MOTHER TONGUE EDUCATION IN OFFICIAL MINORITY LANGUAGES OF ZIMBABWE: A LANGUAGE MANAGEMENT CRITIQUE

By

Eventhough Ndlovu

A Thesis submitted to the Department of Linguistics and Language Practice, Faculty of Humanities of the University of the Free State in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Linguistics

February 2013

Supervisors: Prof. Theodorus du Plessis

Dr. Munene Mwaniki

DECLARATION

I, Eventhough Ndlovu, hereby declare that this thesis submitted by me for the Doctor of Philosophy in Linguistics degree at the University of the Free State is my own independent work and has not previously been submitted by me at another university/faculty. I do further cede copyright of the thesis in favour of the University of the Free State.

…… ……..

Signature Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation and heartfelt gratitude to all the people who helped see this thesis to its completion. Most especially, my two supervisors Prof L.T. du Plessis and Dr M. Mwaniki who so freely and enthusiastically guided the writing of this thesis and provided direction and support. A very special word of thanks goes to Prof Sinfree Makoni, Dr Johan du Plessis, Dr Finnex Ndhlovu, Dr Dion Nkomo, Dr Kobus Marais, Chrismi, Lebohang, Mariana, Marlie and Xany, who took the time to carefully read the draft, offering very helpful advice and constructive suggestions. They assisted me to clarify ideas, thoughts and perspectives by reading different chapters of the thesis.

My sponsors DAAD/ANSTI who graciously funded my studies deserve a big thank you for their financial support throughout the study period. Members of the Department of Linguistics and Language Practice and the Unit for Language Facilitation and Empowerment, both academic and support staff supported me and deserve mention, especially Tannie Reinet, Vanessa, Susan and Corrie - many thanks ladies. I cannot forget all the participants of this study who so freely and enthusiastically participated in this study: Ngiyabonga, Thank you, Kea lebua kamartha, Ndaboka kasa kasa, Ndaboka kwazo kwazo, Twalumba kapati, Ndzakhesa ngopfu, Ndo livhuwa nga maanḓa, Ndinotenda.

I would also like to thank all my family members and brethren who stood with me during the course of the research. Many thanks for the prayers and kind words of encouragement beloveds; they kept me going, especially after the loss of my dear grandmother. Many thanks to friends, Bevs, Dolly, Ennet, IIse, Israel, Jani, Khetha, Marisia, Monna, NaChichi, Trevor and Tshepo. A special word of thanks to Dee, Derick, Hle and Mavunga who monitored media reports related to my topic of study. Thank you Jeanne for translating the abstract, and Danila for editing the whole thesis. Most importantly, I express my deepest gratitude to the Almighty for sustaining me during the course of the research project. Had it not been for the Lord, I would not have done it!

DEDICATION

To my dear grandmother, MaThebe, MaBhoqo, mntakaMkhophe! It is sad that she left me at a time when I needed her the most, but her labour and toiling was not in vain. She was just about to see the fruits of her labour when the Lord called her home.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACALAN – African Academy of Languages

AFRILEX – African Association for Lexicography

ALASA – African Languages Association of Southern Africa

ALRI – African Languages Research Institute

AU – African Union

BIDA – Binga Development Association

CASAS – Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society

CCJP – Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace

CDA – Critical Discourse Analysis

CDU – Curriculum Development Unit

COMESA – Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa

DEO – District Education Officer

ETF – Education Transition Fund

ICT – Information Communication Technology

IMF – International Monetary Fund

LMA – Language Management Approach

MDC – Movement for Democratic Change

PED – Provincial Education Director

PRAESA – Project for the study of Alternative Education in South Africa

PUMA – Patriotic Union of Matabeleland

OSISA – Open Society Initiative of Southern Africa

SAALA – Southern African Applied Linguistics Association

SABC – South African Broadcasting Corporation

SADC – Southern African Development Community

TOLACCO – Tonga Language and Cultural Committee

UN – United Nations

UNDP – United Nations Development Programme

UNESCO – United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation

UNICEF – United Nations Children's Emergency Fund

USAID – United State Agency for International Development

VETOKA – Venda, Tonga and Kalanga Association

ZANU-PF – Zimbabwe African National Union-Patriotic Front

ZIMSEC – Zimbabwe School Examinations Council

ZILPA – Zimbabwe Indigenous Languages Promotion Association

ZPH – Zimbabwe Publishing House

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the background to the study, the statement of the research problem, research questions and objectives as well as the rationale of the study. It also provides the contribution of the study, an overview of the research methodology and an outline of the thesis.

1.2 Background to the study

1.2.1 Language-in-education policy and planning in Zimbabwe

Zimbabwe is a multilingual country. It has an estimate of 16 languages of which three enjoy supremacy and prominence. English is the national official language, i.e. the official language while Ndebele and Shona are the official national languages, i.e. national languages. Kalanga, Tonga, Sotho, Venda, Nambya and Shangani are the official minority languages. There is a preference of the term 'marginalised indigenous languages' for these official minority languages because of the derogatory nature of the term 'minority languages'. The rest of the languages are designated minority languages.

Zimbabwe has no explicit formulated and written language policy or language-in-education policy. The current Zimbabwean language policy elements and language-in-education policy guidelines are enshrined and inferred from the following documents: The *1997 Position Paper on Zimbabwe's Language Policy*; The *1998 Report on the Formulation of a National Language Policy: National Language Policy Advisory Panel Report*; The*1999 Report of the Nziramasanga Commission of Inquiry into Education and Training in Zimbabwe*; The *1979 Constitution of Zimbabwe;* The *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006;* The *1996 National Cultural Policy of Zimbabwe;* The *Secretary's Circular No. 1 of 2002: Policy Regarding Language*

Teaching and Learning; The *Secretary's Circular No. 3 of 2002: Curriculum Policy: Primary and Secondary Schools;* The *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007: Policy Guidelines on the Teaching of Local Languages in Primary and Secondary Schools in Zimbabwe; Re: Response to the Binga Chiefs' Concern on the Teaching of Languages* and the *Zimbabwe School Examinations Council's Examinations Circular Number 2 of 2011; Constitution of Zimbabwe (Draft 17 July 2012)*.

Before the 2002 policy development, in areas where official minority languages are spoken, the *1987 Education Act* permitted the teaching and learning of these languages up to grade 3. Ndebele in Matabeleland, and Shona, in Mashonaland, were used and institutionalised from grade 4. Consequently, the education system relied, and still relies on quick-exit transitional bilingual programs for official minority language speakers. This led, and leads to the complete submersion of minority language groups and even of official minority language groups in some cases. (See: Tremmel, 1994; Mutasa, 1995; Hachipola, 1998; Chimhundu, Nkiwane, Gutsa, Mano, Matimati & Muchemwa, 1998; The *1999 Report of the Nziramasanga Commission of Inquiry into Education and Training in Zimbabwe*; Thondhlana, 2000; Ndhlovu, 2004; 2005; 2008; 2008; 2009; 2010; Mumpande, 2006; Muzondidya and Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2007; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Nkomo, 2007; 2008; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b; Magwa, 2010; 2010; Gondo, 2009; Mavunga, 2010; Makoni, 2011; Ndlovu, 2011).

1.2.2 Approaches to language and language-in-education planning in Zimbabwe

Since the colonial period, language planning in Zimbabwe has been largely a top-down affair typified by the government monopoly. Speakers, implementers and key stakeholders had little or no input. However, bottom-up initiatives of official minority language groups, particularly the Tonga and Kalanga, and later the Venda groups date back to the colonial days. Available research indicates that the activities of the Tonga group began during the Unilateral Declaration of Independence era when sanctions were imposed on the then Southern Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe). These sanctions banned imports and exports from and into Southern Rhodesia. Cross-

border initiatives with Zambia, which was the source of Tonga teaching materials, were also prohibited. This period led to the exclusion of Tonga and other official minority languages such as Sotho, Shangani and Venda in the curriculum, which relied on South Africa for teaching materials (Tremmel, 1994; Mutasa, 1995; Hachipola, 1998; the *1999 Report of the Nziramasanga Commission of Inquiry into Education and Training in Zimbabwe*; Msindo, 2005; 2007; Mumpande, 2006; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b).

Scholars indicate that the exclusion of Tonga in the curriculum was followed by lobbying and advocacy activities by Tonga speakers and their chiefs persuading the government of that time to reconsider its decision. Between 1978 and 1979 the District Commissioner of Binga conformed to the demands of Tonga chiefs and challenged Tonga speakers to produce their own teaching materials. This led to the formation of the Tonga Language and Culture Committee (TOLACCO), which was short-lived because of the intensification of the war for liberation. Similar advocacy and lobbying activities happened in the other language groups, particularly among the Venda, Kalanga and Nambya groups (Tremmel, 1994; Hachipola, 1998; Mumpande, 2006; Msindo, 2005; 2007; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b).

With the realisation of the power of a united front, after independence the Tonga group formed a coalition with the Kalanga and Venda group. This led to the establishment of the Venda, Tonga and Kalanga Association (VETOKA) in the early 1980s. The lobbying and advocacy activities of VETOKA instigated a new policy development in 1987 which stipulated that *the minister may* authorise the teaching of these languages *up to grade 3 in areas where they are spoken in addition to Ndebele or Shona*. VETOKA did not stand the test of time and collapsed due to financial challenges and a lack of continuity in the leadership of the coalition. Despite the collapse of VETOKA, it is recorded that these groups continued to separately lobby the ministry of education. These groups lobbied mainly through letters and newspaper articles. (See: *Kalanga Language Committee Letter to Minister of Education*, 15 May 1989 cited in Mumpande (2006); *Tonga Language Committee*

Letter to the Minister of Education, 18 July 1989 cited in Mumpande, 2006; *"Tonga Elders press for Teaching of their Language in Schools*" in *The Herald*, 25 April 1994 cited in Tremmel, 1994; *Sunday News*, 3 December 2000 cited in Nyika, 2008a; '*Body wants Minority Languages taught in Schools'* in the *The Daily News*, 2 May 2001 cited in Mumpande, 2006).

In 1996 the Tonga group revived the TOLACCO after the launch of Tremmel's (1994) book, *The People of the Great River*. The launch of this book saw the coming in of Silveria House and the Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace (CCJP) in Binga. With financial assistance from the USAID, Silveria House and the CCJP advocated, lobbied and rolled out civic education to the Tonga group. These lobbying and advocacy activities in Binga led to the identification of the language issue as one of the issues that needed to be addressed to ensure equal access to education for majority and minority language speakers alike. They also sought to redress colonial and postcolonial injustices of marginalisation and the exclusion of ethnic minorities as well as to preserve minority languages and the identity and culture of minority language groups which were threatened by assimilationalist policies which were aimed at achieving nationalist and nationist goals (Tremmel, 1994; Mutasa, 1995; the *1999 Report of the Nziramasanga Commission of Inquiry into Education and Training in Zimbabwe*; Chimhundu, *et al*., 1998; Hachipola, 1998; Mumpande, 2006; Ndhlovu, 2005; 2008a; 2008b; 2009; 2010; Nkomo, 2007; 2008; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b).

With the recurrent realisation of the power of numbers, the Tonga group in collaboration with Silveria House, formed a coalition with other official minority language groups. This led to the formation of the Zimbabwe Indigenous Languages Promotion Association (ZILPA) in 2001. It is because of the lobbying and advocacy activities of these language groups' language associations and committees, ZILPA, representatives of language associations for the official minority language speakers, chiefs from Binga and Hwange, Silveria House, community-based organisations and a constitutional law expert that the 2002 policy was developed (Mumpande, 2006;

Ndhlovu, 2004; 2005; 2008a; 2008b; 2009; 2010; Nkomo, 2007; 2008; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b; Makoni, 2011).

The major argument of the advocacy groups was that the Education Act marginalised and discriminated against minority language speakers. The 2002 policy development only followed after a series of meetings between ZIPLA, representatives of associations for the official minority language speakers, chiefs from Binga and Hwange, representatives from the ministry of education, the education portfolio committee, members of parliament for the constituencies inhabited by official minority language speakers, Silveria House, the USAID, other funding partners and a constitutional law expert. A meeting on 17 October 2001 was the final meeting which led to the 2002 policy development. The policy was declared on 3 January 2002 and applied with immediate effect (Tremmel, 1994; Hachipola, 1998; Ndhlovu, 2004; 2005; 2008; 2008; 2009; 2010; Mumpande, 2006; Zvobgo, 2007; Nkomo, 2007; 2008; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b; Magwa, 2010).

A detailed discussion on the 2002 policy development was compiled by Mumpande (2006), a Tonga speaker who is employed at Silveria House. Silveria House is an advocacy group involved in civic education, research and community mobilisation. Silveria House engages with all official minority language groups to promote the development, teaching and learning of official minority languages. Mumpande's discussion is a lucid description of language activism, particularly in the Tonga group. Msindo (2005; 2007), a scholar in History, discusses the history of language activism of the Kalanga group extensively. He notes that the resistance to education in Ndebele dates back to the early days of colonialism when Doke recommended the use of Ndebele as the medium of instruction in Kalanga speaking areas.

1.3 Statement of the research problem and research questions

In 2002 the government of Zimbabwe through the Ministry of Education, Sport, Arts and Culture declared that with effect from January 2002, it was going to implement the use and teaching of the official minority languages as media of instruction and

subjects in primary schools in areas where they are spoken. The languages covered in this policy development include Venda, Tonga, Kalanga, Nambya, Sotho and Shangani. The ministry stated that these languages would be introduced to a grade per year until they could be taught at grade 7 by 2005 (The *Secretary Circular No 1 of 2002* and The *Secretary's Circular No 3 of 2002*). Among these languages, Venda, Tonga and Kalanga were the pioneers of the advocacy and lobbying activities that constituted the foundation of the 2002 policy development through VETOKA.

However, despite being pioneers, Kalanga and Venda have remained behind. Six years after the target year 2005, out of the six languages concerned, only one language, Tonga, emerged as the first to be examined at grade 7 in 2011. Why this delay and why was Tonga first? What is the secret behind the success of Tonga? Since Venda, Tonga and Kalanga were pioneers that laid the foundation for the 2002 policy development; I decided to focus on them. My assumption is that they would be the first language groups to implement the policy. The focus was also limited to these languages due to restrictions on the length of the thesis.

Multilingual language-in-education policy implementation is a challenge as is usually manifest in top-down language-in-education policies. In current studies on language planning, policy and management there have been strong suggestions that bottom-up approaches may be more successful than top-down approaches. Bottom-up approaches are said to be the most promising in terms of community commitment and sustainability. They are described as a strong foundation for strong programs, which, however, must be supported at the official level by legislation that shift from assimilationist to multilingual policies; policies that tolerate and promote ethnic and linguistic diversity and equity and policies that enshrine and guarantee linguistic human rights and educational linguistic human rights. Scholars who advanced this thinking argue that localised planning supported by national policy and ideology are essential and are likely to be successful (Alexander, 1992; Baldauf, 1994; 2005; 2008; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Mwaniki, 2004; 2010a; Benson, 2005; Trudell, 2006; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008; Hatoss, 2008).

Despite these strong suggestions in recent developments in language planning that bottom-up approaches may be more successful – there appears to be a delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development, which was a result of a bottom-up approach to language planning. In this regard, this study seeks to address the following research questions:

1. Is the 2002 policy development a case of bottom-up language planning?
2. Do bottom-up approaches necessarily guarantee policy implementation?
3. How would the theories adopted in this study explain the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy and the success story of Tonga as well as possibly facilitate the implementation of the 2002 policy development?

To examine the causes for the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development and the factors and conditions that led to the success story of Tonga, I adopted the Language Management Approach (LMA). I used the LMA together with Kaplan and Baldauf's (1997; 2003) seven areas of policy development for language-in-education policy implementation; Giles, Bourhis and Taylor's (1977) ethnolinguistic vitality model and Webb's (2010) factors and conditions that determine the success or failure of top-down and bottom-up policies. The seven areas of policy development, the ethnolinguistic vitality model and Webb's factors overlap with language management variables, methodologies and strategies. The three frameworks are interrelated and also overlap. These theories are considered essential complementary theories to the LMA in accounting for the non-implementation dilemmas bedeviling multilingual language policies that are either as a result of top-down or bottom-up approaches to language planning.

1.4 Aims and objectives of the study

This study seeks to examine the causes for the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development and the conditions and factors that led to the success story of Tonga.

The objectives of the study are:

1. To investigate and describe bottom-up language planning dynamics in relation to implementation realities.
2. To describe the development of the 2002 policy.
3. To evaluate the implementation of the 2002 policy development in classroom practice.
4. To recommend interventions to facilitate the implementation of the 2002 policy development and similar initiatives elsewhere.

1.5 Rationale and significance of the study

The uniqueness of the bottom-up approach to language-in-education planning in Zimbabwe has not been adequately captured in the scholarly discourse; hence this study seeks to fill this hiatus. To my knowledge, a few scholars have focused on bottom-up initiatives of official minority language speakers, but not much has been done to evaluate the implementation process of the 2002 policy development and the success story of Tonga. These scholars include Tremmel (1994); Hachipola (1998); Chimhundu, *et al*. (1998); the *1999 Report of the Nziramasanga Commission of Inquiry into Education and Training in Zimbabwe*; Thondhlana, 2000; Ndhlovu (2004; 2005; 2008a; 2008b; 2009; 2010); Mumpande (2006); Nkomo (2007; 2008); Makoni, Makoni & Nyika (2008); Nyika (2008a; 2008b); Magwa, 2010a; 2010b; Mavunga (2010); Gondo (2010); Makoni (2011) and Ndlovu (2011).

The research of some of these scholars focuses on the initiatives of these groups before the 2002 policy development. Some of the works trace and describe the development of the 2002 policy development and a few examine the implementation process. But they have not evaluated the causes for the delay in the pioneering language groups and the conditions and factors that led to the success story of Tonga. The bulk of the research on language-in-education policy and planning in Zimbabwe focuses on English and Ndebele and / or Shona. These studies focus on the politics of language and language use in Zimbabwe in relation to English, Ndebele and Shona. Recently, Nkomo (2007; 2008) and Ndhlovu (2004; 2005; 2008a; 2008b), and particularly Ndhlovu (2009) focused on the politics of language in

relation to Ndebele and Shona. Scholars such as Mutasa (1995) and Hachipola (1998) pioneered studies that focus mainly on minority languages of Zimbabwe, which include the current official minority languages.

Scholars such as Moyo (2002); Ndhlovu (2005; 2005; 2008a; 2008b; 2009; 2010); Nkomo (2007; 2009); Makoni, Makoni & Nyika (2008); Nyika (2008a; 2008b); Makoni (2011) and Ndlovu (2011) have also extended their research focus to minority and official minority languages of Zimbabwe in their evaluation of the politics of language and language use in Zimbabwe. However, their central focus is on English, Shona and Ndebele. The current observation and findings that dominant African national languages equally thwart and subdue the development, teaching and learning of minority languages, deem it worthwhile and necessary to extend the research focus. The expanded research focus needs to examine the politics of language and their effects on the promotion, development, teaching and learning of non-dominant languages in situations which involve indigenous languages only.

Researchers who focused on the implementation process of the 2002 policy development, such as Nkomo (2007; 2008); Ndhlovu (2009); Ndlovu (2011), concluded that the policy failed to take-off because of the lack of political will and unavailability of teachers and teaching materials. Makoni, Makoni & Nyika (2008) and Nyika (2008a; 2008b) focus on the bottom-up activities of the Tonga, but do not discuss the implementation process examining the causes of the delay in the teaching and learning of Tonga and the success story of Tonga. Gondo (2009) focuses on the Shangani group and concludes that the lack of political will and unavailability of teachers and teaching materials contribute to the delay in the teaching of Shangani. Mavunga (2010) examines the effects of using Shona as a medium of instruction for Tonga speakers in the Nyaminyami District. Makoni (2011) evaluates the adequacy of the stipulations of Section 62 of the *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006* to promote the teaching of minority languages of Zimbabwe. He also assessed the effects of the historical and contemporary status of minority languages in terms of their development, teaching and learning.

Given that the policy in question was as a result of a bottom-up approach to language planning, it is necessary to investigate how the micro, meso and macro levels individually, and in relation to each other contribute to the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development. The same examination needs to take place with regard to the success story of Tonga. This study hopes to contribute to the further improvement of the Zimbabwean language-in-education policy and to better our understanding of how bottom-up approaches work to reduce uncertainty and risk of failure of similar initiatives. It is expected that understanding the causes of the delay in the implementation process, and the conditions and factors that led to the success story of Tonga, may be beneficial in explaining the delay in the implementation process of the other three official minority languages and similar initiatives elsewhere.

This study is an evaluative case study. It aims to evaluate the implementation process of the 2002 policy development to provide improvement-oriented and knowledge-oriented evaluations. Generalisations from this evaluation can also percolate into the body of knowledge for future planners, researchers and agents of language planning to draw from. These generalisations and ideas from the selected cases may also help to shape and inform the formulation of similar policies. On theoretical level, the study hopes to extend the frontiers of research in language-in-education policy, planning, implementation and management and locate the discourse on bottom-up planning within the contemporary debate in the field.

1.6 Overview of research design and methodology

This study is an evaluative case study that largely employs qualitative research techniques for data collection and its analysis. However, a language survey and learners' questionnaires were used, which were analysed qualitatively and quantitatively. The study uses a multi-method approach in the collection of data. This was done to enhance reliability and ensure triangulation of results. The approach also assists to cross-check the findings of one method with another and thus enhances validity. The study employs documentary analysis, semi-structured

interviews, focus group discussions, language survey questionnaires, learners' questionnaires and disclosed non-participant structured class observations. The participants of the study are agents and participants of language-in-education policy, planning and management. Data collection and analysis are all informed by the theoretical frameworks of this study and the reviewed literature. A detailed discussion of the research design and methodology of the study is presented in chapter 4.

1.7 Outline of the remainder of the thesis

This thesis is organised into six chapters:

Chapter 1 provides a background to the language-in-education policy and planning in Zimbabwe. It presents a brief discussion of the colonial and postcolonial language-in-education policies and planning activities that led to the 2002 policy development. It traces the history of advocacy and lobbying that culminated in the development of the 2002 policy development. The chapter includes the research problem statement, research questions, aim and objectives, the rationale and significance of the study, an overview of the research design and methodology as well as an outline of the thesis.

Chapter 2 comprises of the literature research, which provides a summary of the research of the most authoritative scholarship on language-in-education policy, planning, implementation and management. It reveals the agendas concealed by language-in-education policies. These hidden agendas contribute to the non-implementation dilemmas which bedevil multilingual language-in-education policies since schools are state properties and useful tools for achieving national objectives. Schools are also useful tools of creating, sustaining, perpetuating and entrenching social and linguistic inequalities. The chapter also discusses the process of, and approaches to language-in-education planning and implementation. It also describes the participants involved in the school domain and their roles. It provides a discussion on the vitality model and Webb's (2010) factors and conditions that determine the

success and failure of bottom-up and top-down policies. This literature guided and informed the data collection and analysis process.

Chapter 3 presents the theoretical frameworks that serve as source of reference to understand and evaluate the implementation process of the 2002 policy development and guide the data collection and analysis process. In Chapter 3 the historical development of the LMA, its tenets and the major contributors to its development are presented. It also discusses Kaplan & Baldauf's (1997; 2003) seven areas of policy development for language-in-education policy development. The application and relevance of these frameworks to understand and evaluate the implementation process of the 2002 policy development is given in this chapter.

Chapter 4 provides a discussion of the research design and methodology adopted in this study to examine the causes of the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development as well as the conditions and factors that led to the success story of Tonga.

Chapter 5 provides a presentation, analysis and discussion of the data.

Chapter 6 provides an interpretation, discussion and summary of the main conclusions of the study. It also provides recommendations that can be adopted to facilitate the implementation of the 2002 policy development and similar initiatives elsewhere.

CHAPTER TWO

LANGUAGE-IN-EDUCATION POLICY, PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

2.1 Introduction

As Bamgbose (1991:62) rightly notes, the importance of language-in-education planning seems too obvious to require any elaboration. Language-in-education planning is part of national human resource development planning. It is a crucial bedrock of any educational system, especially considering its centrality in national human resource development planning. Education is not only the basis for mass participation, but it is also a means of upward social mobility and manpower training. It encompasses development in its widest sense to fully realise human potential and utilise this potential and the nation's resources for the benefit of all. It is also a major step to socio-cultural, human and economic development (Hawes, 1979; Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; Adegbija, 1994a; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; UNDP, 2004; 1999; 1996; Prah, 2000; Bruns, Mingat & Rakotomalala, 2003; UNESCO, 2006; Kendall & Benson, 2008; Faller, 2008; Djité, 2008).

Language is one of the most critical aspects of any educational system. It is a unique human attribute that enables people to learn, think creatively and change socially. Education is one field in which the language matters of a country can be generally understood (UNESCO, 1953; Cummins, 1981; 2000; Obanya, 1980; 2004; Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; 2007; Adegbija, 1994a; Prah, 2000a; 2000b; 2002; 2005; Batibo, 2005; Molosiwa, 2005; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000; Nyati-Ramahobo, 2000; Reyes & Moll, 2008; Ndhlovu, 2009).

2.2 Language-in-education planning: Definition

Language-in-education planning is also called acquisition planning (Cooper, 1989:33) or language planning in education (Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003:217). Language-in-education planning is one type of language planning activity within a typology of approaches which also includes status, corpus and prestige planning. Language-in-

education planning mainly affects the education sector and it substantially involves formal education structures. In acquisition planning organised efforts are directed at promoting the learning of a language and increasing the number of users – speakers, writers, listeners, or readers (Cooper, 1989:153).

Language-in-education planning is about those measures needed to develop and sustain language proficiency of individuals or communities as part of a language environment or language ecology. It consists of user related learning goals that need to be achieved, usually through the educational (formal and extrinsic) system although individuals develop their own language learning programs (informal and intrinsic) (Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003:217). Language-in-education planning is also about developing both policies for and the specific methods and materials to support individual and community language development for different uses to which the language is to be put. These goals may meet societal, institutional or individual needs (Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003:217).

Wright (2004:61) define language-in-education planning as efforts that seek to bring citizens to competence in the languages designated as national, official or the medium of education or subject. Language-in-education planning is positioned between language policy-making and the classroom with its curriculum. According to Mwaniki (2004:243) language-in-education planning is an aspect of language promotion. It is a methodology or strategy for language management that presupposes the need of programmes and structures within multilingual policy and planning implementation processes. These processes support the acquisition of language competence for speakers with or without knowledge of certain language(s).

Language-in-education planning is divided into two parts, namely, skills development and acquisition planning. Skills development refers to the improvement in the distribution of levels of competence in the population. Acquisition planning means to the increase in the number of individuals who are able to use a particular language at a given level of proficiency (Grin & Vaillancourt, 1999:57). These definitions are

adopted in this study in discussing language-in-education planning, policy and management in Zimbabwe

2.2.1 Language-in-education planning and the nationalist ideology

Language-in-education planning falls under social purpose language planning and it represents the public face of language planning. It is frequently selected as a site for national language planning because the education sector has a more subtle and greater influence on language unlike other sectors. Because of its organised nature, the education sector is often seen as the most potent resource to bring about language change. It represents the key implementation procedure vehicle for language policy and planning. Of all the sectors involved in language planning, it is probably the most crucial. Sometimes it indeed bears the entire burden of language implementation (Eastman, 1983; Gellner, 1997; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; May, 2001; 2006; Fishman, 2006; Shohamy, 2006; Ferguson, 2006; Lo Bianco, 2008; Djité, 2008).

Education receives the most attention in language planning because there is a direct link between the language(s) of education and development. The language(s) used as media of instruction are a clear indication of a country's vision for the future. Together therewith, the quality of education is determined by the language-in-education policy. The education sector and particularly the classrooms are sites where all the entities of the policy system converge and generate tension (Djité, 2008:54).

In his description of the intricate relationship between language, politics and education, Joseph (2006:46, 49) notes that if language and politics were a country, education would be its capital. It would be the great centralised and centralising metropolis where everyone passes through and from which the country is run and its future course determined. Education is at the centre of any language or political debate. It is through education that national identity is created, performed, reflected and, above all, reproduced. Schooling is a form of social and cultural reproduction. It

is openly linked to other societal structures, especially the political and economic ones which produce social relations (Eastman, 1983; Tollefson, 1991; 2002a; 2006; Corson, 1993; Gellner, 1997; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Hailemariam, 2002; May, 2001; 2006; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004a; Tsui and Tollefson, 2004b; Strydom, 2003; Wright, 2004; Paulston & Heidemann, 2006; Fishman, 2006; Ferguson, 2006; Shohamy, 2006; Rassol, 2007; Lo Bianco, 2008; Novak-Lukanovič & Limon, 2012).

Education is a key institution in the apparatus of a nation state. It is a pivotal agent in the inculcation of state values. Through the education system, language-in-education policies serve as vehicles by means of which the agenda of the national language policy can be implemented. The reason is that schools are heavily guarded by gatekeepers of the nation-state. In postcolonial countries, the educational agenda to use the most effective medium of education is often clouded by political agendas of nation building, national identity construction and to foster national unity, cohesion and integration. Language-in-education policies inculcate established traditional values and nationalist attitudes along with and through the medium of instruction. They are interwoven with other aspects of socialisation into national life and the acquisition of a national identity (Tollefson, 1991; 2002b; 2006; Gellner, 1997; May, 2001; 2006; Wright, 2004; Fishman, 2006; Shohamy, 2006; Lo Bianco, 2008; Ndhlovu, 2010).

Language-in-education policies are also seen as ways to create order and manage and control the linguistic repertoire of the nation. They serve as vehicles to perpetuate and promote national language policy goals and are the means to achieve the status, acquisition, corpus and prestige goals of language planning (Harlech-Jones, 1990; Gellner, 1997; Daoust, 1997; Dorian, 1999; Orman, 2008; Ferguson, 2006; May 2001; 2006; Shohamy, 2006; Paulston & Hiedemann, 2006; Wright, 2004; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2006; Bamgbose, 2007; Ndhlovu, 2009; Spolsky, 2009; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh 2010; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010).

Whenever reference is made to status planning, the domain that comes to mind is education. Status planning tends to be restricted to education because all subject matter must be taught through language. It inevitably follows that implicit or explicit language policies in education must be formulated. It is therefore not surprising that in most countries national language policies are mainly enshrined in language-in-education policies or documents. Since language planning involves a change of habits, namely, practices, attitudes or ideologies, education is the surest way to success because it directed to the youth whose attitudes are more easily manipulated (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Bamgbose, 2000; Ferguson, 2006).

A language policy is likely to be easier to sell in education, since it mainly affects the school-going population, which is more inclined to be educated. Schools are also by nature conservative institutions which are expected to pass established traditional values through their language-in-education policy. Language-in-education policies are powerful mechanisms to create *de facto* language policies given the fact that children in most countries are obliged to attend school. Schooling focuses on the young and its sway continues uninterrupted for many years among those who stay within the system. These policies are oriented towards future gains that may last further. Education is the agency that carries this concern for a number of years in each child's life into every corner of the country because it is obligatory. These unique attributes of the education sector renders a very lucrative language-shift mechanism to it (Paulston, 1988; 1994; Gellner, 1997; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Adegbija, 2001; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004a; Ndhlovu, 2009; Wright, 2004; Fishman, 2006; May, 2001; 2006; Ferguson, 2006; Shohamy, 2006; Rassol, 2007; Lo Bianco, 2008; Novak-Lukanovič & Limon, 2012).

The education sector has the power to promote and disseminate certain ideas about the appropriateness of a language, whether relating to standard or non-standard codes, national or non-national or official or non-official and majority or minority language. It provides systematic and repeatable socialisation, which other domains cannot provide. The pervasive influence thereof is institutionalised in the education sector and originates from the power that social institutions like education have, to do

things that individuals can never do on their own. In terms of institutional arrangement, the most organised domain to evaluate the way in which the global macro objectives of language policy and planning processes are related to their implementation is the school system with its classrooms. Language-in-education planning is considered as the most powerful tool to create and impose language behaviour in a system which is state controlled, centralised, largely state-funded and compulsory for all children to participate (Cooper, 1989; Fishman, 1991; Corson, 1993; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Hailemariam, 2002; Obanya, 2004; Bamgbose, 2007; Cartwright, 2006; Fishman, 2006; Ferguson, 2006; May, 2001; 2006; Shohamy, 2006; Lo Bianco, 2008).

Schools are one of the key agencies of socialisation. School pupils are a captive audience and the curriculum affords the state unequalled opportunity to shape the attitudes and behaviours of the next generation. It is therefore not surprising to note that the education sector has been a cornerstone in processes of national transformation. The boundary between language policy-making and language-in-education planning is often unclear. The latter seeks to indicate how the ideals, goals and content of the language policy can be realised in the education system to an extent that is relevant (Ingram, 1989; Cooper, 1989; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; May, 2001; 2006; Hailemariam, 2002; Spolsky, 2004; 2009; Wright, 2004; Ferguson, 2006; Shohamy, 2006; Fishman, 2006; Cartwright, 2006; Lo Bianco, 2008).

According to Rassool (2007:248-249), the choice of particular language(s) for teaching and learning plays a major role in defining the ethno-cultural basis of the politically constructed nation. Language-in-education policies underscribe the literary canon and forms of knowledge legitimated in social policy as hegemonic cultural capital. They imbuies learners with sets of beliefs, morales, traditions and values embedded in the dominant culture. They also shape the cultural and linguistic norms of society as a whole.

Rassool (2007:252) further notes that language-in-education policies serve a socio-cultural role because they frame the cultural knowledge to be learnt. They do not only

include legitimised scientific and technological knowledge, literary canons and historical accounts, but also beliefs, values, aspirations and expectations embedded in the idea of citizenship. Representation of different groups of people, their languages, cultures and social roles therefore play a critical role in educational processes and practices. Through language-in-education policies dominant groups establish hegemony in language use. Language-in-education policies can therefore increase the subjugation and displacement of some languages, undermine cultural landscapes and contribute to the painful demise of cultural ways of knowing and doing (Rassool, 2007:257).

Language-in-education policy can also be instrumental to cultural and linguistic imperialism, but they also have the ability to promote linguistic diversity and cultural pluralism (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). In the nationalist discourse, multilingualism is usually perceived as a barrier to nation building, national integration, unity and identity and a threat to the unity of the state (Dorian, 1998; Coulmas, 1998; May, 2001; 2006; Luoch & Ogutu, 2002; Kamwendo, 2005; Ndhlovu, 2005; 2008a; 2009). Kamwendo (2005:150) describes nation building as 'an altar on which ethnic and linguistic diversity is sacrificed.' Competing languages are deliberately and subtly accorded low status and prestige. The teaching of such languages is allowed under stringent conditions which ultimately make their teaching impossible or very minimal. Covert and overt language-in-education policies are declared and implemented to secure the status of the national language and to assimilate or suppress minority languages. Measures, such as compulsory teaching and learning in the national language with compulsory nationwide teaching and learning of the national language constitute some of the key strategies to secure the position of the national language.

Nationalism results in the transfer of prestige and assertion of superiority to the national language(s). In extreme cases minorities are given no or little rights and space. Nationalism by implication involves the suppression of minority languages. It leads to either overt or covert suppression of minorities. The adoption of national language(s) endangers socially, politically and economically less powerful languages. The tendency to neglect minority languages is often a result of the promotion of

strong national languages (Daoust, 1997; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Crystal, 2000; Batibo, 2005; 2009; Ndhlovu, 2005; 2008a; 2009; Makoni, 2011). Education has often played a key role to facilitate and at times enforce the transition to a majority national language. Education and the language(s) legitimated in and through education play a key role to establish and maintain the subsequent cultural and linguistic shape of a nation state (Safran, 1999:92).

If one or two dominant language(s) are emphasized in the school curriculum, speakers of other languages are forcibly assimilated into the dominant languages because education through the medium of the dominant language is decisive in this assimilation (Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010:11). Support to the national language in public education is an important means to promote the national language. It eventually leads to the linguistic and cultural assimilation by minorities and a shift to the national language. It is mainly due 'to the perception of forced assimilation that the issue of the medium of instruction in the national language becomes tied (Paulston, 1988; 1994; Batibo, 2004; 2005; 2009a; 2009b; Monaka, 2009; Bagwasi, 2009; Gatsha, 2009; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh, 2010; Makoni, 2011; Ndlovu, 2011).

Those who are exposed to the language of instruction the longest and the most intensively will probably shift to it as adults and after school. An example of the exposure is coercive measures in schools such as to learn it as a compulsory and core subject. This language may become the *lingua franca* among the products of such an education system and graduates, and ultimately the mother tongue of a new generation. The reason is that education is all about acculturation, and receiving education mainly or exclusively in a language that is foreign to one's culture, one gradually loses familiarity with his/her culture and start to absorb cultural values inherent in the language he/she has been educated in (Bamgbose, 1991; 2007; Schiffman, 1996; Ongarora, 2002; Obanya, 2004; Fishman, 2006; May, 2006; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2006; Schemidt, 2006; Ndhlovu, 2008a; 2009).

The route to nationhood occurs through the ethnicisation of a polity through its education system. Nation building usually involves the formulation and implementation of education and language policies and the promotion of national symbols via the education system. The battle for nationhood is often a battle for linguistic and cultural hegemony. According to Duekheim (1956:70) cited in May (2001:167), Kedourie (1960:83-84) cited in May (2001:172) and Orman (2008:24) the general belief is that a nation state can survive only if there exists a sufficient degree of homogeneity. Education perpetuates and reinforces this homogeneity by fixing in the child, from very early, the essential similarities that collective life demands. In this regard, the purpose of education is rather political, namely, to bend the will of the learners to the will of the nation.

Research shows that a minority group, whose children attend school in a non-mother tongue environment, usually cannot reproduce itself as a minority. The reason is that in multilingual settings, classrooms are significant sites for the production and reproduction of cultural and linguistic identity. Language is the main vehicle for the replication, construction and transmission of a culture. It is the primary vehicle of acculturation and learning a culture. Languages are the vehicles through which cultural experiences are accumulated, stored and transmitted from one generation to another. With each newly learnt language one acquires a new soul. A man or woman who knows two languages is worth two men or women. As the medium for teaching and learning, language plays a major role to transmit culture through the literary canons and knowledge base sanctioned by the language-in-education policy (Schiffman, 1996; Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981; 2000; 2003; 2006; Crystal, 2000; Obanya, 2004; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004a; Batibo, 2004; 2005; 2009a; 2009b; Ndhlovu, 2008a; 2009; Gatsha, 2009; Monaka, 2009; Bagwasi, 2009; Paulston & Hiedemann, 2006; Bamgbose, 2007; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh, 2010; Novak-Lukanovič & Limon, 2012).

As nation states are built, ethnic languages are replaced by national languages (Buck, 1916:47-49) cited in Safran (1999:78). According to Phillipson (1999:95), one way to forge unity is to select one or more languages as official and national. Most

nation states regard a common national language as central to their nation building policies and implement policies and planning measures accordingly (Orman, 2008:35). Every *bona fide* national language is emblematic of the spirit of a nation and is seen as a unifying force. National languages are viewed as the emblems of national oneness and identity. Nationalism is primarily a principle that the political and national unit should be congruent, and the national unit is most commonly defined in terms of language (Fasold, 1984:77; Obeng & Adegbija, 1999:364).

Ndhlovu (2009:3) states that nation building is a social and political process that seeks to construct a uniform identity for culturally diverse people that exist within boundaries of a specific nation-state. Nationalism accelerates the trend toward linguistic homogeneity (Levy, 2003:233). It often favours linguistic assimilation to ensure that every member of that particular nation is able to speak and use the dominant national language. In most cases the spread, perpetuation and promotion of the national language is executed by the education sector because of its compulsory implementation and the sector's open link with other structures in society (Daoust, 1997:442-443).

National identity is by definition and design, underpinned by notions of exclusion and inclusion because it constructs parameters where some people are included and others are excluded. Ethnically based cultural nationalism, based on a particular language, is usually a subpolitical component of politically based nationalism whereby the language of the dominant ethnic group becomes a superordinate medium (Gellner, 1997; Daoust, 1997; Safran, 1999; May, 2001; 2006; Gill, 2004; Batibo, 2005; 2009b; Kamwendo, 2005; Orman, 2008; Ndhlovu, 2009).

The basic and essential ingredient of national identity is a common language which is viewed as a cultural institution. Language serves as a major building block of nations. Language is important in its role in the politicisation of nationalism that culminates in the creation of a state. Nationalist sentiments endow language with political importance. There is therefore a strong connection between nationalism and language and the emphasis on a common language is believed to lead to a collective

national identity. The presence of a national language is often perceived as important to enhance feelings of nationalism and unity. A national language is one of the conspicuous banners of nationality and a force to shape nationalism (Gellner, 1997; Daoust, 1997; Safran, 1999; May, 2001; 2006; Gill, 2004; Kamwendo, 2005; Orman, 2008; Ndhlovu, 2009; Batibo, 2009b).

2.2.2 Language-in-education planning and inequality

The classroom in multilingual settings is significant for the production and reproduction of social (in)-equality. Education is evoked as a primary site wherein (in)-equality is reproduced, as well as challenged (Tollefson, 1991; 2002a; Tsui & Tollefson, 2004; Paulston & Hiedemann, 2006). From the state's viewpoint, education is a primary means of social control. From the individual's or family's point of view it is a means of upward social mobility (Cooper, 1989:112). Education is thus a direct political activity, regarded and utilised as a key instrument by policy makers (Cooper, 1989:112; Harlech-Jones, 1990:68). Language-in-education policies are never politically neutral. They are ideologically laden and often not merely about a choice of language as medium of instruction, but central to a host of social processes. They reflect social judgement, not only about language, but on a number of factors that bear no overt relationship to language. They represent a form of imposition and manipulation of language policy because they are used by authority to turn ideology into practice through formal education. Language-in-education policies are mechanisms to turn into practice or practice into ideology, and they often reflect the ideological position of those who control them (Tollefson, 1991; 2002a; Corson, 1993; Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; McGroaty, 2002; Tsui & Tollefson, 2004; Shohamy, 2006; Wodak, 2007; Lo Bianco, 2009; Abdelhay, Makoni & Makoni, 2011).

Although acquisition planning also focuses on other goals, the choice of the language of instruction accounts for the lion's share of this planning. Decisions on the media of instruction for school systems are status planning decisions, which are most commonly subject to strong political pressures. The extent to which educational and pedagogical considerations influence the choice of medium of instruction are in most

cases clouded by political and economic considerations (Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; Cooper; 1989; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Tollefson, 1991; 2002a; 2006; McGroarty, 2002; Tsui & Tollefson, 2004; Spolsky, 2004; 2009; Wright, 2004; Shohamy, 2006; Ferguson, 2006).

The decision on the medium of instruction is often driven or clouded by political agendas of nation building, national identity and unity as well as the need to ensure political stability. This stems from need to balance the interests of different ethnic groups, classes or political parties. The choice of the medium of instruction is a reflection of the socio-political and economic forces at work in the nation, as well as a vehicle for the struggle for power among different social groups (Cooper, 1989; Bamgbose, 1991; Tollefson, 1991; 2002b; 2006; Corson, 1993; Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004a; Annamalia, 2004; Wright, 2004; Ferguson, 2006; Shohamy, 2006; May, 2001; 2006; Fishman, 2006; Ricento, 2006; Wodak, 2007; Lo Bianco, 2009; Abdelhay, Makoni & Makoni, 2011).

The decision on the choice of the medium of instruction is never a simple educational issue. Among competing agendas, it is always the political agenda that takes priority. Other agendas, may it be social, economic or educational, only come to the fore if they converge with the political agenda. But it is these agendas that are used as public justification for policy making. Behind educational agendas are political, social and economic agendas that protect the interests of particular political and social groups (Paulston, 1988; Cooper, 1989; Tollefson, 1991; 2002a; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Ferguson, 2006; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004a; Tsui & Tollefson, 2004; Tsui, 2004; Wright, 2004; Rassool, 2007; Novak-Lukanovič & Limon, 2012).

