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ABSTRACT

The study sought to evaluate the implementation of the National Literacy Acceleration Programme (NALAP) and to assess progress made so far after the implementation. This study again sought to assess how the teaching of language and literacy from the Kindergarten to primary three was implemented as a follow-up to the NALAP which is bi-literacy language programme and whether the methods, strategies and materials of NALAP were effectively used. It was also to investigate the extent to which NALAP helped to improve pupils’ literacy development and the challenges the programme might have encountered in the teaching and learning of language and literacy. The study focused on only lower primary teachers. The design was cross-sectional research design. Four instruments; namely, Questionnaire, interview guide, observation guide and document analysis were used for the data collection. The target population for the study comprised 1852 lower primary teachers of the Upper West Region with an accessible population of 656 and sample size of 100 teachers. Multiple sampling techniques such as quota sampling technique, purposive and simple random sampling techniques were used. Quota sampling technique was used to select 20 teachers from each district. Purposive sampling technique was also used to select five districts lower primary teachers among eleven districts. In addition, two teachers were also purposively selected from among the overall sample from each district for the interview and observation respectively. Simple random sampling technique was used to select four schools in each district with five teachers from each school. Two schools too were selected in each district for the document analysis. The results were analyzed using frequency tables and percentages. The findings revealed that NALAP was implemented to some extent in some schools but had a lot of challenges. The results again showed that there were NALAP teaching and learning materials are available in the schools but were insufficient (61%) and some schools had none at all. Recommendations were made for the provision of teaching learning materials, training of teachers in bilingual bi-literacy methods of teaching to enable them teach language and literacy proficiently and in-service programmes for serving teachers in the system. And finally, suggestions were made for further studies.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Language is one of human beings’ major means of expression. It plays a major role in the education of the child both formally and informally. It is the key to communication and understanding in the classroom. The use of Language in everyday communication is therefore very important and it is through language that literacy can be developed. Without language there will be no literacy development because it is through the use of language that the four major language skills are developed. Therefore, the study of language is very important and literacy proficiency in both first language (L1) and second language (L2) in particular and in other academic disciplines in general is also very necessary for lower primary school pupils. However, this aspect has been very low in our basic schools and as a result various language policies have been implemented mostly without success though.

The development of effective Language and Literacy is therefore crucial to the child’s life and his/her entire learning. A child's journey to building strong language and literacy skills starts from infancy and continues throughout the early childhood years and beyond. According to the Ghana Education Service [GES] (2014, p.2) all aspects of literacy play an integral part of the child’s education. Reading in particular, underpins all subjects, as it enables children to access all areas of the curriculum. Consequently, this makes cross-curricular links possible. For instance, demonstrating the ability to read and understand a mathematical word problem in order to solve it is a sign of literacy ability and skills. It is therefore very important that teachers and all other educators teach, encourage and facilitate literacy learning in the lower classes.
Attaining an appreciable level of literacy is a process and not an event. It can actually take a lifetime to achieve (Elkin, 2007). Literacy is a skill that is a very essential pillar of every child's development, if the child will succeed in his/her education and contribute to the growing population of literate society. In fact, literacy forms the fundamental building blocks of every child's academic life. The rate at which pupils acquire these requisite skills is clearly known to be a strong indicator of the future success in pupils’ academic performance and implication for society as a whole (Chen, 2005).

In a multi-lingual society like Ghana, there cannot be proper development without adequate development of people’s languages and literacy. Language is explained as a structured system of arbitrary vocal conventional symbols by means of which members of a social group interact (Bram, 1967) cited in Owu-Ewie (2006). It is the ability to acquire and use complex systems of communication, particularly the human ability to do so. It is the expression of ideas by means of speech-sounds combined into words. Cook (2000) contends that language is the centre of human life. We use it to express our love or our hatred, to achieve our goals and further our career, to gain artistic satisfaction or simple pleasure. Language is the pivot on which all human life activities revolve.

Literacy, on the other hand, is referred to as a set of observable skills especially ones relating to one’s intellectual ability to read and write (UNESCO, 2006). According to the Ghana Education Service (2014, p.2), “literacy is the ability to read, write, view, design, speak, listen, identify, understand, interpret, create, compute, use print and written materials associated with varying contexts. It is also the ability to communicate effectively and to make sense of the world.” Literacy involves a
continuum of learning that enables an individual achieve his/her goals, to develop his/her knowledge and potential to participate fully in the wider society. Literacy is also the ability to read and write at an adequate level of proficiency that is necessary for communication. It is a concept claimed and defined by a range of different theoretical fields (Brain, 1984 & Moat, 2007). From the definitions, literacy is more than the ability to read and write. It is a complex whole of ability for human development and progress.

Cook (1986, p.17) offers a good definition by referring to Literacy as the ability to create and understand printed messages as well as to the changes that this ability brings about. It connotes an assessment of the usefulness of this ability. Literacy therefore, means the acquisition of the skills of reading and writing to be able to function effectively in a community. In this case, literacy cannot be judged apart from some understanding of the social circumstances and specific historical traditions which affect the way this ability takes root in society.

Thus, the importance of language and literacy in our schools’ instruction is very crucial in lower primary school pupils’ literacy development. However, the issue of the best language of instruction in schools has been a thorny one for years in many African countries, including Ghana. Language-in-education policy in Ghana, has been changing over the years and particularly so after independence.

Since independence, successive governments in Ghana have implemented various language policies with much concern for the English Language because it is the official language used in all our transactions. This means that the government’s policy on language of instruction has changed many times over several decades. For instance, from 2002 to 2009, the government mandated English-only instruction
which generated intense public interest was met with a lot of criticisms from sections
of academicians, politicians, educators, traditional rulers and the general populace.
This policy did not last long and the situation reversed to the one that was in practice
before (Owu-Ewie, 2013). According to Seidu, Mereku, Avoke, Ekumah, Tamanja
when the president at that time set up a committee to review the entire education
system. The committee recommended that either the local or the English language
should be used as medium of instruction at the kindergarten and lower primary, as
appropriate (Ministry of Education Science and Sports [MOES], 2003). Following the
recommendation, the government’s white paper 2004 announced that;

*Government accepts the recommendation that the children’s first home language and
Ghana’s official language, English, should be used as the medium of instruction at
the kindergarten and primary level (Anamua-Mensah, 2004).*

With this recommendation, the English only policy which was in place before, did not
last long and a change again was introduced with the inception of National Literacy
Acceleration Programme (NALAP) through a partnership between the Ghana
Education Service (GES) and the United States Agency for International
Development (USAID) as part of the Education Quality for All (EQUALL) project in
2008 (GES, 2014). The language policy with the inception of NALAP was that the
medium of instruction in kindergarten (KG) and lower primary should be a Ghanaian
language and English where necessary. English, the official language of the country is
introduced gradually from KG and becomes the medium of instruction from Primary
The overall goals of the NALAP programme were; first to equip the majority of children leaving the basic education system with skills of literacy that would improve their learning abilities and serve as a springboard for further academic pursuit. Second, it also meant that by primary 3, pupils would be functionally literate and numerate and would achieve reading fluency in both the mother tongue (L1) and the English language (L2) (MOESS, 2008). The objective of NALAP is to provide instruction in predominantly Ghanaian language of the local community of the pupils through KG1 to P3 with English being introduced in primary 4. The assumption of the programme is that the pupils would first become fluent speakers and readers of the local language of instruction and immediately follow with the English language skills.

One prominent issue about NALAP is that, it is a bilingual literacy programme in which pupils learn to read in a Ghanaian language. The pupils also learn to speak English at the same time, but they do not read English until primary 2. NALAP approach is based on studies that show that pupils learn to read and write better and faster in a language they know well, and the skills acquired in the local language transfer to reading a second language.

In order to ensure the success of the programme EQUALL project with the assistance of USAID developed a lot of teaching and learning materials for the early grade pupils in 11 officially approved and recognized Ghanaian languages for instruction. These languages were AkwapemTwi, Asante Twi, Dagaare, Dagbani, Dangme, Ewe, Fante, Ga, Gonja, Kasem and Nzema (GES, 2014). Contrary to the approved languages, additional languages such as Gurune, Kusal, Buli and Likpakpa are also being developed, and some studied in the Universities just like the others taught in the lower primary without officially being taught in basic schools. With the materials
developed in all the eleven languages Ghanaian languages approved for study in schools, their introduction became one of the most far-reaching reforms of education system in Ghana (MOESS, 2008). The materials were prepared in conformity to the syllabus with standards and milestones and reflect the cultural values and practices of the pupils. The standards state what the pupils should know and be able to do while the milestone state the steps along the way to reaching the standards. These standards cover the four major language skills.

The central purpose of NALAP is to contribute to an increase in the literacy rate for early grade primary school pupils. Reports from national assessments show that the great majority of primary pupils cannot read with understanding in their first language or in English. In June 2009 a Baseline Assessment for NALAP implementation found that only 18% of third grade pupils could read text in their school’s Ghanaian language (Leherr, 2009), and at grade six the National Education Assessment (NEA) of 2007 also found that 15% of P3 and 26% of P.6 pupils had minimum competency in English (MOESS, 2007). In 2011 the proficiency level in English for P3 and P6 learners was 42.9% and 48.6% respectively (NEA, 2012). The criterion Reference Test of 2000 also indicated that fewer than 10% of primary school children at level six are able to read with the ability of the grade level (Moomen, 2006).

Though there has been slight improvement since 2008 to date, the result is still unsatisfactory vis-à-vis the standards set by the Ministry of Education. As indicated in the National Education Assessment (NEA) report, test information in Ghana has consistently indicated problems in the learning repertoires for pupils and these problems have persisted. While the education system is improving, test scores have only marginally improved over the years. This gives credence that the fundamental
problem facing Ghanaian children is that of basic literacy skills. It is clear that the phenomenon of these very low rates of literacy and learning has been relatively neglected during the past, with our rapid expansion of primary schooling to meet our constitutional mandate, and the international Education for All target of having all school-age children enrolled in basic education. The consequence is that most children experience and leave school crippled by their inability to access and use text as a tool of understanding. As a result, schooling becomes more a matter of memorization than comprehension. This is a major constraint to Ghana’s socio-economic development that a large proportion of our children and youth are unable to comprehend and to learn from text, or to write with fluency (Hanushek and Wossman, 2007).

As a follow up to ensure that NALAP is well implemented after the development of the materials and Baseline assessment, the project organized workshops for National Resource Team members who in turn trained 5 circuit supervisors of all the districts in the country for further training of KG1 to P3 teachers. In addition to this, all the circuit supervisors, headteachers, and language tutors of Colleges of Education were also trained to ensure NALAP is adequately well implemented. The hope is that NALAP will provide a realistic solution to the problem of local language literacy development in Ghana and this could present a model programme for other African countries battling with language policy problems to emulate.

Despite all these language policy issues, English which is still used in the education system is a second language for all Ghanaians and as such, some Ghanaians cannot speak it. A vast majority of Ghanaian children learn to speak, read and write English for the first time in school. And as a result of difficulties in language policy issues, some Ghanaians feel the mother tongue policies that were implemented do not always
favour the study of the English language too in schools. It is in this light that Daaku (2010) explained that the misconception that the use of local dialect as a medium of instruction in pre-school does not promote proficiency in English language and academic achievement was hindering the efforts of the National Literacy Accelerated programme. According to one Transforming Teacher Education and Learning (T-TEL) Curriculum framework pillars on teacher education on literacy standards, Ghanaian Languages and English Language are the key to success in education and life. And getting this right is the most critical issue for our children’s future and for education in Ghana (T-TEL, 2016). It is therefore expected that teachers would be trained to use the L1 to teach other subjects from KG-P3 and L2 as language of instruction upwards and also L2 as a springboard for improving L2 learning and communication in the basic schools.

Looking at the Ghanaian situation, approximately, we have about sixty (60) languages spoken in the country and none of these is a national language (Dowuona-Hammond & Asante-Frempong, 2000). As such the issue of language policy in Ghana as a multi-lingual country, and for that matter language of instruction in the lower primary schools has always been the subject of public and academic debate and full of controversy. As indicated earlier, some object to the use of the mother tongue as the medium of instruction, especially in the lower primary schools, on the basis that the child knows his/her mother tongue before he/she comes to school. Therefore, there is no need for the school to teach him/her again.

To support the use of mother tongue with empirical evidence, various researches on language in education have established facts that the use of the L1 as medium of instruction during one’s early years of schooling, results in improved acquisition of
knowledge by pupils (Andoh-Kumi, 1992; Fafunwa, Macauley & Funnso, 1989). It has also been established that the use of the mother tongue as language of instruction is effective in helping with the acquisition of second languages. It is quite clear the study of language is very important and Literacy proficiency in both first language (L1) and second Language (L2) in particular and in other academic discipline in general is also very necessary. In the same way, the importance of language and literacy in our schools’ instruction is very crucial for lower primary school pupil’s literacy development. Unfortunately, this aspect has been very low in our schools and this is as a result of the various language policies implemented over the years without success due to so many reasons.

Significant amongst language policies issues is the belief of some people that the policy itself largely accounts for the low level of literacy in English among pupils and students. Lack of resources, teacher preparedness, and other concerns confound schools’ ability to carry out the policy as intended. Negative attitudes toward the use of Ghanaian languages in instruction also compound the problem (Improving Education Quality [IEQ], June28, 2000)

Language use in school is very necessary and has two basic academic functions. In the first place, teachers use language to teach new content and concepts while pupils are expected to learn them through language. Secondly, teachers use language to teach language and to help pupils learn it. With all these importance, the issue of the best language of instruction in schools has always been a thorny one for years not only in Ghana but also in many Africa countries. Language-in-education policy in a multilingual society like Ghana has been a controversial issue since British colonial rule, but particularly so after independence. As Ouadraogo (2000, p.89) stated
“Education and language issues are very complex in Africa because of their multi-ethnic, multi-lingual situation”. The situation is even more severe when the official language of the nation is different from any of the indigenous languages. There is always controversy over which language to use in school especially at the lower primary level in multilingual societies.

Sixty years after independence, Ghana is still grappling with which particular language to use as the medium of instruction in the lower primary school (now KG1 to primary 3). Therefore, English the language of our colonial masters continues to play a prominent role and is officially used in our formal educational system. This implies that all Ghanaians who attend school must study English which is a second language. Majority of Ghanaians cannot speak it. Just the same, our children learn to speak, read and write English for the first time in school. This therefore, is a challenge for basic school pupils in the country because most of them speak different indigenous Ghanaian languages (Dowuona-Hammond & Asante-Frempong, 2000).

Currently, in the Upper West region we have about three distinct languages spoken and they include Dagaare, (Birifo, Chakala, Dagara inclusive) Sissali and Kasem. The issue of the school’s choice of Ghanaian language for NALAP materials, as well as the challenge of teachers who are not fluent in the L1 they are attempting to teach, is a challenge for up to 20% of the schools (EQUALL, 2010). There are schools, particularly concentrated in both Sissala East and West of Upper West Region, where pupils and teachers do not know or speak one of the 11 official languages. If NALAP is to succeed in these areas, teachers need help in making use of the L1 materials or working with the GES to devise other methods of teaching L1 literacy and oral English in the earlier grades.
However, language policy in Ghana, especially, as it affects the lower primary schools has continually always been the subject of public and academic debate. Some object to the use of the mother tongue as the medium of instruction, especially in the lower primary schools, on the basis that the child knows his mother tongue before he/she comes to school; therefore, there is no need for the school to teach him/her again. Some also feel the English only policy too is not favourable for the pupils in a multi-lingual society like ours whilst others again feel mother tongue language policies do not always favour the study of the English language in schools. To support the use of L1 in the lower primary schools with empirical data, various researches on language in education have established that the use of the L1 as medium of instruction during one’s early years of schooling, results in improved acquisition of knowledge by pupils (Andoh-Kumi, 1992; Fafunwa et al, 1989). It has also been established that the use of the mother tongue as language of instruction is effective in helping with the acquisition of second languages.

It is in support of the L1 view that Daaku (2010) states that the misconception that the use of Local dialect as a medium of instruction in pre-school does not promote proficiency in English language and academic achievement was hindering the efforts of the National Literacy Accelerated programme (NALAP) (Daaku, 2010).

It is in light of this that the language policy stipulates that from KG1 –Primary three the pupils should start with the mother tongue (L1) and progress to English from primary four upward to tertiary levels. To facilitate this progression the National Literacy Acceleration programme which is a biliteracy programme was initiated for the pupils to progress smoothly from mother tongue (L1) to English without difficulties.
Language learning involves acquisition of language arts and one cannot acquire language without developing his/her skills in that language. Language arts provide pupils with the skills necessary to learn about their world and the essential knowledge necessary to appreciate cultural aspects of their world. All pupils need to be skillful in language arts to learn successfully in school, to become productive members of society, and to achieve their full potential through life-long learning.

For the lower primary children to develop the language arts they need to develop literacy skills in both L1 and L2. The use of English language as a second language increases the opportunity of children to interact with other peoples, to understand their culture, it can help them be open-minded, sensitive, well-educated citizens, and world languages learning develops the skills, and habits essential to the learning process, creative inquiry, and critical thinking. English can help students participate more fully in the global community and marketplace (Elmira, 2015).

It is very important to teach language and literacy in the lower classes. Teaching Language and Literacy integrates an emergent literacy perspective with scientifically-based instructional practices that are successful in supporting children’s reading, writing, listening and speaking development. As a child's journey to building strong language and literacy skills starts in infancy and continues through the early childhood years and beyond, caregivers are essential partners for children on the path to language and literacy development. The journey begins to be strong when caregivers respond to, talk with and read with infants, toddlers, and preschoolers. Caregivers continue the journey by building on each child's experiences and skill base to encourage continued learning. Encouraging the development of language and literacy is an important way that caregivers can support children’s overall
development. Supporting language development builds the foundation for emergent literacy skills, the large set of pre-reading and writing skills that children develop over time during the early childhood years. Emergent literacy skills are therefore necessary for lower primary children. They include; building vocabulary, story comprehension, phonemic awareness, and building letter and word knowledge. If these skills of children are developed, the foundation for literary skills and further study of any kind will not be a problem to them in their academic ladder.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Educational programmes in every nation are carried out for the development of that nation. There is therefore the need to periodically evaluate the educational system to assess how well a programme has been executed and determine the extent to which it has benefited the students, to identify the areas that are not carried out successfully and the reasons for the failures (Essuman, 2001) as cited in Numali (2003). There is therefore the need for evaluation of the National Literacy Acceleration Programme (NALAP) in the Basic schools to find out the extent to which it has been implemented and the progress made so far.

From the background to the study, there is evidence that NALAP is implemented in certain basic schools in Ghana (Dowuono-Hammond & Asante-Frempong, (2000). However, in the basic schools in the Upper West Region it seems the implementation is not properly done because most pupils in the lower primary still find it difficult to read and write in L1 and L2 (EGRA, 2014). And there are limited literature to establish the fact for the proper implementation of the NALAP and Language and Literacy policy programmes in the region. NALAP is an ongoing process and as such there is the need to evaluate it. According to Print (1993, p.188), ‘Process evaluation
examines the experiences and activities involved in the learning situation; that is making judgements about the process by which students acquire learning or examining the learning experience before it is being concluded’. Concurrent with this view, Patton (1990) also asserts that process evaluation focuses on how something happens. Thus, process evaluation includes the evaluation of instruction, (the teachers’ teaching and the students’ learning).

Patton (1990) again advocates that ‘implementation evaluation’ is imperative for monitoring and getting feedback about the programme as to whether it is running effectively or not and what kind of intervention is needed before evaluating the outcomes of the implemented programme. Hence, implementation evaluation informs researchers what is going on in the programme, how the programme has developed, and how and why the programme has or has not deviated from the objectives as planned (Patton, 1990).

As such, in the context of this study, the assumption is that various language policies in Ghana have failed to achieve the desired objectives (Owu-Ewie, 2013) Another main problem of concern is that most of the lower primary pupils in the Basic schools in the Upper West Region can neither read nor write the mother tongue or the second language effectively. According to the 2014 Early Grade Reading Assessment, most pupils in Ghana are performing poorly in reading and numeracy. The report states that “in general only the top 2% or fewer were able to read with fluency and comprehension” (MOE, 2015, P1). The ability to read and write in our basic schools is therefore a serious problem in most of the schools in Upper West region.

Triebel (2001) states that Literacy is described as a problem for Africa in general, like the rest of the world. Ghana, as such is not an exception in this light since she is one
of the African countries. And quite often, it is common to hear complaints that low literacy rate in the north is hindering progress of development in similar ways to claims for the lack of literacy in some southern communities too. Although there are some common features in the manifestation of the problem, the differences tend to be complex.

It is a widely acknowledged fact that, despite decades of literacy campaigns especially in the north and recent campaigns by ‘The Break Through to Literacy’ (BTL) / Bridge to English (BTE), (Moomen, (2006) NALAP, NGOs, Complementary Basic Education (CBE) and others, much has not been achieved.

Another problem worth noting is that after the implementation of policies and programmes, there is often lack of follow-up to evaluate them to find out whether they are progressing or not. Unfortunately, it appears the language policy being practised in the basic schools leaves much to be desired. It is in the light of all these policy problems that the Ghana Education Service with support from the government in conjunction with the USAID conducted Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) all over the country in 2013 to assess the reading skills in 11 Ghanaian languages and English. The Early Grade Reading Assessment showed that by the end of primary 2, majority of public school pupils could not yet read with comprehension, neither in a Ghanaian language nor in English. In the 11 languages assessed, at least half, and often more, of the pupils assessed could not read a single word correctly.

