

Pedagogical Practices Teachers use to teach Cinyanja in Monolingual Tumbuka Secondary Schools of Chasefu district in Eastern province of Zambia.

Nyimbili Friday,¹ Sakala Bethseba² and Mungala Ruth³

Corresponding author: nyimbili2012@gmail.com

¹Lecturer, Chalimbana University, Department of Literature and Languages

²Senior Examinations Specialists for Zambian Languages, Examinations Council of Zambia

³Lecturer, Chalimbana University, Department of Literature and Languages

Abstract

This study aimed to investigate the pedagogical practices teachers use to teach Cinyanja to the Tumbuka learners of Chasefu district. The objectives were to ascertain the pedagogical practices that teachers use to teach Cinyanja in the secondary schools of Chasefu district, establish the pedagogical challenges being faced by the teachers to teach Cinyanja in the secondary schools of Chasefu district, and how best Cinyanja can be taught in Chasefu schools. A descriptive phenomenological design was used on the population of teachers, administrators, and learners in Chasefu district who were randomly sampled. The study sample was 60, which included five (5) deputy head teachers, five (5) heads of department for the department of Literature and Languages, ten (10) teachers of Cinyanja, and forty (40) pupils in five secondary schools. Data was collected through interviews, classroom observation, and focus group discussion guides. The findings revealed that teachers avoided certain pedagogical practices they had little or no knowledge about. The common pedagogical practices they used included discussions, individual work, pair work, group work, translation and code-switching. The pedagogical practices they avoided included debate, research, project work, drama, sketch, play activities and simulations and role plays. In terms of pedagogical challenges that teachers faced, the study revealed that there were inadequate teaching and learning materials, low literacy levels among learners, L1 interference causing code mixing in the works of the learners, negative attitude of the learners towards the subject and word for word translation when handling translation exercises. The study concluded that the teaching of Cinyanja in monolingual areas like Chasefu needed the implementation of translanguaging practices since they already use the practices in schools. The study recommended that translanguaging practices be used in training and teaching regional languages where monolingualism is more prevalent than the target language.

Keywords: pedagogical practices, Cinyanja, Tumbuka, Chasefu district

Introduction

Teacher training of Zambian language teachers is usually conducted in English language and learners use examples drawn from their local languages (Manchishi and Mwanza, 2018). This is traced back to 1966 when the policy of using the English language as a medium of instruction in Zambian schools was pronounced and it was to be used as an official language in government workplaces and education from grade one to tertiary levels and Zambian languages were to be

taken as subjects where local languages were allowed to be used (Mkandawire, 2017). This pronouncement subsequently degraded the Zambian languages to only being optional languages. Further, seven zonal languages were chosen as languages that will be offered in schools according to their zonal representation being Kaonde, Tonga, Lunda, Luvale, Lozi, Bemba, and Nyanja. Since then, different studies have argued that these languages do not represent the actual linguistic collection of these regions as communities have evolved and some communities have repelled such languages and their influence in the communities. Chasefu is one community which has remained an intact language as Tumbuka has been undergoing language maintenance to cope with the new languages which are coming into contact with it (Nyimbili, Namuyamba-Kabika and Tembo, 2018). Therefore, there are indeed calls for some languages to be reconsidered in the planning system in the next curriculum review so that a proper representation is done.

The Zambian policy guidelines are alive to the fact that children who are taught in their local languages learn better than using a foreign language to deliver such instruction in schools (MOE, 1977; 1992; 1996 & 2014). The 2014 policy document still maintains that the teaching of Zambian languages in-secondary schools should be according to the regional languages which were established after independence. The language policy in Zambia demands that pupils in Chasefu should learn Cinyanja as their examinable Zambian Language at all examination levels despite the regional official language in question being a second language to the learners of Chasefu and that it is also not mutually intelligible (Nkhata et al., 2019; Zimba, 2007).

Han (2022) states that lecturers were confident with the use of the English language in the English Language Medium instruction lecturers' ideology of using the target language only to teach language. Translanguaging practices in multilingual classrooms presented survival strategies to counter the delays in their cognitive thinking to control the language flow during lectures. Interactive learners are usually receptive to translanguaging practices which benefited the minority students as it strengthened their identity in class. Garcia and Kleifgen (2020) also point out that some educators in multilingual classrooms take the initiative to create space for their students to access multiple language resources to enhance and engage learners. Kirsch, and Duarte (2020) realised that teaching programmes are therefore monoglossic in nature and this made many schools to be mainly monolingual in their ideological approach to languages. Their main language-related policy was to develop students' academic abilities in the school language(s) and phase out home languages which was also similar to the Zambian situation where Cinyanja was the target language among the many languages.

Communities that had a Zambian Language which was different from the L1 of its learners needed to have well laid down pedagogical practices to suit them. However, what is transpiring currently is that foreign approaches are being used to teach Zambian Languages even in communities where the same Zambian Languages are also second languages to the learners. The corpus Language Planners needed to consider coming up with workable pedagogical practices for teaching Zambian Languages in communities with different mother tongues if the desired outcomes were to be achieved. As such, the problem at hand was that there was insufficient literature on the pedagogical practices used by the teachers of Cinyanja on the Tumbuka learners in the classrooms of Chasefu district. This study therefore sought to investigate the pedagogical practices used by the teachers of Cinyanja to the Tumbuka learners of Chasefu at the secondary school level in the Tumbuka classrooms of Chasefu district.