Political, economic, social and religious cleavages are often reflected in controversies over the languages to be used as media of instruction, because the choice of the language of instruction opens up possible conflict. The multifaceted nature of language-in-education planning, policy and management impinges on almost all the sectors of a nation (Adegbija, 1994a:96). The choice of the medium of instruction is therefore often at the centre of political pressure and national government decision

making. The choice of the language of instruction is generally a decision that calls for more than educational motivation and it is intimately related to major choices on national and official languages (Cooper, 1989; Tollefson, 1991; 2002a; Spolsky & Shohamy, 2000; Tsu & Tollefson, 2004; Annamalia, 2004; Ferguson, 2006).

Mansoor (2005:xxv) notes that part of the complexities in the choice of the language of instruction stem from decision making that involves various factors, such as the aims of the planners, language needs of the learners and the attitudes of parents and teachers. In addition, there are practical factors involved, such as the availability of economic resources (cost-benefit analysis) to implement the policy and the need to train teachers and to develop material in the selected language.

Decisions about the medium of instruction are not only educational, but also about a range of important socio-political and economic issues, which include globalisation, migration, labour policy, elite competition and the distribution of economic resources and power. Language-in-education policies are therefore an essential means of power (re)distribution and social (re)construction. They are also key arenas in which political conflict among linguistic, social and political groups manifest. They determine which linguistic groups have access to political and economic opportunities and which are disenfranchised and denied their linguistic rights (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981; 2000; 2006; Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; Tollefson, 1991; 2002b; Corson, 1993; Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; Cummins, 2000; May, 2001; 2006; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004a; 2004b; Fishman, 2006; Ferguson, 2006; Paulston & Heidemann, 2006; Wodak, 2007; Lo Bianco, 2009; Abdelhay, Makoni & Makoni, 2011).

Language-in-education policies are reflections of power structures, but they are also agents to change power structures. Language-in-education policies usually reflect the ideological position of those who control them. Issues of educational linguistic human rights also come into play in these decisions. Decisions on medium of instruction policies relate to important socio-economic and political questions, such as; which linguistic group will benefit from an alternative medium of instruction? What decision best satisfies the need for inter-ethnic communication? What decisions

maintain the balance between the interests of different linguistic groups and ensure an acceptable level of political stability and economic equality (Cooper, 1989; Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981; 1998; 2000; 2003; 2006; Tollefson, 1991; 2002a; 2002b; 2006; Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, 1995; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; May, 2001; 2006; Tsui & Tollefson, 2004; Spolsky, 2004; 2009; Shohamy, 2006; Ferguson, 2006; Paulston & Heidemann, 2006; McCarty, Skutnabb-Kangas & Magga, 2008; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010).

Language-in-education policies circumscribe the relative access to power that different groups within society have. They demarcate a power divide, not only culturally and linguistically, but also economically, socially and politically. Those whose languages are supported by the policy have better access to cultural resources and education and implicitly to upward social mobility. The advantaged language serves as the appropriate linguistic capital through which they are able to access the education market and operate more effectively linguistically within the various institutions of the state, which include education (Paulston, 1988; 1994; Cooper, 1989; Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981; 1998; 2000; 2003; 2006; Tollefson, 1991; 2002b; 2002; 2006; Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, 1995; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Dorian, 1998; Bamgbose, 2000; May, 2001; 2006; Tsui & Tollefson, 2004; Spolsky, 2004; 2009; Shohamy, 2006; Ferguson, 2006; Paulston & Heidemann, 2006; Rassol, 2007; McCarty, Skutnabb-Kangas & Magga, 2008; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010).

Following Tollefson (1991:16), the process of language policy-making and planning may in itself be seen as the institutionalisation of a language as basis for the distinction among social groups. Language-in-education policies are therefore mechanisms to position language within social structures to determine who has access to political power and economic resources. They play an important role to facilitate access to life chances and therefore have a significant socio-economic and political role. Cooper (1989:79-80) concludes that language policy formulation becomes the pursuit and maintenance of power. Due to the centrality of educational institutions to determine political power and economic opportunity, language-in-

education policies are perceived to have a key role to organise social and political systems (Tollefson, 2002a:ix). According to McGroarty (2002:17), language-in-education policies represent a critical arena in which a society's expectations for the success of its future members are expressed, enabled and constrained.

Decisions on mediums of instruction play a crucial role to shape the learning activities that take place in the school environment. The medium of instruction in schools has a considerable impact, not only on the school performance of learners and the daily work of teachers, but also on various forms of socio-economic (in) equality. The education sector selects and certifies a workforce. It maintains privileges by taking the form and content of the dominant culture and defines it as legitimate knowledge to be relayed. Schools are agents in the creation and the re-creation of the effective dominant culture. The education sector legitimates new knowledge, new classes and social strata. Given that language planning and policy generally establish or entrench forms of imposition, domination and deepen inequality, inequity and injustice, educational institutions play a central role to determe social hierarchies, political power and economic opportunities. Decisions on mediums of instruction thus play a key role to organise socio-political systems (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981; 2000; 2006; Tollefson, 1991; 2002a; 2002b; 2006; May, 2001; 2006; Paulston & Heidemann, 2006; Fishman, 2006; Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; McGroarty, 2002; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004a; Wodak, 2007; Djité, 2008; Lo Bianco, 2009; Abdelhay, Makoni & Makoni, 2011).

2.2.3 Goals of language-in-education planning: The choice of the language of instruction

The education sector needs to understand what languages are needed in the repertoire of speakers in society and for what purpose those languages will be used. One of the central issues in language-in-education planning is the choice of the language of instruction in the school domain. Most scholars who studied language-in-education planning concur that the choice of the language of instruction is a highly fraught task. The number of languages to be taught and learnt depends partly on the

national language policy (Eastman, 1983; Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981; 2000; 2006; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010; Tollefson, 1991; 2002b; 2006; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004a; Ferguson, 2006; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Spolsky & Shohamy, 1999; 2000; Spolsky, 2004; 2009; Shohamy, 2006; Mansoor, 2005).

The primary goal of language-in-education planning is to define how language learning programs are to be tailored to meet the needs of various groups learning languages for different reasons and with different backgrounds. The language needs may be the acquisition of the language as a second or foreign language, a language shift, language revitalisation and language maintenance. The education sector provides a viable arena for the intergenerational transmission of language. Schooling remains one of the most important institutions through which commitment to language maintenance and development can be demonstrated (Cooper, 1989; Fishman, 1991; 2006; Dorian, 1998; May, 2001; 2006; Strydom, 2003; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004a; Ferguson, 2006; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2006; Djité, 2008).

Language-in-education planning decisions in centralised educational systems focus on the role(s) of the mother tongue, second language and foreign language(s) in education. Decisions on these languages often include issues such as; which language(s) will be taught and learnt in school? When, or at what age or level will the teaching of these languages commence? For how long or how many years or periods of study, should they be taught? By whom or who is qualified to teach and for whom, and who is entitled or obligated to learn? Which methods and materials, which implicate the how, are prescribed? (Bamgbose, 1991; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004a; 2004b; Ferguson, 2006; Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008). Language-in-education planning decisions involve issues that relate to the use of a language as a medium of instruction and when taught as a subject.

Multilingualism poses serious challenges for language-in-education policy makers, especially for the choice on the language of instruction. In multilingual settings, the choice of the language of instruction of public educational system raises the fundamental and complex educational question: What combination of instruction in

the learners' native language(s) and in a second or foreign language will ensure that learners gain both effective content education as well as the second or foreign language skills necessary for higher education and employment? (Tollefson, 1991; 2002a; 2006; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Prah, 2000a; 2005; Brock-Utne & Hopson, 2005; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004a; Ferguson, 2006).

Three major questions are involved in language-in-education planning when the role of language in education is considered: What language? For which purpose? And at which level? Language-in-education planning involves the choice of the medium of instruction for various levels of the education system; primary, secondary and tertiary. It focuses on the role of mother tongue in the educational process, the choice of second or foreign language(s) as curricular subjects or languages of instruction. It involves decisions on when these languages will be introduced into the curriculum, whether foreign study will be compulsory, for whom and for how long as well as the proportion of the school population to be exposed to second or foreign language instruction (Cooper, 1989; Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; Tollefson, 1991; 2002b; 2006; Corson, 1993; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Spolsky & Shohamy, 1999; 2000; Tsui & Tollefson, 2004; Spolsky, 2004; 2009; Mansoor, 2005; Shohamy, 2006; Ferguson, 2006; Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008).

Spolsky and Shohamy (2000:12) note that the complexity to choose a language of instruction partly relate to the lack of congruence between home and school language. This means that most school systems have to face some difficult planning questions to choose the best language of instruction. It is often the case that all, or nearly all, the pupils come to school speaking either a local dialectal variety of the national language or a language quite different from the language that schools use. In such situations, there is a wide range of alternatives. At one extreme is the submersion approach in which the target language is used for all children from the beginning of their school year. On the other extreme one finds immersion an educationally approved practice that helps children to quickly gain control of an additional language. Submersion requires minority children to use the majority

language (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981; 2000; Skutnabb-Kangas & García, 1995; García, 1997; Cummins, 2000).

2.2.4 Language-in-education planning process

Since language-in-education planning is a subset of national language planning, the procedures that lead to a language-in-education policy are similar to those of the national language policy. However, at some point between report writing and policy formulation within the national language planning model branching occurs, which lead to language-in-education planning (Kaplan & Baldauf (1997:123-124). As with national language planning, language-in-education planning needs pre-planning where historical research and cost estimation is done. During pre-planning, planners conduct sociolinguistic surveys to elicit information on the sociolinguistic profile of the concerned community or nation. It is during this stage that information on the number of languages, their status, geographical spread, level of development and popular attitudes towards them is elicited (Bamgbose, 1991:121-122; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997:125).

Just after report writing and before policy formulation, branching occurs, that lead to language-in-education planning. It results in the formulation of a language-in-education policy which is separate from the general or national language policy. The language-in-education policy constitutes of seven subpolicies, namely, the curriculum, personnel, materials and methods, resourcing, community, access and evaluation policy (Spolsky & Shohamy, 2000; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008).

Commenting on language planning in general, Rubin (1971:218) highlights that language planning decisions are made after a number of steps. These steps include fact-finding, consideration of alternatives, establishment of goals, selection, evaluation and the prediction of outcomes in a systematic manner. Bamgbose (1991:111-121; 2000:102-103) argues that language planning in Africa is characterised by non-conformity with rational processes of decision making. He

argues that in Africa the neat and systematic nature of language planning is hardly ever followed. Rather, decisions and decrees are arbitrary and apply with immediate effect. Language planning in Africa is vested mainly in the area of policy formulation.

Bamgbose contends that the planning that underlies, or is incidental to, such policies is inferred from the policies themselves. According to Bamgbose (1991:142) language planning activities in Africa, particularly status planning, do not fit the 'rigid economic planning model'. Policies are formulated without a prior cost-benefit analysis or fact-finding. In Africa, language planning is characterised by the pre-occupation with policy-making, lack of continuity, bureaucratic monopoly of planning and the elite domination of policy-making. Most language-in-education policies are decided in a top-down manner with little or no consultation with the recipient communities (Bamgbose, 1987; 1989; Chumbow, 1987; Alexander, 1992; Baldauf, 1994; 2005; 2008; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Spolsky & Shohamy, 1999; 2000; Webb, 2002; Spolsky, 2004; Shohamy, 2006; Ferguson, 2006; Spolsky, 2009).

2.3 Language-in-education policy: Definition

Language-in-education policies (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003) are also known as language acquisition policies (Cooper, 1989:33), language education policies (Spolsky, 2004, 2009), language policies in education (Bamgbose, 2000), educational language policies (Brock-Utne & Hopson, 2005), language of instruction policies (Prah 2005) and medium of instruction policies (Tollefson 1991; 2002a; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004a). Scholars, who refer to language-in-education policies as language of instruction policies and medium of instruction policies, show the centrality of the language of instruction in the language-in-education policies.

Language-in-education policy specifies the language(s) to learn and teach, as well as those that will be offered as subjects of study (Kamwendo, 2009:10). It legitimises the languages in which learners should acquire knowledge; whether it is mother tongue instruction or second or foreign language instruction. An acquisition or language-in-education policy is a statement that specifies which segment of the population should

spend a defined amount of time to acquire certain levels of competence in specific languages. Language-in-education policies determine the criteria for language correctness and oblige people to adopt certain ways of speaking and writing. They create definitions on language and determine the priority of certain languages in society. They indicate how these languages should be used, taught and learnt. (Tollefson, 1991; 2002a; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Tsui & Tollefson, 2004; Spolsky, 2004; Ferguson, 2006; Shohamy, 2006; Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008).

Language-in-education policies can be stated explicitly through official documents, such as the language-in-education policy, curricula, mission statements, ministry of education circulars, education acts or policies, the constitution and other official national documents. In some cases language-in-education policies are not explicit, but are derived implicitly by examining a number of *de facto* practices and ideologies. They can also be inferred from statements by politicians and policy makers. Language policies can be overt and explicit or covert and implicit (Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; Schiffman, 1996; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Spolsky & Shohamy, 1999; Spolsky, 2009; 2004; Shohamy, 2006).

Commenting on the common features of language policies in African countries, Bamgbose (1991:111-121; 2000: 47; 104) notes that they may be vague and general which prone them to non-compliance. They may be presented as mere statements of intent, without any provision for implementation or with the realisation that implementation is impossible and sometimes they are riddled with escape clauses to facilitate non-implementation and at times they are well-articulated in pronouncements and policy documents, but they remain as archival material only to be quoted by scholars who write on language policy. Bamgbose contends that language planning in Africa is characterised by one or more of the following problems: avoidance, vagueness, inconsistency, arbitrariness, fluctuation and declaration without implementation.

According to Bamgbose (1991:116-121) declaration without implementation manifests itself in three different forms. Firstly, a policy may be declared which

cannot be implemented under given circumstances, and policy makers will be aware of this. In such instances, policies serve propagandistic purposes. An example is a policy to implement mother tongue education in a particular language when there are no teacher training colleges that train teachers in the language, no textbooks and teachers are randomly deployed without any linguistic considerations. It is even more difficult if the implementation of such a policy is said to apply with immediate effect. Who will teach the language? Which textbooks will be used?

Secondly, a policy may be declared with escape clauses, let-outs, opt-outs, modifications, alternatives and stringent conditions built into the policy. This gives an alibi for non-implementation', to quote Bamgbose (1991:117). Escape clauses, opt-outs, let-outs, modifications and alternatives maintain the *status quo* and they are clear indicators of the lack of political will (Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; Annamalia, 2004; Tsui & Tollefson, 2004; Webb, 2004). As Skutnabb-Kangas (1998; 2003; 2006) rightly observes, the use of escape clauses, opt-outs, alternatives and modifications express that the policies are not obligatory. It often promotes reluctance among implementers.

Thirdly, a policy may be declared, but implementation procedures may be left unspecified. This results therein that the policy remains only in blueprint. Policy formulation without a clear statement on implementation procedures such as whose responsibility it is to enforce the policies and provide the necessary resources to back implementation, sustain existing policy. It also indicates the lack of political will (Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; Annamalai, 2004; Tsui & Tollefson, 2004; Webb, 2004). Policy needs to consciously spell out and promote measures to facilitate implementation.

2.4 Incentives

Acquisition planning is achieved by the creation or improvement of opportunities or incentives to learn a language. It is unlikely to succeed if the concerned language serves no useful function for the target population. Very few people prefer to teach or

acquire a language or its literacy only for its own sake. Acquisition planning is not likely to succeed if the target language is not useful or has no instrumental value for its speakers. An increase in the economic value of a language will mean that such a language become essential in the work-place. Knowledge of that language will be demanded for access to job opportunities, especially for particular occupations that promote its teaching and learning (Cooper, 1989; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Paulston, 1988; Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; 2007; Strubell, 2001; Webb, 2002; Shameem, 2004; Tollefson, 2004; Kamanda, 2002; Kamwangamalu, 2003; 2004; Batibo, 2005; Shohamy, 2006; Ojwang, 2011; Makoni, 2011; King & Benson, 2004).

Cooper (1989:159-163) identifies three types of means employed to attain acquisition planning goals, namely, those designed: a) primarily to create or improve the opportunity to learn the language b) primarily to create or improve the incentive to learn the language and c) to create or improve opportunity and incentive at the same time. Methods to create and improve the opportunity to learn include classroom instruction, provision of material for self-instruction and the production of literature, newspapers and media programs for the target language. Bamgbose (2000:25) explains that methods, which promote the provision of material for instruction, include language promotion measures, such as literary competitions and a subsidy for the publication of deserving manuscripts. Methods which focus to create and improve the incentive to learn oblige a target language and establish an entry requirement to the different levels of education and request the language as a prerequisite for employment. They also include testing in the language. These methods often relate to material incentives designed to promote the language as a *lingua franca* outside the school (Cooper, 1989:159-163).

According to Strubell (2001:280) six factors promote the development, teaching and learning of language: heightened positive perception on the usefulness of the language, increased motivation to learn and use the language, an upward slope to learn the language, raised consumption, an elaborate demand and supply of goods and services in the language. The motivation to develop and learn a language depends on the perceived usefulness of the language and the functions it fulfils for

the individual and the society. A language perceived to be of superior status, significant usefulness and key to economic and social advancement, incites a positive attitude, rather than one which has limited use (Cooper, 1989; Paulston, 1988; 1994; Tollefson, 1991; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; 2007; Strubell, 2001; Webb, 2002; Shameem, 2004; Tollefson, 2004; Kamanda, 2002; Kamwangamalu, 2003; 2004; Batibo, 2005; Shohamy, 2006; Ojwang, 2011; Makoni, 2011).

Kamanda (2002:207) argues that the lethargy to mother tongue education in previously marginalised languages is usually due to the restriction on mother tongue literacy uses. These restrictions have a strong impact if the language of teaching and learning is different from the popular and dominant language of the media and job market. The effective promotion of mother tongue education should be accompanied by the demand for literacies in such languages in the public domain. Children, parents or teachers, normally make language choices based on expected socio-economic and political benefits. The minority and majority language groups' attitudes towards multilingual education are reflected and perpetuated by the role that minority languages are allowed to play in the education system (Strubell, 2001:261-262; Novak-Lukanovič & Limon, 2012:36).

According to Bamgbose (1991:65; 2000:25; 2007:9) one of the factors that militate against the effective promotion of previously, marginalised languages is the lack of incentives to encourage their use or promote research on them. Despite a policy environment that enables these languages to be studied in the school system, students still do not opt for it because they know that such a qualification does not offer as much advantage and opportunity for advancement as a qualification in a high status languages. Provision of language incentives is a useful strategy for language empowerment. Such incentives include previously or marginalised languages to become compulsory subjects in the school curriculum, certification at the end of secondary education to be subject to a pass in these languages and proficiency in them specified as an advantage in job applications and promotion. Examination results of mother tongue or second language should be of equal value to qualify for

job and to entrer further education (Cooper, 1989; Skutnabb-Kangas & García, 1995; García, 1997; Batibo, 2001; 2005; Kamanda, 2002; Bamgbose, 2000; 2007).

As Bamgbose (2000:110) rightly notes, if languages are stigmatised, and proficiency in them at the end of the curriculum is not a requirement, then the provisions of the statutory instruments will only remain on paper. Levy (2003:239-240) echoes a similar sentiment that a revival project that continues to encourage fluency and literacy in the language(s) that caused the language shift away from the language to be revived, is highly unlikely to succeed. A revival policy must give primacy to the language being revived. McGroarty, Beck and Butler (1995:328) attribute the success story of Navajo to a policy statement that designated competence in the Navajo language as one of the principal goals of their education. Promotion of a language in the curriculum occurs if the fluency and literacy of language is valued. Scotton (1988:211) and Ojwang (2011:233) note the value to accord language with significant weight by means of an example from Kenya. Kiswahili acquired an inferior status compared to English in the school curriculum, because it was not an examinable subject. As a result, students and teachers had no motivation to concentrate on its teaching and encourage the learning of it.

As long as there is sufficient motivation to study a language based on its instrumental value, the development, teaching and learning of the language is not debatable. But, to attach a low status to a language sets an obstacle an obstacle to its promotion. If a language is not a requirement for specific appointments or enrolments, the low prestige will continue to impact negatively on the conditions and prospects of its development, teaching and learning (Bamgbose, 1991:65; 94). Opportunities for the use of a language in the public sector tend to promote its growth, the teaching and learning thereof and boost its prestige (Adegbija, 2001:302; 306).

Policies may influence acquisition planning and language attitudes by means of the discourse in the language behaviour of policy makers and implementers as well as through legislation. Language attitudes within the nation's education system, which are embedded in policy documents, influence the ways in which language is taught

and used in classrooms. These attitudes are more likely to prevail and are reflected by teachers and pupils. Each language evokes positive or negative attitudes, which depend on the function it serves and the context it is used in. Successful and effective mother tongue education policies that involve minority languages emphasize the minority language as an important function in the school curriculum and secure its role as a link to the pupils' ethnic identity. Language attitudes of pupils, teachers and parents in the education system are largely shaped by factors related to status differences between languages in the curriculum (Cooper, 1989; Skutnabb-Kangas & García, 1995; García, 1997; Pennycook, 1998; Skutnabb-Kangas, 1998; 2006; Adegbija, 1994a; 2001; Strubell, 2001; Shameem, 2004; Batibo, 2005; Paulston & Hiedemann, 2006; Simpson, 2008; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010).

Parents who insist and prefer non-mother tongue education do so because they do not see mother tongue education to produce effective global citizens or facilitate upward social mobility. Status considerations therefore determine the success of the implementation of a language policy. The status of the language(s) concerned, determines the success or failure of the policy. The reason is that their status serves as an incentive. An increase in the educational value of a language develops that language into an indispensable instrument of educational development. It must be taken into account that the status of a language must not limit the citizens to one domain only. It must allow citizens to discover career paths outside the education sector, for example (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Shameem, 2004; Batibo, 2005; Simpson, 2008).

Equality cannot be achieved if the language in which people express themselves does not enjoy parity of esteem. There is a need for all languages to enjoy special protection from the overwhelming impact of global and dominant national languages. The lower the status of a language, the more invisible it is. Then it will be less likely to be seen as a language of choice even by its native speakers. The choice of languages for teaching and learning in education must attempt to ensure that the use of a particular language as a medium of instruction and or subject does not imply condemnation of other languages. It must not downgrade the language to a low

position in the hierarchical linguistic order or exclude a particular language group from access to education, power, resources as well as upward social and economic mobility (Scotton, 1988; Cooper, 1989; Skutnabb-Kangas & García, 1995; García, 1997; Phillipson, 1999; Jones & Martin-Jones, 2004; King & Benson, 2004; Batibo, 2005; Ojwang, 2011; Makoni, 2011).

Phillipson (1999:105) states that to teach a language as an additional subject, is a strategy that is best used to counter its hegemonic status. Phillipson notes that in Sweden and in the Netherlands English is taught as an additional language to Swedish and Dutch to ensure that the expansion of English is not at the expense of Swedish or Dutch. Batibo (2005:114) argues that the revitalisation of marginalised languages can only be successful if there is a removal of the pressure exerted by the dominant language. Success is more likely if the dominance of the language that caused the language shift is lessened.

Skutnabb-Kangas and García (1995:239) note that to allocate everybody's mother tongue important functions in the school curriculum is a good measure to ensure the success of mother tongue education in the concerned language. Some of these functions may be to include it as a core subject in the curriculum and require proficiency therein. Languages excluded from or with limited functional space in formal education, lack social status and exchange value in the labour market (Batibo, 2001:129; Rassol, 2008, cited in Novak-Lukanovič & Limon, 2012:31).

The relation between the teaching of languages as subjects and their use as media of instruction in multilingual language-in-education policies is outlined by Skutnabb-Kangas and García (1995:240). They warn that the mother tongue, especially if of minority status, should be protected from the encroachment of the majority language. This is possibly by means of maintence of a non-hierarchical, functional differentiation in which the mother tongue has clearly defined functions and spaces. To share similar sentiments, Batibo (2005:105) proposes that a strict diglossic use of the minority language and dominant language(s) must be maintained to sustain proficiency in minority languages.

According to Paulston (1988:5) a diglossic-like context, in which languages exist in a situation of functional distribution where each language has its defined functions and functional space and others are not allowed therein, counteracts language shifts. Language shifts are normally towards languages with greater utility (Paulston, 1988; 1994; Adegbija, 2001; Pakir, 2004; Batibo, 2005). Ethnic groups rarely opt for continued language maintenance if the social conditions favour a shift to the national language (Paulston, 1994:34). According to Paulston (1994:12), without incentives and opportunities the norm for subordinates groups, in prolonged contact with a dominant group, is to shift to the language of the dominant group.

The success story of Welsh indicates the importance of language status in education. Jones and Martin-Jones (2004) attribute the success story of Welsh partly to its promotion as a core and foundational subject in all Welsh medium schools. According to Jones and Martin-Jones (2004:52) this served as an important indicator of the currency of Welsh. However, the language-as-subject program is criticised because it is believed that it does not create any real situation for communication and not enough exposure time to develop a learner to fluency. Schools are more likely to succeed to promote language acquisition if they use the target language as a medium of instruction than if they teach the language as a target of instruction. Exposure to the language and incentives to learn it is more beneficial when it serves as a medium rather than as a subject of instruction. The teaching of all subjects in Hebrew was a crucial condition for the success of the language revitalisation efforts (Nahir, 1983; 1988; 1998; Paulston, 1988; 1994; Cooper, 1989; Hinton, 2001).

According to Bamgbose (1991:93) time allocation relates to the importance attached to subjects in the curriculum. The number of periods allocated to each language determines the value and place of the language in the curriculum. It influences pupils' attitudes towards the language. Kaplan, Baldauf and Kamwangamalu (2011:107) note that adequate exposure to language teaching is a necessary condition for learning.

Many studies showed that the success of mother tongue education in previously marginalised languages will not solely depend on a piece of legislation; no matter how well-intended it may be. To succeed, it needs to be treated to a marketing challenge. Its promotion must be attractive to the speakers. It must induce the speakers and other stakeholders, such as publishers, to teach, learn and develop the concerned language(s). For previously marginalised languages to function alongside well-established languages as viable media of instruction, their use in education must be rewarding. Unless a language is given educational and market value, no degree of policy change at school level will be able to ensure its use in high status domains. Change is inevitable if policy makers demonstrate the economic value of the language. Masses need to know what mother tongue education would do for them in terms of upward social mobility (Cooper, 1989; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Paulston, 1989; Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; 2007; Strubell, 2001; Webb, 2002; Shameem, 2004; Tollefson, 2004; Kamanda, 2002; Kamwangamalu, 2003; 2004; Batibo, 2005; Shohamy, 2006; Ojwang, 2011; Makoni, 2011; King & Benson, 2004; Jones & Martin-Jones, 2004; Alexander, 2012b).

2.5 Policy makers

Language-in-education policies are usually imposed by political entities and then reinforced by teacher, materials, curricula and tests. Policy formulation has always been a top-down affair. Government and its agencies constitute the top while consumers to whom the policies are directed, represent the bottom. Policy formulation has been widely perceived as a government oriented and initiated activity, with most of the concerned agents to be predominantly governmental. They comprise ministries of education, language boards, language councils, language centres or institutes, literature bureauxs, language commissions and committees as well as departments in universities (Alisajahbana, 1971; Karam, 1974; Bamgbose, 1987; 1989; 1991; 2000; Chumbow, 1989; Alexander, 1992; Brann, 1983; Khubchandani, 1984; Baldauf, 1994; 2005; 2008; Cooper, 1989; Hornberger, 2006b; 2009; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Jernudd & Neustupny, 1991; Jernudd, 1993; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2003; Benson, 2005; Shohamy, 2006;

Trudell, 2006; Spolsky, 2004; 2009; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Du Plessis, 2010; Ndlovu, 2011).

To limit policy formulation to government and government agencies is to oversimplify the complexity and nature of policy formulation, because significant language planning is carried out by language societies or associations, professional associations, churches, publishing houses, media houses and even individual writers and speakers at community level (Alisajahbana, 1971; Karam, 1974; Khubchandani, 1984; Chumbow, 1987; Bamgbose 1987; 1989; 2000; Cooper, 1989; Kaplan & Baldauf 1997; Spolsky 2004; 2009; Kamwendo, 2005; Shohamy 2006).

Significant policy formulation is done at grassroot level by the community and language associations, language activism and at international level through international recommendations, charters and declarations, UNESCO, the African Union, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) recommended mother tongue education. Supranational organisations influence language policy formulation with the spread and financing of language planning initiatives. They support beliefs about diversity, multilingualism and linguistic human or civil rights. They also back educational and minority language rights that can bolster campaigns of language activists that aim to persuade their national governments and speakers of the target language to support a particular language up. A more reliable view of the agents of language planning is that it is not only a government oriented and initiated activity, but it includes grassroots initiatives and activities of non-governmental and supranational organisations (Alisajahbana, 1971; Karam, 1974; Bamgbose, 1987; 1989; 1991; 2000; Chumbow, 1989; Alexander, 1992; Brann, 1983; Khubchandani, 1984; Baldauf, 1994; 2005; 2008; Cooper, 1989; Hornberger, 2006b; 2009; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Jernudd & Neustupny, 1991; Jernudd, 1993; Dorian, 1998; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2003; Benson, 2005; Shohamy, 2006; Trudell, 2006; Spolsky, 2004; 2009; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Spolsky, 2009; Du Plessis, 2010; Ndlovu, 2011).

2.6 Approaches to language-in-education planning: Top-down vs bottom-up

2.6.1 Top-down language planning: Definition, dynamics and participants

In the traditional top-down approach to language planning, agency is basically retained at the macro level. Fundamental planning is conceptualised and executed at macro level with local levels to take an implementation role. Macro level planning relies heavily on education for the implementation and the spread of the particular reform agenda. Language-in-education planning, policy and management across the globe were historically dominated by top-down policy making by central government education agencies. Teachers in schools were only seen as implementers (Alisajahbana, 1971; Karam, 1974; Bamgbose, 1987; 1989; 1991; 2000; Chumbow, 1989; Alexander, 1992; Brann, 1983; Khubchandani, 1984; Baldauf, 1994; 2005; 2008; Cooper, 1989; Hornberger, 2006a; 2009; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Jernudd & Neustupny, 1991; Jernudd, 1981; 1993; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2003; Benson, 2005; Shohamy, 2006; Trudell, 2006; Spolsky, 2004; 2009; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Ndhlovu, 2010; Mwaniki, 2010; Cuvelier, 2010; Du Plessis, 2010).

Language-in-education planning, policy and management were dictated by nationist and nationalist goals. Syllabi, methodology and teaching material were created or approved centrally to meet these demands. Despite the multilingual nature of most of the world's countries, top-down language-in-education policies meant that students from diverse linguistic backgrounds have to use common material and teachers have to strictly adhere to the syllabus. This has compromised the adaptation of education to local needs of learners, from different linguistic backgrounds, to a large extent (Alisajahbana, 1971; Karam, 1974; Bamgbose, 1987; 1989; 1991; 2000; Chumbow, 1989; Alexander, 1992; Brann, 1983; Khubchandani, 1984; Baldauf, 1994; 2005; 2008; Cooper, 1989; Hornberger, 2006b; 2009; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Jernudd & Neustupny, 1991; Jernudd, 1981; 1993; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2003; Benson, 2005; Shohamy, 2006; Trudell, 2006; Spolsky,

2004; 2009; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Ndhlovu, 2010; Mwaniki, 2010; Cuvelier, 2010; Du Plessis, 2010) .

Language planning, policy and management research focus mainly on macro level planning. But research shows that language planning, policy and management also operate at micro and meso levels. Leading scholars in this area advocate for a reversal of the role of government institutions. They recommend that rather than to impose top-down policies, which rarely work, there is a need to integrate bottom-up and top-down approaches (Alisajahbana, 1971; Karam, 1974; Bamgbose, 1987; 1989; 1991; 2000; Chumbow, 1989; Alexander, 1992; Brann, 1983; Khubchandani, 1984; Baldauf, 1994; 2005; 2008; Cooper, 1989; Hornberger, 2006a; 2009; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Jernudd & Neustupny, 1991; Jernudd, 1981; 1993; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2003; Benson, 2005; Shohamy, 2006; Trudell, 2006; Spolsky, 2004; 2009; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Ndhlovu, 2010; Mwaniki, 2010; Cuvelier, 2010; Du Plessis, 2010).

Most of the traditional participants in language planning and language-in-education planning come from top-down language situations. They are defined as people with authority and power and they make language related decisions for groups. These decisions are often made with little or no consultation with the people, whose language beliefs or practices are to be modified, changed or confirmed. Language planning was largely bureaucratic and elitist. As the afore-mentioned scholars in the field of language planning rightly observe, language planning and language-in-education planning was a government oriented activity for long. This is reflected explicitly or implicitly in the canonical model of language planning, which was advanced by scholars such as Jernudd and Das Gupta (1971), Rubin and Jernudd (1971) and Fishman (1987) cited in Jernudd (1993). To advance the canonical model of language planning, Jernudd and Das Gupta (1971:197-199) argue that the extent to which language planning allows for problems to be consciously and firstly identified by the planners, rather than by a political authority, such freedom of planners must, be constrained by political consultation.

This emphasizes the central role placed on government in language planning by the canonical model. In terms of this model problem identification does not involve consultation with the concerned language speakers. This reveals the predominantly top-down nature of the canonical model of language planning. Proponents of the canonical model argue that language planning implies that the decision makers choose a satisfactory, or even optimal, course of action. The action is limited by the resources and only there to achieve the goals approved by political authority.

The canonical model of language planning advanced by Rubin and Jernudd (1971), sees language planning as a government-authorised, initiated and sustained activity. In response to the shift to language management, as Jernudd and Neustupny advanced, Fishman (1987) cited in Jernudd (1993:133) contends 'For me, language planning remains the authoritative allocation of resources for the attainment of language status and corpus goals, whether in connection with new functions that are aspired to, or in connection with old functions that need to be discharged more adequately'. The language management approach recommended by Jernudd and Neustupny (1991) reflects a shift from the top-down approach to a grassroots, or bottom-up, orientation to language planning.

In their criticism of the canonical model of language planning, Jernudd (1991; 1993); Jernudd and Neustupny (1991), contend that the shift of focus, namely, from the planning to the management model, is an academic response to people power. It is a reaction against central imposition and recognises the multitude of competing interests. They note that language management explains how individuals manage language in communication. Their proposal of language management is based on their argument that language planning was too much government oriented and overlooked significant language planning activities from grassroots levels. They state that the narrow conception of language planning as a government authorised activity excludes language planning decision making from other spheres.

They further argue that language management seeks to explain how language problems arise in the course of people's use of language, namely, in their discourse.

This is in contrast to approaches of language planning which take decision-makers', for example government's specification of language problems as their axiomatic point of departure. They note that language management does not presuppose a democratic, or any other particular political-institutional, process of authorisation. Jernudd and Neustupny (1991) argue that language management view discourse as the centre thereof. They argue that language management is a reversal of the canonical or classical view of language planning which limits language planning to top-down activities.

Critics of the canonical model state that an adequate model of language planning must account, in non-handicap terms, for practices that do not confirm to the canonical model's credo. The credo is clearly set out in the works of the proponents of the canonical model (Bamgbose, 1987; 1989; Chumbow, 1989; Alisjahbana, 1971; Karam, 1974; Alexander, 1992; Cooper, 1989; Brann, 1983; Khubchandani, 1984; Jernudd, 1981; 1993; Jernudd & Neustupny; 1991; Baldauf, 1994; 2005; 2008; Hornberger, 2006b; 2009; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Spolsky, 2004; 2009; Benson, 2005; Trudell, 2006; Shohamy, 2006; Lewis & Trudell, 2006; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Cuvelier, 2010; Ndhlovu, 2010).

In their criticism of the canonical model, the afore-mentioned scholars argue that an adequate model of language planning should accommodate several types or levels of government and non-governmental decision making and implementation as well as several planning mechanisms. With the acknowledgement that the choice of a national or official language is a government decision, the alternative model takes issue with the rigid requirement that government needs to sanction all aspects of language planning. Critics of the canonical model contest the idea that the only level from which authorisation can be derived, is per force the central government. They argue that a language planning model should embrace a wider range of language activities at different levels, which involves government and non-governmental efforts. In their view, this widened conception of language planning is more likely to increase the meaningfulness of language planning and to establish it as a fruitful field of study. This is in addition to be able to respond to local needs (Bamgbose, 1987;

1989; Chumbow, 1989; Alisjahbana, 1971; Karam, 1974; Alexander, 1992; Cooper, 1989; Brann, 1983; Khubchandani, 1984; Jernudd, 1993; Jernudd & Neustupny, 1991; Baldauf, 1994; 2005; 2008; Hornberger, 2006b; 2009; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Spolsky, 2004; 2009; Benson, 2005; Trudell, 2006; Shohamy, 2006; Lewis & Trudell, 2006; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Cuvelier, 2010; Ndhlovu, 2010).

Bamgbose (1987:10) explains that the canonical model is not only too much government oriented, but it even places undue emphasis on the existence of a central authority. This model also neglects the subsidiary levels of government. Bamgbose (1987) argues that actual experience with language development efforts shows that significant, and sometimes much more effective, work is done by non-governmental organisations. In terms of the canonical model, 'language planning' activities by non-governmental organisations, language associations, language activists and religious groups do not amount to planning, because they do not conform to the language planning ideal (Neustupny, 1974). In unitary government systems it is even possible that divergent policies may be pursued at different levels. Alisjahbana (1971:186) says that language groups do not simply implement government initiatives, but they appropriate such policy decisions and steer them into novel, unforeseen directions (Cuvelier, 2010; Ndhlovu, 2010; Webb, 2010).

Policies are not merely implemented, but are actually shaped on the ground since it is in local decisions that planning has its ultimate impact. Citizens are not passive receivers of government policies or the vague resistors. They are social actors who can exercise agency albeit in varying degrees within the constraints imposed by government structures. They are not passive or helpless victims without any form of resistance on which symbolic power is imposed. Without expressed government permission, those from below also take initiative by means of which they seek to persuade government to adopt their decision. The imposition of top-down hegemonic policies is seldom achieved without resistance or with the consent of subordinate groups. Hegemonic practices, require as a condition for their success, that the subordinate groups believe the legitimacy of the dominant group (Alisajahbana,

1971; Karam, 1974; Brann, 1983; Khubchandani, 1984; Scott, 1985; Alexander, 1992; Thompson, 1991; Yee, 1994; Baldauf, 1994; 2005; 2008; Hornberger, 2006a; 2009; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Phillipson, 2007; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Ndhlovu, 2010; Cuverlier, 2010; Georgiou, Ó Laoire & Rigg, 2010).

Hegemonic and assimilationist policies are not easily implemented at the grassroots level without being resisted. The reason is that those at grassroots level are not entirely weak. They in various ways counter, or resist, or even manipulate, the forces of domination and assimilation. Conformity with such forces is calculated if the grassroots squandered the opportunities to resist or manipulate such forces. The calculation may also be based on their acceptance of the *status quo* as the normal or natural order of things or if they are more comfortable with the *status quo*. Consequently, dominated groups have a role both in their marginalisation and emancipation. The success of hegemonic and assimilationist policies is dependant upon the overt or covert willingness and cooperation of the subordinate group with such policies (Alisajahbana, 1971; Karam, 1974; Brann, 1983; Khubchandani, 1984; Scott, 1985; Bamgbose, 1987; 1989; Alexander, 1992; Thompson, 1991; Baldauf, 1994; 2005; 2008; Yee, 1994; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Phillipson, 2007; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Ndhlovu, 2010).

Neustupny's notion of language treatment disqualifies activities of non-governmental organisations and other grassroot level organisations in language planning. According to Neustupny (1974:43), all attempts to address language problems, irrespective by whom and in what circumstances are regarded as language treatment. Only the systematic treatment which confirms to the planning model qualifies to be considered as language planning. Neustupny further notes that language planning is used most suitably to denote language treatment. These activities are informed by language planning theory and they are usually systematic, theoretical, rational, rigorous and future-oriented. This led to the slogan, popularised by Rubin (1973:7) and Jernudd (1973:12) that 'language planning is one kind of language treatment'.

The limited view and conception of language planning is clearly indicated by proponents of the canonical model of language planning. Choices on language use are not always systematic and a result of top-down planning. In the final instance they also stem from grassroots levels (Baldauf, 1994; 2005; 2008; Bamgbose, 1987; 1989; Chumbow, 1989; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Hornberger, 2006b; 2009; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Spolsky, 2004; 2009; Shohamy, 2006; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Ndhlovu, 2010).

Alisajahbana (1971:186) and Karam (1974:111) argue that besides government that work through government agencies, such as the ministry of education, information and communication as well as government appointed commissions or language advisory boards, there are less organised or centralised sources of language change. Alisajahbana (1971:186) identifies prominent social figures or language enthusiasts not affiliated to government, the press and media as well as communities and religious groups as some of the prominent sources of language change that work outside the central system.

The activities of the missionaries in Africa clearly illustrate the observation by critics of the canonical model. Irrespective of the colonial governments' attempts to annihilate indigenous languages, missionaries standardised, developed orthographies and promoted mother tongue education in most African languages; even though the major drive behind it was evangelical. Kamwendo (2005) presents an example of successful efforts of the Livingstonia Mission in Malawi that resisted the colonial administration's decision to marginalise Chitumbuka. A similar example can be drawn from Zimbabwe where missionaries from the London Missionary Society, based at Inyathi mission station, developed the first Ndebele orthography. Standardisation of Shona, by Doke, is also attributed to the works of the early missionaries (Doke, 1931; Hadebe; 2006). These cases clearly illustrate that the centre of authority, even in the early years of language planning was not only confined to a central authority, for example the government of the time.

Liddicoat and Baldauf (2008:3) argue that the marginalisation of bottom-up planning within the context of language planning research is definitional. Most of the definitions of language planning presuppose deliberate, systematic, planned, organised, national level language planning by an organised body. This body enjoys either legal or moral authority. Examples may be government agencies, commissions or academies. Legal or moral authorities are mostly located within macro-level institutions which are created and-/ or sanctioned by nation-states. This interpretation of language planning locates research within a theory of power. This theory sees the top-down exercise of power or domination as the relevant construct to understand decision making on languages.

The afore-mentioned observation was also expressed as early as the 1980s by Cooper (1989:31) who notes that some definitions of language planning restrict it to activities undertaken by government, government-authorised agencies or authoritative bodies. Cooper argues that to restrict language planning to the work of authoritative institutions is too restrictive. Most of the definitions of language planning, particularly those influenced by the canonical model reflect the systematic, national level and government-oriented approach to language planning. Some of these definitions are listed in Cooper (1989:30-31). This observation can be illustrated with the use of this set of definitions; Rubin and Jernudd (1971:xvi) define language planning as the *deliberate*, *future-oriented systematic* change of language code, use and/ or speaking, undertaken by *some organisation mandated* for such purposes – *most visibly by governments* in some social situation, that is, in a community of speakers.

Jernudd and Das Gupta (1971:196) reflect the ideals of the canonical model of language planning. It limits agency in language planning to activities of the government with: '*the broadest authorization for language planning is obtained from the politicians*.' *A body of experts* is specifically delegated the task of *planning* a plan. To prepare this, experts ideally *estimate existing resources and forecast potential utilisation of such resources* in terms of developmental targets. Once targets are agreed upon, a strategy of action is copmpiled. It is *authorised by legislature* and

implemented by an *organisational set-up*, *authorized* in turn, by the *planning executive*. The implementation of tasks may be *evaluated* periodically by the planners.

