. Unpublished M.Phil Thesis, University of Oslo, Norway.

Mercado, C.I (2003). Biliteracy development among Latino youth in New York City communities: An unexploited potential. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.). *Continua of Biliteracy: An ecological framework for educational policy, research and practice in multilingual settings,* pp. 166-186. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Merritt, M., Cleghorn, A., Abagi, J.O. & Bunyi, G. (1992). Socialising multilingualism: Determinants of code switching in Kenyan primary classrooms. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development,* 13(1/2):103-121.

Met, M. (1998). Curriculum decision-making in content-based language teaching. In J. Cenoz & F. Genesee (Eds.). *Beyond bilingualism: Multilingualism and multilingual education,* pp. 35-63. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Metcalf, A. (1999). Nationalism as a destructive force. http://regentsprep.org/regents/global/themes/nationalism/division.cfm [accessed 07/08/2012]

Michaels, S. (1981). 'Sharing time': Children's narrative styles and differential access to literacy. *Language in Society,* 10:423-442.

Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd edition). London: SAGE Publications.

Milroy J. & Milroy, L. (1999). *Authority in Language: Investigating standard English* (3rd edition). London: Routledge.

Milroy, J. (2007). The ideology of standard language. In C. Llamas, L. Mullany & P. Stockwell (Eds.). *The Routledge companion to Sociolinguistics,* pp. 133-139. London: Routledge.

Moll, L. & Dworin, J. (1996). Biliteracy development in classrooms: Social dynamics and cultural possibilities. In D. Hicks (Ed.). *Discourse*, *Learning*, *and Schooling,* pp. 221-46. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Moll, L.C., Amanti, C., Neff, D. & Gonzalez, N. (2001). 'Funds of knowledge' for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice,* XXXI(2):132-141. Available: http://www.sonoma.edu/users/f/filp/ed415/moll.pdf [accessed 27/07/2012].

Molyneux, P. (2009). Education for biliteracy: Maximising the linguistic potential of diverse learners in Australia's primary school. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy,* 32(2):97-117. Available: http://www.alea.edu.au/documents/item/67 [accessed 27/07/2012].

Moodley, V. (2003). Language attitudes and code switching behaviour of facilitators and learners in language, literacy and communication senior phase outcome-based education classrooms. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Natal. Available: http://researchspace.ukzn.ac.za/xmlui/handle/10413/4070 [accessed 10/08/2010].

Moss, A. & Stott, J. (1986). *The family of stories.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Mouton, J. (2000). *How to Succeed in your master's and doctoral studies.* Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Musau, P. (2003). Linguistics human rights in Africa: Challenges and prospects for indigenous languages in Kenya. *Language, Culture and Curriculum,* 16(2):155-164.

Musau, P. (2004). Linguistic human rights in Africa: Challenges and prospects for indigenous language in Kenya. In M. Muthwii & A. Kioko (Eds.). *New Language bearings in Africa: A fresh quest,* pp. 59-68. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Mutasa, D. (1999) Language policy and language practice in South Africa: An uneasy marriage. *Language Matters: Studies in the Languages of South Africa,* 30(1):83-98.

Muthwii, M.J. (2002). *Language policy and practices in education in Kenya and Uganda: perceptions of parents, pupils and teachers on the use of Mother Tongue, Kiswahili and English in primary schools*. Nairobi: Phoenix.

Muthwii, M.J. (2004a). Language of instruction: A qualitative analysis of the perceptions of parents, pupils and teachers among the Kalenjin in Kenya. *Language, Culture and Curriculum,* 17 (1):15-32. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07908310408666679 [accessed 05/07/2012].

Muthwii, M.J. (2004b). Language planning and literacy in Kenya: Living with unresolved paradoxes. *Current Issues in Language Planning* 5(1):34-50. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14664200408669078 [accessed 27/07/2012].

Muthwii, M.J. & Kioko, A. (2004). Editorial: A fresh quest for new language bearings in Africa. In M.J. Muthwii & A.N. Kioko (Eds.). *New Language bearings in Africa: A fresh quest,* pp. 1-9. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Mutiga, J., Ngure, K. & Omondi, E. (2006a). An evaluation of the Tharaka mother tongue education programme. Unpublished programme evaluation report, BTL, Kenya.

Mutiga, J., Ngure, K. & Omondi, E. (2006b). An evaluation for the Sabaot mother tongue education programme. Unpublished programme evaluation report, BTL, Kenya.

Myers-Scotton, C. (2006). *Multiple Voices: An introduction to bilingualism.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Ndayipfukamiye, L (1994). Code switching in Burundi primary classrooms. In C.M. Rubagumya (Ed.). *Teaching and researching language in African classrooms,* pp. 79-95. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Ndayipfukamiye, L. (1993). *Teaching- learning bilingually: The case of grade five Burundi primary schools.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Lancaster University, UK.

Ndayipfukamiye, L. (1996). The contradictions of teaching bilingually in post-colonial Burundi: from Nyakatsi to maisons en étage. *Linguistics and Education,* 8:35-47. Available: http://ac.els-cdn.com/S0898589896900054/1-s2.0-S0898589896900054-main.pdf?_tid=be38fd3ba55be6fab617bad399d456cb&acdnat=1336996865_6a788cc34d6ef2ca2a2ab00339f7359f [accessed 14/05/2012].

Ng, S.M. (2006). Literacy and diversity: Challenges of change. In A. McKeough, L.M. Phillips, V. Timmons & J.L. Lupart (Eds.). *Understanding literacy development: A global perspective,* pp. 153-183. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate Publishers.

Ngugi wa Thiong'o. (1986). *Decolonising the Mind: The politics of language and culture in African literature*. Nairobi: Heinemann.

Nicholson, T. (2006). How to avoid reading failure: Teach phonemenic awareness. In A. McKeough, A.L. Phillips, V. Timmons & J.L. Lupart (Eds.). *Understanding literacy development: A global perspective,* pp. 31-64. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate Publishers.