Since the implementation of NALAP, various researches have been carried in some parts of the country on literacy. For instance, Asante (2011) carried out a study on the role of extensive reading on literacy development of primary school pupils at Beach Road Metro Assembly in Saltpond. Moomen (2006) before the implementation also
did evaluation survey of the “Break through to Literacy (BTL) and Bridge to English (BTE)” project in the Bole district. This clearly shows that researches are being carried out in the area of literacy development. These studies are all aimed at how programmes are implemented.

It therefore, seems the NALAP and the Language and Literacy policy as practised in the lower primary schools have not lived up to expectation. The question is, to what extent are NALAP strategies being implemented in the lower primary schools? Do the pupils have access to quality teaching of language and literacy? Do the basic schools have adequate resources for the teaching and learning of language and literacy? Answers to these questions and many others are not known. It is against this background that the study sought to find out the extent to which NALAP and the language and literacy policy practised in the lower primary schools is being implemented. It is also against this background that the study sought to evaluate the National Literacy Acceleration Programme on the effective teaching and learning of language and literacy in selected lower primary schools in the Upper West Region of Ghana.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the implementation of NALAP on the teaching and learning of language and literacy in the Upper West Region of Ghana.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study are to:

- assess the involvement of teachers in the teaching of language and literacy in lower primary schools in the NALAP,
• find out whether teachers are using the NALAP methods and strategies in the teaching of language and literacy in the lower primary schools,

• assess the use of NALAP materials in the teaching of language and literacy in the lower primary schools,

• find out whether the NALAP has helped to improve lower primary school pupils’ literacy development,

• examine the challenges that might have affected NALAP implementation in the teaching of language and literacy at the basic schools.

1.5 Research Questions

Based on the purpose of study and the statement of the problem, the following research questions were raised to guide the study

1. How effective is the involvement of teachers in the implementation of the NALAP in the teaching of Language and Literacy?

2. How efficiently have the teachers been using the teaching methodologies and strategies of NALAP in the teaching of language and literacy in the lower primary schools?

3. To what extent has the use of NALAP materials been implemented in the lower primary schools?

4. In what way has the NALAP helped to improve literacy development of lower primary pupils in the teaching of language and literacy?

5. What are some of the challenges affecting the proper implementation of the NALAP in the teaching of language and Literacy at the lower primary school level?
1.6 Significance of the Study

The study attempts to evaluate the implementation of the National Literacy Acceleration Programme on the effective teaching and learning of Language and Literacy in lower primary schools. The findings of this study will benefit the classroom teacher and inform him/her to adopt suitable methods in the teaching and learning of Language Literacy at the lower primary level. The results will also help teachers to improve upon the teaching and learning of language and literacy in the basic schools for the overall improvement of pupils’ performance in both reading and writing in the mother tongue and English language. The findings of the study again will inform the new Language Policy Working Group, Reading/Numeracy Syllabus Development Working Group, Supplementary Materials Working Group, In-Service/Pre-Service Policy Working Group, curriculum planners, and educational authorities to review existing policies and engage Stakeholders including educators, civil society organizations, the business sector, parents, communities, and faith leaders to gather feedback and input so that they review and update policies to support better outstanding of literacy achievement in both the mother tongue and English language.

The findings that emerge from this study will also generate the interest of other research institutions and Universities to carry out further research into other areas of language and literacy development and language policy issues. Thus, other researchers as well may also use this study material as a source of reference in their studies.
The study will again benefit educational policy makers, the Teacher Education Unit, the Ghana Education Service, all other stakeholders in education, and trickle down to the basic school teachers and pupils in basic schools.

It will also serve as a guide for teachers to adopt certain teaching methods and strategies of teaching language and literacy in the lower primary schools to facilitate and improve the development of literacy skills among pupils in both L1 and L2. As such, this study will go a long way to improve the teachers teaching methods and strategies in handling language and literacy lessons at the basic levels so that a solid foundation is laid for the pupils to build on as they progress to the upper classes. It is also envisaged that findings of the study will contribute to existing literature on language development policies.

1.7 Delimitation and Scope of the Study

The study was focused on only lower primary teachers of basic schools; that is, from KG 1-P3 in the Upper West Region of Ghana. The languages of instruction in our lower primary schools are the local language (L1) and English language (L2). Therefore, the research examined issues of mother tongue (L1) on the teaching and learning of second language (L2). The scope of the study therefore, was limited to National Literacy Acceleration Programme to the study of language and literacy in the lower primary schools. Therefore, upper primary school teachers and Junior High School teachers were not included in the study.
1.8 Organization of the Study

The research study is organized into five (5) chapters. The first chapter provides information on the background to the study, statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, objectives of the study, research questions, significance of the study and delimitations. The second comprises the review of the related literature of the study. It examines the empirical studies in addition to theoretical underpinnings and finally concludes with summary of the literature. The third also deals with the methods and procedures employed in this study. It comprises the research design, the population used, pilot study, the sample and sampling techniques employed, the instruments used, the data collection procedures and data analysis. The fourth chapter focuses on the discussions of the results and findings. And the last chapter deals with summary, conclusions and recommendations and suggestions for further study.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.0 Overview

Chapter two presents an overview of related literature involving theoretical underpinnings and empirical data from magazines, written journals, and other research works that have a bearing on the research topic. It explains the concept of evaluation, literacy in Africa, Language policy issues in Ghana, literacy situation in Ghana, the development of language-in-education policy in Ghana, the role of the first language in second language acquisition, language and culture, socio-culture theory, teaching learning materials, challenges and assessment of language and literacy.

2.1 Concept of Evaluation

There seems not to have been much literature on evaluation of the National Literacy Acceleration Programme in the basic schools of Upper West Region after the implementation of the programme. It also seems most programmes implemented in Ghana are often not are evaluated. However, the concept of evaluation has been examined by various writers based on varied view-points. Farrant, (1982) views evaluation as a process by which a project or programme is judged in relation to its stated objectives. According to Kankam (1997), cited in Man (2013) evaluation consists of making systematic judgements of the relative effectiveness with which goals are attained in relation to specific standards. Kankam, (1997) supports the views of both Farrant (1982) and Pecku (1991) when he stated that evaluation of any programme is meant to find out the programme objective are being realized. Evaluation therefore, involves assessment of worth or merit of some educational objects and making judgement. As such, it includes assessment of the educational
objectives to enhance the performance of teachers and learners in the teaching and learning process.

From the preceding explanation, it would be observed that people very often constantly evaluate what happens to them daily in their life officially or unofficially on many issues that take place in whatever environment they find themselves. For example, newspapers review segment, the standpoint, talking point, breakfast show, Sports Highlight and many others on Ghana Television stations are examples of evaluation.

Evaluation work in the NALAP at the lower primary is therefore necessary to assess the extent to which the programme is implemented so far in order to offer suggestions for decision making purposes. The evaluation of the NALAP will enable the lower primary schools teachers, circuit officers and district directors to judge how well they are performing in the programme. This can provide a base for deciding the nature of improvement needed in NALAP.

In evaluating a programme data is required for effective monitoring of the programme. The data collected through evaluation are needed to assist school personnel in interpreting the NALAP performance to teachers, parents, stakeholders and the communities throughout the country to understand the role of this bilingual policy in education. This will help parents, academics, teachers and the Ghanaian community to have a positive attitude towards bilingual policies usually implemented in the country.

Thus, evaluation of any programme is therefore necessary to ascertain whether the objectives are being achieved or not. This awareness will help the National Literacy Acceleration Programme Task Force, the Co-ordinator, curriculum and Research
Development Division and other policy makers to understand whether they are on the right path towards the stated objectives of the programme. Therefore, comprehensive evaluation of NALAP is needed to be approached in these three ways; the objective of the programme, the method used to attain the objectives and procedures adopted to collect evidence. These are fundamental for the evaluation of any programme and NALAP as a bilingual and biliteracy programme is not an exception.

2.2 Theoretical framework; socio-cultural theory

There are many theories regarding assisting second language learners in the learning process, and one of them is socio-cultural theory (SCT) in which learners are considered as active agents in the learning process and are seen as individuals who become part of the L2 community. The socio-cultural theory is one of such theories that take cognizance of society influence on language acquisition. This study therefore, focused on Vygotsky’s socio-cultural theory of language learning. Socio-cultural theory argues that human mental functioning is fundamentally a mediated process that is organized by cultural artifacts, activities, and concepts (Ratner, 2002; Lantof, 2000).

Vygotsky socio-cultural theory has had an immense impact on the field of education. Although Vygotsky does not deny the indispensable roles of biological factors, he maintains that socio-cultural factors are also significant in the development of the human being's mental processes. Vygotsky (1978) regards socio-cultural settings as the essential and determining factor in the development of higher mental activities including voluntary attention, intentional memory, logical thought, planning and problem solving. In this theory learning is thought of as a social event taking place as a result of interaction between the learner and the environment.
According to this view, the existing cultural artifacts enable human individuals to regulate and modify his/her behavioural and biological activities. As such language is also believed to be the primary means of mediation. Thus, the child’s developmental processes occur as the outcome of his/her participation in cultural, linguistic and historical settings such as getting involved in interactions within families, peer groups, educational institutions, workplaces, sport activities, and so forth. Although Vygotsky does not reject the neurobiological factors for higher level of thinking ability, he stresses on the importance of interactions within social contexts in the development of human's cognitive ability (Lantolf & Thorne, 2007).

Socio-cultural theory holds the view that human mental function is from participating cultural mediation integrated into social activities. This means the theory has profound implications for teaching, schooling, and education. The main idea of this psychological view of human development is that social interaction is responsible for the development of higher order functions. In this regard it is believed that the individual’s internal cognitive process alone cannot account for his/her developmental process. Socio-cultural theory considers the external social factors in the child’s environment as paramount. Children participate in activities which entail the use of cognitive and communicative functions and by doing so, these functions scaffold and nurture them in their developmental process. Hence in language classrooms successful instructions should be within the child’s zone of proximal development (ZPD).

Also, socio-cultural theory believes successful learning process cannot be an individual’s unmediated or unassisted effort but a collaborative process in a language community. Looking at the perspective of the socio-cultural theory, one would realize
that Ghana being a multi-lingual and multi-cultural society has an implication in the socio-cultural theory propounded by Vygotsky. The Ghanaian social environment and cultural setting has a strong impact on the study of English as second language. As Vygotsky argues the driving force behind speech is communication among both adults and children. In the earliest stages in children, speech is believed to be a social phenomenon which has a singular purpose (communication) and is multifunctional. Vygotsky (1996) perceives language development as a process which begins through social contact with others and then gradually moves inwards through a series of transitional stages towards the development of inner speech. In other words, the phenomenon of inner speech is rooted in the society, as internalized social speech. The importance of inner speech can be realized in some psychologists’ viewpoints when they describe thought as the inhibited, soundless speech (Vygotsky, 1978).

From Vygotsky’s theory, literacy is viewed as a complex interaction and interpretative process which development is determined by its cultural and social factors (Bruner 1967, & Vygotsky, 1978) as cited in Vygotsky (1996). Through social interaction and the use of culturally determined tools and symbols, basic literacy processes are transformed into higher intellectual function (Vygotsky, 1978, 1989). Vygotsky believes each intellectual function must appear twice; first, on a social, external plane between two people and secondly, on personal, internal plane within the child. The connection between external and internal activity is conceptualized by Vygotsky (1978) as inter and intra psychological functioning.

Vygotsky (1978) theory emphasizes the social interaction as tool for transmitting specific knowledge for learning how to construct problem-solving activities. The concept maintains that children move from people-regulatory (external) to self-
regulatory (internal) behaviours through interaction with individuals in their environment. He maintains that the child’s ability to organize and monitor his/her own thinking occurs as a result of demonstration during social exchange with other people around him. Therefore, mediated learning experiences with more literate individuals demonstrates the language needed to guide the child towards regulating his/her own thinking (Forman, Minick & Strone, 1993; Newman, Griffin & Cole, 1993) as cited in Vygotsky (1996). Vygotsky’s perspective is that children literacy awareness is shaped by the social structure of the event, which was simultaneously shaped by the degrees of linguistic support needed to communicate a mutual understanding for purposeful, meaningful literate activity. Vygotsky (1996) view emphasizes the intricate nature of talk and action working together within the structure of the literacy event to promote within the child an inner control over particular literate activity.

Based on Vygotsky’s (1996) findings, he concluded that teachers and children employ talk for knowledge, assisting and communicating about literacy. In addition, that these types of talk do not work independently of each other but harmonized together to shape the child’s construction of literate awareness for a particular concept. Secondly, he indicated that the teacher provides degrees of linguistic support which are contingent on the child’s demonstration of literate understanding for particular concept of literacy. Thirdly, Vygotsky maintained that children utilize teacher talk about literacy for guiding and regulating their personal understanding of literature actively and fully, that language and action serve as complementary tools for shaping children’s literacy constructions for particular concept of literacy.
Vygotsky regards instruction as crucial to L2 development and should be geared to the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) that is beyond the learner’s actual development level. Vygotsky (1978) believes that learning in an L2 context should be a collaborative achievement and not an isolated individual’s effort where the learner works unassisted and unmediated.

Vygotsky’s theory has so many implications for literacy development among Ghanaian children because of multicultural and multilingual with varying social dimensions. Literacy development in the Ghanaian curriculum must take into account the socio-cultural network of the system so that literacy development reflects on what the social-cultural system stands for. In consonance, with this, NALAP is designed to cover a lot of speech/oral work for the children from the KG to P3 in at least the first three languages skills (listening, speaking and reading) and thereafter, they learn to commence the writing skills in the subsequent classes. Apart from the socio-cultural theory that talks about language development, others such as the behaviourist, interactionist and innatist theories place emphasis on children second language learning.

2.2.2 The Behaviourist theory

The behaviourists are of the view that language learning is simply a matter of imitation and habit formation. This means children learn the language through the sounds patterns they hear from people around them. The theory emphasizes that as the child imitates the sounds he/she hears around him, he is praised and that encourages him to improve upon the production of sound patterns and finally form a habit from it. The behaviourists therefore, believe that the quality and quantity of the language the child hears and the consistency of reinforcement from caregivers have effect on the
success of the child’s language development. This implies that most Ghanaian children hear their first language around them and this has implication for second language (English) learning.

The behaviourists believe the child comes into this world as blank slate or ‘tabula rasa’ and through environmental influence shapes the child learning of language by providing stimulus and the child mating responses with some reinforcement. The child produces responses which are often more reinforced. As a criticism from Chomsky Innatist Theory that every individual comes to the world with an innate potential to learn and not as blank slate, the theory broaden with the existence of mediation theory. Mediation theory claims that linguistic stimulus elicits a mediating response; that is self-stimulating. This mediation has connection with the Socio-cultural theory which considers human mental functioning as essentially a mediated process organized by cultural artifacts, activities and concepts (Lantolf, 2000). Ghanaian children social being and culture which is a way of the people has a key role in children’s language development. In case, whether the mediation theory did not take abstract nature of language into consideration, it should be noted human being are surrounded by cultural artifact, activities and concepts which contribute immensely to the development of children’s language.

2.2.3 The Interactionist Theory

This theory focuses on the role of the linguistic environment in interaction with the child’s innate capacities in determining the development. The interactionists believe there is interplay between the human features of the child and the environment in which he develops. The interactionists are of the view that adults in the use of language modify their language in simpler sentence patterns with repetition to suit the
capability of the child in the acquisition process. To the interactionists, language is a manifestation of the cognitive and affective ability to deal with the world, with others and self. The theory recognizes the role of environment of the child’s cognitive development in language acquisition. This theory deals with forms of language and not with deeper functional levels of meaning constructed from social interaction. Thus, it is a combination of ideas from the behaviourist and the innatist theories of language development.

### 2.2.4 The Innatist Theory

The innatist theory which was initially propounded by Noam Chomsky believes children are biologically programmed for language and that language develops in the child just in the same way as his/her other biological functions. Chomsky (1965) cited in Owu-Ewie (2013) argued that there is some in-built mechanism or structure in every human being which he calls the Language Acquisition Device (LAD) that helps the individual to speak. Chomsky indicates that the innate properties of this language explain why children acquire and master a native language within a very short time.

Lenneberg (1967) as cited in Owu-Ewie (2013) indicates that language is “species-specific” and other language-related mechanisms are biologically determined. From the explanation it is clear that every child is capable of acquiring any language. If children are capable of acquiring any language as Chomsky claims the individual is biologically programmed, the issue of learning and acquiring English as second language should not be a difficult task for Ghanaian lower primary school children. The implication is that teachers should note that every child is capable and present lesson that suit the age of the children with a lot of motivation to enable them learn. McNeil (1966) believes that children Language Acquisition Device has the property
of the ability to engage in evaluation of developing linguistic system so as to construct the simplest possible out the available linguistic input. It is therefore the duty of the teacher to help in this direction for the child’s second language development to take place.

2.2.5 Empirical studies

The empirical review examined the implementation level of the NALAP in relation to the teaching of language and literacy, and how the language policies influence classroom instruction in first language. The empirical studies again looked at the important role of mother to the development of literacy skills in the second language. As a matter of fact, it is quite clear that most studies conducted in Ghana on the effective medium of instruction at the basic level, have shown that the use of mother-tongue is superior to the use of English language (L2). For example, Collinson (1972) undertook a study on language and concept development in Ghanaian elementary schools. The results showed that learning science in the Ghanaian language results in higher conceptual thinking than when the learning is done in English. In 1996, the Local Language Initial Literacy (LLIL) Project in Northern Ghana as cited in Kwapong and Aboagye (2010) and Andoh-Kumi (2001) conducted a study in nine schools to compare the effect of initial reading and writing in local language (L1) with English language (L2) on performance in English comprehension. The results not only showed that the English reading comprehension scores of the children who had first learned to read in their mother tongue were markedly higher than those children learning to read only in English but it was well observed that those who started L1 literacy were doing well in the basic Ghana Education Service curriculum than those in English. However, a study conducted by Kwapong (2006), showed that there is no
significant difference between the use of Twi (L1) as a medium of instruction and English at the lower primary.

The results of Kwapong and Aboagye (2010) study shows that the performance in mathematics of P3 pupils in Suhum Kraboa Coaltar district who received instruction in Twi was not significantly different from those who received instruction in English language. This finding supports Andoh-Kumi (2001) study of the Central Region of Ghana on the medium of instruction at the basic education level. He found out that when pupils were taught in their L1 it did not always necessarily result in lower achievement in pupil’s general performance. Andoh-Kumi’s research showed no significant difference in mathematics achievement between the use of Akan and English as medium of instruction among half of the schools involved.

Andoh-Kumi (2000) and Bamgbose (1976) studies on medium of instruction had also established that the use of local language produces better academic achievement than the use of a second language. Other studies also favour the use of second language (L2) as medium of instruction (Wagner, 1992). All these is quite evident that starting first language or mother tongue instruction has a strong influence on the performance of children in the lower primary school. Research in Africa, and specifically in Ghana, also confirms our intuitive understanding that children who are taught to read and write first in a language that they already understand and speak are much more likely to become literate in that language as well as English. (EQUALL, 2010)

In a study conducted by Moomen (2006) on evaluative survey of the ‘Break Through to Literacy’ and ‘bridge of English’ in Bole District of the Northern Region, Moomen explained that Cummins (1981) maintains that mother-tongue promotion in school helps develop not only the mother-tongue but also the ability in the majority school
language. This finding is not surprising in view of the previous findings that; bilingualism confers linguistic advantages on children and that abilities in the two languages are significantly related or interdependent. He postulates that the bilingual children perform better in school when the school effectively teaches the mother-tongue and where appropriate, develops literacy in that language. Cummins further argues that when children are encouraged to reject their mother-tongue, its development stagnates, and their personal and conceptual foundation for learning undermined.

Moomen (2006) finding agrees with Hakuta (1990) that children should be exposed to literacy in the mother-tongue for long periods than is the practice in most countries, if literacy in a foreign language is to spring from that skill. It is in line with this view point that NALAP programme allotted 90 minutes for a bilingual and biliteracy for each from KG to p3. Again, Moomen (2006, P.53) study indicated that all 39 teachers he used for the study unanimously supported that Gonja literacy would facilitate reading in English, though they differ in the extent to which the facilitation will occur. This finding falls in line with Dakubu (2001) who says “for the young and for masses whose education in English stops at Senior Secondary School or before, reading something in a writing system that is not recognized as a symbol of possession of one’s community, and therefore as part of oneself, has a special impact, as well as resulting in the better understanding of the written texts”

Dombele and Ndeyo (2005) as cited in Moomen (2006) also found that relevant curriculum foster learning in that they (the curriculum) are based on learners previous experiences, language, literature, environment and knowledge, to facilitate the profession from the known to unknown, from family and community to school
education. The development of literacy is therefore a crucial one for pupils in the basic schools and as such literacy issues have been a problem for many communities and Ghana is not an exception as well as the whole of Africa.

2.3 Literacy in Africa

Literacy issues have been a serious problem in many countries and the Africa situation is even far worse than the rest of the continents in the world. Literacy is therefore, described as a problem for Africa, like the rest of the world (Triebel 2001). Studies in Africa, and specifically Ghana, confirm that children who learn to read and write first in a language that they already understand and speak are much more likely to become literate in that language as well as English (Dutcher, 2004; Lipson & Wixon, 2004; Hayford & Gharrey, 2007) as cited in Owu-Ewie, (2013). Literacy development is improved when the transitional bilingual literacy programme at the lower primary is employed. Literacy is even improved better when the programme is the late exit transitional bilingual model (Owu-Ewie, 2013).