The different changes in the curriculum and education practices through the Educating Our Future policy proposed several teaching and classroom practices that are to be used in the different subjects. There was a turn from the teacher-centered teaching methods to learner-centered methods in both teacher-training institutions and in the schools (Manchinshi, 2004). The different policies in education provided a guide for the teaching and learning of languages in all Zambian schools. A review of the teaching methods indicated that Zambia has had experience with traditional teacher-directed methodologies as well as the more participatory teaching methods as a means of teaching communicative skills in another language to speakers of different languages (Simasiku, 2011).

Studies have noted that teachers were not following the government policy on education to teach learners using learner-centred techniques. There was rigidity in teachers to welcome change in the pedagogical area of educational practice. This revelation also meant that learners were not learning the needed soft skills embedded in the learner-centred techniques through the teachers in schools. Perhaps this was the more reason teachers avoided complicated learner-centred techniques like projects, drama, and role play. However, there was no justification as to why they did not follow the new policy on education and utilise the disadvantages to their advantage so that they teach the learners as the syllabus and schemes demand (Nyimbili, Namuyamba, Chakanika, 2018). In addition, Makoe (2018) argue that many educational systems continue to follow policies that are based on traditional conceptualisations of languages as discreet, autonomous, hermetically sealed units; consequently, characterising children's rich experiences, multilingual skills or 'funds of knowledge' as detrimental to learning in general.

Garcia and Kleifgen (2020) state that some educators in multilingual classrooms take the initiative to create space for their students to access multiple language resources to enhance and engage learners. Nyimbili (2017) also found that project, drama, and role play were not used in English classes in secondary schools. This trend seems to repeat itself even amongst the teachers of language and this can be attributed to the lack of effective communicative and interactional activities. Meanwhile, the teaching techniques used by teachers are part of the learner-centred techniques recommended by the MOE (2014) and Nyimbili et al., (2018) who found that certain learner-centred techniques were preferred by teachers who developed an interest in them and had confidence that learners can do it with minimum supervision learners to integrate linguistic and cultural funds of knowledge amassed from different settings including home, community, a school in fluid and seamless ways

In other studies, Lopez et al., (2017) concur that most current initial content assessments administered within schools assume monoglossic ideological practices in that they assume all students are monolingual. Lasagabaster (2014) add that it is obvious that due to the growing linguistic diversity in today's classrooms, not all teachers can speak all the languages spoken in their classrooms, but each teacher can participate in the dynamic bilingual model which calls for students to also begin to speak their weaker language. Makoe (2018) provide contrary views to the teacher's assertion that mixing languages confuses learners and will inhibit their learning, translanguaging spaces provide opportunities for teaching and learning.

The implementation of local language teaching in the Zambian context has been characterised by the teaching and learning material challenges which should be addressed if learners in secondary schools can learn effectively (Nyimbili et al., 2018: Mkandawire, 2020 and Mwanza, 2016). The Ministry of Education too acknowledged the lack of sufficient teaching and learning materials in the Zambian languages and English classes and linked this to the poor

academic performance being experienced in the schools today (MOE, 1996:2014). In doing so, the teaching of Cinyanja in the Zambian schools has been facing specific challenges like that of lack of text books, trained teachers, and other teaching and learning materials (Nyimbili, 2020: Mkandawire, 2022 and Sakala, 2020). The other challenge has been the negative language attitude which is also developed by the teachers who are not speakers of the regional language but have learnt how to teach using the regional language in an area where the regional language is not familiar (Pali, 2020).

To solve such challenges, Lasagabaster (2014) argues that scholars must combat the monoglossic vision of bilingualism prevailing in most educational institutions which puts a significant part of our students at a disadvantage, especially in the case of emerging bilinguals for whom the language of instruction is their weaker language, further, Iversen (2019) add that learners in groups functioned as negotiations in which pre-service teachers would bring up opinions and suggestions associated with different concerns and ideologies. When multilingual practices are used in monolingual classrooms, Nyimbili (2021) stated that learners were able to interact freely and contribute to the lesson, share knowledge in class, share cultural knowledge through translation, and enrich their linguistic power through multiliteracy development.

In the process of implementing translanguaging, Lasagabaster (2014) noted that translanguaging pedagogical practices seek to promote pedagogical practices that consider bilingualism as a resource rather than a problem. He argues that bilingual classes must embrace a more open and flexible view that fosters the synergies of the languages in contact, rather than penalize the simultaneous use. Iversen (2017) argues that many students with a migrant background might be hesitant to draw upon their home language because they have previously experienced the exclusion of these languages from school. Later, Iversen (2019) contends that the teacher should explicitly encourage students to translate key vocabulary into and compare grammar with, other languages in the students' repertoires. Such measures will enable the children in the changing Zambian schools to have access to education and discard the current symbolic violence (Mwanza, 2020) which is currently visible and reducing access to knowledge. Nyimbili (2021:71) explains that the lack of translanguaging policy makes the teachers fail to raise the needed hopes for the multilingual children who need access to content in education which is hidden in another language of power.

