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DEFINITION OF TERMS

Language of instruction
It is also termed as ‘medium of instruction’ and has been defined by the Wikipedia dictionary as the language that is used in teaching. It may or may not be the official language of the country in question. This is the same meaning used in this study.

Language policy
Language policy is what a government does either officially through legislation, court decisions or policy to determine how languages are used, cultivate language skills needed to meet national priorities or establish the rights of individuals or groups to use and maintain languages.

Children’s Homes (CHs)
These are the foster homes or centers where foster parents permanently reside. The centers may have schools and other essential facilities from which the children take their studies and make use of.

Minority language
The language of an indigenous community, who happen to be few, compared to the other indigenous communities in the country, and so the language has few people using it.

Linguistic Culture
A set of behaviors, assumptions, cultural forms, prejudices, folk beliefs-systems, attitudes, stereotypes, ways of thinking about language and religious-Historical circumstances associated with a particular language (Schiffman, 1996: 5). The same definition has been used in this study.
Sheng’
In this study, Sheng’ is considered as a language used by the youth and more so in the streets and estates of the cities and big towns in Kenya. It is marked by its borrowing, clipping and mixture of several languages.

Native Language
That language a person is born into especially the parents’ indigenous community’s language. It does not have to be a language of the ethnic groups in the country.

Linguistic alternant
This is a choice of word or language mode instead of another for the purposes of sharing a common goal. For instance, when young people code-switch they do so because they do not want a parent to understand them.

Communally Owned
Homes are started and run by more than one person. Usually are organizations like NGOs and Churches, in an effort to offer charity services to the poor and the homeless.

Individually Owned
Homes are started by a single person and run under the person’s directives. The aim of starting the Home is to assist the poor and the homeless.

Family Homes/ Natural Homes
These are homes where biological parents bring up their children. This is used as opposed to Children’s Homes
ABSTRACT

This study is a sociolinguistic survey of the status of Language of Instruction (LOI) in Children’s Homes. It considers the fact that there is a variety of languages at the disposal of the children in CHs, who are a minority group in the society and so have no common language as the educational language policy requires during schooling. The study, therefore, sought to describe the status and implication of LOI in CHs in order to give empirical recommendation. The literature reviewed showed that while pupils from CHs do not have immediate families to nurture their first languages, their counterparts do, hence the gap this study fills. The Critical Language Planning and Policy approach that is meant to reduce various forms of inequalities was adopted to guide this study. The objectives of the study were to: identify the language(s) used during classroom instruction in Children’s Homes; investigate the factors that influence or motivate the choice of the language(s) used in classroom contexts and to identify the difficulties faced in applying the national LOI policy in the lower primary school level in CHs in urban centres. The language policy identifies mother tongues or the language of the catchment area as the language of instruction. The survey data was collected from a sample of 76 respondents that comprised teachers, administrators and pupils from a sample of six Children’s Homes in Nairobi City. All the respondents were subjected to an interview. Questionnaires and document analysis were also used. Data interpretation was both qualitative with Critical Content Analysis used in the interview and qualitative questionnaire responses and quantitative with SPSS used in the management of the quantitative data. The study revealed that there are many languages used in class by both the teachers and the pupils in an effort to communicate including verbal and non-verbal communication. A number of factors such as a common language, the language used in the Home and the linguistic background influence the choice of language to use in class. It is not likely to find Kiswahili or mother tongue a common language among the pupils of standard 1-3 from Children’s Homes. Whenever teachers use language as per the educational language policy, they exclude some pupils especially those from Children’s Home.
CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Language of Instruction (LOI) refers to the mode of communication in a classroom. In Kenya, the National Committee on Educational objectives and policy recommends the language of instruction which is then enforced through a circular or policy document by the Ministry of Education. There are 69 languages that are spoken natively according to Sil Ethnology in National Population Census of 2009. In a typical classroom of Standard 1-3 in Kenya, the LOI may be English, mother tongue or Kiswahili, which means that the textbooks used, the notes given and the examinations taken are all in the specified language. However, the actual interaction in the classroom could be in a different language; for example, Kiswahili or/and mother tongue. There could even be code switching and code mixing.

Earlier developments influenced by the recommendations of the East African Royal Commission Report of 1953 – 1955 saw English introduced as the language of instruction from class one in 1958 in some schools (Hutasoit & Prator, 1965). Later, according to the Gachathi Report (1976), the Kenyan policy on language of instruction in schools changed. It recommended that primary classes 1-3 learners should be taught in mother tongue/the language of the catchment area, or in Kiswahili (where there are mixed languages). It also recommended that English be a compulsory subject and be used from standard four upwards as the language of instruction. Kiswahili should be a compulsory subject too (Republic of Kenya, 1976; Sifuna, 1980). Nevertheless, going by the findings of several researchers such as Kembo-Sure (1996), Kiliku (2011), Mwinsheikhe (2002), and as shown in the literature review ahead, it is clear that
a number of alternative languages are used for instruction. This choice of an alternative language depends on the language background of a community, irrespective of the language policy on LOI.

Children’s Homes are set up by non-governmental organizations that reach out to identify the most deserving cases of under-privileged children in the community and rehabilitate them by giving them hope and a conducive home environment that facilitates healing of both emotional and physical wounds. Children’s Homes meet the needs of children on day-to-day basis in such crucial areas as food, clothing, shelter, entertainment and recreation, medical care and schooling. They meet the needs of the children all through to secondary and tertiary levels depending on a child’s academic ability. The children are brought up to maximize their potential and ultimately become self-reliant.

Children’s Homes are of different kinds. Some receive their children through referrals from government administrators such as the area chiefs and District Officers. They also receive those children orphaned or displaced due to war, natural calamities, abusive parents, forced and early marriages, HIV/AIDS victims, problematic single parenthood, street children and refugees. These children are housed according to their gender and age. The children come to the Children’s Homes with a variety of languages and therefore communication becomes a problem. Immediately they come in, they are enrolled in school based on their age and academic capability. After going through primary or secondary school, they are integrated with the other members of the family if any, and then those without any relative are integrated into the society.
Some other Children’s Homes receive newborn babies from hospitals and elsewhere. They specialise in the orphaned, abandoned and destitute. These Homes bring the children up from their tender age to maturity. In the course of their growth, children are integrated with other members of the society and use the language of the Home. The children, therefore, are brought up in a particular linguistic environment irrespective of their actual ethnic backgrounds. They are also subject to adoption, and hence they may learn other languages later.

Yet other Children’s Homes are situated right in the middle of problematic areas like slums. Children are brought to these Homes at any age, through the areas’ government administrator. The circumstances giving rise to this situation could be where parents have abandoned their children (Kassamani, 1992). Other circumstances include calamities like fire, disease outbreaks, HIV/AIDS victims, abusive parents, extreme poverty and other many slum area problems. For some children, their stay in the Children’s Homes is short if the problem is minor and can be resolved. They therefore go back to their families. The children also have varied language backgrounds, and take some time to learn the languages of the Children’s Homes. They also result to using ‘sheng’, a youth variety of language in the Kenyan streets, and this becomes a problem for teachers when communicating in class (Kassamani, 1992).

Learning for these children is such that they go to school in the community or a school belonging to the Home but open to the public. This means that pupils from the Children’s Homes learn together with their counterparts from the community and learn through the language of instruction in that school.
When the children get together in a classroom in the Children’s Homes, they may initially speak different languages. The 1953 UNESCO Report recommends that a child should use his or her native language for initial instruction because of the psycho-cognitive benefits. A pupil may not be competent in the second language if they are not competent in their mother tongues hence cannot transfer the mother tongue vocabulary into the second language. A Children’s Home is an institution where children have no common native language and so cannot use their mother tongues.

Muthwii (2004) observes that many people come to sincerely believe that their indigenous languages do not have the capacity to deal with ‘complex situations’, advanced or abstract concepts. What learners see in the public domain, where in most cases the first language does not feature at all, is reinforced by what they see in the classroom. In most cases, especially in rural Kenya, a child is not sure whether to love or hate his first language because, as Adegbija (2001:286) says, “Indigenous languages have acquired an inferiority syndrome and complex associated with them.” The children in Children’s Homes and in the urban centres could be facing these language problems.

The teachers’ performance in class is faced with a number of constraints. A teachers’ performance is not only constrained by the language policy and the desired outcomes, but it is also more immediately constrained by their own languages competing with their own knowledge of the subject areas. Other constraints include the learning capacity of their pupils, the availability of suitable reference materials in the language of instruction and other resources, alongside the teachers’ own habits and attitudes towards a language. In fact, in many cases, both
the teacher and the pupil may find the English language an easier and better language to use than Kiswahili or mother tongue (Wangia, 1991). A major paradox in Kenya today is that the teachers’ language cannot serve as a model for the pupils because the teacher has no mastery of the norm demanded by the school system; the standard British variety of English. Neither the teacher nor the pupil is in any meaningful touch with the variety (Muthwii, 2004). Thus, it might be that there may not be common languages, among not just the children, but also between the children and the teachers.

It is against this background that the study recognizes the presence of a group of children in Children’s Homes (CHs), which is linguistically different from its counterparts in the community. The children in CHs have no family backup in maintenance and use of their native languages. They have a number of caretakers, administrators and other workers that will speak in varied languages as well. However, their counterparts in the community neatly fit in a society and a family set-up with a well-rooted language they are competent in. According to this researcher, the children in a CHs do not have a choice of language, but have to use the language they have been exposed to in the CHs.

With regard to the language of education, Muthwii (2004) states that the child’s first language knowledge and skills are not developed or nurtured at all at school because it is not in school where a child learns the first language, but home. Some children from CHs learn their first language from the Children’s Homes and school and not in their own family homes. Muthwii (2004) further posits that for the children who experience these dilemmas, there are no reciprocal learning environments between school and home. Considering this argument then,
one wonders what language of instruction children from Children’s Home use if the policy has specified the language of the catchment area or Kiswahili.

Education is not only an area of intervention that children in CHs require to build their future, but also one of their fundamental rights. Their success in education is determined, largely, by the LOI used in their Homes. The provision of basic education in these centers is through the languages prescribed by the Ministry of Education in the national LOI policy, that classes 1-3 should use MT or Kiswahili or one’s first language as recommended by UNESCO (1953).

Many scholars in Africa today argue that the genesis of the language problems seen in schools or in society can be traced back to the type of language policies that African nations have decided upon (Adegbija, 1994; Alexander, 2000; Bamgbose, 2000; Muthwii & Kioko, 2003; Owino, 2002; Parry, 2000; Prah 1998). Is it possible that schools in Children’s Homes in urban centres share the same predicament?

This study has taken a critical language planning and policy approach to investigate the question of the status and implication of the language of instruction policy used in the Children’s Homes in urban centres. To answer this question is the concern about the languages used in the classroom and the factors that govern and influence the choice of the language of instruction in these CHs.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

In order for the children in Children’s Homes to succeed in life, their initial language situation in the CHs needs to be understood. The variety of languages in the classroom need to be established so that they can be considered for use during instruction, because the child needs good and fair initial introduction to education in the language he or she understands best. This language may not be Kiswahili or MT, because not all the children in a CH may know a common language. Therefore, a number of factors may lead to the choice of the language of instruction, thus locking out some children during instruction. There are usually many languages at the children’s disposal as a group in the CHs, and the question is which language will be chosen and why. Considering that this is a minority group in the society, do they even stand a chance of being noticed as far as their language problems are concerned?

From the literature available, no study known to the researcher has been carried out with regard to what language of instruction is appropriate for use in these CHs. Further, no study has critically analyzed the appropriateness of the national language-in-education policy in these Children’s Homes.

The present study sought to describe or explain the present situation with regard to LOI issue in Children’s Homes in urban centres in Kenya. Specifically, it investigated the present status and implications of the current LOI in a bid to provide recommendations for development of a more effective LOI for pupils in Children’s Homes.
1.3 Objectives of the Study

The following were the objectives of the study:

1. To identify the language(s) used during classroom instruction in CHs in urban centres.
2. To investigate the factors that influence or motivate the choice of the language(s) used in classroom contexts in the CHs in urban centres.
3. To identify the difficulties faced by both teachers and pupils in applying the national LOI policy in the lower primary school level in CHs in urban centres.

1.4 Research Questions

Based on the objectives above, the study sought to address the following questions:

1. Which languages are used for instruction in the classroom in the CHs in urban centres?
2. What factors influence or motivate the choice of language(s) used in classroom contexts in CHs in urban centres?
3. What difficulties are faced by teachers and pupils in applying the national Language of Instruction policy in the lower primary school level in CHs in urban centres?

1.5 Assumptions

In carrying out this research, the following were the assumptions.

1. That both the pupils and the teachers in urban CHs use different languages during instruction.
2. That there are a number of factors that influence the choice of the language(s) to be used in the classroom instruction in urban CHs.
3. That there are difficulties faced by both the pupils and the teachers when they use the national LOI in classroom in the lower primary school of CHs in urban areas.