Literacy is simply the ability to read and write. The society considers literacy to mean knowing about, and knowing to “do” particular subject. Nowadays we speak of mathematics Literacy, scientific literacy, computer literacy and so forth. In English language and Ghanaian languages literacy will mean a different thing.

It is common to hear complaints that low literacy in the Northern part of Ghana is obstructing economic development in similar ways to claims for the lack of literacy in the South too. Although there are some common features in the manifestation of the problem, the differences tend to be complex and often stark. It is widely acknowledged that, despite decades of literacy campaigns by UNESCO, and efforts like Education for All (EFA) (Triebel 2001), attempts to ensure that what is often
referred to as the ‘spread of literacy’ in Africa have failed. Jung & Ouane (2001) point to the fact that “writing as a psychological and socio-historical practice has been invented in only a few societies” but “borrowed and adapted” in many others and that for development policy, it is critical that we understand “the mechanisms of literacy transfer from one culture to another”. The popular belief that Africa is an ‘oral’ continent and that literacy, though necessary, is somehow alien to the continent is captured as follows: “Africa needs oracy more than any other community in the world” (Bamgbose, 2000). However, the rediscovery of the Timbuktu manuscripts in Mali presents unfolding documentation of the rich and varied African literacy practices that formed part of social, political and economic life in the Sahel region from the 12th to the 16th Century and again provides evidence that it never was it true that African civilizations relied on oral traditions (Dijan, 2004). But colonial policies ensured a deep rupture of “transfer” to other parts of Africa, particularly sub-Saharan Africa, which in some ways, despite modernization, has continued to deepen through the post-colonial language policies of many countries. This understanding points of departure for deliberating on early literacy development in Africa. In addition to poverty, two fundamental and intrinsically related issues have affected and continue to affect movements to make literacy an integral part of daily life in many parts of Africa (Bamgbose, 2000). One, as indicated, is the issue of language. Several years ago, Michael Halliday wrote as follows:

*There is no doubt that many of our problems in literacy education are of our own making; not just ourselves as individuals, or even educators as a profession, but ourselves as a whole society, if you like. In part the problems stem from our cultural attitudes to language. We take language all too solemnly - and yet not seriously enough. If we (and this includes teachers) can learn to be a lot more serious about language, and at the same time a great deal less solemn about it, then we might be more ready to recognize linguistic success for what it is when we see it, and so do more to bring it about where it would*

Language we can understand, is a deeply complex and political issue (Bamgbose 2000) and the insidious consequences of the fact that literacy under colonialism, and after independence in many cases, has been taught to the majority of people in unfamiliar, ex-colonial languages is often not faced head on, and literacy is dealt with as if it were disjointed to language. For instance in the UNESCO thematic study on Literacy and Adult Education, Wagner (2000) refers to the common problem of participants dropping out of adult literacy programmes, and gives several possible reasons, omitting language as an issue.

Many varied and valid reasons have been cited as causes of this problem, such as inadequate programme quality; lack of time and resources of learners; poor quality of textbooks and pedagogy; lack of social marketing, and so forth. There is little doubt, however, that the general factor behind all these technical issues is that learners, for whatever sets of reasons, do not feel motivated to participate and remain in such literacy programmes. When a learner refers to language, he does not actually state the case for mother tongue learning. In many developing countries, a significant proportion of children in primary schools are either illiterate in their first language or receive only a few years of first language instruction before a second language is introduced as a medium of instruction. Poor second language proficiency is a principal cause of high repetition and wastage rates, and of low achievement in academic subjects in primary and senior high schools, with profound consequences for employment and other externalities of schooling (Wagner 2000).

To find out what literacy really mean, Cook (1986) provides a definition: Literacy thus refers to the ability to create and understand printed messages as well as to the
changes that this ability brings about. Yet, at the same time, it connotes an assessment of the usefulness of this ability. To my understanding literacy simply means the ability to read and write meaningfully. We can see that literacy cannot be judged apart from some understanding of the social circumstances and specific historical traditions which affect the way this ability takes root in society. More recently, the ideological model, within which perspectives of ‘emergent’ literacy that deal specifically with literacy in early childhood have come to be situated, has influenced discussion and practice in African development programmes and education for adults and children, in both formal and non-formal situations (Wagner 2000, Jung and Ouane 2001, Bloch 2002).

Apart from the definitions given, the definition of literacy has expanded over the years. For instance, in Scotland literacy has been defined as the ability to read, write and use numeracy, to handle information, to express ideas and opinions to make decisions and solve problems, as family members, workers citizens and lifelong learners (Literacy Reports, 2007).

In 2004, a panel on literacy in grade 4-6, in Ontario prepared a report on literacy and learning and the panel which was made up of researchers and educators defined literacy as the ability to use language and images in rich and varied forms to read, write, listen, speak, view, represent and think critically about issues. It enables us to share information to interact with others and to make meaning. Literacy is a complex process that involves building on prior knowledge, culture, and experiences in order to develop new knowledge and deeper understanding. It connects individuals and communities, and is an essential tool for personal growth and active participation in a democratic society (Literacy BC, 1990) as cited in Asante, (2011).
Literacy is not about whether or not one can read, but how well one reads. Literacy is a spectrum of ability, as one can deduce from the explanations. From the explanation I can equally add that literacy is the ability to read and write and use written information effectively in a context of varied ways. And early, childhood literacy starts with emergent literacy, that is; literacy for beginners. Emergent literacy or whole language perspective which guides my imagination of young children constructing their own literacy in personally useful and meaningful ways as part of developmental, personal, social and cultural learning processes (Bloch 1997). In the second half of the 20th Century, international research into early language and literacy learning undertaken in a range of disciplines led to revised and powerful understandings about how young children who grow up in literate settings come to be literate. This relatively new but fast growing body of research into early childhood literacy has begun to close the gap between the previously very separate areas of adult and child literacy, bringing together influences and perspectives from anthropology, linguistics, psychology, sociology and education (Holdaway 1979, Taylor 1983, Goodman, 1986, Hall 1987). It is due to these issues that I focus my attention on language and literacy issues in Ghana.

2.4 Language Policy Issue in Ghana

The issue of the best language of instruction in schools has been a thorny one for years in many Africa countries, including Ghana. Language-in-education policy in Ghana has been inconsistent since British colonial rule but particularly so after independence (Dowuona-Hammond & Asante-Frempong, 2000). A close examination of post-independence language-in-education policies show these fluctuating policies have moved from one form of bilingual education policy to another. Many tensions and paradoxes that arise from bilingual education policies in multi-ethnic/multilingual
communities stem from a conflict between policy decisions that are rooted in a particular linguistic tradition and the sociolinguistic realities such policies are to address (Nyarko, 2014). Some of the policies may have been based on assumptions that do not reflect the sociolinguistic practices in Ghana.

Since independence, successive governments in Ghana have implemented various language policies with much concern for the English Language because it is the official language used in all our transactions (Dowuona-Hammond & Asante-Frempong, 2000). Despite that, English is a second language to all Ghanaians and as such, majority of Ghanaians cannot speak it. Majority of Ghanaian children learn to speak, read and write English for the first time in school. Because the children learn English as a second language in school, performance in it has been poor. As a result, most Ghanaians tend to blame the poor performance of students in most of our national examinations on the type of Language policies that are always being implemented. Some Ghanaians feel the mother tongue language policies do not always favour the study of the English language in schools. It is in support to dispel this view that Daaku (2010) states that the misconception that the use of local dialect as a medium of instruction in pre-school does not promote proficiency in English language and academic achievement was hindering the National Literacy Acceleration programme (NALAP) (Daaku, 2010). Most people especially parents have the conviction that the success of their wards depends on how fluent they can speak English (L2) losing sight of that fact that children can only learn, speak and understand the L2 better if the local dialect was in use as the medium of instruction from kindergarten level to primary three, while English language is used for instruction at the upper primary level (Daaku, 2010).
Considering the policy issue, approximately, we have about sixty (60) languages spoken in Ghana and none of these is a national language (Dowuona-Hammond & Asante-Frempong, 2000). As such the issue of language policy in Ghana, especially, as it affects the lower primary schools has always been the subject of public and academic debate. Some object to the use of the mother tongue as the medium of instruction, especially in the lower primary schools, on the basis that the child knows his mother tongue before he/she comes to school; therefore, there is no need for the school to teach him/her again. This also stems from the argument that pupils in the private schools who are taught using the English language as the medium of instruction have higher academic achievements than those in the public schools, which use the mother tongue (L1) as the medium of instruction (Owu-Ewie, 2010).

To others also, even if the child is fluent in the local language, it is only the oral skills that he has acquired. He still needs to acquire the listening, reading, and writing skills in the local language as well. It is also argued that the use of the L1 as the medium of instruction in the early stages eases concept formation and bridges the gap between home and school. The Ghanaian languages are also seen as the vehicles of cultural transmission, especially values, moral and norms of the society (Owu-Ewie, 1992).

Contrary to the L1 medium of instruction at the lower primary school language policy, Cabinet declared in May, 2002 that English should be used as the only medium of instruction at all levels of education. The then Minister of Education, speaking on behalf of the NPP Cabinet, observed that the new policy had become necessary to improve pupils’ comprehension of English, which is used in all examinations at all levels of education.
On the other hand, acting upon the recommendation of the President’s Committee on Review of Education Reforms in Ghana 2002, the Government’s White Paper on the report of the committee asserted that “where teachers and learning materials are available and linguistic composition of classes is fairly uniform, the children’s first language must be used as medium of instruction in kindergarten and lower primary school” (Anamuah-Mensah, 2004). This assertion did not completely rule out the use of English at the lower primary schools of such areas, and also has a reservation that English should be used as the dominant medium of instruction where there was lack of teachers and learning materials in the children’s first language. The choice is therefore, between the use of English and the local languages. With these issues, the white paper of Anamuah-Mensah (2004) report did not mention the people who were to determine the appropriate language to use. As a result, individual district assemblies, schools, directors, headteachers and teachers do what they deem is appropriate. This shows that it is quite clear that each government takes over and comes out with different language policy. One cannot tell whether the ruling government will not reform the present policy and whether subsequent governments will not continue to dictate the policy. It is possible that the current NPP government may introduce another policy again as before.

Though there is a policy in the country that the medium of instruction in the first 3 years of primary education should be in the child’s L1, there is no emphasis on it because the policy makers themselves on their part do not believe in such a policy. Most policy makers send their own children to international schools where the language of instruction even at the kindergarten (KG) level is English. Policy implementers do not believe in the policy either, since most educational authorities
overlook the practice of using English as a medium of instruction even in the KG (Seidu, 2011).

The above proceedings reveal that language policy of Ghana is, therefore, not stable, specific and it is full of inconsistencies. The current language policy of Ghana’s education is indeterminate. The tendency is, however, to use English as the medium of instruction since many have opined that pupils from private schools where English Language is exclusively used as the sole medium of instruction are usually able to perform better than their counterparts from the public schools where the “indeterminate language policy” is used.

As we all know English Language plays a very important role in Ghana. It is a colonial legacy and the official language for business and commerce, law, education, the learned professions, administration, governance and politics in Ghana; that’s the approved language for all formal and official communication. Despite that, Ghana is a highly multilingual country without its own national languages. And for one to function well in such an English-speaking environment, one needs to acquire sufficient proficiency in the English language.

Indeed, many Ghanaian children (most especially, the majority rural dwellers) are unable to achieve the appreciable proficiency levels to even progress from the basic to the senior high level. The problem even becomes worst at the senior high level. The weak foundation at the basic level is compounded by the challenges of the senior high education causing many to fall by the wayside because of English Language. The question to ask is whether Ghana is ready to develop any of its many local languages as a National or an Official Language. If the answer to this question is a big “NO”, then our language policy issues are just been theoretical but not realistic in our quest
for economic, social and political development. If there is anyone who is in doubt, the relationship between language and development, then we should learn something from the story of the Tower of Babel in the Bible, Genesis 11:1-9 to elucidate this point. A determinate language policy therefore, must be consciously implemented instead of the bipartisan way in which the language policy is torched with the sole aim of enhancing development.

To support the first language or mother tongue policy with empirical evidence, various researches on language in education have established that the use of the L1 as medium of instruction during one’s early years of schooling, results in improved acquisition of knowledge by pupils (Andoh-Kumi, 1992; Fafunwa et al, 1989). It has also been established that the use of the mother tongue as language of instruction is effective in helping with the acquisition of second languages. As noted earlier, English is the official language of Ghana and is universally used in the schools in addition to other indigenous local languages. Even though Ghanaians use English as the official language, yet majority of them do not speak it as L1. Ghanaians learn English mostly in school as L2 because it is the language of instruction. The use of English as medium of instruction for schoolwork demands a reasonable ability to understand, read and write it. Consequently, every Ghanaian who enters school has to learn English in addition to his/her own L1. In fact, one of the national language education policy states that:

“In the first three years of primary education, the Ghanaian language prevalent in the local area is to be used as the medium of instruction, whilst English is studied as a subject. From Primary Four, English replaces the Ghanaian language as medium of instruction, and the Ghanaian language is then treated as just another subject on the timetable” (GES Syllabus, 2007).
The Ghanaian school child therefore uses his mother tongue (L1) in the first three years of the primary school, and learns English as a subject. He/she then replaces the L1 with English as the medium of instruction from primary four to the University level. Language policy issues continue to be a very dicey issue and hinges on how Ghana views Literacy situation in the development of the citizens.

2.5 Literacy Situation in Ghana

The Population and Housing census report of 2010 shows that majority (74.1%) of the population 11 years and older in Ghana is literate. This means a large proportion (67.1%) of the population can read and write in English. Also, about one-fifth (20.1%) can read and write in the English language only while 53.7 percent of the population can read and write in at least one Ghanaian language. In terms of sex, the report indicated males (80.2%) are more likely to be literate than females (68.5%).

The report also revealed that Regional variations exist in literacy levels, with the three northern regions having less than 50 percent of the population aged 11 years and older as literate while the other regions have at least 69 percent of their population being literate.

From the report, it is evidently clear that the three Northern regions have low literacy rate as compared to the southern section. This clearly also shows NALAP and Language and Literacy teaching in these three regions need to be seriously pursued to improve upon it so that these regions will match up with the southern sector. A bilingual and bi-literacy programme like NALAP, if properly supervised will definitely change the trend of literacy development in the northern sector of the country.
Despite the fact that 2010 population report paints a gloomy picture, the report as compared to the 2000 census data, the level of literacy has increased tremendously. The proportion of the population aged 15 years and older reported as literate increased from 54.1 percent in 2000 to 71.5 percent in 2010. The change is greater for females (19.6%) than for males (15.4%). This clearly shows that literacy rate is gradually improving in the country as a whole. Despite the fact that there is significant improvement the lower primary sector leaves much to be desired because our language-in-education policies have not been seriously pursued as expected.

2.6 The development of language-in-education policy

Language-in-education policies have evolved over the years and according to Agbedor (1994) cited in (Nyarko, 2014) the earliest form of formal (Western) education in Ghana is recorded as starting with the castle schools in the 15th Century. These were schools that were established by the European settlers at their forts; The Christianborg Castle Accra (Danish), Elmina Castle (Portuguese then Dutch) and the Cape Coast Castle (British) to provide education to children and relatives of wealthy African merchants, children and relatives of some important chiefs but largely Molato children of European castle staff by African women. These schools were not meant for the formal education of indigenous Ghanaian children.

During this era, there was no official language-in-education policy; the medium of instruction in the castle schools shifted from one European language to another depending on which European group that was in control at the time. During the mission school era however, the various missions had and practised different private language policies in education. For instance, while the Wesleyan Mission emphasized the use of English language, the Basel and Breman missions encouraged the use of the
local/indigenous Ghanaian language in the areas where they operated. In other words, while the Wesleyan mission adopted an English monolingual education policy, the Basel and Breman missions adopted a mother tongue based education policy, using the native languages of the localities in which they operated as the medium of instruction in formal education (Agbedor, 1994).

Since there were more missionary schools that operated a mother tongue-based education policy than any other kind of school at the time, the use of Ghanaian languages in education was so deeply entrenched that in spite of the fact that it was a private policy (the missionary societies had been operating as independent groups) when the colonial government took over the administration of education in Ghana in 1925, it could not reverse the mother tongue education policy (Bamgbose, 2000). While British colonial governments tried to centralize education in Ghana by passing, trying and abandoning several education ordinances, there was no official language-in-education policy until the reign of Sir Gordon Guggisberg (1919–1927) when the first official language-in-education policy was legislated in 1925. The first language-in-education policy was a bilingual (mother tongue and English) policy that made the use of mother tongue as the medium of instruction at lower primary school compulsory (Agbedor, 1994).

According to Gbedemah (1975) the same year that Guggisberg’s committee went to work, The Phelps-Stokes commission visited West Africa, and its reports which became available late criticized the inadequate use of local languages in education, on the natives of Africa, and the resultant alienation of the products of the schools from their respective communities. These views of the commission and that of the Ghana educationists committee were peculiarly identical at that point in time.
In 1927, the Guggisberg Education Committee, set up to review the government’s education policy, made the following recommendations with regards to language-in-education policy:

\[
\text{That in line with Guggisberg’s idea that the children of Ghana must not be denationalized: vernacular should be used as the medium of instruction at lower primary school. However, English was to be introduced as a subject of instruction in early primary;}
\]

That, in line with the Basel mission policy, text books in vernacular should be produced. English, which was to be taught as a subject at lower primary, then replaced mother tongue as the medium of instruction from primary four onwards while indigenous Ghanaian languages were to be studied as subjects. (Agbedor, 1994).

The encouragement of the vernacular in education was interpreted by the Ghanaian as a somewhat deliberate attempt by the British government to provide inferior education to the Africans, perhaps because of the negative connotations, that were typically associated with the term ‘vernacular’ (e.g. non-standard, non-literary and not cultured). Hence, under the Government’s Accelerated Development Plan of 1951, the three year mother tongue education policy was changed to early mother tongue medium policy (1951–1956), which made the child’s mother tongue the medium of instruction at primary one only, and then replacing it with English thereafter. On the eve of independence in 1956, ‘The Bernard Committee’ was set up to investigate the feasibility of the use of English as the sole medium of instruction in formal education in Ghana. The Committee recommended a return to the 1951 three year mother tongue education policy. Even though the committee’s report was accepted by government, a member of the committee submitted a minority report recommending an English only policy.
The language policy issues continued to move forth and back until the current policy of September 2007 one reverts to the 1974–2002 three-year mother tongue education, but with some significant modifications. These among other things are that:

*The medium of instruction in Kindergarten and Lower Primary will be a Ghanaian Language and English, where necessary;*

English is the medium of instruction from Primary 4 in the school system with the new policy. This means that success in education at all levels depends, to a very large extent, on the individual’s proficiency in the language (MOESS, English Language Syllabus, 2007)

To the average lay person in urban Ghana, the 2002 language policy in education was a proactive measure by the government to solve the apparent problems inherent in the previous policy. The current policy (2007) seems to have taken several factors into consideration. For instance, it includes pre-schoolers in the policy; a step none of the previous policies took serious. In addition, by making room for the use of English or a Ghanaian language (where possible) as the language of instruction, the current policy provides more opportunity for children to be taught in a familiar language. On the one hand, the few children who speak English as L1 get to be taught in English right from the pre-school stage (4yrs old). In this way, while children who speak Ghanaian languages as L1 may be taught in their L1s or a familiar language, they also get to be familiar with the English language from 4–9 years old, long before English becomes the sole medium of instruction. According to one of the T-TEL curriculum frame pillars for tutors’ professional development on literacy, Ghanaian language and English language is the key for success in education and life. Getting this right is the
most critical issue for our children’s future and for education in Ghana (T-TEL, P.41 2016).

Nevertheless, the 2002 policy did not solve all the problems. For instance, the problems associated with equating a dominant (community) language with a mother tongue have not been addressed nor is the problem of ensuring that primary school teachers are equipped and able to teach in the languages of the community addressed. Another significant modification in the current policy is the removal of Ghanaian languages as a compulsory and examinable subject at the senior high school level Ghanaian language which was core subject in the senior high schools is changed to be an elective subject (Owu-Ewie, 2013).

To help resolve some of the challenges associated with the language policy the National Literacy Acceleration Programme (NALAP) which is a bilingual and biliteracy programme was launched in 2007 onwards. Before NALAP came into the educational system a lot of reading materials were developed with the assistance from the USAID. The government did a lot of feasibilities to ensure the programme works. It was based on the introduction of NALAP that the Language and Literacy Policy also emerged and is now implemented in schools. Looking at all these issues of the forth and back movement of partisan policies in recent times, the role of first language in second language development cannot be over looked. A lot of research work has proved that literacy first language has direct and positive influence on second language development.

2.7 The Role of the First Language in Second Language Acquisition

The issue of first language interference in the acquisition of a second language has had an unusual history. For many years, it had been presumed that the only major
source of errors in people second language performance was the performer's first language (Lado, 1957), and a great deal of materials preparation was done with this assumption in mind (Banathy, Trager, and Waddle, 1966). Subsequent empirical studies of literacy errors made by second language students have led to the discovery, however, that many errors are not traceable to the structure of the first language, but are common to second language performers of different linguistic backgrounds (Buteau, 1970). These findings have led several scholars to question the value of contrastive analysis and to argue instead for error analysis. The first language, it is maintained, is but one of several sources of errors and other sources need to be considered.