Recent studies (Nyimbili and Mwanza, 2020 and Nyimbili, 2021) have argued that regional languages do not represent the actual linguistic collection and do not show the actual classroom sociolinguistics to warrant the use of some zonal languages in the Zambian communities. The Chasefu community is monolingual, and all social functions are presided using Tumbuka instead of Cinyanja which is a regional language (Simwinga, 2006 and Zimba, 2007). The MOE (2014:ii) guides that the main methods of teaching and learning Zambian Languages, especially in line with Vision 2030 for Zambia, should include among others: Simulations and role-play, drama/sketch/play activities, project work, pair and group work activities, discussions, debate, research and information transfer. Therefore, this study needed to be conducted to find out the pedagogical practices teachers use to teach Cinyanja in monolingual Tumbuka secondary schools of Chasefu.

Objectives

The study sought to address the following research objectives.

- i. To ascertain the pedagogical practices that teachers use to teach Cinyanja in the secondary schools of Chasefu district,
- ii. To establish the pedagogical challenges being faced by the teachers to teach Cinyanja in the secondary schools of Chasefu district,
- iii. To suggest best practices for teaching Cinyanja in Chasefu monolingual schools.

Theoretical framework

The theory was anchored on the Three Language Orientations (RUIZ, 1983) where he discussed language planning to surround the idea of being a right, a problem, and as a resource. When language is planned as a right, it will provide that language will mediate access to society including education and employment. He also argued that linguistic inequality leads to social inequality and that pupils have the rights to use their own language in specific domains including the classroom for education (Hult 2016:33). When such happens, there is classroom democratisation and knowledge is shared through a local language. In considering language as a resource, it means that societal multilingualism and cultural diversity are valued and that all languages are valued and used in various domains including the classroom. Learners have more access to knowledge through their languages and teachers encourage such practices. However, planning language as a problem meant that monolingualism in an officially designated language, policies seek to limit or eliminate multilingualism, and minority languages are perceived to be a threat to the status of the dominant majority language (Hult 2016:33). Such classes limit the learners to stick to one language of instruction and it is used for educational purposes.

Methodology

The study used a phenomenological design. This design was relevant for this study because it enabled the researcher to interact with the participants in their natural setting and understand their experiences. The study population included the teachers of Zambian languages and the learners who took Zambian languages in the secondary schools of Chasefu district in Chief Magodi. The study sample was 53 which included five (3) heads of department for the Department of Literature and Languages, ten (10) teachers of Cinyanja, and forty (40) pupils in five secondary schools. These schools were homogeneously picked because they have been offering Cinyanja as a subject for more than seven years and learners have been writing examinations at grade 9 and 12 levels. There were other secondary schools which are in the chiefdom, but they were not as established as the sampled schools. All the schools had two teachers of Cinyanja and one head of department hence they were sampled using a typical sampling procedure. A typical sampling procedure involves picking a sample which is knowledgeable about a situation at hand (Patton, 1990). These teachers were teaching the learners Cinyanja hence their experiences are what were typically important in this study. The classrooms for observation were also sampled using maximum variation because these classes were unique to the other classes because of them taking Cinyanja.

The researcher used two research instruments to gather data for the study. Firstly, interview guides were used to collect data from heads of department and teachers. These were interviewed because the later taught Cinyanja in the secondary schools while the former supervised the teachers in the schools. An observation schedule was also used to understand the classroom pedagogical practices that the teachers used to teach Cinyanja in the monolingual classrooms in Chasefu district. Observing lessons was important as it helped the researcher to

understand the practices and how the learners interacted in such a classroom. Data was analysed thematically by sorting and grouping similar responses and the present views that were relevant to the study. This enabled the researcher to make the study present relevant data which was rich and unique. The participants' names, locations and identification have not been disclosed in this study. A consent form was also signed between the participants and the researcher to ensure adherence to the ethics of research was followed.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The findings were presented under three themes of the study, and these have become the subheading of this section. In presenting the findings, 'T' stands for 'teacher' and 'H' stands for 'head of department in this study and they must be considered as such.

Pedagogical practices that teachers use to teach Cinyanja in the secondary schools of Chasefu district.

The study findings revealed that teachers used pair and group work when teaching Cinyanja in the secondary schools of Chasefu district. These teaching techniques were frequently used because the teachers found them easy to use when teaching learners since they created learner-to-learner interaction. In probing further, it was revealed that these teaching techniques settled well with the teaching of structure which called for learner interaction before they could respond to the questions presented to them. T8 said: *I can simply say the use of group work makes my work easy because learners interact with each other at that level, and they make sense out of it.* H2 also said: *pair work was interactive although the teachers did not know the languages the learners used. All they wanted to achieve was the pairs interacting.* The teaching techniques used by teachers are part of the learner-centred techniques recommended by the MOE (2014) and Nyimbili et al., (2018) who found that certain learner-centred techniques were preferred by teachers who developed an interest in them and had confidence that learners could do it with minimum supervision. What has to be understood is that these two techniques applied to the teaching of the English language while teachers struggled to use these techniques in Zambian language classes. Structure was presented in Cinyanja to the learners and the teacher did not supervise the class discussions, pair, and group work which resulted in-teaching being less effective hence a well supervised learner centred engagement brings about effective learner interaction through a neutral language.