1.6 Justification and Significance

In Kenya, more and more centers are being set up to care for disadvantaged children. These children are admitted into these Homes from diverse backgrounds, ages and cultures. Some of these centers provide basic (primary) education. The provision of this education is expected to be carried out through the language prescribed by the Ministry of Education in the national LOI policy, that classes 1-3 should use MT (a native language), Kiswahili or one’s first language. Language is an essential factor in the promotion of national unity and an individual’s identity. A country needs to maintain and enhance its cultural heritage through its mother tongues which are passed on from parents to children (UNESCO: 1953).

Kenya’s language policy has been reviewed several times since independence (Mbaabu, 1996) but these reviews have always been characterized by two factors. First, the indigenous languages have never captured appropriate attention and second, the resulting revisions have been influenced by conflicting theories, divergent attitudes, changing political ideologies and aspirations and indecisiveness (Muthwii, 2002).

Most researches done in Kenya, on the issue of language use and language policy in education, have been done on adults, adolescents and children, as well as refugees, but not on this special category of children, who have a different background from the normal family background. For the better part of their early life, these children live together in the urban areas and are exposed
to a totally new or/and different environment from their original family homes, which is mostly multilingual and has mixed cultures. These children are different from other children because they may not have the original families to teach, nurture, maintain and enhance language and culture on them. Furthermore, their first language knowledge and skills cannot be developed or nurtured enough at school (Muthwii, 2004).

Nevertheless, the children have to develop a language to communicate in and use during instruction. They should also benefit from the language policy set by the government just like their counterparts in the community do. These children are a small percentage of all the children in urban areas and the country at large. They are a minority, and are entitled to all the human rights including the right to education and language maintenance as well as consideration during language decision making, just like every other child.

A study on these children will create awareness of the language situation in Children’s Homes. This awareness would guide policy makers in formulating clear language policies that are beneficial to all children, thus, affecting both the children and the country positively. It can provide and add new knowledge about language in Children’s Homes. The knowledge would be a springboard for other researchers on similar studies in future.

In view of the limited information available on languages used in Kenyan Children’s Homes, this study will contribute to the much-needed data about these minority language groups.
1.7 Scope and Limitation

Although this study was about CHs in Kenya in the urban areas, it was not possible to investigate every CH and in every town but Nairobi because that is where we have almost all Kenyan ethnic languages spoken. Nairobi is also central and can represent all the other urban centres. The choice of pupils, administrators and teachers sample was also limited to enable the researcher to concentrate on a small number within the given time. Nairobi City was preferred because of its complexity of multilingual contexts found due to varied language backgrounds. The control of these factors is discussed in the methodology section.

This study concentrated on the linguistic issues of the pupils and their teachers. It did not consider non-linguistic factors that would have led to or contributed to the choice of LOI in class. These could include socio-psychological factors, physical disabilities, economical factors or even environmental factors. The researcher needed to concentrate only on one area of linguistics and not other fields because the studies demanded so.

There has not been much documentation on LOI in CHs. In fact, the researcher was unable to get any on language of instruction or language choice except in the pamphlets written by the CHs management, and newspaper articles. In an attempt to describe the language situation in CHs, only what pupils, teachers and administrators said was used. It is hoped that although this information may not exactly reflect the present linguistic characteristics of the CHs, it presents a picture that is clearer than what is already there.
There has been the problem of reliability of the data collected on respondents’ opinions. This is because opinions are psychological and what respondents may give as self opinion may not necessarily be genuine. This is worsened by the fear of the law especially on the part of the teachers who did not want to appear like they are using the unauthorized LOI in class. Their opinions and the questionnaire responses contradicted at some point. This problem of reliability could be overcome by using the same instruments to collect data more than once from the same respondents. Resources did not allow for this kind of test, re-test reliability to be carried out.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Review of the Related Literature

This section discusses and comments on the literature available in the area of language in education, Language of Instruction and the policy issues concerned.

2.1.1 Language Acquisition and Development

Chomsky (1969) demonstrates that children between 5 and 10 years of age are still acquiring the structures of their first language. For children younger than five, many aspects of their first language such as sentence structures and synonyms have not yet fully developed. While older learners have the foundation of a fully developed first language when they begin acquiring a new language, Young English Learners (YEL), according to Coltrane (2003), are working towards two milestones at the same time: the full development of their language and the acquisition of English. This is the same case for most children acquiring a new language. What about those children in a Children’s Home? Every now and then, there is an introduction to yet another language depending on who the caretakers are, the schools they go to, the presence of other children from different ethnic backgrounds and teachers from different language backgrounds. There are many languages for the children to learn. Which one will be their first or second language?

Coltrane (2003) in his discussion about working with Young English Language Learners’ says that children need to develop their native language(s) along with English. Educators must consider that Young English Learners primary mode of communication with their parents,
extended families and community members is their native language. He says that children are socialized into their communities, learn how to interact in socially appropriate ways, and receive nurturing and develop self-esteem through interactions with their parents and families. Children in Children’s Homes will need this kind of interaction but theirs is a different case altogether because they were not in this family from the start of their lives.

Coltrane (2003) further adds that in order to develop their native language skills fully, young English Language Learners need support in both their native language and English. Ideally, those who work with young English Language Learners should be able to speak the native language(s) of the children. However, because many classrooms include children who speak a variety of languages and because bilingual teachers are not always available, this support may need to be provided by bilingual paraprofessional or by parent and community volunteers. This support is a requirement for the children in a Children’s Home. Coltrane concludes that children should be provided with opportunities for meaningful interaction in both native language and English, including verbal interaction and engagement language with printed materials such as books and other media. In as many ways as possible, programmes for young English Language Learners should support children’s native languages.

Stubbs (1976) describes the school as a language environment with pupils dealing with language the whole day. He says that, one can only gain knowledge through language. The reality of the language policy in the classroom as noted by Bamgbose (1999:1) is “language is without doubt the most important factor in the process of learning, for the transfer of knowledge and skills is mediated through the spoken and written word.”
Stubbs (1976) further says that African education is a societal project that takes into consideration African languages, cultures, values and belief systems and above all the type of societies that each nation would want to build. It is an education system that emancipates and empowers as it helps children and adults develop skills and knowledge that are needed in order to positively transform their environment. Therefore, the aim of education must be primarily to develop human resources who can work effectively towards achieving goals set by people living in the same communities and the same countries. That is why it is necessary for children in Children’s Homes to be considered when making language policies because their language development trend is not the same as that of a child in a normal family setup. Otherwise, these children will always lag behind when their counterparts are enjoying their services to the society.

Stubbs (1976) study helps to understand what the communities of Children’s Homes require in order to produce resourceful citizens. In support of this argument, Okrah (2004) argues that schools and education systems should perform the function of positive change in our societies; African schools should prepare the African youth to become critical and logical thinkers and not just to denounce some old customs and traditions in Africa. They should be able to critique Western ideologies in all disciplines rather than accept them as sacrosanct facts.

Gumperz and Charez (1972) observe that, to the extent that social conditions affect verbal behaviour, findings based on research in one type of bilingual situation may not necessarily be applicable in another socially different one. Nevertheless, in the current study, there could be
some similarity because immigrants and children in Children’s Homes have a lot in common especially being separated from their immediate families. They further observed that linguistic alternant directly reflect significant information about such matters as group members, values, relatives and so on. Among the Spanish-English bilinguals of the United States, code switching was mostly used as a mark of group identity. Gumperz and Charez’s study considers school children of ages five and six and how their ethnic background affects their classroom interaction. These are basically children of immigrants. The Spanish-English bilinguals of the United States (who are immigrants) are therefore similar to the children in a Children’s Home in the present study because like stated earlier, they do not have their parents to nurture their Mother tongues.

According to Bains (1961), some teachers thrive on the use of abstract language style, which makes linguistic demands on the pupil and the subject being taught. Steiner and Maybin (1994), say that it takes time to learn any language, more so if it is a second language. When teachers see that their students do not understand because the language is unfamiliar (even foreign), they result to code switching, observed Mwinisheikhe (2002). The bottom line here is that, there cannot be proper communication if the language medium is unfamiliar to both parties; one has to switch to another language or use non-verbal kind of communication when there is no understanding.

Paulson and Heideman (2006), feel that there is no policy that is likely to be successful in the long run, if it goes counter to the existing sociocultural forces acting on the local contextual situation. Therefore, it is necessary that the LOI policy be one that agrees with what the learner
already has. Paulson and Heideman (2006), as well as UNESCO (1953), take it as axiomatic that “the medium for teaching a child is his mother tongue. However, it is not always possible to use the MT in schools, and even when possible, some factors may impede or condition its use”, (UNESCO, 1953:11). This is the case in CH’s schools.

Wei and Thomas (2005) reported that in China in 1996, pupils had little interest in their school learning, and the learning styles were rigid. Most of the pupils were unable to use their learned knowledge to solve their practical problems and some pupils had no sense of responsibility in their community and country. This meant that what is taught and how it is taught in the classroom should be in consonance with what the child desires, the community’s expectation and above all, be in a language they already know and can easily understand. The present study looks into whether the language the children in Children’s Homes use in class is known to them.

Muthwii (2004) says that there are high levels of illiteracy, that have persisted decade after decade simply because a large portion of the population does not manage to attain meaningful literacy in society, especially in important discourses and thoughts that are by and large expressed in a foreign language. The present study is curried out so that some light could be shed to avoid such a case among the children in Children’s Homes.

Foley and Thompson (2003) note that, in many societies, children have to learn in a new language when they get to school because the language of instruction differs from the one used at home. This fact has considerable implications for a child’s development of educational
knowledge. This observation could be a replica of what happens to children in a Children’s Home once they go to school.

The minorities in the society suffer whenever a country makes a policy in LOI as it goes for a language that is common. Turi (1994) points out that the fundamental goal of all legislation about language is to resolve the linguistic problems that stem from the conflicts and inequality among languages used within the same territory, by legally establishing and determining the status and use of the languages concerned. This may not be what happens in the Children’s Homes.

Another study conducted by the Center for Minority Education and Research at the University of California, Turi (1994), evaluated the effectiveness of bilingual education programs and found out that, the MT is the primary language of learning, and that early transition to English does not work, as students do not maintain or develop the linguistic and cognitive skills required in the first language. These reveal further support that the child should learn in his/her MT. This study establishes that there is need to establish which LOI should be used in the CHs. Should code switching and code mixing be considered in the policy and/or which is the appropriate LOI for this minority lot?

2.1.2 Language issues in Kenya

Kenya has a bilingual educational language policy in which English is the LOI from upper primary class 4, while Kiswahili or MT/catchment area’s language is LOI in the lower primary, class 3 and below. Muthwii (2004) looks at this policy and says that a close look at Kenya’s
literacy statistics, literacy working definitions used in Africa, language attitudes, and school language practices demonstrate that, contrary to the reasons given at independence for not favouring indigenous languages as languages of instruction or as language for communication in public discourse, the very things that the language policy meant to safeguard have happened. There are high levels of illiteracy that have persisted decade after decade simply because a large portion of the population does not manage to attain meaningful literacy levels through the school system, and many are not able to participate meaningfully in society, especially in discourses that are by and large expressed in a foreign tongue.

In a study to find out the extent to which the language policy and the concomitant language practices on LOI encourage or hamper the acquisition of desirable learning competencies in Kenya and Uganda, it was observed that there is a lot of code-switching in the teaching process, especially in schools that have poor resources (Muthwii, 2002). The presence of code-switching is partly explained as being an outcome of attempts to apply a language policy favouring first language instruction in the classroom while lacking of instructional materials written in that first language (Muthwii, 2004). The children are picking up code-switching habits from the only language model they have (Alexander, 2000; Banda, 2000; Kioko and Muthwii, 2001). These studies help the current one in shedding some light on what might be the case in schools in Children’s Homes.

Kembo-Sure (1996) advances the view that a multilingual language policy debate would validate the use of code-switching by teachers and pupils in the Kenyan classrooms where the
official policy is to use the English medium. Children in CHs are part of these Kenyans and so code-switching would be expected from the teachers and pupils in their CHs classrooms.

There is a lot of documentation and discussion on the subject of Kenyans’ attitudes towards the languages within their repertoire and the factors bringing about these attitudes (e.g. Abdulaziz, 1982; Kiliku, 2010, 2011; Mbaabu, 1996; Musau, 2002; Muthwii, 2002; Owino, 2002; Whiteley, 1974, among others). This information indicates that there is pressure for youngsters in Kenya to learn English. These factors that bring about attitudes include the high status English is given in schools as the LOI and the low status given to Africans’ first language in national/ public matters. The status of the first language is also affected by the practice of punishing children when they speak it at school, an act which itself is a grave violation of children’s rights (Musau, 2003; Owino, 2002). These studies are similar to the current study as it investigates the LOI used in Children’s Homes.