Nomlomo, V. (2010). Turn-allocation and learner participation in Grade four Science lessons in isiXhosa and English. In Z. Desai, M. Qorro & B. Brock-Utne (Eds.). *Educational challenges in multilingual societies,* pp. 129-146. LOITASA Phase Two Research. Cape Town: African Minds.

Nyaga, S. (2005). An evaluation of the perceived long term effects of teaching Kimenti for the subject mother tongue in Tharaka schools on children's language development and identity. Unpublished MA dissertation, University of Huddersfield, UK.

O'Connor, M.C. & Michaels, S. (1996). Shifting participant frameworks: Orchestrating thinking practices in group discussion. In D. Hicks (Ed.). *Discourse*, *Learning, and Schooling*, pp. 63-104. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ogechi, N.O. (2003). On language rights in Kenya. *Nordic Journal of African Studies,* 12(3):277-295. Available: http://www.njas.helsinki.fi/pdf-files/vol12num3/ogechi.pdf [accessed 03/08/2012].

Okombo, O. (2001). *Language policy: The forgotten parameter in African development and governance*. Nairobi: University of Nairobi Press.

Osborne, A.B. (1996). Practice and theory into practice: Culturally relevant pedagogy for students we have marginalised and normalised. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly,* 27(3):285-314.

Pajares, M.F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy contract. *Review of Educational Research,* 62(3):307-332.

Palinscar, A.M. & Brown, A.L. (1984). "Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities." *Cognition and Instruction,* 2:117-175.

Parker, S. (1989). The initial reading scheme: Is there an alternative? In E.Z. Sonino (Ed.). *Literacy in School and Society: Multidisciplinary perspectives,* pp. 235-260. New York & London: Plenum Press.

Pattanayak, D. (1986). Educational use of the mother tongue. In B. Spolsky (Ed.). *Language and education in multilingual Settings,* pp. 5-15. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd edition). Thousand Oaks, Carlifornia: Sage publications.

Peck, J. (1989). Using stories to promote language and literacy development. *Reading Teacher,* 43(2):138-141. Available: http://www.jstor.org/stable/20200308 [accessed 09/03/2010].

Penfield, J. (1987). ESL: The regular classroom teachers' perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21(1):21-39.

Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied lingusitics.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pennycook, A. (2007). Postmodernism in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.). *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (2nd edition), pp. 60-76. Malden, MA: Blackwell publishing.

Pennycook, A. (2010). Nationalism, Identity and popular culture. In N. Hornberger & S.L. McKay (Eds.). *Sociolinguistics and language education,* pp. 62-68. Bristol: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Peterson, C. (2004). The politics of language in the assessment of literacies. In K. King & B. Trudell (Eds.). *Language politics and the politics of language in education.* Network for Policy Research Reviews and Advice on Education and Training (NORRAG) NEWS. Issue 34, 46-47. Available: http://www.norrag.org/issues/34/en/language-politics-and-the-politics-of-language-%28in-education%29.html [accessed 06/072012].

Peyton, J.K. (1990a). Beginning at the Beginning: First-Grade ESL students learn to write. In A.M. Padilla, H.H. Fairchild & C. M. Valadez (Eds.). *Bilingual education: Issues and strategies,* pp. 195-218. London: SAGE.

Peyton, J.K. (1990b). Dialogue Journal writing: Effective student-teacher communication. In A.M. Padilla, H.H. Fairchild & C.M. Valadez (Eds.). *Bilingual education: Issues and strategies,* pp. 184-194. London: SAGE.

Phillipson, R., Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Africa, H. (1986). Namibian educational language planning: English for liberation or neo-colonialism. In B. Spolsky (Ed.). *Language and education in multilingual settings*, pp. 77-95. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Pinnock, H., Mackenzie, P., Pearce, E. & Young, C. (2011). *Closer to home: How to help school in low- and middle-income countries respond to children's language needs.* London: Save the Children, UK.

Plüddemann, P., Mati, X. & Mahlalela-Thusi, B. (2000). Problems and possibilities in multilingual classrooms in the Western Cape. Unpublished PRAESA Occasional Paper No. 2.

Pontefract, C. & Hardman, F. (2005). The discourse of classroom interaction in Kenyan primary schools. *Comparative Education* 44(1):87-106. Available: http://www.jstor.org/stable/30044520 [accessed 19/04/2010].

Powell, R. (1996). "The music is why I teach": Intuitive strategies of successful teachers in culturally diverse learning environments. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 12(1):49-61. Availbale: http://ac.els-cdn.com/0742051X9500018F/1-s2.0-0742051X9500018F-main.pdf?_tid=cec2d1853d942394fae07d57b1bee2d1&acdnat=1344859421_f8b12178 4bd64a44b4b9683528b74905 [accessed 10/08/2010].

Punch, K.F. (2000). *Introduction to social research: Quantitative and qualitative approaches.* London: SAGE Publications.

Punch, M. (1994). Politics and ethics in qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research,* pp. 83-97. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Rajabu, R. & Ngonyani, D. (1994). Language policy in Tanzania and the hidden agenda. In C.M. Rubagumya (Ed.). *Teaching and researching language in African classrooms*, pp. 6-14. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Ramirez, J. (1992). Executive summary. *Bilingual Research Journal,* 16 (1&2) 1-62.

Ramirez, J., Yuen, S. and Ramey, D. (1991) "Final Report: Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy", early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual education programmes for language-minority children. Report for United States Department of Education. San Mateo, CA: Aguirre International. www.nabe.org/documents/research/Ramirez.pdf [accessed 08/08/2012]

Rasinski, T. (1990). Effects of repeated reading and listening while reading on reading fluency. *The Journal of Educational Research,* 83(3):147-150. Available: http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/40539669 [accessed 10/08/2012].

Republic of Kenya (RoK) (1976). *Report of the National Committee on Educational Objectives and Policies.* Nairobi: Government Printer.

Ricento, T.K. (2000). Ideology, politics and language policies: introduction. In T. Ricento (Ed.). *Ideology, politics and languages policies: Focus on English,* 1-8. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Robinson, C. (2004). Language, EFA and the MDGs: What's the connection? In K. King & B. Trudell (Eds.). *Language politics and the politics of language in education.* Network for Policy Research Reviews and Advice on Education and Training (NORRAG) NEWS. Issue 34, 44-45. Available: http://www.norrag.org/issues/34/en/language-politics-and-the-politics-of-language-%28in-education%29.html [accessed July 6 2012].