The issue, as one can observe it, is not whether first-language-influenced errors exist in second language performance, or even what percentage of errors can be traced to the first language in the people, but, rather, where first language influence fits in the theoretical model for second language performance. The discussion here attempts to come out that findings on first language influence on second language performance are quite consistent with findings and hypotheses from other apparently nonrelated areas, and that they contribute to a clear theoretical picture of second language acquisition and performance.

Research findings on first language influence revealed that first language influence appears to be strongest in complex word order and in word-for-word translations of phrases. Evidence for this generalization comes from several sources. For instance, Duskova (1969) studied written errors in the compositions of Czech postgraduate students and concluded that interference from the mother tongue was plainly obvious in errors of word order and sentence construction, an example being the placement of
the direct object after an adverbial, as in “I met there some Germans”. Also present in
the compositions were many word-for-word translations of Czech expressions into
English, such as "another my friend" instead of "another friend of mine". LoCoco
(1975, p.101), in a study of American college students learning Spanish and German
in the US, reported that the "high incidence of interlingual (L1 interference) errors in
German was due to word order errors."

Again, research in first language influence also showed that L1 language-based errors
in Spanish were less numerous and "pertained primarily to adjective position". Thus,
the greater word order differences between English and German as compared to
English and Spanish accounts for the differences in frequencies in interference word
order errors. Spanish students were more often correct in using English surface
structures in utterance initiation due to the greater surface similarity between English
and Spanish. This also accounts for Chan's (1975) finding that English to Spanish
interference errors occurred mainly on grammatical categories absent in either the
native (NL) or target (TL) and not in word order. LoCoco (1975) also found that
second level Spanish students showed an increase in interference type errors that
LoCoco calls "whole expression terms", or word-forward translations of an L1
expression, which is similar to what Duskova reported.

In addition to these, research findings on first language influence indicated that L1
influence is weaker in bound morphology. According to Duskova (1969, p.21) errors
in bound morphology are not necessarily due to first language influence in her Czech
students of English as a Foreign Language (EFL). To the author, Czech nouns do not
distinguish singular and plural, Czech finite verb agrees with its subject in person and
number. Duskova conceded that these errors are, rather, interference between the
other terms of the English subsystem in question. Moreover, these errors occur even in cases where the English form is quite analogous to the corresponding Czech form.

Another concern on first language influence seems to be strongest in acquisition poor environments. Gillis and Weber (1976) Dulay and Burt (1974) and have demonstrated that first language influence is rare in child second language acquisition. On the other hand, studies that report a high amount of first language influence are mostly foreign and not second language studies. In this regard, it is interesting to note first language influence can be found in immersion bilingual programmes where input is often primarily from the teacher and not from peers. Following the preceding discussion on the role of first language on second language one would realize that the society and the surrounding environment contribute a lot to a learner success in language acquisition. One theory concerned with the influence of society and culture is the socio-cultural theory.

2.8 Language and culture

Cultural influence on foreign language learning is also very distinct. Foertch (1998) describes second language learning as an important factor that influences how children learn to read. Foertsch explains that literacy should be defined in terms of what it takes for one to effectively function in one’s culture on daily basis rather than solely upon an indefinable standard language. He cites several authorities and instances from immigration experiences to prove his point. Foertsch, for instance, explains that the way in which children communicate in their home culture are critical to the development of written language models of reading and writing. The home language of children provides the foundation for the emergence of reading and writing behaviours. In this case, if there is a mismatch between the structures, values, and
expectations of the home language and school language, children may be at a
disadvantage for success in early reading tasks, and thus spend their entire school
career attempting to catch up.

responsive instruction” can be defined as using the cultural knowledge of the child to
make learning more relevant” They argue that both the home and the school are
responsible for learning outcomes and that for pupils to be successful, teachers must
bridge the gap between the home and the school. Supporting this view, Au and Mason
(1998) also formulated propositions for all elements of cultural responsive teaching.
Two of these propositions are relevant for the discussion here: The first is that, the
school literacy learning of students of diverse background will improve as educators
recognize the importance of students’ home language and come to see bi-literacy as
an attainable and desirable outcome. Second, that school literacy learning of students
of diverse background will improve as educators become culturally responsive in their
management of classrooms and interactions with students.

Just like Au and Mason (1998), many researchers of children of diverse background
believe that culturally responsive instruction as well as strong bonds between the
home and school can enhance students’ learning. For instance, in their study, Bauman
and Ivey (1997) observed that language was a process involving interactions among
the student’s cultural, social and linguistic background and experiences. To them, all
of these represent capital and resources for language development. Furthermore, they
contended that parents and other caregivers, siblings and extended family members
played an important role in nurturing and supporting children’s linguistic
development both at home and in the classroom. With all these in mind, once NALAP
is a bilingual and bi-literacy programme, it falls in line with the views expressed by these authorities on culturally responsive instruction because Ghana is a multi-lingual and multi-cultural society endured with diverse culturally linguistic background. Thus, the language policy needs to reflect on our national structures, cultural values, national interests and our expectations on the teaching of language and literacy. These must therefore, be exploited for effective language and literacy development of our pupils in the lower primary schools.

Conforming to these theoretical perspectives this study is my effort to contribute to the building of the bridge in language and literacy teaching in lower primary schools in the Upper West Region. The focus is on how the National Literacy Acceleration Programme influences the teaching of language and literacy of basic schools. One theory of much concerned with the influence of society and culture is the socio-cultural theory.

2.9 Understanding Literacy

The development of literacy among children occurs across the lifespan of the individual; from birth till adulthood. It is therefore very important to view literacy across such a lifespan developmental framework and in turn to consider and conceptualize a definition of literacy from a broad perspective viewpoint. As such, the definitions of literacy are viewed across the life span from childhood to adulthood. The Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) conducted a study with students aged 15 years in collaboration with the Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD) define literacy as understanding, using, and reflecting on written texts, in order to achieve one’s goals, to develop one’s knowledge and potential, and to participate in society (OECD, 2010, p. 37).
On the other hand the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) also conducted a study with fourth grade students define literacy as the ability to understand and use those written language forms required by society and/or valued by the individual. Young readers can construct meaning from a variety of texts. They read to learn, to participate in communities of readers in school and in everyday life, and for enjoyment (Mullis, Martin, Kennedy & Foy, 2007). One will realize that both definitions, from comparative international studies, emphasize the constructive interactive processes of reading where readers actively construct meaning from text (Anderson & Pearson, 1984).

Snow (1992), cited Foerstch (1998) on his part suggests that literacy be defined in the light of language variety. That is, literacy should be defined in terms of what it takes to function in one’s culture on the daily basis rather than solely upon an indefinable standard language. Thus, literacy is much more than simply being able to read and write. Rather, it is a set of complex tasks and behaviours that for some individuals encompass the use of several languages and ways of being literate. Looking at these definitions of literacy, learning to read in the language that encompasses those things familiar and meaningful is critical to success in learning to read in a second language. While these definitions are broad, critically, they do recognize the importance of literacy to include reading, writing, communication and oral language in both print-based and digitized formats.

There is the need for child language and literacy skill to develop well. For this to happen we should note that the child’s early language and literacy development begins at birth, but many children do not receive the ongoing experiences that support this learning. Children’s language and literacy development may be negatively
affected by factors, including poverty; limited English proficiency; visual, hearing, and language impairments; cognitive deficiencies; and parents who have had difficulty reading (National Early Literacy Panel [NELP], 2008).

The children’s strong language skills are essential success in school and life (Hart & Risley, 2003; Jalongo, 2008; Kalmar, 2008; Heath & Hogben, 2004), and one of the best predictors of educational and life-skills competency is the level to which a child progresses in reading and writing (Neuman, Copple, & Bredekamp, 2000). Effective instruction in the early years can have a large impact on children’s language and literacy development, and children at risk for school failure stand to benefit the most from high-quality experiences (Campbell, Ramey, Pungello, Sparling, & Miller-Johnson, 2002). Without such instruction, differences in children’s understanding and use of language can vary enormously by age 3 (Copple & Bredekemp, 2009; Strickland & Shanahan, 2004).

Supposing that the child’s language and literacy develops during the first five years, early childhood educators need to make a conscious effort to intentionally plan activities and experiences that optimize conditions for children to acquire positive attitudes, skills, and knowledge about language and literacy. Research studies tell us that the teacher’s role is critical to a child’s learning and that teachers can inspire children to read, write, and learn through thoughtful planning and developmentally appropriate literacy instruction (Neuman et al., 2000). Other important research findings have led to issue of updating teaching strategies. For instance, The Creative Curriculum for Preschool. This expanded curriculum, includes special new materials that emphasize the function of language as a tool to help children use language to express their own thoughts and ideas and communicate with others. This Creative
Curriculum shows early childhood educators how to intentionally infuse literacy practices in their classroom and use the environment as a natural source to create literacy-related experiences. It also offers teachers explicit language to model when engaging the interests of children and stimulating their intellectual capacity in a myriad of specific, focused, small- and-large-group activities, which can be found in new ‘Intentional Teaching Cards and teaching guides’(NELP, 2010).

From the studies of the Creative Curriculum, it has indication that it takes a comprehensive approach toward teaching literacy in lower primary schools. The Creative curriculum incorporates the latest best practices that support children’s language and vocabulary, phonological awareness, knowledge of the alphabet, concepts of print, read-alouds, and writing. Research indicates that children’s development does not occur in one discrete, isolated area at a time but is interdependent (NELP, 2010).One other key addition to the creative curriculum articulates strategies that help teachers develop the emergent literacy and language skills of English-language learners and children with disabilities. Teachers will learn how to gauge the level of support to assist a child’s learning, and how and when to more actively engage families in their child’s literacy development

The Creative Curriculum leans on other research findings that language is the foundation for ongoing literacy support (Strickland & Shanahan, 2004) and involves learning about the structure and sequence of speech sounds, vocabulary, grammar, and the rules for engaging in appropriate and effective conversation (Berk, 2006). It also helps educators support the literacy and language development of children from low-income families. Research shows that poverty issues affect development, and that children from low-income families face the most difficulty learning to read in the
lower primary grades. They begin school with less prior knowledge, verbal abilities, phonological sensitivity, familiarity with the basic purposes and mechanisms of reading, and letter knowledge (National Early Literacy Panel). These less affluent children have not been exposed to as many reading hours as children from middle-class families and have smaller vocabularies by first grade. Research findings show that a child from a low-income family has been less exposed to one-to-one reading unlike the average child from a middle-class family (Neuman 2003). The size of their vocabulary also is one-fourth the size of their middle-class peers (Berk, 2006).

For these children in particular, the importance of incorporating purposeful and intentional language and literacy experiences into each lower primary school cannot be underestimated and is an essential task for any high-quality early childhood programme. Taken as a whole, Teaching Strategies’ literacy-related resources empower teachers and parents with the latest research-based strategies so that language and literacy learning is integrated into everyday interactions with children while intentionally teaching critical literacy skills (NELP, 2010).

From the explanation advanced above it is also very important that not only children from poor background or low-income families face challenges of literacy development. However, language-minority children also face challenges as far as language and literacy development is concerned, especially in areas of bilingual and bi-literacy education with second language learners. It is consonance with this that, Foerstch (1998) states that language-minority children faced many challenges in school and were 1.5 times likely to drop out of school than their native speakers. Second language learners, who also receive lower grades were judged by their teachers to have lower academic abilities and scored below their classmates on
standardized tests of reading and mathematics. Foerstch therefore, reminded policy
makers and educationists that the best way to assist students as they learn English as a
second language continued to be hotly debated and there were still no conclusive
decision on the issue. In addition, Foerstch (1998) asserts that it is a mistake to
believe that the first thing students must learn is English, thus isolating the language
from abroad complex of other issues. He conceded that it is not a compelling issue
that students should know English before they join their peers in classroom.

Foerstch (1998) contended that cognitive and academic development in the first
language have been found to have positive effects on second-language (L2) learning,
academic skills, literacy development, concept formation, subject knowledge and
strategy development. However, due to the fact that literacy development depends on
social interaction, it was equally critical to provide a supportive school environment
that facilitates the academic and cognitive development in the first language.

Again, Foerstch (1998) asserted that research strongly supported the idea that native
language use is advantageous in second language (English) acquisition. This use, he
intimated depends on commitment, to bilingual programmes in which almost all
instruction takes place in English and native language is used to clarify and extend
students’ understanding. In this it quite clear that second-language students make
sense of the second-language by using many of the same strategies that work so well
in acquiring the first language. To him, what was different was that second-language
students already had an understanding of the meaning, uses, and purpose of language
and now only had to learn how the second-language oral and in print expressed the
purpose, uses, and meanings.
From the discussion so far what seems suggestible is that learning to read and write in the first language supports success in reading and writing in the second language. Added to that, like Hakuta, Foerstch found that literacy skills that were related to decoding tasks of reading had been found to transfer between languages. On the other hand, Foerstch again observed that these skills must be contextualized within meaningful instructional contexts for full transfer to occur. The conclusion Foerstch drew from his argument was that many studies supported a balanced literacy programme as appropriate for students whose first language is not English. This is because a balanced literacy programme provides a balance of explicit instruction and students-directed activities that incorporate aspect of both traditional and meaning-based curricula. However, there is no best way of teaching English language because of the diverse cultural background of learners in different classroom conditions in Ghana.

### 2.9.1 Literacy Development

Asante (2011) believes literacy develops over time as the student progresses from emerging to skilled reader who can comprehend and analyze complex texts. Reading and understanding requires an active thinking process that is influenced by the reader’s prior knowledge and experiences. Strategies for increasing literacy development should as a matter of fact focus not only on improving reading skills, but also on developing the higher-order thinking skills that enables students to comprehend, analyze and communicate about ideas. Well-designed literacy programmes provide students with frequent opportunities to use language-reading, writing, listening and speaking for varied and authentic purposes.
Literacy development among learners of English as a second language can be developed through many ways. August and Sanahan (2006) indicate that the oral proficiency and literacy in the first language can be used to facilitate literacy development in English. Students who come to learn English as a second language are not blank slates. They enter classroom with varying degrees of oral proficiency and literacy in their first language. There is clear evidence that tapping into first-language literacy can confer a higher degree of advantage to English-language learners. For instance, there is evidence that language-minority students are able to take advantage of higher order vocabulary skills in the first language, speaking a second language. Studies have also shown that students are able to take advantage of cognate relationship between their first language and English to understand English words, an important precursor to comprehension. The implication of this is that the L1 of a child should be well developed so that skills acquired on the L1 can be transferred to the learning of English. Another way of developing the child’s literacy skills is through reading. Intensive reading which is what goes on in the classrooms does not have any immense contribution on children’s literacy development and the flair for reading outside the classroom.

Cooper and Kiger (2003) argue that children and young adults develop literacy skills by having a variety of real literacy experiences and considerable amount of direct or explicit instruction. They begin by developing oral language (listening and speaking) and then later develop reading and writing. Cooper and Kiger (2003) argue that all the elements of literacy; that is speaking, listening, reading and writing, and thinking continuously developed together. They suggested that understanding how these components develop helps teachers, create an effective literacy programme for students.
In order to supplement what goes on in the classroom to develop children’s literacy skills, there is the need to use extensive reading and writing activities for this purpose. It against this background that I will like to advocate for the use of the child’s first language in the NALAP to promote literacy development in Ghana especially in Upper West Region basic schools.

2.10 Reading and Writing Relationship

Early literacy depends so much on the children’s ability to read and write in the basic school. Reading and writing are two basic skills necessary for the literacy development which is a springboard towards academic progress in school. Reading and writing are therefore related activities. They are both deeply related activities of language and cognition that are shaped through use. The structure and strategies that readers and writers use to organize, remember and present messages are generally the same in both processes. These structures and strategies change with time in the child’s schooling process. Despite these facts, all reading and writing activities are not the same and the way in which children approach a reading or writing task is based on their reason for doing the task in the first place.

Carson (1990) as cited in Man (2001) examined many arguments for assuming that reading influences writing, that writing influences reading and that they interactively influence each other. She pointed out that reading and writing are likely to influence each other reciprocally but not as reverse of the same process. Rather, a bi-directional model states that the writing or reading relationship changes at different stage of language development and some aspects of this relationship will be independent of each other. In both reading and writing, the goal is to construct meaning at any stage for easy understanding. Knowledge about reading supports growth in writing and vice
versa. And teachers, need to ensure the children read and write and that they come to understand that reading and writing are “two sides of the same coin.

2.11 Bilingual Education

Bilingualism is the use of two languages. Bilingual education is therefore the use of two languages in education. Bilingual education is defined as education in which two languages are used within the school (Owu-Ewie, 2014). Hamer and Blanco (1989) see bilingual education as the use of at least two languages in education at a time, at varying amount of time and/or used concurrently. In the case of Ghana, it is the use of the child’s home language and English.

Therefore, many children grow up learning two languages in their communities. That means they become bilingual. The children may be equally proficient in both languages, or as is often the case, one language may be stronger than the other. The child’s bilingual education starts in the L1 and gradually, the L2 is introduced. Becoming a bilingual has obvious advantages. First, it enables children to communicate freely with a wide range of people in their community. Secondly, research suggests that children who learn a second language are more creative and better at solving problems than those who do not (Neuman, 2003).

The way that languages are used in the child’s home and community affects what languages the child learns. Children develop conversation skills in two or more languages when they are encouraged to interact in those languages. Subsequently, one language is often stronger than the other because it is used in the home and perhaps in the community, and because children have continuous opportunities for interaction in that language from birth or after (GES, 2007).
Cummins (2007) believes that the level of development of children's mother-tongue is a strong predictor of their second language development. Children who come to school with a solid foundation in their mother-tongue develop strong literacy ability in the school language (L2). When parents and other caregivers are able to spend time with their children and tell stories or discuss issues with them in a way that develops their mother-tongue vocabulary and concepts, children come to school well-prepared to learn the school language and succeed educationally. Children's knowledge and skills transfer across languages from mother-tongue they learned in the home to the school language. From the point of view of children's development of concepts and thinking skills, the two languages are interdependent.

From studies it is widely believed that learning and achieving higher competences in several languages (bilingualism) provide cognitive benefits which include the ability to learn, higher intellectual capabilities, and higher abilities into older age. There is evidence from bilingual learning and from Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) that there are wider benefits in terms of attainment in other subjects, motivation and other skills for employability from learning through a language which is not the mother tongue as well as learning the mother tongue. There is widely believed to be a ‘proficiency transfer’ from language learning as hypothesized by Cummins (2000) as people with higher competences in several languages gain greater intercultural competences from the greater knowledge and awareness of other cultures they have gained through language learning. It is again recognized that pupils achieve this and have the social and cultural skills to be mobile. Equally pupils gain a greater ability and confidence to learn another language.
Looking at bilingualism, children can become bilingual without any instruction. However, developing bi-literacy; that is ability to read and write in two languages requires instruction in the two languages. In this case, children who are taught to read in a language they do not speak have very difficult learning it. They may not have the grammatical and vocabulary knowledge that reading requires. They may not also know what the words written on the pages mean. As teachers we need to help children learn to read in a language they know very well. Once they know how to read, they can learn to read another language that they have learned to speak.

Studies in the early 19th century indicated that there are detrimental effects in being bilingual. It was concluded that bilinguals were mentally confused and at a disadvantage in thinking compared to monolinguals. This conclusion was due to difficulty in defining and measuring intelligence. Later studies indicated that there was no difference between bilinguals and monolinguals in intelligence quotients. However, recent research has proven that bilinguals have cognitive advantages over monolinguals (Baker, 2001).

Dembele and Ndoye (2003) cited in Moomen (2006) report on the situation in Burkina Faso that bilingual education was conceived, designed and implemented in partnership by a community at the grass-root level with the support of a team of University Researchers, members of the ELAN-Development Association, a Swiss NGO (SLA), and the Ministry of Basic Education and Literacy through a National Literacy Institute. After the experimentation in limited number of schools showed a significant impact on students’ learning achievement, the Ministry of Basic Education designed and validated a specific curriculum for bilingual schools. This curriculum
covers the content of the classical primary school five years instead of six. The children’s L1 is used and progressively French (L2) is introduced.

Table 1: Time Allocation for Local Language and French in Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Local Language</th>
<th>French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd year</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd year</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th year</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th year</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th year</td>
<td>00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart, simply illustrates the allocation and use of time for the bilingual schools in the Burkina Faso Bilingual programme situation.

In a similar situation the National Literacy Acceleration Programme which is a bilingual programme implemented in Ghana provided room for gradual transition from the local language (L1) to English (L2). To solve this problem the periods for teaching language and literacy have been merged. The important feature of NALAP is that the Ghanaian Language and English Language periods have been merged into what is now referred to as Language and Literacy period. In this case both Ghanaian Language and English Language are taught within the same period or simultaneously within a specific period of 90 minutes just as the Burkina Faso programme mentioned earlier based on percentages. The chart below illustrates how the time for English and Ghanaian language is allocated in minutes per period.

Table 2: Time allocation for the teaching of language and literacy in NALAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Ghanaian Language</th>
<th>English Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KG1</td>
<td>80 minutes</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG2</td>
<td>70 minutes</td>
<td>20 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>50 minutes</td>
<td>40 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>45 minutes</td>
<td>45 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NALAP Material, 2017
The chart explains the allocation of time the various classes in Ghana. However, the emphasis of the National Literacy Acceleration is on oral work and drill in the lower primary school. The higher period of time allocation for the lower primary is meant to consolidate the children foundation in the two language skills and gradually introduce them to the remaining two other skills; that is the reading and writing skills. NALAP programme as a bilingual and bi-literacy programme aims to use the mother-tongue or first language as a stepping stone for transition into the second language learning and development.