Mulama (2006) comments that studies conducted by UNESCO have shown that, children who receive basic education in their language perform better than those educated only in English. She further says that the Kenyan policy on the LOI only seems to have been implemented in rural areas. In urban areas, there is no uniform mother tongue that can be used for instruction. The researcher observes the same about the Children’s Homes.

A children’s Home is one of those centers that have language minorities. There are diverse languages that could be termed as mother tongues found in CHs. There is a lot of code-switching and code-mixing and as it was shown during a performance in Isinya, Kajiado in
2008 June 16th, in an international Day of the African Child celebrations by the Koinania’s Ndugu Mdogo and Anita Homes, the children used different languages perfectly well including Sheng – an informal ‘street’ language, Kiswahili, English, Kimaasai, Kimeru among others, to “achieve a permeating eloquence that drove the message straight home, regardless of whether the listener was a pupil, youngster, teacher, parent, local authority official or an incidental walk-in guest” (Daily Nation 17th June, 2008). These languages were not learned that day for that performance, but are languages the children had been using for long. The International Day of the African Child commemorates the June 16, 1976 ‘Soweto Uprising’ when many of black South African Students were shot and killed by Apartheid police in Johannesburg as they protested against the imposition of Afrikaans – the language of the country’s oppressive Boer minority – as the medium of instruction in their schools.

Wangia’s (1991) study concentrates on the family domain, environment and school and observes that the environment and the language behavior of the Home environment that the children came from determine the school language pattern. More so, the environment and adults (mainly the parents) in the child’s life influenced the children’s choice of language. However, the present research investigates what happens when the children do not have a particular or permanent family background.

The literature review here, from Kenya and elsewhere, shows the very critical role that medium of instruction plays in determining success or failure of a learner particularly where the language is foreign to that learner. It is the failure of the language of instruction that will be regarded as a social injustice to the Kenyan children and specifically to those that are
disadvantaged in their first languages in one way or another in the CHs. There is social injustice and inequality because most of Kenyan children learn in languages they know, but a small group of children (especially from CHs) struggle to learn in a language they first must learn.

2.2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The theoretical framework adopted for this study is adapted from Critical Language Planning and Policy approaches developed by Tollefson (1991). It started as the Critical Language Policy (CLP) approach and later developed to Critical Language Planning and Policy approaches (CLPP).

CLPP was founded on the premise that many language policies are designed to serve the interests of a certain group. These approaches are adopted to solve problems of communication in multilingual settings and increase social and economic opportunities for linguistic minorities (Tollefson, 1991). The fact that the classroom in CHs is a setting with learners who have many languages presents a challenge with regard to a common language of instruction. Multilingual classroom situation, therefore, require a careful choice of the common language to be used during teaching. The choice has to be fair to all learners. This unfortunately is never the case.

Children’s Homes are few in any country compared to the ordinary household (the normal family setup). The children in family homes have the advantage of using a particular language since childhood, while children from Children’s Homes have to adjust to a language of the Home. In most cases, a Children’s Home is multilingual by nature because the children have different language backgrounds. In Children’s Home the learners are integrated, the learners
from Children’s Homes form the minority and their plight is sidelined during the choice of LOI. It is from this point of view that language policies are criticized because the linguistic minorities eventually miss the social and economic opportunities their societies offer. The smallest linguistic group suffers at the mercy of the largest groups because divisions made along linguistic boundaries lead to the predominant language being of the larger groups and so chosen as the LOI.

In Kenya, many people are competent in Kiswahili and English, but there are those that cannot use the two languages except their mother tongues. Furthermore, other people come to Kenya in search of safety or by chance. They may not have a common language to use. English and Kiswahili are used in such cases where the multilingualism prevails. This kind of policy benefits only those learners that have some prior exposure and knowledge of these two languages. In a typical Children’s Home classroom, this policy would be discriminative because some learners, especially immigrants, may not have any knowledge of these languages. The children found in a children’s Home speak many different languages including various Mother tongues, English, Kiswahili, Sheng, foreign languages and other first languages that children acquire at the Home. However, these children are too few to be considered by policy makers. Ricento (2006) says that traditional approach was believed to be useful for integrating linguistic minorities into mainstream social economic systems, but this is not the case in CLPP for the policies tend to overlook these minorities and hence create and sustain various inequalities. The policy makers promote the interests of dominant social groups such as those linguistic groups that are many in numbers in a given region.
Among the premises that Tollefson (1991) talks about in this approach is that, Critical research places emphasis on the ethno linguistic communities as the main factor in policy formulation because they experience the consequences of the policies. It also examines the role of institutions like schools as possible agents in fulfilling class interests and in the process of doing so, they seek to normalize the evils of social inequality by making wrong decisions look natural, acceptable and unchangeable. Language policies are meant to reduce various forms of social inequality in order to achieve social justice.

In adopting the CLPP theories, the study uses among the different approaches of this theory, mainly the cognitive approach, which uses two models in handling language policy: namely, Rationalistic and Romanticist Models.

The Rationalist model utilizes the ‘LANGUAGE AS A TOOL’ metaphor (Kembo-Sure; 1996), in which language is seen in terms of the immediate material benefits that accrue from learning and using it. For instance in Kenya, English has a higher social prestige compared to the other languages because of the communicative effectiveness it provides in higher education and international communication. Thus, you will find teachers in primary schools insisting that pupils communicate in English, and punishments are given to those who do not comply. This is done so that children may become competent in the language. In addition, passing English in the National Examinations is a requirement for one to gain entry to institutions of higher learning as well as to gain employment. The Mother tongues and Kiswahili have therefore lost their status as Languages of instruction, and English has taken their place instead. This means that the institution does not consider the ethno community in fulfilling the class interests.
The Romanticist model uses the conceptual metaphor ‘LANGUAGE AS IDENTITY’ (Kembo-Sure, 1996). The argument is that the semantic structure of the language a person speaks either determines or limits the ways in which they conceive or conceptualize the world around them. One may want to be associated with some class of people and therefore teach or make children grow in such an environment. There is also loss of languages and this loss therefore entails a loss of cultural characteristics or specific world-view of a language group. In most primary schools, teachers and parents will steer their pupils and children away from their mother tongues because these will degrade their status as a high-class school or civilized parents.

Skutnabb-Kangas, (2000) says that, language is not merely for communication, but also a medium through which, members of a linguistic community express their individual and group rights. It is for this reason that we can rationalize Kenya’s choice of English as the ground for detribalizing the country, by providing a medium through which Kenyan children would conceptualize their world in a uniform way and thereby, perceive themselves as members of the same nation. A center like a children’s Home would do the same for the very same reasons as a country does.

This CLPP approach therefore seeks to examine and analyze the links between language policies and social inequality, thereby contributing to development of a policy that will serve all children comfortably and equally. This theory was adopted for this study because, in the various Children’s Homes, there are various languages brought in as native languages, and it would analyze those languages and identify a language or languages most suited as LOI in their
schools, one that would give them the identity they deserve. Kembo-Sure (1996) feels that in educational terms, the approach is not helpful in the transition from the home language environment to the linguistic environment at school. Culturally and psychologically, it is disorienting the children’s perception of themselves as individuals and as members of a cultural group. This may not be the case in Children’s Homes, who may not have any sort of identity in any way before coming to these Homes. Therefore, it is after they have identified themselves with the home that they embrace a particular culture and language. This is what may finally give them identity.

CLPP approaches emphasize the expansion of economic and social opportunities for linguistic minorities, whereas traditional approaches focus on communication problems in multilingual communities by promoting dominant languages. The theory, therefore, supports and fights for linguistic minorities to be economically considered in the social opportunities available, among them, the disadvantaged children. If their base in school is not taken care of early enough by providing the right LOI, then they cannot compete with their counterparts in rural or urban areas in future.

This study looks at the status and implications of the language of instruction and the linguistic entry behaviour of the pupils from Children’s Homes into the schools. The assumption is that when these children join these centers, they have varied languages yet the LOI policy in Kenya is that in urban schools, Kiswahili be used in primary 1-3, while the language of the catchment area be the medium of instruction in primary 1-3 in areas with common languages. So in
essence, this category of children does not fall in either of the given sides (urban or rural) as a group.
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter discusses the data required for the study and the sources from which the data was collected as well as the area where the study was done. It also discusses the research design adopted, the target population, the sampling methods and the sample size. More discussion is made on the instruments used in the data collection and the procedures used in the actual collection.

The study collected data on the following variables:

i. the languages used during classroom instruction in CHs in urban areas

ii. the factors that influence or motivate the choice of language(s) used in classroom contexts in CHs

iii. the difficulties faced by both teachers and pupils when they use the national LOI policy in lower primary level.

3.1 Research Design

This study has adopted a descriptive approach. Descriptive studies help to generate hypotheses as opposed to testing them. The study used qualitative and quantitative research approaches to gather an in-depth understanding of the LOI in CHs.
According to the national population census of 2009, *SIL Ethnology* lists a total of 69 native languages spoken in Kenya. If we assume that all the languages spoken in Kenya are represented in Nairobi City, such a representation is expected in the CHs. Nevertheless, the common ethnic groups in a population of 38.6 million in Kenya are listed in Table 3.1 showing the common languages in Kenya to allow a fair judgment of what should be expected in Nairobi.

**Table 3.1: Ethnic Groups in Kenya**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNIC GROUP</th>
<th>POPULATION-IN MILLIONS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Kikuyu</td>
<td>8.492</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Luhya</td>
<td>5.404</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Kalenjin</td>
<td>4.632</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Luo</td>
<td>5.018</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Kamba</td>
<td>4.246</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Kisii</td>
<td>1.930</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mijikenda</td>
<td>1.544</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Meru</td>
<td>1.930</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Turkana</td>
<td>0.772</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Maasai</td>
<td>0.772</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Smaller Indigenous groups</td>
<td>3.474</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Non-African groups Arabs, Indians, Europeans</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL POPULATION</strong></td>
<td><strong>38.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Kenya National Housing and Population Census (2009)*

Children’s Homes are among the minority groups in Kenya and in the world at large. The researcher felt that Children’s Homes belong to the minority groups in Kenya and the world at
large because they really are few. Facilities that are widely used like education policies may and have eluded them. Majority of children in Kenya have their immediate families. They are brought up in steady language backgrounds and taken to school where there is a language they know. The children in Children’s Homes lack the family language background and a common language at school as they begin their education. It was felt that they deserve an equal and fair treatment as their counterparts.

To carry out this study effectively, the researcher felt that there was need to consider the fact that the children did not have a family background and a common language at school. To know the status of the language of instruction policy used by this minority group, it was important to identify the languages represented and those used, what determines their choice as well as the difficulties faced when the pupil and the teacher use the language as per the LOI policy. Once this information was collected and analyzed, the researcher was able to show the implication of the status of language of instruction in CHs.

Data on language policy and language use can be collected from sources such as personal documents and records in CHs, which can shed light on things and persons in the institution. A careful and critical review of these documents provided valuable information on the variables of the study. Data was also collected from respondents who included;

a) standard 1-3 pupils from sampled children’s Homes

b) primary school teachers who teach pupils that come from Children’s Homes

c) administrators in the sampled Children’s Homes
The researcher felt that information collected from these sources would provide a fuller and detailed picture of the variables under investigation. The specific reasons and motives for the inclusion of these groups are highlighted below.

3.2 The Target Population

3.2.1 Pupils

In many sociolinguistic studies such as Wangia, (1991), Wei & Thomas (2005) and Hutasoit and Prator (1965), learners are viewed as ideal respondents. Pupils are the youngest among learners especially when they have just learned or are learning and using languages. Pupils come from communities and institutions in which the languages under investigation are used. They can therefore authoritatively provide data on language use. As mentioned earlier, many sociolinguistic studies have involved pupils and children as part of their sample. It was felt that pupils, though young, would be crucial in providing reliable data on the languages they know and use. The researcher thus decided to include standard 1-3 pupils in the sample of respondents.

3.2.2 Teachers

Teachers are seen as implementers of language policies in schools. They have the content to be given to the pupils and in a particular language. They are therefore ideal respondents for the study because, besides teaching their subjects, they know which language to use to reach their pupils. They would also give their opinions about and attitudes towards language policies and the languages of their pupils. Many sociolinguists like, Kembo-Sure (1996) and Kiliku (2010) have involved teachers in their studies as part of their sample.
Thus, the researcher decided to include teachers of language and science subjects in the sample of respondents. Teachers were thought to be the best placed to provide reliable data on the languages used in class in relation to the policy on the languages to be used.