Robson, C. (2002). *Real world research: A resource for social scientists and practitioner-researchers* (2nd edition). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Rogers, A. (2004). Language in adult education and in higher education. In K. King, & B. Trudell (Eds.). *Language politics and the politics of language in education.* Network for Policy Research Reviews and Advice on Education and Training (NORRAG) NEWS. Issue 34, 26-30. Available: http://www.norrag.org/issues/34/en/language-politics-and-the-politics-of-language-%28in-education%29.html [accessed 06/07/2012].

Rose, S. & van Dulm, O. (2006). Functions of code switching in multilingual classrooms. *A Journal for Language and Learning,* 22(2):1-13. http://dx.doi.org/10.5785/22-2-63 [accessed 18/07/2012].

Rosenshine, B. & Meister, C. (1992). The usefulness of scaffolds for teaching higher-level cognitive strategies. *Educational Leadership,* 49(7):26-33.

Roy-Campbell, Z.M. (1992). *Power or pedagogy: Choosing the medium of instruction in Tanzania.* A PhD thesis, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Roy-Campbell, Z.M. (2006). The status of African languages and the global language politics: Empowering African languages in the era of globalization. In F.O. Arasanyin & M.A. Pemberton (Eds.). *Selected proceedings of the 36th annual conference on African linguistics*, pp. 1-13. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com document #1401.

Rubagumya, C. (1991). Language promotion for educational purposes: The example of Tanzania. *International Review of Education,* 37(1):67-87.

Rubagumya, C.M. (1990). *Language in education in Africa: A Tanzanian perspective.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Rubagumya, C.M. (1994). Epilogue: Towards critical language awareness in Africa. In C.M. Rubagumya (Ed.). *Teaching and researching languages in African classrooms*, pp. 155-157. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Rubdy, R. (2007). Singlish in the school: An impediment or a resource? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 28(4):308-317. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.2167/jmmd459.0 [accessed 27/07/2012].

Ruíz, R. (1984). Orientations to language planning. *Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE)*, 8(2):15-34.

Ruíz, R. (2010). Reorienting language-as-a resource. In J.E. Petrovic (Ed.). *International perspectives on bilingual education: Policy, practice and controversy,* pp. 155-172. Charlotte, NC: Information Age publishers.

Ryanga, C.W. (2002). Indigenous languages and national identity: The Kenyan experience. In F.R. Owino (Ed.). *Speaking African: African languages for education and development,* pp. 55-63. Cape Town: Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society (CASAS).

Ryen, A. (2002). Cross-cultural interviewing. In J.F. Gunbrium & J.A. Holstein (Eds.). *Handbook of interview research: Context and method,* pp. 118-137. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Save the Children (2007). *The use of languages in children's education: A policy statement.* London: Save the Children.

Save the Children (2009). *Steps towards learning: A guide to overcoming language barriers in children's education.* London: Save the Children. Available http://www.savethechildren.org.uk/en/54_7939.html [accessed 01/08/2012].

Schiffman, H. (1996). *Linguistic culture and language policy.* London: Routledge.

Schwarzer, D., Haywood, A. & Lorenzen, C. (2003). Fostering multiliteracy in linguistically diverse classrooms. *Language Arts,* 80(6):453.

Scribner, S. & Cole, M. (1981). *The Psychology of literacy.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Setati, M. (1998). Code switching in a senior primary class of Second-language Mathematics learners. *For the Learning of Mathematics,* 18(1):34-40. Available: http://www.jstor.org/stable/40248259 [accessed 14/05/2012].

Shaeffer, S. (2009). Foreword. In Save the Children. Steps towards learning: A guide to overcoming language barriers in children's education. http://www.savethechildren.org.uk/en/54_7939.html [accessed 01/08/2012].

Shafer, R.E. (1975). *A cross-national study of teachers' attitudes toward children's language in England and the United States.* Los Angeles: Annual meeting of the Teachers of English to speakers of other languages. (Eric Document reproduction service No. ED 109707).

Shohamy, E. (2001). *The Power of tests: A crtical perspective of the use of language tests.* Singapore: Longman.

Shohamy, E. (2004). Assessment in multicultural societies: Applying the principles and practices to language testing. In B. Norton & K. Toohey (Eds.). *Critical pedagogies and language learning,* pp. 72-93. London: Cambridge Univeristy Press.

Shohamy, E. (2005). The power of tests over teachers: The power of teachers over tests: In D.J. Tedick (Ed.). *Second language teacher education: International perspectives,* pp. 101-111. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers. Available: http://books.google.co.za/books?hl=en&lr=&id=e-gxMoj-jG4C&oi=fnd&pg=PA101&dq=shohamy+2004+assessment+in+multicultural+societies:+applying+democratic+principles+and+practices+to+language+testing&ots=dZibuzP7hW&sig=nlIvPoyB9K7ybocFUPg6Nd2PZdU#v=onepage&q=shohamy%202004%20assessment%20in%20multicultural%20societies%3A%20applying%20democratic%20principles%20and%20practices%20to%20language%20testing&f=true [accessed 20/06/2012].

Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agenda and new approaches.* London: Routledge.

Silverman, D. (1993). *Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analysing talk, text and interaction.* London: SAGE.

Silverman, D. (2000). *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook.* London: Sage Publications.

Sinclair, J.M. & Coulthard, R.M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils.* London: Oxford University Press.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1986). Who wants to change what and why - conflicting paradigms in minority education research. In B. Spolsky (Ed.). *Language and education in multilingual settings*, pp. 153-181. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1988). Multilingualism and the education of minority children. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas & J. Cummins (Eds.). *Minority education: From shame to struggle,* pp. 9-45. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1990). *Language, literacy and minorities.* London: The Minority Right Group.

Slavin, R.E., Karweit, N.L. & Wasik, B.A. (1992). Preventing early school failure: What works. *Educational Leadership,* 50(4):10-17.