Weistein (1980:55), cited in Cooper (1989:30-31), defines language planning as a *government authorised*, *long term sustained* and *conscious effort* to alter a language or change its function in a society. According to Jernudd and Das Gupta (1971:211) language planning is not an idealistic and exclusively linguistic activity, but a *political and administrative activity* to solve language problems in society. Prator, cited in Cooper (1989:31), defines language planning as language policy-making, which involves decisions concerning the teaching and use of language, and their *careful formulation by those empowered to do so*, *for the guidance of others*.

Fishman (1974b:79), cited in Cooper (1989:30), defines language planning as an *organised pursuit* of solutions to language problems, *typically at national level*. Karam (1974:105) defines language planning as an activity which attempts to solve a language problem, *usually on a national scale*. It focuses on either language form, or language use, or both. Kaplan and Baldauf (1997:xi) define language planning as an activity, *most visibly undertaken by government* (simply because it involves massive changes in a society), intended to promote *systematic* linguistic change in some community of speakers. According to Kaplan and Baldauf (1997:xi) language planning leads to, or is directed by, the promulgation of a language policy *by government (or any other authoritative body or person)*. Grin (2003:30) defines language policy as a *systematic*, *rational*, *theory-based* effort *at societal level* to modify the linguistic environment with a view to increasing aggregate welfare. It is *typically conducted by official bodies or their surrogates* and aimed at *part or all of the population* living under their jurisdiction.

These definitions show that language planning is normally thought of as a political activity, often undertaken by government and government agencies. They also reflect that language planning is often seen as a large-scale activity, typically at national level. Not many of the existing cases of language planning fall into this description

and conceptualisation of language planning. These definitions exclude language planning by communities, non-governmental organisations, language associations, language activists and religious groups.

This interpretation of power in language planning is problematic and misleading. It acts as a delimiting agent that constitutes the focus of language planning. Firstly, deliberate language planning issues imply a direct causal relationship between decisions made by those with power to execute it and the actual results of language planning. It leaves aside acceptance of the language plan itself. A causal link lacks evidence and backing from language planning outcomes which are unplanned or result from activities which were not planned. The enclosement of language planning activities to deliberate planning is not useful enough to help understand the realities of language planning (Scott, 1985; Bamgbose, 1987; 1989; 2000; Yee, 1994; Baldauf, 1994; 2005; 2008; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Shohamy, 2006; Phillipson, 2007; Ndhlovu, 2010; Webb, 2010; Cuvelier, 2010).

These definitions of language planning also limit language planning to a systematic, rational, theory-based, explicit, conscious, deliberate, organised pursuit. It expresses language planning as orderly and as goal oriented decision making process with regard to language. These definitions conform to the ideals of the canonical model. The model limits language planning only to systematic treatment; which conforms to the planning model. However, as Bamgbose (1991; 2000) rightly notes, language planning in Africa, is mainly characterised by non-conformity with the afore-mentioned rational processes of decision making.

In most cases decisions are last-minute rushes taken in a crisis situation. There is little time for thoughtful analysis and careful preparation and planning. An absence of a recognised, uniform and clearly defined model for the enterprise of language planning is clear (Chumbow, 1987:15; Bamgbose, 1987:10-11; 1991; 2000:102-104). Critics of the canonical model, which include some of the reformed proponents of the canonical model like Jernudd and Neustupny (1991), argue that the canonical model is restrictive of the scope of language planning. It excludes significant planning

activities that can enrich the understanding of the scope and dynamics of language planning.

The criticism of limiting research on language planning to deliberate planning stem from the realisation that it is often the local contextual agents that affect how macro-level plans are implemented. This limited interpretation of language planning reflects an awareness of micro level planning. (Alisajahbana, 1971; Karam, 1974; Brann, 1983; Khubchandani, 1984; Bamgbose, 1987; 1989; 2000; Chumbow, 1989; Spolsky, 2004; 2009; Shohamy, 2006; Baldauf, 1994; 2005; 2008; Kamwendo, 2005; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008).

Secondly, this view of language planning oversimplifies the nature of power, because it applies in speech communities and how power is realised in matters on language. What must be noted is that all social groups involve technologies of power through which the actions of social agents are shaped. The operations and roles of power are very complex, because power does not simply lie in the ability to dominate, but also in the ability to shape the behaviour of others. The operation of power is therefore not just the enforcement of particular norms, but also to get others to act, of their own volition, in particular ways. This means that individuals and groups also have the potential to exercise power over other members of their society; in ways which affect the behaviour of others (Alisajahbana, 1971; Karam, 1974; Scott, 1985; Bamgbose, 1987; 1989; Chumbow, 1989; Yee, 1994; Baldauf, 1994; 2005; 2008; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Spolsky, 2004; 2009; Shohamy, 2006; Phillipson, 2007; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Cuvelier, 2010; Ndhlovu, 2010).

To limit language planning to government agencies is to oversimplify its complexity. It involves levels of decision making and the reality that what passes as policy at one level may need to be implemented at another. Lower-level policy decisions, particularly those that arise in the course of the implementation of higher-level decisions may be taken by subsidiary agencies. Examples are as the speech communities, language activists and implementers, namely, teachers and private institutions (Alisajahbana, 1971; Karam, 1974; Brann, 1983; Khubchandani, 1984;

Chumbow, 1987; Cooper, 1989; Alexander, 1992; Bamgbose, 1987; 1989; 2000; Baldauf, 1994; 2005; 2008; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Kamwendo, 2005; Shohamy, 2006; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Spolsky, 2009; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Cuvelier, 2010; Ndhlovu, 2010).

It is not only through coercive and normative power of institutions – the power ascribed by status or realised through sanctions - that behaviour changes, but by means of more subtle operations. These more subtle choices include, and are not limited to, charm. An example is the ability to use culturally understood identity claims and norms to gain trust and loyalty as well as contractual power over others. An example is an agreement that specifies the reciprocal obligations between parties. With this elaborated view of power in mind, the restriction of language planning to top-down planning does not offer an accurate and complete understanding thereof (Scott, 1985; Bamgbose, 1987; 1989; 2000; Chumbow, 1989; Alexander, 1992; Yee, 1994; Baldauf, 1994; 2005; 2008; Kamwendo, 2005; Shohamy, 2006; Phillipson, 2007; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Spolsky, 2004; 2009).

Language planning in local context is a fundamental and integrated part of the overall language planning process. This process merits attention both within the context of the operation of macro level planning and as local activity with, or without, macro roots (Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008:4). To comment on the reasons why micro level planning activities do not command the attention they deserve, Bamgbose (2000:112) notes that the all-encompassing role of the government is something that must be appreciated, especially in Africa to explain the neglect of bottom-up planning.

Bamgbose notes that government is expected to provide leadership and legislate on every conceivable subject. Whatever does not emanate from government, nor is sanctioned by it, does not have the required force to compel compliance. Governmental planning may be presumed to have the broadest scope, since government generally has the power to legislate, and the ability to foster, incentive

structures and dis-incentive structures to enforce planning decisions (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997:5).

2.6.2 Bottom-up language planning: Definition, dynamics and participants

Bottom-up approaches to language planning are defined as alternatives to top-down approaches to language planning. They are also referred to as local context planning, bottom-to-top language planning, micro level language planning, community-based language planning, grassroots planning or initiatives, democratic language planning, language planning from below and non-governmental language planning. Bottom-up language planning is described as self-empowering language planning and participatory decision making. Acconding to this perspective, language planning is people or community planning with the emphasis on the educational, economic, political and social development of people. This approach to, and conceptualisation of, language planning see language planning from the perspective of people development rather than just language development. Language development must lead to the empowerment and intellectual freedom of the concerned speakers (Baldauf, 1994; 2005; 2008; Hornberger, 2006b; 2009; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Bamgbose, 1987; 1989; 2000; Chumbow, 1987; Alexander, 1992; Webb, 2002; 2009; Spolsky, 2004; 2009; Shohamy, 2006; Baldauf, 1994; 2005; 2008; Phillipson, 2007; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Ndhlovu, 2010).

Bottom-up planning is where lower levels and even communities make an input to language planning or initiate language planning. Matters that require a decision will be considered by the community, likely to be affected by the decision and initiatives, to make changes to the policy. Change will originate from individuals, organisations and other non-governmental institutions or organisations that represent the speakers (Hornberger, 2006b; 2009; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Bamgbose, 1987; 1989; 2000; Chumbow, 1987; Alexander, 1992; Webb, 2002; 2009; Spolsky, 2004; 2009; Shohamy, 2006; Baldauf, 1994; 2005; 2008; Trudell, 2006; Phillipson, 2007; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Ndhlovu, 2010). Webb (2009:194)

defines bottom-up language planning as language cultivation activities of individuals and pressure group agencies. Bottom-up language planning is also defined as a case of language planning where the agency is located in the community. The community is the active agent and advocates for the maintenance of its cultural and linguistic heritage (Hatoss, 2008:55).

Micro level planning is locally driven for, and, in specific contexts where the speakers are the primary agents of planning. It reflects efforts by local groups to determine and shape their linguistic repertoire, based on their own needs and priorities (Baldauf, 2005:30). According to Baldauf (2008:26; 30; 36) micro level planning refers to cases where businesses, institutions, groups, communities or individuals hold agency and create what can be recognised as a language policy. They plan how to utilise and develop language resources. Micro level planning is not always directly the result of some larger macro policy, but it is a response to local needs, language problems and requirements for language management. In local context planning, the agency is located at the local or micro level. Micro level planning is initiated in the community, but can only be understood within the wider scope of macro level planning (Baldauf, 2008:36; Webb, 2010:134).

Bottom-up approaches contrast with top-down policies or the local implementation thereof, although the two influence each other. An example is when grassroot resistance is a reaction to a top-down policy or where governmental funding is provided to support local initiatives. Micro level planning is a form of resistance to top-down policies. Grassroot contexts are where language use and language changes are experienced and understood by people (Bamgbose, 1987; 1989; Chumbow, 1987; Alexander, 1992; Baldauf, 1994; 2005; 2008; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Hornberger, 2006b; 2009; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Ndhlovu, 2010; Du Plessis, 2010).

Bottom-up language planning is characterised by two processes. First, individuals become aware of language related threats to the interests of their communities. These threats may be forced assimilation to the dominant language, marginalisation,

and exclusion of their language in higher domains, threats to the community's linguistic identity and ethnolinguistic vitality as well as an intergenerational shift to a dominant language which heralds language endangerment. Grassroots initiatives seek to redress social inequality, injustice or inequity. It also actively defends identity.

Micro level planning resists or challenges hegemonising powers and identify alternative approaches through the development oriented methodologies and strategies. They may be development communication, advocacy, litigation, legislation, participatory action research and dialogical intervention strategies. Bottom-up initiatives therefore occur when communities gain prior ideological clarification and become aware that they are being dominated, marginalised and disempowered. It usually happens when they realise that their basic linguistic human rights, educational linguistic rights included, are infringed on. Language, then, becomes a rallying point for activism (Hatoss, 2008; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Webb, 2009; Ndhlovu, 2010; Du Plessis, 2010).

Since bottom-up planning is tailored to meet specific community needs, locally based, originates in and evolves according to the desire of local people its impact depends on the communicative and socio-political needs of the speakers of the language. Bottom-up or grassroots level planners negotiate, demand and introduce alternative language policies. It involves people from grassroot level who attempt to influence the national language policy by persuading the government to support one or more languages. Micro level initiatives on community level are however not isolated from government and non-government organisations (Nahir, 1983; 1984; 1988; 1998; Paulston, 1988; Fishman, 1991; Shohamy, 2006; Chriost, 2008; Chua, 2008; Webb, 2009; Spolsky, 2009).

Current studies in language planning strongly suggest that bottom-up approaches may be more successful than top-down approaches. Bottom-up approaches are said to be the most promising in terms of community commitment and sustainability and more likely to lead to success (Alexander, 1992; Adegbija, 1993; Baldauf, 1994; 2005; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Dauenhauer & Dauehauer, 1998; Webb, 2002; 2009;

2010; Crystal, 2000; Adegbija, 1993; 1994; 1997; 2001; Strubell, 2001; Heugh, 2003; Benson, 2005; Trudell, 2006; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Baldauf, 2008; Hatoss, 2008; Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008). These scholars argue that a mixture of local or internally motivated and initiated survival strategies seems to be the most promising for minority groups in multilingual contexts to guarantee their survival and growth. Scholars who share this thinking describe bottom-up approaches as strong foundations for solid programmes. They need to be supported by enabling policies or legislation at official level. These policies must shift from assimilationist to multilingual and multicultural policies which promote ethnic and linguistic diversity. These policies need to enshrine and guarantee linguistic human rights.

These scholars argue that the formulation and implementation of policies must not be left to government alone. Instead, these processes should be owned by civil society stakeholders. They should be the linguistic responsibility of the citizens. Scholars argue that unless the necessary effort is actively supported by civil society, including the concerned language speakers, the success of the language policy will be highly unlikely (Alexander, 1992; Baldauf, 1994; 2005; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Dauenhauer & Dauehauer, 1998; Grenoble & Whaley, 1998; England, 1998; Dorian, 1998; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Crystal, 2000; Adegbija, 1993; 1994; 1997; 2001; Strubell, 2001; Heugh, 2003; Benson, 2005; Trudell, 2006; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Baldauf, 2008; Hatoss, 2008).

The growing realisation that language planning and policy studies - that focus only on the individual nation state and its centralised language planning - are likely to miss many significant features of language planning and policy have also contributed to the increased concern with bottom-up approaches. To consider language planning only as the property of those who hold the institutional power to effect their decisions is to ignore the interplay between the macro and the micro. Both are fundamental to all language planning work. Such an approach to language planning fails to consider how language problems arise and are perceived as problems at the macro level. It also fails to consider how the macro is actually played out in local communities where

it is being implemented (Alisajahbana, 1971; Karam, 1974; Brann, 1983; Khubchandani, 1984; Bamgbose, 1987; 1989; 2000; Chumbow, 1989; Spolsky, 2004; 2009; Shohamy, 2006; Baldauf, 1994; 2005; 2008; Kamwendo, 2005; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008).

To emphasize the importance to increase the scope of study in language planning and policy, Georgiou, Ó Laoire and Rigg (2010:115) note that studies in language planning and policy should not only look at policy makers at the top, but also at the bottom. It is in the latter that language policy takes its final shape. Georgiou, Ó Laoire and Rigg note that this shift in language planning and policy studies provides fresh insights and perspectives to the examination of central language planning, policy and implementation issues.

Part of the need and rise of bottom-up planning stems from the realisation that existing national-level power structures underwent an erosion of legitimacy in many contexts. Planning cannot be remedied by centralisation of decision making. There is rather a need to evolve to a local process to address local context. A focus on local contexts is not only warranted by the democratisation of decision making, but also from the perspective of devolution. This is true, especially in education where the locus of decision making lies largely with local communities (Bambgose, 2000:114; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008:4).

Democratisation of decision making in language education issues, as Bamgbose explains, emerges from the conscious realisation that the philosophy of education in the country is essentially the participation of citizens in fundamental policy decisions. Top-down language planning violates democratic principles and personal rights. It becomes an imposition of decisions. It constitutes a viable weapon to disempower local communities and impose hegemonic and assimilationist policies. Top-down policies are criticised because they fail to reflect local community practices and perspectives and also because of the lack, or little, consultation with affected communities (Alexander, 1992; Baldauf, 1994; 2005; 2008; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997;

Zvobgo, 1997; 2007; Bamgbose, 2000; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Shohamy, 2006; Ndhlovu, 2009; 2010).

Focus on local contexts in language planning mirrors an increased concern for the democratisation of decision making in social policy in general which recognises the impact of power asymmetrics on policy outcomes (Bamgbose, 2000:114; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008:4). Bottom-up planning is also described as the democratisation of language planning (Webb, 1991:14, cited in Bamgbose (2000:114). In bottom-up approaches people, and not language, are placed at the centre of language planning: what languages they know, what their attitudes to these languages are, what their preferences are, is what should be emphasized. In this approach to language planning, people and institutions are fully involved in language planning, management and implementation processes. This entails maximum community involvement, consultation and participation.

Concerned communities need to take their destinies into their own hands and be involved emotionally, intellectually and mentally. Maximal successful and effective bottom-up approaches are locally or internally motivated and perpetuated. Those who speak the language have to show an active and dynamic interest to plan the existence, development, teaching, learning, promotion and survival of their language. When a community has a stake in an initiative, they are obliged and constrained to carry on, even when there is no external support or political will. If speakers have a higher affective stake and deep emotional inventory in the survival, promotion and maintenance of their language, any language shift mechanisms is bound to face resistance. Indigenisation and ownership can be achieved through prior ideological clarification by means of the deployment of some of the development oriented methodologies and strategies (Cooper, 1989; Ladefoged, 1992; Tremmel, 1994; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; England, 1998; Grenoble & Whaley, 1998; Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer, 1998; Grinevald, 1998; Zvobgo, 1997; 2007; Crystal, 2000; Fishman, 1991; Adegbija, 1993; 1994b; 1997; 2001; Strubell, 2001; King, 2001; Klaus, 2003; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2003; Mwaniki, 2004; Kembo-Sure, 2004; Batibo, 2005; Benson, 2005; Trudell, 2006; Troy & Walsh, 2008; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Lasimbang &

Kinajil, 2008; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Hatoss, 2008; Hornberger & Hult, 2008; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b; Ndhlovu, 2010; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Hornberger, 2006b; 2009).

There is a significant chance for success and hope for minority groups that have a strong stake in the promotion, revitalisation and maintenance of their language. Success is likely for minority groups that have an unshakeable resolution not to be assimilated by government action or inertia. A strong determination to survive, coupled with bold and stubborn local or internal generated and motivated efforts within the minority group itself ensure the promotion, survival, maintenance and revitalisation of the group's language. Successful efforts to reverse language shift, increase language promotion, maintain and revitalise, must be grounded in the indigenous community. Community mobilisation, initiative and participation are decisive for the survival of the concerned speakers' language. These efforts must have an agenda that is people-bound with a long term orientation if the revival fervor is to be generated, accepted and sustained. The Hebrew, Māori and French Quebec success stories, for example, attest to this observation (Nahir, 1983; 1988; 1998; Paulston, 1988; Adegbija, 1993; 1994b; 1997; 2001; Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer, 1998; Crystal, 2000; Strubell, 2001; Lastra, 2001; Fishman, 1991; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2003; Kembo-Sure, 2004; Batibo, 2005; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Hatoss, 2008; Trudell, 2006; Ndhlovu, 2010).

Citing Kishindo (1987:107), Webb (2002:272) notes that people are not passive beneficiaries of technical and scientific terms. They are actors in the drama of their development. Corpus, status, prestige and acquisition planning are responses to social change and agents of social change. They must lead to the intellectual liberation and emancipation of the community through community participation and involvement in these decisions. To share similar sentiments, Lewis and Trudell (2008:272) argue that, even though language cultivation usually require the involvement of professional linguists, community members should also be engaged to a significant extent in all corpus planning activities. Adegbija (1993:34-35) argues that corpus and status planning efforts that are internally motivated and initiated, or

strongly supported by speakers of the concerned languages, yield appreciable results.

Local ownership of orthography is one of the key factors to accept the written language. Testing in, and consultation with, local contexts is imperative. To emphasize the importance of local ownership of orthography, Coulmas (1999:12) notes that orthographic conventions are never socio-culturally neutral for those concerned. Rather than being mere instruments of a practical nature, they are symbolic systems of great social significance. Scripts and orthographies often carry cultural and political overtones; hence the importance of local ownership. For orthography to be successful it has to be scientifically and socially acceptable. It is essential to note that the values and ideals of technical experts are matched and aligned with those of the speakers of the language. Without this interaction, the social rationale of language planning may become subordinated to a predominant normative linguistic and political rationale (Mutasa, 1995:93-94).

An important prerequisite for successful bottom-up approaches is community involvement, participation, ownership and indigenisation of the initiative. Language revitalisation efforts must involve the total community and not just a part of it. There is need for wide local consultation and local community level responsibility; as well as control of the initiatives. Languages need communities in order to live. The community, and only the community, can preserve and revitalise a living language. It is the community, in the last analysis, which decides the future of the language and is the true architect of any language in its linguistic repertoire (Fishman, 1991; Ladefoged, 1992; Grenoble & Whaley, 1998; England, 1998; Jacobs, 1998; Dorian, 1998; Grinevald, 1998; Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer, 1998; Crystal, 2000; Lastra, 2001; Strubell, 2001; Adegbija, 1993; 1994b; 1997; 2001; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Heugh, 2003; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2003; Batibo, 2005; Trudell, 2006; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Ndhlovu, 2010).

To attest to this, Hatoss (2008:60) notes that the main impact upon the language planning initiatives in the Hungarian community was derived from the strong intrinsic

aspect of their community. In the Hebrew case the critical factor was a remarkable level of personal commitment, which led to the emergence of a socially, dynamic community (Nahir, 1983; 1988; 1998; Paulston, 1988; Crystal, 2000). To comment on the South African situation at local government level, Webb (2009:199) notes that African languages in South Africa will only be meaningfully used at local government level if actions directed at their promotion and development, secure the involvement of their communities. Community leaders and organisations need to spearhead their use.

Crystal (2000:100) describes bottom-up language planning initiatives as a top priority because they help to form the ground swell of public opinion which mostly leads to government action. Given the political and social marginalisation that characterises minority language communities, it is easy to assume that local decisions regarding language are of much less importance than nationally mandated policies. Since a community's language use is such a locally-sited cultural phenomenon and so intimately bound to the identity of that community, language use decisions made by speakers ultimately carry more weight in the language cultivation arena than official formulations of policy. It does not matter how politically disenfranchised the speakers are (Adegbija, 1994a:86).

Agents of language planning at local context level range from individuals or small groups of individuals, enthusiasts, language activists, local communities, officials from local community representatives, such as traditional leaders and political leaders, officials from official institutions which are not necessarily language oriented. One of the most prolific of these groups is religious bodies, particularly missionaries in Africa, and these participants usually work with local, national and international non-governmental organisations. They sometimes collaborate with government organisations and institutions (Alisajahbana, 1971; Bamgbose, 1987; 1989; Chumbow, 1989; Cooper, 1989; Baldauf, 1994; 2005; 2008; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Kamwendo, 2005; Trudell, 2006; Shohamy, 2006; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Hatoss, 2008; Lasimbang & Kinajil, 2008; Liddicoat & Baidauf, 2008; Spolsky, 2009; Ndhlovu, 2010).

While participants or agents of bottom-up planning lack power to manage, they can be successful to support and spread beliefs and ideologies which prepare the way for government planning. They can be successful to lobby for change in policy decisions. They depend on acceptance of their ideology by those they try to influence. They attempt to influence two groups, i.e. speakers of a language or ethnic group associated with the language and government who might undertake planning favouring the language(s). They are commonly encouraged by supranational organisations and by the growing acceptance of views associated with language rights (Spolsky, 2004; 2009; Shohamy, 2006).

The community must also select bodies or committees to act on their behalf. A good working and collaborative relationship that involves even the local, traditional and political leadership, as well as the macro and meso level agents of language change, needs to be developed.

2.6.2.1 Language committees/ associations

Although bottom-up initiatives can be initiated in some way by a selected few, an important requirement is that these leaders sensitise and mobilise other members of the community and establish bodies, non-governmental organisations and community-based committees or associations. These bodies manage, coordinate and monitor the process in an organised and collaborative way. These committees or associations are established through the work of initiating individuals to promote the interests of these communities. They manage the process in organised ways and ensure continued efforts to preserve, develop, promote the language as well as monitor and coordinate language work needed to be set up (Nahir, 1983; 1988; 1998; Fishman, 1991; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Klaus, 2003; Nagai & Lister, 2003; Trudell, 2006; Spolsky, 2009; Lasimbang & Kinajil, 2008; Hatoss, 2008; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Ndhlovu 2010).

These bodies must obtain community based support, legitimacy and authority in the eyes of the broader community to influence the views and behaviour of the members

of the broader community. The aim of language committees of community mobilisation for local language development, promotion, teaching and learning is achieved through embedding themselves in, and drawing their authority from, the community they represent. This entails the rhetoric of cooperation and networking. The bodies and committees need the necessary trust and support of their communities. They have to secure the right to speak on their behalf. They must be legitimate to shape and support the local desire for language development, teaching and learning (Nahir, 1983; 1988; 1998; Fishman, 1991; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Klaus, 2003; Nagai & Lister, 2003; Trudell, 2006; Spolsky, 2009; Lasimbang & Kinajil, 2008; Hatoss, 2008; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Ndhlovu 2010).

Community involvement in, and acceptance of, the bodies' work is vital for their survival and the success of the initiative. Effective bottom-up approaches require dialogical intervention strategies, development communication and advocacy between stakeholders on the goals of process of change. These committees must ensure positive community involvement by means of advocacy, dialogical intervention strategies, development communication and participatory action research. There is a need for these organisations to mobilise and raise awareness among the local population in a process of consciousness heightening and reformation to attain the requisite prior ideological clarification. There is need to engage and involve the speakers in everything. Successful efforts to resist hegemonic practices and policies need to be collective and organised, rather than private and unorganised (Fishman, 1991; Yee, 1994; Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer, 1998; Mwaniki, 2004; Lasimbang & Kinajil, 2008; Trudell, 2006; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Webb, 2009; 2010; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Ndhlovu 2010).

These bodies must have the required capacity, namely, the knowledge, understanding and skills together with the necessary social, political and financial authority. Such coordinating bodies must present a unified voice to fully utilise the impact of efforts of the community. These committees need a wide membership and

representation that includes everyone who speaks the language to reflect that the committee is leading a wider community movement. The committees must be people-driven and not executive-driven (Kamwendo, 2005; Trudell, 2006; Mumpande, 2006; Lasimbang & Kinajil, 2008; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b; Chriost, 2008; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Troy & Walsh, 2008; Webb, 2009; 2010; Ndhlovu, 2010).

Trudell (2006) provides examples of language committees that played a crucial role in the development and maintenance of minority indigenous languages of Northwest Cameroon. Trudell (2006) indicates that these committees' task include the overseeing of the production of teaching materials, local advocacy and raising awareness among the population of the value of mother tongue education and accessibility. Lasimbang and Kinajil (2008) also provide an example of a language association that serves the interests of the Kadazandusun community and kept the spirit of activism alive among community members and ensured continued efforts to preserve, develop and promote the Kudazandusun language.

The Kudazandusun Language Foundation monitored and coordinated language work that needed to be set up. It mobilised the Kudazandusun community to take more responsibility to develop and promote their language. The foundation also ensured the provision of technical and financial support, advice, consultancy, training workshops, networking and advocacy. The committees and the communities they represent constitute a group called language activists.

2.6.2.2 Language activists

Language activists are some of the principal participants at national level who add a significant linguicentric view. Spolsky (2009:258) refers to them as aspiring language managers who also influence language management in the school domain. They are part of all levels of society: members of the family, religious groups, enthusiasts, professionals or academics. Language activists can also constitute of various language minority organisations that operate at grassroots or national level. They

focus their efforts to persuade their governments to support them to enable or convince their fellow members to maintain or restore the use of their language (Magwa, 2010b:157).

Language activists attempt to influence national language policy and language-in-education policy by persuading government to support a particular language (Spolsky, 2009:184). They are concerned with the maintenance, revitalisation and spread of a threatened target language. Spolsky (2009:185) distinguishes between three classes of participants in this group; activists who are would-be managers, speakers of the target or other language(s) (Lewis & Trudell, 2008; McCarty, Skutnabb-Kangas & Magga, 2008; Spolsky, 2009).

Regardless of their lack of power to manage they can be successful to support and spread beliefs and ideologies, as well as practices which prepare the way for government management. They may be able to successfully lobby for legislation and other management decisions (Spolsky, 2009:198). Language activists usually depend on the acceptance of their ideology by those they try to influence. They are commonly encouraged and supported by supranational organisations and by the growing acceptance of views associated with linguistic human rights, educational linguistic human rights and minority rights (Spolsky, 2009:204-205).

2.6.2.3 Local institutions: Traditional leaders

Language planning and implementation initiatives cannot be sustained without adequate support from local institutions. The influence of local institutions is significant, whether they are indigenous institutions such as traditional leadership and cultural or language associations or nationally organised institutions with local representation. In addition to community support, bottom-up approaches must enlist the support of base-line opinion leaders unless they cause resentment and provoke popular resistance (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977; Bourhis, 2001; Kembo-Sure, 2004; Trudell, 2006; Cartwright, 2006; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b; Webb, 2009; Ndhlovu, 2010).

Research in bottom-up initiatives of official minority languages in Zimbabwe, particularly among the Tonga group, shows the centrality of traditional leaders in bottom-up initiatives (Tremmel, 1994; Mumpande, 2006; Makoni, Makoni, & Nyika, 2008; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b; Ndhlovu, 2010). To recount the success story of the three language committees in Northwest Cameroon, Trudell (2006) indicates that negotiation and collaboration with local power bases was key. It helped the Bafut, Kom and Nso' committees accomplish their local language promotion efforts. This type of institutional support alone is not sufficient, because other factors like the historical, socio-cultural and economic environment of a community are extremely influential and have the ability to outweigh any measure of institutional or official influence (Lewis & Trudell, 2008:271).

2.6.2.4 Elite

The perspective of members of the community's elite, whether they live locally or outside the community, often has an influence on the community's initiatives (Prah, 2005). To comment on the role of the African elite, Bamgbose (2000:2) notes that apart from the lack of political will by those in authority, perhaps the most important factor that impedes the increased use of African languages is the lack of interest by the elite. He notes that the African elite is quick to judge that African languages are not enough developed to be used in certain domains or that the standard of education is likely to fall if ex-colonial languages are not used as media of instruction at certain levels of education.

The African elite think indigenous languages are linguistically crippled and are incapable to be used in higher domains. A major part of the non-implementation of bottom-up policies stems from the attitude of those who benefit from the maintenance of the *status quo*. In some cases the promotion of non-national languages is feared to cause political instability and ethnic clashes. There are fears that the promotion of these other languages will undermine the nationalist objectives of the nation-state (Luoch & Ogutu, 2002; Batibo, 2005; Kamwendo, 2005; Mumpande, 2006; Ndhlovu, 2008a; 2009; Makoni, 2011; Ndlovu, 2011). Language planning is unlikely to succeed

unless it is embraced and promoted by the elite and counter-elite. Neither the elite nor counter-elite are likely to embrace language planning activities by others unless they perceive it to be in their own interest too. Where the community's elite is concerned, advocacy activities have to focus particularly on the positive impact of the initiative on their priorities and concerns (Cooper, 1989; Fishman, 1991; Myers-Scotton, 1993; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Bamgbose, 2000; Strubell, 2001; Webb, 2002; 2009; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2003; Mwaniki, 2004; Prah, 2005; Kamwendo, 2005; Alidou, 2004; Annamalia, 2004; Trudell, 2006; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b; Ndhlovu, 2010).

The Malawian Chitumbuka case presents an interesting example of how elite closure jeorpadises grassroots initiatives. According to Kamwendo (2005:149) the first move towards the promotion of Chinyanja, at the expense of Chitumbuka, came from Chitumbuka-speaking politicians. They were of the opinion that Chitumbuka is not able to serve as the nation's national language. It must be noted that it is not always the case that the elite is against the development of their languages. There are cases, like with the Hebrew where Eliezer Ben Yehuda and David Yellen pioneered initiatives that led to the revitalisation of Hebrew (Nahir, 1983; 1988; 1994; Cooper, 1989; Fishman, 1991; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Crystal, 2000; Shohamy, 2006; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008:5; Spolsky, 2009:185).

Rob Amery, a linguist that worked in collaboration with his community, helped with the revival of the Kaurna language in Australia. Sabino Arana created a variety of cultural symbols of Basque nationalism which pioneered the development of the first standard variety of Basque. Frank Le Maistre pioneered the development of a standardised orthography and the development of a codified lexicon for Jersey Norman French (Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008:5). Liddicoat and Baldauf (2008) and Spolsky (2009) document a number of bottom-up initiatives which were pioneered and sustained by the unwavering support of the elite.

According to Trudell (2006:204), a strong sense of responsibility and commitment for the welfare of the home language among the elite from the Bafut, Kom and Nso'

language groups ensured the success of mother tongue education in these languages in northwest Cameroon. Trudell (2006) notes that among the elite, development of their area are a priority and loyalty to local languages and cultures exist among them. The elite are part of teams that develop and promote the teaching and learning of their languages. They see it as efforts to maintain their identity and vitality.

2.6.2.5 Government and its branches

The central government, by means of ministry of education, oversees language in education management. Education systems are principally the property of states. Even if authority is devolved to semi-autonomous bodies to deliver schooling, states typically licence, authorise, control, fund or certify educational practices. In a diverse of ways, the education sector carries the imprimatur and conditioning of political systems. The overarching interest of states in formal education is deep and longstanding. Various levels of government use the school as the principal medium to teach language to children. The decision on language of instruction and core/ compulsory, optional/ additional subjects and foreign languages are a key activity of government (Cooper, 1989; Dorian, 1999; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; May, 2001; 2006; Fishman, 2006; Shohamy, 2006; Ferguson, 2006; Ndhlovu, 2009; Lo Bianco, 2008; Spolsky, 2009).

The state has to create language development infrastructure, enabling policy environment, provide funding, the necessary human resource base and materials, offer political will, address elite closure and work in liaison with all the stakeholders. A central agency, such as government authority, is required to oversee and coordinate all planning activities to ensure a measure of uniformity of form, norms and goals as well as to maximise all efforts directed towards national development. Since the government and government institutions are the primary institutions concerned with the promotion of status, corpus and acquisition planning, language groups have to be careful to cultivate cooperative relationships with the government as well as with its different structures and institutions. No language policy can be successfully

implemented without the support of an authoritative body. All departments of the authoritative body need to be involved. Implementation of a language policy requires an authoritative backbone to achieve the goals. This backbone motivates the execution of the language policy by the people affected (Eastman, 1983; Crystal, 2000; Batibo, 2005; Chumbow, 1987; Fishman, 1991; 2006; Corson, 1993; May, 2001; 2006; Webb, 2002; Shohamy, 2006; Trudell, 2006; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2006; Ndhlovu, 2010).

According to Valiquette (1998:107), cited in Crystal (2000:154), an appropriate bureaucracy and technology are important aids to foster language revitalisation and maintenance. This can never be its foundation, because the foundation has to emerge from within the homes and neighbourhoods of the community members themselves. Government funding and structural assistance are needed in the success of both bottom-up and top-down policies (Strubell, 2001; Batibo, 2005; Baldauf, 2008; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008). Governments have to secure and deploy language management variables, methodologies and strategies. They also have to develop the seven areas of policy development for language-in-education policy implementation (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Mwaniki, 2004; 2010b; 2012).

Government support is often necessary because the scope and duration of language policy activity is so vast that only immense infusions of funding and human time will produce reasonable results. Communities of speakers must be ‘sold’ whatever plan is conceptualised. The cost and duration of the ‘selling’ process can be vastly reduced if there is wide-scale participation in the process (Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003:225; Tulloch, 2008:95). Government must formulate appropriate language policies that indicate which language will be used for which roles, provide a schedule of implementation and establish specific government departments to oversee implementation.

Government must also establish active national councils or academies to deal with policy mattersfor language promotion and development. Government must also establish language research centres which should be mandated to conduct language surveys and advise on issues of language promotion and development. It must be at

the forefront to sensitise and cultivate in people a sense of pride in their languages. This should come as a resource from which they can draw to increase the value of their potential contribution to productivity. It needs to generate language policies based on objective research and national consultation. It needs to integrate both the top-down and bottom-up approaches. Without an enabling policy environment from government, bottom-up initiatives struggle to succeed (Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Crystal, 2000; Webb, 2002; 2009; Mwaniki, 2004; Batibo, 2005; Trudell, 2006; Lewis & Trudell, 2008).

To illustrate the value of government support in local context planning, Spolsky (2004:196) notes that Māori revitalisation efforts owe their success not only to the Maoris themselves, but also to government recognition and support. The success story of the Hungarian bottom-up initiatives points to the importance of an enabling policy environment. It can also be attributed to the Australian government's shift from assimilationist policies to inclusive, multilingual and multicultural policies that were more tolerant of ethnic and linguistic diversity (Hatoss, 2008:59; 61).

To relate the value of language legislation and status planning, Tollefson & Tsui (2004b:288) note that in New Zealand the change in Māori-Pākehā relations led to the re-invogarated *Treaty of Waitangi*. It introduced biculturalism and equality into the law and public discourse. With the Māori language legally recognised as an official language of state, Māori communities achieved significant gains in Māori medium education. Tollefson & Tsui (2004b) conclude that these gains were possible and sustained, in part, through language rights guarantees in the *Treaty of Waitangi*. In the case of Rama in Nicaragua, the constitutional commitment to linguistic and cultural rights ensured the success of the revitalisation efforts thereof (Crystal, 2000:129). Jones and Martin-Jones (2004:52) note that the *Welsh Language Act* of the 1990s ensured that Welsh was recognised as to have the same status as English. The Act made Welsh medium education obligatory. This increased parental demand for Welsh medium education.

According to Novak-Lukanovič and Limon (2012:28), the formal assurance of Slovene equality with other federal languages in *The 1974 Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Slovenia* created a legal basis for the more decisive enforcement of linguistic rights. It also laid the foundation for the legal framework for the public use of the Slovene language. *The 1974 Constitution* also offered powerful arguments for those that advocate for the teaching Slovene as a compulsory language in all the sectors of public life. *The 1974 Constitution* also granted Italian and Hungarian minorities the right to freely use their languages and granted them the status of official languages in areas populated by Italian and Hungarian ethnic communities. This legal framework enabled the successful teaching and learning of these minority languages.

Although government must be involved, purely political motivations must not be allowed to capture the process. The Malawian case of the Society for the Advancement of Chiyao, presented by Kamwendo (2005:152), clearly illustrates the effects if government is allowed to invest its interest more than the community's. The collapse of the Society is attributed to Yoa politicians who were part of the society who started to use it to satisfy their political motives. Even the failure of the 1984 initiatives of official minority language speaking communities of Zimbabwe can be attributed to them being hijacked by the government of the time. They pretended to give in to their demands, but this was a political move in a crisis situation to pacify these speakers and gain their support. Their concerns were used as a rallying point for a coalition with the government's 'enemy' at the time.

2.6.2.6 Other government institutions

Bottom-up planning need to be intentional and institutionally well supported to succeed. Apart from the participation of civil society and government, the need for intelligent and ingenious measures by language planning policy implementers and institutions, which include researchers and academics, is indispensable. Publishers, the media, schools, colleges, universities and other national and international institutions are crucial to provide the needed technical expertise and funding.

Language revitalisation may be more effective if the introduction of a well-planned and aggressive set of measures is supported by both the speakers and national institutions (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977; Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; Fishman, 1991; Crystal, 2000; Bourhis, 2001; Adegbija, 2001; Strubell, 2001; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Batibo, 2005; Cartwright, 2006; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Harford, 2011).

2.6.2.6.1 Higher and tertiary education institutions and language research institutes

Universities and other national institutions play a critical role in language planning since they are expected to serve the communities they are located in. They have a clearly defined community service commitment in addition to their teaching and research tasks. They need to provide specific support for the languages of the communities around them. Universities are an integral part of their immediate community and should establish dialogical relations with the community. They have to involve them to identify and design the curriculum and priorities. Universities must be at the centre of the search for solutions to the problem of non-implementation dilemmas that bedevil multilingual language policies. Their mission should derive partly from the locality and context from which they derive their sustenance. Language research institutes provide a channel of communication between the local community and government and serve as a mechanism to direct energies, funds and revitalisation activities. They give indigenous languages an institutionalised presence and thus prestige. Without prestige, and the power which this brings, no language movement can succeed (*Organisation of African Unity, 1986 Language Plan of Action for Africa*; Peddie, 1991; Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; Ngara, 1995; Chimhundu *et al*., 1998; Crystal, 2000; Strubell, 2001; Webb, 2002; Batibo, 2005; Nkomo, 2008; Harford, 2011).

To highlight the centrality of universities, Bamgbose (2000:55) notes that much of the progress in the teaching of African languages is due to the efforts of universities and colleges of education. They lead in the training of teachers, experiment in pilot projects, do basic research and develop materials, terminology and metalanguage.

They drive language standardisation and development. Developments in mother tongue education in several Africa countries, is not only due to deliberate policy decisions, but rather to the efforts by universities. Examples thereof are, the Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society (CASAS), Academy of Language (ACALAN), Open Society Initiative of Southern Africa (OSISA), the Project for the study of Alternative Education in Southern Africa (PRAESA) at the University of Cape Town, The Nziramasanga Commission from the University of Zimbabwe, the works of the National Language Policy Advisory Panel in Zimbabwe and the Multilingualism Education Project by the Centre for Higher Education Development at the University of Cape Town.

Universities also have powerful and active language or linguistic associations and societies, such as the African Association for Lexicography (AFRILEX), the Southern African Applied Linguistics Association (SAALA), Linguistic Society of Southern Africa and African Languages Association of Southern Africa (ALASA), which generate valuable insights through research that contribute to sound policies, language development and documentation. To emphasize the role of universities in language planning, Peddie (1991:35) notes that the success story of the development of Māori in New Zealand, that culminated in the development of Māori relates to the research, advice and consultative activities of specialists in the field of language planning. Therewith it was assisted by strong ethnic community involvement, a long established literacy presence and a supportive policy environment (Crystal, 2000:128; Batibo, 2005:110).

During the colonial era, Afrikaans universities generally regarded their departments of Afrikaans as their “flagships” (Webb, 2010:264). They provided these departments with strong support, well-trained staff and funding for research work. Given the central role of tertiary and higher education institutions, close cooperation should be forged between them and other stakeholders involved in language-in-education planning and implementation. A detailed discussion of the role of tertiary institutions and language research institutions is included in the methodology chapter.

2.6.2.6.2 Publishers

Publishers are custodians of language, because they determine or influence the educational material available to the learners to a large extent and determine the language in which it will be available. There is no doubt that it is more profitable to publish in well established languages with a ready market. Publishers are unlikely to extend their production of educational materials into less established languages, unless they are guaranteed a market. There are always fears that to publish in minority languages is not economically viable and sustainable. But an enabling policy environment provides the impetus to publish in minority languages (Webb, 2002; Klaus, 2003; Benson, 2005; Djité, 2008).

2.6.2.7 Supranational or Non Governmental Organisations

While it is generally assumed that national policy is resourced and implemented by the government and its agencies, in some nations the implementation of language policy may depend on the assistance from international agencies - both governmental and non-governmental. The participation of local, community-based development organisations becomes particularly important when the national government's capacity to resource policy is limited. Where resource support from the national government is not forthcoming at all, local communities may be forced to fund and equip their own language cultivation efforts (Lewis & Trudell, 2008:270).

Research shows that the role of the donor community and other community-based organisations in bottom-up activities is indispensable. It is, especially true where the state does not show political will, or is financially unable to finance the initiative or when the community's financial strength is weak (Bamgbose, 1987; 1989; Chumbow, 1987; Fishman, 1991; Dorian, 1998; Stroud, 2001; Klaus, 2003; Heugh, 2003; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2003; Kamwendo, 2005; Trudell, 2006; Chriost, 2008; Baldauf, 2008; Tulloch, 2008; Troy & Walsh, 2008; Lasimbang & Kinajil, 2008; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Spolsky, 2004; 2009; Shohamy, 2006; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003;

Benson, 2005; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Hatoss, 2008; Mumpande, 2006; Ndhlovu, 2010; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Webb, 2009; 2010).