3.2.3 Administrators

These are the managers of Children’s Homes. They include the Directors and the Social workers as well as some Head teachers in schools within the Homes. They are the ones that receive these children into their institutions and therefore know the entry language behaviour of the pupils. They are also there during the whole process as these pupils bring in their languages, discard and/or improve their languages as well as acquire new ones according to the social life they find in the Children’s Home.

It was therefore felt that the administrators had crucial information and would be very important in providing data on the language policy in their Children’s Homes and policy in the schools the children go to. The administrator is the go-between in the school and the home. He is able to give his opinions on the policy on the language of instruction in schools and the languages the children have, as well as the language they use in the Children’s Homes.

3.2.4 Children’s Homes

There are very many children’s Homes in Kenya. Some are registered and others are not. Children’s Homes sprout every time and others die as soon as they start. The researcher had to sample CHs from a list/booklet entered “Children’s Data Exchange” of 2007 that has 210 CHs. The researcher sampled out 69 of those that had school programmes. Afterwards, the researcher
went to verify them and identify their location. Extra CHs were found on-line and the researcher purposefully chose the six that met her expectation with regard to the data required.

3.3 The Area of Study

Data were collected from CHs in Nairobi. This area was chosen because it is a cosmopolitan area, therefore, it is multilingual. The target population was children from Children’s Homes that are situated in Nairobi city, a multilingual area. Nairobi being the capital city of Kenya has representation of all the Kenya ethnic groups, hence its multilingualism. People in Nairobi group themselves according to mainly their income. This therefore dictates the kind of population within a specific area in Nairobi. The researcher got the sample from three different areas in Nairobi according to income status of its residents, that is, where there is a lot of affluence, average and no affluence at all. Below is the map of Nairobi. The areas the researcher went to include Lang’ata, (Kenya Children’s Home), Makadara (Kwetu Home of Pease), Embakasi (SOS), kasarani (House of Mercy and Ebenezer Restoration Christian Centre) and kamukunji (Lunga Lunga Baptist and School CH).
3.4 Sampling Technique and the Sample

This section explains how the sampling was done and the actual sample; the number of respondents that participated in the study. One of the techniques used was *judgmental* where the researcher chose the sample based on whom she thought would be appropriate for the study. Only children from Children’s Homes, their teachers and administrators were considered for the
sample as well as specific Children’s Home. The researcher had in mind the kind of data she required and from whom. It was, therefore, easy to get the right sample. The other technique was *simple random sampling* in which the researcher expected the probability of getting any particular sample. The children in the Homes were chosen at random provided they were in standard 1, 2 or 3. The researcher thus felt that a selection of pupils, teachers and administrators would constitute a representative sample.

### 3.5 Research Instruments

Two main instruments, the questionnaire and the interview, were preferred in this study for various reasons. Document analysis was also done.

#### 3.5.1 Questionnaires

Different questionnaires were used for the teachers and the administrators. The questionnaire was preferred because it can be used to collect data from scattered respondents, as the researcher needed to move to different schools where children from the CHs go to and also reach the administrators at their various locations and residence. The questionnaire was also preferred because it saves time when compared to interviews and it leaves the researcher with a record that can be studied later. Further, data on variables like language policy and language use is best collected through the survey questionnaire (Adegbija, 1994). A justification for the choice of this instrument is the fact that similar studies have used the questionnaire to elicit similar data (Kembo-Sure, 1996; Kiliku, 2010, 2011; Wangia, 1991).
3.5.1.1 Questionnaire A

This was developed for Administrators. The researcher wanted to:

a) establish the linguistic backgrounds of the children in the CHs
b) establish the languages used at the CHs and school
c) establish the language policy in the CHs and school
d) evaluate the implementation of the national language policy of education for children in the CHs

3.5.1.2 Questionnaire B

This was developed for teachers in an effort to:

a) establish the languages the teacher uses when teaching
b) establish the teachers’ perception on learners’ understanding when teachers use particular languages
c) establish the linguistic background of both the pupils and the teacher
d) evaluate the implementation of the national language policy on education for all the children in class and especially those from the CHs.

3.5.2 Interview

The interview is another tool that was used in the study. All the respondents were subjected to an interview. This was thought to be important because more important information could be collected compared to when the questionnaire is used. The researcher felt that through interviews, she would access people’s perceptions, meanings, definitions of situations at Children’s Homes better than through any other tool. Just like Silverman (1993) says, that
interview data are seen as giving access to facts about the social world, the researcher felt that a construction of the reality in the Children’s Homes would be brought out better through talking than writing. This does not mean that filling in the questionnaire was ignored or was futile, but rather that it was a worthy course for the researcher to hear the respondents speak out about Children’s Homes. Silverman (1993) continues to say that the interview is seen as a social event based on mutual participant, observation and the primary issue is to generate data using no fixed format or questions, which gives authentic insight into people’s experiences.

3.5.2.1 Pupils’ Interview

The researcher felt that it was inappropriate to subject young pupils of class 1-3 (ages 6-10) to a questionnaire. Young pupils would have been incapable of reading and answering a questionnaire. The respondents that the researcher sampled were interviewed using an interview schedule. All the respondents received the same questions and in the same order hence, little room for variation in order to create uniformity. However, there were some open-ended questions, to which the respondents gave their own views. General information on the pupils language background as well as their names, helped get their possible mother tongues. The questions asked aimed at establishing;

a) The language(s) the pupil knows or uses both at school and at the Home.

b) Their opinion on the languages their teachers use in class as compared to those they know.
3.5.2.2 The Administrators’ Interview

The administrators’ interview was a supplementary instrument to the questionnaire. There were no pre-planned interview questions or anything standardized for that matter, so the researcher began with general questions which led to specific ones emerging as the interview unfolded. The questions asked ranged from how the administrators admit their children, at what ages, which languages the children come in with, the language policy in the CHs, to their opinion about the national language policy in education.

3.5.2.3 Teachers’ Interview

The teachers did not feel comfortable writing what happens in the classroom as far as the language of instruction was concerned in the questionnaire. This may be due to the fact that they are supposed to follow the authorized syllabus and languages, which may be, they were unable to follow for various reasons. An interview was a better option to get the information the researcher sought. After establishing rapport and earning their trust, the researcher asked about the languages the teachers use to reach their pupils and especially where the pupil does not know the common language in the institution. The questionnaires and interview schedules are shown in the appendix section.

3.5.3 Document analysis

The researcher used this form of qualitative research in which documents are interpreted by the researcher to give a voice and meaning around an assessment topic. She read documents that were related to the considered aspects of social world such as Chiefs’ acceptance letters of lost children, CHs filled admission forms, pamphlets of the various CHs and schools advertising and
explaining the institutions and personal documents of the children such as birth certificates and report forms. Document analysis was used to gain insight into the instructional activities or approaches in CHs and schools, examine trends, patterns, and consistency in instructional documents, provide a preliminary study for the interviews and observations as well as evaluate aspects of language use in CHs.

3.6 Data Collection Procedure

The research was done in four phases:

- Acquisition of permission in various CHs to carry out the research
- Sampling of respondents
- Carrying out interview sessions
- Administration of questionnaires

The researcher had to move from one CHs to the other seeking permission to carry out the study. Many did not want a study on their Homes, others sent the researcher to other offices to start a long process of getting permission, while others welcomed the researcher there and then, and allowed her to carry out the data collection.

After permission was granted, sampling was carried out. The questionnaires to the administrators were then administered as well as those to the teachers if the school was within the CHs. The researcher used the assistance of the head teacher of the school to get to the teachers. The researcher then interviewed the teachers and then distributed the questionnaires. She then proceeded to interview the pupils sampled. In the CHs that take pupils to the public schools, the
researcher used the administrator to sample out children and identify their schools. The CHs’ administrator then permitted the researcher to go to the school, seek the head teacher and carry out the same process as of the CHs that have schools within them. In some cases, the respondents requested to be left with the questionnaire to be collected later. Others filled them immediately.

3.7 Data Analysis

Most of the responses were quantified to enable data manipulation. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used for most of the data analysis. Frequency counts and mean scores were used in some of the analysis and cross-tabular analysis done to compare responses in relation to different variables. Critical content analysis was used on the interviews and the rest of the responses.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the data on the language used for instruction in the classroom in the CHs. It also examines the factors that influence or motivate the choice of the languages used in classroom contexts as well as difficulties faced in implementing the national language of instruction policy in the lower primary school level in those centres. The study was guided by Tollefson's Critical Language Planning and Policy approaches. This was meant to bring forth an analysis of the link between language policies and social inequality, thereby contributing to a policy that will serve all children equally.

This chapter presents both the descriptive and analytical results of the study. The findings in this study are based on the responses of the administrators, teachers and pupils with regard to their opinion on issues in the questionnaires administered and interviews conducted.

4.1 Children’s Homes

Kenya Children’s Home (KCH), Kwetu Home of Peace(KHP) and Save Our Souls Village(SOS) were established in the 1990s while Ebenezer Restoration Christian Centre (ERCC), House of Mercy (HOM) and Lunga Lunga Baptist School and Children’s Home (LLB) in the 2000s. This gave the researcher an opportunity to draw data from CHs in the two decades for the purposes of a wider coverage in time.
Location of the Homes was also categorized into those in the slum and in the lower market areas including ERCC, HOM and LLB. Those that are situated in the upper market areas included KCH, KHP and SOS. The location of the Home influenced the kind of children and the social life they live as well as the language they use. The researcher also considered the ownership of the Homes. It determined the living style of the Homes as well as the languages used in the Homes. ERCC, HOM and LLB were individually owned while KCH, KHP and SOS were communally owned by the churches and independent, non-political and non-government, social development organisations.

Some Homes such as KCH, LLB and SOS have schools within the institutions while the others, ERCC, HOM and KHP take their children to the public schools in the neighbourhood. This allows the integration of the Homes in the society. The way the children live in the Homes is such that KCH, KHP and SOS have family units while ERCC, HOM and LLB just live together.

Finally, language policy was also a consideration. KCH and SOS had a Home language policy which is English, while the rest did not have one. Having a language policy or not, very much determined pupils’ perception of the language of instruction in school. The six CHs were therefore selected according to their nature and characteristics as summarized in the Table 4.1 below.
Table 4.1: Nature and Characteristics of the Children’s Homes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHS CATEGORY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>(ERCC)</th>
<th>(HOM)</th>
<th>(KCH)</th>
<th>(KHP)</th>
<th>(LLB)</th>
<th>(SOS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Established</td>
<td>1990 - 1999</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Slum area</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None slum</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>In-house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family programs</td>
<td>Family units</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language policy</td>
<td>Language Policy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. Respondents Instrument Return Rate

Twelve administrators returned the questionnaires; this represented a 100% return rate. Only fifteen teachers completed and returned the questionnaires. This represented 83% return rate. 49 pupils were successfully interviewed. This represented a 96.1% of the total pupil respondents. This information is summarised in Table 4.2 below.

Table 4.2: Respondents Instrument Return Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Type</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>% of the total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>96.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.1: Administrators’ Profile

As shown in Table 4.3, the CHs administrators that participated in this survey represented 50% directors, 41.7% social workers and 8.3% head teachers; the response rate was 100%. 75% of the survey sample comprised female administrators, while male administrators made up 25.0%. It seemed that most of the administrators were female especially in HOM and ERCC rating 16.7% each. This shows that female administrators were preferred probably for the purposes of providing a maternal touch to these children. Every CH had at least a female administrator. The male administrators were found in LLB, KCH, SOS and KHP.

The age of the CHs administrators ranged from 20 to 50 years with an average of 36 years (SD=10.01). All Homes used middle-aged people (41-50 years) and they comprised 66.7% but LLB, ERCC and HOM had young people below 25 years, forming 25% of the administrators. The younger ones could probably be newly employed or volunteers. 8.3% were middle aged (31-40 years) and were represented in KCH.

Majority of the administrators were directors of the institutions forming a 50% and with a representative from every Home. All the Homes had social workers representing a 41.7% except LLB which had a head teacher, probably because it was a young Home in the slums relying on volunteers for its management and running. This formed 8.3% of the administrators.

3.3% of the administrators had worked for over 5 years, 33.3% 4 to 5 years and 33.3% less than four years. This service depended on the years the Home had been in existence so that KHP and SOS had the longest serving administrators, serving for over six years.
### Table 4.3: Nature and Characteristics of the Administrators’ sample in percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTORS</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>LLB</th>
<th>ERCC</th>
<th>HOM</th>
<th>KCH</th>
<th>SOS</th>
<th>KHP</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>Below 25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 – 40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 – 50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positions</td>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social workers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>1 – 3 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 – 5 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6+ years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.2.2: Teachers’ Profile

The analysis of teachers’ gender composition reveals that 60.0% were female while 40.0% were male. This shows that most schools that have CHs have more female teachers than male probably because, just like the administrators, they are needed to provide maternal touch on the children’s life.