Smit, B. (2010). Theoretical frameworks, conceptual frameworks and literature reviews. In E. Henning (with W. van Rensburg & B. Smit). *Finding your way in qualitative research,* pp. 12-29. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Smits, J., Huisman, J. & Kruijff, K. (2008). Home languages and education in the developing world. Paper commissioned for the EFA Global Monitoring Report 2009, Overcoming Inequalities: Why governance matters.

Snow, C.E. (1990). Rationales for native language instruction: Evidence from research. In A.M. Padilla, H.H. Fairchild & C.M. Valadez (Eds.). *Bilingual education: Issues and strategies,* pp. 60-74. London: SAGE.

Snow, C.E., Barnes, W., Chandler, J., Goodman, J. & Humphill, L. (1989). *Unfulfilled expectations: Family and school effects on literacy.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Spolsky, B. (1986). Overcoming language barriers to education in a multilingual world. In B. Spolsky (Ed.). *Language and education in multilingual settings,* pp. 182-191. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Stake, R. (1988). Case study methods in educational research. In R.M. Jaeger (Ed.). *Contemporary methods for research in education,* pp. 251-279. Washington DC: American Educational Research Association.

Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Stanovich, K.E. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly,* 21:340-406.

Stanovich, K.E. & Cunningham, A.E. (1998). What reading does for the mind. *American Educator,* 22:8-15.

Street, B. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Street, B. (2001). Literacy and development: Challenges to the dominant paradigm. In A. Mukherjee & D. Vasanta (Eds.). *Rethinking literacy: Dominant and alternative discourses*. Sage: London.

Street, B. (2011). Thematic Overview 11: New literacy studies and the continua of biliteracy. In Hult, F.M &King, K.A. (Eds.). *Educational linguistics in practice: Applying the local globally and the global locally,* pp.59-67. Bristol: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Stroud, C. (2001). Towards a Policy for Bilingual Education in Developing Countries. New Education Division Document No. 10. Stockholm: SIDA.

Sturman, A. (1999). Case study methods. In J.P. Keeves & G. Lakomski (Eds.). *Issues in educational research,* pp. 103-112. Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd.

Sulzby, E. (1986). Young children's concepts for oral and written text. In K. Durkin (Ed.). *Language development in the school years,* pp. 95-116. London: Croom Helm Ltd.

Sulzby, E. & Teale, W.H. (1991). Emergent literacy. In R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal & P.D. Pearson (Eds.). *Handbook of reading research, vol. 2*, pp. 727-758. New York: Longman.

Teale, W.H. (1986). Home backgrounds and young children's literacy development. In W.H. Teale & E. Sulzby (Eds.) *Emergent literacy: Writing and reading*, pp.173-205. Norwood, NJ: Ablex publishing.

Tembe, J. & Norton, B. (2008). Promoting Local Languages in Ugandan Primary Schools: The Community as Stakeholder. *The Canadian Modern Language Review,* 65(1):33-60.

Terralingua (2011). *Langscape, II(8):The case for linguistic diversity.* Availbale: https://www.terralingua.org/linguisitcdiversity/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2011/11/L II 8.pdf [accessed 14/08/2012.

Thomas, W. & Collier, V. (1997). *School effectiveness for language minority students.* Washington D.C.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. www.ncela.gwu.edu/ncbepubs/resource/effectiveness/ [accessed 10/08/2012].

Tollefson, J.W. (1991). *Planning language, planning inequality*. London: Longman.

UNESCO (2000). World Education Forum: Dakar framework for action. Paris: UNESCO: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001211/121147e.pdf [accessed 05/07/2012].

UNESCO (2003). *Education in a Multilingual World.* Paris: EBSCO publishing.

UNESCO (2005). EFA Global monitoring Report; Education for all: The quality imperative. Available: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001373/137333e.pdf [accessed 18/06/2012].

UNESCO (2007). Advocacy kit for promoting multilingual education: Including the excluded. Bangkok: UNESCO, Bangkok. Available: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0015/001521/152198e.pdf [accessed 14/08/2012]

UNESCO (2008). *Mother tongue matters: Local languages as a key to effective learning*. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO (2010). *Why and how Africa should invest in African languages and multilingual education: An evidence- and practice-based advocacy brief.* Hamburg: UNESCO Institute of Lifelong Learning.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (2004). *Human development report 2004: Cultural liberty in today's diverse society.* New York: UNDP.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) (1953). The use of vernacular language in education. *UNESCO monographs on foundations of education, No. 8.* Paris. UNESCO.

Uys, D. & van Dulm, O. (2011). The functions of classrooms code-switching in the Siyanda District of the Northern Cape. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Languages Studies,* 29(1):67-76. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.2989/16073614.2011.583159 [accessed 21/12/2012].

Valdman, A. (1989). The use of Creole as a school medium and decreolization in Haiti. In E.Z. Sonino (Ed.). *Literacy in School and Society: Multidisciplinary perspectives,* pp. 55-75. New York & London: Plenum press.

Van der Walt, C., Mabule, D. R. & De Beer, J. J. (2001). Letting the L1 in by the back door: code-switching and translation in Science, Mathematics and Biology classes. *SA Language Teaching Journal*, 35 (2&3):170-181.

Verhoeven L. & Aarts, R. (1998). Attaining functional literacy in the Netherlands. In A.Y. Durgunoğlu & L. Verhoeven (Eds.). *Literacy development in a multilingual context: A cross-cultural perspective,* pp. 111-134. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Verhoeven, L. (1994). Linguistic diversity and literacy development. In L. Verhoeven (Ed.). *Functional literacy issues and educational implications,* pp. 199-219. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Vogt, L., Jordan, C. & Tharp, R. (1987). Explaining school failure, producing school success: Two cases. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly,* 19:276-286.

Walter, S.L. & Trammell, K. (2010). The Kom experimental mother tongue education project report for 2010. Unpublished Programme report, SIL, Cameroon.