In a research carried by Improving Educational Quality (IEQ) Project in 2000 in Ghana, these policy options were made for Ghana; that the policy should include changing the policy to delay the transition from the local language to English as medium of instruction until a later grade when the children are ready for it. Also, that the change from the local language to English as medium of instruction could be phased in as a gradual process, with percentages of language use assigned to different grades. For example, 10% English 90% Ghanaian language in P1, 20% English 80% Ghanaian language in P2, 40% English 60% Ghanaian language in P3, 60% English 40% Ghanaian language in P4. Percentages should be designated according to research studies and guidelines established in successful mother tongue education programmes.

Many studies have argued for the use of L1 through to the study of the second language. Hakuta (1990) argues in a number of ways in support of bilingual literacy in the first years of the child’s education. In an article on foreign language learning and bilingualism, Hakuta explains that older children learn foreign languages more easily and comfortably than younger ones because of the effect of what he calls
positive transfer, which he affirms is more pronounced and influential than negative transfer.

Barry and Taylor cited in Deku (2008) found transfer errors in L1 to L2 more frequent with beginners than with intermediate students. They stated that if the nature of the learner’s first language is similar to that of the target language, it facilitates the learning of the second language. However, if there are differences between the two languages the learning becomes difficult. For instance, a Dagaare speaking child learning English as a second language would not have difficulties in saying “My name is Bayuo” in English because the structure is similar to that of Dagaare “N yuori la Bayuo” This type of transfer is what Hakuta referred to as positive transfer. In other words, where the structures are different the learner is confronted with problems, and so it is termed as negative transfer.

2.12 Methods of Teaching Literacy

In the teaching and learning process, teachers present skills, facts, ideas, attitudes, and many other meaningful skills to the child or group of children through some means. This is referred to as the standard procedure or methodology or strategies. Tamakloe (1994) views teaching strategies as ways by which a teacher attempt to impact the desire learning experiences by the use of skills. A carefully planned combination of teaching methods appropriate to a particular teaching and learning situation is normally referred to as strategies (GES, 2014). In the classroom, teachers do not use one strategy but a combination of them in any particular lesson to meet the needs of all the children. In the same way, language teachers use many approaches to teach literacy in the basic schools. And many approaches to the teaching of bilingual classes have been developed over the years. The need for instruction in other languages has
led to a variety of educational approaches, methods and techniques aimed at fostering bilingual learning in basic schools. However, lower achievement in literacy, especially in Africa, has been blamed partly on bad or ineffective methods of teaching in our schools. Dembele & Ndeyo (2005) as cited in Moomen (2006), in stressing the need for effective technique in imparting literacy skills commented that evidence accumulated since the 1970s suggested that teaching was strong determinant of student achievement. He observed that most classrooms in Sub-Sahara Africa however, teaching is reported to be ineffective: It places students in a passive role and limit their activity to memorizing facts and reciting them back to the teacher. Dembele and Ndeyo (2005), described it as rigid, chalk-and-talk, teacher dominated, lecture-driven. Dembele and Ndeyo (2005) explained that there was substantial evidence that this kind of teaching did not help students develop conceptual understanding, critical thinking and problem-solving skills; that this merely fostered formulaic and rote learning.

Dieterich (1973) and Adams (1990) reporting on research in effective methodologies to be adopted in teaching reading to beginners especially in the lower primary school have argued for the adoption of the phonic approach. Haskell, Forman and Swank, (1992) assert that children who receive explicit training in letter-sound correspondence were more accurate on word recognition tests consisting of both regular and irregular words than students who receive whole training or on training. Dietrich (1973) and Adams (1990) have both also supported phonics instruction in the teaching of language and literacy in the lower primary school. Thus, for the teacher to be effective in his/her teaching strategies he/she has to play strong in ensuring the learners’ needs are considered. The success of his students depends to large extent on how he plays role in language and literacy teaching.
It was recognition of the importance of the phonic approach that at the initial stage of
the development of the materials that NALAP included phonological awareness in the
Teacher Guides and dealt with it systematically. Phonological awareness deals with
lower primary pupils’ ability to know about the sounds words have, apart from the
meaning; for instance, KG and P1 pupil’s knowledge about syllables and rhymes.

2.13 Pedagogical Role of the Teacher in Teaching Language and Literacy
The role of the teacher in teaching and learning process has been emphasized very
often. It is evidently clear that there can be no success in education divorce of the
study on methodology and the role of the teacher in education in sub-Saharan Africa
stated that teacher effect on student achievement is both cumulative and residual. This
simply meant that teacher effect not only add up but also left long-term marks on
students. Consequently, it could be that an effective teacher could not fully
compensate for earlier negative impact on students cause by an ineffective teacher.
These findings had critical implication for sub-Saharan African primary school pupils
in particular, as in a given year they are taught by the same teacher. For instance,
pupils who in a given year move their grade with the same in the case of some schools
may suffer the consequence of an ineffective teacher. This meant that the successful
completion of primary school and access and success in Junior High including Senior
High School depended on whether pupils had effective or ineffective teachers in their
early grades.

This simply means that teachers need to provide effective instruction and create sound
classroom environment conducive enough for the children to learn literacy with ease.
From the argument advanced by Dembele, & Ndyeo (2005) he believes that unless
teachers provided effective instruction and create a conducive classroom environment for learning, the children would not achieve at high levels, even when essential materials inputs were available and the curriculum was relevant and well designed.

2.14 Teaching and Learning Materials in Language

Teaching and learning materials (TLM) are very necessary in language and literacy classroom because young children always want to manipulate with objects, manipulatives, realia and things around them in the classroom. Teaching learning materials are resources that serve as aids to the teacher during lesson delivery. Teaching and Learning materials according to Transforming Teacher Education and Learning (T-TEL), (2016) refers to any kind of material used in teaching, including chalk, blackboard, paper, pens, books, bottle tops, every objects, technology of any kind , and much more--even the natural or built up environment as well as own bodies. Teaching and learning materials are stimuli, things, real objects and materials that the teacher uses to create sensory impression (GES, 2014). Teaching and learning materials are an important part of many learning experiences in the classroom. Education research in Ghana and across sub-saharan Africa provides evidence that teaching and learning materials are an important part of productive learning environment. Thus, the use of TLM helps students learn better in the classroom.

Teaching /learning materials are sometime called teaching aids and at others times instructional media. Yemeh (2015) believes teaching learning materials are objects or activities that make teaching more effective and learning easier. Yemeh (2015) described teaching aids as those instructional materials that may be used to convey meaning without complete dependence on verbal symbols or language (cited in Yemeh, 2015). In the context of language teaching, teaching aid may be said to be
something that the learner is made to see, hear, feel, smell and taste to facilitate learning. Some teaching aids may offer the learner the opportunity to use more than one of these senses in the course of learning.

Teaching and learning materials in the lower primary is the key to a successful lesson delivery. This is why there the KG class is provided with a teaching and learning material corner with different TLMs to support the pupils in the study of language and literacy and other subjects or topics. Pupils in the KG can go to this corner to manipulate or play with those things or objects, enjoy themselves, relax and recreate their minds and get ready for other lessons. And as the pupils use these materials, they will practice their language and literacy skills.

In order to help pupils to understand a lesson effectively and enjoy it, it is the responsibility of the teacher to use some resources or teaching and learning materials to supplement his/her verbal information to facilitate learning in the classroom. This is so because TLMs explain even abstract concepts and provide information to enhance learning and promote progress as well as addressing various learning needs or styles. This also means TLMs are used as appropriate resources that engage the learners’ six senses of seeing, hearing, touching, feeling and so forth to facilitate learning.

In order to solve the teaching and materials problem NALAP was able to develop a lot of materials in the various languages. These materials include Teacher’s Guide, Big Books, Pupils textbook, thirty (30) conversation posters, alphabet cards and Readers. This means NALAP is centre of education in the teaching of language and literacy because these materials are to help learners engage in interesting learning activities for them to develop their language skills.
2.15 Challenges of NALAP

Every research study goes through the laid down research produces in order to be successful. However, there cannot be a research study without challenges and as it is, the study into NALAP means certain challenges the programme might have encountered would be exposed. Before NALAP was implemented there were studies to find out how feasible the programme was to the Ghanaian child and education in general. From research findings it was clear children learn to read and write in a language they are familiar with and can understand better.

Looking at the NALAP implementation, Hartwell (2010) as cited in Owu-Ewie (2013) enumerates some problems that;

i. majority of Ghanaian (parents, teachers and stakeholders) detest the use of L1 as medium of instruction; an attitude that is more prominent in many private schools and communities,

ii. there are inadequate supply of relevant reading and instructional materials in the Ghanaian languages,

iii. there is lack of pursuance to facilitate the use of L1 medium of instruction as well as a subject of study to facilitate the teaching and learning of English as a means for attaining bi-literacy skills,

iv. there is lack of standards and milestones to guide the development of the curriculum, the assessment of pupils, teaching and learning of literacy in both Ghanaian language and English over the years,

v. there is lack of conscious efforts to weigh and properly allocate the time and methodology for ensuring a gradual acquisition of bi-literacy skills,

vi. there is lack of mechanism to orient, train and retrain Ghanaian language teachers to ensure the effective implementation of the language policy.
Owu-Ewie (2010) also added that the multilingual nature of the country and multilingual classrooms inhibit the successful implementation of the use of L1 as a medium of instruction in the lower primary schools. From the NALAP Implementation Study there was an indication of late delivery of NALAP Teacher Guides and instructional materials and this delayed compromised full implementation of the programme during the 2009/2010 school year. Some materials began to arrive in districts and schools early in the 2nd term, but there were a number of shipments, which caused a staggered and uneven delivery to the schools and, within the schools, to teachers. Although headteachers and teachers for grades KG1 to P3 received a one week orientation workshop in December, 2009 and February 2010, for the most part schools and teachers did not have all the materials until May, the start of the 3rd term. This had a number of unfortunate consequences. First, according to the implementation report many teachers interviewed spoke of timing gap in receiving the Teacher Guides long after the training workshop as a significant impediment to building their confidence to implementation of NALAP in the classroom. Second, by June 2010, it is reported only one-third of the schools had implemented the GES directive to change their timetables and introduce the new subject, Language and Literacy, as a 90minutes period combining L1 and English. Some headteachers interviewed said they would wait until the 2010/11 school year to do this. Without the framework provided by the 90minute Language and Literacy period, teachers could not follow the guidance for the timing of activities in L1 and English provided in the Teacher Guides (EQUALL, 2010).

A third consequence of the late start of the programme explained by the NALAP implementation report is that it compounded the challenges for classes P2 and P3, where pupils did not have the advantage of the NALAP programme in their earlier
grades. The activities and materials for P2 and P3 are designed to build on knowledge and skills acquired earlier. For that start-up year in particular these students faced a tasks and text materials in L1 for which they were not prepared. Teachers were not trained or supported to manage this challenge, particularly given the gap in time between their orientation and startup (EQUALL, 2010).

Another challenge worth noting is that there were a large number of untrained and transient teachers in the system, particularly in rural and disadvantaged regions, and they have found it particularly difficult to cope with this innovative programme. A large proportion of untrained teachers from the National Youth Employment programme (NYEP) during the implementation left the schools between the 2nd and 3rd terms, and they had not been replaced at the time. The conditions were very uneven across the country. For instance in town and cities, particularly in the Western, Central, Ashanti, Eastern and Volta regions, there were no shortage of trained, experienced and disciplined teachers. However, in the rural areas, particularly in the Northern and Upper West Regions, it was estimated about 60% of the teachers were not there. Of those teachers in the Northern Region who were present in the schools, 64% were untrained. Since many of the untrained and NYEP teachers had received the NALAP orientation training left, the schools that lost these teachers were ill equipped to implement the programme. Those without that training were not using the Teacher Guide. As might be expected, teachers’ training and experience (teacher status) was one of the key factors contributing to effective teaching practices (EQUALL, 2010)

One other serious issue worth noting was also the school’s choice of the Ghanaian Language for NALAP materials, as well as the challenge of teachers who are not
fluent in the L1 they are attempting to teach is a challenge. There are a number of facets to the language problem. For instance, there are schools, particularly concentrated in the northern part of the country where pupils and teachers do not understand, know or speak one of the eleven official languages. Teachers in such areas needed help in pedagogical skills to make use of the L1 materials or work with the GES to devise other methods of teaching L1 literacy and oral English in the lower primary classes. Thus, addressing the issue of people and languages not currently served by the 11 official languages was a challenge and is still vital and need to be tackled, especially in areas with such difficulties.

In addition, the implementation report revealed that there were cases where some schools mistakenly received materials in a language which the majority of the pupils in the school do not understand or speak. This problem was peculiar the periphery of Accra, Volta, and northern regions. And NALAP is based on the principle that learning to read should start with a language that the pupil understands and speaks. Those schools that received language other than their language therefore suffered. Moreover, there are some districts where a significant proportion of teachers are not also fluent or literate in the Ghanaian Language selected for the school. As result, there were a number of strategies that some districts and schools have adopted to address this challenge, including redeployment, community volunteers and peer support.

Again, the NALAP Implementation Study report and the in-Depth classroom Observations by Adger and Dowuona-Hammond illuminate the major shift in teachers’ concepts and practice that NALAP demands. Teachers who were attempting to use the materials and follow the Teacher Guides were challenged to abruptly
reorient their instructional practices. This was a challenge for those who do not want a change. In some urban areas too, particularly areas in and around Accra, pupils come from diverse linguistic backgrounds, and there is no single dominant Ghanaian language spoken by these communities that schools serve. Furthermore, there are pockets of linguistic diversity within areas which do not use one of the 11 Languages in NALAP, and in some cases these communities received materials in a language pupils did not speak. All these were a challenge for the implementation of the whole programme.

Another group of Schools much challenged in implementing NALAP are the private schools. Private schools were the last in line to receive NALAP materials, and often are short changed. Added to that, they often have low motivation to implement the programme, with the conviction that an English only programme is what their parents want and expect. There are some notable exceptions to this, which often reflect the private school directors’ understanding of the purpose and rationale of the programme (EQUALL, 2010). Looking at all these challenges uncovered by the NALAP Implementation Study at the initial stage of its inception, it is evidently clear that after the implementation, there were still yet to be other difficulties. It is in light of this that I have decided to evaluate the programme to ascertain its implementation level and the extent to which the NALAP is in progress.

2.16 Assessment in Language and Literacy

Assessment issue has become an urgent one in pedagogy in recent years for many reasons; that is, the need for uniformity of criteria for competences across national boundaries, the need for just and reliable assessment within a country, and the need for helping all learners and to understand the basis for evaluation of the work.
Assessment is thought to serve many different purposes and a variety of needs locally and global for the individual learner and society. It is important to be able to distinguish the different functions of assessment to be able to develop good tools for practice.

As such, assessment is one of the tools of finding out how the children are performing in language learning. It is method of used to determine a child’s knowledge and skills. As the child’s ability is always changing, it is important to assess it regularly to make proper judgements about the child’s progress. Assessment is very important in the teaching and learning process. Assessment is a systematic process of gathering information about what a student knows, is able to do, and is learning to do. Assessment information provides the foundation for decision-making and planning for instruction and learning. It is the process for obtaining information that is used for making decisions about students, curricula, programmes and educational policy (Amedahe & Asamoah-Gyimah, 2013). Assessment is an integral part of instruction that enhances, empowers, and celebrates student learning.

Generally, there are two kinds of assessment: the criterion-based and norm-based. Criterion-based assessment measures how well a child performs compared to standards. For example, a child learning to read in the English language, a question could be whether the child can orally segment a multi-syllable English word. For instance, with the word elephant, can the child break it down to e-le-phant? On the part of the norm-based assessment it is suitable for making comparisons between children, for example, to put them in groups for reading practice to see whether they could advance to the next class.
Assessment in language and literacy may be formative or summative. Formative assessment offers feedback on a child’s performance or class’s current skills. Formative is continuous assessment because it is a kind of assessment done regularly. It is an assessment given on a continuing basis throughout the learning in school. The value and worth of continuous assessment cannot be overemphasized because of its exhaustive nature in evaluation. Ababu (2006) explains that continuous assessment gives opportunity to the teacher to evaluate his students and himself. Secondly, it gives a clearer picture than a single examination, since it is done throughout a period of the programme. And thirdly, it reduces tension and fears surrounding the single examination. Finally, it reduces all forms of examination malpractices and leakages of examination questions.

Assessments are most helpful to teachers when making instructional decisions. Formative assessment allows teachers to decide whether their teaching is effective. For instance, a review of homework over the course of a week reveals that a majority of the class is having difficulty understanding a concept. This result of assessment can help the teacher modify his teaching to meet the needs of the group or decide if the unit needs to be re-taught. In addition to homework, teacher observations, oral or written reports and quizzes are formative assessment tools.

Summative assessment measure what children have learned over the course of a learning cycle such as a term or a year. Summative assessments inform a teacher about a child's overall knowledge in specific subjects. In lower primary school, children take tests that measure their ability to master skills and objectives designated for their grade level. Summative assessments are end of term tests, end-of-course tests, in-depth projects and standardized tests. They give teachers data that helps them
determine a child’s academic weaknesses and decide if a child is ready to progress to the next grade.

2.17 Summary of the Review

From the literature reviewed, it can be seen that research on literacy and language foundation at the basic school level is not conclusive and had been scanty in Upper West Region in particular. For example, the Criterion Reference Test of 2000 revealed that fewer than 10% of primary school children at level six are able to read with the ability of their grade level. This gives credence to the assertion of Kraft (2003) that the fundamental problem still facing Ghanaian school children is that of basic literacy skills in English. It can be summarized that the development of effective Language and Literacy is therefore crucial to the child’s life and his/her entire learning. A child's journey to building strong language and literacy skills starts from infancy and continues throughout the early childhood years and beyond. To the Ghana Education Service [GES] (2014) all aspects of literacy play an integral part of the child’s education. Reading in particular, underpins all subjects, as it enables children to access all areas of the curriculum. Consequently, this makes cross-curricular links possible.

For example, Cummins (2000) believes the development of children mother-tongue (MT) is strong predictor of second language development and that children who come to school with a solid foundation in their Mother Tongue develop strong literacy ability in the school language (L2). This assertion is supported by GES (2014) in the Facilitator Guide for Early Grade Reading Materials Implementation Training which stated that there is strong evidence in Africa and elsewhere that children should learn to read and write in a familiar language, a language they already know how to speak
before transferring their reading skills into a second language. Again, GES (2014) have revealed that research shows that it is easier for children to learn to read in a language familiar to them. Children learn to read second language, such as English, when the concepts of reading and writing have been established in the language that the pupils already speak.

This chapter examined the concept of evaluation in general and the literacy situation in Africa and in Ghana. The development of language-in-education policy, the role of second language influence and socio-cultural issues in language development were also discussed, taking into consideration of some theoretical underpinnings in language development. The study was based on the socio-cultural perspective on literacy development which emphasized on the power of social relation. And based on relations, it focused on literacy as a social practice. The review also discussed issues on empirical studies, reading and writing relationship including bilingual and bi-literacy views on the teaching and learning of language and literacy. The review would not be complete without looking into methods of teaching language and literacy, and the pedagogical role of the teacher in the use of teaching learning materials. The review of the related literature finally ended with some challenges discovered by the Implementation Study during the inception of the programme and assessment processes of language teaching in lower primary schools. For the fact that language and literacy develops during a child’s early years, teachers need to make a conscious effort to intentionally plan activities and experiences that optimize conditions for children to acquire positive attitudes, skills, and knowledge about language and literacy. Research tells us that a teacher’s role is critical to a child’s learning and that teachers can inspire children to read, write, and learn through
thoughtful planning and developmentally appropriate literacy instruction (Neuman et al., 2000).

2.17 Conclusion

Considering the diversity of ways in which the language policies are implemented over the years by the various governments, the implications of teaching of language and literacy in these settings, and nurturing the collaborative partnerships efforts between researchers, policy makers, and policy implementers, as it is can help make a very important contribution to improve the quality of education in Ghana through building a strong literacy foundation at the lower primary pupils. There is therefore, the need for the Ministry of Education, Ghana Education Service and NALAP Task Force to work collaboratively with Colleges of Education across the whole country to ensure that primary school early childhood teachers are well trained and equipped to teach language and Literacy in the lower primary schools they will be posted to teach if the current language-in-education policy is to work effectively. This will go a long way to enhance the teaching and learning of language and literacy at the lower primary level based on the bilingual and biliteracy policy of the National Literacy Acceleration Programme which gave birth to the teaching and learning of Language and Literacy. In addition, for successful implementation of the NALAP in the lower primary schools in Ghana it is important that quality qualified professional teachers and educational materials are available for the proper implementation of the bilingual and biliteracy curriculum with the teaching methods of the programme effectively implemented.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

The chapter describes the research design used, the study population, sample and sampling technique, administration of the instruments and the instruments used, pilot study, method of data collection procedure and method of data analysis employed to achieve the desired purpose of the study. The purpose of this study was to evaluate the National Literacy Acceleration Programme to find out the extent to which the programme has been implemented in the lower primary schools in the Upper West Region of Ghana. It is also to ascertain how far the programme is implemented as far language and literacy teaching in the basic schools concerned after the implementation.