Lewis and Trudell (2008:270) note that, in cases where national level capacities to resource and implement are inadequate, local capacities become essential for effective language policy implementation. In these cases, local perspectives on language policy assume an especially important role. Local community leaders will need to be aware of language issues, the policy options available as well as the costs and benefits of the options. In these cases, consultants from organisations outside the community, national or international, may play a significant role to provide access to the information and expertise that these leaders need.

If ownership of language cultivation efforts is not clearly local, sustained success of those efforts is unlikely; no matter how supportive the non-local bodies are. There is a need for indigenous communities to have positive attitudes towards their language and demonstrate an interest to obtain help. The concerned language speakers need to be prepared for change. The whole, or a significant majority of a community, has to be involved, and develop a sense of responsibility for language revitalisation initiatives to attract and sustain external support. Speakers need to take their destiny in their hands before they expect external support, because, 'when you do not attempt to carry your own load, you cannot expect assistance from anyone' (Adegbija, 1993; 1994b; 1997; 2001; Crystal, 2000; Strubell, 2001; Batibo, 2005; Trudell, 2006; Lasimbang & Kinajil, 2008; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Ndhlovu, 2010).

Non-governmental organisations and various institutions are important actors in the initiation and implementation of micro planning initiatives (Hatoss, 2008:56). Spolsky (2009:206, 224) describes supranational organisations as activist groups outside the nation who seek to persuade government to develop a specific policy. They provide financial, moral and rhetorical support for advocates within a nation. They assist to develop and promote statements and charters that proclaim human and civil rights relevant to minority groups. Their main participation in macro and micro level language planning is to present rhetorical statements of international and regional

consensus, which are available to governments, language activists and the micro level. They disseminate information to promote linguistic diversity, respect of rights of linguistic minorities, namely, linguistic human rights and educational linguistic human rights (Bamgbose, 1987; 1989; Chumbow, 1987; Fishman, 1991; Dorian, 1998; Stroud, 2001; Klaus, 2003; Heugh, 2003; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2003; Kamwendo, 2005; Trudell, 2006; Chriost, 2008; Baldauf, 2008; Tulloch, 2008; Troy & Walsh, 2008; Lasimbang & Kinajil, 2008; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Spolsky, 2004; 2009; Shohamy, 2006; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Benson; 2005; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Hatoss, 2008; Mumpande, 2006; Ndhlovu, 2010; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Webb, 2009; 2010).

Supranational organisations are also involved in civic training, education and the certification of officials and professionals in language planning matters. They offer legal guidance on issues related to activism, advocacy, legislation and litigation. They advocate for education and social equity (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997:80). They influence beliefs and ideologies more than practices. They support notions of human, linguistic and civil rights, without implementation implications or to face the practical consequences. They can formulate policies without the responsibility to enforce them. Occasionally, they can become participants, but unless their charters are ratified and implemented by their sovereign members, their influence is to spread and support beliefs about diversity, multilingualism, human, language and civil rights. It may bolster the campaigns of language activists that aim to persuade their national governments. In the *1997 Report of Amnesty International*, released on the 17th of June, 1998, it was revealed that the Human Rights Declaration is ignored in as many as 141 countries of the world and is not implemented by the signatories (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1998; 2000; 2003; 2006; Bamgbose, 2000; Spolsky, 2009; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010).

These international and regional declarations and charters remain archival material to be quoted by scholars that write on language policy, because they are not always enforceable and infractions do not attract sanctions. Behind the beautiful rhetoric of the declarations and charters of the supranational organisations there is little

commitment to what they stipulate. Some of the declarations, treaties and charters do not provide a set of models for the legal implementation of stipulations (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1998; 2000; 2003; 2006; Bamgbose, 2000; Tsui & Tollefson, 2004; Spolsky, 2009; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010). Alidou (2004:204) has similar sentiments that in spite of the World Bank calls for the promotion of quality education in Africa and its recognition of the value of mother tongue education to attain this goal, its funded projects in Africa do not specifically include budgets for bilingual schools. This further confirms the gap between the rhetoric of international declarations and the reality of their implementation.

Mazrui (2000), cited in Alidou (2004:204), argues that part of the lack of wide acceptance and ratification of international charters and declarations relates to African governments' fears of hidden agendas of international organisations. He notes that the World Bank's loans to developing nations are always tied to a package of conditions. This distanced most African governments to just be signatories of some international declarations and charters. Brock-Utne and Hopson (2005:7) note that the World Bank pays lip service to the claim that mother tongue education is the preferable choice. Instead, the World Bank seems to see the use of African languages in the early grades of primary education just as a strategy to the smooth transition to the European languages as languages of instruction. Skutnabb-Kangas' (1998; 2000; 2003; 2006) comments of the limitations of binding educational clauses of human rights instruments are discussed in chapter three.

As Spolsky (2009:206) rightly notes, in spite of the commonly held myth that the 21st century's globalisation marks the end of the power of the nation-state, devolution and partition of multilingual and multiethnic states into smaller ones, constitute a reaffirmation of the power of the nation state. Supranational organisations are in their operations handicapped by the need to respect the national sovereignty of the individual nations that are signatories to these declarations. Thereof, supranational organisations do not have adequate authority to set policy, but are able to influence nations to set policy. As a result, supranational organisations mainly provide moral and rhetorical support for advocates within a nation.

Given this lack of authority, and respect for national sovereignty, of supranational organisations, there is a need to empower these organisations. For mother tongue education to be effectively implemented, the power of supranational organisations needs to be restructured, redefined and redistributed. Supranational organisations, such as the African Union (AU) and those under the auspice of the United Nations (UN) on mother tongue education, need to be empowered with the responsibility to enforce their declarations, treaties and charters. If comppleted, it will be easy for these supranational organisations to ensure that infractions attract sanctions (Ndlovu, 2011:237-238).

The implementation of international, continental and regional policies, expressed in treaties, charters and declarations of supranational organisations, will not be a problem if their stipulations on mother tongue education are domesticated in the constitutions, national language policies and language-in-education policies of the member states. Constitutions, national language policies and language-in-education policies of member states of the international, continental and regional communities should, and must, engender a culture of these declarations, treaties and charters. They have to champion the ethos of these declarations, treaties and charters (Ndlovu, 2011:237-238).

To relate the success story of Chitumbuka's bottom-up initiatives, Kamwendo (2005:153) argues that, despite strong community support, the efforts of the Chitumbuka people were nearly ruined by severe lack of financial and technical support. The Chitumbuka case reveals how important it is for bottom-up initiatives to forge links with expert support and the different agencies of language-political change. With the realisation of the indispensable role of supranational or non-governmental organisations in the implementation of the 2002 policy development, the current Minister of Education, Sports, Arts and Culture in Zimbabwe, Senator Coltart stated that his ministry saw it necessary to partner with the donor community to produce millions of textbooks and stationery kits for schools affected by the policy statement (Moyo, 2010). With acknowledgement of the central role of supranational or non-governmental organisations, the district local languages coordinator for Venda

and Sotho appealed to donor communities to intervene. He also revealed that the publication of Shangani textbooks was as a result of donor support (Bulawayo Bureau, 2010).

Examples of these supranational organisations include UNESCO, the European Union, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the United Nations Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF), the African Union (AU), the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), the Southern African Development Community (SADC), the World Bank/IMF and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Too much outside support can actually be harmful, because it might undermine the indigenous community's motivation and sense of self-sufficiency. If the community surrenders its responsibility to outsiders, or only to a few persons within the community, the language revitalisation efforts are bound to fail (Crystal, 2000; Strubell, 2001; Adegbija, 2001). To share similar sentiments, Chriost (2008:90) explains that it is crucial that the momentum for community based language planning initiatives comes from within the specific local communities, rather than as result of the action of external agencies.

2.6.2.8 Religious groups: Christian churches and other religious groups

The role of the church in language development and acquisition planning in Africa dates back to the colonial era. The activities of the churches in language development are with the hidden agenda to promote the spread of the gospel. This is widely documented in literature. In most minority languages, where literature is available, the literature is mainly Christian literature. To negotiate and collaborate with such institutions in bottom-up and top-down activities is indispensable. Language use in religious circles contributes immensely to the vitality of the language. Churches are strong, potential supporters of written mother tongue to ensure the spread of the gospel to all corners of the world. It is evidenced by the large number of Bible translations, Christian literature and hymn books in a variety of languages. It must be a priority for language groups to gain the support of Christian churches and other religious groups (Alisajhbana, 1971; Karam, 1974; Bamgbose,

1987; 1989; Chumbow, 1987; Mutasa, 1995; Grenoble & Whaley, 1998; Dorian, 1998; Hachipola, 1998; Kamwendo, 2005; Msindo, 2005; Mumpande, 2006; Trudell, 2006; Hadebe, 2006; Nkomo, 2008).

2.7 Complementary nature of top-down and bottom-up approaches: The mixed approach

Most successful top-down and bottom-up initiatives owe their success to collaboration and the coordination of activities between the top and the bottom; within the top and its structures and the bottom and its structures. The macro level enables implementation through legislation and allocation of resources, while the micro level provides grassroot commitment and community support. The meso level provides a facilitatory and supportive role. The effectiveness of top-down and bottom-up approaches, especially in cases that involve minority languages, depend on a range of policy and implementation issues. These issues include the national political will, the availability of resources and expertise, local interpretation of national policy direction and local readiness to participate in their implementation (Bamgbose, 1987; 1989; Chumbow, 1987; Alexander, 1992; Fishman, 1991; Zvobgo, 1997; 2007; Crystal, 2000; Klaus, 2003; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2003; Batibo, 2005; Benson, 2005; Kamwendo, 2005; Trudell, 2006; Chriost, 2008; Baldauf, 2008; Tulloch, 2008; Troy & Walsh, 2008; Lasimbang & Kinajil, 2008; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Spolsky, 2004; 2009; Shohamy, 2006; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Baldauf, 2008; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Hatoss, 2008; Jankie, 2009; Mwaniki, 2010; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004b; Jones & Martin-Jones, 2004; Novak-Lukanovič & Limon, 2012).

Language planning and language policy implementation demand commitment, a shared sense of responsibility, a clear sense of direction and a wide range of special skills. It requires a team work approach, because the task is so huge that it needs proper planning and management. It requires the involvement of selected people with individual skills that act on behalf, or in consultation with, the community as a whole. Where local motivation to engage with policy is strong and adequately supported, by either government or non-government institutions, bottom-up and top-down initiatives

significantly contributes to multilingual language policy implementation (Crystal, 2000; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2003; Trudell, 2006; Hatoss, 2008; Baldauf, 2005; 2008; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008).

Bottom-up and top-down approaches must not be separate, independent processes. There is need for cooperation, coordination, interdependency and mutual understanding between the agents of or participants to the two approaches. They are interdependent processes needed to achieve the local or national goals of any language policy. Macro and micro level planning are often simultaneously at work. To obtain a clear understanding of bottom-up language planning, clarity must be obtained on the nature of top-down planning, together with the relationship between the two directions of planning. Top-down planning is initiated at the top, but can only be understood within the wider scope of bottom-up planning (Cooper, 1989; Baldauf, 1994; 2005; 2008; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Spolsky, 2004; 2009; Shohamy, 2006; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Chua, 2008; Hatoss, 2008; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Mwaniki, 2010; 2012).

The complex interaction of macro, meso and micro level planning demonstrates the ways in which national or supra-national and locally held values converge or conflict with regard to language. Successful language planning, policy implementation and management, are a result of careful attention to both levels of decision making. The focus is also on all of the sectors and stakeholders in terms of the influence of each on language planning, policy implementation and management. There is a need for a network of committed, consented, coordinated, informed and participatory action from all levels of decision making. Language planning and policy implementation need the direct involvement of citizens through consultation, together with awareness and information campaigns. There needs to be continual dialogue between government agencies, the private sector, non-governmental organisations, education institutions, communities, labour organisations and any other concerned bodies (Schiffman, 1996; Bamgbose, 2000; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Mwaniki, 2004; 2010b; 2012).

To discuss the interaction of bottom-up and top-down planning, Liddicoat and Baldauf (2008:10-11) state that the two are particular processes within a general framework of language planning. Though it is necessary to distinguish between them, such a distinction is in reality a false one. What happens mostly in local language planning contexts is related to the macro-level context, but the interaction between the levels can be complex. Interaction between the micro and the macro can operate in either direction. Language planning activities that commence at local level can influence macro-level decision making.

When a speech community takes action to change, enhance, promote, revive, maintain or defend its own language, their decisions are not made in isolation. While the local language ecology is the core site for these activities it is embedded within, and influenced by, broader ecologies. It is these influences which are being articulated as problems and in opposition to the prevailing influences and solutions. Equally, language planning activities at national level is able to influence decision making at local level. Language planning at macro level is implemented in local context in response to (although not always) local conditions. A macro level institution may create and establish norms and expectations for the way in which languages are to be used in local communities. How this is realised, depend on decisions made at other levels (Bamgbose, 1987; Baldauf, 1994; 2008; Liddicoat, 2008; Webb, 2010; Ndhlovu, 2010; Cuvelier, 2010).

To emphasize the importance of micro level planning, Hatoss (2008:56) reports that the role that local communities play in language planning is not only a gap-filling-exercise which aims to satisfy the planning needs that official policies cannot achieve. Micro planning is an essential and necessary complement to the overt, official macro level planning and policy, because language planning is concerned with the influence on the language behaviour of local communities. It is the local communities who are in the best position to fulfil this role. The macro and meso levels need to be heavily involved and the community has to take ownership and actively participate in the whole process. The success of bottom-up and top-down initiatives lie in mutual cooperation between the micro, macro and meso agents

(Baldauf, 2008:25). Language policy formulation is everybody's business and without the help of communities involved, as well as the larger community, a stable language ecology will not develop. With this, no amount of planning is likely to bring sustained language change (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Lasimbang & Kinajil, 2008).

To emphasize the importance of the interaction between top-down and bottom-up approaches to language planning, Webb (2002:42-43; 236) highlights that language planning should be a non-technist activity. It must be sensitive to the potential of language hegemonic goals, to its use as an instrument of power, discrimination, manipulation and exploitation. The absence of community involvement in decision-making exacerbates language exclusion thereof community involvement in all types of language planning is essential. Irrespective of language planning essentially viewed as a top-down activity that needs to be authoritative, requiring governmental resources and effective management, it actually needs the support of communities it is intended for. It cannot succeed without the support of the community, unless excessive force is used.

Top-down policy is not enough. It may fail if there is no bottom-up or local support. The opposite is equally true (Hornberger, 2009:3). To implement a language policy, the existing government machinery needs to adapt itself to the language policy needs of the community. If previously or marginalised languages, particularly minority languages, are to be empowered to be able to maintain themselves and flourish as effective media for their users together with being vehicles for their solidarity and self-identity, there is a need for concerted institutional support. The support should involve logistic and material contributions from the respective communities, governments, regional or continent-wide organisations as well as institutions, non-governmental organisations and regional associations and societies (Eastman, 1983; Crystal, 2000; Batibo, 2005; Chua, 2008; Hatoss, 2008).

Macro, meso and micro level planning are needed in any re-adjustment to the education policy, because policy is text and action, words and deeds. Macro level

planning need meso and micro level planning in individual schools if it is to be effectively implemented. Neither micro, nor macro level planning initiatives can be sustained by the community or government alone. They are essential, complementary elements of language planning (Baldauf, 2008:36). Language policy implementation can only succeed where the efforts and support of the speakers and national institutions become more powerful and integrated. The policies at national level interact with less studied and less obvious policies that occur at lower levels. The lack of interaction between these different levels contributes significantly to the failure of a national policy. The opposite is also true (Baldauf, 1994; 2005; 2008; Spolsky, 2004; Batibo, 2005; Hatoss, 2008; Lewis & Trudell, 2008).

According to Batibo (2005:127), the future of African languages, particularly the marginalised minority languages, depends largely on the extent to which collective action can be mobilised. It needs to involve local and external expertise and resources and has the support of respective governments. It is important to coordinate diverse efforts, build consensus among the players and encourage collaboration among them (Lewis & Trudell, 2008:270). Batibo (2005:127) proposes that these efforts should ideally be coordinated by language experts. They should be given every opportunity to liaise with relevant authorities in the government and correspond with outside organisations, donors, individuals or communities.

A bottom-up approach does not only mean that people from grassroot level are actively involved in the process, but also their interests are served too. Language planning has to explicitly note the wants and needs, the views and attitudes and the linguistic competencies of the general public. Language planning happens according to expressed needs directed. It is important to determine the needs of the community to fulfil them. Macro level planning requires meso and micro level planning not only for its implementation, but also to ensure that it responds to local needs (Ball, 1994:10), cited in Baldauf (2008:34); Chua, 2008:195).

Given that language education policies of the 21st century need to grapple with local and global challenges simultaneously in order to respond to the multiple challenges

that small languages face, a mixed approach to language-in-education planning will be the best option. The challenges are due to the ever-increasing forces of globalisation and nationalism and therefore there is a need for local planning, supported by national policy and ideology. Effective bottom-up planning requires agreement between stakeholders throughout the whole process. This agreement is achieved by means of development communication, advocacy, participatory research and dialogical intervention strategies. All efforts need the dedicated cooperation of all stakeholders and effectively deploy development communication strategies whose aim is to create public awareness, mobilise public participation as well as obtain and support the cooperation of other key stakeholders (Strubell, 2001; Adegbija, 1993; 1994b; 1997; 2001; Trudell, 2006; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Hatoss, 2008; Webb, 2009).

The most important strategy and mechanism in a bottom-up movement is the promotion of the sustained discourse between government, community organisations, supranational organisations and the concerned community(ies). The influence and enthusiasm of the language community and speakers is not sufficient. There is a need to also mobilise support from other influential institutions. Sustained micro, macro and meso level discourse and dialogue builds and entrench mutual trust, cooperation and coordination at the different levels of language planning. It also leads to the construction of new language ideologies among the different stakeholders. This is not always easy to achieve and the gap is often located here (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977; Fishman, 1991; Strubell, 2001; Bourhis, 2001; Trudell, 2006; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Hatoss, 2008; Chriost, 2008; Spolsky, 2009; Webb, 2009).

In the case of Welsh, critical factors that contributed to the successful efforts to revitalise it, include the rise of a strong community movement in the 1970s, the presence of a visionary leader and protective legislation. In the case of Rama in Nicaragua, chief factors were the involvement of a visionary language rescuer who managed to motivate and mobilise the local community, together with a constitutional commitment to linguistic and cultural rights. The presence of a team of professional

linguists was also secured (Crystal, 2000:129). The success of Hungarian bottom-up initiatives show that bottom-up planning is an essential, complementary element of top-down planning. Neither top-down planning, nor bottom-up planning is sufficient on their own (Hatoss, 2008). The same is true for the Hebrew, Maori, and French Quebec cases (Nahir, 1984; 1988; 1998; Fishman, 1991; Bourhis, 2001).

2.8 The ethnolinguistic vitality model

The ethnolinguistic vitality model is very useful to systematically analyse how ethnolinguistic vitality affects the implementation of top-down and bottom-up policies. The model was first developed by Giles, Bourhis and Taylor (1977) to assess demographic, institutional support and prestige of Quebec's French against the English speaking elite. Its structural variables overlap with language management variables, methodologies and strategies and Webb's (2010) conditions that determine the success and failure of top-down and bottom-up policies. The model is a necessary tool of analysis that complements the LMA, especially given that the policy in question is a result of a bottom-up approach to language planning. The ethnolinguistic vitality framework is a necessary tool of analysis that complements the LMA in explaining the non-implementation dilemmas that bedevil multilingual language-in-education policies. It explains, especially those that are a result of the bottom-up approach to language planning. The framework provides an analytic tool to explain the success and failure of bottom-up policies.

Ethnolinguistic vitality is defined as that which makes an ethnolinguistic group likely to behave as a distinctive and active collective group in intergroup situations (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977; Paulston, 1988; Bourhis, 2001; Cartwright; 2006). Giles, Bourhis and Taylor (1977) argue that ethnolinguistic minorities that have little or no group, vitality will eventually cease to exist as an active, collective and distinctive group in intergroup situations. The more vitality an ethnolinguistic group has, the more likely it is to survive and thrive as an active, collective and distinctive group in intergroup contexts. An ethnolinguistic group with high vitality is more likely to have high social status, heightened ethnolinguistic awareness, linguistic nationalism and

ethnic nationalism. They are prerequisites for successful bottom-up initiatives. Such a group is more likely to succeed to revitalise, maintain and promote its language.

Giles, Bourhis and Taylor (1977) developed a three-level structural analysis to investigate how a community, identified by its mother tongue, can survive and behave as an active, collective and distinctive group in intergroup situations. Giles, Bourhis and Taylor organised variables that are likely to influence the vitality of a group into three categories, namely, status, demography and institutional support. These three variables allow an ethnolinguistic group to survive and behave as an active, collective and distinctive group in intergroup situations.

2.8.1 Status variables

Status variables relate to the ethnolinguistic group's social prestige, economic status, sociohistorical status and language status; within and without. The more status an ethnolinguistic group has in the context of intergroup interactions, the more vitality it will have (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977:310).

2.8.1.1 Economic status

Economic status refers to the degree of control a language group has gained over the economic life of its nation, region or community. A linguistic group's vitality in terms of economic status is determined by its degree of control over its own economic destiny. Economically strong groups are more likely to succeed in their bottom-up initiatives, because they are able fund their own initiatives (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977:310).

2.8.1.2 Social status

Social status is defined as the degree of esteem that an ethnolinguistic group affords itself. More often, this group self-esteem reflects what is attributed to it by the outgroup (Milner, 1975), cited in Giles, Bourhis & Taylor (1977). Low self-esteem and prestige on the part of the group can sap its morale. Conversely, high self-esteem is

more likely to bolster it. According to Batibo (2005:112) the more positive community attitudes are towards their language, the more pride they take in their language and the stronger it is. The social status of an ethnolinguistic group reflects what Webb (2010:139) refers to as the social and cultural character of the community. It is an essential ingredient in successful cases of bottom-up approaches.

The social status of an ethnolinguistic group reflects its language ideologies or attitudes, namely, its language loyalty. It relates to the community's support for its language and its tendency to express its identity through its language. A community with a strong social and cultural character or high social status has a tendency to express its identity through its mother tongue. Bottom-up approaches that involve a language which its speakers are ashamed of, and which the younger generation would rather forget, usually take time and a lot of effort to succeed. A language of which its speakers are proud, which has a vibrant culture and which the younger generation is eager to use and be associated with, will never die (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977; Bourhis, 2001; Adegbija, 2001; Cartwright, 2006; Hatoss, 2008).

2.8.1.3 Sociohistorical status

Linguistic groups can be distinguished from each other on the basis of their respective histories. Some groups struggled to defend, maintain or assert their existence as collective entities. These histories can constitute mobilising symbols to inspire individuals to bind together as group members in the present. For some groups, the past offers only demobilising symbols that lead individuals to forget or hide their linguistic identity. It dilutes the vitality of the group as a collective entity. The number and type of historical symbols or experiences salient to an ethnolinguistic group can be conducive, or not, to feelings of group solidarity. They contribute to the vitality of the group (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977; Dorian, 1998; Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer, 1998; Bourhis, 2001).

Historical experiences of domination tend to make the concerned speakers feel inferior to those who speak the dominant languages. These speakers often lack self-

esteem and readily abandon their language, culture and self-identity in favour of the more widely used languages. Their languages often become a stigma. Minority language groups that suffered historical legacies of domination by larger or dominant language groups tend to have a low estimation of their languages and culture (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977; Paulston, 1988; 1994; Batibo, 2005; Cartwright, 2006).

These experiences culminate in language accommodation, language shifts, diglossia and low ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness. They leave permanent legacies and syndromes of inferiority among minority language speakers. In most cases, this legacy and syndrome of inferirity sticks to the minds of minority language speakers to such an extent that it becomes institutionised and canonised. Consequently, minority language speakers develop low emotional, functional, intellectual and loyalty stake in language and shift to dominant languages. Linguistic groups in this dilemma rarely succeed to revitalise and maintain their language. Promotion initiatives fail because they do not have a communicative need to be fulfilled in terms of their 'inferior' variety (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977:310-311; Adegbija, 2001:286-287).

2.8.1.4 Language status

Language status relates to the status planning of the LMA. The status of the language spoken by the linguistic group both within and without the boundaries of the community network significantly determines the group's vitality. Linguistic groups that speak a low status language are disadvantaged in terms of group vitality if it is compared to those who speak a high status language (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977:311-312). Language status is more vivid based on the degree that status differentials between language groups are perpetuated through language stereotyping, internalised through diglossic language norms and enshrined through language laws that establish the relative status of rival, language groups (Bourhis, 2001:109).

Language attitudes usually, although not always, follow the socio-economic and linguistic hierarchies in society. The higher the status of a language, the more

positive the speakers' attitudes are towards it, and the lower the status of a language, the more negative the attitudes are. Language attitudes of the speakers play an important role to strongly resist language shifts. Resistance to language shifts is usually possible if speakers have a positive attitude about their language and hold it in high regard. As long as speakers see some social status or socio-economic value in their language, they will certainly wish to maintain it. For the speakers of one language to be attracted to another language, there must be significant differences in prestige and status between the two languages. Language status is therefore a much subtler, but more pervasive determinant of language maintenance, revitalisation and language attitudes (Paulston, 1988; 1994; Grenoble & Whaley, 1998; Adegbija, 1993; 1994a; 1994b; 1997; 2001; Crystal, 2000; Shameem, 2004; Pakir, 2004; Batibo, 2005).

The attitudes of teachers and parents in diglossic communities, where there is a high and low variety, show strong loyalty towards the high variety. There is a strong desire for children to know this variety in addition to, or at the expense of, their home language. Where a language is felt to have little or no socio-economic value or prestige, speakers will not be motivated to preserve it. They are more inclined to abandon it in favour of a language with greater prestige (Paulston, 1988; 1994; Nahir, 1988; 1998; Adegbija, 1993; 1994a; 1994b; 1997; 2001; Crystal, 2000; Kamwendo, 2002; 2005; Shameem, 2004; Batibo, 2005; Liddcoat & Baldauf, 2008; Tulloch, 2008; Webb, 2009; 2010).

2.8.2 Demographic variables

According to Giles, Bourhis and Taylor (1977:309) demographic variables relate to the sheer number of group members and their distribution in a particular nation. Giles, Bourhis and Taylor (1977) argue that ethnolinguistic groups with favourable demographic trends are more likely to possess vitality as an active, collective and distinctive group than those whose demographic trends are unfavourable and not conducive for group survival.

2.8.2.1 Group distribution factors

Group distribution factors relate to the numeric concentration of group members in various parts of the nation and their proportion relative to outgroup members. It indicates whether, or not, the group still occupies its traditional territory.

2.8.2.1.1 Concentration

According to Giles, Bourhis and Taylor (1977:313) the concentration of ethnolinguistic group members in a given area also contributes to its group vitality. Minority groups, which are concentrated in the same geographic area, namely, those which are linguistically homogeneous, stand a better chance to survive as an active, collective and distinctive group. In linguistically homogeneous regions the local language is integral to everyday life and members of such communities demonstrate limited bilingualism. Members of such communities tend to exhibit pride in their language and speak it by preference in most of the contexts and domains within and without their community. The large demographic concentration of speakers in an area also strengthens the group's language network (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977; Bourhis, 2001; Kembo-Sure, 2004; Cartwright, 2006; Trudell, 2006).

In cases where speakers of official minority languages have low ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness as a result of linguistic heterogeneity and fragmentation, which foster language shifts, language accommodation and diglossia, they prefer to function mostly in the politically, dominant languages. As time progresses, the *lingua franca* becomes the mother tongue in terms of competence, function and identification. Language maintenance is possible in the absence of an adjacent political or cultural dominant group. The norm for ethnic groups in prolonged contact within a nation is for the subordinate group to shift to the language of the dominant group. The less vitality a linguistic group has, the higher the likelihood that it will not survive and develop as a collective entity. This is even when it is in contact with a dominant group (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977; Paulston, 1988; 1994; Adegbija, 1993; 1994a; 1994b; 1997; 2001; Strubell, 2001; Dorian, 1998; May, 2001; 2006;

Obanya, 2004; Batibo, 2005; Cartwright, 2006; Fishman, 2006; Paulston & Heidemann, 2006; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2006; Bamgbose, 2007; McCarty, Skutnabb-Kangas & Magga, 2008).

A linguistic group, concentrated in the same geographic area, remains largely, linguistically homogeneous and it facilitates the easy implementation of mother tongue education policies. In these areas, most children are monolingual when they start school and this creates a favourable and compelling environment to implement mother tongue education policies. Linguistically heterogeneous and linguistically fragmented communities, or those in contact with dominant or numerically superior groups, are unlikely to survive as active, collective and distinctive groups. Widespread diffusion of a linguistic group facilitates linguistic fragmentation and linguistic heterogeneity. It poses serious challenges to the implementation of mother tongue education policies. Implementation of mother tongue education policies in these settings require creative classroom organisation (Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; Skutnabb-Kangas & García, 1995; García, 1997; Siemienski, 1997; Henrard, 2003; Batibo, 2005; Benson, 2005).

2.8.2.1.2 Proportion

The proportion of speakers that belongs to an ethnolinguistic ingroup compared to those that belong to the relevant outgroup, also affects the group's ethnolinguistic vitality. In cases where the ingroup is numerically inferior to the outgroup, the vitality of the former is likely to be lower than that of the latter. It is especially true when the status variables of the former are very negative. In cases where the ingroup is numerically inferior, language accommodation, language shifts, diglossia and expansive language contact takes place that lead to low ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness as well as marked bilingualism and lack of communicative need of the ingroup's language (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977; Paulston, 1988; 1994; Hinton, 2001; Batibo, 2005; 2012).

2.8.2.2 Group numbers factors

Number factors refer to the ethnolinguistic groups' absolute group numbers, their birth rate, exogamy or endogamy, and their patterns of immigration or emigration.

2.8.2.2.1 Absolute numbers

Giles, Bourhis and Taylor (1977:313) indicate that the more the speakers of a group are, the more vitality the group will exhibit and the better its chances will be to survive as an active, collective and distinctive group. Higher speaker numbers promote an attitude of pride and ethnolinguistic vitality. Strength in numbers is a useful, legitimating tool to empower ethnolinguistic groups with the institutional control to shape their own active, collective and distinctive density in intergroup situations (Kristiansen, Harwood & Giles, 1991: 422).

The population size of an ethnolinguistic group plays a legitimate role to determine the specific demands that a minority group can pose to the state. Higher speaker numbers confer security and influence language maintenance. These demographic characteristics point to the relative strength of a linguistic group and the future of its language. The state provides education in a particular language if the ethnolinguistic group is of a certain size and only in those areas where the group reached a certain concentration (Adegbija, 1994a; Sieminski, 1997; Grenoble & Whaley, 1998; Henrard, 2003; Kembo-Sure, 2004; Paulston & Heidemann, 2006).

2.8.2.2.2 Exogamy

Increases in the proportion of ethnolinguistically-mixed marriages between the ingroup and the outgroup affect an ethnolinguistic group's vitality. Exogamy is cited as a mechanism to language shifts. In inter-marriages the high status variety has a better chance to survive than the language in which the child was socialised and parented. It is especially true if the female spouse, whom society views as the traditional carrier of the culture in the home, is from the high status variety (Fishman, Hayden & Warshauer, 1966; Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977; Paulston, 1988; 1994;

Fishman, 1991; Adegbija, 1993; 1994b; 1997; 2001; Baldauf, 1994; Grenoble & Whaley, 1998; Morgan, 2001; Strubell, 2001; Cartwright, 2006). Fishman, Hayden and Warshauer (1966) state that the resultant effects of exogamy on language behaviour are measured in terms of language retention ratios. This means the extent to which a language is used from one generation to the next. Ethnolingustic minorities are likely to possess more vitality when their language retention ratios are favourable or if exogamy is low among them.

2.8.2.2.3 Marked bilingualism

Marked bilingualism is cited as a major mechanism in language shifts, often if combined with exogamy and subtractive bilingual education. Bilingual families often choose to teach only the majority language to their children, which doom the minority language to oblivion. Marked bilingualism involves the spread of the *lingua franca*. It means that the language of wider communication forms the reality for out-group communication and when this occurs, the *lingua franca* becomes a new mother tongue in terms of function and competence. Consequently, language spread becomes a case of language accommodation, language shifts, diglossia and it leads to low ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness among speakers of the low variety (Paulston, 1988; 1994; Nahir, 1988; 1998; Adegbija, 1993; 1994a; 1997; 2001; Baldauf, 1994; Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer, 1998; Dorian, 1998; Morgan, 2001; Hinton, 2001; Strubell, 2001; Batibo, 2005; 2012; Fishman, 2006; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2006; 2003; 2000; 1981; May, 2006; Cartwright, 2006; Paulston & Heidemann, 2006; Shohamy, 2001; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010).

Marked bilingualism usually leads to comfort in a second language, which results in a lack of the communicative need in the home language. It impacts negatively on the social and cultural character of the community if the community prefers to express its identity through the second language. According to Nahir (1988:276-277) the existence of a communicative vacuum is a prerequisite condition for language revival, spread and acquisition. Nahir (1988:277) attributes the failure of Irish language revival efforts to the lack of a communicative need. Irish speakers already had a

common ‘new’ language, namely, English and Irish was meant to be used only as a second language, ‘with bilingualism the ideal.’ Language revitalisation, promotion, acquisition and maintenance efforts succeed if the prospective language fills a communicative vacuum (Rubin, 1971; Macnamara, 1971; Nahir, 1983; 1984; 1988; 1998; Paulston, 1988; 1994; Fishman, 1991; Dorian, 1998; Grenoble & Whaley, 1998; Hinton, 2001; Webb, 2009).

2.8.2.2.4 Immigration

Immigration patterns may enhance or decrease the vitality of a linguistic group. The influx of large numbers of one or more linguistic groups may swamp another numerically. The immigration may be planned or unplanned. Migrants can contribute to strengthen or weaken the ethnolinguistic vitality of the receiving group. In cases where the receiving group has low vitality, immigration is more likely to further erode the receiving group’s vitality. Immigration is also a source of linguistic heterogeneity which presents challenges to the implementation of mother tongue education policies. Immigration patterns affect the group distribution and number of a linguistic group, which also determine a group’s vitality. It also impacts on the subordinate group’s ethnolinguistic awareness and the social and cultural character of the community (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977; Fishman, 1991; Baldauf, 1994; Dorian, 1998; Grenoble & Whaley, 1998; Lastra, 2001; Morgan, 2001; Strubell, 2001; Cartwright, 2006; Webb, 2010).

Immigration and emigration usually lead to intermarriages. The offspring of such marriages are either bilingual in both parents’ languages or have one of the two as their home language and this will have a negative impact on the intergenerational transmission of the subordinate language. Research shows that language shifts for ethnic groups in prolonged contact, means that the subordinate group shifts to the language of the dominant group. It contributes to a lack in the communicative need among these groups. It leads to low ethnolinguistic vitality, decreased awareness and linguistic nationalism (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977; Pauslton, 1988; 1994; Strubell, 2001; Adegbija, 2001; Cartwright, 2006; May, 2006; Fishman, 1991; 2006; Paulston

& Hiedemann, 2006; Obanya, 2004; Bamgbose, 2007; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2006; 2000; 1981; Nyika, 2008a; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010).

2.8.2.2.5 Emigration

Out-migration also affects the ethnolinguistic vitality of ethnolinguistic groups. Push and pull factors can force vast numbers of economically active groups to leave their traditional communities in search of greener pastures. Emigration also affects group distribution factors and group number of a linguistic group, which also determine a group's vitality. This contributes to the group's numerical inferiority which also significantly determines the group's vitality. It also perpetuates language shifts (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977; Fishman, 1991; 2006; Baldauf, 1994; Lastra, 2001; Morgan, 2001; Paulston & Heidemann, 2006; Cartwright, 2006).

2.8.3 Institutional support and control factors

Institutional support variables relate to the extent in which a language receives formal and informal representation in various institutions, ranging from the nation right to the community. It relates to the degree in which an ethnolinguistic group gained formal and informal representation in the various institutions of a nation. A linguistic minority is vital to the extent that its language and group members are well represented; formally and informally in a variety of institutional settings. An ethnolinguistic group's vitality is largely determined by the degree that its language is used in the various institutions (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977:309; 315-316).

2.8.3.1 Informal institutional support and control factors

Giles, Bourhis and Taylor (1977:315-316) define informal support as the extent to which a minority organised itself in terms of pressure groups to represent and safeguard its own ethnolinguistic interests. A minority group that has organised itself to lobby and advocate for the promotion, maintenance and safeguarding of its interests has more vitality. Giles, Bourhis and Taylor (1977:316) argue that such organisation assists minorities to safeguard and promote their interests. Adegbija

(2001:305) notes that in every context, a committee or body is required to assume responsibility to reverse language shifts. When responsibility belongs to nobody, nobody will be committed to reverse language shifts. A minority group that recognises and accepts the value of its own language and takes noteworthy actions not only to promote it, but also to guarantee its future security, stands a much better chance to be seen, recognised and attended to, than another that merely awaits government or external intervention.

Attention-seeking by minority language groups from government and other external agencies is greatly enhanced by the amount of pressure and pertinent attention that are engineered by such groups. More organised groups are likely to succeed in their language revitalisation efforts than less organised and mobilised groups (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977; Adegbija, 1994b; 2001; Strubell, 2001; Bourhis, 2001; Lastra, 2001; Trudell, 2006; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Lasimbang & Kinajil, 2008; Ndhlovu, 2010). This factor overlaps with the LMA's advocacy and indigenisation.

2.8.3.2 Formal institutional support and control factors

Giles, Bourhis and Taylor (1977:316) stress the critical importance of ethnic minority groups to their language in the state's education system. According to Skutnabb-Kangas (2006:275) a minority whose children attend school where the dominant language is the main language of instruction, usually cannot reproduce itself if its right to mother tongue education is not guaranteed. Given the power of education in the production and reproduction of cultural identity, the use of a minority language in education is indispensable in the quest to maintain, promote or revive a group's vitality and language (Corson, 1993; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2006; 2003; 2000; 1981; Obanya, 2004; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004b; May, 2001; 2006, Ferguson, 2006; Tollefson, 1991; 2002b; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Paulston, 1994; 1988; Batibo, 2005; Paulston & Hiedemann, 2006; Fishman, 2006; Cartwright, 2006; Shohamy, 2006; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh, 2009).

Giles, Bourhis and Taylor (1977:316) state that groups, which are widely represented at decision-making levels of the state and in other key strategic and influential positions, will be more able to survive as distinctive groups than those which have little representation. Gains on institutional control depend on the emergence of speakers of these languages as activists and charismatic leaders. They need to succeed to mobilise fellow speakers to fight in favour of their own language in multilingual settings (Bourhis, 2001:107). Lewis and Trudell (2008:271) argue that the influence of nationally organised institutions, such as schools, government institutions and non-government organisations with local representation, is significant in language revitalisation and promotion.

Formal institutional support and control depend on how supportive the elite is, namely, on issues of elite closure. The perspective of the members of the community's elite, whether they live within or outside the language area, often determines the success or failure of bottom-up approaches (Cooper, 1989; Fishman, 1991; Strubell, 2001; Mwaniki, 2004; Prah, 2005; Bamgbose, 2000; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2003; Kamwendo, 2005; Alidou, 2004; Annamalia, 2004; Trudell, 2006; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Myers-Scotton, 1993; Webb, 2009; Ndhlovu, 2010). To recount the success story of three Northwestern Cameroon language groups, Trudell (2006) notes that the respective committees of these three languages counted on influential members of the language community for leadership. Trudell (2006) argues that when language committees have the support of people who matter in society, they are more likely to succeed in their initiatives.

2.9 Webb's factors and conditions that determine the success or failure of top-down and bottom-up policies

Webb (2010) gives a lucid description of factors and conditions that need to be secured to enable the success of bottom-up planning. These factors and conditions closely relate to the structural variables of the ethnolinguistic vitality model. They also overlap with some of the language management variables, methodologies and strategies. Webb outlines that to understand why top-down and bottom-up efforts

succeed or fail, it is necessary to consider the role of the factors that interact with these processes. He identifies five factors, namely, power, ethno-linguistic awareness and linguistic nationalism, the social and cultural character of the community, community support for language-political change and role of globalisation together with a market-driven economy.

All these factors and conditions are equally important to determe the success of both approaches. The set of factors and conditions actually point to the complementary nature of bottom-up and top-down approaches. Even though Webb's discussion is centred mainly towards majority languages, his insights can be equally applied in a discussion that involves minority languages.

2.9.1 The role of power

This factor closely relates to informal and formal institutional support and control factors as well as economic and social status of the vitality model and political will and the elite closure of the LMA. In bottom-up and top-down planning the power dimension is critical. Power is conceptualised, not only in its political dimension, but also according to its economic and social nature. Community organisations and their members must have the required capacity. Thus they need to have the required knowledge, understanding, skills and the necessary social, political and financial authority to sustain language planning, policy, implementation and management initiatives. If a government has the political, economic, social and religious power to control its citizens, its language planning agencies will be able to implement language policies. Similarly, if those from below possess power in various forms and have a significant degree of community support, they will be able to initiate 'unplanned language planning or influence top-down policies. This power can also be in the form of political backing from the central government and elite. If those from below, or the bodies that act on their behalf, do not have the required forms of power to influence or secure political will and elite closure, such activities will not yield the desired results (Webb, 2009:196; Webb, 2010:138).

It must be noted that, unless all the dimensions of power are secured or in place, to have one power dimension is no guarantee for the success of initiatives and it applies to both approaches. To secure one or two power dimensions is not enough; all power dimensions need to be mobilised. It is clear that it is rare to find a combination of all these variables in one approach Therefore the need for the complementarity of the two approaches. Webb (2010) indicates that the lack of political power in this dispensation among the Afrikaner community in South Africa shows the failure of what can be said to be bottom-up initiatives from the Afrikaner community. An example is the frequent talks about and contested issues related to, language in education with regards to Afrikaans medium.

The lack of power among the Chitumbuka speakers in Malawi shows how helpless those from below are when they lack power. Chitumbuka speakers and the Livingstonia Mission were not able to resist or challenge Banda's imposition of Chichewa as the only national language, because they lacked power. Kamwendo (2005:150) indicates that the cost to oppose Dr Banda and his government was just too high. Consequently, Chitumbaka speakers and missionaries were powerless in their efforts.

To recount the success of top-down policies, Webb (2009:193) notes that a feature thereof is the essential role of power. Webb notes that top-down planning is successful, because the implementing agency, namely, the government, has the necessary power. He explains that when government is not strong enough or is directed to establish liberal democracies, top-down policies are usually resisted due to a lack of strong government power or liberal democracies.

2.9.2 Ethno-linguistic awareness and linguistic nationalism

Ethno-linguistic awareness as well as linguistic and ethnic nationalism focuses on the role of language as an expression of individual and group identity. It involves the perception of language as an instrument to obtain access to human rights, linguistic human rights and educational linguistic rights, among other language and cultural

related issues. The effectiveness of ethno-linguistic awareness and linguistic and ethnic nationalism serve as a rallying point for the speech community to mobilise community support and establish legitimacy and authority of community representatives and the language problem. Ethno-linguistic awareness and linguistic and ethnic nationalism justify the cause of the community. They attract the concern of all stakeholders such that it becomes an issue or cause that wins the sympathy and attention of all interested parties (Crystal, 2000; De Kadt, 2006; Hatoss, 2008; Webb, 2010).