Wardhaugh, R. (1997). *An Introduction to sociolinguistics* (3rd Edition). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Wardhaugh, R. (2007). *An Introduction to sociolinguistics* (5th edition). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Weinstein, B. (1980). Language planning in Francophone Africa. *Language Problems and Language Planning,* 4(1):55-77.

Whitehead, M. (1996). *The development of language and literacy.* London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Wigginton, E. (1992). Culture begins at home. *Educational Leadership,* pp. 60-64. Available: http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_199112_wigginton.pdf [accessed 27/07/2012].

Wilde, S. (1988). Teaching skills or learning language? Spelling in the whole language classroom. Paper presented at the Modern Language Association Right to Literacy conference, Columbus, Ohio.

Wiley, T.G. (1996). Language planning and policy. In S. McKay & N.H. Hornberger (Eds.). *Sociolinguistics and language teaching,* pp. 103-47. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Willenberg, I.A. (2004). Getting set for reading in the Rainbow Nation: Emergent literacy skills and literacy environments of children in South Africa. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis: Faculty of the Graduate School of Education, Harvard University: ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

Williams, C.H. (1994). *Called unto liberty! On language and nationalism.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Williams, E. (1998). *Investigating bilingual literacy: Evidence from Malawi and Zambia.* London: Department for International Development (DFID).

Williams, E. (2004). Research and policy on language in education in Africa. In K. King & B. Trudell (Eds.). *Language politics and the politics of language in education.* Network for Policy Research Reviews and Advice on Education and Training (NORRAG) NEWS. Issue 34, pp. 34-37. Available: http://www.norrag.org/issues/34/en/language-politics-and-the-politics-of-language-%28in-education%29.html [accessed 06/07/2012].

Williams, E. (2006). *Bridges and barriers: Language in African education and Development.* Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Williams, F., Whitehead, J.L. & Miller, L. (1972). Relations between language attitudes and teacher expectancy. *American Education Research Journal,* 9:263-277.

Williams J.D. & Snipper, G.C. (1990). *Literacy and bilingualism.* New York: Longman.

Wolff, H.E. (2003). Convenor's introduction: The Vision of the African Renaissance. In H.E. Wolff (Ed.). *Tied Tongues: The African renaissance as a challenge for language planning,* pp. 1-19. London: Transaction publishers.

Wolff, H.E. (2006). Background and history - language politics and planning in Africa. In ADEA. *Optimizing learning and education in Africa - the language factor: A stock-taking research on mother tongue and bilingual education in Sub-Saharan Africa,* pp. 26-56. http://www.adeanet.org/adeaPortal/adea/downloadcenter/Ouga/B3_1_MTBLE_en.pdf [accessed 10/05/2012].

Wong-Fillmore, L. (2000). Loss of family languages: Should educationists be concerned? *Theory into Practice,* 39(2):203-210. Available: http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/1477339 [accessed 27/07/2012].

World Bank. (2005). In their own language: Education for All. In *Education Notes*, June. http://www.worldbank.org/education/ [accessed 10/08/2012].

Wright, S. (2004). *Language policy and language planning: From nationalism to globalisation.* Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.

Yack, B. (2012). *Nationalism and the moral Psychology of community.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Yates, R. (1995). Functional literacy and the language question. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 15(4):437-447. Available: http://ac.els-cdn.com/073805939500018X/1-s2.0-073805939500018X-main.pdf?_tid=ea4c8a51f83a6e491349cb934878a17c&acdnat=1344355012_4fbb2a49f895f71293677b638e36c613 [accessed 07/08/2012].

Yin, R.K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd edition). (Newbury Park, CA: SAGE publications.

Yin, R.K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yolen, J. (1981). *Touch magic.* New York: Philomel Books.

Zappa-Hollman, S. (2007). EFL in Argentina's schools: Teachers' perspectives on policy changes and instruction. *TESOL Quarterly,* 41(3):618-625.

# Appendix I

# Introductory letter from General Linguistics Department



UNIVERSITEIT·STELLENBOSCH·UNIVERSITY
jou kennisvennoot · your knowledge partner

31 August 2010

**TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN**

This is to confirm that **Ms Susan Nyaga** (student nr. 16399293) has been registered as a full-time PhD student in the Department of General Linguistics, Stellenbosch University, since February 2010. The topic of her research is *Managing linguistic diversity in language and literacy development: an analysis of attitiudes, skills and strategies in multilingual classrooms in Kenyan primary schools*.

Her interest is specifically to find out how the attitudes, skills and strategies of teachers in multilingual classrooms in early primary education are articulated and implemented in their handling of young learners with different mother tongues in the same classroom. Considering how tricky it is to do justice to all the needs of learners with different, often mutually unintelligible, mother tongues this study intends to find out how different languages are accommodated in the development of language proficiency and literacy in learners' first year of schooling.

To enable her research, we request your assistance in allowing ms Nyaga to do a preliminary study, investigating the possibility of collecting data within your institution. This will entail getting in touch with various roleplayers with a view to making sure that this will be a feasible endeavour. As the purpose at this stage is simply to determine whether data can be gained by interaction with teachers under your supervision, who are faced with the difficulty of teaching learners with different mother tongues, her current enquiry is provisional. No data will actually be recorded. If eventually it becomes clear that ms Nyaga can meaningfully collect information through access you allow, ethical clearance will be obtained from the research sub-committee A of Stellenbosch University to proceed with her project. Then, she will need your assistance to identify suitable participants, from whom she will also obtain due consent before doing any recording of communicative events. Every possible measure will be taken to assure confidentiality, anonymity and respect for the privacy and integrity of individual participants as well as your educational institution.