3.1 Research Design of the Study

A design refers to a plan for selecting subjects, research site and data collection procedures to answer proposed question (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997). Based on Cross-sectional research design, descriptive statistics was used for the data analysis. This design was used to get qualitative and quantitative data for the analysis and determine the extent to which NALAP is being implemented in the teaching of language and literacy. A cross-sectional design involves collecting data at one point and over a short period to provide a ‘snap-shot’ of the outcome and the characteristics associated with the population at specific period (Alhassan, 2012).

The cross-sectional design was used because it is flexible in using different instruments for the data collection (OUT 2010). This cross sectional design employed
mixed method to get in-depth views of about the implementation of NALAP in lower primary schools. Descriptive statistical data was therefore, necessary for the analysis.

Frankael & Wallen (2000) state that the purpose of descriptive survey is to observe, describe and document aspects of a phenomenon as it naturally occurs in a situation. According to Best and Kahn (1995) and Amedahe (2000) as cited in Man (2013), in descriptive research the event or condition either already exists or has occurred and the researcher merely selects the relevant variables for analysis of their relationships. Descriptive research is designed basically to find out the existing situation of a particular phenomenon of the relationship among non-manipulated variables. It determines and reveals the way things are (Gay, 1992).

The rationale for using this descriptive design for this study was based on its advantages. In the first place descriptive design affords the researcher the opportunity to select a sample from the population for generalization from the study (Best & Kahn, 1995). Secondly, descriptive survey often employs randomization techniques so that error may be estimated when population characteristics are inferred from observation of samples. As such, the findings can form the basis of generalization about the phenomenon studied. And thirdly, variables and procedures are described as accurately and completely as possible so that other researchers can replicate the study.

Nevertheless, there are also disadvantages in descriptive survey. They include ensuring the questionnaire are clear and not misleading, getting respondent to answer questions thoughtfully and honestly and getting sufficient number of questionnaire completed and returned for analysis to be made (Frankel & Wallen, 2000). Descriptive
surveys are also easily influenced by distortions through biases to measuring instrument. Lastly, it has an element of subjectivity based on personal judgements.

3.2 Biographical data on the Respondents

This study was conducted in five Districts of the Upper West of Ghana in four lower primary schools in each district. These lower primary schools are located within the Districts where a common local language such as Dagaare or Sisaali is used in the lower primary. Apart from the information on the statistical data collected about the respondents, they also indicated their ages, sexes, school, qualification and classes taught on the questionnaire.

It is believed that the age, sex, qualification might influence the responses of the respondents, since ones level of education has direct influence on the way he/she understands issues.

3.3 Population

A population is a group of elements or cases, whether individual, object or event that conforms to specific criteria and to which the researcher intends to generalize the results of a research (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997). The target population for the study comprised 1852 lower primary school teachers (KG1 to P3) of Upper West Region of Ghana. The accessible population was 656 KG-1 to P3 teachers in public basic schools in five Districts chosen out of the total number of eleven. The reason for using the lower primary teachers is that they teach language and literacy in the schools and should be able to provide accurate information on how the programme was implemented. In addition, the lower grade teachers are the ones who lay the foundation of the pupils in language and literacy for them to build on that for further studies in all other subject areas.
Furthermore, in 2009 Baseline Assessment for NALAP implementation it was found that only 18% of third grade pupils could read text in their Ghanaian language (Leherr, 2009), and at grade six the National Education Assessment (NEA) of 2007 also found that 15% of P3 and 26% of P.6 pupils had minimum competency in English (MOE, 2014). Added to these reasons the Early Grade Reading Assessment of 2014 also indicated that only the top 2% or fewer pupils were able to read with fluency and comprehension (MOE, 2014). It is based on these reasons and others that since NALAP had not been evaluated in the region that this section of the population was selected.

In addition, it is in recognition of the importance of literacy among lower primary pupils that the Ghana Education Service developed an integrated Approach to literacy Teachers’ Guide in 2014 to help achieve a common strategy for teaching literacy and language and English using a methodology that integrates mathematics, Science and literacy in a holistic fashion (GES, 2014). It is believed the mother-tongue (L1) based literacy instruction approach helps the pupils to develop literacy and language skills first in the L1 and systematically transfer these skills to English (L2) by gradually the introducing age-appropriate lessons in the English language. This approach is based on evidence that mother-tongue based instruction enhances the acquisition and acceleration of literacy skills in L1 and boost transfer to L2 (GES, 2014).

It is in light of all these reasons and others that the lower primary teachers were the focus of this study since they are at the apex of affairs in laying the foundation of lower primary pupils in literacy and language skills development in those selected districts in Upper West.
3.4 Sample and Sampling Technique

Sampling technique is the process of choosing the unit of the target population which is to be included in the study (Sarantakos, 1998). The sample for the study comprised one hundred (100) lower primary school teachers comprising 75% females and 25% males. Ten (10) teachers each were chosen from the sample for observation and interview and 20 schools for the document analysis. The study used a combination of multiple sampling techniques such as purposive, simple random and quota sampling techniques. Purposive sampling technique was used to choose the five (5) districts in the Region and for KG1-P3 teachers in each school. Purposive sampling was adopted when the respondents selected may be either judged to have certain characteristics or more commonly those who are likely to provide the most useful information for the purpose for which the study is being done (Shaughneesy and Zechmeister, 1990). It therefore means the KG-P3 teachers have been teaching language and literacy, and are likely to provide accurate information for this study.

Simple random sampling procedure was also used for four schools in each district. Names of the schools in each district were written on slips of paper and put in an empty container. A child was blindfolded and asked to pick four in each district. Quota sampling technique was used to select teachers from each of the districts making twenty (20) teachers of five (5) from each school. Ten teachers, two from each district were observed and ten, comprising two teachers from each district were also interviewed. Table 3 shows the illustration of the sample for the questionnaire in the study.
### Table 3: Distribution of the Sample by District and Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>KGI M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>KG2 M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P1 M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P2 M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P3 M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawra</td>
<td>Eremon-Dazuri Prim.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kalsagра prim.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lawra Catholic Prim.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EremonTangzu Prim.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jirapa</td>
<td>Sigri R/C Prim.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tizza R/C Prim.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baazu D/A Prim.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St Joseph Prim.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sissala West</td>
<td>Pulima Prim.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sissala East</td>
<td>St Gabriels Prim.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United Prim.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; KG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TUCE Demo. Prim.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa</td>
<td>St Andrew’s Prim.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Busa ‘A’ Prim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Busa ‘B’ Prim.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wa Methodist Prim.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field data, 2017

From Table 3, it is quite discernible that majority of the respondents are female teachers in the lower primary schools, representing 75%. The male are the least also representing 25%. In the SissalaEast district, 31<sup>st</sup> DecemberSchool does not have P1-P3 and this can be seen in the table as indicated. However, the school has two KG teachers in eachclass and is also under African Kids (Afrikids) Programmewhich is a literacy programme aimed at improving literacy among KG and lower primary school pupils in northern Ghana. The high number of female teachers in the lower primary could mean that they are capable and have patience, love and motherly care for little children than their male counterparts.
Table 4: Distribution of Sample by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Data, 2017*

Table 4 shows that majority of the teachers in the lower primary school are female and a few male teachers. Out of the total of one hundred lower primary teachers 75% are the female while 25% are the male. This is clearly an indication that there more female teachers in the lower primary than their male counterparts in the lower primary throughout the region. It is believed that females are very often closer to early grade pupils and also use the mother tongue more than their male counterparts. As such, I hope the dominants of the female teachers will have a strong influence in laying the foundation of lower primary pupils in their early childhood literacy development.

Table 5: Distribution of Respondent Teachers by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41+</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Data, 2017*

The data in Table 5 reveals that majority of the respondent teachers were in the age range 26-30, representing 31% and followed by range 31-35, also representing 22%. Table 5 again shows that range 36-40 and 41 above have 14% and 23% respectively. It also shows that only 10% of the respondents were within the age range 20-25. Again, from the Table 5, it is revealing that most of the teachers are youth within the working age and are not very experience teachers teaching in the lower primary schools in
almost all the districts. It therefore, means these teachers have not taught for long and as such might not have much experience in teaching language and literacy. They would therefore need to be exposed to the methods of teaching language and literacy as 70% and 34% of respondents respectively suggested for provision of teaching learning material, and training and capacity building in the last open ended question in the questionnaire.

Table 6: Distribution of Respondent Teachers by Academic/Professional Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Untrained teacher</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s Certificate ‘A’</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Secondary teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, 2017

From Table 6, it is quite discernible that 53% of the teachers are diploma holders and 35% are also first degree holders in the lower primary schools in the districts sampled. This is a clear sign that if these teachers with these qualifications put up their best in the teaching of language and literacy, a proper foundation of pupils will be laid for literacy development. The fewer untrained teachers, Certificate ‘A’ and Post-secondary teachers, is also a clear fulfilment of the Anamuah-Mensah committee report on review of education reforms in 2002 that the critical factor in achievement of the millennium development goal will be the training of sufficient number of teachers at diploma level in order to be able to deploy professionally qualified teachers right down to the kindergarten stages (Anamuah-Mensah, 2004).
3.5 Data Collection Instrument

The instruments used for data collection for the study were questionnaire, document analysis, observation and interview. Since it was qualitative research and deals with events in their natural setting, these instruments helped the researcher meet the teachers in their natural setting in the data collection process. The questionnaire involved structured Questionnaire and one open ended question. The main reasons for choosing a questionnaire was that, it is a quick way of collecting data. Secondly, it is also known to be quite valid and reliable if well-constructed. Thirdly, the questionnaire ensures uniformity and creates no variation. Fourthly, the questionnaire can be completed at the respondents own convenience which ensures chance of obtaining valid and reliable information and finally, because the respondents were all literates it was easy to apply. A four-point response questionnaire was designed using likert scale of strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly disagree with values 4, 3, 2, 1 respectively. This was done to enable respondents to indicate the degree of their belief in the given statement (Best & Khan, 1995).

The questionnaire was organized into five sections comprising of section A, B, C, D and E. Section A covered background information of respondents personal data. Section B focused on general questions on the extent to which NALAP is implemented. Section C also dealt with how effective teachers have been using the methods and strategies of NALAP in the teaching of language and literacy. Section D was devoted to the use of NALAP materials in the lower primary schools in the programme. Section E centred on whether the programme has facilitated and improved language and literacy in the lower primary schools. And section F discussed the challenges and problems of NALAP if any.
The questionnaire used in this study was based on the following reasons. In the first place questionnaire is less expensive as compared to other methods. Secondly, the questionnaire can be completed at the respondents own convenience and this ensures obtaining valid information. Thirdly, questionnaire ensures also uniformity in items and thus creates no variation. Fourthly, the questionnaire gives assurance of anonymity in cases of sensitive issues. And lastly, the questionnaire gives on-the-spot administration and collection and as result produces quick results. Despite the usefulness of the questionnaire it cannot be used to collect information from uneducated illiterate population unlike the other methods. The questionnaire is also believed to be highly expensive considering the time and materials needed for the design.

The interview was also conducted in the data collection procedure. Thus, the researcher made arrangement with the teachers to meet at convenient times for the interview session. The interview helped the researcher to get into direct contact with the teachers in their real setting since such a setting provides an effective forum for gathering comprehensive information on the study. According to Best and Khan (1995) interview is in a sense an oral questionnaire and the major reason for interview is the fact that many people are more likely to talk than to write and therefore, will provide data more ready and fully in the interview than on a questionnaire. The interview questions were well planned and put on paper to guide both the researcher and the interviewees.

In addition, document analysis was useful source of data for this study as an instrument for data collection. The document analysis provided the opportunity for the researcher to check the primary data collected during the interview and application of
the questionnaire and observation. Creswell (2012) described document analysis as a good source to search for answers, which also provide an effective means of checking primary data gathered through interview. Key document looked at included lesson Notebooks, pupils work and exercises, Available NALAP materials, language and literacy materials and others.

On the part of observation, it was done on the teachers’ work (10) directly in the classroom after conferring with them on what was to be done for 30 minutes during a separate language and literacy lessons. The observation therefore, helped the researcher gain insight into what actually exists in the classroom setting which helped made the study more credible.

3.6 Pilot Study
The research questionnaire for the study and other instruments were pilot tested in two schools in Sissala East District prior to being administered to the sample. The purpose was to pre-test the validity, clarity and relevance of the questions. It was also done to ensure that the instruments generate relevant information in addressing the research questions and also identify challenges that might be faced. The pilot group was made up of ten (10) respondents. After analysis of the responses, it was realized that there was the need to, delete, rephrase, restructure and modify some of the items to improve upon the quality and clarity. This helped improve the content validity of the instruments. In addition the pilot group was individually interviewed to further determine the opinion of survey length, format, wording, and content. Two participants of the pilot group noted that the questionnaire was lengthy but that it did not change their responses. As a result, the survey was modified for this research study.
3.7 Validity and Reliability

Validity according to Sorantakos (1998) is one of the basic principles of research and it is the ability to produce findings that are in agreement with the theoretical or conceptual values in other words to produce accurate results and to measure what it is supposed to measure. A valid measure produces true results that reflect the true situation and conditions of environment it is supposed to study. According to the American Psychological Association, American Educational Research Council on Measurement and Education (cited in Crowl, Kaminsky & Podell, 1997, p.313) validity is the appropriateness, meaningfulness and usefulness of the specific inference made from test scores. They further assert that what matters is that the inference regarding the specific uses of the test scores are validated, not the test itself. Validity pertains to the extent to which a test measures a particular phenomenon among particular population. Validity of the instrument also represents the extent to which the instrument measures, what it is purports to measure. It refers to the accuracy of the inferences or interpretations one makes from the data collected.

To ensure validity of the instrument for this study, the items were made available to experienced lecturers in measurement and evaluation who made valuable suggestion which in the end shaped the questionnaire in its present state. This means the test items in the questionnaire were subjected to the supervisor’s and experts’ review to determine the face and content validity. The face validity established the clarity of the instructions, appropriateness of the language used and form it should take. On the other hand, the content validity was used to determine whether all the instruments reflected objective of NALAP and the language and literacy policy.
On the part of reliability, Miles (2001) said reliability is the measure to give consistent scores (cited in Kaar, 2009). The reliability co-efficient of the study produced 0.763 using the Cronbach’s Alpha co-efficient with the help of Statistics Product for Service Solution (SPSS) version 20.

3.8 Data Collection Procedure

In order to effectively capture, explore and analyze the data emerging from the study, qualitative data collection approach was employed. This was appropriate because the data required was qualitative in nature and could best be obtained through interviews, direct observation, document analysis and the use of questionnaire. To succeed in carrying out the study successfully after the pilot study, the questionnaire were administered at the four schools in each district of the five district using two days each. Two research assistants were trained to assist in the application of the questionnaire. Prior to the application of the instruments the Researcher obtained official letter of introduction from his Head of Department. The district Directors of the various districts were met, briefed of the exercise, and the school selected and permission granted for the exercise to take place. Then the selected schools were visited and teachers briefed before the questionnaire was also administered.

In addition to the application of the questionnaire, some of the teachers in the selected schools were interviewed using an interview guide to facilitate the process. This means, a personal face-to-face and one-to-one interview was used throughout the field data collection process. This was preferred method because it allowed for in-depth exploration and collection of not only verbal data compared to other interview methods (Fowler & Mangione, 1990; Seidman, 2006 & Silverman, 2005). Seidman (2006) argues that the personal interview is appropriate for an in-depth qualitative
study because when human beings communicate directly with each other, much more information passes between them since the exchange extends beyond purely verbal expression. What was key interest was therefore the choice of words, facial expression and other body language of the respondents during the interview process.

Others were also observed to teach one lesson on language and literacy at the lower level. In this regard, direct field notes taking was employed (Seidman, 2006). Document analysis was also carried out using a checklist, especially on lesson notes, NALAP materials, NALAP strategies, assessment and pupils’ exercises. Creswell (2012) describes documents as a good place to search for answers, which also provide an effective means of checking primary data gathered through interviews.

3.9 Data Analysis
The data analysis was mainly influenced by the research questions, interview, questionnaire, document analysis and observation. The Statistics Product for Service Solution (SPSS) version 20 was used to analyze the data gathered from the teacher survey on the teaching and learning of language and literacy lower primary schools. Data were analyzed and interpreted from the perspective of study participants, paying particular attention to the context in which they were collected (Creswell, 2012). The data was analyzed using descriptive statistical procedures. Being a descriptive research study, the frequencies of the responses were calculated using tables and converted into percentages guided by the research questions to describe characteristic of the respondents. These were used to determine the implementation level of NALAP on the teaching and learning of language and literacy in the lower primary schools. As such, several aspects of language and literacy teaching were analyzed and
before analyzing, editing was done to identify any inconsistencies in the answers for corrections to be made.

Qualitative data from the observation, interview and document analysis were analyzed by reporting and explaining the facts based on the themes already established in the document analysis guide and the observation and interview guides. The structured interview and systematic observation schedule used provided qualitative data to validate that of the questionnaire and document analysis. However, in the discussions of the data ‘strongly agree and agree’ and ‘disagree and strongly disagree’ were combined for only ‘Agree’ and ‘Disagree’ to avoid misunderstanding of the results.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.0 Introductions

Chapter four presents the results of the study obtained through the analysis of data. The results from the data analysis of the questionnaire, interview, document analysis and observation are presented for easy understanding in tables and frequencies. The purpose of the study was to assess the implementation level of the National Literacy Acceleration Programme and the teaching of language and literacy in the lower primary schools. The discussion and analysis focused on the extent to which the National Literacy Acceleration Programme was implemented and whether the teaching of language and literacy is taking place at the lower primary level. The analysis was done using the Statistics Product for Service Solution (SPSS) version 20 software. In analyzing the responses to the research questions, frequencies and percentages were used with tables. The percentages for the respondents were used to determine the implementation levels of the NALAP on the teaching of language and literacy in the lower primary level in the basic schools.

A total sample of 100 teachers was used in the study. The sample used all the 100 teachers for the questionnaire, 10 each out of the total for both observation and interview and 20 for document analysis. Specifically, they were lower primary teachers of schools from Sissala East, Sissala West, Lawra, Jirapa and Wa Districts Basic Schools in Upper West Region of Ghana. The teachers were all teaching in same level of classes and multiple sampling techniques were employed to arrive at the samples. The questionnaire given to the teachers were meant to obtain data for objective analysis of the information on the teaching of language and literacy skills in the lower primary schools.
It should be clearly noted that the data was collected based on the purpose of the study and its significance to literacy development in the lower primary schools and reflected the objectives of the research questions.

4.1 Analysis and Presentation Main Data

Research Question 1

How effective is the involvement of teachers in the implementation of the NALAP in the teaching of Language and Literacy?

This question sought to find out how effectively teachers are involved in the implementation of the National Literacy Acceleration Programme in the teaching and learning of Language and Literacy in the lower primary schools. The question sought to also find out the extent to which the combined 90 minutes for both mother and English language is carried out. In addition to that, the question tried to find out whether pupils learn better in a language they are familiar with or not and also whether the teachers are even aware of the L1 and L2 policy and integrate their lessons with the teaching and learning or not.
Table 7: Teachers Opinions on Effective Implementation of NALAP and Language and Literacy (N-100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation of NALAP and teaching of language and literacy</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The School implemented combined language and literacy policy of NALAP</td>
<td>87 (87%)</td>
<td>13 (13%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The School implemented the combined 90 minutes literacy period</td>
<td>74 (74%)</td>
<td>26 (26%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower primary pupils learn to read and write in language they speak and understand</td>
<td>88 (88%)</td>
<td>12 (12%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are aware of L1 and L2 early grade literacy programme</td>
<td>87 (87%)</td>
<td>13 (13%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are able to integrate other available literacy materials into teaching language and literacy</td>
<td>91 (91%)</td>
<td>9 (9%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, 2017

Table 7 reveals that 87% of the respondent teachers admitted the school implemented the combined language and literacy policy of NALAP whilst 13% disagreed. In the same vein 74% of the respondents agreed that the school implemented the 90 minutes literacy period policy and 26% did not agree to it. This finding contradicts the NALAP Implementation Study report which indicated that 16% of all the classes observed were using the 90 minutes language and literacy period. This clearly showed that the policy was not totally implemented as the implementation study reports indicated in their findings that by June, 2010 only one-third of the schools had implemented the GES directive to change their timetables and introduce the new subject, Language and Literacy, as a 90 minute period combining L1 and English. And according to the reports some headteachers interviewed said they were going to wait until the 2010/11 school year to change the timetable. It is believed that without the framework provided by the 90 minute Language and Literacy period, some teachers could not follow the guidance for the timing of activities in L1 and English provided in the Teacher Guide (EQUALL, 2010).
Again, 88% of the respondent teachers confirmed that lower primary pupils learn to read and write better in a language they can speak and understand. This finding supports GES (2014) that mother-tongue (L1) based literacy instruction approach helps the child to develop literacy and language skill first in the L1 and systematically transfer these skills to the English language. However, 12% of the respondents disagreed to this assertion. Similarly, 87% of the respondents also affirmed that teachers were aware of the Ghanaian language and English early grade language and literacy programme policy and 13% disagreed to the statement. In the same way, 91% of respondent teachers again agreed that teachers integrate other available literacy materials into the teaching and learning of language and literacy in the lower primary schools whilst only 9% disagreed with idea.