It was also established that teachers used individual work, discussions, and research to teach Cinyanja in the monolingual classes in Chasefu district. From the classroom observation and document analysis, it was realised that learners were never given work to research and what was dominant was individual work through exercises and reading passages in comprehension. As much as the teachers were confident that they used the prescribed teaching techniques to teach Cinyanja, the learners were not being taught using discussion and research techniques since this did not appear in their lesson plans though it was documented in the schemes of work. This meant that teachers did not use all the planned teaching techniques to execute the Zambian language lessons in the monolingual classes.

These findings are a manifestation that the Cinyanja classrooms in Tumbuka schools were not learning Cinyanja using the prescribed curriculum prescribed methodologies because the language being taught is not familiar to the learners. Such challenges are not isolated as Nyimbili (2017) found that project, drama, and role play were not used in English classes in

secondary schools. This trend seems to repeat itself even amongst the teachers of language and this can be attributed to the lack of effective communicative and interactional activities. Therefore, the data then suggest that teachers were not of the idea of exposing learners to practical language skills as the use of drama, role play, and research was a way of promoting the soft skills of the learners through the hard skills that are imparted in them. This can also be linked to the lack of interest by the learners in their learning Cinyanja which influenced their comprehension inconsistencies.

The study also established that teachers did not use the different types of translations as a teaching strategy in the Zambian language classes. As much as the translation was a component which was taught by the teachers, it should be realised that it is a strategy which is used to teach Cinyanja in the different classes. One H1 said: *teachers fail to use translation as a teaching strategy when translating from one language to another despite the learners not knowing Cinyanja*. Such deprived the learners from knowing the knowledge they deserved. T3 also said: *I usually use English when I am teaching translation from Cinyanja into English and vice versa. I have not been translating words from Cinyanja into Tumbuka since this is not the target language*. From the classroom observation, it was also seen that learners were not conversant with Cinyanja, and the teacher did not care to translate some of the difficult words into Tumbuka but paid a blind eye and continued teaching. This resulted in learners not grasping the concept being taught and led to learners not performing very well.

Translation in the Cinyanja classes was used to help learners make meaning from the lessons they were learning in a language they could not understand effectively. The monolingual teaching practices fail to make learners make meaning in multilingual classrooms because learners are not helped to make meaning of the lesson which is in a foreign language to them. To this, Makoe (2018) argues that many educational systems continue to follow policies that are based on traditional conceptualisations of languages as discreet, autonomous, hermetically sealed units; consequently, characterising children's rich experiences, multilingual skills or 'funds of knowledge' as detrimental to learning in general. Through routine translation, learners were able to understand what the teachers were teaching in the class since translation was tapping into their emergent literacy which they related to the lesson and realised that they knew what the teacher wanted except that it was in a different language. The translation is seen to free up the space for teacher-to-learner interaction and help learners build their knowledge in the manner they needed in another language. Through translation, the classroom language, Tumbuka, was used as a resource-for the learning of Cinyanja in a discontent classroom and this was common in all the schools.

The study further revealed that other teaching practices and methods were not used to teach Cinyanja by the teachers as they said that they were not friendly to learners and the learners did not appreciate them. Pedagogical practices which were more engaging like role play or drama, research, and individual presentations were not used by the teachers. H1 said: *the time I decided to ask my learners to participate in drama for the sake of learning Cinyanja, the results were that learners used Tumbuka continuously in the play and this failed the purpose and Cinyanja was not used*. T4 also said: *if you want to continue listening to Tumbuka in a Cinyanja lesson, try to dramatize your lesson. These children are all good Tumbuka speakers and not Cinyanja*. From the classroom observation, learners interacted with each other in groups using Tumbuka and they presented in some Cinyanja which was not fluent at the level of a secondary school students.

Some teaching practices which teachers were used to teaching Cinyanja in the Tumbuka monolingual classroom created space for learners to participate in the lesson. To the foregoing, Garcia and Kleifgen (2020) consent that some educators in multilingual classrooms take the initiative to create space for their students to access multiple language resources to enhance and engage learners. If this initiative had not been taken in the Zambian secondary schools, it would have been difficult to make learners learn in such classrooms as the language being taught is not the learner’s language. Therefore, the teacher’s diverse practices which are not prescribed in the Zambia curriculum have become more useful to the monolingual classes where Cinyanja is not their community language. This brings about the understanding that the teachers were able to use the classroom languages as a resource to learn Cinyanja.