Regards

Prof Christine Anthonissen
_____
Research Supervisor

**Departement Algemene Taalwetenskap • Department of General Linguistics**
Privaat Sak/Private Bag XI • Matieland 7602 • Suid-Afrika/South Africa
Tel: +27 21 808 2052 • Faks/Fax: +27 21 808 2009
E-pos/E-mail: linguis@sun.ac.za

# Appendix II

# Research permit (Kenya)

**REPUBLIC OF KENYA**

# NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Telegrams:"SCIENCETECH", Nairobi
Telephone: 254-020-241349, 2213102
254-020-310571, 2213123.
Fax: 254-020-2213215, 318245, 318249
When replying please quote

P.O. Box 30623-00100
NAIROBI-KENYA
Website: www.ncst.go.ke

Our Ref:

**NCST/RRI/12/1/SS-011/41/4**

Date:

**4th February 2011**

Susan Karigu Nyaga
Stellenbosch University
SOUTH AFRICA

**RE: RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION**

Following your application for authority to carry out research on
*"Managing linguistic diversity in literacy and language development:
An analysis of teachers' attitudes, skills and strategies in multilingual
classrooms in Kenyan primary schools"* I am pleased to inform you that
you have been authorized to undertake research **in Nairobi, Central and
Eastern Provinces** for a period ending *30th June 2012.*

You are advised to report to **the District Commissioners and the
District Education Officers in the selected Districts** before embarking
on the research project.

On completion of the research, you are expected to submit **one hard
copy and one soft copy** of the research report/thesis to our office.

**P. N. NYAKUNDI**
**FOR: SECRETARY/CEO**

Copy to:

The District Commissioners
Selected District

The District Education Officers
Selected District

# Appendix III

# Ethical clearance letter from Stellenbosch University

UNIVERSITEIT·STELLENBOSCH·UNIVERSITY
jou kennisvennoot • your knowledge partner

2 March 2011

Tel.: 021 - 808-9183
Enquiries: Sidney Engelbrecht
Email: sidney@sun.ac.za

Reference No. 488/2010

Ms S Nyaga
Department of General Linguistics
University of Stellenbosch
**STELLENBOSCH**
7602

Ms S Nyaga

**APPLICATION FOR ETHICAL CLEARANCE**

With regards to your application, I would like to inform you that the project, *Managing linguistic diversity in literacy and language development: an analysis of teachers' attitudes, skills and strategies in multilingual classrooms in Kenyan primary schools*, has been approved on condition that:

1. The researcher/s remain within the procedures and protocols indicated in the proposal;
2. The researcher/s stay within the boundaries of applicable national legislation, institutional guidelines, and applicable standards of scientific rigor that are followed within this field of study and that
3. Any substantive changes to this research project should be brought to the attention of the Ethics Committee with a view to obtain ethical clearance for it.

We wish you success with your research activities.

Best regards

**MR SF ENGELBRECHT**
Secretary: Research Ethics Committee: Human Research (Non-Health)

Afdeling Navorsingontwikkeling • Division of Research Development
Privaat Sak/Private Bag XI • Matieland 7602 • Suid-Afrika/South Africa
Tel: +27 21 808 4985 • Faks/Fax: +27 21 808 4537

# Appendix IV

# Informed consent form

UNIVERSITEIT·STELLENBOSCH·UNIVERSITY
jou kennisvennoot • your knowledge partner

**STELLENBOSCH UNIVERSITY**
**CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH**

**Managing linguistic diversity in language & literacy development:**
**an analysis of teachers' attitudes, skills and strategies**
**in multilingual primary schools in Kenya**

You are being asked to participate in a research study conducted by Ms. Susan Nyaga, PhD candidate, in the Department of General Linguistics at Stellenbosch University.  The results will be used in my PhD thesis. You were selected as a possible participant in this study because you are currently the year one teacher in a multilingual school which is of interest to this study.

### 1.   PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The primary interest of the research is in to gain insight into how teachers manage in a classroom with learners from different language communities. Particularly, the focus is on strategies of teachers for handling linguistic diversity in language and literacy development of year one learners.

### 2.   PROCEDURES

If you are willing to participate in this study, we would ask you to do the following things:

Allow the researcher to sit in your class and observe lessons as you teach.
Allow the researcher to interview you following her classroom observations.
Allow the researcher to record (audio or video) some of the class observations and the interviews.

The researcher will observe your lessons for one week and interview you following the class observations

### 3.   POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

No foreseeable risks. You are also hereby reassured that the results of this research will not be used in any way for staff appraisal or disciplinary hearings.

### 4.   POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO SUBJECTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

No direct benefits to the participants.

Insights gained from this research project will improve our understanding of the challenges and coping mechanisms of teachers tasked with language and literacy development in the first year of schooling, when the learners come from different language communities.

### 5.   PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

No payments for participation in the study

## 6.  CONFIDENTIALITY

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission. Confidentiality will be maintained by means of securing the recorded data and by coding transcripts in such a way that the identity of participants is not disclosed to others than the researcher and the supervisor. The recorded data will be kept on a password protected computer, and after completion of the study, in a central electronic database set up specially for these purposes by the University of Stellenbosch.

All information will be used purely for purposes of this study.

If so requested, the researcher will have a report back session with the participants at the end of the study.

*In writing up the research and preparing for publication in scholarly journals, pseudonyms will be used for participating teachers' and school names.*

*Participants are further reassured that the results of this research will not be used in any way for staff appraisals or disciplinary hearings.*

## 7.  PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether to be in this study or not.  If you do decide to be a participant, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind.  You may also refuse to answer any questions you don't want to answer and still remain in the study. The investigator may withdraw you from this research if circumstances arise which warrant doing so.

## 8.  IDENTIFICATION OF INVESTIGATORS

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact
Principal investigator:  Susan Nyaga at 16399293@sun.ac.za Tel nr. +254 722 685773
Supervisor:  Prof. Anthonssen at ca5@sun.ac.za, tel. nr +27(0)21 808 2006
address: Department of General Linguistics, Stellenbosch University
P/bag X1, Matieland, 7601  South Africa

## 9.  RIGHTS OF RESEARCH SUBJECTS

You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty.  You are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies because of your participation in this research study.  If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact Ms Maléne Fouché at mfouche@sun.ac.za Tel nr. +27(0)21 808 4622 at the Division for Research Development, Stellenbosch University.

| SIGNATURE OF RESEARCH SUBJECT OR LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE |
| --- |

The information above was described to *me* by _____ [principal investigator] in *English* and *I am* in command of this language. *I* was given the opportunity to ask questions and these questions were answered to *my* satisfaction.