From Table 7 findings, it is evident that most of the respondents admitted that implementation had taken place, the 90 minutes period policy is in place, that lower primary pupils read and write better in a language familiar to them, and also that teachers were aware of the language and literacy policy and integrate other available materials into the teaching and learning. This findings is not conclusive that implementation is perfectly executed since some of the respondents disagreed to the statements. It is possible that some people did not think the implementation is actually effective done. There seems to dispute in the claim of implementation as one cannot tell clearly whether those who disagreed with the statements benefitted or are also part of the implementation. The reason of some disagreeing could be attributed to those people not having any training in the teaching of language and literacy.
Research Question 2

How efficiently have the teachers been using the teaching methodologies and strategies of NALAP in the teaching of language and literacy in the lower primary schools?

The rationale for this question was to find out whether the teachers have been using the teaching methodologies and strategies of the National Literacy Acceleration Programme to influence the performance of pupils at lower primary level in the language and literacy classes. The main focus of any literacy programme is how effective teachers use their pedagogical skills to improve pupils’ literacy development and their skills.

Table 8: Teachers Views on the Use of NALAP Methods and Strategies in Language and Literacy Teaching (N-100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers use of methods and strategies of NALAP</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers use the lesson plan of NALAP in teaching language and literacy</td>
<td>75 (75%)</td>
<td>25 (25%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers use the methods and strategies of NALAP in teaching language and literacy</td>
<td>80 (80%)</td>
<td>20 (20%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers use L1 and L2 in teaching language and literacy</td>
<td>97 (97%)</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers follow the NALAP prescribed guide in their lesson plans</td>
<td>71 (71%)</td>
<td>29 (29%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are comfortable and proficient teaching language and literacy</td>
<td>78 (78%)</td>
<td>22 (22%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, 2017

Teachers by their professional ethics are supposed to draw up elaborate lesson plans, following detailed steps in the Teacher Guide of NALAP and use these plans in their lesson delivery. The survey revealed that teachers were to a great extent using lesson plans. The results from Table 8 show that 75% of the respondents agreed that teachers use the lesson plan of NALAP in the lower primary schools while 25% disagreed. This view on the use of lesson plan is similar to that of Moomen (2006) study in the
Bole district which revealed that 87.2% of the teachers prepared and used their lesson plans always. Also, 80% of the respondents admitted that teachers use the methodologies and strategies of NALAP in the teaching of language and literacy in the lower primary school. However, 20% of the respondents did not agree to this view. Again, 97% of the respondents confirmed that teachers use the L1 and L2 in the teaching of language and literacy in the lower primary schools whilst only 3% disagreed with this view. This finding is in line with UNESCO (1953) affirmation that the use of L1 in education is psychologically, sociologically, and educationally beneficial to learners and that every effort should be made to provide education in the L1. To ensure freedom and human dignity for all Ghanaian children the government of Ghana should ensure the use of the L1 policy is implemented to the letter.

This finding also supports Seidu (2011) study in 11 districts in Ghana which revealed that 55% of teachers (426 out of 771) firmly supported the view that official permission should be granted for the use of both English and L1 in all subjects on the curriculum. Added to this, Seidu’s (2011) finding also revealed that over 70% (561 out of 776) teachers think the combined use of English Language and Ghanaian language is educationally beneficial to the pupils, that is 81% for lower primary and 64% for upper primary. Teachers therefore, preferred bilingual education to language specialization. The finding further indicated that teachers felt parents would be happy if primary school pupils are literates in both English and Ghanaian language by the end of year six primary programme. Above all, Seidu’s finding concluded on the point of L1, that teachers supported the view that “language alternation” should be officially recognized as means of instruction at the lower primary level.
With regards to the issue of whether teachers follow the NALAP prescribed Teacher Guide in the lesson planning, 71% of the respondents indicated they used it while 29% disagreed to this point of view. As regard to whether teachers are comfortable and proficient in teaching language and literacy, 78% affirmed to this whilst only 22% disagreed to this opinion.

The findings of this study has a strong support for the use of L1 instruction for the teaching and learning of language and literacy in the lower primary schools since there are a lot of research evidence in favour of the L1 instruction at lower primary levels. This so because it is believed that when pupils learn language skills in L1 when gaining literacy skills in their familiar language Ghanaian language, they establish a transferable set of skills that can make learning to read and write in English easier and quicker.

**Research Question 3**

**To what extent has the use of NALAP materials been implemented in the lower primary schools?**

This question sought to find out the extent to which the use of NALAP materials had been implemented in the teaching and learning of language and literacy in the lower primary. In addition, the question was also posed to find out whether the materials are even available, sufficient and put to good use in the lower primary schools. Added to this, the question again sought to find out about the current state of materials in the various lower primary schools. Table 9 is used to answer this research question.
Table 9: Teachers Views on the Use of NALAP Materials in Teaching Language and Literacy (N-100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of NALAP materials in the teaching and learning of language and literacy</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers use the teacher guide and NALAP instructional materials in the planning and teaching of language and literacy</td>
<td>72 (72%)</td>
<td>28 (28%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NALAP teacher guide is comprehensive enough for use in teaching language and literacy</td>
<td>75 (75%)</td>
<td>25 (25%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils' spoken language is same chosen for the NALAP materials and is suitable to local environment</td>
<td>67 (67%)</td>
<td>33 (33%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NALAP provided sufficient and adequate materials</td>
<td>39 (39%)</td>
<td>61 (61%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NALAP materials are used in other lessons</td>
<td>68 (68%)</td>
<td>32 (32%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NALAP materials are available in the school</td>
<td>63 (63%)</td>
<td>37 (37%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, 2017

The Teacher’s Guide is an indispensable resource material for the teacher in the lower primary schools. The text in the NALAP teacher’s Guides is predominantly in English Language with specific sections in the Ghanaian language (MOE, 2014). The teacher’s Guide for NALAP is so comprehensive and apparently easy to follow that both trained and untrained would not have any difficulty using it. It takes the teacher through Ghanaian language (L1) stages of the lesson step-by-step into the English language (L2) for the ninety (90) minutes assigned to both L1 and L2 teaching and learning. Teachers during the inception of NALAP were trained through workshops on how to use the Teacher Guide and other teaching and learning materials. This presupposes that teachers had adequate knowledge of the NALAP methodologies because the Teacher Guide served as a dependable prop in the application of these methods.
From Table 9, 72% of the respondent teachers agreed that they use the Teacher’s Guide in planning and teaching of language and literacy, while 28% disagreed. In the same vein, 75% agreed that the Teacher’s Guide is comprehensive enough for the teachers to use in teaching language and literacy while 25% disagreed. This finding is in line with the NALAP implementation study findings which indicated that 99.4% of the teachers responded that the Teacher Guide was easy to use (EQUALL, 2010). With regard to the pupils’ spoken language chosen for NALAP materials, 67% of the respondent teachers affirmed that the spoken language is the same chosen for NALAP materials and is suitable to the local environment whilst 23% also disagreed. This finding again also supports the NALAP implementation study which revealed 97.8% of the teachers said the materials were related to the child’s environment and culture (EQUALL, 2010).

On the part of sufficient teaching and learning materials (TLM), 61% disagreed that NALAP provided sufficient and adequate materials for both teachers and pupils in the teaching and learning of language and literacy. This finding is also related to Moomen’s (2006) study which revealed that 25 teachers representing 64.1% felt the materials were insufficient. This clearly showed that teaching and learning materials were inadequately supplied to the schools for the National Acceleration Literacy Programme. The implication here is that most of the pupils in the language literacy classes did not benefit from effective use of teaching and learning materials and would not be able to acquire the intended needed skills in the L1 and L2 as envisaged by the NALAP.
However, the finding also contradicts part of the same Moomen (2006) study which said teachers enjoyed full complement and timely supply of teaching and learning materials in the BTL/BTE programme in the Bole District. Moomen (2006) finding contrary said it was not the same in the ‘cycle 1’ schools of BTL/BTE and that their materials arrived late and were not in the quantity as the pilot phase. This finding is almost the same with the implementation study of NALAP as revealed that the materials distribution was not favourable to some schools just as the experience of Buoti primary school revealed is this study.

It should be noted that teaching and learning materials are an important part of every learning experience. According to T-TEL (2016) education research in Ghana and across sub-Saharan Africa provides evidence that teaching and learning materials are important part of a productive learning environment. The use of TLMs helps pupils learn better in any topic. It further explained that while TLMs is an integral part of effective teaching and learning, they on their own do not lead to improve learning outcomes. The T-TEL went on to further explain that there was shortage of TLMs across schools and colleges.

With regards to availability of the materials 63% agreed that materials were available while 37% disagreed that the materials were in the schools. This is also clear evidence that the materials were actually not available in all the schools since more than one-third of the respondents indicated that they were not available. The fact that NALAP materials were not sufficient or available in the schools could be attributed to lack of the materials in the system or some hitches in the distribution to the various schools in the districts.
Research Question 4

In what way has the NALAP helped to improve literacy development of lower primary pupils in the teaching of language and literacy?

An effective Language and Literacy programme would depend largely on the availability of material resources to help improve the development and performance of pupils in the language and literacy skills. Therefore the rationale behind this question was to find out about the current state of literacy development in the lower primary school and whether the teaching of language and literacy has facilitated and improved pupils’ performance in their literacy development and other areas.

Table 10: Teachers Opinions on how NALAP Facilitates the Development and Improve Performance in Language and Literacy (N-100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitate Development and Improve Performance in Language and Literacy</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching of language and literacy in the NALAP has improved pupils literacy skills in both L1 and L2</td>
<td>77 (77%)</td>
<td>23 (23%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching of language and literacy has facilitated and improved pupils' oral and listening skills</td>
<td>83 (83%)</td>
<td>17 (17%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NALAP has facilitated the study of other subjects through the use of the materials provided</td>
<td>75 (75%)</td>
<td>25 (25%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching of language and literacy has improved the general performance of lower primary pupils</td>
<td>80 (80%)</td>
<td>20 (20%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching of language and literacy has improved the development of literacy among lower primary pupils</td>
<td>83 (83%)</td>
<td>17 (17%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, 2017

Table 10 indicates 77% of the respondent teachers agreed that the teaching and learning of language and literacy has improved pupils’ reading and writing skills. However, 25% disagreed to this assertion. Similarly, 83% of the respondents also indicated that NALAP has facilitated and improved pupils’ oral and listening skills whilst 17% did not agree to the statement. Also, 75% confirmed that NALAP has facilitated the study of other subjects through the use of the materials and 25%
contrary disagreed with it. Again, 80% of the respondent teachers affirmed that the teaching of language and literacy has improved in general performance of lower primary pupils in language and literacy. However, 20% disagreed with this. In the same, 83% of the respondent teachers confirmed that teaching of language and literacy has improved the development of literacy among lower primary pupils and 17% contrary disagreed.

From the findings, it is clear that literacy in L1 aids pupils’ general performance in all other subject. This goes to confirm other research findings that advocated for use of L1 at the lower primary level. For instance, this finding goes to confirm the results in a study which showed that learning science in the Ghanaian language results in higher conceptual thinking than when the learning is done in English. This finding was in 1996, where the Local Language Initial Literacy (LLIL) Project in Northern Ghana as cited in Kwapong and Aboagye (2010) where Andoh-Kumi (2001) conducted a study in nine schools to compare the effect of initial reading and writing in local language (L1) with English language (L2) on performance in English comprehension. The results not only showed that the English reading comprehension scores of the children who had first learned to read in their mother tongue were markedly higher than those children learning to read only in English but it was well observed that those who started L1 literacy were doing well in the basic Ghana Education Service curriculum than those in English.

Also, Moomen study in the Bole District in the BTL/BTE project indicated that respondent who suggested for improvement of the project unanimously agreed that starting with the L1 helped children to acquire reading and writing skills easier than it would have been outside the project. Moomen (2006) confirmed that all the 39
teachers agreed that children in the project schools acquired reading skills easier than they expected. Similarly Education quality for All (EQUALL) report (2006) compared the performance of pupils in English language proficiency, with different levels of proficiency in L1 in Ghana and the results from their study revealed that pupils with high level of proficiency in the local language developed and transitioned at higher rate than those with lower levels of proficiency in the English. However, in a related study conducted by Kwapong (2006) showed that there was no significant difference between the use of Twi (L1) as a medium of instruction and English at the lower primary.

**Research Question 5**

**What are some of the challenges affecting the proper implementation of the NALAP in the teaching of language and Literacy at the lower primary school level?**

The rationale behind this question was to find out about some the challenges that might have been confronting the implementation of the National Literacy Acceleration Programme in the teaching of language and Literacy at the lower primary school level. This question was also posed to find out if it had been difficult for the National Literacy Acceleration Programme to be implemented in the lower primary schools. Table 11 is used to illustrate analysis on this research question.
Table 11: Teachers Views on the Challenges of the implementation of NALAP in the Teaching of Language and Literacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges of NALAP Implementation in the teaching of language and literacy</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are lot of challenges in the implementation of NALAP with reference to the teaching of language and literacy</td>
<td>70 (70%)</td>
<td>30 (30%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers have challenges in the use of NALAP methods in the teaching of languages and literacy</td>
<td>70 (70%)</td>
<td>30 (30%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 use in the teaching of the language and literacy is a challenge to both teachers and pupils</td>
<td>51 (51%)</td>
<td>49 (49%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers have difficulty using the teaching and learning materials provided by NALAP in the classroom</td>
<td>36 (36%)</td>
<td>64 (64%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers cannot read, write and speak the L1 they are to teach in the lower primary classes</td>
<td>43 (43%)</td>
<td>57 (57%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Field Data, 2017

In Table 11, 70% of the respondents indicated that there were a lot of challenges in the implementation for NALAP and that the teachers also had challenges in the use of the NALAP methods in the teaching at the lower respectively. Also, 51% agreed that the use of L1 in the teaching and learning of language and literacy was a challenge to both teachers and pupils. These findings on the challenges is in consonance with the EQUALL (2010) implementation study report which revealed that teachers in P2 and P3 reported that pupils who had not learned to read in the Ghanaian language were finding it difficult to use the P2 and P3 materials. This challenge to the teachers is supported by the evidence with 30% teachers both classes finding the materials difficult for the pupils.

Contrary on the part of teachers having difficulty in using the materials of NALAP, 64% of the respondents indicated that they had no difficulty using the teaching and
learning materials provided by NALAP in the teaching and learning of language and literacy. Thirty-four (34%) of the teachers also said they had difficulty using the NALAP materials just the same 34% as teachers indicated in Moomen (2006) study. With regard to the issue to whether the teachers cannot read, write and speak the L1 they were using to teach, 57% of the respondents disagreed whilst 43% agreed to the statement. Meaning some of the teachers were comfortable and could read and write the L1 while others cannot. The findings also reflected in the NALAP implementation study findings which indicated that there were some districts where a significant proportion of the teachers were not fluent or literate in the Ghanaian language selected for the school, especially Tamale Metro, East Nzema, East Dangme and Sissala East and West districts. The 43% teachers who indicated in this study that they could neither read nor write the L1 approved for those schools in the districts is a clear sign that language and literacy programme in those schools was likely to fail and the policy implementers could have known and nip it from the bud. It is also obvious that pupils in those schools might not have benefitted anything from the NALAP language and literacy policy since the teachers themselves did not know what to teach and how to do it.

Table 12: Teachers Suggested means to facilitate effective teaching of language and literacy (N-100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested means to facilitate effective teaching of language and literacy</th>
<th>Frequency (no. of suggestions)</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and learning materials</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and capacity building</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision and monitoring</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher motivation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>135</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, 2017
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From Table 12, respondent teachers were required to suggestions as to how to improve NALAP and language and literacy in the lower primary schools. It therefore, means one could give one, two or more suggestions. Though respondents were one hundred (100) for the questionnaire, hundred and thirty-five suggestions were received and coded into four themes as seen in Table 10.

Out of the total of 135 suggestions, 70 (52%) suggested provision of teaching and learning materials was necessary to be provided for the teaching and learning of language and literacy in the lower primary schools. Second on the suggestion, 46 (34%) advocated for more training and capacity building for lower primary school teachers to enable them teach language and literacy effectively. The suggestions finding is similar to Moomen (2006) study on the issues of the way forward where respondents unanimously advocated for more refresher courses and training of teachers in BTL/BTE project. In addition, 12 (9%) of the respondent teachers in this study suggested that supervision and monitoring should be intensified. However, a few respondent teachers suggested teachers’ motivation as a tool for proper implementation and progress of NALAP. It is evident that teachers were not much concern about their personal motivation but felt their professional development is paramount if language and literacy teaching is to be successful. This is seen in the way the teachers made their suggestions.
Table 13: Interview Results of Respondent teachers on NALAP (N-10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers have training in NALAP and Literacy Teaching</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mother Tongue is important in teaching language and Literacy</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can read Ghanaian Language Fluently (Dagaare or Sisaali)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NALAP Materials are Available in School</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers use Teacher Guide for Teaching Language and Literacy</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty in the use of Materials for Teaching Language and Literacy</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NALAP are Materials Related to the environment and Culture of the pupils</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Training again on NALAP or Language and Literacy Teaching</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers face Difficulties in the teaching of language and Literacy</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NALAP, Language and Literacy Policy is Necessary</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, 2017

Table 13 shows that all the 10 (100%) teachers interviewed admitted that the use of the mother was important in the teaching and learning of language and literacy in the lower primary schools. In support of the claim on the use of mother tongue, 9 (90%) of the respondent teachers also indicated that the language and literacy policy was necessary in the lower primary school. This revelation falls in line Wilmot & Wilmot (2013) assertion that there is evidence that children do not learn better when second language either than the mother tongue is used for instruction, especially when the ambient language for majority of the children as we have Ghana.

In the same vein 9 (90%) of the respondent admitted that they had training in language and literacy and contrary disagreed that they had difficulty teaching language and literacy. Again, 8 (80%) indicated that NALAP materials were related to the environment and culture of the pupils. This affirmation on whether NALAP materials were related to the environment and culture of the pupils goes to confirm what Dolphyne, (1998) said that language mirrors people’s culture and it is a matter
of obligation to develop and sustain our languages. Also 6 (60%) of the respondents affirmed that they had difficulty using the materials. This finding is consonance with Moomen (2006) study of the Break Through to Literacy (BTL) in Bole district which revealed 69.2% of teachers said they had difficulty using the teaching and learning materials. On the part of using the Teacher Guide, 5 (50%) respondent teachers confirmed that they use it. This goes to confirm the NALAP Implementation Study report which revealed that 170 (88%) were using the Teacher Guide in the classrooms. This clearly shows how uncertain whether the teachers were really using the Teachers’ Guide, if the respondents are just half of them who agreed they were using it. It not is certain whether teachers are real dedicated to the use of NALAP Teacher Guide. In respect of the ability to read and write in the mother tongue, 70% of the respondent teachers said they could read the mother tongue and the same number answered that NALAP materials were available in the lower primary schools.

From the results in Table 13, it clearly shows that there is lack of commitment on the part of the respondent teachers if 90% said they had training and at the same time revealed that they had difficulty teaching language and literacy or using the materials. The result is controversial because if the respondent teachers had training it is assumed they had knowledge in the area and should therefore be able to handle it using the materials provided. From this revelation it is possible teachers after going for training were not practicing what the learned and did not receive any training again after their initial training.

In addition, during the interview in the two Sissala districts teachers expressed their concern that the L1 approved (Dagaare) was not the children’s L1 and such, most teacher felt it was not to teach since it is also an L2 to the pupils. They suggested that
the books and all NALAP materials should have been written in Sissali. Some even concluded that the approved language was imposed on them because at the Junior High School (JHS) level candidates of the Basic Education Certificate Examination (BECE) are compelled to write Dagaare which is not their MT/L1 against their wish.

Table 14: Results of Document Analysis Collected from the Various Schools (N-20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Document</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Guide for KG 1-P3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Books</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversational Poster for KG1-P1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Cards</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary Readers for p2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Notes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils Exercises</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let’s Read and Write</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils Books for P2, 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alphabet Cards</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Cards</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter Cards</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary Readers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils Books</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, 2017

The data in Table 14 shows that some of the schools do not have some of the teaching and learning materials designed and supplied to schools on the National Literacy Acceleration Programme. The only document found in all the schools was the Teacher Guide with 100% supply to the schools. This finding is similar to the results of Rapid Assessment Survey cited in EQUALL (2010) where there was no prior notice given to the districts and schools of the visit where it revealed that 75% of the schools received and were using the Teacher Guide. Similarly, EQUALL survey, carried out throughout also indicated 90% of the schools and teachers were using the Teacher Guide in the KG-P3.

On the issue of lesson notes, it is clear almost all the 20 (100%) teachers indicated they have been preparing lesson notes but from observation, some did not follow the
NALAP procedures as planned in the Teacher Guides. This finding is consonance with Moomen (2006) study of the ‘Break Through Literacy’ (BTL) in Bole District which revealed 87.2% of the indicated that they prepared lesson notes. Other documents such as the Big Books (80%), Conversational Posters (75%), Let’s Read and Write (75%), Text Book (55%), Supplementary Readers (65%) and other Readers (80%) were also available in some of the lower primary schools. Exercises for the pupils were also found to be carried out in some schools.