The teachers prohibited learners from code switching and code mixing when learning Cinyanja in the secondary schools of Chasefu district as they thought such would make learners fail to learn effectively in the Cinyanja class. During the literature lessons, learners who could not express themselves coherently in Cinyanja hence they tried to code-switch into Tumbuka and mix it with English to some extent. However, teachers did not support such efforts. This meant that teachers did not appreciate the knowledge which learners held in other languages. From classroom observations, teachers were strict in ensuring that only one language flourished in the classroom. The use of Tumbuka was not allowed hence most learners remained quiet in class since they did not know Cinyanja. T7 said: *these children hardly speak Cinyanja fluently, but they switch between Cinyanja and Tumbuka when learning Cinyanja which I discourage because learning should be in Cinyanja*. H3 said: *when I go to observe my teachers who teach Cinyanja, I usually see teachers not allowing learners to mix Cinyanja and Tumbuka and even English*. The teachers do not allow it, and learners remain silent in most cases since they do not know Cinyanja.

The findings are in line with Makoe (2018) who also found that contrary to the teacher’s assertion that mixing languages confuses learners and will inhibit their learning, translanguaging spaces provide opportunities for learners to integrate linguistic and cultural funds of knowledge amassed from different settings including home, community, school in fluid and seamless ways. In addition, it can be inferred that learners were being suppressed by the teachers in Cinyanja classes and were forced to relinquish their Tumbuka identity and be made to respect Cinyanja was not their language. Such linguistic suppression is embedded in the way the language is planned for education purposes which recommends monolingual practices and sees other languages and multilingualism as a problem to the strengthening of Cinyanja. For this, making Cinyanja-popular is to make multilingual ideologies like code mixing be suppressed and promote monolingual ideologies.

Pedagogical challenges being faced by the teachers to teach Cinyanja in the secondary schools of Chasefu district.

The study established that there were several challenges which were being faced by the teachers and learners as a result of teaching and learning Cinyanja in the Tumbuka communities of Chasefu district. The first challenge is the code switching which was found in the learners’ writing where Tumbuka words appeared in the Cinyanja text. It was learnt that the common words which were used included:

Tumbuka	Cinyanja
----------------	-----------------

Mwana wanga wakwamba ni Malita	<i>Mwana wanga woyamba ni Malita</i>
Wakamanganyumba iyi mbadada	<i>Anamanga nyumba iyi ndi atate</i>
Dzulo kunali nyimbu kwambiri chomene	<i>Dzulokunaliudzudukwambiri</i>
Mwana akudyabala	<i>Mwana akudyaphala</i>
Pa chinkondi ninzenge kwanu	<i>Pa chinai ndidzabwera kwanu</i>

Table 1: code switching in Cinyanja classrooms.

Such words were very common in the learners' writing and this made the learners comfortable in their writing. These writings were not only common in compositions but also in oral communication which was used. H3 said: *we have been seeing a lot of writing which combines Tumbuka and Cinyanja in one sentence. If the teacher does not know Tumbuka, the sentence does not make sense.* After examining the learners' books, it was indeed found that there were many such constructions which were written by the learners. Even during classroom presentations, learners code-switched and mixed languages to stress a point in the Cinyanja lesson. T5 stated that: *I can tell you that we have language challenges here. Learners are more of Tumbuka than Cinyanja because Cinyanja is not common in the community.*

Code mixing in the written work was perceived as a challenge because the teachers and the government believes that literacy and education gains should be tied to monolingual. Lopez et al., (2017) concur that most current initial content assessments administered within schools assume monoglossic ideological practices in that they assume all students are monolingual. Lasagabaster (2014) adds that it is obvious that due to the growing linguistic diversity in today's classrooms, not all teachers are able to speak all the languages spoken in their classrooms, but each teacher can participate in the dynamic bilingual model which calls for students to also begin to speak their weaker language. From the write-up which was mixed, the study does not consider this as a challenge but as a multiliteracy development process which only needs linguistic separation so that learners can use each language for its purpose. In the meantime, the lack of policy guidelines on translanguaging pedagogical practices brings such progressive linguistic inscriptions to be known as challenges instead of being celebrated as a literacy breakthrough in the minor language.

The other challenge established in the study was that of lack of adequate teaching and learning materials coupled with low literacy levels in Cinyanja. When it came to the teaching of reading comprehension, summary, and literature, it was learnt that the teaching materials like books were in short supply in schools. During the class observation, it was discovered that learners crowded for one book to read and answer a comprehension passage which was not healthy. T2 lamented that: *this is how we teach. I have three pupil's books which I use to teach with comprehension and summary. How do you expect learners to read the passage for themselves, it cannot work.* H2 also said: *the Cinyanja books are in short supply and the teachers fail to teach comprehension and summary in the manner it is supposed to be taught.* This applies to the literature component where we just have one copy, and some copies are just a photocopy of the original since the books are not seen. From such challenges, the teachers couldn't use proposed learner-centred activities to teach Cinyanja in monolingual classes as the teacher is the first source of the language.