In terms of the age of teachers, 6.7% were aged above 50 years a representation in LLB. HOM, KCH and KHP had teachers aged between 41-50 years. Younger ages of between 26-30 years were found in ERCC and HOM, while the youngest teachers were found in LLB and SOS with 6.7% each at the age below 25 years.
The study revealed that 20% of the teachers had served more than 6 years while those that had served for 4 to 5 years constituted 33.3% and 46.7% had served in less than 4 years. The young ages, 20% found in LLB were volunteers, while those in HOM and SOS had been recently employed. This is summarised in Table 4.4 below.

Table 4.4: Nature and Characteristics of the Teachers’ Sample in Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>LLB</th>
<th>ERCC</th>
<th>HOM</th>
<th>KCH</th>
<th>SOS</th>
<th>KHP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>Below 25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of service</td>
<td>1 – 3 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 – 5 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6+ years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.3: Pupils’ Profile

The analysis of pupils’ gender composition reveals that 53.1% were female while 46.9% were males. This shows that most children’s homes in urban centres are hosting more girls than boys. The mean age of the pupils was calculated by adding all of the ages up and then dividing by the total number, 49 as shown in Table 4.5 below. A standard deviation for the ages gave information about the spread of the numbers about the mean value, how close and how far all the age values are to the calculated mean. Thus, the extreme values are seen in SOS Children’s Home where the oldest girl was 18 years and in standard three. As a result, this high value influenced the mean and average score.
Table 4.5: Nature and Characteristics of the Pupils’ Sample in Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTORS</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>LLB</th>
<th>ERCC</th>
<th>HOM</th>
<th>KCH</th>
<th>SOS</th>
<th>KHP</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std Deviations</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>4.097</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>2.158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Pupils’ Linguistic Backgrounds

The administrator, the teacher and the pupil respondents were asked through the questionnaire to list the linguistic communities of the pupils in the Homes and the languages represented in class, as well as the languages the pupils speak respectively. These are the same languages used in class. The list of these languages brings out a pattern whose analysis can provide scenarios pointing to factors that influence or motivate the choice of language(s) used in classroom contexts in Children’s Homes.

Among the languages that were listed were various Kenyan mother tongues which took the highest percentage of 63, Kiswahili followed with 14%, then English with 9.97%, a Sudanese language 3.43%, Sheng with 3.1% and those that had not yet acquired language rated 2.77%. The rest were foreign languages such as French (0.83%) and languages from other countries like,
Uganda (1.13%), Rwanda (1%), Tanzania- Chagga (0.43%) and Somali (0.37%). The various languages were pooled into Table 4.6 below and their frequencies given.

**Table 4.6: Pupils’ Linguistic Backgrounds in Percentages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATORS</th>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>PUPILS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiswahili</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>9.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudanese</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheng</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugandan</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwandese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chagga</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This presentation reveals that mother tongues are widely known and used more than any other language. It means that these children are born and brought up in a particular society, hence the reason why they know their mother tongues. Kiswahili is the lingua franca in the country. Since these children grow up amidst others with different languages, they use Kiswahili hence the reason why Kiswahili takes the second position. Kiswahili and English are the recommended languages of instruction. This is another reason why Kiswahili takes second position and English third. Sheng is a language used by the youth especially those in the streets of the city. The pupils use it amongst themselves. To some, it is a first language and the only language they know, but most of the pupils acquired it as they came into conduct with its speakers. The languages from other countries were used by pupils who had come to the country probably because of political instability in their countries. Other pupils strayed into the country from neighbouring countries.
The specific mother tongues of the pupils were also plotted as shown in Table 4.7. The respondents acknowledged that some Kenyan ethnic languages (mother tongues) were used including Kikuyu 11.3%, Kikamba 9.9%, Luyha, 9.6%, Luo 6.6%, Kalenjin and Kisii 4.3% and other ethnic languages that took smaller percentages such as the Ateso with 0.3%

Kikamba and Kikuyu were ranked higher, probably because Kambas and Kikuyus border Nairobi making access to the city easy, even for the poor. There were also the ethnic clashes that took place in western region of Kenya, which affected the Kikuyus, Kalenjins, and Luos greatly. The internally displaced people and those that feared for their lives relocated to Nairobi. This may also explain why the Luyhas, a western community took the third position followed by the Luos, Kalenjins and the Kisiis. This does not mean that all the children in these Homes came due to these clashes only. There were those that ran away from their homes or were orphaned or abandoned.

The foreigners are children relocated from refugee camps because their mother countries had been at war for some time. These countries include Sudan whose language rating is 2.6% and Rwanda 2%. French, which took 1.3%, is a language used by the Rwandese. French had been a national language in Rwanda before English took over (Kiliku, 2011) and so the children know and use it. The Chagga speakers, 0.7%, are from Tanzania, apparently lost children that were taken to SOS Village. Tanzania being a neighbouring country, it is possible to have its citizens finding their way into Kenya. In HOM and ERCC there are some children from Uganda, whose language rated 1%. They speak English and their mother tongues. Their presence, like the Tanzanian one, is that Uganda is also Kenya’s immediate neighbour.
Sheng, as it is with the Kenyan youth, was common among the street children and those in the slum area in Kwetu Home of Peace and Baptist Children’s Home. Sheng represented 4%.

Those that did not know their ethnic groups constituted 3.3%, owing to the fact that they may have been born in the Homes or parted with their parents before they had known their mother tongues. Kiswahili, English and Sheng then became their languages.

Table 4.7: Pupils’ specific Linguistic Backgrounds in Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Pupils</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kiswahili</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikuyu</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikamba</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luyha</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dholuo</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheng</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalenjin</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abagusii</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudanese</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwandese</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borana</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maasai</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mijikenda</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chagga</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embu</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meru</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samburu</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taita</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ateso</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Figure 4.1, the Pupils listed Kiswahili (15.6%), English (11.3%), Sheng and Kikuyu (3.6%) and Luyha 2.0% as common languages among pupils. The fact that the languages are common can constitute a reason to choose the languages for instruction. The pupils recognized Kiswahili and English as the main languages probably because they are the languages that everybody in their surrounding knows. They also revealed that some major ethnic languages that are used were represented rating 3.6% for Kikuyu, 2% for Luyha and 1.7% for Kikamba. French took 1% and other languages took as low as 0.3%.

![Fig. 4.1: Languages used by pupils when admitted in the CHs as listed by pupils](image)

The teachers listed Kikamba 4.6%, Kikuyu 4.3%, Luyha 4% and Dholuo 3% as shown in Figure 4.2 as the common languages they find the children using once they have been admitted in the CHs. This is contrary to what the pupil respondents gave but related to what the administrators
said. English and Kiswahili were not common because as expected, they are second languages. Those that spoke English and Kiswahili represented 2% and 1.7% respectively. The teachers showed that Sheng was among other languages like Taita, Samburu, Meru, Embu, Chagga and French that took a small portion of 1% of the rating of the languages used. This was probably because the pupils were sensitive to the fact that they are in school and are supposed to use the language of instruction as per the National Education language policy if they knew it and not Sheng. The languages enumerated are shown in Figure 4.2.

![Languages Used by Pupils](image)

**Fig.4.2: Languages used by pupils when admitted in the CHs as listed by teachers**

The administrators, just like the teachers said that the ethnic languages are widely and mainly used compared to English and Kiswahili. Luyha and Kikamba had 3.6% , Luo and Kikuyu 3.3%
and Kalenjin 2%. English and Kiswahili as well as Maasai, a Ugandan and Sudanese languages had the ratings of 0.7%. All the other represented languages took the rate of 0.3% as shown in the Figure 4.3.

![Bar chart showing languages used by pupils when admitted in the CHs as listed by administrators]

Fig. 4.3: Languages used by pupils when admitted in the CHs as listed by administrators

### 4.4 Children’s Ages at Admission

On the question of the age at which the children are admitted into the CHs, the administrators revealed that half the sampled CHs receive their children from ‘at birth’ while SOS, LLB and KHP admit those children who are between 2-3 years, 5-12 years and at 6 years and above respectively. The reason CHs do not receive children at birth is that their objectives are to take care of abandoned and street children that are already past infancy. These children have already developed mother tongues (ethnic languages) and first languages (any other language apart from...
the parents’ language, but the first language to know as a child). The respondents reported that most of CHs spans the entry ages from infancy to 18 years of age and care for them to their adulthood. This is shown in Table 4.8 below.

Table 4.8: Children’s Age at admission into CHs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admission age</th>
<th>Children’s Homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LLB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>birth to 6 years</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>birth to 10 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>birth to 18 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 2 to 3 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 5 to 12 years</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above 6 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 Languages Used by Children to Communicate Immediately After Admission at the CHs

In item 3 of the administrators’ questionnaire, the researcher wanted to find out the language the children communicate in immediately they joined the CHs. This question expected the respondents to list the languages used during classroom instruction as per the objective of this study. Identifying these languages helped the researcher to complement the question on linguistic backgrounds of the children thus justifying the choice of such languages during classroom instruction.

The administrators revealed that Kiswahili was a commonly used language immediately these children come into the CHs. Since Kiswahili is used by almost everyone in Kenya today, it was expected in the CHs. It took the rating of 50% followed by Mother tongues with 18.8%. This showed that those children that used mother tongues had come from their ethnic homes probably
in the rural areas and so knew none of the official languages. Sheng took the third position at 12.5% rating owing to the fact that this language is predominant in Nairobi City among the youth and especially the street children. Since it is a street language, it was bound to find its way into the CHs. English was not a commonly used language among the children on admission like Kiswahili was. It took the rating of 6.2%. Those that remained silent because they did not have a common language to communicate in were represented by 6.2% rating, just like English and those that their languages were not known. Some children’s languages could not be known because when the children came into the Homes, they were either too young, probably at birth to have any language. This is shown in table 4.9 below

Table 4.9: Languages used by Children immediately after Admission at the Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages used after Admission</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kiswahili</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheng</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remain silent</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 The Languages Actually Used in the Classroom

In item 4 of the administrators’ questionnaire, the researcher wanted to know the languages that are actually used in the classroom by children from CHs according to the first objective of the study. The researcher considered the fact that the teachers would insist that they use Kiswahili and English because they are the languages of instruction stated by the national education language policy. The reality is that other languages, apart from English and Kiswahili are used in
class. Therefore, the languages used for instruction are English and Kiswahili rating 46.2% each and then the mother tongues at 7.7%. This shows that the official languages are mainly used although other languages are also used to help learning take place. This is shown in the Figure 4.4 above.

![Languages actually used in the classroom](image)

**Fig. 4.4: Languages actually used in the classroom**

A further insight into how these languages were represented in the particular Homes revealed that the administrators were reluctant to write the truth about the languages used during learning. This conclusion came about because first, on interviewing them face to face, they gave different answers from what they wrote, and secondly, the teachers and pupils gave different answers on the same. 3.8% of the administrators in HOM and LLB acknowledged the fact that they use mother tongues along with English and Kiswahili which rated 7.7% each. ERCC, KCH, KHP and SOS do not use mother tongues but English and Kiswahili as shown at the rate of 7.75 each, in the Table 4.10. This contradiction was probably because being administrators they wanted to show that they were following the specified language of instruction as per the language policy.
Table 4.10: Languages Actually Used in the Classroom in Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGES USED</th>
<th>CHILDREN'S HOMES</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ERCC</td>
<td>HOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiswahili</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother tongue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7 The Language Policy Comfort and Satisfaction

In an attempt to investigate the factors that influence the choice of language of instruction in the classroom, the researcher asked the administrators to give their views on whether they are comfortable with the language of instruction policy. The policy states that Standard 1-3 should be instructed in mother tongues or the language of the catchment area. From standard four upwards, the language of instruction should be English. Most of the respondents (58.33%) said that they were not comfortable or satisfied with this LOI policy. This shows that those that use the languages of instruction in class are not necessarily using the languages because they know or like them. They could be using them because they have no choice. That is why most of them are uncomfortable and dissatisfied with the language of instruction policy. The remaining 41.67% claimed to be comfortable and satisfied with the policy. This is shown in Table 4.11.
Table 4.11: Rating of Administrators on Whether they are Comfortable and Satisfied with the Language of Instruction Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHs</th>
<th>Comfortable with Language of Instruction Policy?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERCC</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCH</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHP</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>58.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were mixed feelings in some Homes. For instance, half of the responses in SOS, KCH and KHP (8.33%) were a ‘yes’ and the other a ‘no’. A total 16.67% of the responses of HOM and LLB were dissatisfied and uncomfortable with the policy. A total 16.67% of the respondents from ERCC were comfortable and satisfied with it. This is summarized in the Figure 4.5.

These results reveal that, though English and Kiswahili, the languages of instruction in schools are used, many pupils and teachers are struggling to use them. The struggle could be because the pupils have to learn the languages. As for the mother tongues, in urban centres, they are so many. It would not be possible to have a mother tongue that can be considered the language of the catchment area in urban centres.