Despite the fact that these documents were available in some schools, they were not put into good use as others. They were found in the offices of the teachers during the document analysis session. However, some schools such 31st December, St Gabriel and Egala in the Sissala East put theirs’ into good use. Similarly, St Andrew’s in Wa, Eremon Tangzu in Lawra, St Joseph in Jirapa districts respectively also had theirs’ put into good use. Sissala West was the one with the least NALAP materials supplied to the schools. For instance, Buoti Primary school in particular had only one Teacher Guide and none of the rest of the materials except the lesson notes of teachers and pupils’ exercises.

The teachers in Buoti school of Sissala West thought I was their source of help because the school is old without early childhood development centre and lacks facilities and teaching learning materials. Luckily, the Circuit Supervisor who was also there with me collecting information on behalf of the Member of Parliament (MP) disclosed to the teachers that the MP has promised to assist the school with most of their needs.
Table 15: Classroom instructional Observation of Ten teachers’ work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competences Area</th>
<th>Absent 0</th>
<th>Poor 1</th>
<th>Weak 2</th>
<th>Average 3</th>
<th>Good 4</th>
<th>Excellent 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepares adequate lesson plans using NALAP Teacher Guide</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sets clear lesson objectives and ensures they are achieved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starts lesson properly with preliminary introductory activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranges and uses teaching and learning materials adequately</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides sufficient and adequate teacher learner activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carries out lesson presentation and development adequately</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves pupils and allows participation in the lesson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses teaching methods, techniques and strategies of NALAP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assesses and carefully summarizes language and literacy lesson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizes and controls learners in the lesson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Field Data, 2017

The data from Table 15 presents the observation carried out on ten teachers in the five districts. The results show that most of the teachers were not proficient in handling the lessons in language and literacy. One distinct issue was that most of the teachers were not comfortable when asked to teach just for 30 minutes for observation. In this case, teachers who volunteered were involved and mostly the male teachers did, with only a few female teachers despite the fact that the female were the majority in the lower primary schools. The teachers’ skills in the schools vary, for example 31st December KG and Tumu College Demonstration schools in the Sissala East where males taught proved they were putting NALAP materials into good use.
On the issue of preparation and setting objectives for lessons, about 60% of the teachers averagely did that. The introduction of the lessons, arrangement of teaching and learning materials, involvement of the pupils in the lesson, and assessment of the pupils in the lesson were areas most of the teachers did not perform very well (50%). In addition, the worst area of the teachers’ performance was the presentation of the lessons and the teaching methods used in the lessons. This finding clearly reflected the suggestions in the last question in the questionnaire that more training and capacity building (34%) should be given to the teachers.

Generally, the observation and interview with the teachers in the districts showed that some districts had prepared lesson notes from NGOs which they were using to teach literacy and thus, were not exactly following the NALAP plan, especially Afrikids programme in the Sissala East and West. From this observation, one will realize that programmes are implemented and within a few years they are abandoned because other NGOs come in with different programmes just like the Afrikids literacy programme in selected schools of the Sissala districts. To ensure programme successes in language policy programmes, NGOs should not be so much entertained to interfere with government already implemented policy programmes.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the summary of findings, conclusions and recommendations resulting from the study. The chapter first looks at the summary of the study, derives conclusions and makes recommendations based on the findings of the study. The study was meant to find out the implementation level on the teaching and learning of language and literacy at the lower primary levels with the inception of NALAP. The study sought to evaluate the extent to which NALAP is implemented, especially on the teaching and learning of language and literacy in the lower primary schools in the Upper West Region of Ghana.

5.1 Discussion

The results of this study revealed that there are serious problems in the teaching and learning of language and literacy that might cause poor performance and achievement of lower primary pupils in the basic schools. This situation seems to be a great problem to teachers and pupils at the basic levels. This is quite evident since 50% of the teachers in the interview disagreed they had training in NALAP or language and literacy. It means that if half of the sample had no training, it is certain that they might not be able to teach language and literacy very well as expected.

Furthermore, 90% of the respondents also confirmed in the interview that teachers face difficulties in the teaching of language and literacy while 60% also admitted in the same interview that teachers had difficulty in the use of materials for language and literacy. This finding is in consonance with the results of the EQUALL (2010) implementation study report that teachers in P2 and P3 had difficulty in the use of the
P2 and P3 materials. The interview finding contracts that of the questionnaire in which 64% of the respondents who disagreed that teachers had no difficulty in using the teaching and learning materials provided by NALAP in the classroom.

Again, 100%, 72% and 50% of the respondent teacher indicated in the document analysis, questionnaire and interview respectively that teachers use the Teacher Guide and NALAP instructional materials in the planning and teaching of language and literacy in the lower primary schools. Contrary, 28% and 50% disagreed in the questionnaire and interview that teachers use the Teacher Guide in teaching language and literacy. This revelation is a sign that all the schools were not using the Teacher Guide in the classrooms. And if some were not using the Teacher Guide it could have disastrous consequence on the pupils’ performance at the lower primary levels.

In the document analysis, observation and interview session, it was observed that most of the teachers did not follow the NALAP 90 minute lesson plan for both L1 and L2 instruction, yet in the questionnaire 75% indicated that they did. This revelation is controversial because one cannot explain why the teachers agreed and in practice did not actually practice as planned in the classrooms. The observation also revealed that not much was done on the use of NALAP methods and strategies by those teachers who taught and were observed.

In addition, 63% and 70% agreed in the questionnaire and interview respectively that NALAP materials were available in the schools. It also means that some schools were still not using the NALAP materials because if 37% and 30% disagreed to the statement, it is clear fact others were not using them or they had no materials at all to use. Similarly, 67% and 80% also admitted that the National Acceleration Programme materials were related to the environment and the culture of the pupils in the
questionnaire and interview respectively. On part of using the mother or L1, 87%, 97%, and 100% indicated in the questionnaire on implementation, methods and the interview respectively that the use of both the L1 and L2 was important and necessary in the lower primary schools.

The high general support for the use of the L1 in the interview has some implications. In the first place most of the teachers interviewed said the pupils easily understand concepts better when L1 is used. Secondly the teachers explained that the pupils already had a foundation in the L1 from home and understand it and as a result easily grasp concepts in it. Thirdly, some of teachers indicated that the use of the L1 makes the teachers work easier because he/she has no difficulty struggling to get pupils understand the lesson.

5.2 Summary of Main Findings

This study cannot be concluded without making some comments on the outcome of the findings.

1. Majority of the teachers admitted NALAP was implemented to some extent. The implication of the findings is not conclusive that implementation was perfect since some teachers disagreed on some the views.

2. Teachers were using some of the methods and strategies of NALAP in the lower primary schools. For instance, the use of L1 and L2 falls in line with UNESCO (1953) affirmation that the use of L1 in education is psychologically, sociologically, and educationally beneficial to learners.

3. The findings also revealed 61% of teachers disagreed that NALAP provided sufficient and adequate materials for both teachers and pupils. Similarly, 37% disagreed materials were available. It means that these percentages revealed
are a clear sign that they were not necessarily adequate if 61% indicated materials were insufficient. Finding is also related to Moomen’s (2006) study which revealed that 64.1% felt the materials were insufficient.

4. The results again showed that teaching and learning of language and literacy helped improve the pupils’ four language skills to some extent. It has also facilitated the study of other subjects through the use of the materials, and improved in general performance of pupils.

5. The findings again revealed that 70% of the teachers indicated that there were a lot of challenges in the implementation for NALAP the same percent of respondents had challenges in the use of the NALAP methods in the teaching language and literacy. In the way, 51% agreed that the use of L1 in the teaching and learning of language and literacy was also a challenge to both teachers and pupils. This is a clear sign that the programme had a lot challenges and needed to be resolved.

The implications of these findings is that language policies which do not employ basic planning processes and principles to cater for all these findings are likely to encounter implementation problems. It is therefore recommended that since language and education are two inseparable concepts the main attention of every government should be to develop a comprehensive national language-in-education policy that would place emphasis on providing language learning resources coupled with the training of professional teachers to be able implement language and literacy programmes.
5.3 Conclusions

The goal of this study was to understand whether the teachers at the lower primary schools have implemented NALAP instruction and whether they implemented the NALAP methods and strategies in their classrooms using NALAP materials or not, especially in teaching language and literacy. It was not the researcher’s intent to assess and judge the schools based on the data collected, but to use the data to help inform professional development and increase support for teaching and learning of language and literacy in the lower classes.

In the findings 67% of the respondent teachers affirmed that the spoken language was the same chosen for NALAP materials and was suitable to the local environment. And since NALAP materials were developed to meet societal requirement and reflected socio-cultural needs of the learners, educators and governments should provide adequate teaching learning materials to meet theoretical requirement of teaching language and literacy for learners to develop the four language skills appropriately in the lower primary schools.

Also, this study was based on socio-cultural theory. Thus, language is completely entwined in socio-cultural context, in regards for language teaching, and Ghana language policy must support the socio-cultural needs of the learners. Language teachers must instruct their learners on the background of language usage, choose cultural appropriate teaching style, and explore culturally based linguistic differences to promote understanding instead of creating misconceptions among learners. Language in-education policy should create awareness and understanding of socio-cultural differences, and written to incorporate the cultural values of learners. If teachers therefore, teach language without teaching about the culture in which it operates, the learners will be learning in a vacuum and learners may attach the incorrect meaning to what is being taught. The learners in using the learnt language
may use the language inappropriately or in wrong cultural context, thus defeating the purpose of learning a language.

5.4 Recommendations

From the results discussed in this study and the conclusions made from a number of issues, the findings of this study naturally lead to some recommendations that would help improve the teaching and learning of language and literacy in the lower primary schools. It is therefore, recommended that;

1. the main area that requires attention is to develop a comprehensive National Language in-Education Policy that will place premium on the teaching and learning of language and literacy at the lower primary levels with a strong legal backing, supervision, monitoring and evaluation. This demands the engagement of key educational development partners in the area of language and literacy to collate general views and inputs on the use of L1 and L2 at the lower primary levels, and to review NALAP and arrive at a collective way forward so as to ensure that NALAP initiative to address Ghana’s early grade literacy crisis is fully supported and sustained.

2. school authorities in conjunction with the Ghana Education Service, the Ministry of Education, other organizations and Non-Governmental organizations, should wake up from their slumber and support the teaching and learning of language and literacy by strengthening the capacity building of lower primary school teachers.

3. since language and education are two inseparable concepts, because education is mediated through the use of language, teachers need to be trained to be competent in the use of the L1 and L2 instruction and communication to enable them handle the teaching and learning of language and literacy at the
lower primary levels in our basic schools. This is so because about 46 suggestions representing 34% were made for more training and capacity building of teachers in lower primary school to enable them teach language and literacy effectively.

4. The role of Colleges of Education in preparing teachers for bilingual and bi-literacy education is pivotal to the development of literacy among children in Ghana. And one way of achieving the goals of the Language Policy is to properly solidly incorporate bi-literacy instructional methodology for teaching language and literacy into the Colleges’ of Education programmes so that after trainees completion will be able to implement this in the basic schools.

5. Furthermore, in-service training be given to already practicing teachers in the system and pre-service for newly recruited teachers for the NALAP implementation within ongoing programme by service providers of the Ghana Education Service and the Ministry of Education.

6. The Government in conjunction with the Ministry of Education should provide adequate teaching and learning materials and other resources to ensure effective and efficient progress of the NALAP programme.

5.5 Limitations of the Study

Honesty could have threatened internal validity. Teachers may have been hesitant to state they had limited understanding of language and literacy policy and limited ability to implement it in the classroom. A limitation to consider was the lack of male teachers at the lower primary school level. The researcher was unable to change the lack of males but it was important to keep in mind when analyzing the data. Due to the fact that there were more females than males in the lower primary schools, this might have affected the results of the study.
One other limitation of this study was the scope of the study. There are about two hundred and sixteen (216) Districts in the whole country. However, this study focused on only five districts in one region. This might have affected generalization of the findings. The study could have also covered all lower primary schools in the Upper West Region but due to financial constraints and other resources such as lack of adequate time, only a selected few lower primary schools in five Districts of the region were used.

In addition to this, the use of multiple instruments such as questionnaire, observation, document analysis and interview guide might not have given a true reflection of what is expected from the KG and lower primary teachers, since they might give false information for fear of victimization of any form. Again, uncompromising attitude of some teachers made it difficult to carry out the study as scheduled. Some of the teachers thought the researcher was doing this study to uncover their weaknesses and report to Ghana Education Service, especially the female teachers. Thus, some were reluctant to respond to the questionnaire with the reasons that it was overloaded for them and they were busy trying to prepare their pupils for the end of third term examination.

The teachers at the time of collecting the data from them at their various schools were seriously preparing their pupils for the end of third term examinations and were therefore not willing to compromise with the researcher but with persuasion dialogue some uncomfortable accepted to participate. This development could have also affected their responses to the administration of the four instruments.

Also, at the time of this study, the researcher himself was a fulltime employee in Tumu College of Education, specifically as Head of Department of Languages,
Assistant Hall Master and Assistant Guidance and Counselling Co-ordinator and as a result, was always busy with official duties. In addition, although the researcher is a tutor at the college, other teachers at the lower primary schools in which this study was carried out could have felt threatened since the researcher has been assisting the District Education office in supervision of teachers for promotions.

Another limitation was that the five districts were far apart hence travelling on bad roads from one district to the other to collect or retrieve the questionnaire from the teachers was also a serious challenge. The study on a few districts and a few schools too might affect generalization of the findings for all schools in the region and the country as a whole. Despite these limitations the findings would serve as a guide for further studies in the education enterprise, especially in the area of language and literacy in the lower primary schools.

5.6 Suggestion for Further Study
The study could have covered a wider area, but due to financial constraints and other challenges it was limited in scope as far as the sample coverage was concerned. It is hope this study could be replicated and carried out on a large scale in all the schools in the Upper West Region of Ghana to assess the extent to which the National Literacy Acceleration as well as the language and literacy is implemented in lower primary schools.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF BASIC EDUCATION

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS’ SURVEY

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather comprehensive information that will help improve the National Literacy Acceleration Programme on the teaching of Language Literacy in your school. You are kindly requested to read and offer the required information necessary in this exercise according to your personal candid opinion. Be assured that the answer you provide would be treated with utmost confidentiality and this will provide information on the teaching of language and literacy in lower primary school. Thank you very much for your co-operation.

INSTRUCTION: Please read and tick only one answer for each question like [✓]

SECTION A: PERSONAL DATA
1) Age: a) 20 – 25 [ ] b) 26 – 30 [ ] c) 31 – 35 [ ] d) 36 –40[ ] e) 41–above [ ]

2) Sex a) Male [ ] b) Female [ ]

3) Workplace a) Name of School ......................... b) Name of District .........................

4) Qualification a) Untrained teacher [ ] b) Certificate ‘A’ [ ] Post sec. [ ] c) Diploma [ ] d) Degree [ ] e) Masters [ ]

SECTION B: GENERAL QUESTIONS ON NALAP IMPLEMENTATION
5) The school implemented the combined language and literacy policy of NALAP.

   Strongly agree [ ]
   Agree [ ]
   Disagree [ ]
   Strongly disagree [ ]
6) The school implemented the combined language and literacy period (90mins.) of NALAP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) Lower primary pupils learn to read and write better in a language they speak and understand better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8) Teachers are aware of the new Ghanaian language and English early grade language and literacy programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9) Teachers are able to integrate other available literacy materials (English textbooks, Ghanaian lang., TLMs, etc.) into language and literacy lessons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION C: QUESTIONS ON METHODS AND STRATEGIES OF NALAP

10) Teachers use the lesson plan of NALAP in teaching language and literacy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11) Teachers use the methods and strategies of NALAP in language and literacy lesson delivery.
   - Strongly agree [ ]
   - Agree [ ]
   - Disagree [ ]
   - Strongly disagree [ ]

12) Teachers use both L1 and L2 in teaching language and literacy.
   - Strongly agree [ ]
   - Agree [ ]
   - Disagree [ ]
   - Strongly disagree [ ]

13) Teachers follow the NALAP prescribed Guide in their lesson plans.
   - Strongly agree [ ]
   - Agree [ ]
   - Disagree [ ]
   - Strongly disagree [ ]

14) Teachers are comfortable and proficient with the teaching in the prescribed language and literacy programme.
   - Strongly agree [ ]
   - Agree [ ]
   - Disagree [ ]
   - Strongly disagree [ ]
SECTION D: QUESTIONS ON USE OF NALAP MATERIALS IN THE TEACHING AND LEARNING OF LANGUAGE AND LITERACY

15) Teachers use the Teacher Guide and NALAP instructional materials in the planning and teaching of language and literacy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16) NALAP Teacher Guide is comprehensive enough for teachers to use in teaching language and literacy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17) The pupils’ spoken language is the same language chosen for The NALAP materials and is suitable to local environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18) NALAP has provided sufficient and adequate materials for both teachers and pupils in the teaching and learning of language and literacy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19) The NALAP materials are being used in other lessons apart from language and literacy lessons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19) The NALAP materials are available in the school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION E: QUESTIONS ON WHETHER NALAP FACILITATES LITERACY DEVELOPMENT AND IMPROVE PERFORMANCE IN THE TEACHING AND LEARNING OF LANGUAGE AND LITERACY

20) Teaching of language and literacy in the NALAP has improved pupils reading and writing skills in both L1 and L2.

   Strongly agree [ ]
   Agree [ ]
   Disagree [ ]
   Strongly disagree [ ]

21) Teaching of language and literacy in the NALAP has facilitated and improved pupils’ oral skills and listening skills.

   Strongly agree [ ]
   Agree [ ]
   Disagree [ ]
   Strongly disagree [ ]

22) NALAP has facilitated the study of other subjects through the use of the materials provided.

   Strongly agree [ ]
   Agree [ ]
   Disagree [ ]
   Strongly disagree [ ]

23) Teaching of language and literacy has improved the general performance of lower primary pupils in the NALAP.

   Strongly agree [ ]
   Agree [ ]
   Disagree [ ]
   Strongly disagree [ ]

24) Teaching of language and literacy has improved the development of literacy among lower primary pupils in the NALAP.

   Strongly agree [ ]
   Agree [ ]
   Disagree [ ]
   Strongly disagree [ ]
SECTION F: QUESTIONS ON CHALLENGES OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF NALAP IN THE TEACHING OF LANGUAGE AND LITERACY

25) There are a lot of challenges in the implementation of NALAP with reference to the teaching of language and literacy.

   Strongly agree [ ]
   Agree [ ]
   Disagree [ ]
   Strongly disagree [ ]

26) The teachers have challenges in the use of NALAP methods in the teaching of language and literacy.

   Strongly agree [ ]
   Agree [ ]
   Disagree [ ]
   Strongly disagree [ ]

27) The L1 use in the teaching of the language and literacy is a challenge to both teachers and pupils.

   Strongly agree [ ]
   Agree [ ]
   Disagree [ ]
   Strongly disagree [ ]

28) Teachers have difficulty using the teaching and learning materials provided by NALAP in the classroom.

   Strongly agree [ ]
   Agree [ ]
   Disagree [ ]
   Strongly disagree [ ]

29) Teachers cannot read, write and speak the L1 they are to teach in the lower primary classes.

   Strongly agree [ ]
   Agree [ ]
   Disagree [ ]
   Strongly disagree [ ]

30) Teachers and pupils have difficulty in using the NALAP materials for language and literacy lessons.
31) Suggest things you feel should be put in place for the effective teaching of language and literacy in the lower primary schools.

..........................................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................................
## APPENDIX B

### CLASSROOM INSTRUCTIONAL OBSERVATION GUIDE
(Tick [✓] the appropriate column)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCIES AREA</th>
<th>RATING SCALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVANCE PREPARATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prepares adequate lesson plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>using the NALAP Teacher Guide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESSON PLANNING AND PRESENTATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sets clear lesson objectives for pupils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the lesson and ensures they are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Starts lesson properly with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preliminary introductory activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Arranges and uses teaching learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materials adequately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides sufficient and adequate teacher-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learner activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Carries out lesson presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and development adequately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Involves pupils and allows participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the lesson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uses teaching methods, techniques and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategies of NALAP effectively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assesses and carefully summarizes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language and literacy lesson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizes and controls learners in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the lesson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX C

**DOCUMENT ANALYSIS INSTRUMENT** (Tick [✓] the appropriate column)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF DOCUMENT</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Guide for KG1-P3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Posters for KG1, 2 &amp; P1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonic Cards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary Readers for P2 &amp; P3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils Exercises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let’s Read and Write</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils Books for P1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alphabet Card Set</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Cards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter Cards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

TEACHER INTERVIEW GUIDE

School..................

Class taught..................

Sex..........................

Qualification..................

1). Please, do you have any training in NALAP literacy teaching? a) Yes   b) No

2). Is the use of mother tongue important in the teaching language and literacy? a) Yes   b) No

Reasons..................................................

3). Can you read the Ghanaian Language fluently (Dagaare or Sisaali) a) Yes b) No

4). Are NALAP materials available in your school? a) Yes   b) No

5). Do you use the teacher Guide for teaching language and literacy? a) Yes   b) No

6). Is there any difficulty in the use of the materials for the teaching of language and literacy? a) Yes   b) No

7). Are the NALAP materials related to the environment and culture of the pupils? a) Yes   b) No

8). Have you got any training again on NALAP or Literacy teaching? a) Yes   b) No

9). Are there difficulties you face in the teaching and learning of language and literacy? a) Yes b) No

10). Is NALAP, language and literacy policy necessary a) Yes   b) No

Reasons..................................................
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