The implementation of local language teaching in the Zambian context is a mould with teaching and learning material challenges which should be addressed if learners in secondary schools can learn effectively (Nyimbili et al., 2018; Mumba & Mkandawire, 2020 and Mwanza, 2016). The Ministry of Education also acknowledged the lack of sufficient teaching and learning materials in the Zambian languages and English classes and linked this to the poor academic performance being experienced in the schools today (MOE, 1996:2014). Therefore, it should be realised that in translanguaging classes, teaching and learning materials are linked to the availability of the teachers and learners who are key in the teaching and learning. There is a need for educational practitioners to understand that the government has the obligation to make the teachers teach effectively through the provision of relevant teaching and learning materials in secondary schools. These materials lead to improved pedagogical implementation which make the learners benefit from the teachers as much as they add their creativity in the process.

The other challenges have been the negative attitude towards the teaching and learning of Cinyanja in secondary schools. It was learnt that the teachers who were teaching Cinyanja were not indigenous Chewa speakers, but Tumbuka people who were just trained how to teach Zambian languages from colleges. The learners too, had a negative attitude because they were not learning the language as expected using the necessary materials. During the class observation, learners were not participating in the lessons because they had no book to follow the reading both in literature and comprehension lessons. The summary was and translation was written on the board to enable every learner to take part in the lesson. T7 stated that: *teaching Cinyanja components like reading is not possibly best done in Chasefu district because there are no books for learners to read and follow the phonological and phonetic aspects of Cinyanja.* This is the reason learners speak Cinyanja in the Tumbuka intonation. H1 said: *getting learners motivated is a problem because we do not have teaching and learning materials. It is a sad story on this one.* With such challenges in the secondary schools, it is a challenge to make learners develop a positive attitude towards the teaching and learning of Cinyanja in the secondary schools of Chasefu district. Learners fail to read accurately, translate, and understand text and the interest of learning the language is never in them as a language attitude is developed.

The teaching of Cinyanja in Zambian schools has been facing challenges of lack of textbooks, trained teachers and other teaching and learning materials (Nyimbili, 2021; Mkandawire, 2022; Kafusha et al., 2021; Sakala, 2020). A negative language attitude is also developed by teachers who are not speakers of the regional language but have learnt how to teach using the regional language in an area where the regional language is not familiar (Pali, 2020). The lack of materials coupled with standard assessment tests which are usually given in a single language make teachers and learners negative with the Zambian languages which are taught in schools, thus confusing subject knowledge with linguistic competence. Lasagabaster (2014) adds that scholars must combat the monoglossic vision of bilingualism prevailing in most educational institutions which puts a significant part of our students at a disadvantage, especially in the case of emerging bilinguals for whom the language of instruction is their weaker language. This demonstrates that teachers still view multilingualism as a problem and their innovation is limited because they wait for the government to provide the teaching and learning materials instead of them improvising to some extent.

Suggested best practices for teaching Cinyanja in Chasefu monolingual schools

Participants established that communities like Chasefu needed special consideration in the teaching and learning process because the Tumbuka and Cinyanja languages have different orthographs which should be discussed. Firstly, there was a need for the teachers to teach the linguistic differences before the learners could use Cinyanja to learn Cinyanja in such schools. This will enable the learners to perform better. From the classroom observations which were conducted in schools, it was true that learners were unable to use Cinyanja to learn Cinyanja effectively in the sampled schools because the two languages were different, and this calls for pedagogical harmonization. This harmonization should deal with the extensive use of multilingual teaching practices to avert the current challenges being faced. One teacher said: we should use teaching practices which will enable the learners and teachers to interact and learn from each other in class.

These findings are supported by Iversen and Mkandawire (2020) who also found that learners in groups functioned as negotiations in which pre-service teachers would bring up opinions and suggestions associated with different concerns and ideologies. Through these negotiations, they created a space where multilingual practices were considered legitimate as long as they did not compromise the target language. Cinyanja classrooms have to be democratized so that learners are able to use the languages which are in class when presented with tasks to discuss. Such language practices would bring about better learner to learner interaction in a less controlled environment, and it would lead learners to use the classroom languages as a resource instead of seeing Tumbuka as a problem as the policy sees it.

In such suggestions, participants indicated that there was a need for teachers to use translation as a teaching practice in classes like Chasefu whose first language is different from the language of instruction. H1 said: *in classes like the Chasefu classes, we have to continue translating from Cinyanja into Tumbuka and vice versa because when the teachers use one language consistently, learning fails to take place.* T1 added that: *I usually translate from Cinyanja to Tumbuka and vice versa because the two languages are the different from each other.* The translation was then seen to be a helpful teaching practice as only content is translated from Cinyanja into Tumbuka for the sake of learning in that class.

The use of translation as a pedagogical practice is supported by Nyimbili (2021) who stated that learners were able to interact freely and contribute to the lesson, share knowledge in class, share cultural knowledge through translation, and enrich their linguistic power through multiliteracy development. It can be argued that translation was a way of providing linguistic meaning between and amongst languages as learners become literate in the classroom languages. Iversen (2017) argues that many students with a migrant background might be hesitant to draw upon their home language because they have previously experienced the exclusion of these languages from school. Iversen (2019) contends that the teacher should explicitly encourage students to translate key vocabulary into and compare grammar with, other languages in the students' repertoires. In this case, monolingual communities like Chasefu need translanguaging pedagogical practices to enable learners to acquire biliteracy and use the power in their first language to transfer the skills into the second language. If teachers can continue providing such space through translation, then, learners would be able to thrive and use multilingualism in the classroom as a resource-for learning.