De Kadt (2006:4) states that the existence of a linguistically based ethnic identity is important. But, it is only when a linguistically defined, ethnic identity, namely, ethnic nationalism, develops to become politically important that language development is taken seriously. De Kadt argues that while some factors may cause a state to profess support for language development, the extent of language development will be limited without strong ethno-linguistic awareness as well as linguistic and ethnic nationalism in place. De Kadt's observation emphasizes the importance of strong ethno-linguistic awareness as well as linguistic and ethnic nationalism for bottom-up or top-down policies to succeed.

Crystal's (2000:122-123) view of language as a pre-eminent, but not an exclusive badge of ethnicity, provides the most promising basis for language revitalisation. If a community works according to this perspective or is able to be persuaded to work with it, it allows for what Crystal calls a *modus vivendi* between different language speakers. Crystal argues that since involvement in ethnicity means participation in shared cultural practices, gains in language use are likely. To recount the success story of the growth and development of Afrikaans in South Africa, Webb (2010:139) notes that high and strong ethno-linguistic awareness and linguistic and ethnic nationalism accounts for the birth, growth and development of Afrikaans as a language in South Africa. Hatoss (2008:59) notes in another success story that the main motivation for Hungarian communities was to maintain a unique identity and prevent complete assimilation into mainstream Australia.

This strongly indicates the Hungarian language as an expression of individual and group identity. To describe the ethno-linguistic awareness of the Hungarian community in Australia, Hatoss notes that they are among those ethnic groups which appear to be language-centred and their ethnic language is among their core values. For the Hungarians in Australia, the value of their first language transcends any instrumental consideration and represents strive to self-fulfilment that makes language a symbol of survival and 'autotelic significance'.

The Hungarians are an essentially language conscious community that attach strong value to their language. For such a group, it is the language itself that creates their unique identity. The Hungarian language is strongly attached to Hungarian-ness and is considered as a core value in the Hungarian culture. In language conscious and centred communities, like the Hungarian community, the loss of the native tongue signals a cultural and linguistic shift to the periphery and it weakens the cultural and linguistic transmission chain (Hatoss, 2008:60-61). The position of language in a community significantly determines the success or failure of the community's bottom-up initiatives. The impact and efficacy of community-based language planning initiatives depends on the initial situation of the language in the local community. The more threatened and vulnerable the language is, the more urgent and aggressive the initiatives will be (Chriost, 2008:90).

Bottom-up initiatives of the Chitumbuka people in Malawi reflects how ethno-linguistic awareness is indispensable in the success thereof. Kamwendo (2005:162) reveals that Chitumbuka became a symbol of ethnolinguistic and cultural identity among the Chitumbuka speakers. They developed a heightened sense of language loyalty and positive identification with their language, which led to the recognition of Chitumbuka alongside the imposed Chichewa. To use the Afrikaner community in South Africa as an example, Webb (2010:139) shows how ethno-linguistic awareness and linguistic nationalism ensured the survival of Afrikaans in the 19th and 20th century when the government sought to do away with exclusively Afrikaans medium schools and universities. Ethno-linguistic awareness leads to the rise of linguistic and ethnic

nationalism which, according to Webb, carries immense weight in the language-political establishment of a language.

To emphasize the importance of the interaction of the factors and conditions that ensure the success of bottom-up and top-down policies, Webb has the following opinion. He notes that despite the attempts of Afrikaner activists, who are still characterised by a strong sense of ethno-linguistic identity and linguistic and ethnic nationalism, Afrikaans is steadily losing grip and ground. It is evident from the changes to language policies and practices of some of the previously Afrikaans medium schools and universities. As much as the Afrikaner community exhibit strong ethno-linguistic awareness, strong economic, religious and social power as well as community support for language-political change, it lacks the political backing for these initiatives.

With a black government and a very supportive constitution, the use of eight official African languages in South Africa in higher domains remained largely on paper. The reason for this is that there is a missing link, namely, the prerequisite ethno-linguistic awareness, linguistic and ethnic nationalism and community support for language-political change. This has a negative social and cultural character among speakers of indigenous African languages. There is still a lack of confidence in African languages as linguistic capitals that can increase upward social mobility for African language speakers. That is why the government did not experience pressure to put the constitutional clauses on language issues in practice. Black parents push for English to be taught to their children from an early age to give them an early start. They think it means better. It equally applies to government that also pays lip service to the recognition and development of African languages (Webb, 2010).

Ethno-linguistic awareness and linguistic nationalism closely relate to some of the development oriented variables of the LMA and informal institutional support and control factors as well as the socio-historical and social status of the ethnolinguistic vitality model.

2.9.3 The social and cultural character of the community

Equally important to the success of bottom-up and top-down policies is the social and cultural character of the community. It refers to the community's language loyalty as a united front. If focuses on the community's social and cultural intactness, which result from a common bond created by the language. A positive social and cultural character of the community towards its language ensures the success of the community's bottom-up language planning initiatives. Once a community's language loses its social and cultural place among its speakers, efforts aimed to revitalise it through bottom-up or top-down initiatives are bound to fail. This is due to negative language ideologies associated with it (Webb, 2010:139-140).

Speakers' attachment to their language provides the drive to revitalise, promote, maintain and preserve it. To appreciate, acknowledge and understand the value attached to a specific language helps to determine effective ways to revitalise, promote, maintain and preserve it. The more value the community attach to its language, the more likely it is to maintain or promote it. The more positive the community's attitudes are towards its language, the stronger it is. Speakers' attitudes towards their language determine their ability to maintain and promote its development, teaching and learning (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977; Nahir, 1988; 1998; Paulston, 1988; 1994; Cooper; 1989; Marshall, 1994; Adegbija, 1993; 1994a; 1997; 2001; Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer, 1998; Crystal, 2000; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Shameem, 2004; Batibo, 2005).

Tulloch (2008:98, 107) indicates that a certain way to guarantee the success of bottom-up initiatives, aimed at dialect preservation, is to establish goals and strategies locally, which are based on speakers' values. The speakers' attachment to their language provides an important impetus to preserve it. There exists a need to identify the values, beliefs and desires that speakers hold with regard to their language and allow them to drive planning. This reveals the importance to consider the attitudes and interests of the community, if planning is locally based and tailored

to specific community needs (Schiffman, 1996; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Mwaniki, 2010; Batibo, 2005; Tullock, 2008).

In similar situations the goals, strategies and actions can build on the practical and symbolic values that speakers already attach to their languages. These affective factors are possibly the strongholds in favour of the revitalisation, preservation, maintenance and promotion of a language (Tulloch, 2008:107). It equally applies to top-down planning given the power of the community to modify or resist decisions from above. If a language has a strong social and cultural value among its speakers, and is backed by other variables, bottom-up or top-down initiatives aimed to develop that language usually succeed. To relate the success of bottom-up initiatives of the Hungarians in Australia, Hatoss (2008:60) attests to the importance of a positive social and cultural character of the community in the success or failure of bottom-up initiatives. Hatoss narrates that the main impact upon language planning initiatives in the Hungarian community derived from the strong intrinsic culture of the Hungarian community.

The social and cultural character of a community overlaps with some sociolinguistic oriented methodologies and strategies, the socio-cultural variables of the LMA as well as the social status and socio-historical status of the ethnolinguistic vitality model.

2.9.4 Community support for language-political change

Equally important to the success or failure of bottom-up or top-down initiatives is community support for language-political change. As indicated earlier in the discussion of top-down and bottom-up initiatives, the role of the community must not be underestimated. It is especially important, because those from below are not passive receivers of top-down decisions (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Cuvelier, 2010; Webb, 2010; Ndhlovu, 2010). Community support for language-political change involves the community's acceptance of the language decision, be it from below or from above. It relates to the reigning language ideology of the community, which implies the meaning and role that a language has in a

community. Bottom-up approaches fail due to the lack of social support or because speakers of the concerned language do not see language issues as their most urgent needs. They may perceive their language to have little value in the job market (Webb, 2010:140).

Community support for language-political change revolves around issues of community ownership and indigenisation of the language planning decision. Unless the policy has the backing of the community, it is bound to fail, given that communities are not passive receivers of decisions. Unless language planning is congruent with the will of the community, nothing will change (Webb, 2002:44). The 1976 Soweto uprisings show the value of community support for language-political change. Community support to resist the imposition of Afrikaans led to the change in policy in favour of the black majority. Sallabank (2008:134) notes that language revitalisation, promotion, preservation and promotion measures gain the support of gate-keeping and funding authorities if they accepted by the community.

Webb (2009:194) shares similar sentiments with the attribution of failure to effectively implement the multilingual South African language policy, to the lack of meaningful support from the speakers of the languages concerned. He argues that language planning in South Africa was handled only as a top-down affair to linguistic transformation. He concludes that the successful implementation of the South African multilingual policy will only succeed if it is also approached in a bottom-up manner.

To be effective, language planning needs to be complemented by efforts from below as indicated earlier in this discussion. This entails community involvement and engagement to serve the interests of the community. Planning decision will have to respond to the local needs of the community and be locally based and tailored to address specific community needs. Community support for language-political change may it be bottom-up or top-down entails that the community takes ownership of the decision, establish bodies or associations to act on their behalf develop a working relationship of trust and mutual understanding with these bodies and associations and closely work with them during all stages (Baldauf, 1994; 2005; 2008; Hornberger,

2006b; 2009; Kaplan & Baldauf; 1997; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Liddicoat, 2008; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Chriost, 2008; Du Plessis, 2010).

2.9.5 Role of globalisation and the market-driven economy

It closely relates to the status planning of the LMA and economic status and language status of the ethnolinguistic vitality model. According to Webb (2010:141) globalisation and the market-driven economy, which operate mainly in English, pose serious challenges to bottom-up and top-down initiatives aimed to develop languages which are not languages of wider communication. Phillipson (1992) has made an invaluable contribution on the role of English as a form of linguistic imperialism and how it has impacts on the growth and development of other languages. He especially cites cases in the developing world, particularly countries colonised previously by English speaking countries.

In Africa, English and other ex-colonial languages are no longer the only killer languages. Dominant African national or official languages equally contribute to the underdevelopment of marginalised African languages. Emerging research in mother tongue education shows that the most formidable challenges to mother tongue education in minority languages in Africa is the negative attitude to mother tongue education. This is probably a result of the instrumentality, supremacy and hegemony of the national languages and ex-colonial languages (Adegbija, 1994a; 2001; Batibo, 2004; 2005; 2009a; 2009b; Kamwendo, 2009; Maruatona, 2009; Monaka, 2009; Molosiwa, 2005; Gatsha, 2009; Ndhlovu, 2005; 2008a; 2008b; 2009; 2010; Bagwasi, 2009; Ndlovu, 2011).

Attitudinal factors in favour of ex-colonial languages and dominant African national languages divert the attention, love, involvement and loyalty of minority language speakers in the direction of official and national languages. Lack of official standing or low status and prestige for a language always puts its speakers and the language in a disadvantage in pure practical terms. Few speakers of the language, and let alone outsiders, are likely to learn it if it has little to offer in terms of economic or

social advantages (Paulston, 1988; 1994; Dorian, 1999; Adegbija, 2001; Cartwright, 2006; Fishman, 2006; May, 2006).

In Africa, the impact of globalisation and the English market-driven economy forced parents to insist on English right from kindergarten. They believe that they give their children a head-start. Negative attitudes towards African languages, instilled by colonialism, globalisation and the English market-driven economy, derail and seriously jeopardise efforts aimed to develop indigenous languages (Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; 2007; Prah, 2000a; 2005; 2009; Webb, 2010). In cases that involve minority languages the forces at work increase. The forces that bottom-up and top-down initiatives have to contend with reflect double or more than double linguistic imperialism for minority language speakers. Apart from colonialism, globalisation and an English market-driven economy, the nation-state ideology rears its ugly head every time when minorities seek to develop their languages.

Dominant African languages, which have been accorded official or national language status subdue and thwart the development and promotion of minority languages in a similar way as the ex-colonial languages. The nation-state ideology in Africa has the tendency to adopt a national language which endangers social, political, economical, historical and numerical less powerful languages. Nationalism results in the transfer of prestige and asserts superiority to a dominant national language. In extreme cases, linguistic minorities are given little, or no, rights or space.

Nationalism promotes and entrenches the hegemonic status of national languages and stifles efforts aimed to develop minority languages. As Kaplan and Baldauf (1997:201) attest, language planning is often bound with the notion of ‘one people, one nation’, and by implication the suppression of minority languages. This became the predominant way of nation building and to foster cohesion within nations around the world. It is in these contexts that the nation-state model of language planning, policy and management led to the overt or covert suppression of minority languages and the minoritisation of other languages. It is even true where multilingualism is acknowledged.

Kamwendo (2005:149-150) presents an interesting case of how nationalism affects bottom-up initiatives. In Malawi, during Dr Banda's term of office, Chichewa was declared the sole national language. Banda's supporters resisted with "one Kamuzu (Banda), one flag, one nation, one language and one party." The declaration of Chichewa as the sole national language was guided by the desire to forge and cultivate national cohesion and unity. It was not only particular to Malawi, but most African leaders embraced this nationalist ideology with independence. In Botswana, Setswana is the only national language. In Zimbabwe, Ndebele and Shona are the only national languages.

The same can be said of Lesotho and Swaziland which are viewed as linguistically homogeneous. Sotho and Swati respectively are said to be the only indigenous languages, yet there are other indigenous languages that exist. Nationalism is driven by the mistaken belief that multilingual policies will not help the nation state to achieve socio-cultural cohesion and political unity in multiethnic, multilingual and multicultural societies (Bamgbose, 1994:36, cited in Kamwendo, 2005:150-151). Nationalism is blind to the value of unity in diversity. Bottom-up and top-down activities in Africa contend with the forces of colonialism, globalisation, an English market-driven economy and nationalism.

2.10 Language management in education

2.10.1 Definition

Language management, as a third component of language policy, is defined as the specific, conscious efforts or acts that take place to manage and manipulate language behaviour in a given entity (Spolsky, 2004; 2009; Shohamy, 2006). Mwaniki (2004:164) states that language management refers to the actions and strategies devised to achieve language policy objectives. Following this broad definition, language management in education therefore refers to specific acts or language interventions that seek to modify, confirm, impose, influence or manipulate language practice and behaviour of learners within the school domain. Language management

in education is also called language acquisition management (Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008:233). Language in education management is part of organised language management (Spolsky & Shohamy, 1999; Neustupny & Nekvapil, 2003; Spolsky, 2004; 2009).

Given the increasing role of the education sector as a tool for intergenerational transmission of language, language acquisition management is now primarily executed by the education sector through schooling. According to Baldauf, Li and Zhao (2008:236) language management in education is considered to play a key role to maintain national unity, foster economic development, provide citizens access to social services and minimise internal conflicts. This is true if such decisions are in the 'right' hands since language-in-education planning, policy and language acquisition management are often clouded by ideological interests of the ruling elite (Tollefson, 1991; 2002a; 2006; Joseph, 2006; Wodak, 2007; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004a; Shohamy, 2006).

In almost all the domains, like family, work and military, language management is concerned with language acquisition. In most nations, the education sector is the primary and principal agency of organised language management that sets out to remedy learners' perceived language inadequacies. The education sector in society is most often charged with the development, management and implementation of language acquisition (Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008:233). Spolsky (2009:90) cites that the school domain is probably the ultimate test of the theory of language management, because schools manage the language of their students.

Language management in education seeks to facilitate the actual implementation of the language-in-education policy. Language-in-education policies constitute the most powerful forces in language management (Spolsky, 2009:90). Language management in education can be overt by means of explicit or planned policy or covert, through implicit or unplanned policy (Baldauf, 2005:957). Language management in education can be ideologically driven, non-consultative and top-down or bottom-up (Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008:234; Spolsky, 2009:114).

The school plays a crucial role, not in language learning per se, but also to shape speaker's attitudes and self-awareness. Through the formal or covert curriculum and extra-curricular activities, a school may produce more or less positive attitudes and may change attitudes. The school system plays a pivotal role to ensure language vitality (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981; 2000; Baker, 1988; 1992; Skutnabb-Kangas & García, 1995; García, 1997; May, 2001; 2006; Nical, Smolicz & Secombe, 2004; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2006; Fishman, 2006; Paulston & Hiedemann, 2006; Ndhlovu, 2009; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010). The achievement of full multilingualism, multiliteracy and pluralism that involve minority languages require the active involvement of the school. Teachers must develop a school context or culture that supports multilingualism and pluralism in the societal culture and classroom. The entire school must be designed to promote all the languages (Skutnabb-Kangas & García, 1995; García, 1997; Cummins, 2000).

Staff should encourage the use of all languages everywhere, may it be in the hallways, offices, lunchroom, playground, school signs or assemblies. An example is the choice of the choruses, the language in which the national anthem is sung and memory verses are said or the language in which devotions or correspondence are relayed (Skutnabb-Kangas & García, 1995; García, 1997; Cummins, 2000). This relates to the visibility and validation of pupils' mother tongue in the school. The greater the visibility of a language and culture, the more pride its speakers and other language groups carry for it. The self-confidence of the official minority language speakers can be restored only if sufficient public recognition and visibility is given to their language in the school curriculum and beyond. The more visible a language is, the more it attracts speakers and second language learners (Skutnabb-Kangas & García, 1995; García, 1997; King & Benson, 2004; Cartwright, 2006).

2.10.2 Tools and agencies of language management in education

The school domain uses a number of tools of language management, namely, the policy process perspective, the choice of the language of instruction, teaching of core or compulsory, optional or additional subjects, foreign languages, testing,

punishment, entry requirements, recruitment, training, and deployment, and the employment of teachers (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Shohamy, 2006; Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008; Spolsky, 2009). The seven areas of policy development for language-in-education policy implementation are also useful tools for language management in the education sector (Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008).

2.10.2.1 Policy process perspective

Language acquisition management is defined as decisions on access policy, personnel policy, curriculum policy, methods and material policy, resourcing policy, community policy, evaluation policy and teacher-led policy. Policy decisions in each of these areas contribute to language acquisition management. The question, who the agent of each of these policies is, is crucial to understand how language acquisition is managed in the school domain (Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003; Baldauf, 2005; Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008).

2.10.2.2 Teacher-led policy

Teacher-led policy asks whether teachers have agency, namely, if they are given some agency for language acquisition management in their classes. Teachers overtly and covertly influence and shape learners' language attitudes, preferences and use. The preference to a particular language(s) by teachers has the power to affect pupils' language preferences (Henrard, 2003; Shameem, 2004; Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008; Simpson, 2008). To validate or accord status to a language in the curriculum, promotes positive attitudes towards the language and it is likely to inevitably become the pupils' preferred medium. The validation of mother tongue in the school lifts the stigma attached to minority languages. Teachers have the power to influence practice that promote or undermine hegemonic languages in their choice of the language(s) of instruction. For the effective implementation of mother tongue education, teachers should aim to attribute status to all the languages. No individuals should be forced to reject their identity to climb a perceived hierarchy (Skutnabb-Kangas & García, 1995; García, 1997; Alidou, 2004; Henrard, 2003).

Pupils usually prefer the language(s) their teachers use for teaching and learning. They tend to believe that their language is worthless compared to those used as media of instruction (Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010:10). Language attitudes and preferences of pupils are tied to the functional use of each language in the education system. The pupils' language preferences reflect prestige related effects on language choice as a result of the sociologically determined language hierarchy (Shameem, 2004:163; Simpson, 2008:7).

Minority language speaking pupils develop negative attitudes towards their language and shift to the dominant language when all, or most, of the teachers are from the dominant language group or do not speak the minority language (Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010:10). Languages that figure prominently on schedules and in classrooms as well as languages for which there are trained teachers and teaching materials are the most preferred by teachers and pupils (Phillipson, 1999:100).

2.10.2.3 Choice of the medium of instruction

Kaplan and Baldauf (1997:200) state that the language of the educational system plays a powerful role to determine the identity that individuals adopt. The more positive official attitudes and policies are towards a language of the community, the stronger the language will be (Batibo, 2005:112). Skutnabb-Kangas and Dunbar (2010:10) argue that there are harmful consequences if the dominant state language is used as the only language of instruction despite efforts to promote the teaching of a minority language in that school. The use of the dominant language as the only, or main, medium of instruction has a marked, negative impact on the minority language speakers' attitudes to their language.

The choice of the medium of instruction, core or compulsory subjects, optional or additional subjects and second or foreign language in school define issues related to language acquisition management inside school. These two variables draw on the sub-policies of the language-in-education policy. As variables of language acquisition management, the choice of the medium of instruction and core or compulsory,

optional or additional subject together with second or foreign language is strongly related to access policy. It is indirectly related to curriculum policy, materials and methods policy (Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008:236).

2.10.2.4 Punishment or language proscription

Punishment is also another tool of language management in schools. Learners are punished if they use the 'wrong' language. It may be the legal banning to use certain languages within the school premises. Children may be labelled with negative tags or inscriptions, such as I'M A FOOL or I'M A DONKEY. They may even be asked to brush their mouth when they use the 'wrong' language (Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; Spolsky, 2004; 2009; Shohamy, 2006; Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008).

2.10.2.5 Entry requirements

Admission requirements at schools constitute a powerful way to manage the language of a school. Entry requirements may exclude learners on grounds of lack of proficiency in certain prescribed languages or by setting language-related geographical boundaries. An example is English and Afrikaans medium schools in South Africa (Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; Spolsky, 2004; 2009; Shohamy, 2006; Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008).

2.10.2.6 Recruitment, training, deployment and employment of teachers

The selection or recruitment, training and deployment of teachers have an important effect on the language-in-education policy, as also indicated in chapter three under subsections 3.2.7.4.1.5 and 3.3.2. Regulations for the qualification of teachers may directly or indirectly manage school language policy (Spolsky, 2009:227). Spolsky (2009:109-110) notes that the social group from which teachers are commonly recruited, the upward and mobile lower-middle class is particularly liable to accept established standards of accuracy and purism among other related language-in-education decisions. This is not always the case, as reflected in the revitalisation efforts of the Hebrew, where teachers became language activists (Nahir, 1983; 1984;

1988; 1998). In the process to implement language policy, teachers pursue divergent policies, or as Webb (2010:141) notes, steer them in novel, unforeseen directions by their everyday language practices, perceptions and interpretations of linguistic realities.

2.11 Language management in schools

Language management in schools vary with the school in question. In self-managed or private schools, teachers, parents, school administrators and school committees constitute the management team at school level. Central government, through its ministry of education, constitute top management. The various arms of the ministry, such as district and provincial education officers, curriculum units and examination boards, are the middle level management team (Spolsky, 2009:94-94). In locally managed schools, teachers, parents, school committees and funders constitute the management team at school level. Central government, through its ministry of education, constitutes top management. Its various arms, which include district and provincial education officers, curriculum units and examination boards, constitute the middle level management team.

In externally managed schools, which may be under religious groups or organisations, the teachers, parents, school administrators and school committees constitute the management team of the school level. External managers are the overseers of the school management system and they are influenced by decisions from the central government through its ministry of education which operates by means of arms, such as the district and provincial education officers, curriculum units and examination boards (Spolsky, 2009:95-98). In all these types of schools, management efforts of language activists and supranational organisations cannot be underestimated, since they contribute immensely to language acquisition management in schools.

2.11.1 Participants and language managers in the school domain

The two principal participants in language management in the school domain are students, whose language practices and beliefs are to be modified, confirmed, manipulated or influenced, as well as teachers or the local language managers who are charged with the process of modification (Spolsky, 2009:91). These two principal participants in the school domain are complex and diverse in many respects. They vary in terms of their language practices, ideologies, age, gender, level of training, experience, social standing, ability level, language variety and level of proficiency in the languages they know and use.

There are other participants in the school domain, such as educational managers, curriculum officers, education officers, school principals, examining bodies, school boards, committees, parents, education boards, ministers of education, national, regional, provincial and supranational language boards, organisations, school support staff and language activists (Spolsky, 2009). The school domain is therefore under strong external pressure. Each of the former groups is complex and diverse in their language practices and language ideologies.

2.11.1.1 Students

As students arrive at school, they are subject to continued pressure to modify their pre-school language practices and ideologies and use varieties and variants chosen by the school language managers. According to Spolsky (2009:91) pre-school language practices and ideologies form the basis on which school language management must build. The school domain manipulates, modifies or confirms pre-school language practices and beliefs of learners. In developing and developed countries, school is most likely to confirm or conflict with the pattern of home language use. In most cases, learners find a gap between their home language, which could be a dialect or a variety of the school language and a totally different language as the language of the school (UNESCO, 1953; Cummins, 1981; 2000;

Williams & Snipper, 1990; Allwright & Bailey, 1994; Tickoo, 1995; Spolsky & Shohamy, 1999).

The effects of this home-school language gap is the subject of debate and it was noted that this language gap severely impedes learning, impacts negatively on the learners' identity, cognitive development, academic success and acquisition of the school language (Bowers, 1968; Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, 1995; Cummins, 2000; Letsie, 2002; Henrard, 2003). On humanitarian grounds, linguistic human rights activists argue that this gap leads to the violation of the learners' right to education, as well as their educational linguistic human rights. It also has an effect on universal access and equal access to education where majority and minority language speaking pupils alike are able to access education (Phillipson, Rannut & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995; Skutnabb-Kangas, 1995; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000; Wiley, 2006; Djite, 2008; Ndlovu, 2011).

2.11.1.2 Teachers

The second group of participants in the school domain is the teaching staffs, who were trained to believe in the essential worth of school variety and the official language (Spolsky, 2009:92). Spolsky argues that given the definition of their roles, they are closer to the external administration than to the learners. However, this is not always the case; it can be the other way round. The teaching staffs constitute the local language management team and are responsible for, and charged with, the process of the modification of learners' language practices and beliefs. Teachers operate under a greatdeal of pressure from those in authority within and outside the school domain (Spolsky, 2009:91; 114). Although schooling is conducted in a classroom where the teacher appears to be the manager, teachers' language practices and beliefs as well as management activities are largely controlled from outside by higher authority (Spolsky, 2009:253).

These external authorities range from a school board of parents, local citizens, religious or political bodies at various levels to the supranational organisations. Each

of them has different beliefs, practices sets, goals and constraints (Spolsky, 2009:253). There are other potentially significant participants in the school domain. Among them are professional administrators, who include principals, heads of departments, owners and managers of private schools. They may be from the same group as teachers and they report to authorities outside the school in terms of their management of educational and language policies (Spolsky, 2009:93). Like learners and teachers, they are complex and diverse in their language practices and ideologies.

2.11.1.3 Non-academic support staff

Another significant group in the school domain is non-academic support staffs who, in most cases, are likely to be local residents of the school area. Spolsky (2009:93) argues that the support staffs serve an important, intermediary role between the school (teachers), students and (the community). One underlying and common factor between all these participants is that they bring their own language practices and ideologies.

2.12 Conclusion

A review of the literature presented in this chapter reveals that there is a close-knit relationship between language, politics and education. It shows that the three are intricately linked and permeate each other so fully that it is impossible to separate them. A comprehensive understanding of non-implementation dilemmas that bedevils multilingual language-in-education policies can be obtained by contextualising these problems in the politics that inform them. It also emerges that the education sector is the most frequently selected site for national language planning, because of its centralised, organised and compulsory nature. It is a site where all entities of the whole policy system converge and generate tension. It is at the centre of language and political debates in the nation.

The education sector is the battlefield for linguistic, social and cultural production and reproduction. It is used to challenge, impose, maintain and entrench linguistic

imperialism and hegemony. This review also revealed that a thorough understanding of the dilemmas that bedevils multilingual language policy implementation can also be obtained from grassroot levels and the speakers of the concerned languages, especially in cases where minority language speakers and other previously marginalised languages are involved. The ethnolinguistic vitality of the concerned language groups also determines the success and failure of both top-down and bottom-up policies. Apart from this, this review shows that the meso level is also a useful source of information on dilemmas that challenge multilingual language-in-education policy implementation.

CHAPTER THREE

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: THE LANGUAGE MANAGEMENT APPROACH (LMA)

3.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines and discusses the theoretical framework of the study, namely, the Language Management Approach (henceforth: LMA). It is used alongside the seven areas of policy development in language-in-education policy implementation. Given that the policy development in question is the result of a bottom-up approach to language-in-education planning, the study complements the LMA with the ethnolinguistic vitality model, advanced by Giles, Bourhis and Taylor (1977) as well as Webb's (2010) factors and conditions that determine the success or failure of bottom-up and top-down policies. These frameworks are used to examine the causes of the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development and the factors in the success story of Tonga. These frameworks are interrelated and to a large extent overlap. The study discusses the vitality model as well as Webb's factors and conditions in chapter 2 under sections 2.8 and 2.9 respectively.

To examine the causes of the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development and the factors in the success story of Tonga, this research adopted the LMA, advanced by Mwaniki (2004). Because of its multifaceted nature as a discipline, practice, theory and method of doing sociolinguistic science, the LMA offers a coherent framework for understanding and analysing problems that underpin multilingual language policy implementation. It offers language management variables, methodologies and strategies that can be deployed to facilitate multilingual language policy implementation (Mwaniki, 2004; 2010b; 2011; 2012).

The seven areas of policy development for language-in-education policy implementation, developed by Kaplan and Baldauf (1997; 2003), are part of the issues that need to be examined as part of any language-in-education policy implementation program. Through these seven areas of policy development, the

study ascertains whether issues which need to be examined as part of any language-in-education policy implementation program were given the attention they deserve. These seven areas of policy development overlap with some of the language management variables, methodologies and strategies.

Language management variables, methodologies and strategies need to be secured to an appreciable degree for the successful implementation of multilingual language-in-education policies. Actors involved in the implementation process need to strive to ensure that they secure, sustain and reinforce the optimal mix of these variables, methodologies and strategies in an effort to effectively implement multilingual language policies (Mwaniki, 2004:242).

In this chapter the historical development of the LMA, the major contributors in the development of the theory, its major tenets and application to multilingual language-in-education policy implementation, are highlighted.

3.2 The historical development of the LMA

The LMA, developed from the language management theory, which was developed by Neustupny (1978; 1974; 1968), Jernudd (1973; 1977; 1993), Jernudd and Neustupny (1987; 1991) as well as Neustupny and Nekvapil (2003:184-5). Scholars such as Webb (2002), Mwaniki (2004; 2010; 2012), Spolsky (2004; 2009) and Shohamy (2006) also contributed to the development of language management.

3.2.1 Jernudd, Neustupny and Nekvapil

According to Neustupny and Nekvapil (2003), language management derives from the language correction theory advanced by Neustupny (1978) as well as Neustupny and Jernudd in the 1970s and 1980s. Jernudd (1993) asserts that language management grew as an extension and adjustment of the language planning theory. Jernudd further argues that the bulk of what constitutes the language management theory and practice has been around. He notes that language management

represents the logical development of language planning, policy theory and practice, and is not a replacement of the latter.

In language management theory, management refers to a wide range of acts of attention to language problems. This extension and adjustment of the language planning theory grew from the realisation that in language planning theories of the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s, language problems were mainly problems of language in the narrow sense of the word (Jernudd, 1993; Jernudd & Neustupny, 1987; 1991; Neustupny & Nekvapil, 2003; Mwaniki, 2004). Current language management theory seeks to incorporate and encompass language as defined in the traditional narrow sense, and as a wide range of additional problems that implicate discourse and communication in intercultural contact situations and matters that arise in proof reading, speech therapy or literary criticism (Jernudd, 1993; Neustupny & Nekvapil, 2003).

According to Jernudd (1993:133), the language management model differs from the theory and practice of language planning. The former seeks to explain how language problems arise in the discourse of peoples' use of language; whereas the latter takes decision-makers' specification of language problems as the axiomatic point of departure. Language management theory seeks to explain how language problems arise from discourse, in whose discourse and how they project into discourse if they arise from non-linguistic interests or from systematic linguistic principles. Language planning is an aspect of language management. It is a process by which particular people are given the authority to find and suggest systematic and rigorous solutions to language problems. These language problems may be potential or actually encountered by members of a community (Jernudd & Neustupny, 1987; 1991; Jernudd, 1993; Neustupny & Nekvapil, 2003). This approach embodies the ideals of an integrated approach to language planning, which combines bottom-up and top-down processes of language planning.

Unlike the language planning theory, the language management theory does not presuppose a democratic or any other particular political institutional process of

authorisation. It requires the conscious and extensive identification of language problems in discourse (Jernudd, 1993:134). The language management theory represents a shift of focus from the concerns of language planning of finding optimal strategies for government-initiated action, towards an interest to explain how individuals manage language communication and uses this as the basis for community-wide language management. According to Jernudd (1993:134), this shift of focus adopted in the language management approach is an academic response to people power. It is a reaction against central imposition and recognises the multitude of competing group interests. The language management model seeks to describe bottom-up and discourse-based planning, which was the missing link in language planning (Jernudd, 1993:133).

The assumption that people will not alter the use of a certain feature of language unless individuals pay attention to that particular feature of the language, at least in the short-term memory of the discourse process, is a critical, empirical property of the language management model. This model predicts that language planning is effective when language managers offer solutions to language inadequacies. These inadequacies need to be evaluated by language users in the general community within the discourse as inadequate and in need of adjustment. According to the language management theory, language managers can successfully provide adjustment items for speakers to adopt and use. If planners and people do not share in noting and evaluating particular features of language, it is very difficult for planners to suggest that people change their ways of speaking (Jernudd, 1993:134).

Unlike the language planning model, the language management model focuses on discourse processes. It bridges the gap between the language planner and the language user. It predicts that language planning works if language planners offer solutions to language inadequacies that language users have noted and evaluated as inadequate and in need of adjustment. Jernudd (1993:139-140) criticises language planning models that are axiomatically centred on the decision-making agency. He argues that they lack an explicit way of relating discourse to language problems, which forms the basis for language planning. Jernudd notes that the

language management model allows relationships at any of the points of noting features of language in the discourse process. It evaluates these features, adjusts inadequate features and implements these adjustments. The language management model calls for the separation of linguistic and non-linguistic interests in language planning. This however is near to impossible, if not totally impossible. The focus on discourse in language management theory provides the basis for relating language planning to other language management systems, such as language cultivation, terminology and language teaching.

With its grassroots or bottom-up orientation, language management employs data from the way individuals cope or fail in communication challenges. This forms the basis for community-wide actions (Antia, 2000:8). Through the language management framework, language planning is able to reflect the relationship between individuals and discourse (Jernudd & Neustupny, 1991:31; Jernudd, 1993:140).

3.2.2 Neustupny and Nekvapil

3.2.2.1 Simple and organised management

Neustupny and Nekvapil (2003:185) note that one of the basic features of the language management theory is a distinction between simple and organised management of language. Simple and organised management is distinguished in terms of the number of participants and the features of discourse involved. Neustupny and Nekvapil define simple management as the management of problems as they appear in individual communication acts. Examples are problems of spelling a particular word or how to redress the use of an expression that a speaker uttered, but it is not considered as sufficiently polite. Simple management focuses on language use, such as grammaticality and politeness at an individual level.

Organised management involves more than one person in the management process. Discourse about management occurs, while thought and ideology intervene. Since these features are present in varying degree, there is a gradual transition between

the two extremes: simple and organised management. Management theory maintains that language problems originate in simple management and from there they are transferred to the organised management domain. This does not mean that organised management is merely a summary of simple management acts. The results of organised management are transferred back to discourse and without the correction of individual discourse; the management process becomes meaningless.

3.2.2.2 The management process

The second prominent feature of the language management theory is its processuality. Neustupny and Nekvapil (2003:185) state that it constitutes the management process. This feature was conceived after the realisation that both simple and organised management are viewed as developing according to a sequence of stages. The development process begins with *deviation* from the norm. Participants often possess different norms or expectations. With time this deviation may be *noted* and a noted deviation may be *evaluated*. An *adjustment plan* is selected and then *implemented*.

The notion of language correctness, espoused by Neustupny and Nekvapil (2003), seeks to rectify deviation from the norm or the standard. It runs against the ultimate goal of language management of enlarging peoples' choices. Once speakers of the so-called non-standard variety, are denied use of their variety it means their choices are ultimately reduced. Consequently, the ultimate goal of the LMA of serving the greater social good of enlarging people's choices with the provision of a platform through which they can access and share knowledge, information and skills without the constraints of language, is seriously jeopardised (Mwaniki, 2004; 2010b; 2011; 2012).

The context in which Jernudd (1993) as well as Neustupny and Nekvapil (2003) discuss language management is limited to a single language and its non-standard varieties. Yet, in Africa in particular and also in other continents, language management has to grapple with challenges of multilingualism. In this regard, the

focus of language management should not be limited to a single language and its non-standard varieties, but it needs to increase its scope to deal with the bigger and greater challenge of the management of multilingualism (Mwaniki, 2004; 2010a, 2010b; 2012).

The third feature of the language management theory is the establishment of a hierarchy between language (in the narrow sense), communication and socio-economic management. A fourth feature is the emphasis on the recognition of the multiplicity of interests in a community. Neustupny and Nekvapil (2003:186) contend that language management is not a value-less, objective 'scientific' process. Instead it values the realisation that the capacity to implement one's interests, namely, power, is subject to variation.

The fifth feature of language management relates to its levels of management. Neustupny and Nekvapil (2003:186-187) indicate that while language planning theory focuses mainly on society-wide management such as governmental committees or various arms of the government, language management theory focuses on a number of levels that range from individual, associations, social organisations, media, economic bodies, educational institutions, local government to central government or international organisations. The shift in language management to include grassroot levels embodies the ideals of an integrated approach to language planning. This approach combines top-down and bottom-up processes in dealing with language problems.

Neustupny and Nekvapil (2003:186-187) argue that many existing theories, for example, language acquisition, language therapy, literary criticism and critical discourse, operate in a space similar to the theory of language management. To explain the link between language planning and language management, Neustupny and Nekvapil (2003:187) state that there is no contradiction between the two theories. They note that language management furnishes a wider framework that seeks to focus on a wider range of acts related to language problems. They also indicate that language management is a further development and adjustment of

language planning. Neustupny and Nekvapil (2003:187) indicate that language management has a list of rules or strategies that can become its object. These strategies may be participant, variety, situational, function, setting, content, frame or channel strategies.

3.2.3 Chaudenson

Another significant contributor to the development of language management is Chaudenson (1989; 2003) cited in Kaplan and Baldauf, 1997; Osborn, 2010). His model for language management was further developed by Osborn (2010). To describe Chaudenson's model for language management, Kaplan and Baldauf (1997:207-208) indicate that this model shows the complexity of the decision making process of language planning and the need to integrate all relevant factors into the decision making process. Kaplan and Baldauf (1997:208) note that the principles of analysis, used in Chaudenson's model, can be used for any type of language management. According to Osborn (2010:21), Chaudenson's (2003) model illustrates the interrelationship of various factors in decision making related to language management. Chaudenson's model constitutes five elements, namely, the linguistic, technical, psycholinguistic, i.e. individual reactions, language beliefs and attitudes, economy, i.e. in the sense of economy of usage and sociolinguistic.

3.2.4 Osborn

According to Osborn (2010:21), Chaudenson's (2003) model focuses specifically on four aspects of linguistics. These are the aspects of the language itself, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics and economy of use. They are considered separately alongside technical factors. Social dimensions refer to the ways in which people interact with an element of orthography and are implied in other factors. To relate Chaudenson's (2003) model to localisation ecology, Osborn (2010:21) identifies language, technology, society or socio-cultural aspects as fundamental factors. To justify the position of society and socio-cultural aspects as fundamental factors in localisation ecology, Osborn (2010:21) notes that even though society and

socio-cultural aspects are sometimes implied, they merit attention as separate categories. Osborn (2010:21) argues that although language and technology are the immediate focus to accomplish the transition within a localisation project, the social and cultural dimension is at the same level of importance when one considers the user dimensions as well as the impact of localised technology on society.

Based on Haugen's (1972) definition of language ecology, Osborn (2010-22-23) adjusts Chaudenson's (2003) model with specific reference to the localisation of Information Communication Technology (ICT). Osborn (2010:22) records that there are other factors, other than language, technology and socio-cultural factors that affect the potential and results of localisation. It is therefore necessary to 'think outside the triangle', thus one needs to consider factors other than language, technology and socio-cultural factors. Osborn (2010:22) identifies three additional factors which he considers equally important. These are policies and the process that produces them (politics); financing, markets and resource availability (economics); and the schooling and training of people in general skills, literacy and the use of ICT (education).

Osborn's (2010:22-23) PLETES model is an abbreviation derived from the first letters of each of the six factors that affect localisation or language management:

- Political factors relate to policies, decision-making processes and the interplay of interests that lead to those as well as the legal and licensing environment.
- Linguistic factors focus on the linguistic situation in a country or region, aspects of each language, the number of languages spoken, their distribution and body of speakers, if there is a standard orthography for each language and whether the languages are characterised by diverse dialects.
- Economic factors relate to standards of living, resources available for various kinds of business, the public, social and philanthropic investments as well as individual and family income levels.
- Technological factors focus on the availability of electricity and communication infrastructure, for example, computers and other types of operating systems

like internet connectivity and the ways in which these factors differ across the territory of a country.

- Educational factors relate to systems of education, whether formal or informal and school infrastructure.
- Socio-cultural factors focus on demographics, social structure, ethnic groups, culture(s) as well as popular and individual attitudes.

These six categories, and the connections between them, make this model a useful tool for understanding the environment for localisation or language management (Osborn, 2010; Mwaniki, 2011). Osborn's PLETES model closely resembles language management variables, methodologies and strategies advanced by Mwaniki (2004). All the six factors are considered as key to the localisation feature in the LMA of Mwaniki (2004) in terms of language management variables, methodologies and strategies.

3.2.5 Webb

According to Webb (2002) language management derives from management which refers to the set of activities undertaken to ensure that the goals and strategies of an organisation are achieved in an effective and efficient way. In language planning terms, Webb (2002) defines language management as the actions and strategies devised to achieve language policy objectives. Webb (2002) notes that in the presence of a comprehensive language plan and an overt or explicitly stated policy, language planning and management differ. The latter refers only to the management of the implementation plan.

If language policy and language planning development is still in progress, language management refers to the entire process involved, i.e. from the strategic analysis stage. The strategic analysis stage involves the identification and definition of the major language problems which need to be resolved, the decision about the language planning framework to be used. It also involves the analysis of the relevant external and internal environments, the description of the language planning vision

and mission, and the formulation of general and specific language policy goals, through the strategic planning stage, i.e. the description of the specific plan of implementation, to the actual management of the implementation of the language policy and plan (Webb, 2002:281).

3.2.6 Spolsky

Spolsky (2004; 2009) made significant contributions to the understanding of language management theory and practice. Spolsky (2009) adopts a processual approach that conceptualises language management theory and practice as a logical development from language planning and policy theory and practice. According to Spolsky (2009:17) language policy is about choices and its goal is to account for the choices made by individual speakers on the basis of rule governed patterns, identified by the speech community which they are part of. Spolsky (2009:1) indicates that some of these choices are a result of language management and they reflect the conscious and explicit efforts by language managers to control individual speakers' choices.

Spolsky (2009:5) states that language management starts with the individual and this constitutes simple language management. Language management at macro levels is organised language management. Schooling is a domain committed to language management and is a meeting place for a variety of language managers, who claim to have a share and influence. The family domain has a stake together with domains like government, the church and supranational organisations (Eastman, 1983; Fishman, 1991; 2006; Corson, 1993; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Hailemariam, 2002; Obanya, 2004; Ferguson, 2006; Shohamy, 2006; May, 2001; 2006; Lo Bianco, 2008; Spolsky, 2009).

Spolsky (2009:1-2) identifies the delay in the development of a theory for language management as a result of the problem that occurs across social sciences whose efforts aim at formulating a satisfactory framework that accounts for human behaviour. Watt (2007:489) cited in Spolsky (2009:2) traces this problem to the

challenge of social phenomena. He suggests that this challenge and complexity can be best captured with the use of network analysis. But, there is a huge challenge involved in analysing social networks, which are dynamic, diverse and exist in a larger framework. According to (Spolsky 2009:2), the theory of language policy is based on the assumption that while language policy accounts for individual choices, it depends heavily as social phenomenon on the beliefs or ideologies, as well as consensual behaviours of members of a speech community.