It is, therefore, not possible to satisfy every pupil and teacher on the language to use. It is also not possible to have comfortable languages to use because not everyone may know them.
4.7.1 Reasons why Administrators are Comfortable and Satisfied with the Language Policy

The respondents that were comfortable and satisfied with the current language policy supported this response because ‘children eventually learn English and Kiswahili’ so they can learn their mother tongues first. They also felt that if the children were taught in their mother tongues, this would help them learn the language and appreciate their culture. Furthermore, there is a need for the pupils to be conversant with their cultural languages as it is important for self-expression and in building such languages as English and French. The respondents added that mother tongues are comfortable languages to use. You do not have to struggle to learn them first. If other languages, apart from mother tongues are to be used, then English and Kiswahili are better than Sheng, because Sheng, according to the respondents, is considered dirty and abusive. These responses constituted the factors that motivate and lead to the choice of the language to be used in the classroom. Figure 4.6 summarises the responses.
4.7.2 Reasons for Discomfort and Dissatisfaction with the Language Policy

The respondents that were uncomfortable and dissatisfied with the current LOI policy said that it was difficult for the learners to communicate to each other in their mother tongues especially since the CHs were cosmopolitan places that included foreign languages among the Kenyan languages. Other respondents felt that ‘different languages had to be used for the child to understand’. This meant that there should not be any restriction on the language to be used as long as the child understands it. Yet other respondents felt that ‘English should not be introduced so late, as it affects pupils understanding in the other subjects’. This meant that English should be a language for the pupil to start his/her learning. It should be introduced early and not in standard four. These arguments therefore showed that there was a difficult in applying the current LOI policy in the school system for the pupils from CHs. The chart below summarises the ratings of these reasons.
Fig. 4.7 Reasons for Discomfort and Dissatisfaction with the Language Policy by CHs Administrators. 4.8 Languages of Instruction as Suggested by Administrators

The researcher needed the opinion(s) of the administrators on the language(s) they thought could be appropriate as Language(s) of instruction. The common response was Kiswahili and English at 50% each. With a rating of 16.7% each, LLB suggested English and SOS Kiswahili. ERCC preferred only Kiswahili 8.3% while HOM preferred only English at 8.3%. Both KHP and KCH equally suggested both English and Kiswahili at the rate of 8.3%. This is shown in the Table 4.12 below.

Table 4.12: Suggested Languages of Instruction by the Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHS</th>
<th>Suggested Language of Instruction in %</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>KISWAHILI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLB</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCH</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHP</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERCC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOM</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The respondents gave various explanations to justify these suggestions. Some said that Kiswahili would make the pupils equal since there are many languages among the pupils, caretakers, teachers and administrators in the CHs. Others argued that Kiswahili was a common language, and identifies all the parties as ‘one family’. Yet others said that English was seen as a common language and a language to be used with visitors to their Homes, so it was important. There are those that felt that English should be the only language of instruction while others suggested Kiswahili alone. Other respondents felt that they should use any language the child can understand. This implies that it should be open for teachers to use whichever language the pupil would understand.

4.9 Languages used by Teachers in Class

In item 2 of the teachers’ questionnaire, the researcher wanted to find out which languages the teachers actually use in class. This would help identify the languages used in the classroom instructions as per the study’s objectives.

It was revealed that apart from using, the official languages, English and Kiswahili, rated 38.5% each; the teachers use other languages for instruction such as Mother Tongues which rated 17.9%. This showed that mother tongues were commonly used probably because the teachers wanted to make the children understand. The mother tongues included Kikamba 2.6%, Kikuyu 7.7%, Luyha 2.6% and others 5.1%. This presentation was necessitated by the fact that some teachers gave in their responses generally Mother Tongues, while others specified the Mother Tongue. Hence both the Mother Tongues and the specific Mother Tongues appeared in the chart. Teachers also use Sheng, 5.1%, probably because Sheng was common among the street children.
and the other children that lived in the city. This showed that other languages are also used together with the recommended ones during learning. This is shown in Figure 4.8.

![Languages Used by Teachers in Class](image)

**Fig. 4.8: The specific Mother Tongues that are used in Class**

All mother tongues were cummulatively rated against English, Kiswahili and Sheng. English and Kiswahili had the highest score of 38.5% each. This could be expected because these are the languages of instruction that are obvious. Mother tongues followed at a response rate of 17.9%. This showed that a number of teachers and pupils use their mother tongues in class probably for better communication. Sheng was rated the last at 5.1%. This showed that at least some teachers and pupils could understand each other better when they use Sheng. This is summarised in Figure 4.9 below.

![Languages Used by Teachers in Class](image)

**Fig.4.9: Languages used in class**

English and Kiswahili are used in all the Homes but mother tongues are not used in KCH and
SOS. This could be because these Homes existed for long and are developed institutions that have had the privilege of using a language policy. They also get most of their children when they have not yet developed their first languages. This gives the children an opportunity to know the language of the Home; hence, no one uses mother tongue. In KCH and KHP Sheng’ is mostly used. The two Homes have children from the streets and the slum areas, where Sheng is predominantly used. This is summarised in Table 4.8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGES USED</th>
<th>CHILDREN'S HOMES</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ERCC</td>
<td>HOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiswahili</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheng</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.10 Difficulties of Language Use in Class**

The researcher wanted to find out if there are times when a teacher lacks a word or is unable to explain a concept in class in the specific language of instruction he is using. The aim was to find out whether there are real difficulties in the use of the language of instruction as stipulated by the policy. A majority of the respondents (80%) agreed that they really have difficulties with the language of instruction using certain words. The remaining 20% said that they did not have any problem with the language of instruction. This result, according to the researcher, was insincere because even in the interview, it came out strongly that there are times it is difficult to communicate using the recommended languages. The teacher has to code-switch, or use other means like signs and gestures, to make sure their pupils understand. The Figure 4.10 shows the rating.
4.11 How Teachers Solve Difficulties of Language Use

In item 3 of the teachers’ questionnaire, the researcher further sought information on what the teachers do to communicate to their pupils in case the language they are using hinders comprehension of some concepts. This helps us accept the fact that other languages are used apart from the recommended LOI. It also shows a factor that influences the choice of that other language.

The teachers provided a number of strategies in which they reach their pupils. Some 38.9% consult other teachers or pupils of the same linguistic background as the pupil, to make the pupil understand. Other teacher respondents, 27.8%, demonstrate, use charts, use descriptions, gestures and body movements while others 22.2% just code-switch to a language the pupils can understand such as Kiswahili or a mother tongue, especially the language of the majority. Some respondents, 11.1%, said that some teachers just let the pupil be until they learn a language to
communicate in. This means that the pupils did not know a language they could communicate in and so relied on gestures and observation to imitate what the others were doing. All in all, it is clear that teachers communicate with the pupils even when there is a language barrier. The LOI could be in use but some pupils will always require special treatment because they may not understand the LOI. An alternative language comes in as a solution. The Figure 4.11 below summarises what the teachers do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What Teachers do When Unable to Explain a concept in the LOI</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ask other teachers and students to explain in a language the pupils can understand</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They use gestures and body movements, demonstrations, charts and...</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teachers and the pupils code switch</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>let them be until they learn the LOI</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig: 4.11 When Unable to Explain a Concept Because of a Language*

**4.12 Are the Pupils Comfortable and Fluent when Using the Teachers’ LOI?**

The researcher then wanted to find out if the pupils were comfortable and fluent when using the language of instruction. 66.7% of the teacher respondents said that they were, while 33.3% were not. This is shown in the Figure 12. These results imply that a factor to consider in coming up with a choice of the language to use in class is how comfortable and fluent one is in that language.
4.13 How Pupils solve Communication Problems in Class

Item five, which was a follow up of item four sought to find out what pupils do in order to communicate with the teacher and also show that they understand the subject at hand. 20% of the teacher respondents revealed that pupils use many gestures to demonstrate what they are saying; 33.3% said other pupils mix Kiswahili, English and their mother tongues; while 20% said the pupils use other teachers and pupils that can understand their language to translate. Some pupils according to 26.7% of the respondents said that the pupils remain quiet until they learn the language of instruction in the school. This shows that pupils would try what they can to make sure they understand what the teachers say irrespective of the language barrier. A summary of how the pupils solve this problem is shown in the Figure 4.13.
4.14 The Languages that are Easy to Use in Class According to Teachers

The researcher sought to find out which language the teachers found the easiest to use with the pupils in class. Three languages were listed, with Kiswahili rated the highest at 53.8%, followed by English at 42.3% and then mother tongues at 3.8%. Kiswahili may have taken the highest rating because it is an official/national language as well as English, hence used by many Kenyans. It is therefore easier to use Kiswahili than mother tongue because many of the pupils, administrators and teachers know and use it. It is also the only language that was neutral and common to a variety and most of the respondents. The fact that a language is easy to use is a factor influencing the choice of a language to use. This is shown in the Figure 4.14.
The Table 4.14 shows how the response was per CHs. LLB listed the three languages. English and Kiswahili took equal rating of 11.5% each, and 3.8% for Mother Tongue. This meant that there is no restriction as to which language to use during instruction. LLB was the only Home that used Mother Tongues. This could have been because it is in the slum area of Nairobi, where there is constant flow of people in and out of the area from upcountry. Children come in from upcountry with the knowledge of only their mother tongues. KCH and KHP supported English and Kiswahili equally at a rating of 7.7%. According to the researcher, the teachers in these Homes do not want to admit that they use other languages other than English and Kiswahili, especially KHP where Sheng’ could be the common language among the boys. SOS favoured English (11.3%) over Kiswahili (7.7%) probably because it is the language policy of the Home. HOM favoured Kiswahili (11.5%) over English (7.7%), probably because it is a common language and the same is used in the Home, while ERCC favoured Kiswahili (7.7%) only.
Though the researcher did not find them sincere, when they showed that they do not use mother tongues, as these had been accepted earlier and in the interviews, these findings showed that mother tongues are also used in schools in the urban areas. English and Kiswahili are used alongside other languages like mother tongues and Sheng.

Table 4.14 Languages the Teachers Find Easier to Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHs</th>
<th>Easier Language to use in Class</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Kiswahili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLB</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOM</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCH</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHP</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERCC</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.15 Appropriateness of the Current Language Policy for Pupils in CHs

Item seven of the teacher’s questionnaire sought to find out if the current language policy in education, that mother tongue, Kiswahili or the language of the catchment area should be used in standard 1-3 and English in standard 4-8 is appropriate for the children from Children’s Homes. Majority of the respondents said that it was not appropriate at a rate of 53.3% against 46.7%. Though this range is very close, it still creates doubt in the appropriateness of the current LOI policy. It then implies that another choice of a language to use in class is needed. Figure 4.15 shows the rating.
4.16 What then should be The Language of Instruction?

From the above question, the researcher then wanted to know which language should be the language of instruction if they found the policy inappropriate. 13.3% of the respondents suggested English, 33.3% English and Kiswahili, 6.7% only Kiswahili, and 6.7% supported the language the child knew before coming to school. 40% of the teacher respondents, chose not to suggest any. This was probably because they had mixed feelings about the issue and were reluctant to be seen to go against the set language regulations. The reasons for their choice also varied. Those that chose only English said that it is used in examinations and in all the other subjects except Kiswahili. They also said that in case of a transfer, the pupil should be able to catch up with the syllabus coverage in any other school. They felt that since English is the language used in the Home, it should be used in school and from the lowest class. Those that chose Kiswahili said that it was the simplest language to understand because many people in the country communicate in it and so did they. This is summarised in Figure 4.16.
4.17 Teachers’ Mother Tongues in General

In the last item of the teachers’ questionnaire, the researcher wanted to know the linguistic background of the teachers by asking them to state their mother tongues. The teachers mother tongue is a factor to reckon with should a teacher decide to use it in class. Kikuyu was the common language at the rate of 33.3% while Luyha and Kikamba followed with a 20% each. Dholuo had 13.3% and the last was Ekegusii and Kalenjin each with 6.7%. This is shown in Figure 4.17.

The teachers speak mixed languages just like their pupils. This means that their mother tongues are used at times when pupils need translation. Most of the teachers come from the majority communities such as Kikuyu, Luyha, Kamba and Luo. Their larger numbers than the other communities like Kisii and Kalenjin, are probably because the communities are proportionately smaller in numbers in the country and also in Nairobi city (Kenya National Housing and
Population Census –2009).

**Fig. 4.17: Teachers’ Mother Tongue**

### 4.18 Languages Children Speak Before Joining CHs

The researcher sought to know the languages the children were speaking before joining the CHs. The languages known to the pupils would be a factor to determine which language to choose in class for instruction.