It was also revealed that teachers should be encouraged to code switch and code mix during teaching and learning in Tumbuka-oriented classes. The use of code-switching provides learners with linguistic options which can be used to replace the unfamiliar words in the target

language in class. During the classroom observations, the learners who could code-switch were able to communicate their ideas to the rest of the class and teachers effectively. T6 also said that: *learners who code switch is able to demonstrate the knowledge they hold in a local language mixing with the target language. This makes them come out better with answers.* H2 said: *I have allowed my teachers to code switch in their classes so as to help the learners who do not have sufficient linguistic competencies in Cinyanja to also have access to knowledge and classroom participation.* Therefore, teachers should be encouraged to code switch in classes if they are to improve learner participation and content understanding in the Tumbuka-speaking classrooms.

These suggestions are supported by Lasagabaster (2014) who stated that translanguaging pedagogical practices seek to promote pedagogical practices that consider bilingualism as a resource rather than a problem. He argues that bilingual classes must embrace a more open and flexible view that fosters the synergies of the languages in contact, rather than penalize the simultaneous use. Despite the teachers in the Cinyanja bilingual class being able to translanguange spontaneously and against the policy, it should be noted that this is the only way such learners in such isolated classes can have access to knowledge and escape the suppressive policy and curriculum which hinder their academic achievement. With such isolated success stories which have influenced learning in the linguistically and pedagogically suppressed classes, we have to start thinking positively and embrace the sociolinguistic realities existing in our classrooms and communities to support multilingual pedagogical practices in the multilingual Zambian schools. This will enable the children in the changing Zambian schools to have access to education and discard the current symbolic violence (Mwanza, 2020) which is currently visible and reducing access to knowledge. Zambian should consider implementing translanguaging pedagogical practices because Nyimbili (2021:71) argues that the lack of a translanguaging policy makes the teachers fail to raise the needed hopes for the multilingual children who need access to content in education which is hidden in another language of power. Since Cinyanja is a subject, it can be taught better when translanguaging practices are a policy in the Zambian context. Other minority and suppressed languages would benefit its people in the wider Zambian communities.

Conclusion

The study concludes that teachers of Cinyanja were using translanguaging practices unknowingly to make meaning in their classrooms where the learners were monolingual, Tumbuka speakers. To this, teachers used few prescribed learner-centred techniques like individual work, pair work, and group discussions which were characterised by Tumbuka and not Cinyanja. Cinyanja classrooms in Tumbuka schools were not learning Cinyanja using the curriculum-prescribed methodologies because the language being taught is not familiar to the learners hence teachers used the familiar language to teach the target language. Teachers resorted to responding to the rigid monolingual pedagogical practices by implementing multilingual practices like translation, code-switching, and code mixing among others to enable learners to have access to knowledge in their classrooms which also manifested in their writing. This was a way to provide the right to education through Tumbuka which the curriculum failed to provide as teachers used Tumbuka as a resource for learning Cinyanja. Therefore, the teaching pedagogical practices in such communities as Chasefu should be in multilingual practices like translanguaging which provides unlimited boundaries to knowledge access in the bilingual and multilingual communities.

Recommendations

The study recommends that:

1. The government should provide a policy guideline for the use of multilingual practices in the changing communities where sociolinguistics do not respond to the proposed regional language. This will enable learners to have access to better learning and knowledge access in such areas.
2. Secondly, since the classes did not have books for practicing Cinyanja and literature teaching, there was a need for such materials to be provided for the teachers to use communicative practices like individual reading, pair work, and also better individual reading. This would reduce crowding and increase learner participation in class.
3. Lastly, Tumbuka being a language which has a larger following and speaking community, should be considered a language of instruction in such communities as Chasefu and other areas in Eastern province.