Spolsky (2004:8; 2009:4) describes language management as a third component of language policy. It refers to the explicit and observable efforts by someone or some group that has, or claims, authority over the participants in the domain to modify or confirm their language practice and ideology. He notes that the main aim of language management is to account for the language choice and to impose, modify or confirm language practices and ideologies in the lower domain. Spolsky (2004; 2009) presents language planning and language management as synonyms and the latter as the replacement of the former. His justification to use "management" rather than "planning" leaves the impression that these are near synonym and management is more of a replacement of planning. He asserts:

> I use the term "management" rather than "planning" because *I think it more precisely captures* the nature and phenomenon. Planning was the term used in the 1950s and 1960s in the post-war enthusiasm for correcting social problems; the subsequent failures of social and economic planning have *discouraged its continued use*.

As the proponents of language management rightly note, language management must be conceptualised as a logical development, extension and adjustment of language planning. It is not as a replacement of language planning, and the two must not be used interchangeable because they refer to different, but related, acts of addressing language problems.

3.2.7 Mwaniki

3.2.7.1 The Language Management Approach (LMA): The basis, rationale and nature of the LMA

Mwaniki (2004; 2010; 2011; 2012), a significant contributor to the development and understanding of language management, describes it as a complex of theoretical precepts, which derive from language planning theories, such as the decision-making theory, sociolinguistic theory, modernisation theory, systems theory, critical theory, phenomenology, human development theory and management theory, particularly advanced by the new public management paradigm. Mwaniki (2004; 2010; 2011; 2012) describes the LMA as a discipline, a theory, a practice and a method of doing linguistic and social science.

Blommaert (1996:205) notes that previous theories, especially in disciplines that strongly rely on contingent historical and socio-political realities, should be reassessed in terms of current factors and there should be a degree of fair-play. Criticism of these theories need be oriented towards optimising them and not proclaiming them as irrelevant. Consequently, Mwaniki (2004) developed the LMA based on the reassessment of past and contemporary language planning theories, models, frameworks, approaches and methods.

It is against this backdrop that Mwaniki (2004:179) notes the limitations of Jernudd and Neustupny's (1987; 1991); Jernudd's (1993); Webb's (2002); Neustupny and Nekvapil's (2003) and Spolsky's (2004; 2009) definitions of language management. Mwaniki (2004) contends that attempts by Webb and Spolsky to define language management concentrate on either to map management functions on language or describe the functions and processes that are supposed to constitute language management. Mwaniki (2004) argues that these attempts ignored what should be the epistemological foundations and domains of language management. Consequently, he contends that the approach espoused by Webb and Spolsky cannot address the current epistemological dilemmas in language planning.

Mwaniki (2004) proposes that an elaboration of language management must go beyond the description of the functions and processes that would constitute language management. It must attempt to grapple with complex epistemological issues of a theoretical, methodological and pragmatic nature. Language management seeks to address challenges that relate to occasioning a theoretical paradigm shift in language planning. It seeks to incorporate into language planning theories, models, methods, frameworks and approaches insights drawn from the lived experiences of speakers of various languages in a multilingual context at the levels of general theory, method and practice (Mwaniki, 2004:167).

Mwaniki (2004) posits that the construction of the LMA must address theoretical challenges that are not addressed in language planning theory. The LMA must also be able to move language planning from the current rationalistic and positivistic orientation, which is primarily preoccupied with notions of efficiency and effectiveness, to an orientation that seeks to introduce an empowerment discourse in language planning. This discourse must place more emphasis on the creation of social capital, rather than economic aggregates. Language planning must serve the greater social good of enlarging people's choices by providing them with a platform by means through which they can access and share knowledge, information and skills without the constraints of language.

Through the LMA, the implementation of multilingual language policies and plans is given a utilitarian perspective. The implementation of these policies serves the greater purpose of creating social capital that is essential in the development of human societies. To effectively address the aforementioned theoretical challenges in language planning, Mwaniki (2004) incorporates critical theory, phenomenology and human development theory as some of the theoretical frontiers for language management.

Mwaniki (2004; 2010; 2011; 2012) notes that various theories, frameworks, approaches, models and methods that contributed to the development and understanding of language planning constitute the much needed elements in the

construction of the language management theory. The reason for this is that they provide the theoretical basis and insights on the nature and scope of language planning that cannot be simply overlooked and ignored. In this regard, the LMA is conceptualised as an alternative paradigm of doing sociolinguistic science. It is a complex of theory and method(s) that seek to understand, explain and resolve problems in the interactive dynamics of language in society and language and society, especially in multilingual settings.

To justify the need to develop the LMA, Mwaniki (2004) notes that the epistemological and pragmatic domains of language planning, namely, language planning theory and practice, necessitated the development of the LMA. Mwaniki (2004) contends that language planning theory has inherent, unresolved weaknesses and dilemmas. These weaknesses and dilemmas impact on the ability of language planning theory to generate models or approaches that can be deployed to facilitate language policy and language planning implementation, especially in multilingual settings. The LMA is therefore an alternative approach that provides a set of optimal language management variables, methodologies and strategies that can be deployed to address dilemmas which affect multilingual language policy implementation.

Mwaniki (2004) points out that if it is true that language planning theory and practice, as they are at present, fail to an appreciable degree to provide solutions to the dilemmas in multilingual policy and planning implementation, then any alternative theory and practice that seeks to address these problems must embrace theoretical and pragmatic domains beyond “policy” and “planning”. Mwaniki derives the LMA from the understanding that policy formulation is an aspect of the planning process and planning is a component of a greater undertaking, which is management; hence the naming of the new approach as the LMA. Mwaniki describes language management as a logical development of language planning as a discipline by extending its epistemological scope. He presents it as a response to the limitations and dilemmas of contemporary language planning theory and practice, that stand to benefit from concepts greater than policy and planning for their resolution.

The LMA seeks to formulate approaches or frameworks that can be deployed to address language-related challenges in society, but fundamentally the formulation of approaches, frameworks, methodologies and strategies that can be deployed to harness language resources in society. Through its variables, methodologies and strategies, language management seeks to explain and address the non-implementation dilemmas that bedevil multilingual language policies. The LMA seeks to address theoretical challenges that were not addressed in the past and in contemporary language planning theory (Mwaniki, 2004:270).

The elaboration of language management, advanced by Mwaniki (2004) conceptualises language management as a complex of theory and method(s). Language management is a particular way of thinking and conceptualising social and linguistic phenomena. It is a particular way of conceptualising language in particular and language in society in general. Language management is a particular way of engaging in science that is preoccupied with the interactive dynamics of language and society in totality, thus it is a way of doing socio-linguistic science.

3.2.7.1.1 Language management: The theory

According to Mwaniki (2004:270) language management is a complex of theoretical precepts that derive from the decision-making theory, social and linguistic theories, modernisation theory, systems theory, critical theory, management theory, particularly the ones advanced by the new public management paradigm, phenomenology and human development theory. Mwaniki (2011:13) adds social psychology, social cultural theory and game theory as other theories that contribute to the construction of the language management theory.

The inherent interconnectedness of the theories that constitute the language management theory constitutes its defining feature. As a complex of theoretical precepts, language management seeks to understand and explain the interactive dynamics of language in society and language and society, especially in multilingual societies. Mwaniki (2004; 2010; 2011; 2012) notes that the language management

theory is not a collection of theoretical precepts, but a complex of theoretical precepts. This inherent interconnectedness of the theories that constitute the language management theory partly derives from its aim to account for the interactive dynamics of language in society and language and society in multilingual societies.

The inherent interconnectedness of the theories that constitute the language management theory also derives from the systems theory that is one of the constitutive theories of the language management theory. The systems theory provides the requisite tools for identifying and accounting for the multiplicity of variables in language management scenarios. It is also a potent tool in the overall understanding of the complexities of the interaction of social phenomena and the nature of scientific enquiry. Mwaniki (2011:14) describes the systems theory as a theory that "ties-up" all the theoretical precepts of the language management theory into a coherent network of theory. The notion "complex" of theoretical precepts has far-reaching implications to language management epistemology, namely, the open-endedness of the language management theory. According to Mwaniki (2011:14), as the scientific community advance new theories for conceptualising the interactive dynamics of language in society and language and society in multilingual settings, the open-ended nature of the language management theory allows for the addition and incorporation of more theoretical precepts.

The ultimate objective of the language management theory in understanding and explaining the interactive dynamics in society is to formulate approaches and/or frameworks that can be deployed to address language-related challenges in society. This is meant to serve the greater purpose of serving the social good of enlarging peoples' choices by providing them with a platform through which they can access and share knowledge, information and skills without the due constraints of language (Mwaniki, 2004:270).

3.2.7.1.2 Language management: The method

From the viewpoint of method, Mwaniki (2004:270) defines language management as a complex of methods of doing linguistic and social science. The language management method is derived from the constitutive theories of the language management theory. The complex nature of the language management method derives from the complex of theoretical precepts of the language management theory. Like the language management theory, the language management method is equally open-ended. Other methods can be added as new theories emerge in the discipline. Following the addition of the social cultural theory, social psychology theory and game theory, Mwaniki (2011; 2012) adds critical discourse analysis, conversational analysis and ethnographic methods that are traceable to socio-cultural theories and phenomenology. He also includes psycho-sociological methods, which derive from social psychology, and social network analysis, that originates from the systems theory.

The language management method is multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary. In its multidisciplinary nature, it draws from various disciplines to explain the interactive dynamics of language in society and language and society. As an interdisciplinary method, it crosses the traditional boundaries between linguistic disciplines and schools of thought in linguistics as new needs and challenges continue to emerge in the quest to explain the interactive dynamics of language in society and language and society (Mwaniki, 2011:14-15).

The language management method is distinct from other methods of doing linguistic and social science, because language management is preoccupied with efforts of fully understanding linguistic and social phenomena as a basis for the formulation of optimal frameworks for multilingual language policy implementation. To fully understand the interactive dynamics of language in society and language and society, the language management method depends on thick descriptions of linguistic and social phenomena (Mwaniki, 2004:270). The language management method also derives its uniqueness from the rational method of the decision-making

theory and management theory which require that formulations emanating from language management must be rationale. These formulations must be backed by available data, resources and expected outcomes. Unlike the language planning method, the language management method relies on the participatory method in investigating, describing and accounting for and harnessing power relations in society as well as in realising its empowerment agenda (Mwaniki, 2004:270).

3.2.7.1.3 Language management: The discipline

Language management is also defined as a discipline or a field of study which represents a nascent shift in the theorisation of language planning. It is an academic response to people power and rejects central imposition and recognises the multitude competing interests (Jernudd, 1993; Antia, 2000; Mwaniki, 2004). It is described as the logical development of language planning and policy as a discipline, because it derives its knowledge base from the past and contemporary language planning theories, approaches, frameworks, methods and practices of doing sociolinguistic science (Mwaniki, 2004:271). Mwaniki (2004:271) asserts that language management is or attempts to be, an organised body of knowledge that preoccupies itself with a particular set of questions related to language in society and language and society with a view of enlarging people's choices. It is a discipline that preoccupies itself with harnessing language resources in society to contribute to human emancipation, liberation and freedom.

As a nascent shift in the theorisation on language planning, language management as a discipline preoccupies, or seeks to preoccupy, itself with questions relating to the theoretical and methodological adequacy of past and contemporary language planning theories, methods and models of explaining the non-implementation dilemmas attendant to multilingual language policies as well as in facilitating their implementation. It is also preoccupied with questions related to language as a resource/language as a problem in society; questions on what accounts for language choice(s) at individual, institutional or societal level, questions on how language in society can be harnessed to facilitate and foster a holistic development of society and

questions about the nature of optimal approaches and frameworks for multilingual language policy implementation. Language management as a discipline seeks to provide answers to these questions, while leaving room for the emergence of more questions (Mwaniki, 2004:271; Mwaniki, 2011:15).

Drawing from the critical theory, language management as a discipline is self-critical. It holds the premise that social and linguistic scientists should undertake a close and thorough analysis of what is involved in doing social and linguistic science as true and of fundamental importance. As a self-critical discipline, language management considers how the process of doing socio-linguistic science relates to the larger project of enhancing human freedom and emancipation. Language management seeks to develop an open attitude to any philosophical tradition that has held or holds the promise of human emancipation through social critique. Language management as a discipline seeks to continuously review language planning to establish whether research undertaken within and under language management is self-critical in such a way that it serves the larger project of enhancing human freedom (Mwaniki, 2004:272).

3.2.7.1.4 Language management: The practice

Mwaniki (2011) argues that while practice without theory is meaningless, the inverse is also true. He contends that it is futile to pursue language management not based on sound theoretical and practical premises. The dialectics of theory and practice in language management show that the theory and the method it presupposes as well as its practice exist in a dialectic relationship. Language management as practice is defined by Mwaniki (2004:272) as the execution of doing language policy and planning activities, especially in multilingual settings.

This practice engages in language planning activities, in different variances to current practices in language planning that are mainly centralised, bureaucratic, reactive and top-down. The practice of language management involves the critical and creative formulation and deployment of language management variables and management,

sociolinguistic as well as development oriented methodologies and strategies to address language related challenges in society. These variables, methodologies and strategies are deployed to harness language resources in society taking into account, most, if not all, of the variables that affect language in society and how societal dynamics impact on language.

As a practice, language management uses public and development theories and contexts as the main drivers for multilingual language policy implementation. It integrates insights from public and development theory and contexts in the formulation of its methodologies and strategies with the ultimate goal of enlarging peoples' choices. These choices may be at macro levels of governance, development and democracy or at the micro levels of individual freedom and advancement, access to service, access to and transfer and application of information and knowledge. In the education sector, the enlargement of peoples' choices holds imply universal access to education where children everywhere, majority or minority language speakers, are able to access and successfully complete their education in languages that they know and understand best (Mwaniki, 2004:272).

3.2.7.2 Language management variables

Language management variables, methodologies and strategies are features of the LMA. Mwaniki (2004) states that they can be deployed to address language related challenges in society. Language management variables were developed by Mwaniki (2004) based on Cluver's (1991) five levels at which a language plan should be evaluated using the systems approach to language planning.

Cluver (1991:56) identifies five levels according to which a language plan should be evaluated. These levels or variables interact with the proposed language policy and determine its success:

(a) The socio-political level focuses on the degree to which the plan foster and promote national cohesion and unity.

(b) The administrative level relates to the extent to which the language plan will enable the central government to communicate with more isolated villagers. This level focuses on nationalism.

(c) The educational level focuses on the extent to which the chosen language(s) of instruction in the language plan will be used as a language of instruction and how it actually affects the learners' academic performance.

(d) The economic level assesses the extent to which the language plan will create equal opportunities for upward social mobility, employment and facilitate issues of operational efficiency and links with the global village.

(e) The legal level pitches the extent to which language rights of minority language speakers will be protected.

In the development of the LMA, Mwaniki (2004) modified the five variables developed by Cluver. He posits eight language management variables, namely, linguistic, political, legal, economic, socio-cultural, management, educational and technological variables. This set of variables need to be secured to an appreciable degree if multilingual language policy implementation is to succeed. Mwaniki (2004:228) warns that these variables must not be taken as guarantee. Policy makers that implement multilingual language policies need to secure and deploy the best possible mix of these variables to facilitate multilingual language policy implementation. Conscious efforts need to be made to secure and sustain them and where they exist in varying degrees, they should be reinforced.

3.2.7.2.1 Linguistic variables

These are variables that relate to language development in all respects; may it be corpus, status, acquisition or prestige planning. For multilingual language policy implementation to be successful the concerned languages must be developed to such a level that they are able to serve almost all, if not all, functions in the modern and changing world (Mwaniki, 2004:243). Language development entails language empowerment. It is a measure that seeks to raise the social status of a language and make it more viable to handle public domains (Batibo, 2005:115). Language

development calls for massive efforts to ensure that the chosen languages are standardised, modernised, cultivated and accorded high status roles in society. A serious investment in time and resources by government, with a commitment to collaboration between linguists, educators and community members, is required to develop a language. Implementation of language policies is often derailed by decision-makers' failure to collaborate with language experts or to allocate resources to language development efforts. It also fails if linguists impose decisions on the linguistic community without involving it in the process (Benson, 2005:9).

A language that is not used in a wide range of domains will not develop appropriate vocabulary and expression for discussing concepts in such domains. Because of the low level of development, such languages are perceived as unsuitable for use in certain domains. But it is simply that they have not been allowed to develop as others have. A vicious circle is perpetuated in which non-use means low development and vice-versa. A constant argument against the use of African languages in domains, in which they are not currently used, is that they lack the terminology to cope with concepts in such domains. It has to be noted that language development is intended to remedy the underdevelopment of such languages and empower them. Although language development is important, the impression should not be created that complete language development must be in place before a language can be used in a wider range of domains (Haugen, 1983; Chumbow, 1987; Cooper, 1989; Adegbija, 1994; Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; 2007; Webb, 2002; Annamalia, 2004; Batibo, 2001; 2005; Benson, 2005).

Language development is a process and part of language policy implementation. After policy formulation, as soon as codification and elaboration of norms for selected languages start, the policy is already being implemented. Codification and elaboration are processes initiated to give effect to language policy. To meet the demands of educational materials, most programs do not wait for all linguistic decisions to be made, but they become part of the process which also involves communities. Terminology creation and development of literature in a language go hand in hand with expanded use. It is by means of the use of a language for new

concepts that terminology creation, dictionary making, compilation of grammar books and writing of textbooks occurs (Chumbow, 1987; Cooper, 1989; Adegbija, 1994; Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; 2007; Webb, 2002; Annamalia, 2004; Batibo, 2001; 2005; Benson, 2005).

Languages develop with use, especially in expanded domains, and in this way, they are developed and empowered. The development of a language takes place through use, not prior to use. The implementation of policy must not wait until a language is developed to a level where it serves almost all, if not all, functions in a modern and changing world. All languages are capable of fulfilling the roles allocated to them, provided that an opportunity is given to them through clear policies (Chumbow, 1987; Cooper, 1989; Adegbija, 1994a; Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; 2007; Webb, 2002; Annamalia, 2004; Batibo, 2005; Benson, 2005).

3.2.7.2.2 Political variables

Political variables relate to challenges that confront multilingual language policy implementation. Since language planning is often clouded by political agendas and issues, multilingual language policy implementation need to conceptualise political will, support and elite closure as political factors that need to be addressed to facilitate multilingual language policy implementation. Research in language planning, policy and management is unequivocal on the general lack of political will among political leaders to implement the steps necessary to promote multilingualism. Multilingual language policy implementers need to formulate and deploy proactive methodologies and strategies to secure and retain the prerequisite political will, support and elite support. This will assist multilingual language policy implementation to proceed without unnecessary derailments by political forces (Cooper, 1989; Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; 2007; Tollefson, 1991; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Webb, 2002; 2004; 2009; 2010; Annamalia, 2004; Mwaniki, 2004; Batibo, 2005; Trudell, 2006; Lewis & Trudell, 2008).

Webb (2002:166) observes that political will is the primary ingredient to utilise language in any meaningful way in the process of national development. There is a need for government to manifest genuine, sustained, stronger and more honest political will. To underscore the importance of commitment on the part of strategy formulators, Ehlers and Lazenby (2010:262) note that it is important for strategy formulators to remain committed to the implementation process to inspire the managers and employees. Strong and good strategic leadership, provided by government, drives strategic change. Strong leadership is an important tool in the implementation toolkit that gives direction and purpose to strategy implementation. Language policy formulation and implementation rarely take place until the political machinery makes its need obvious and pressing.

Government is in a position to provide motivational structure that other implementing agencies cannot provide. A central agency, such as government authority, is required to coordinate and oversee all planning activities. Government need to ensure a measure of uniformity of form, norms and goals. It also needs to maximise all efforts directed towards national development. Given the complexity of the language issue and the enormity of the task, a comprehensive and meaningful policy of multilingualism can only be successfully implemented if there is a strong and clear directive from government structures with maximum authority. Language policy is ultimately a political decision taken by government, which has to enact the necessary legislation. This provides an enabling environment for policy implementation (Chumbow, 1987; Cooper, 1989; Bamgbose, 1987; 1989; 1991; 2000; 2007; Tollefson, 1991; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Webb, 2002; 2004; 2009; 2010; Annamalia, 2004; Mwaniki, 2004; Batibo, 2005; Trudell, 2006; Lewis & Trudell, 2008).

Since language planning and policy is essentially a top-down activity, it needs to be authoritative. It requires governmental resources and needs to be effectively managed. Government provides and sources the funding needed to implement policy. Language planning needs strong backing by political leaders if it is to succeed. Language policy implementation succeeds if the machinery of government adopts a radical, pro-active approach and becomes an agent of social change.

Political will is required to give momentum to the implementation of the policy (Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; 2007; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Webb, 2002; 2004; 2009; 2010; Annamalia, 2004; Batibo, 2005; Trudell, 2006; Lewis & Trudell, 2008).

At national level, policy decisions have to be comprehensive, carefully considered and backed with adequate resources to implement them. Explicit, supportive national policy can, but does not always, energise nationally organised institutions to engage in overt promotional activities for the local language in education, local government and other institutional contexts. When not accompanied by resources or implementation plans, such policy decisions result in a complex mix of supportive and antagonistic perspectives at local level as local government and non-governmental institutions and community members take positions based on their own concerns and agendas. Even when non-governmental organisations are encouraged by permissive and positive policy decisions their efforts tend to be frustrated over time. This may be because of covert negative attitudes to change from leadership (Crystal, 2000; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Novak-Lukanovič & Limon, 2012).

Political will is demonstrated through the provision of the necessary inputs, conditions and an enabling environment for policy implementation. The establishment and implementation of sanctions to non-compliance with policy stipulations, and mandatory follow-up sessions devoted to progress in implementation, are also useful indicators of political will behind the policy in question. Lack of political will among policy makers is often visible in poor planning, organising, controlling and leading. It is also visible in policy documents that contain escape clauses, qualified statements, opt-outs, modifications, alternatives, the use of technical justifications, lack of a definite time frame for implementation and no follow-up measures or clear guidance. Governments that are seriously committed to the policies of multilingualism have to ensure that conditions for implementation are satisfactory. This includes legitimisation of policies and adequate provision of strong institutional support. If these provisions are not present, multilingual language-in-education policy implementation will remain rhetorical (Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; Webb, 2002; 2004; Annamalai, 2004; Tsui &

Tollefson, 2004; Batibo, 2005; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000; 2003; 2006; Paulston & Hiedemann, 2006; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010).

It is clear that for language-in-education policy implementation to succeed there needs to be a positive political climate, committed to the preservation of ethnic identity, multilingualism, multiculturalism, linguistic human rights and cultural rights. There is need for the political machinery to be prepared to allocate money according to its principles and where the political implications of multilingual language-in-education policies have been thought through. This highlights the dire need to maintain pressure on government across all levels to ensure that something is actually done. This leaves no room for complacency with regard to lobbying government (Crystal, 2000:102; 135).

Elite closure refers to a social mobilisation strategy through which those in power establish and maintain their powers and privileges via linguistic choices. Elite closure is accomplished when the elite successfully employ official language policies and their own non-formalised language usage patterns to limit access of non-elite groups to political positions and socio-economic advancement (Myers-Scotton, 1993:149). Elite support does not ensure the successful implementation of multilingual language policies, but it can hinder the successful execution of such policies (Cooper, 1989; Peddie, 1991; Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; Fishman, 1991; Myers-Scotton, 1993; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Strubell, 2001; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2003; Mwaniki, 2004; Prah, 2005; Kamwendo, 2005; Alidou, 2004; Annamalia, 2004; Trudell, 2006; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Webb, 2002; 2009; Ndhlovu, 2010).

To effectively address elite closure and secure political will, there is a need to deploy development oriented methodologies and strategies, such as advocacy, development communication and dialogical intervention strategies. Political authorities need to be given the impetus to realise the importance of multilingual education. Government need to be convinced of the national benefits to be gained with the implementation of a particular language-in-education policy decision. These benefits include universal access to education, access to information and participation in national issues

(Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; Vawda & Patrinos, 1999; Webb, 2002; Brock-Utne & Hopson, 2005; Batibo, 2005; 2009; Turrent & Oketch, 2009; Patrinos & Velez, 2009; Kamwendo, 2009; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh, 2010).

3.2.7.2.3 Legal variables

Legal variables relate to the conscious realisation that multilingual language policy implementation needs to be based on a legal premise, namely, the constitution. Language rights need to be entrenched in the fundamental principles of the constitution because they are indispensible to the achievement of other founding values in the constitution. Before the actual implementation of multilingual language policies all the necessary legislative instruments like language acts, policies and by-laws must be enacted. The development and implementation of language policies has to emanate from legislative instruments (Crystal, 2000; Bamgbose, 2000; Henrard, 2003; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2003; 2006; Mwaniki, 2004; 2010a; 2011; 2012; Batibo, 2005; Trudell, 2006; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Lo Bianco, 2009; Novak-Lukanovič & Limon, 2012).

The formulation and implementation of language policies must be premised on the constitution and other legal instruments, such as language policies, language-in-education policies, the bill of rights, policy circulars and education acts. These policy documents have to engender a culture of constitutionalism and be the vanguards of the constitutional ethos. To premise language policies on legislative instruments provides a substantial basis for their implementation. It gives credibility to language stipulations. Language legislation provides the legal and licensing environment for policy implementation. In multilingual or linguistically diverse polities, without an appropriate language law, the natural tendency to augment the social and economic power of the dominant language community and the hegemony of its language at the expense of the numerical or social minorities manifest itself unchecked (Zvobgo, 1997; 2007; Bamgbose, 2000; Webb, 2002; Batibo, 2001; 2005; Mwaniki, 2010; Ndlovu, 2011; Alexander, 2012a).

Lo Bianco (2009:103) describes the constitution as an official state text which serves as a source of information. It is the most authoritative and decisive source of information that enshrines the linguistic intentions of the state. Legislation is one of the means through which state institutions attempt to regulate and promote language use. As a language management tool, legislation defines and prescribes a framework for mapping the languages in a community's macro repertoire to activity domains (Matras, 2009:45). For acquisition planning that involves minority languages, language planning legislation is vital to maintain and promote the development, teaching and learning of these languages (Cartwright, 2006:197).

Given this background, there is need for a legal premise on which mother tongue education in official minority languages will be based and through which language-related rights violations can be redressed in a legal way. Legislation enables government to give direction to policy implementers and enable them to operate within the law. Zvobgo (1997:39) states that the educational policy of any community requires legislative action to enact it. Consequently, effective education legislation is fundamental to educational practice. In the absence of legal sanction, educational policy is regarded as state agenda or propaganda.

Georgiou, Ó Laoire and Rigg (2010:100) argue that the absence of statutory bodies or instruments encourage non-compliance. Their presence promotes a general goodwill towards change among implementing stakeholders. It also discourages a *laissez-faire* implementation of the policy among all stakeholders. Georgiou, Ó Laoire and Rigg observe that policies outside statutory guidelines are often ignored, disregarded or not taken seriously, with the result that they remain on paper. Implementing agents can ignore or selectively implement policy directives, because there are no penalties attached to it. The need for language legislation accompanied by sanctions to discourage non-compliance is indispensable.

Legislation is a form of language empowerment which is not meaningful unless it is accompanied by a detailed plan for implementation. This plan for implementation has to spell out time frames for the achievement of certain objectives, domains of policy

application, incentives and indicate bodies set up to facilitate compliance and sanctions to discourage non-compliance. If non-observance does not attract any sanctions, the policy is as good as dead. Such legislation ought to be visible, enforceable and accessible to all language speakers, especially in their languages. Such a legal framework will work if it is systematic, unambiguous, rational and written down (Kaplan and Baldauf, 1997; Crystal 2000; Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; 2007; Strubell, 2001; Webb, 2002; 2004; 2009; 2010; Henrard, 2003; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2003; 2006; Mwaniki, 2004; 2010a; 2011; 2012; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004a; Jones & Martin-Jones, 2004; Annamalia, 2004; Batibo, 2005; Trudell, 2006; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Hatoss, 2008; Lo Bianco, 2009; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh, 2010; Novak-Lukanovič & Limon, 2012).

Seeing that in education, issues of educational linguistic rights are taking centre stage in the analysis of language-in-education policies, it is worth-while to consider Cluver's (1991:56) discussion of legal variables, which relate to the extent to which a language plan promotes educational linguistic human rights of minority language speakers. The right to education is void if there is no implication or reference to the right to mother tongue education. Any educational policy that guarantees children's right to education, but does not guarantee access to such education in the mother tongue fails to lead to access to the right to education (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1998; 1999; 2000; 2003; 2006; May, 2001; 2006; Henrard, 2003; Paulston & Hiedemann, 2006; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh, 2010; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010).

Mother tongue education is central in equal and universal access to education for all children, given the role of the mother tongue in determining who enrolls, repeats, drops-out and successfully completes a full course of education, particularly in primary education. Language in education is central in the realisation of the right to education because it determines who has access to education (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1998; 1999; 2000; 2003; 2006; May, 2001; 2006; Henrard, 2003; Paulston & Hiedemann, 2006; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh, 2010; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010). Ouane (2010: x) adequately captures the centrality of language in education by noting that;

Language is not everything in education, but without language everything is nothing in education.

In this regard, there is no education without language. If the right to education is perceived as an indispensable human right, then the right to mother tongue medium education is a necessary prerequisite to the right of access to education. Mother tongue medium education has to be guaranteed as a human right (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000; 2003; 2006; Kamwendo & Kachiwanda, 2002; Henrard, 2003; Paulston & Hiedamann, 2006; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh, 2010; Ndlovu, 2011).

3.2.7.2.4 Economic variables

Economic variables focus on issues related to the budget for multilingual language policy implementation. They encompass issues like cost-benefit analysis, which is envisaged and undertaken as an integral part of policy formulation. Resource allocation is essential for any policy innovation and adoption of a policy means acceptance of its financial implications. Economic variables must be understood in a more encompassing way. Not only monetary benefits, but also the perception that any money spent in multilingual language policy implementation is money spent to create social capital, needs to be included. Multilingual language policy implementation has a multiplier effect, because it facilitates access to information and knowledge and this enlarges peoples' choices as they participate in economic activities without the constraints of language (Eastman, 1983; Chumbow, 1987; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Vawda & Patrinos, 1999; Mwaniki, 2004; Benson, 2005; Patronis & Velez, 2009).

An investment in multilingual language policy implementation is for the long term, economic well-being of a nation as well as the individual members of the nation. Multilingual language policy implementation encompasses political, social, educational benefits that are not always easy to quantify. These benefits cannot be reduced to pure economic aggregates, but they are valuable. This multiplier effect of multilingual language policy implementation enables people to understand and employ basic technologies that can lead to self-sustenance in food production. It

promotes access to universal education, which improves academic results, lower drop-outs and decrease repeat rates. It enhances the maximum participation of all citizens in national development programmes (Devonish, 1986; Bamgbose, 1991; Adegbija, 1994a; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Zvobgo, 1997; 2007; UNDP, 1996; 1999; 2004; Prah, 2000; Mwaniki, 2004; 2010a; 2011; 2012; Brock-Utne & Hopson, 2005; Djité, 2008; Kendall & Benson, 2008; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh, 2010).

Language in education is one of the criteria to determine which people will complete different levels of education. In this way, language is a means for rationing access to better paying jobs. Whenever people have to learn a new language to have access to education or understand classroom instruction, language creates and sustains social and economic divisions (Tollefson, 1991:8-9). Given this role of language in education, multilingual language-in-education policies facilitate the even spread of literacy and economic opportunities to all citizens. Dependence on foreign and dominant African (national) language impedes the spread of literacy and hinders access to economic opportunities. The quality of life of the masses can be improved with education in their own languages; the languages in which they are most creative, innovative and speak to their hearts and minds most primordially (Cluver, 1991; Prah 2002; 2005; Mbeki, 2000; UNDP, 2004; Djité, 2008; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh, 2010).

To apply and relate economic variables to the implementation of multilingual language-in-education policies, especially where minority languages are involved, the view that cost is an insurmountable obstacle is usually discussed rather one-sided and exaggerated. The objections against the use of African languages, particularly, the so-called minority languages in economic terms, include such objections as: they have no economic value and that the implementation and maintenance profitably of mother tongue based multilingual language-in-education policies is too expensive. This economic argument against mother tongue education tends to ignore the important role of education to development. It overlooks that education involves the liberation of human potential that is needed for the welfare of the individual, community and the nation (Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; 2007; Adegbija, 1994a; UNDP,

1996; 1999; 2004; Vawda & Patrinos, 1999; Webb, 2002; Bruns, Mingat & Rakotomalala, 2003; Brock-Utne & Hopson, 2005; Kendall & Benson, 2008; Turrent & Oketch, 2009; Patrinos & Velez, 2009; Kamwendo, 2009; Batibo, 2009a; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh, 2010).

Education ministries often object to the perceived costs to implement multilingual language-in-education policies. They object to the large investments needed, particularly in teacher preparation, materials and language development. This may prevent decision-makers to consider the implementation of such policies. There are benefits which need to be taken into account which are often difficult to quantify, but they are of real significance (Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Vawda & Patrinos, 1999; Webb, 2002; Benson, 2005; Brock-Utne & Hopson, 2005; Turrent & Oketch, 2009; Patrinos & Velez, 2009; Ndlovu, 2011).

The initial high costs to develop minority languages cultivated among policy makers an attitudinal misconception that mother tongue based multilingual education is from the practical and economic viewpoint impossible. This attitude has in some cases cultivated among policy makers an attitude of surrender or resignation to the eternal impossibility of such policy developments. To many policy makers, the expending of the scarce resources on the development of mother tongue based multilingual policies is a misplacement of priorities. The reason is that language issues are not considered as priority or urgent (Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; 2007; Adegbija, 1994a; Batibo, 2005; 2009a; Brock-Utne & Hopson, 2005; Kamwendo, 2009).

Research shows that the initial higher costs to implement mother tongue education programmes are outweighed by its benefits after only two years. The real cost of education in an ex-colonial language has to be quantified in terms of poor performance, drop-out rate, cost of recruitment of foreign personnel and the use of material that is ill-adapted for the local situation. These costs should not be determined in simple material terms with a narrow focus only on the costs to train teachers in a variety of languages, develop teaching materials and standardisation of these languages. There are more significant costs which need to be considered

within the whole equation (Bamgbose, 1991; Chiswick, Patrinos & Tamayo, 1996; Vawda & Patrinos, 1998; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000; 2006; Brock-Utne & Hopson, 2005; Batibo, 2005; 2009a; Kamwendo, 2009; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010; Ndlovu, 2011).

It is important to emphasize that the benefits of mother tongue based multilingual education must not be only conceived in economic terms or in terms of upward social mobility. Apart from these benefits, others are educational, pedagogical, cognitive or psychological, cultural or linguistic. The mother tongue represents a platform for the effective acquisition of a second language. Benefits of mother tongue based multilingual education stretch beyond economic benefits. The whole range of benefits of mother tongue education need to be considered in the cost-benefit analysis of a mother tongue based multilingual language-in-education policy plan (Bamgbose, 1991; Chiswick, Patrinos & Tamayo, 1996; Vawda & Patrinos, 1998; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000; 2006; Brock-Utne & Hopson, 2005; Batibo, 2005; 2009; Kamwendo, 2009; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010; Ndlovu, 2011).

A limited view of the benefits of mother tongue based multilingual language-in-education policies impacts negatively on government's commitment to implement them and on parents' acceptance and support of such policies. This clearly indicates the indispensable and urgent need to deploy development oriented methodologies and strategies to debunk and deconstruct some of these myths about mother tongue based multilingual education.

The same applies for the real costs of education in dominant African national languages which thwart and subdue the development and use of minority languages. The benefits of mother tongue based multilingual education for minority language speakers as an investment in human capital are more significant and worthwhile. Mother tongue based multilingual education leads to an increase in educational attainment. The better the learners perform, the more schooling they will attain. The more schooling they attain, the higher their earning will be and the lesser will be the statistics of people living below the poverty datum line, and the higher the chances of

achieving the other Millennium Development Goals (Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; 2007; Mbeki, 2000; Webb, 2002; Prah, 2005; Brock-Utne & Hopson, 2005; Kendall & Benson, 2008; Djité, 2008; Patrinos & Velez, 2009; Bagwasi, 2009; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh, 2010).

A plethora of studies show that investment in universal primary education guaranteed by mother tongue based multilingual education is a good investment for the individual and society. This stems from the realisation that education is the foundation for progress in all other development goals. In combination with strong macroeconomic policies, the expansion of educational opportunities through mother tongue based multilingual language-education policies is fundamental to construct globally competitive economies and democratic societies. As a form of investment in human capital, mother tongue based multilingual education yields personal and national economic benefits. It increases the productive capacity of its people, may they be majority or minority language speaking (UNESCO, 1953; 2006; Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; 2007; Adegbija, 1994; UNDP, 1996; 1999; 2004; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Zvobgo, 1997; 2007; Vawda & Patrinos, 1999; Webb, 2002; Prah, 2005; Djité, 2008; Patrinos & Velez, 2009; Turrent & Oketch, 2009; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh, 2010; Ndlovu, 2011).

Mother tongue based multilingual education needs to be conceived as people development. An investment in language-in-education leads to long term dividends, although gradual, but it is a worth investment to prioritise even in gloomy and bleak economies. It becomes significant if it is considered that education is part of human resource development. Education is the power house of development in every nation. An investment in language, the oil to the educational, political, economic and structural engine of a nation, ensures the continued health of an education system and is worth to undertake (UNESCO, 1953; 2006; Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; Adegbija, 1994a; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Zvobgo, 1997; 2007; UNDP, 1996; 1999; 2004; Vawda & Patrinos, 1999; Webb, 2002; Brock-Utne & Hopson, 2005; Djité, 2008; Turrent & Oketch, 2009; Patrinos & Velez, 2009; Ndlovu, 2011).

Many governments may decide not to allocate resources to local language investment, particularly minority languages because it leads to consistent recurrent expenditure over a long period. Another reason may be the limited understanding of the benefits of such investments. Short term political goals may not accommodate a long term investment focus, but it needs to be stressed that benefits of investing in mother tongue based multilingual language-in-education policies blossom in different forms (Adegbija, 1994a; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Vawda & Patrinos, 1999; Brock-Utne, 2005; Patrinos & Velez, 2009; Turrent & Oketch, 2009). Economic variables relate with resourcing policy and evaluation policy and management oriented methodologies and strategies of the LMA, such as planning, organising and controlling. They are also intricately interlinked with political variables.

3.2.7.2.5 Socio-cultural variables

Socio-cultural variables encompass the social and cultural issues of society that need to be considered for multilingual language policies to be successful. The close-knit relationship between the social and cultural fabric of the society and language, demand that multilingual language policy implementation must not overlook the place of language in the social and cultural fabric of the society. If this relationship is overlooked, the policy is more likely to be met with untold resistance (Mwaniki, 2004:244). For any language-education policy implementation to succeed, it needs to promote a social fabric that affords all citizens their identities and existence that are embedded in their languages. It needs to ensure that the citizens' languages are not threatened. Most ethnic minorities threatened with extinction, assimilation, marginalisation and exclusion claim that without language, their culture is lost (Obanya, 1980; 2004; Williams & Snipper, 1990; Schiffman, 1996; Obeng & Adegbija, 1999; Phillipson, 1999; Crystal, 2000; Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981; 2000; 2003; 2006; Prah, 2000a; 2005; UNDP, 2004; Mumpande, 2006; Bamgbose, 2007; Rassol, 2007; Hatoss, 2008; McCarty, Skutnabb-Kangas & Magga, 2008; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010).

Language is a vehicle and expression of culture. It is a carrier and transmitter of culture. Language is an identity marker, a social value and the cultural glue that binds and holds a community together. It links generations and preserve a heritage and people's values. Language is a core value of culture which determines members' cultural identity. Most ethnic groups build their ethnic identity almost exclusively and primarily on the defence of their linguistic rights. Language is essential for the transmission and maintenance of a culture. It identifies a given culture and it is not just a vehicle of the culture, but it is the embodiment of culture. Language is a dominant feature of any culture and more than any other aspect of culture register and catalogue the cultural heritage of society. Language is the aspect of culture which directly mirrors in verbal and written forms and it is the root directory of the culture of a society (Obanya, 1980; 2004; Williams & Snipper, 1990; Schiffman, 1996; Obeng & Adegbija, 1999; Phillipson, 1999; Crystal, 2000; Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981; 2000; 2003; 2006; Prah, 2000a; 2005; UNDP, 2004; Mumpande, 2006; Bamgbose, 2007; Hatoss, 2008; McCarty, Skutnabb-Kangas & Magga, 2008; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010).

The close connection between language and culture in education is too well-known to elaborate on. In most countries of the world, ministries and departments of education are referred to as the ministry or department of education and culture. The name emphasizes the close knit relationship between language and culture. A situation, in which peoples' language is marginalised, implies that their culture is marginalised. Language is the primary vehicle to acculturate and learn one's culture. Education mainly in the dominant national language(s) or ex-colonial languages, gradually assimilate minority language speaking learners into the culture of the language of education (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981; 2000; 2003; 2006; Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; 2007; Corson, 1993; Schiffman, 1996; May, 2001; 2006; UNDP, 2004; Tsui & Tollefson, 2004; Obanya, 2004; Fishman, 2006; Shohamy, 2006; Rassol, 2007; McCarty, Skutnabb-Kangas & Magga, 2008; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010; Ndlovu, 2011).

Obanya (2004:10) observes that education is about acculturation. To be learned, is to be cultured. The accumulated wisdom and knowledge embodied in the mother tongue is the major instrument for acculturation. A state of all-round acculturation creates a feeling of belonging. Starting off an acculturation process with a non-mother tongue tends to exacerbate the 'far away and long ago syndrome'. It does not lead to a situation in which a person becomes knowledgeable, but not cultured and developing a feeling of belonging nowhere. Learning in an unfamiliar language compromises the learner's self-concept and worth, hence mother tongue education is important for the socio-cultural development of the learner.

In multilingual settings, classrooms are significant sites for the production and reproduction of cultural identity. A minority, whose children attend school where the dominant national language or ex-colonial language is mainly used as the sole language of instruction, usually cannot reproduce itself as a minority. It cannot integrate, but is forced to assimilate. When minority learners are denied mother tongue education, it is not only culture that is at stake, but also the question of identity (Obanya, 1980; 2004; Corson, 1993; Batibo, 2001; 2004; 2005; UNDP, 2004; Paulston & Hiedemann, 2006; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2006; Bamgbose, 2007; McCarty, Skutnabb-Kangas & Magga, 2008; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh, 2010). Chimhundu, *et al*. (1998:33) summarise that mother tongue is the voice of the socio-cultural identity, and socio-cultural identity is the heart and content of the learner's mother tongue.

Language-in-education policies that promote mother tongue education, promote a better understanding between home and school. Consequently, the school will better integrate into the local community (UNESCO, 1953; 2006; Cummins, 1981; 2006; Appel & Muysken, 1987; Letsie, 2002). This increases the needed parental involvement in the child's education. Given the increasing role of formal education institutions as viable arena for language and cultural maintenance, revitalisation and intergenerational transmission, it is indeed an oversight to overlook the socio-cultural aspects in any language-in-education planning effort. Schooling remains one of the

most powerful institutions to demonstrate one's commitment to language maintenance and development (Fishman, 1991; 2002; Ferguson, 2006; Djité, 2008).