Kiswahili and Mother tongues are the languages that were the most spoken before coming into the institution at a rate of 36.5% each. Each Home listed Kiswahili with ERCC recording the largest percentage of 8.2 and the lowest in KHP at 3.5% rating. Mother tongue was highest in LLB rating 11.8%. This could be because, like explained earlier, LLB is in the slum area and most of the people come from upcountry well versed with their mother tongues. Their children know their mother tongues very well and only learn the other languages later. Mother tongue rating was lowest in ERCC and KCH at 2.4% in each.

Sheng followed at a rate of 14.1% overall with the highest rate in KHP where every pupil was speaking it before joining the CHs. To some pupils Sheng’ was their first language as they had
been born or grown up in the streets but to others, they had moved to the streets and acquired it after their Mother Tongues or first languages. ERCC and HOM did not have any respondent answering that they know Sheng’. This could be because these Homes are in the outskirts of Nairobi City.

English followed at a rate of 7.1%. It was found in only three Homes, ERCC (2.4%), LLB (1.2%) and the highest score with SOS (3.5%). English is the language used in SOS so the reason it was favoured.

Foreign languages including French in SOS and a Ugandan language in HOM were listed but at a low rating of 1% each. Nevertheless, there are those pupils that joined the Homes before they had acquired any language, that is when they were infants. They had to learn the language of the Home and acquired language according to what was being spoken in the Home by the various persons within. They were represented at a rate of 3.5% in KCH. This is summarised in Table 4.15 below.

**Table 4.15: Languages Children Speak Before Joining Children’s Homes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE</th>
<th>CHILDREN’S HOMES</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ERCC</td>
<td>HOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiswahili</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheng</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Ugandan language</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.19 Languages Pupils Learn in School

The pupils were asked to state the languages they had learned in school. This would reveal that it is difficult for the pupils to learn if they do not know the language of instruction. They have to learn the language of instruction first in order to understand. Many of the respondents, (51.1%), revealed that they learned the English language in school after joining the C’sHs. All the sampled Homes had representatives with the majority coming from LLB (10.6%) and the least was from ERCC and KHP at 7.4% each. Other pupils learned Kiswahili (41.1%) in school. SOS had the least number of pupils learning Kiswahili (4.3%) and the highest in HOM and KHP at 8.5% each. French took 4.3% of the languages learned and was found in ERCC 1.1% and SOS 4.3%. The least learned was Kikuyu at 3.2% rating and only in ERCC. The presence of Kikuyu in this Home was probably because the Home is predominantly occupied by members from the Kikuyu community, as the area is occupied by more Kikuyus than any other tribe and the owner is also a Kikuyu. For a non-Kikuyu, one has to learn it to communicate with the others. Table 4.16 below shows the ratings of these languages.

Table 4:16 Languages Learned in School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGES LEARNED</th>
<th>CHILDREN’S HOMES</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ERCC</td>
<td>HOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiswahili</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikuyu</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.20 The Languages Pupils Understand in Class

The researcher wanted to find out which languages the pupils understand best when their teachers are teaching. Comprehension by the pupils is a factor that would be considered when making the choice of the language to use for instruction. As shown in Table 4.17, Kiswahili led in preference with a percentage of 51.9 and was recommended highly in HOM, KHP and LLB at a rate of 10.4% each. ERCC and KCH followed at a rate of 7.8% and those that recommended it least were SOS at a rating of 5.2%. This could be because Kiswahili is a predominant language in Kenya, a National Language and it is used as a Lingua Franca.

English was the second choice in rating with a percentage of 42.9% as the Table 4.17 shows. It was recommended highly in KCH at a rate of 10.4%, and least in LLB at a rate of 6.5%. It was not recommended at all in KHP probably because English is used in official settings and street boys rarely use it. ERCC and SOS were second in preferring it at 9.1% followed by LLB at 6.5%. English is the language of examination in all papers except Kiswahili. Those who recommend it do so probably because they feel it is to their advantage because it is the language of testing and a requirement for employment.

French was the least in choice, as pupils in all the Homes did not recommend it except SOS at 3.9% rating followed by ERCC rating 1.3%. French was suggested because the pupils who knew it did not want to forget it. French was the only language they knew since childhood. It then follows that SOS and ERCC recommended all the three languages but the rest, HOM, KCH, KHP and LLB were for only English and Kiswahili as shown in Table 4.17. This is in contrast
with what the teachers and the administrators said as they included Mother Tongues, Sheng’ and even gestures among the languages they use when teaching, for the pupils to understand.

This contrast could be because the pupils wanted to please the researcher, their teachers and administrators by saying what they thought would help them look proficient in English, Kiswahili and French. Others wished they knew these languages and so mentioned them. The researcher relied on the face to face interviews as a little bit more interrogation and testing of the spoken languages was done.

\[
\text{Table 4.17: The Languages Pupils Understand Best if used in Class}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGES UNDERSTOOD</th>
<th>CHILDREN'S HOMES</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ERCC</td>
<td>HOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiswahili</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.21 Languages Pupils Wish to be Used in Class

The researcher wanted to find out which languages the pupils would wish that their teachers use in class and their justification for the suggestions. If the pupils make another choice apart from what is in use in the school, it means that there is a difficulty in the language that is supposed to be used. Another choice of language means that there are factors that are considered in order to come up with that choice. A summary of their choices and reasons for the choice is shown in Figure 4.18.
The pupils that chose English argued that they understood it better, while others wanted to know it more. Other pupils argued that English was a local language probably because it was the language used in their Home for communication and socialization. Yet others felt that it was necessary to use English since it was the language used in examinations and textbooks. Some pupils said that they loved it, so they would rather use it than use any other language. All these
reasons for the pupils to suggest English showed that the pupils use the language that they think they know or has a certain benefit to them and not because they know it.

Those that chose Kiswahili said that they understood it better, and they liked it because it was a nice language. This could mean that they admired the way it is spoken, the accents and the sound of it. Probably, this admiration will make those that do not know Kiswahili learn faster and those that already know it enjoy learning hence make learning possible.

Pupils also said that they spoke Kiswahili at home, so it was the most suitable language to use in class, as pupils already knew it. Some pupils compared Kiswahili with Sheng’ and felt that Kiswahili was a better language than Sheng’ because Sheng had vulgar words. Not that Kiswahili does not have vulgar words but it is more controlled.

Yet some pupils chose Sheng’ and argued that they understood it better than any other language, that they knew only Sheng’ and that they found it a nice language. Most of those that chose Sheng’ were the street children. The researcher felt that since these speakers of Sheng’ may have been exposed only to the street language, they found it difficult to adjust to Kiswahili or English or so hoped to continue with the language they knew best.

Once again, there was a wide contrast between what the teachers and the administrators suggested as the language of instruction, and what the pupils said. As the teachers felt that mother tongues were important, the pupils who actually use the languages did not want to admit that they use them. This was probably because they did not want to be seen as less knowledgeable. This is summarized in Figure 4.18.
4.22 Critical Analysis of Children’s Homes in Urban Centres; Data from the Interviews and Document Analysis

This section divides the Homes into three categories: namely; urban-based, (those located in the heart of the city of Nairobi), Peri-Urban based, (those in the outskirts of Nairobi city centre) and those in the Slum areas. The location of the Home dictates the kind of children received in these Homes due to proximity and hence the language they use in the Home. The location also determines the influence of the neighbours on the Home and on the Children. The fact that the Homes are established and have acquired a certain status in the society makes them live up to the standards expected of such institutions.

4.22.1 Urban-Based Children’s Homes

In the heart of the city of Nairobi is a sense of affluence and high living standards. The Homes situated in such areas live a life of prestige and high income earners. As mentioned earlier and following the theory discussion in chapter 2, languages could be chosen for identity sake or as a tool to achieve a certain goal. The language policy in these Homes is English as shown in the institution’s newsletter. This could be their choice because of the prestigious place they live in demanding they use English so as to fit in the society. However, since the Homes receive children from various places such as other countries, upcountry and the neighbourhood, and receive these children at different ages, it is not every child that speaks English. Some children may not be old enough to speak when they join the Homes, but those that are, have their mother tongues if they come from upcountry, Kiswahili and/or Sheng if they come from the urban areas. Others speak foreign languages like French for children from Rwanda and “a Sudanese language” by those from Sudan. For the children that have already acquired a language, some are
bi- or multi-lingual. These Homes receive children as young as less than 3 years and as old as 16 years according to the admission documents. These older ones are mainly foreigners. They do not know the language of instruction used in the class. The institution uses School Accelerated Approach where the child takes the shortest time possible to learn in a class, starting from standard one, and then progresses to the next class within the same year, according to how fast they learn the language and understand the subjects at hand. This was shown by the report forms from the class teachers. This approach helps the older children that are incapacitated in the language of instruction, to learn this language and use it within the possible time to learn the other subjects in the curriculum. I find it a fair approach for the older pupils to eventually reach their right classes at the right age.

Unfortunately, for some children, the language policy in the Homes may not favour them because it is not many families in Kenya that bring up their children in an English language background. Nevertheless, SOS Village and KCH have had their policy that has English as the language of communication. Just as Kembo-Sure (1996) says, a policy could have a language just for identity’s sake. Kembo-Sure (1996) observes that the language a person speaks either determines or limits the ways in which they conceive or conceptualize the world around them. It is therefore for this reason that I believe that Homes in this area use English to fit in their status. The children that join these Homes are therefore disadvantaged if they do not know or use English. Those that learn their first language in these Homes are of course advantaged, unlike those that come in with their languages already developed.
The children that are brought up in these Homes end up learning English as their first language as was reported during the interviews. When other children join them at school or in the Home, they come with Kiswahili and Mother Tongue as well as Sheng’. As much as one wants to believe that since there is a language policy in the Home, things run smoothly when it comes to language use, it is not the case. The fact here is that the language of instruction to be used in the school is not necessarily English. The teachers themselves have their own languages, Kiswahili and Mother tongues included as was reported. The teachers want to reach all their pupils, should a child have a language problem or the teacher realize that s/he is not communicating with pupils in the way they should, the teacher will code-switch for better understanding.

In the researchers’ opinion, these Homes fail to consider all the other children’s languages since they want to uphold a certain status in the society. This is why the LPP Theory talks about language inequalities because institutions choose language without considering who knows it and the implications. Just like the academies today in the society, where an academy is in the village but the pupils have to use English with the argument that all exams are set in English except one paper in Kiswahili, a rationalistic argument which Kembo-Sure (1996) says it utilizes the language as a tool. These Children’s Homes are using English to attain the status of a prestigious Home, hence the use of ‘Language as Identity’.

4.22.2 Peri-Urban-Based Children’s Homes

In the peri-urban areas of Nairobi city is the middle income earners. People in this area live an average life style as they have jobs though not highly paying. As the population keeps moving, there is the constant flow of people from different linguistic backgrounds. However, there is a
fair and stable nature of life, so that not many children are abandoned due to economic constraints.

When pupils from CHs get to schools in these areas, the language of instruction is just like any other child’s in the public schools. The problem arises when there is a child that has just come from the village due to may be displacement, being orphaned or one who has become a refugee. They suffer, because by the time they learn the language of instruction, others have already made a lot of progress in their studies.

These Homes do not have a language policy but they receive children of different ages. Most of them have already acquired a language and by the time their languages are harmonized to the one used for instruction, which is mainly Kiswahili, they have already been disadvantaged in class.

4.22.3 The Slum-Based Children’s Homes

This is the most remote area in Nairobi, where the lower middle income earners and the “have-nots” live. The living standards are very low because the dwellers do not have the required and appropriate infrastructure. The place is congested with people and often there are calamities and a high level of insecurity. Most of the children from the streets and the slum areas speak up to three languages. The children taken to rehabilitation centres and Children’s Homes are drawn from a variety of linguistic backgrounds. It is interesting to note that some children in these areas are runaways from rich families and even know three languages. The children mainly speak a mixture of Kiswahili, English and the urban youth variety – Sheng.
The Administrator respondents interviewed confirmed that street children come from various backgrounds. Some are born and brought up in rural areas, before they are relocated to towns. These children may have competence in their local languages. Some are children that are siblings of street families that have sprung up as a result of children growing up and intermingling in the streets. According to Jwan J. and Oyori, O. (2004) and Githiora (2002), and in support of what the interviews revealed, these children have no knowledge of any single language apart from a juxtaposition of Kiswahili and English and/or Sheng’.

It is therefore arguable that the street children’s first language is the fused dialect as Auer (1999) puts it, comprising surface morphemes from English, Kiswahili, the local languages and Sheng’. Auer (1999) adds that the core reason for use of this fused dialect in the streets is to transcend linguistic ethnicity.

Language plays a very important role in the rehabilitation of the street children. Their teachers are also multilingual as they can speak Kiswahili, English and their mother tongues. Teachers insist on the use of Kiswahili but most of the time, the children speak to their teachers and administrators in Sheng. The teachers and the administrators do not allow the children to use their mother tongues for fear of ethnic groupings. Like Kassamani (1992) argues, if street children are allowed to use their mother tongues, this might make those from an ethnic group that is numerically strong, bully or molest those whose number is small.