References

- Han, J. (2022). When Structuralism and Post-structuralism Collide. *EMI Lecturers' Monolingual Ideology and Translanguaging Practice*. [10.1007/978-3-031-19904-2_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-19904-2_7)
- Iversen, J. (2017). The role of minority students' L1 when learning English. *Nordic Journal of Modern Language Methodology*, 5(1), 35–47.
- Iversen, J. Y. & Mkandawire, S. B. (2020). Comparing Language Ideologies in Multilingual Classrooms Across Norway and Zambia. *Multilingual Margins*, 7(3), 33-48.
doi: <https://doi.org/10.14426/mm.v7i3.218>
- Iversen, Y. J. (2019). Negotiating language ideologies: pre-service teachers' perspectives on multilingual practices in mainstream education. *International journal of multilingualism*. 18:3, 421-434
- Kafusha, M. M., Mwelwa, J., Mkandawire, S. B., & Daka, H. (2021). Reading Culture in Zambia: Perspectives of Selected Households of Zambia on their Reading Practices. *Journal of Lexicography and Terminology*, 5 (2), 80-106
- Kirsch, C. and Duarte, J. (2020). *Multilingual approaches for teaching and learning: From acknowledging to capitalising on multilingualism in European mainstream education*. London: Routledge
- Lasagabaster, D. & García, O. (2014) Translanguaging: towards a dynamic model of bilingualism at school / Translanguaging: hacia un modelo dinámico de bilingüismo en la escuela, *Cultura y Educación*. *Culture and Education*, 26:3, 557-572,
- Makoe, P. (2018). *Translanguaging in a Monoglot Context: Children Mobilising and (Re) Positioning their Multilingual Repertoires as Resources for Learning*. Springer International Publishing AG, part of Springer Nature
- Manchishi, P.C. (2004). The status of indigenous languages in institutions of learning in Zambia: Past, present and future. *The African Symposium*, 4/1: 11–19.
- Ministry of Education (2014). *Education Curriculum Framework 2013*. Lusaka: Curriculum Development Centre
- Ministry of Education. (1966). *Education Act*. Lusaka: Government of the Republic of Zambia,
- Manchishi, P.C. and Mwanza, D.S. (2018). Reforming School Experience in Pre-Service Teacher Preparation for Quality Teacher Graduates. *Multidisciplinary Journal of Language and Social Sciences Education*, 1 (2): 1-26.

- Mkandawire, S. B. (2017). Familiar Language Based Instruction Versus Unfamiliar Language for the Teaching of Reading and Writing Literacy Skills: A Focus on Zambian Languages and English at Two Primary School in Lusaka. *Zambia Journal of Language Studies*, 1(1): 53-81
- Mkandawire, S. B. (2022). A Comparative Assessment of Grade One Learners' Reading Achievements Between Speakers and Non-Speakers of the Language of Instruction in Multilingual Classes of Lusaka Vis-À Monolingual Classes of Katete District of Zambia. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis]. The University of Zambia in Association with Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences
- Mumba, M. & Mkandawire, S. B. (2020). Reading Achievements of Pupils with Preschool Background and Those Without at A Primary School in Lusaka District of Zambia. *Malcolm Moffat Multidisciplinary Journal of Research and Education*, 1(1), Pp 53 – 80.
- Mwanza, D. S. (2016). *A Critical Reflection on Eclecticism in the Teaching of English Grammar at Selected Zambian Secondary Schools*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Western Cape, South Africa.
- Mwanza, D. S. (2020). *Critical reflections on the Zambian education system and the teaching of English in post-colonial Zambia*.
- Nkhata, B., Mkandawire, S. B., Nachiyunde, K., Phiri-Nalube, P., Kaani, B., Mulenga, I. M., Phiri, C., Chileshe, B., Sichula, K. N., Sikayomya, P., Munachaka, J., Banda, D., Mulaenzi, F., Serenje-Chipindi, J., & Chipindi, F. M. (2019). Exploring selected theories applicable to educational disciplines and social sciences research. *International Journal of Humanities, Social Sciences and Education*, 7(2), pp.97-116 <http://dx.doi.org/10.20431/2349-0381.0612008>
- Nyimbili, F. (2016). *The Use of Learner Centred techniques in the Teaching of English language in Selected secondary Schools of Lundazi District*. The University of Zambia, Lusaka, Zambia
- Nyimbili, F. and Mwanza S. D. (2021). Translanguaging challenges faced by teachers and learners in first grade multilingual literacy classrooms in Zambia. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)*.
- Nyimbili, F. and Mwanza S. D (2020) Quantitative and qualitative benefits of translanguaging pedagogic practice among first graders in multilingual classrooms of Lundazi district in Zambia. *Multilingual Margins*, 7(3) 69-83
- Nyimbili, F. (2021). *Impact of translanguaging as pedagogical practice on literacy levels among grade one literacy learners in Lundazi district, Zambia*. The University of Zambia, Lusaka, Zambia.
- Nyimbili, F., Namuyamba, M., and Chakanika. W. W. (2018). "The Use of Learner Centered Techniques in the Teaching of English Language in Selected Secondary Schools of Lundazi District". *International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education (IJHSSE)*, 5(3), pp. 143-149
- Nyimbili, F., Namuyamba-Kabika, M., and Tembo, B. (2018). The Use of Mobile Phone Related Terminologies among the Tumbuka People of Lundazi District of Zambia. *Journal of Lexicography and Terminology* 2 (2):
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. SAGE Publications: New Delhi.
- Simasiku, L. (2011). *The pupil's and Teacher's Perceptions of Learner centred Methods in the*

- Teaching and Learning of History*. (Unpublished master's Dissertation, UNZA).
- Simwinga, J. (2006). *The Impact of Language Policy on the Use of Minority Languages in Zambia with special reference to Tumbuka and Nkoya*. Phd Thesis. Lusaka UNZA.
- Zimba, S. (2007). *The effect of Nyanja as a language of initial literacy in a predominantly Tumbuka speaking area: The Case of Lumezi District*. (Unpublished Masters Dissertation, School of Education, University of Zambia).