Community and evaluation policy can be classified under socio-cultural variables. Given the close-knit relationship between culture and language, multilingual language policy implementation has to blend into the social and cultural fabric of the society to be successful. A multilingual language policy implementation project that respect and recognises the cultural and social fabric of the society becomes an integral part of the material and non-material culture of the concerned society. If language planning is not congruent with the will of the society, especially if it denigrates and marginalises socio-cultural values, it is bound to face resistance (Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Mwaniki, 2004).

3.2.7.2.6 Management variables

These are variables that relate to the conscious realisation and understanding that the implementation of a multilingual language policy is an effort to manage linguistic diversity and other language related issues that cannot be divorced from language use in society. Management variables are not only limited to management functions, but they also encompass management principles. To conceptualise management variables in this all-encompassing way, entail creative formulation and deployment of optimal methodologies and strategies that work effectively in the process of multilingual language policy implementation. It entails to think beyond the range of traditional management functions, principles and strategies. Language planning as a massive and complex project requires a well-coordinated team that effectively manages the whole process (Mwaniki, 2004; Webb, 2002).

Based on Mwaniki's (2004:177) justification of the LMA, it is apparent that management variables derive from the hypothetical situation that current language planning theory and practice have largely failed to provide solutions to the problems and dilemmas of multilingual language policy and planning. Consequently, any attempt to address the problems and dilemmas of multilingual language policy and

planning has to embrace theoretical and pragmatic domains beyond policy and planning, which in this case, entails the incorporation of the management aspect.

Management variables derive from the conscious realisation and acknowledgement that language, like other national resources, needs to be properly managed. As a component of national human resource development planning, multilingual language policy implementation calls for a management approach for successful execution.

3.2.7.2.7 Educational variables

Educational variables demand that multilingual language policy implementation remain conscious of the educational needs of society for which the language policy is intended. It has to recognise what the impact of the chosen language(s) of instruction will be on the learners' academic performance, their access to education and their education rights and educational linguistic human rights. Educational variables include the need to have a trained and specialised corpus of multilingual policy experts at the managerial and technical skills levels (Cluver, 1991; Mwaniki, 2004; 2010b; 2011). The issue of trained and highly specialised staffs is best discussed under staffing, human resources and technical skills development under the management oriented methodologies and strategies.

Policy areas that relate to educational variables are access policy, curriculum policy, methods and materials policy, evaluation policy and personnel policy. Curriculum, methods and materials policy also fit with management variables as well as management oriented methodologies and strategies, such as planning, organising, staffing, technical skills development, conceptual skills development and human skills development.

3.2.7.2.8 Technological variables

Technological variables for multilingual language policy implementation relate to the realisation and acknowledgement that, with ever changing and advancing technology, the multilingual language policy implementation process must take

advantage of the opportunities it offers. This is especially applicable to information communication technology (Mwaniki, 2004:231). This entails e-learning and e-books which mean less cost to publishing hard copies.

However, this works very well in well-resourced societies where most people live in areas with electricity and have access to computers, 'smart' phones and internet. Most nations that are bedevilled by problems of non-implementation of multilingual language policies are those with a shortage, and limited access to electricity. They have minimum access to computers, the internet and other information technology resources, which make the use of technology to facilitate multilingual language policy implementation a challenge in Africa. For such an endeavour in Africa, a lot needs to be done with regards to rural electrification, to secure computers, provide internet network coverage. A massive impartation of computer literacy skills is also necessary. In Africa, and particularly in Zimbabwe where most, if not all, of the schools targeted by the 2002 policy development are in areas with the aforementioned challenges present, this variable is not considered as a possible avenue to facilitate the implementation process of the policy development in question.

Technological variables are discussed in the context of corpus planning. In the Zimbabwean context, the researcher focused on the use of the corpora in corpus planning initiatives at the African Languages Research Institute (ALRI) and by language experts at tertiary institutions. The researcher focused on how ALRI and language experts at tertiary institutions take advantage of technological innovations in areas, such e-lexicography, human language technology and documentation of official minority languages. The focus is on how these innovations are used in language description and comparative linguistics with regards to other levels of language study in view of official minority languages.

3.2.7.3 Strategic management: Definition

Strategic management forms the basis of language management, particularly for language management oriented methodologies and strategies. It is a process where all the organisational functions and resources are integrated and coordinated to implement formulated strategies which are aligned with the environment in order to achieve the long term objectives of the organisation and therefore gain competitive advantage through adding value for the stakeholders. Competitive advantage refers to the edge that an organisation has that other organisations do not have. For an organisation to achieve a competitive edge it has to meet the needs of the stakeholders. Satisfaction of the stakeholder's needs adds value to the organisation. To add value is to bring in certain characteristics to a product or service of an organisation that competitors, consumers or stakeholders cannot do or do not have. Strategic management is a way of securing and achieving a competitive advantage. A strategy refers to an effort, or deliberate action, that an organisation implements to out-perform its rivals (Webb, 2002; Mwaniki, 2004; Ehlers & Lazenby, 2010).

Strategic management's cutting edge is the conscious realisation that in management, human resources need to be prioritised within the strategic plan. This originates from traditional management strategies that fell in the trap of forgetting the most important factor, namely, the human resource base in the management process. No matter how technologically advanced an organisation, how much its client value, how low the cost of its products or services or how high the quality of its products or services, the real difference is made by its human resources base. In strategic management the most important asset in any organisation is usually its human resources base. Employees are the most important and effective catalysts to take the organisation's strategies and implement them successfully. The strategic plan and top management are not the drivers of strategy implementation as often perceived. Instead the employees are the main drivers of strategy implementation (Ehlers & Lazenby, 2010:3-4).

Given that the policy in question is a result of a bottom-up initiative, this research also aims to examine the competitive edge that contributed to the success story of the Tonga group. This is done in addition to the evaluation of the causes of the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development.

3.2.7.3.1 The process of strategic management

Ehlers and Lazenby (2010:4) state there are three stages in strategic management, namely, environmental analysis, strategy formulation and strategy implementation.

3.2.7.3.2 Environmental analysis: What is it? Who is involved? What are the challenges involved?

The strategic management process begins with environmental analysis which is led by top management, influenced by inputs from all levels. Each management level is a speciality on its own, therefore environmental analysis is a duty and responsibility of all managerial levels across the organisation structure (Ehlers & Lazenby, 2010:4-5). In language planning, environmental analysis relates to language surveys, fact-finding, cost-benefit analysis, planning, leading and organising initiatives. Environmental analysis is a demanding task which requires adequate resources and ample time.

3.2.7.3.3 Strategy formulation: What is it? Who is involved?

The second stage is mainly the responsibility of top management. It involves formulation of strategies based on the results of environmental analysis from all management levels and stakeholders. Formulation of strategies is a critical stage which calls for inputs from all levels of management within the organisational structure and other stakeholders (Ehlers & Lazenby, 2010:10).

3.2.7.3.4 Strategy implementation: What is it? Who is involved? What are the challenges involved?

Strategy implementation is the last and quite often the most challenging stage. It is the stage where formulated strategies of the first two stages are translated into action to ensure that the stated goals are accomplished. Effective and successful strategy implementation is only achieved if there is effective mutual communication and understanding between all stakeholders.. Ehlers and Lazenby (2010) warn that organisations cannot expect their strategic plans to be successfully implemented if they do not have the support of important stakeholders, employees and the target audience. They emphasize that strategic management is not the responsibility of only the top management. Instead, it is all-encompassing and calls for the inclusion, participation and contribution of all employees and stakeholders involved. Successful implementation of a strategic plan rests with the employees and they need to be involved from strategic planning to strategic implementation. This will lead to successful execution of the implementation process.

In as much as strategy implementation filters through all the levels of the organisation structure, Ehlers and Lazenby (2010) stress that middle management plays an especially important role in strategy implementation. Middle managers are the recipients of decisions from top management and are instrumental to motivate lower-level managers and employees. Top management relies on the support of middle level management to push strategy implementation into all the functional areas and daily operating units. Ehlers and Lazenby stress the importance of unwavering commitment to the implementation process on the part of the strategy formulators who mainly are top management. The reason is that they have to inspire managers and employees. The challenge to successful strategy implementation is to create a series of tight fits between the chosen strategy and leadership, strategy and culture, strategy and reward system, strategy and structure, strategy and policies as well as strategy and resource allocation.

It is necessary that organisations ensure that the entire workforce is committed to strategy implementation and change. For successful strategy implementation, organisations may employ various strategy implementation drivers, namely, leadership organisational culture, reward systems, organisational structure and resource allocation (Ehlers & Lazenby, 2010:260). Of all the strategic management process, strategy implementation is singled out as the most difficult. To explain the difficult nature of this stage, Ehlers and Lazenby (2010:261) note that it is easier to formulate a plan than to implement it. The real value of the strategy can be recognised best by its implementation. The ability to implement a strategy is much more important than the quality of the strategy itself. Strategy implementation poses serious challenges to management, not only with regard to the motivation of employees, but also in terms of discipline, commitment, resource mobilisation and other required sacrifices.

3.2.7.3.5 The relevance of strategic management to multilingual policy implementation

Mwaniki (2004:235) notes that strategic management is critical to implement multilingual language policies because of the value that multilingual language policies add to services provided by the public sector. It provides valuable lessons to policy makers on the complexities in multilingual language policy implementation. Mwaniki states that multilingual language policies and equitable public service provision complement each other. He acknowledges that the challenge is to relate the two in the process of multilingual language policy implementation. A strategic management approach to multilingual language policy implementation informs policy makers that it is important to scan the environment in the process of multilingual language policy formulation, and environmental analysis should involve all levels of management in the organisation's structures. (Zvobgo, 1997; 2007; Webb, 2002).

A strategic management approach also informs policy makers of the value to involve all stakeholders in the formulation and implementation process. This is especially true for employees who are charged with the responsibility to drive the multilingual

language policy implementation process. It informs policy makers that effective consultation, collaboration, cooperation and communication across all levels of the organisation and with all stakeholders involved in the implementation of a multilingual language policy, is important for successful multilingual language policy implementation. In countries where public services are rendered in a multiplicity of languages, they become more accessible to the majority of the citizenry. This enhances participation and inclusion of the citizenry (Mwaniki, 2004; 2010a; 2011; 2012). The same opportunities are offered if education is accessible in a multiplicity of languages where mother tongue based multilingual education is emphasized.

A strategic management approach to multilingual language policy implementation identifies multilingual language policies as an integral part of the strategic management processes in the public sector, especially with the provision of equitable public services. A strategic management approach to multilingual language policy implementation gives a country, or a certain department of the public sector, the competitive edge over other countries or departments with regard to public service provision (Zvobgo, 1997; 2007; Webb, 2002; Mwaniki, 2004; 2010b; 2011; 2012).

3.2.7.4 Language management methodologies and strategies

Language management methodologies and strategies are features of the LMA as advanced by Mwaniki (2004). These methodologies and strategies deployed to understand and explain the interactive dynamics of language in society and language and society. They are divided into three categories, namely, management oriented methodologies and strategies, sociolinguistic oriented methodologies and strategies and development oriented methodologies and strategies. These methodologies and strategies need to be secured and deployed to facilitate multilingual language policy implementation (Mwaniki, 2004:233).

3.2.7.4.1 Management oriented methodologies and strategies

Management oriented methodologies and strategies build and expand on language management variables. They offer extensive detail and insight on management

variables. They derive from the conscious realisation that multilingual language policy implementation needs to be managed if it hopes to succeed. Mwaniki (2004) derives management oriented methodologies and strategies from the insights of management in the public sector. He indicates that these methodologies and strategies need to be appropriated to multilingual language policy implementation from the viewpoint of strategic management. Mwaniki (2004:236-240) identifies the following management oriented methodologies and strategies, namely, planning, leading, organising, technical and human skills development.

3.2.7.4.1.1 Planning

Planning is a future oriented activity which is the foundation of successful multilingual language policy implementation. It is a decision-making process that serves as foundation for the management process. The implementation phases of language policies must be carefully planned and costed. Planning gives purpose and direction to an organisation. It increases the likelihood of success of a plan and must occur at all levels of the organisation to mobilise all sectors thereof to achieve objectives of the policy. Planning does not end with the development of a plan. The plan must be successfully implemented. Planning must be a continuous activity. The plan must be reviewed time and again during the implementation process to maximise its effectiveness (Mwaniki, 2004:236).

Planning sets objectives and determines what needs to be done to accomplish the objectives. It determines processes that need to be secured for the successful implementation of the policy. Planning helps managers to organise, lead and control. It develops their managerial skills to organise, lead and control. It prepares all staff involved in the implementation of the policy for change and it facilitates the coordination of interdepartmental efforts (Mwaniki, 2004:236).

Planning provides a clear framework to make non-ad hoc and non-arbitrary decisions. It motivates these decisions and forces the planner to include control and evaluation measures, such as performance indicators. It enables the timeous

identification of deviations and obstacles. Planning also enables policy makers to determine their priorities and gather relevant information needed to ensure the successful implementation of the policy (Webb, 2002:301). Takala and Sajavaara (2000:129) identify two types of planning namely; strategic planning and operational planning. Strategic planning involves problem and stakeholder analysis, analysis of objectives, inputs, external influencing factors and responsible organisations. Operational analysis consists of the formulation of a detailed guide for implementation, which requires an elaboration on specific objectives, procedures, tasks, time scales, human resource and budgets.

Webb (2002:282) outlines three types of planning, namely, strategic planning where objectives that are needed to achieve the mission are specified; functional planning which indicates marketing and resource strategies for achieving objectives and tactical planning which focus on short term programmes needed to implement the policy. In language planning terms, an acquisition plan has to be developed. To build consensus of acceptance of the proposed policy, inform the important constituencies, develop the materials and make resources available, are all aspects of an acquisition plan (Lewis & Trudell, 2008:269).

Before a country can invest in mother tongue based multilingual language-in-education policies, it is important to consider the demand for such education and the cost involved. Considerations also need to be given to the production of teaching materials, teacher training, schools to target, the number of learners affected, implementation modalities in different contexts, the number of teachers and teaching material required (Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Benson, 2005). The major challenge that faces many organisations is to make decisions that will ensure the future success of an undertaking (Mwaniki, 2004:236).

3.2.7.4.1.2 Organising

Organising means to define the procedures needed to attain specified objectives. It ensures that the resources needed for the attainment of an organisation's objectives

are in place. They are, for example, human resources, teaching and learning materials, capital and physical resources. It involves the development of an organisational structure that indicates how human and other resources will be secured, deployed and employed to achieve the specified objectives. It also means the delegation of duties within the organisational structure (Mwaniki, 2004:237).

With organising, strategy formulators clearly describe who does what, where, how and with what resources. They specify the necessary management mechanisms and implementation strategies, required resources, time schedules, support services, performance indicators, control and evaluation measures and how complaints are mediated. It outlines responsibility and authority. It indicates who the responsible bodies are and what their authority is. Organising is to assign and delegate tasks, for example what is to be done and how tasks are distributed and co-ordinated, how the activities of collaborating units are synchronised and how resources are going to be allocated by whom and when (Webb, 2002:40).

Georgiou, Ó Laoire and Rigg (2010:106) indicate that if the organisational structure is not specified, delegation of tasks and responsibility is not clear or responsibility not broadly shared, then implementation slows or seizes once the key, driving individual of the strategy move or leave the organisation. There is a need to ensure that the implementation process remains a shared joint venture, which may not be paralysed or disabled by the departure of individuals. The organisational structure aids to identify the tasks necessary for strategy implementation. It groups them together and ensures coordination of these tasks across the organisation for the implementation of the policy to succeed (Ehlers & Lazenby, 2010:320).

Ehlers and Lazenby (2010:320) note that an effective organisational structure forms the stable basis on which the organisation can build its strategy implementation efforts. An organisational structure is like a human skeleton. It provides the backbone of the organisation's formal reporting relationships, procedures, controls, authority, systems and decision-making processes. It is a formal process that integrates

different resources of the organisation to ensure successful implementation of the policy decision.

Policy formulation, without a clear statement of whose responsibility it is to enforce the policies and adequate provision of resources for the implementation maintains the *status quo*. There is a need to ensure that government provides adequate financial and material resources to make effective implementation possible (Bamgbose, 1991:118). A language-in-education policy must provide mechanisms for implementation which include training of teachers and a reward system. Such a system is pertinent in this study, because teachers in districts, where the languages in question are spoken, will have an extra subject to be taught.

Organising also encompasses curriculum development and the production of teaching materials. No teaching programme can succeed without adequate teaching materials and such materials are of no value unless there are teachers trained to use them (Bamgbose, 1991; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Crystal, 2000; Batibo, 2005; Benson, 2005; Chiuye & Moyo, 2008). Ehlers and Lazenby (2010:335) note that strategy implementation will succeed when it is backed with the necessary and adequate resources. It is essential that resources are allocated in such a way that they support the organisation's policy. Resource barriers are one of the most common barriers to successful policy implementation.

3.2.7.4.1.3 Leading

Leading involves leadership, supervision, motivation, disciplining and communication of objectives of the policy to all stakeholders. All managers involved in the implementation process require knowledge, skill and attitudes to lead, supervise, motivate and communicate to the middle level managers, supervisors and participants in the implementation process. Leaders provide strategic direction to the implementation process and they lead, in collaboration with all stakeholders involved. They do not act in isolation, but have to act in consent with all stakeholders (Mwaniki, 2004:237). They have to seek consensus within and outside the organisation. They

need to ensure communication which promotes co-operation among working units (Webb, 2002:282). Strategic leaders must is guide and encourage others to implement a policy.

Cooperation among working units ensures the successful implementation of the policy. If an organisation fails to take external stakeholders, such as the community into consideration, policy implementation efforts could be seriously jeopardised. This is true, especially if the community has the power to block or delay key elements of the policy. Given the complexity of the language issue and the enormity of the task of policy implementation, a comprehensive and meaningful policy can only be successfully implemented if there is a strong and clear directive from government and if it is overseen by strong government structures with maximum authority. The government must provide strategic direction to the implementation process. Cooperation among working units such as large specialised government and non-governmental organisations are a necessity if the state is to penetrate society in a significant way, i.e. if it will be able to achieve its policy objectives and outcomes (Human, 1998; Babbie & Mouton, 2001; Webb, 2002; Trudell, 2006; Hatoss, 2008; Ehlers & Lazenby, 2010).

Middle level managers, charged with the responsibility of implementation, must provide policy direction in the implementation process, because they play an especially important role in policy implementation. Middle managers are the recipients of decisions made by top management and are instrumental in motivating lower-level managers and employees to continuously improve on how strategy-critical activities are performed. Top management relies on the support of middle management to push policy implementation into all functional areas and daily operating units (Ehlers & Lazenby, 2010:262). Webb (2002:282) notes that leadership ensures effective performance and it involves securing experts such as advisors and evaluators. Leadership requires frequent reports and builds team spirit as well as creates a sense of ownership.

According to Ehlers and Lazenby (2010:262-263) most organisations fail to successfully implement their strategies because of managerial incompetency, inadequate information and communication systems to report on the progress with strategy implementation, ineffective coordination of implementation efforts, inadequate leadership and direction from the top and middle management, lack of ownership by implementers, goals were not sufficiently defined and not well understood by employees and the formulators of the strategy were not involved in the implementation process or left before the implementation was complete. It is therefore important for the policy makers to remain genuinely committed to the implementation process and to serve as a powerful inspirational force for managers and employees in the implementation process.

According to Bamgbose (1991:132) lack of continuity in personnel responsible for policy making may limit the extent to which language policy may be influenced. Findings and recommendations may be discussed with one minister who may be keen on pushing the case and getting a decision made and implemented. Suddenly, his/her term of office comes to an end or there is a change in government or a cabinet reshuffle or he/she passes on. A new minister comes in and his/her priorities do not include language matters, consequently the implementation of the policy is affected. In essence, effective implementation of policies requires strong leadership which serve as the most important toolkit to give direction and purpose to strategy implementation and control.

Implementation of decisions is distantly removed from the decision making site; instructions for implementation pass through many hands before they arrive in the actual schools in geographically distant provinces and many layers of bureaucrats interpret those instructions along the way. Any bureaucrat opposed to the decision can delay implementation indefinitely simply by failing to act (Pattey-Chavez, 1989; 1994 cited in Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997:57). Because of this, it is necessary to keep the entire workforce motivated.

3.2.7.4.1.4 Controlling and evaluation

Controlling is mainly a matter of structure. It involves the development of measures that constrain and direct the behaviours of all the participants involved in the implementation process. Controlling involves establishing the standards for measuring performance, compliance and the standards to be met. It seeks to enforce adherence, conformity and compliance with the policy objectives. Controlling measures highlight deviations from the plan and effect corrective measures (Mwaniki, 2004:238). Controlling and evaluation measures aim at determining the degree to which the set objectives have been realised (Webb, 2002:40). In multilingual language policy implementation controlling seeks to establish the languages services standards that need to be met so that an organisation can be regarded as being multilingual or rendering services in a multilingual way. It involves measuring performance standards against the standards that were previously set and taking corrective measures where there are deviations from the plan (Mwaniki, 2004:238).

Evaluation constitutes one of the key areas in policy formulation and implementation that can enhance language planning, policy formulation and implementation and management. The successful implementation of a policy depends on how much research takes place before, during and after policy formulation and implementation. Since language planning entails making decisions, it therefore requires monitoring to determine the impact of the decisions (Rutman, 1984; Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; Rossi and Freeman, 1993; Zvobgo, 1997; 2007; Takala & Sajavaara, 2000; Babbie & Mouton, 2001; Mwaniki, 2004; Ehlers & Lazenby, 2010).

Takala and Sajavaara (2000:133) outline four types of evaluation with regard to a language plan. Firstly, there is context evaluation, which determines aims. Context evaluation constitutes the foundation of language planning and it involves careful definition of the relevant language community, description of the desired and actual conditions pertaining to the language environment, identification of implementation modalities for different linguistic contexts, identification of unmet needs and unused opportunities and diagnosis of the problems that prevent or interfere with the

fulfilment of needs or restrict the full use of existing opportunities. The diagnosis of problems constitutes an essential basis for developing objectives whose attainment will lead to improved language policies.

Input evaluation involves structuring decisions to determine program designs. It also involves provision of information for determining the type and amount of resources needed and the manner in which they will be used to achieve the envisaged policy outcomes. It includes evaluation of the capabilities and capacities of stakeholders involved in the implementation of the policy, strategies for achieving the desired policy outcomes and designs for implementing a selected strategy. Alternative language planning options are assessed in terms of their resource, time and budget requirements; their potential barriers; the consequences of not overcoming potential barriers and ways of addressing them and the benefits of the plan. Process evaluation as the name suggests monitors the implementation of decisions to control program and project operations. Finally, product evaluation serves to recycle decisions to judge and react to program and project attainments against the stated objectives and aims as well as the envisaged policy outcomes (Rutman, 1984; Harlech-Jones, 1990; Rossi & Freeman, 1993; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Zvobgo, 1997; 2007; Takala & Sajavaara, 2000; Babbie and Mouton, 2001; Mwaniki, 2004; Ehlers and Lazenby, 2010).

It is not enough to devise and implement strategies to modify a particular language situation; it is equally important to monitor and evaluate the success of the strategies and progress shown towards implementation. Evaluation should constitute an ongoing process and must be designed to give constant feedback for strategy implementation so that strategy implementation can be corrected in the light of the information flowing from the evaluation phase. It is imperative to monitor change both at the level of the plan and its societal outcomes so that appropriate modifications can be made, where necessary, to the plan itself and/or to the dissemination mechanisms so that implementation leads to appropriate societal goals (Rutman, 1984; Harlech-Jones, 1990; Rossi & Freeman, 1993; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997;

Zvobgo, 1997; 2007; Takala & Sajavaara, 2000; Babbie and Mouton, 2001; Mwaniki, 2004; Ehlers and Lazenby, 2010).

To emphasize the importance of evaluation, Harlech-Jones (1990:208) stresses that evaluation is not only the consistent monitoring of implementation, but it is a continual learning process. Harlech-Jones further underscores that evaluation, if properly done, would prove to be a process of salutary intervention, a dialogue between theory and context, facilitating understanding amongst policy makers, planners, implementers and target populations. It also does not only enhance an awareness of roles and responsibilities in and among implementing agencies, but it seeks to unravel complex patterns of cause and effect.

According to Takala and Sajavaara (2000:135), evaluation should be done by all the different stakeholders involved. It should be a feature at the micro, meso and macro level. However, as most scholars attest, it is generally the case and trend that evaluation is a neglected area of language planning and policy. Consequently, scholars emphasize the need for language policy and language planning to be more systematical than in the past, draw on the work of policy studies in general and forge closer links with evaluation. Good planning implies continuous evaluation and revision of a plan during the implementation phase of the language planning process. Good planning must be informed by good evaluation (Rubin, 1983:338; Takala & Sajavaara, 2000:131).

Evaluation should occur at every stage of language planning. It should start at policy development stage and cut across the various stages of plan implementation and should be monitored and checked against reality. Without evaluation, the evidence is hearsay and one cannot be sure whether the goals are being reached. The implementation of the plan has to be monitored on a continuous basis for information needed for follow-up purposes. Process evaluation is needed to provide periodic feedback to persons responsible for implementing plans and procedures (Rutman, 1984; Harlech-Jones, 1990; Rossi & Freeman, 1993; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997;

Zvobgo, 1997; 2007; Takala & Sajavaara, 2000; Babbie & Mouton, 2001; Mwaniki, 2004; Ehlers & Lazenby, 2010).

Product evaluation seeks to measure and interpret outcomes not only at the end of a program or a project cycle, but as often as necessary during the process. This provides a major review of the state of achieved language planning goals and objectives as well as the envisaged policy outcomes (Rutman, 1984; Harlech-Jones, 1990; Rossi & Freeman, 1993; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Zvobgo, 1997; 2007; Takala & Sajavaara, 2000; Babbie & Mouton, 2001; Mwaniki, 2004; Ehlers & Lazenby, 2010). Stressing the importance of linking planning and evaluation, Takala and Sajavaara (2000:142) note that planning and evaluation and planning are like two sides of the same coin. They must always go together and be inseparable since each process permeates to the other so fully that it is impossible to separate one from the other. It must therefore be said that good language planning, policy implementation and management is informed by systematic monitoring and evaluation of the efficiency.

3.2.7.4.1.5 Staffing

Staffing involves the recruitment, selection, pre and in-service training, deployment and retention of the appropriate human resources that is needed for the successful implementation of the policy. This includes all levels of human resources, for example, language experts such as lexicographers, linguists, terminologists, language-in-education policy experts, translators, writers, resource teachers, trained teachers, competent education officers, curriculum experts, trained examiners, lecturers as well as technical and managerial human resources. Teacher training must be addressed and serious in-service training, especially as short term measure and pre-service training as a long term measure must be seriously considered and be supported for mother tongue education policies.

3.2.7.4.1.6 Conceptual skills development

Conceptual skills development is a key to successful policy implementation. It ensures that the human resource base, involved in policy implementation, is able to conceptualise the entire policy and how it buttresses into the entire human resource development plan and other related policies. Successful implementation of policies largely depends on the conceptual skills of the human resource base involved in policy implementation (Mwaniki, 2004:239). There is need to ensure that ways of developing these conceptual skills are put in place to ensure that the whole human resource base involved in the implementation process conceptualise the entire project and understands how it buttresses into the entire human resource development plan.

3.2.7.4.1.7 Technical skills development

Technical skills development is critical for multilingual language policy implementation since the success of the multilingual language policy implementation also depends on the availability of technical skills and experts. Technical skills development involves the development of the necessary technical skills among all language practitioners involved in the implementation process (Mwaniki, 2004:239). For example, in language-in-education policy implementation this means training editors, writers, language experts such as lexicographers, terminologists, curriculum experts, language teachers, linguists, translators among many others. In language-in-education policy implementation, technical skills development ensures that the necessary human resource base and materials and methods needed in the implementation of the policy are in place.

3.2.7.4.1.8 Human skills development

The successful implementation of multilingual language policies depends on the human skills development of those involved in the implementation process. Given that multilingual language policy implementation involves changing people's perceptions of the importance of multilingual services provision, human skills

development of those involved in the implementation of these policies is indispensable (Mwaniki, 2004:239).

3.2.7.4.2 Sociolinguistic oriented methodologies and strategies

Sociolinguistic oriented methodologies and strategies focus on the language and societal end of multilingual language policy, planning and implementation. Sociolinguistic oriented methodologies and strategies serve to "prepare" the languages involved in multilingual language policy implementation for optimal use and value. They seek to ensure that the languages involved are able to function in a multiplicity of domains without restrictions of corpus planning inadequacies. They provide decision makers with information that serves as the basis for planning in terms of planning and organising, particularly in terms of determining the resources needed for the successful implementation of the policy (Mwaniki, 2004:241).

Sociolinguistic oriented methodologies and strategies provide decision makers with the knowledge, and thus the tools to justify why they engage in multilingual language policy, planning and implementation. Considering the rational nature of language planning, sociolinguistic oriented methodologies and strategies reveal the importance of basing language planning on reasoning and factual material and subjecting it to objective justification. They equip planners with the relevant facts such as the precise sociolinguistic realities of the situation which needs to be transformed, the exact goals they are expected to achieve and the resources available to them (Webb, 2002:41). They also provide information that helps to determine what development oriented methodologies and strategies need to be deployed to address negative language attitudes and support positive language in the process of multilingual language policy, planning and management (Mwaniki, 2004:241).

According to Spolsky (2004; 2009) and Shohamy (2006), language attitudes or beliefs or ideologies are what policies seek to modify or confirm. This is the reason why they have to be established before policy implementation. The constraint of attitudes is perhaps one of the most important challenges to multilingual language

policy implementation, especially in cases where minority languages are involved. Unless attitudes are favourable, multilingual language policy implementation that involves low status varieties is likely to fail to yield the desired results.

Sociolinguistic oriented methodologies and strategies relate closely to linguistic, technological and socio-cultural variables of the LMA. Mwaniki (2004) identify eight sociolinguistic oriented methodologies and strategies, namely, language surveys, corpus planning, acquisition planning, status planning, functional language planning, linguistic auditing, technological customisation and multilingual services provision.

3.2.7.4.2.1 Language surveys

Environmental analysis, policy setting or background knowledge is cardinal in policy making and implementation, and language surveys are useful tools for providing this type of knowledge (Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Zvobgo, 1997; 2007; Ehlers & Lazenby, 2010). Language surveys fall under what Bamgbose (1991) and Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) call fact-finding or sociolinguistic surveys. Relating the importance of sociolinguistic surveys, Bamgbose (1991:121-122) notes that sociolinguistic surveys constitute the necessary inputs that influence policy formulation. They are designed to provide information on the language situation of the country. Such information include a detailed account of the location and geographical spread of all languages in the country, number of languages and speakers, which languages are major languages, the genetic relationship and state of development of the languages, and language use in different domains. This information is useful in deciding on an official language policy and ideally, it should be part of the process of fact-finding before decisions are made on status planning.

Similar information is not less important for an educational language policy. If a government is planning to choose a language as a medium of instruction, it would need to know how many people speak the language, whether as first or second language, and in which domains it is used, what proportion of the school population speak the language, whether the language is already being used in education and to

what extent, and what the attitudes of native speakers and others are to the language. Data generated through language surveys serves as a scientific basis for multilingual language policy planning and implementation and justifies the decisions adopted and the commitment of the motley of resources in the plan (Mwaniki, 2004:241).

In view of language-in-education policies sociolinguistic information obtained through language surveys is very useful in developing the seven areas of policy development in language-in-education policy implementation. They also influence decisions related to planning and organising. They help decision makers determine where the policy is most urgently needed and where it would be easily operationalised. Data derived from language surveys constitute the basis for designing implementation modalities and interventions, especially when such interventions have to address linguistically heterogeneous and fragmented schools. Areas of extreme linguistic fragmentation and those that are linguistically heterogeneous in the composition of school and class population are a source of difficulty in the implementation of mother tongue education policies. This is even more difficult if the concerned languages are not of equal status and prestige. The incidence of linguistically heterogeneous and fragmented classes impedes mother tongue education, particularly in urban settings (Bamgbose, 1991; 2002; Skutnabb-Kangas & García, 1995; García, 1997; Batibo, 2005; Benson; 2005).

According to Skutnabb-Kangas and García (1995:240) and García (1997:419) the pupils' mother tongue should be used as a medium of instruction and taught as a subject in linguistically homogeneous groups. Mother tongue education is more possible easily operationalised in those areas in which the groups have reached a certain level of concentration. The higher the number of mother tongue speakers of the concerned language and the more linguistically homogeneous the school, the more easy and suitable it is to implement mother tongue education in the concerned language. In areas of extreme linguistic fragmentation or in the case of linguistically mixed classes in most cases the population of speakers may be too small to support all that goes into mother tongue education or require creative classroom organisation

(Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; Siemienski, 1997; Henrard, 2003; Batibo, 2005; Benson, 2005; Skutnabb-Kangas & García, 1995; García, 1997).

3.2.7.4.2.2 Corpus planning

Corpus planning is an element of language development which relates to the development of the lexical base of a language so that it can be able to serve in the domains where it is designated for use (Mwaniki, 2004:242). Corpus planning involves the codification, elaboration or cultivation and or modernisation of the language. Corpus planning involves orthographic innovation, including design, harmonisation, change of script and spelling reform, pronunciation, changes in language structure, vocabulary expansion, simplification of registers, style and the preparation of language material (Kaplan and Baldauf, 1997:38).

According to Haugen (1983:269), corpus planning involves the establishment of norms, i.e. establishing the standard variety. Mwaniki (2004) contends that it would be futile to advocate for and actually attempt multilingual language policy planning and implementation if a majority of languages that are intended for use when a multilingual language policy and plan are implemented do not have adequate lexical corpus. In as much as the constraint of corpus planning is a very real one, to accept Mwaniki's view will mean that a decision to use a language in higher domains should necessarily await corpus planning. It must be noted that lack of corpus planning in the languages involved should not be an excuse for not implementing a policy because corpus planning is an aspect of policy implementation that is initiated to give effect to a policy.

Corpus planning prior to changes in the status of a language is unlikely to be effective because it is only after a language begins to be used for new functions that corpus planning is likely to be effective. Language development is intended to remedy the situation and empower the concerned languages. However, important language development is the impression should not be created that all of it is to be done before a language can be used in a wider range of domains. Language

development is a continuous process in every language, aiming to improve its efficiency in meeting communication challenges in a changing world. It is by using a language for new concepts that terminology creation occurs, and a language develops by being used (Chumbow, 1987; Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; 2007; Adegbija, 1994a; Webb, 2002; Benson, 2005; Batibo, 2005; Djité, 2008; Ndlovu, 2011).

Webb (2002:268) explains that corpus planning is an important activity for a language community to facilitate development. The development of a language supports the development of the conceptual systems of the cultural community which reflect the community's categorisation systems and the paths of its metaphorisation processes. Once a language is used in the secondary domains such as government, administration and education, the need arises to develop its expressive power beyond the colloquial level of primary domain. This affects the vocabulary of the language, the terminology of all specialised fields among other aspects of the language, allowing the exploration of new mental experiences in art, science and religion. In this regard, corpus planning enriches the language(s) involved in multilingual language planning and policy implementation and also empowers the speakers of the languages in question by allowing them to explore new mental experiences (Webb, 2002; Mwaniki, 2004).

As much as corpus planning is done by language experts, the speakers of the language must not merely be treated as passive beneficiaries thereof. They must be, as it were, actors in the drama of their own development (Kishindo, 1987:107, cited by Webb, 2002:272). Further stressing the importance of the active participation of the local community in corpus development, Lewis and Trudell (2008:266) note that the effectiveness of language cultivation efforts in cases where some languages are designated minority and others majority depends on a range of policy and implementation issues, including local readiness to participate in corpus planning, local, interpretation of the policy directions, national political will, availability of resources and expertise.

Local ownership of the orthography in particular is one of the key factors in acceptance of the written language, especially given that orthographic conventions are never socio-culturally neutral for those concerned. They are symbolic of great social significance and often carry cultural and political overtones (Coulmas, 1999:12; Hadebe, 2006:175-176). Given that a community's language use is such a locally-sited cultural phenomenon and so intimately bound into the identity of that community, language use decisions made by speakers themselves ultimately carry far more weight in the language cultivation arena than official formulations of policy, no matter how politically disenfranchised the speakers are (Adegbija, 1993; 1994b; 1997; 2001; Strubell, 2001; Trudell, 2006; Lewis & Trudell, 2008).

Considering the ultimate goal of the LMA of enlarging people's choices and enhancing human freedom across all levels of human society, corpus planning activities must not reduce people's choices through the creation of a standard form that will exclude and disadvantage other groups whose varieties are not incorporated in the standard form. In many instances, insistence on the standard variety in education has been a source of exclusion for learners speaking the non-standard variety. Insistence on the standard norm contributes to low enrolment rates, high drop-outs, high grade repetition rates, low retention rates and poor academic performance leading to the failure to achieve universal primary education, where children everywhere, majority and minority, standard and non-standard language speaking alike are able to complete a full course of primary education.

In an effort to guard against the exclusion of other speakers, corpus planning, particularly standardisation and harmonisation of orthographies, has to adopt a democratic approach to language standardisation and harmonisation. Non-standard varieties should be accommodated in classroom activities to ensure universal access to education by all learners without the due constraint of the language(s) of teaching and learning.

3.2.7.4.2.3 Acquisition planning

Acquisition planning is a type of language planning that was introduced by Cooper (1989). Cooper describes acquisition planning as a language planning activity that focuses on an increase in the users or the uses of a language or language variety. It is directed towards increasing the number of users – speakers, writers, listeners, or readers. Mwaniki (2004:243) describes acquisition planning as an aspect of language promotion. He notes that corpus planning presupposes that there is a need to have programmes and structures that support the acquisition of language competence, either by speakers who do not have knowledge of certain language(s) or speakers seeking to extend their existing knowledge of certain language(s). Acquisition planning should be supported by incentives to promote the acquisition and development of the languages in question.

3.2.7.4.2.4 Status planning

Status planning involves authoritative measures that are undertaken to elevate the status of a language or languages. These authoritative measures arise from statutory and government measures usually following an increase in the economic, educational, cultural and social value of a language (Webb, 2002:259; 277). It must, however, be noted that this can be from the grassroots levels not only from the government, especially considering that micro language planning is becoming common. As a language promotion programme, status planning is a necessary strategy which, however, must be accompanied by determination to implement such a language ideology.

Mwaniki (2004:243) notes that status planning is a key methodology and strategy for language management because it enriches the value of languages as they apply to the material condition of speakers. It determines the level of upward social mobility and participation of the speakers involved. Status planning, corpus planning and acquisition planning need to be supported and facilitated by statutory measures since on their own they are insufficient strategies for the promotion of a language.

Status planning has also been used as a source of exclusion of other speakers whose languages are designated lower level functions. The recognition of a language as an official or national language implies that this language has to be used for all official and national transactions such as government business, record keeping, laws and judicial proceedings in courts, administration, teaching and learning. The same is equally true for the majority-minority divide. In this situation, the minority status becomes a parameter for exclusion and majority status a parameter for inclusion. The end result of this is the creation of two groups, the included/ advantaged and the excluded/ disadvantaged. This has been a feature of countries obsessed with the nation state ideology which has led to more than double linguistic imperialism for speakers of minority languages. The nation state ideology entrenches language hegemony and privileges certain languages by according them the national, official, majority and regional language status (Bamgbose, 2000; 2007; Batibo, 2004; 2005; 2009a; Nkomo, 2008; Ndhlovu, 2008; 2009; Kamwendo, 2009; Ndlovu, 2011).

Considering the ultimate goal of language management, exclusion of other languages through status planning reduces people's choices and works against the ideals of enhancing human freedom. As Bamgbose (2000:14) rightly suggests, what is required is that an adequate language policy must provide for appropriate, but not identical, roles for all languages. The exclusive use of the ex-colonial language and dominant African national languages in Africa must give way to the use of all languages that will involve more people and enlarge people's choices. Status planning also determines the languages' level of development because it is the status that a language has that determines its level of language development. The legal status given to a language is usually part of the package which, if it is to be successful in regulating domain use, must usually also include the provision of resources, such as translation services, teacher training, media, corpus development, incentives to use the language, and often a strategy to protect and promote it (Matras, 2009:54).

An increase in the economic, educational, social, political and cultural value of a language usually leads to an increase in its demand and promotion (Cooper, 1989;

Webb, 2002; Mwaniki, 2004; 2011; 2012). The more status a language has the more vitality the speakers of that language gain. The status of a language is a reflection of the status or symbolic of the power of the concerned speakers. Status differentia where some languages acquire dominant status, while others are marginalised lead to processes of language accommodation, language shift, diglossia and low ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness. It also erodes the positive social and cultural character of the community that speaks the low status variety (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977; Paulston, 1988; 1994; Bourhis, 2001; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Cartwright, 2006; Novak-Lukanovič & Limon, 2012).

Muthwii (2002:78) states that the major obstacle to language development is primarily one of status planning. The value, prestige and importance attached to a language is proportional to its perceived usefulness in various areas of activity (Wolff, 2002:141). When error or inappropriateness occurs in status and prestige planning, the whole process of language planning and development is adversely affected. The prominence that is given to national and official languages renders other languages instrumentally valueless. A language cannot rise to the challenge if the language policies determining its use and development go against it absolutely (Cooper, 1989; Tollefson, 1991; Bamgbose, 2000; 2007; Adegbija, 2001; Strubell, 2001; May, 2001; Muthwii, 2002; Kamwangamalu, 2003; 2004; Batibo, 2005; 2009a; 2009b; Kamwendo, 2009; Ndhlovu, 2009; Ndlovu, 2011).

Those languages not favoured by the public policy of a nation receive minimal institutional support. If minority languages are viewed as of low status, to be social and culturally restrictive and an obstacle to social mobility, then language accommodation, shift and diglossia are inevitable. Official and national language status is bound with notions of communicative currency and languages accorded these functions enjoy an enviable attitudinal posture (May, 2001:147). Formal recognition of all languages as equal by the state most prominently by their inclusion in the list of the state's official languages satisfy morally compelling interests in symbolic affirmation and identity promotion, in addition to the practical benefits of fluency in one's mother tongue (Levy, 2003:243). In this regard, status planning as it

relates to the use of official minority languages is too crucial an aspect to take lightly in the efforts of promoting their development, teaching and learning.

Sociolinguistic circumstances that include usage-related factors such as inequalities in public use of languages and the complex patterns of language use which favour certain languages cause other languages to become redundant and marginalised (Batibo, 2005:60; 94). The value of mother tongue education in official minority languages is continually demeaned by the institutional reverence of the major languages.

The dominant/non-dominant language dichotomy

The dominant/non-dominant dichotomy places one language on the scale of dominance relative to another language (Bamgbose, 2007:4). The dominant language at the societal level is sometimes referred to as a prestige language. Prestige in this sense is more or less synonymous with institutional backing and dominance in the public domains. *Dominant* and its synonyms *main* and *major* represent the fact that some degree of proficiency in the relevant language is essential in order to participate in certain types of social activities, mostly associated with public and institutional interaction. In most cases the term dominant language is substituted with its euphemism widely spoken language or its depoliticised synonymy main language. This dichotomy suggests hierarchically structured relations of power between a group whose language is widely spoken and other groups whose languages are less spoken (Ndhlovu, 2008a; 2008b; 2009; Nkomo, 2008; Abdelhay, Makoni & Makoni, 2011; Makoni, 2011).

Dominant languages that are promoted to the role of national languages gain so much status, prestige and weight that they usually push the minority languages into marginalised positions. Dichotomisation of languages as having instrumental majority – language or identity minority language functions projects and perpetuate a negative and limited view of minority languages. It renders minority languages as instrumentally valueless and constricts their functional space. This dichotomisation is

a reflection of relationships of power and domination rather than objective and linguistic (Tollefson, 1991; May, 2001; 2006; Ricento, 2006; Ndhlovu, 2008a; 2008b; 2009; Matras, 2009; Abdelhay, Makoni & Makoni, 2011; Makoni, 2011).