*I hereby consent voluntarily to participate in this study.* I have been given a copy of this form.

_____
Name of Subject/Participant

_____
**Name of Legal Representative (if applicable)**

_____          _____
Signature of Subject/Participant or Legal Representative          Date

| SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR |
| --- |

I declare that I explained the information given in this document to _____ [*name of the subject/participant*]. *H*e/she was encouraged and given ample time to ask me any questions. This conversation was conducted in *English* and *no translator was used.*

_____          _____
Signature of Investigator          Date

# Appendix V

# Research permit application form

FORM A (Revised 2009)

**REPUBLIC OF KENYA**

**MINISTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY**

**NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY**
**P.O. BOX 30623-00100**
**NAIROBI**

**APPLICATION FOR AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT RESEARCH IN KENYA**
*(To be completed by Kenyans)*

**PART I**
*(Notes to be read before completing the Forms)*

1. An application for a research permit must be submitted in **two(2)** copies to reach the Executive Secretary, National Council for Science and Technology, P.O. Box 30623-00100, Nairobi, Kenya (herein referred to as NCST) at least **one month** before the date the Applicant intends to start conducting the research in Kenya.

2. The research clearance application forms must be accompanied by the following:
   (a) Comprehensive curriculum vitae of all the applicants **(2 copies)**.
   (b) A comprehensive project proposal, including details of objectives, hypothesis, literature review, methodology and envisaged application of the research results **(2 copies)**.
   (c) A letter from the sponsor, if any **(2copies)** (Sponsor *is the person or body providing primary financial and or material support towards the project)*.
   (d) A copy of National Identity Card.
   (e) Two current passport-size photographs of the Applicant(s) duly endorsed by the Sponsor or Referee.
   (f) Non-refundable research application fees payable to the Executive Secretary, National Council for Science and Technology, P.O. Box 30623-00100, Nairobi.

   i.   Student Attachment/Undergraduate/Diploma............ Ksh.100.00
   ii.  Research (Academic) MSc.................................... Ksh.1,000.00
   iii. Research (Academic) PhD................................. Ksh.2,000.00
   iv.  Research (Individual/Post Doctoral)....................... Ksh.5,000.00
   v.   Research (Public Institutions)…..................................... Ksh.10,000.00
   vi.  Research (Private Institutions/Companies).......... ….. Ksh.20,000.00
   vii. Extensions.......................................Half of the rate concerned.

3. An Applicant who has been permitted to conduct research in Kenya must undertake to deposit **two (2) bound copies** of his/her research report/thesis with the NCST on completion of the research. If the research is to be completed outside Kenya, the raw, unfinished material must be endorsed by the affiliating institution and the relevant Government office before such materials may be taken out of Kenya. The final research reports must be submitted within a year from the date indicated as the completion date on this application form unless an extension has been approved in writing by the NCST.

4. For projects which take longer than a year, **two (2) copies** of yearly progress report, duly endorsed by the affiliating institution, must be submitted to the NCST.

5. Any loss or damage to materials or documents made available to a researcher must be made good by him/her.

1

6. Materials, specimens, information or documents obtained in the course of the research work must not be used or be disposed of, in a manner prejudicial to the interests of the Republic of Kenya.

7. Research association/affiliation with a relevant Kenyan research institution intended or finalized, must be shown on this application form (see Part II, No.4). It is the applicant's responsibility to negotiate for the affiliation and provide the necessary documentary evidence of this affiliation. No Research Permit will be issued until the affiliation is confirmed. A list of institutions approved for affiliation purposes is appended.

8. For short and medium-term projects, the research permit will be issued for a period **not exceeding two (2) years**, with a provision for renewal for a further one year. An application for renewal shall be submitted to the NCST at least **two (2) months** before the expiry of the permit, a renewal fee of half of the original fee, shall be paid.

9. For long-term projects taking more than three years, Applicants are advised to request for guidance and further information from the NCST before submitting their application.

10. The Government of Kenya will have access to Data and Research premises of the Projects.

11. Persons who have not submitted satisfactory final reports/thesis on the previous research work in Kenya may not be cleared for new projects.

12. Attention is drawn to the sponsoring institutions and referees on the shared responsibility of making sure that researchers sponsored by them observe the foregoing regulations. A breach of the regulations could result in refusal of permits for other researchers sponsored by same institutions or referees.

## PART II
### (To be completed by the applicant)

**1. Personal Information**

(a) Surname of the Applicant………..…………………………………………………………………

(b) Other Names………………………………………………………………….........................

(c) National Identification Number (ID No.) …………………………………………………….

(d) Permanent Residence Address………………………………..…………………………………

………………………………………...……………………………………………..……………..

(e) Postal Address…………………………………….………………………………………

(f) Contacts: Telephone……………….………………...……Fax……………………………….

        E-mail…………………………….…………………………………………………..

(g) Age………………………………….Sex………………………………..

(h) Qualifications…………………………………………………………………………………
        *(Please attach the above details for other research staff and their curriculum vitae)*

**2. Personal References**

2

*(Give names and full addresses of two senior academic/professional Referees. These should be professionally qualified in the field of research which the applicant wishes to undertake).*

(i)  Name ......................................................................................................

    Address ...................................................................................................

    Occupation ..............................................................................................

    Contacts:  Tel:........................................ Fax...........................................

             E-mail..............................................................................

    Date .............................          .................................................

                                          *(Referee's Signature)*

(ii)  Name ......................................................................................................

    Address ...................................................................................................

    Occupation ..............................................................................................

    Contacts:  Tel:........................................ Fax...........................................

             E-mail..............................................................................

    Date .............................          .................................................

                                          *(Referee's Signature)*

3. (a)  Have you applied for a Permit to conduct research in Kenya before?  Yes/No

   (b)  Title of the research (if any) previously applied for .............................................

        .................................................................................................................

        .................................................................................................................

   (c)  The application was approved/rejected *vide* the NCST's letter Ref.  No. .........................

        ...............................................Dated ...................................................

4. (a)  Have you sought affiliation with a Kenyan Institution approved for affiliation purposes?