The language of instruction is supposed to be Kiswahili since it is a multilingual place, but they will not understand each other, at least not everyone in class. Some children come with their parents to live in the slum areas straight from upcountry where they had learned only their mother tongues. When a problem arises, the child is left alone or with a single parent. As they go to school, they find those with other languages like Sheng, Kiswahili and mother tongues. The
teachers try to use English since the books are written in it, but very few pupils understand this. We cannot therefore satisfactorily say that the Kenya Language policy is effective in these Homes in the slum area.

4.23 Chapter Summary

In conclusion, this chapter has presented, analyzed and discussed the data collected through questionnaires, interviews and document analysis. Through the questionnaires for the administrators, it has been discussed that the linguistic backgrounds of the children in CHs are varied, ranging from our ethnic communities, children from neighbouring countries to foreigners. The languages that were used (if any) by the children before coming to the C’sHs are the same ones used in the schools. These languages include mother tongues, English, Kiswahili, Sheng’ and foreign languages. Even though some Homes prescribe a language that should be used by everybody in the Home, and there is a LOI policy that should be used in the schools, it is not possible to strictly adhere to those policies. The teachers, pupils, administrators and caretakers in reality use the languages that their interlocutors can understand. If there is no common language between interlocutors, then gestures and borrowing of people that can understand and translate become the better option. Personal opinions on the languages that should be used as LOIs revealed that, people, including the pupils believe that they cannot do without English because it is the language of examination and a requirement for employment. Nevertheless, many respondents felt that the language of instruction should be a language one can understand, and one that has no restriction to any particular language.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study was to find out the status of Language of Instruction in Children’s Homes and its implications. The researcher used questionnaires and interviews to elicit information from the respondents on the various languages used in class during instruction. The two instruments were also used to get the opinions of the respondents on the reasons for choice of those languages for instruction. Document analysis was also done to elicit information on the running of the Children’s Homes, especially on issues of linguistic matters. The researcher further used these instruments to get opinions on the National Language Policy and its implementation in Children’s Homes.

5.1.1 Language of Instruction in Children’s Homes

The Kenyan language policy specifies that the medium of Instruction in standards 1-3 should be the language of the catchment area or Kiswahili where there are mixed languages. English should be used for instruction from standard four upwards. There is evidence that the Children’s Homes do not adhere to the language of instruction policy. In fact, some Homes have their own language policies that conflict with the national language policy in school. The schools where these children go to, do not use the language of instruction as intended by the policy. There is no particular language of the catchment area for children in children’s Homes because they come from different language backgrounds. Some of these children do not know Kiswahili, which is the other option after the language of the catchment area. It is not even a first language to some of the children. All the respondents attested to this.
5.1.2. The Languages Used During Classroom Instruction in CHs

From the results in chapter four, it is clear that as teachers and pupils try to use the recommended languages in class, they include other languages in a bid to achieve successful communication between them. Other than English and Kiswahili, teachers and pupils use Mother Tongues, Sheng, Foreign languages like French, and even languages from neighbouring countries like Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Rwanda and Somalia. They also use non-verbal cues to communicate during instruction in class. These include demonstrations, illustrations as well as gestures. There is also translation from some languages to others depending on the language in question and that in use. All these other languages and ways of communication prove that English and Kiswahili, or even the language of the catchment area, are not the only languages that should be used as the languages of instruction.

5.1.3 The Factors that Influence or Motivate the Choice of the Languages Used in Classroom Contexts in CHs

Fieldwork data revealed that a number of factors influence both teachers and pupils in choosing the languages to use in class. One of these main factors is a language every pupil can understand. This means that both the teachers and the pupils will choose a language they are comfortable with, not necessarily English or Kiswahili, but a language they can express themselves in because they understand it well. The teachers and the pupils may not choose a language to use in class if it is imposed on them.

Fieldwork data further revealed that the language of the majority teachers and pupils in the class was another factor that was considered. When a number of pupils are in a class, it is only fair that
together with the teachers, they use a language common to all, so that everybody participates in
the exercise at hand. This language does not have to be English or Kiswahili or a specific Mother
Tongue, but any language that is common to all.

The findings also revealed that pupils and teachers choose the language pupils know, especially
the local language. The point here is that the teacher should communicate with each child even if
it means through code-switching and code-mixing.

The respondents revealed several methods that are used by both teachers and pupils in order to
communicate. Such methods include using another teacher or pupil to communicate what they
want to say to each other in their own language, using gestures and body movements, charts and
drawings to make sure they have communicated what they needed to.

From the fieldwork data, teachers and pupils revealed that they choose English and Kiswahili
purposely because these are the languages used in examinations and even in the textbooks. The
concern is that the pupils should compete with the rest of the pupils in the country and pass well.
Both the teachers and the pupils struggle to learn and use these languages for the sake of exams,
not that they are their best choices, but because they have no alternative but to use them. Mother
tongues and Sheng have no place in this, because they are never used in testing or in textbooks.

Teachers and pupils also considered the pupils’ cultural background, especially those that had
joined the Children’s Homes when they had already learned their Mother Tongues. They choose
Mother Tongues because they want to continue learning them, appreciate them and preserve their
culture. The idea is to make sure that these pupils do not lose the culture of the community they came from before joining the Children’s Homes because of the language of instruction. It is only fair if these pupils keep their languages for use when they are re-united with the original community as adults.

The language policy of the Children’s Home is another factor that the teachers and the pupils consider. Not all Children’s Homes have a prescribed language policy. The pupils that come from Homes that have a language policy use the language during instructions. As the children learn the language agreed upon in the Homes they live in, they realize that it is useful even in school and so encourage each other to use it. To some children, the language used in the Home is the only language they know so when it is used in school, it is to their advantage.

5.1.4 The Difficulties Faced in Applying the National LOI Policy at the Primary School Level in CHs

From the fieldwork findings, the current Language of Instruction is not sufficient enough for the children in Children’s Homes. It is difficult for these children in multilingual areas to use the LOI they find in the schools they go to because they do not know it. The policy advocates for the common language in the area of the school, but these children come from different linguistic backgrounds. The National Language policy recommends that schools use Kiswahili where there are different language backgrounds, but again, some of these children do not know Kiswahili either. It therefore becomes difficult for them to use the recommended LOI for they do not know it.
The fact that there are so many languages including foreign languages in any cosmopolitan area implies that getting a common language to be used as a language of instruction in class is difficult. In Children’s Homes, the children have so many different language backgrounds that it is so difficult to choose which language to use. The policy assumes that there are only two choices, Kiswahili and the language of the catchment area, but there are pupils that would be disadvantaged by this situation.

The fieldwork results noted a weakness in introducing English as a language of instruction at standard four. Pupils and teachers noted that English affects the other subjects and exams negatively when introduced this late because it is a new language to the pupils. Both the teachers and the pupils felt that pupils should be introduced to English, learn it and use it immediately they join school, so that they can learn and get used to it as early as they start their education.

5.2 Implications and Conclusions

It is clear from the fieldwork results that there are diverse language backgrounds for the children in Children’s Homes, and that there may not be a common language for all of them unless the pupils are taught that language. It then follows that the teachers use whatever means to communicate with their pupils. It is not enough to say that there is Kiswahili that is common because there are pupils that do not know it.

In a cosmopolitan environment, there is no language that we can say is the language of the catchment area. There is a variety of languages that both the teachers and the pupils have. It is
therefore difficult to identify a language that fits the description of the language of the school’s catchment area.

The communication in class is such that all manner of means of communication including translation, code switching and code mixing, gestures and body movements, drawings and illustrations to reach these pupils are used. The main purpose of a choice of a language to use during class instruction by both the teacher and the pupils is to have effective communication.

5.3 Conclusion

In conclusion, the languages used for instruction in CHs include any manner of communication whether verbal (and in any language for that matter) or non-verbal, provided there is understanding. Both teachers and pupils use different languages during instructions. The choice of the languages used during instruction is influenced by factors such as a language every pupil can understand, the language of the majority pupils and teachers, the language the pupil knows including a local language even non-verbal means of communication for those who do not have a common language with the teachers. It is, therefore, clear that there are difficulties faced by both the pupils and the teachers when they use the LOI during instruction as they will not be communicating to every pupil.
5.4 Recommendations

This section suggests the importance of the findings of the study in the classroom language of instruction in Children’s Homes. It suggests some recommendations worthy noting if successful learning in Children’s Homes is to be achieved.

In Children’s Homes, it is not always that all the pupils can understand a particular language during instruction in the classroom. Their linguistic backgrounds are different. It is, therefore, important and necessary to use many and different languages if there is to be successful communication. There should be freedom of choice of the language of instruction in class, not restriction as to which language to use, so that every participant in the class can understand clearly the subject at hand. This is necessary in the lower classes of primary schools during class instruction. For purposes of examination, as the children grow, they learn the language of examination. Meanwhile, the teachers should interpret and translate for the pupils as they are being tested.

As the researcher recommends the use of the language that a child comes to school with, it is necessary to say that other languages are also important to the life of the pupil especially in future. These languages do not have to be the languages of instruction. Nevertheless, should they be introduced to the pupils, especially languages that are common in the world like English, Kiswahili, French and any other foreign language, they should be introduced early, as the pupil starts her or his education. The pupil will be able to learn easily because it is time in their life when they acquire languages and so will not get confused as they do with English when they start using it in standard four instead of from the lower classes.
5.5 Suggestions for Further Research

When the researcher was carrying out this study, it was found out that some issues needed to be investigated further. These are presented below:

1. This study was about a minority group; Children who are raised in Children’s Homes instead of their natural homes. There are other minority groups such as the deaf and the refugees. It would be good for similar studies to be done to establish their predicament as far as Language of Instruction is concerned.

2. Because the Children’s Homes are different in different ways such as the way they are run and the ages at which they admit their children, a replication of this study with a wider sample would be of use to the makers of policies, not just language policy, but all policies in the country.
REFERENCES


Mulama, J. (2006). Mother Tongue Education both Effective and Elusive, Nairobi, Kenya


Okrah, A. (2004), African educational reform in the era of globalization: Conflicts and harmony, the African symposium; 4(4.)


APPENDIX 1

Questionnaire to the Administrators

1. From which linguistic backgrounds (community/society) are the children admitted?

2. At what age are the children admitted into this Institution?

3. In which languages do they communicate immediately they are admitted into the children Home?

4. Which languages are actually used in the classroom?
   a).
   b).
   c).
   d).

5. Are you comfortable and satisfied with the National policy on education that classes 1 - 3 be instructed in mother tongue or Kiswahili and class 4 upwards in English?
   Yes
   No
   if yes, why
   if No, why

6. Which language(s) would you prefer the pupils in Children’s Homes to be instructed in?
APPENDIX 2

Questionnaire to the Teachers

1. List the linguistic communities of your pupils.
   
2. List the language(s) you use when teaching classes 1-3? 1. 2. 3. 4.

3. Are there times you lack a word or are unable to explain a concept in class in the particular language you are teaching in? Yes No
   If yes, what do you do in order to reach your pupils?

4. Are your pupils comfortable and fluent when using your language of instruction in class? Yes No
   If no, what do they do in order to communicate with you and even show that they understand the subject at hand?

5. Which language(s) do you find the easiest to use with the pupils in class in order to understand better? 1. 2. 3. 4.
6. Is the current language policy in education, that mother tongue or Kiswahili or the language of the catchment area be used in standard 1-3 and English in std 4-8, appropriate in your children’s Home? Yes ---------- No ------------

If no, what do you think should be the language of instruction in your Children’s Home?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Why is your alternative the best in your view?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

7. Which is your mother tongue?---------------------------------
APPENDIX 3

Scheduled interview for the Pupils

1. Name the languages you speak
   -
   -
   -

2. Which language(s) were you speaking before you came to this school?
   -
   -
   -

3. Which languages have you learned while in this school?
   -
   -
   -

4. When the teachers are teaching, in which language(s) do you understand best (when they explain?)
   -
   -
   -

5. Which language(s) would you wish the teacher to use when teaching you in order to understand better, why
   -
   -
   -

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

102
### Table 4.18: Languages Pupils Wish to Use in Class and Why

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Why Pupils wish to use these Languages in Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **English** | Understand it well  
Want to learn it  
It is a local language  
Like the language  
It is compulsory/ mandatory to use it |
| **Total** | |
| **Kiswahili** | Understands it better  
Like the language  
Speak the language at home  
It is better than Sheng’ |
| **Total** | |
| **Sheng’** | It is better than all the other language  
It is the only language they know  
Understands it better than any other language |
| **Total** | |
| **French** | Did not want to forget their language |
| **Total** | |