      Yes/No.........................if yes, please give name of institution............. ...............

      .................................................................................................................

   (b)  If No, you should seek research affiliation with a relevant approved Kenyan institution and provide name of the Institution (*A list of Institutions approved for affiliation is appended*). Affiliation is mandatory before a permit can be issued.  It is the responsibility of the researcher to look for such affiliation at own cost, if any.

*Note---* Affiliation is **not** required for researchers under approved bilateral or multilateral aid schemes.

5. Name of University/ Organization under which the research Project is being undertaken

..............................................................................................................

6. (a) Source(s) of Finance ..............................................................................

..............................................................................................................

(b) Amount ..............................................................................................

7. Title of the research project ........................................................................

..............................................................................................................

..............................................................................................................

8. Purpose of the research (e.g. MSc., PhD., Post-Doctoral, others (*specify*) .......................

..............................................................................................................

9. Location of Fieldwork: Location/Division ...........................................................

District............................................. Province ...........................................

10. Estimated period of the project: from ...................................to...........................................

11. I will need access to the following Public Records ...............................................

..............................................................................................................

12. I will interview the following Government Officials .............................................

..............................................................................................................

13. I will need to interview members of the Public whom I will select as follows:
..............................................................................................................

..............................................................................................................
(*Please incorporate details of sampling procedures, if relevant in the description of your project*).

14. I intend to use the attached copies of questionnaire(s) (*if applicable*) .............................

15. I certify that I have read and understood the conditions given in parts **I** and **II**. I do agree to abide by them as required and that the information given by me in part **II** is correct to the best of my knowledge.

16. I,..........................................................(Name) do agree to deposit **two (2) bound** copies of a final comprehensive report/thesis on my research project with the NCST within a year from the date indicated as the completion date of the project in **No. 10** in part **II** above.

Signature ................................. Date ...........................................

4

**PART III**
*(For official use by institution where research is undertaken)*

1.  Name of the Institution...............................................................................

2.  Recommendation by the Head of the Institution...................................................

    .........................................................................................................................

    .........................................................................................................................

3.  Name................................................................................................................

4.  Position.............................................................................................................

5.  Official Stamp and Signature...............................................................................

    Date..................................................................................................................

**PART IV**

*(For official use only)*
1. Comments by NCST Specialist Sub-Committee...................................................

    .........................................................................................................................

    .........................................................................................................................

    .........................................................................................................................

    Date.......................................          ...............................................
                                                                *Chairman of the Sub-committee*

2. NCST Research Committee Recommendations......................................................

    .........................................................................................................................

    .........................................................................................................................

    .........................................................................................................................

    .........................................................................................................................

    .........................................................................................................................

    .........................................................................................................................

3. Approved/Not approved.

    Date.......................................          ...............................................
                                                                *Chairman, NCST Research Committee*

# Appendix VI

## A section of English lesson on 7th June 2011 – school Z (OT5 SZ.34-38)

T: How many days are there in a week? Ukauga there are seven days in a^

[You say]

Ls: week

T: Now, how many days are there in a week?

T: (cues for the learners) There ...

Ls: There are seven days in a week

T: Again, there ...

Ls: There are seven days in a week

T: Again

Ls: There are seven days an a week

T: in a week

Ls: in a week

T: Aa ... stand up ... stand up ... raitha nyuma ... spell the word seven

[stand up ... stand up ... look at the back ... spell the word seven ]

Ls: S e v e n –seven

T: Again spell the word seven

Ls: s e v e n – seven

T: Yes sit down ... so there are seven days in a week ... we have seven days

T: Now, I want we start learning about the seven days

T: The first day ... ntuku ya mbere [the first day]

T: Day tugire in ntuku. Day tugire i mbi yo? [day we said it is 'day'. Day we said it is what?]

Ls: i ntuku [it is day]

Ls: i ntugu [it is day]

T: i ntugu [it is day]

T: Uga day [say day]

Ls: day

T: Spell the word day

Ls: d a y – day

T: Yes, so the first day is called Sunday ...

T: Say Sunday is the first day

Ls: Sunday id the first day

T: Sunday is

Ls: Sunday is

T: Learner N, utiri kiraciini [Learner N you are not in class]

T: Sunday is

Ls: Sunday is

T: the first day

Ls: the first day

T: in a week

Ls: in a week

T: niyo yiitawa Sunday ... yiitawa ata? [It is the one that is called Sunday]

Ls: Sunday

T: Yiitawa ata? [it is called what?]

Ls: Sunday

T: So say the first day ... say the first day

Ls: the first day

T: is Sunday

Ls: is Sunday

T: ok spell the word sun ... sun

Ls: s

T: s

Ls: u

T: u

L:  n

T: n

T: spell the word day

Ls: spell the word

L: d

T: d

Ls: a

T: a

Ls: y

T: y

T: Kwogu indi tukaathooma Sunday ... uga Sunday

Ls: Sunday

T: Sunday

Ls: Sunday

T: Sunday is the first day

Ls: Sunday id the first day

T: Sunday is the first day

Ls: Sunday is the first day

T: of the week

Ls: of the week

T: Sunday is the first day

Ls: Sunday is the first day

T: in a week

Ls: in a week

T: Kwogu, twauga ntuku ya mbere, ira yaambagiiria kiumia yiitawa Sunday [So we have said the first day that begins the week is called Sunday]

T: Twauga ntuku ya mbere ya kwambiiria kiumia iitawa Sunday. Iitawa ata? [We have said the first day that begins the week is called Sunday. It is called what?]

Ls: Sunday

T: Yiitawa ata? [it is called what?]

Ls: Sunday

T: Twauga there are seven days in a week. And the first day is Sunday

[We have said ...]

T: the first day is^

Ls: Sunday

T: Stand up, look at the back, spell the word Sunday

Ls: S u n d a y – Sunday

**After this, the teacher moved on to other days of the week (Monday and Tuesday) with each day being taught in the same manner. They then sang a song in which the three days they had learnt were mentioned and went through the whole process of repeating the sentences after the teacher and spelling them all over again.**