The national /non-national language dichotomy

The national/non-national language dichotomy means the elevation of one or more languages as a symbol of national unity, identity and integration, and in most cases it comes with the marginalisation and even outright suppression of other languages designated the non-national language status (Bamgbose, 2007:3;5). A national language is the chief language in a country (Ojwang, 2011:244). Batibo (2005:106;109; 114) proposes that in order to promote mother tongue education in all languages there is need to institute a supportive language policy that promotes all indigenous languages to national language status because elevating one or two at the expense of others undermine efforts of promoting mother tongue education in all the other languages.

The more positive official attitudes and policies are towards marginalised languages, the more likely is mother tongue education in these languages. Supportive policy documents are important because they determine the national role that a language is going to play and indirectly determine its utilitarian value. However, the official favouring of a certain language(s) over others can hardly prevent the development of a perception that a state cares more for some languages than for others. In this regard, mother tongue education in marginalised languages can be facilitated by a lessening of the dominance of the languages that are causing language shift. The language used in education is responsible and main driver of language shifts (Paulston, 1988; 1994; Nahir, 1983; 1988; 1998; Skutnabb-Kangas & García, 1995; García, 1997; Phillipson, 1999; Adegbija, 2001; Strydom, 2003; Shameem, 2004; Batibo, 2005; Cartwright, 2006; Fishman, 2006; May, 2006; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010).

According to Batibo (2005:28, 94, 99), promotion of a language to the role of a national language is associated with an actual expanded use of this language in the public functions. Not only has its social status and prestige increased, but its utilitarian value has also been augmented. This, in turn, gives this language more weight relative to the non-national language, making the latter more vulnerable. Consequently, speakers of minority languages lose their loyalty to their languages and prefer the dominant languages as it is judged to offer more socio-economic and political benefits. Promotion of a language to the role of a national language confers power and privilege on such languages. It fosters and cultivates the domination of one language by another due to belligerent or aggressive nature of the stronger group (Adegbija, 1993; 1994b; 1997; 2001; Bamgbose, 2000; 2007).

The nationally dominant and the major areally dominant languages are normally characterised by their socio-economic prestige, dominance, demographic superiority nationally and areally. They also have influence over other languages in the country and attract a sizeable number of second language speakers. They are the most devastating in causing language shift, language accommodation and diglossia because of their power, charm and extent. They can easily penetrate into the primary domains. It is their influence and attraction that promotes and perpetuates language shift (Paulston, 1988; 1994; Adegbija, 2001; May, 2001; 2006; Batibo, 2005; 2009b; Ndhlovu, 2008a; 2009; Kamwendo, 2009; Gatsha, 2009; Bagwasi, 2009; Ndlovu, 2011). According to Bamgbose (1991:71-72) any language that is accorded the status of a national or official language has a prominent place in the education system much higher than the role accorded to other languages. It receives priority of attention in as far as language development and promotion is concerned. The establishment of national languages results in the minoritisation of other languages which are viewed as obstacles to the nation building agenda of the nation state. The hierarchising of majority and minority languages are processes deeply embedded with the politics of nation building and integration (May, 2006:256).

The entrenched hegemony and preponderance of the dominant African national languages stifle efforts of extending mother tongue education to minority language

speakers. Dominant African national languages are subduing and thwarting the development and promotion of the minority languages just as the ex-colonial languages do. In this regard, lumping together all African languages and presenting them as equal victims of ex-colonial languages without getting into the finer details of how linguistic imperialism takes place among African languages themselves is a very dangerous and misleading generalisation (Adegbija, 1994; 2001; Batibo, 2004; 2005; 2009; 2009a; Ndhlovu, 2008a; 2008b; 2009; Nkomo, 2008; Bagwasi, 2009; Gatsha; 2009; Kamwendo; 2009; Ndlovu, 2011).

The official /non-official language dichotomy

The official/non-official language dichotomy elevates the official language as the language of government and quite often leads to the marginalisation of the non-official languages (Bamgbose, 2007:3). In this regard, policies established to create national and official languages suppress other languages (Indede, 2002:102).

The developed /non-developed language dichotomy

The developed / non-developed language status dichotomy also contributes to the exclusion of non-developed languages. The languages of a developed status are those languages that have adequate literature, grammars, dictionaries and vocabulary for coping with the demands of the modern world. Languages with a low development status range from those that are not yet written to those that lack adequate language resources to cope with science and technology. This dichotomy has been used to exclude non-developed languages from use in several domains, including use as languages of instruction in schools. Because of their low level of development, such languages are viewed as unsuitable for use in certain domains, and consequently, people tend to develop negative attitudes towards them (Adegbija, 1994a; 2001; Bambgose, 2000: 2007; Muthwii, 2002; Benson, 2005; Batibo, 2005).

Languages develop through an increase in the domains of use, through the provision of adequate resources, development of literary works and if given priority of place in the school system. It is by using a language for new concepts that terminology

creation occurs. A language develops by being used, and a language that is not used in a wide range of domains will not develop appropriate vocabulary and expressions for discussing concepts in such domains. The more a language is used in a particular domain, the more it faces new challenges in that domain, and the greater the need to develop new terminology to cope with new experiences (Cooper, 1989; Adegbija, 1994a; 2001; Bambgose, 2000: 2007; Muthwii, 2002; Benson, 2005; Batibo, 2005).

The population dimension of language exclusion

The population dimension of language exclusion is usually expressed in terms of a dichotomy between major languages, spoken by larger groups, and minority languages, spoken by smaller groups. Language policies tend to favour major languages to the neglect of minority languages, and as a result, minority languages become excluded (Bamgbose, 2007:2). According to Adegbija (1994a; 2001), in multilingual settings population size of speakers of a particular language carry weight in the national schemes of things. Big languages tend to be accorded higher status and more functional space as well as priority of attention and preference in as far as language development is concerned and in the national scheme of things. Smallness in number of speakers of a language results in official neglect and denial of developmental attention.

Population size of speakers of a particular language guarantees and gives security. It influences the group's ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness. Therewith, it affects its status, power and maintenance of a language. Largeness of population size often accords the concerned language power which promotes domination of smaller groups and result in language shift, language accommodation, diglossia and low ethnolingustic vitality and awareness in latter groups. Largeness of speaker numbers entails power, control, dominance and it confers political and economic weight. Speaker numbers also determine publishing priorities and directions. The larger the population, the more likely are the chances of publications for the language group. Small population sizes are less attractive to commercial publishers. Publishers generally publish books for which there is some sort of demand, i.e. books which they

expect to sell (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977; Adegbija, 1994a; Mutasa, 1995; Webb, 2002; Klaus, 2003; Benson, 2005).

The hierarchical ordering of languages

Decisions on the choice of the medium of instruction reflect the struggle for power among different language groups. Through language-in-education policies, dominant groups establish hegemony in language use, and as such language policy formulation becomes the pursuit and maintenance of power. Medium of instruction policies play a crucial role in determining social hierarchies, political power and economic opportunities. They play a great role in the organisation of social and political systems and in the subjugation and displacement of some languages. Consequently, medium of instruction policies must be understood in the broader social, economic and political context (Paulston, 1988; Cooper, 1989; Tollefson, 1991; 2002a; Ferguson, 2006; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004a; Tsui & Tollefson, 2004; Tsui, 2004; Wright, 2004; Rassool, 2007; Novak-Lukanovič & Limon, 2012).

The hierarchies of languages generally reflect socio-cultural, economic and political organisation within a nation (Novak-Lakanovič & Limon, 2012:31). According to Pelinka (2007:141) the ranking order of languages often reflects a hierarchy of power. In language policies, languages are very often listed in a particular hierarchical order not to maintain the alphabetic order, but to send across the message on their statuses. The hierarchical ordering of languages beyond the alphabetical ordering justification and status differentials created, perpetuated and sustained by language policies are useful in understanding and explaining the non-implementation dilemma bedeviling multilingual language-in-education policies.

3.2.7.4.2.5 Functional language planning

Functional language planning is a level of language planning that was introduced by Donnacha (2000). According to Donnacha (2000:15), functional language planning is the most diverse area. The various functions devolve from language planning level. Functional planning involves the management of the planning process itself, research

activities and the planning of various activities which lead to changes in language attitudes and ideologies, levels of ability and usage and changes in the levels of intergenerational transmission of the language.

3.2.7.4.2.6 Linguistic auditing

According to Reeves and Wright (1996:5), the primary objective of linguistic auditing is to help the management of a corporation identify the strengths and weaknesses of their organisation in terms of communication in foreign languages. Through linguistic auditing the corporation will map out the current capability of departments, functions and people against the identified need. This need will be established at the strategic level, at the process level and at that of the individual post holders. Linguistic auditing must also indicate how much in terms of time, human resources, training and finances is needed to improve the system so that the resource implications can be fed back into strategic and financial planning.

In the implementation of multilingual language policies and plans, linguistic audits facilitate the establishment of the strengths and weaknesses of various departments and agencies involved in the implementation process in terms of communication in the adopted official languages. Linguistic audits also help in the mapping of current capabilities departments and agencies, their functions and the people in these departments and agencies against the identified need of rendering services in a multilingual way, especially in public sector organisations. Linguistic audits facilitate a clear mapping of the cost in terms of time, human resources, training and finances that will be required to make the system under review capable of rendering multilingual services. Linguistic audits are therefore, measures that seek to minimise error in the decisions and activities that constitute language policy implementation (Mwaniki, 2004:244).

In the education sector, linguistic auditing relate to the establishment of the ministry of education's human resource base. This includes teachers' capabilities to implement, for example, a mother tongue education policy.

3.2.7.4.2.7 Technological customisation

As a result of globalisation the world is witnessing an era of unprecedented technological innovation. These technological developments and innovations have come with the promise of better lives, greater social freedom, increased knowledge and more productive livelihood. In view of these technological innovations, there is a need to implement policies that encourage innovation, access and development of advanced skills. In this network era, countries need to understand and adapt global technologies for local needs (UNDP, 2001:1-4).

As an aspect of corpus planning and partly acquisition planning, technological customisation concerns itself with the adaptation of languages for compatibility with diverse technological application (Mwaniki, 2004:245). Relating technological customisation to language management, Mwaniki (2004:245) notes that language management need to respond to the pressures of technological innovation and take advantage of the technological advances that can be used to facilitate multilingual language policies implementation. Despite being a viable strategy and methodology of facilitating multilingual language policy implementation technological customisation is not useful in places where there is no electricity and later lone computers and internet. However, technological customisation in this study is discussed in view of its use by the African Languages Research Institute (ALRI) and other language experts in compiling corpus-aided dictionaries in official minority languages.

3.2.7.4.2.8 Multilingual services provision

According to Mwaniki (2004:245), multilingual services provision is the ultimate test of multilingual language policy planning and implementation. It is defined as the actual rendering of services in a multiplicity of languages. Multilingual service provision promotes and entrench a culture of multilingualism and also creates a multilingual ripple effect across organisations, i.e. when services are rendered in a multilingual way, it becomes easier for other sectors in an organisation to embrace a culture of

multilingualism. As Mwaniki (2004:235) notes, multilingual language policies add value to the services provided by the public sector.

Multilingual service provision entails “giving voice”, a situation whereby citizens are enabled to participate effectively in the public affairs of their country through their mother tongue. Multilingual services provision entail enabling different speakers of the different languages to develop educationally to their maximal potential, to obtain meaningful access to the economic life of the country, to participate meaningfully in political processes, to raise the quality of their lives and enjoy their linguistic, civil, religious and cultural rights to the full (Webb, 2002:243). When public services are rendered in many languages, they become more accessible to a majority of the citizenry. Multilingual services provision facilitates the provision of equitable public services (Mwaniki, 2004:245).

Multilingual services provision is the cornerstone for human development where human development entails the widening of people’s choices. Empowerment of the people’s languages in all domains is an essential precondition for equitable and sustainable development and access to education (UNDP, 1996; 1999; 2004; Prah, 2000; 2005; Mbeki, 2000; Simala, 2002; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh, 2010). Provision of education in a multiplicity of languages makes such an education system more accessible to a majority of learners. It creates room for mother tongue education which facilitates cognitive development and growth; enhance deep learning; ameliorate the home-school break; lead to proper acquisition and mastery of the second language used later in the curriculum. Mother tongue education has pedagogical, linguistic, psychological and affective advantages for learners. It enhances academic performance as well as promote cultural diversity, multilingualism and multiculturalism (UNESCO, 1953; 2006; Bowers, 1968; Awoniyi, 1976; Bamgbose, 1976; 2000; Obanya, 1980; 2004; Cummins, 1981; 2000; 2006; Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981; 2000; 2006; Appel & Muysken, 1987; Tickoo, 1995; Luckett, 1995; Spolsky & Shohamy, 1999; Prah, 2002; 2005; 2009; De Wet, 2002; Wolff, 2002; Indede, 2002; Moto, 2002; Letsie, 2002; Henrard, 2003; Batibo, 2004; 2009a; Kamwangamalu, 2004; Shameem, 2004; Ejieh, 2004; Rubanza, 2005; Brock-Utne,

2005; Makalela, 2005; Molosiwa, 2005; Brock-Utne & Hopson, 2005; Opuku-Amankwa, 2009; Kamwendo, 2009; Gatsha; 2009; Bagwasi, 2009; Mohanty, Mishra, Reddy & Ramesh, 2009; Mohanty, 2009; Panda & Mohanty, 2009; Skuntabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh, 2010).

Multilingual services provision in education through mother tongue based multilingual education also reduce drop-outs rates; increase enrolment and retention rates; reduce repeat rates; guarantee cultural continuity even for minority language speakers; promote intergenerational transmission of the language; place all learners on an equal footing and increase parental involvement in the learner's school work. Multilingual language-in-education policies therefore guarantee access to universal primary education, where children everywhere majority and minority language speaking alike are able to complete a full course of primary education (UNDP, 2004; Brock-Utne, 2005; Brock-Utne & Hopson, 2005; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh, 2010).

Multilingual services provision recognises the need to centralise all the communities in a nation by means of the recognition of all the languages in the nation. Language based exclusion has implications for national development because the majority of minority language speakers are excluded from making an input in national development right from education since education is part of national development. A necessary requirement for meaningful development is mass involvement and this necessarily entails making full use of a country's multilingual resources and incorporating indigenous knowledge systems to enhance relevance as well as to tap on local experiences (Cummins, 1981; 2000; Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; 2007; Prah, 2000a; 2005; Mbeki, 2000; UNDP, 2004; Panda & Mohanty, 2009; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh, 2010).

Mother tongue based multilingual education seeks to develop learners' home language competence from basic interpersonal communication skills to cognitive academic language proficiency in the mother tongue before gradually bringing in second, third and other languages into formal education. Mother tongue based multilingual education offer strategies for building on learner's everyday concepts and

facilitates their progressive engagement with scientific discourse. Learners in a mother tongue based multilingual system gradually develop the capacity to engage in meta-discursive practices in all areas of school learning, such as mathematics, history, science, literature and human ecology, firstly in their mother tongue and subsequently in the second language and other languages. Multilingual education is therefore holistic, culturally situated and historically informed of culturally embedded social, mathematical, literacy/ oracy and science practices (Prah, 2000a; 2005; UNDP, 2004; Bamgbose, 2007; Mohanty, 2009; Panda & Mohanty, 2009; Hornberger, 2009; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh, 2010).

Mother tongue based multilingual education facilitates empowerment and development of marginalised communities without linguistic and cultural assimilation. It develops strong multilingual competence, identity and vital collective processes that sustain the linguistic and the ecocultural diversity of the society. It is a strategy for human development, poverty alleviation and social justice. It is an ideological promise, a first step towards a better world, equity and human dignity. It is a concrete reality founded on solid theoretical groundings for realisation of the very best in every child irrespective of their language. It is a promise of universal, quality and inclusive education for ethnolinguistic minorities and previously marginalised linguistic communities (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981; 2000; 2003; 2006; May, 2001; 2006; Paulston & Hiedemann, 2006; Bamgbose, 2007; Mohanty, 2009; Panda & Mohanty, 2009; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh, 2010; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010).

Mother tongue based multilingual education is much more than just bringing languages into the process of education; it is in fact, deeply rooted in a philosophy of critical pedagogy that seeks to actively empower learners from ethnolinguistic minorities and majority language speaking communities alike and their communities. It revolves around the issue of linking the school to the community as efforts are being made to simultaneously empower both and to use one to enrich the other (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981; 2000; 2003; 2006; May, 2001; 2006; Paulston & Hiedemann, 2006; Bamgbose, 2007; Mohanty, 2009; Panda & Mohanty, 2009; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh, 2010; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010).

Mother tongue based multilingual education is a new commitment which seeks to strengthen the foundations of a necessary bridge – a bridge between home and school, between languages and cultures. A bridge from the home language, the non-standard variety, the mother tongue to the dominant indigenous national language(s) or the standard school variety and the language of wider communication; an empowering bridge that leads to meaningful participation in the wider democratic and global setup without homogenising the beauty of diversity; a bridge that liberates, but does not displace (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981; 2000; 2003; 2006; May, 2001; 2006; UNDP, 2004; Paulston & Hiedemann, 2006; Bamgbose, 2007; Mohanty, 2009; Panda & Mohanty, 2009; Hornberger, 2009; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh, 2010; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010).

Hornberger (2009:1) states that multilingual education offers the best possibilities for preparing future generations to participate in constructing more just and democratic societies in a globalised and intercultural world. It constitutes a wide and welcoming educational doorway toward peaceful co-existence, and especially the restoration and empowerment of those who have been historically oppressed. It draws out, taking as its starting point the knowledge students bring to the classroom and moving toward their participation as full and indispensable actors in society – locally, nationally and globally.

Mwaniki (2011:7-8) argues that at the very basic level, language management considers mother tongue education as an instance of “language correction” with specified attention to the array of possible interventions that can be formulated and deployed to mediate “language problems” attendant to mother tongue education. Mwaniki further contends that at the level of the individual learner, language management takes cognisance of the fact that the language of the school (both spoken and taught) is often structurally at variance with the language that learners bring to school. In Mwaniki’s view, language management understands the acquisition of mother tongue within formal school settings as an instance of “language correction” aimed at mediating language problems” of individual learners

as they navigate the transition between the informal mother tongue acquired before schooling and the formal mother tongue of the school.

Mwaniki thus, concludes that language management should strive to formulate interventions to assist individual learners navigate this transition. At the core of this intervention, he proposes, would be a rethinking of the pedagogy for mother tongue education both at the level of acquiring the formal mother tongue spoken and taught at school and at the level of the mother tongue as a language of teaching and learning. At the level of organised management, language management will concern itself primarily with the codification of mother tongues into standard languages used in schools. In so doing, the language management concern ensures that the resultant standard languages from the standardisation process are as close as possible to the languages the learners bring to school and already know. Consequently, language management will seek to ameliorate the “shock” experienced by learners as they navigate the transition between the home and school language.

The argument that pupils should begin their schooling in their mother tongue, the language that they already know, encompass the accommodation of the non-standard varieties of the standard school variety, if the language in question has such pronounced varieties. It ensures that whatever language the learners bring to the classroom must be validated to make the break between home and school as small as possible. This argument of validating the learners’ mother tongue is not only limited to a case where the home-school language difference involves unrelated varieties. Accommodation of the mother tongue entails validating even non-standard varieties of the school language to enlarge the pupils’ choices.

Scholars who advocated for the inclusion of non-standard varieties of the standard school variety contend that when pupils enter school, they bring a perfectly, well-designed and “logical” dialect. This dialect is no better or worse in grammatical terms than other dialects of the school language; therefore there is need to validate and build on these varieties in class. There is need for teachers to understand the linguistic and cultural resources that all children bring to their classrooms. These

resources serve as a base from which to build educational success for all children (Gee, 2001:647; 657). Language variation among pupils must be recognised as valuable. The main sources of contributions to this debate are by scholars such as Labov (1969; 1972) Trudgill (1975; 1979), Fasold and Shuy (1970), Leap (1986), Fasold (1990), Verhoeven (1997), Gee (2001) among others.

Further applying and relating the practice and theory of language management to mother tongue education, Mwaniki (2011:8-9) argues that in the contemporary globalising world, mother tongue education must be aligned with the emerging aspiration of individuals and societies to participate in a globalised world. Mwaniki further notes that mother tongue education should never be the albatross that prevents education systems from performing the role of socialising effective global citizens. In as much as there are fears such as the ones raised by Mwaniki, the ultimate goal of proper mother tongue based multilingual education is to produce local and globally relevant citizens and to facilitate the easy acquisition of other languages.

Research is unequivocal of the fact that effective literacy acquisition and second language acquisition depend on well-developed first language proficiency. Mother tongue education prepares learners to better master whatever second language that the school use as a medium of instruction. The level of development of learners' mother tongue is a strong predictor of their second language development. When the learner's first language has been developed sufficiently for use in decontextualised classroom learning, then a second language is relatively easily acquired. The acquisition of a second language may be impended when a high level of proficiency has not been reached in the mother tongue or when the attempt to replace the mother tongue with a second language occurs too soon (UNESCO, 1953; Appel & Muysken, 1987; Cummins, 2000; Baker, 2000; Letsie, 2002; Kamwangamalu, 2004; Shameem, 2004).

Conceptualised in this framework, mother tongue education and, particularly mother tongue based multilingual education, becomes an integral part to enlarge pupils'

choices within, and outside, the school system. It serves a wide range of goals which are not only educational in nature, but socio-economic, socio-political, cultural to mention a few. In essence, mother tongue based multilingual education which validates and builds on all the linguistic and cultural resources that all children bring to their classrooms serves the greater purpose of the LMA of serving the greater social good of enlarging the learners' choices by providing them with a platform through which they can access education, information, skills and knowledge without the due constraints of the language of teaching and learning. Mother tongue based multilingual education seeks to promote equal educational and work opportunities and equal access to the higher paying jobs as well as enable the country link up with the international community.

Even though the study of languages of wider communication is important, it should not be at the expense of the mother tongue, and likewise, though mother tongue education is important, it should not be one that prevents education systems from socialising and educating effective global citizens. Mother tongue education should be used as a strategy for the effective and proper acquisition of languages of wider communication and literacy so that learners are better prepared to participate in the global village. In essence, mother tongue based multilingual education must not be understood as 'kissing goodbye' to the so-called global languages or dominant languages; instead it must be understood as an attempt to reduce them to equality with other languages. It must also be understood as an effective way of converting them into popular rather than elite languages used to exclude the masses or minority language speakers. It is not an attempt to pigeon-hole the speakers (Phillipson, 1996:162).

Mother tongue based multilingual education is a fundamental precondition for informed democratic societies and enterprising individuals. It is an essential means of enhancing the spread of knowledge and the use of new technologies. It is useful in laying the foundation for the efficient application and distribution of natural resources, information and goods. It is the platform on which the building blocks for personal and collective progress – the capacity to learn the basics of literacy and numeracy skills,

the ability to acquire information and to process it critically, and the acquisition of life skills are shaped and laid (Bamgbose, 1991; Bruns, Mingat & Rakotomalala, 2003; Faller, 2008; Kendall & Benson, 2008; Hornberger, 2009) .

It is a powerful instrument for reducing inequality and poverty, and for laying the foundation of sustained economic growth. It is credited with a strong human capital effect and viewed as critical for individual and national economic development. It promotes higher literacy rates and greater access to formal education which are precursors to national development Mother tongue based multilingual education ensures that mother tongue education serves the greater purpose of human emancipation and enlarging peoples' choices, whether at the macro levels of governance, development and democracy or at the micro levels of individual freedom and advancement and service access in its broadest sense (Bruns, Mingat & Rakotomalala, 2003; Faller, 2008; Kendall & Benson, 2008; Hornberger, 2009).

3.2.7.4.3 Development oriented methodologies and strategies

Mwaniki (2004:247) states that development oriented methodologies and strategies in multilingual language policy implementation provide a link between multilingual language policy implementation and the macro and micro contexts of language management. They integrate top-down and bottom-up approaches in multilingual language policy implementation. They also provide a link between multilingual language policy implementation and the material conditions of people in multilingual contexts, for example in multilingual language-in-education policies they show how mother tongue based multilingual education improves the material conditions of the affected citizens and how it contributes to their upward social mobility, human freedom and emancipation.

Moreover, they provide a link between multilingual language policy implementation and development oriented initiatives. Finally, they ensure that multilingual language policy implementation is done in a way that allows for the monitoring of the achievement of stated policy objectives and outcomes, timeframes and

available/allocated resources. Mwaniki identifies eight development oriented methodologies and strategies, namely, legislation, advocacy, litigation, development communication, participatory research, dialogical intervention strategies, indigenisation and project management.

3.2.7.4.3.1 Legislation

Legislation is closely related to the legal variables. Legislating multilingual language policies is vital for multilingual policy implementation because at the decision-end, language legislation provides a legal basis for the commitment of the motley of resources needed for the successful implementation of multilingual language policies. At the citizens' end, it provides a means through which language-related rights violations can be redressed in a legal way (Mwaniki, 2004:247). Legislation also regulates the behaviour and actions of policy makers and all the stakeholders involved in the implementation of multilingual language policy implementation. Legislation regulates and monitors the use of different languages.

Language legislation provides the macro-framework that binds all stakeholders to act in judicial and socially responsible ways when responding to language related challenges in society and also when committing public resources for the harnessing of language resources in society (Mwaniki, 2004:247). Language legislation also sets norms that can be used to challenge laws, policies, beliefs and practices that tend to violate linguistic human rights of whatever form. Language legislation also insures the survival of the language and of its people (Bailey, 1998:217).

Language legislation serves as a monitoring instrument that ensures that decision makers implement and monitor the implementation progress of a policy. Policy implementation succeeds when it has been formalised in legislation such as acts, ordinances and by-laws or issued as regulations, instructions, proclamations, administrative rulings and decisions of law courts. Scholars argue that in order to do justice to the concept linguistic human rights, a state must have an explicitly written down language policy at its disposal and ensure that specific linguistic human rights

are legally regulated (Martel, 1999; Bamgbose 2000; 2007; Webb, 2002; Lubbe, 2004; Mwaniki, 2004; Batibo, 2005)

Language legislation must promote the recognition and respect for linguistic human rights as fundamental human rights, particularly the right to mother tongue education and the right to receive education in one's language(s) of choice. It must eliminate language based discrimination and enable speakers to preserve, promote and develop their language. Instruments which uphold the need to respect educational linguistic rights must inform the language-in-education policies. Bamgbose (2007:8) notes that language legislation as a way of regulating language policy and practice serve as a point of reference for what is expected. Anyone not complying with the legislation will be aware that he/she is involved in an infringement.

Adopting and adapting Mwaniki's (2010) proposal that language policies of municipalities must entrench a culture of constitutionalism, language-in-education policies must take cues from the Constitution, Charter of linguistic human rights among other similar instruments. The language policy and language-in-education policy must therefore entrench and engender a culture of constitutionalism. These policy documents must be vanguards of the ethos of these binding legal instruments (Ndlovu, 2011:238). This will engender and promote the respect of language rights and entrench a culture of multilingualism as well as promote a multilingual ripple effect across the entire nation, especially given that the education sector is frequently selected as a site for national language planning and represents the public face of national language planning (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; May, 2001; 2006; Cartwright, 2006; Shohamy, 2006; Fishman, 2006; Ferguson, 2006; Lo Bianco, 2008).

The legal system is a very powerful language planning tool for ethnolinguistic minorities. However, such planning must be supported by a dualistic or pluralistic type of ideology at all levels of government. Otherwise, the law will remain non-operational; one level of government will be in disagreement with another and the courts will judge in favour of the dominant ideology (Martel, 1999:79). All this calls for the government's legally entrenched commitment to recognising and promoting the

language policy. Commenting on language legislation through linguistic human rights instruments and declarations, Skutnabb-Kangas (2006:275-277) notes that binding educational clauses of human rights are riddled with opt-outs, modifications, alternatives and escape clauses. These opt-outs, alternatives, modifications and escape clauses permit reluctant states and policy makers and implementers to meet the requirements in a minimalist way which they can legitimate by claiming that a provision was not “possible or “appropriate” or “reasonable practicable”.

This means that speakers of the concerned languages might, as far as possible and within the framework of the state’s education system or whatever sector get some vaguely defined rights. Skutnabb-Kangas notes that the articles covering language issues are so heavily qualified that the speakers of the concerned languages are completely at the mercy of the state, policy makers and implementers. Language legislation should guard against these common opt-outs, modifications, escape clauses and alternatives and ensure the clauses are obligatory, positive and not vague. Skutnabb-Kangas (1998; 2003; 2006) further notes that in binding clauses, especially in binding educational clauses, two things often happen; one is that language disappears completely or it gets very weak treatment and much poorer treatment in legal instruments than other important human attributes. And in some cases the articles on education in human rights instruments are silent about the right to choose the language in which the education is given. Skutnabb-Kangas argues that language is one of the most important human attributes which human beings are not supposed to be discriminated against.

3.2.7.4.3.2 Advocacy

Advocacy entails a “marketing” approach to multilingual language policy implementation. It also entails a conscious effort from all stakeholders in the language policy implementation process to ensure that the message of the importance of multilingual language policy implementation is popularised, relayed to all the stakeholders and remains alive in the consciousness of the stakeholders. Advocacy is a process of creating and raising awareness among people about a

particular issue that deserves attention (Mwaniki, 2004:248). It seeks to promote the idea with the aim of popularising it and encouraging as many people as possible to buy into it. It seeks to ensure that as many people as possible rally behind the idea or strategy in question.

Crystal (2000:98) argues that there is an urgent need for memorable ways of talking, to capture what is involved and to develop ear-catching metaphors that will elicit local, national and international support for policy implementation. Crystal (2000:99) further argues that within and outside a country people do not change their minds, or develop positive attitudes about language revitalisation initiatives just by being given information; instead the arguments need to capture their emotions and have a lasting impression that calls for action.

Advocacy targeting all the stakeholders involved in language-in-education policy implementation is a top priority because funds and support do not come unless people are aware of the urgency of a need and convinced of its desirability. Specialised organisations and institutions are necessary if the state is to penetrate society in a significant way since government bodies are popular for being quite static and re-active and "designed" to resist change and to maintain the status quo (Webb, 2002; Pennycook, 2002; Heugh, 2003). Fostering a climate of opinion thus has to be carried in parallel with a wide range of public relations and political initiatives. This calls for efforts that involve devising appropriate publicity campaigns. There is need to develop awareness programmes designed to remove ignorance about the centrality of language in human and national development (Crystal, 2000:95-96).

Public awareness campaigns seek to establish a consciousness amongst local communities with regard to the fundamental importance of their languages in personal, local and national development. Advocacy seeks to raise the speakers' ethnolinguistic awareness and entrenches a positive cultural and social character of the community. Advocacy seeks to heighten the concerned language speakers' sensitivity and extreme involvement which is a prerequisite for the success of language acquisition planning efforts. It seeks to establish local ownership of

language related programs where the community fully understands the need to invest in the initiative.

For policy makers, advocacy seeks to secure political will and support and one targeting all the employees in the organisation, it ensures that the entire workforce is committed to the idea or policy as well as the change that comes with its implementation. According to Crystal (2000:99), the concerned language speakers need inspiration and encouragement, especially when confronting recalcitrant government; and awareness that they are not alone, and that there are channels of communication which can be used to elicit national and international cooperation and support.

Advocacy targeting non-governmental organisation seeks to gunner support which can come with both moral and financial support. Advocacy targeting the citizens aims at ensuring that they also give their consensus to the idea because without their consent and support implementation efforts could be seriously hampered when the citizens resist the policy. Stressing the importance of community involvement through advocacy, Webb (2002:42) highlights that if language planning does not have the support of the communities it is intended for; it cannot succeed, except when excessive force is applied. Advocacy should be a continuous activity to sustain public support of the policy.

For language planning to be effective, it has to be complemented by a bottom-up approach. Webb notes that a bottom-up approach does not necessarily mean that people from grass-root levels have to be actively involved in the process. It however means that the interests of the community have to be considered not just the interests of the government. Language planning must take explicit note of the needs and wants, the views and attitudes and the linguistic competencies of the general public. Webb concludes his emphasis on the importance of advocacy by stressing that language policy development as well as implementation needs the direct involvement of citizens, through awareness and information campaigns and with continual dialogue between government agencies.

There must be political will and mobilisation of the populace to support such policy; and there must be a strong or revolutionary government to give the necessary impetus and backing for the formulation and implementation of the policy (Bamgbose, 1991:120). The instruments used for advocacy include litigation, lobbying, research, community mobilisation, media coverage and even violence in most cases as a last resort (Martel, 1999:47).

According to Lewis and Trudell (2008:272), advocacy processes are also part of language cultivation. Negative attitudes within communities are not immutable and local perceptions of what the language is appropriate for can be influenced by positive example or the endorsement of locally esteemed persons or institutions. Advocacy processes targeted at community members might thus include pilot educational programs using the community language, publications in the community's language and personal testimony from those whose opinion is respected. Where members of the elite or institutional authorities are concerned, advocacy needs to focus particularly on the positive impact of language cultivation on their own priorities and concerns.

Advocacy therefore cultivates a deep understanding of, and identification with, the policy. It thus leads to indigenisation where all stakeholders are dialogically brought to "own" multilingual language policy implementation initiatives (Mwaniki, 2004). Advocacy ensures that all stakeholders take the policy as being their own and feel they have a duty to see it succeed. Only if there is a strong political will associated with a chain of activities such as the sensitisation of speakers and other concerned stakeholders will language acquisition planning succeed. African governments and policy makers need first to be given the impetus to realise the importance of appropriate language policies involving the minority languages. Such an impetus could be given through advocacy activities that emphasize the institution of true democracy, along with measures to ensure the participation of minority groups in national affairs and the right of all people to have equal access to education and information in the languages in which they are most proficient in (Batibo, 2005:114).

Advocacy is a form of popular empowerment which helps raise people's awareness of their language problems. It involves enhancing people's awareness of their legal language rights and the means by which to realise or defend them. The best defenders of people's rights are the people themselves and knowledge about language rights under the law is the basic tool in that defence through litigation. Informed people usually try hard to do something about their situation (Simala, 2002:52).

3.2.7.4.3.3 Litigation

In language management, litigation is a legal redress mechanism that could be deployed in instances where there are grievances with regard to language right violations in the process of multilingual language policy implementation, or when there is lack of implementation of such a policy. Litigation serves as a check-mechanism for ensuring that the positive and negative obligations imposed on state agencies with regard to language matters are executed. It is also a mechanism for ensuring that where language-related grievances occur, they are redressed in a judicious manner. Litigation is usually pursued through judicial structures and processes and seeks to mainly arbitrate or redress language-related rights violations. Litigation is considered as one of the most important instruments of language activism and means of obtaining linguistic rights (Martel, 1999; Mwaniki, 2004; Lubbe, 2004).

Litigation guarantees the respect of language-related rights, because it provides a legal avenue to enforce language-related rights. Litigation involves knowing how complaints should be mediated. A simple acceptance of language rights is in itself relatively meaningless. It is necessary to indicate as precisely as possible what language rights entail and to provide practical instruments to enable citizens to make these rights meaningful realities in their lives. It is important that legal provisions specify exactly who the holders of the rights are and what legal sanctions can be imposed for their denial and that funds be provided for acceptable court cases. Listing language rights is a relatively easy task, but making them everyday realities is

much more difficult. A right is only of value if there are accessible legal avenues to enforce it; hence, litigation involves being sufficiently clear about the bases upon which language related rights violations can be handled. Citizens need to be clear about the meaningful basis for the promotion and protection of language rights (Webb, 2002:157).

Citizens also need to know the different structures available to redress language-related rights violations. These structures need to be dedicated, independent, impartial, highly visible, accessible and affordable for the ordinary citizens. This entails that there is need for the establishment of dedicated independent institutions that will mediate language-related rights violations such as the Constitutional Court and independent institutions which will educate citizens about their language rights, give content to the principles in the light of language related rights violations, help them protect their rights and monitor government to make sure that it respects the citizens' language rights. There is need to develop instruments, systems and processes with which ordinary citizens can enter into disputes with government as well as each other being in possession of the necessary knowledge, skills and resources (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1998; 2000; 2003; 2006; Martel, 1999; Bamgbose, 2000; Webb, 2002; Henrard, 2003; Mwaniki, 2004; Lubbe, 2004; Batibo; 2005; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010).

3.2.7.4.3.4 Development communication

Development communication entails the deployment of methodologies and strategies, specifically designed to spread information and contribute to behaviour change. Development communication aims at improving the opportunities for community dialogue and access to information. It seeks to enhance communication as a defining aspect of citizenship and participation in political communities. It involves identifying, segmenting and targeting specific groups and audiences with particular strategies, messages and training programmes through various mass media and interpersonal channels and traditional and non-traditional ways (Mwaniki, 2004:249). The Rockefeller Foundation cited in Mwaniki (2004:249) defines

development communication as a process of dialogue, information sharing, mutual understanding and agreement and collective action. Development communication is a methodology and strategy of initiating, implementing and sustaining development projects and interventions. It entails the deployment of methodologies and strategies specifically designed to spread information and contribute to behaviour (Mwaniki, 2004:249).

In multilingual language policy implementation development communication enables actors involved in multilingual language policy implementation to focus on individual and contextual factors that impact on behaviour change needed to support multilingual language policy implementation. It focuses on the integration of top-down and bottom-up approaches, i.e. the lobbying of government officials at all spheres of government and lobbying communities and individual citizens on the importance of multilingual language policy implementation (Mwaniki, 2004:248-249).

Development communication is a strategy and methodology used to ensure that an organisation that implements a policy achieves consensus within and outside organisational structures. If an organisation fails to involve other stakeholders it could seriously jeopardise strategy implementation efforts if these groups have the power to block or delay key elements of strategy implementation. The successful implementation of language policies depends very much on the extent to which collective action can be mobilised that involves both local and external experts and resources as well as government support (Webb, 2002; Batibo, 2005; Trudell, 2006; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Ehlers & Lazenby, 2010).

Development communication focuses on the deployment of methodologies and strategies that would facilitate multilingual language policy implementation. It focuses on the combination of media and interpersonal approaches in the processes of multilingual language policy implementation. Development communication also focuses on ensuring that implementers of multilingual language policy remain conscious at all times of the main goal of multilingual language policy

implementation, namely, community empowerment and enlargement of people's choices (Mwaniki, 2004:249).

As a methodology of initiating, implementing and sustaining development projects and interventions, development communication consists of:

(a) Communication for development
(b) Communication for social change
(c) Information, education and communication
(d) Behaviour change communication
(e) Social mobilisation
(f) Media advocacy
(g) Strategic communication
(h) Participatory communication
(i) Strategic participatory communication

According to Coetzee (2001), in development communication there are five key ideas that are fundamental, namely,

(a) Focus on individual and contextual factors in behaviour change
(b) Integration of top-down and bottom-up approaches
(c) The deployment of a tool-kit approach
(d) A combination of media and interpersonal communication
(e) A commitment to the idea that community empowerment should be the goal.

In view of mother tongue based multilingual education for minority language speakers, development communication has to entail the deployment of methodologies and tools which are specifically designed to spread information. These tools also contribute to behaviour change in terms of peoples' views of mother tongue based multilingual education for minority language speakers. With many years of colonial indoctrination, many people have come to accept that 'real' education can only be obtained in ex-colonial languages and this is even compounded in cases involving minority languages where nationalism presents

another form of linguistic imperialism. Despite the plethora of research that has demonstrated that a child immensely benefits if his/her education is offered in the mother tongue there is still an overwhelming majority that thinks otherwise.

Given this misconception and prejudice there is need for enlightenment and awareness campaigns designed to facilitate massive decolonisation and debunking of these misconceptions because it is these very misconceptions and unfounded myths that derail the successful implementation on mother tongue based multilingual education. There is need to effectively deploy measures aimed at communication for social change, information, education, communication, behaviour change communication, social mobilisation, strategic communication, participatory communication and strategic participatory communication.

Development communication helps to communicate the value of mother tongue based multilingual education for minority language speakers and how it contributes to the whole process of national human resource development. It will seek to promote and entrench the understanding that language development entails people development. And that when indigenous languages, minority languages included, are developed and effectively used, the prospects of more effective national mass mobilisation, which can enhance national economic and general productivity are bound to be considerably enhanced (Adegbija, 1994a; UNDP, 1996; 1999; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh, 2010).

This will seek to extensively spread information that mother tongue based multilingual education ensures access to universal primary education and education for all, where children everywhere, majority and minority language speakers are able to complete primary education entirely. Development communication will seek to widen peoples' understanding of the pedagogical, economic, political, cultural and social benefits of mother tongue based multilingual education, i.e. creating awareness that benefits of mother tongue based multilingual education are not only educational, but range from pedagogical, economic, sentimental and language rights related.

Most African governments understand the importance of economic planning for national development, which is why they all have national development plans well conceived, often based on research and couched in economic terms. What they fail to see is the relevance of language planning, i.e. language-in-education planning and investing on mother tongue based multilingual education to the economic development of the nation. It is through development communication that government can be persuaded and be properly informed of the role of language planning, language-in-education planning and mother tongue based multilingual education in national development. Mother tongue based multilingual education results in accumulation of human capital and leads to further educational attainment. Given the centrality of primary education, investments in schooling, especially at the lower level, are a very good investment, both for the individual and for society (Vawda & Patrinos, 1999; Prah, 2000; 2005; UNDP, 2004; Brock-Utne and Hopson, 2005; Bamgbose, 2007; Mohanty, 2009; Turrent & Oketch, 2009; Panda & Mohanty, 2009; Patrinos & Velez, 2009; Hornberger, 2009; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh, 2010).

Development communication will seek to emphasize the urgency of language matters. Bamgbose (1991:112) observes that in Africa language matters are deemed less urgent and as the least priority of government budgets, especially if minority languages are involved. It will seek to entrench the understanding espoused by Adegbija (1994a:96) that the educational system is the power house of development in every nation. When it is sick, its sickness will most likely be contagious and affect the entire nation. On the other hand, when it is healthy, the entire system will probably enjoy fairly good overall health. Language of instruction is crucial in ensuring the health of an educational system and attitudes towards mother tongue based multilingual education for minority language speakers can make or mar an entire educational edifice.

Development communication will seek to deconstruct and debunk misconceptions about mother tongue education, such as the myth that the earlier the better for any second language predominantly used in the curriculum where it is thought that introducing learners to the second language as their language of instruction right

from kindergarten is giving them a head-start and automatically result in better acquisition of the second language. Research has shown that the best way to achieve good proficiency in a second language is through learning it as a subject and not through its use as a medium of instruction. It has also shown that the successful acquisition of a second language proceeds from the platform of a well mastered and developed first language (UNESCO, 1953; 2006; Bamgbose, 1976; 1991; 2000; Cummins, 1981; 2000; Appel and Muysken, 1987; Allwright & Bailey, 1994; Lemmer, 1993; De Wet, 2002; Luoch & Ogutu, 2002; Letsie, 2002; Shameem, 2004; Chiuye and Moyo, 2008).

Development communication will also help stakeholders to realise that they are equally important to realise of mother tongue based multilingual education. It will further help people understand that mother tongue based multilingual education does not create a language learning load as most people think. Instead multilingualism has been shown to be an enrichment experience generally and educationally and it strengthens the linguistic repertoire of the learners (Adegbija, 1994a:106; Brock-Utne & Hopson, 2005:8-9).

Implementing agents can ignore or selectively implement policy directives because of insufficient knowledge resulting from a lack of communication among staff. Lack of communication among implementing agents with regard to the provisions of the policy can be one of the factors that contribute to the non-implementation dilemma of policies (Georgiou, Ó Laoire & Rigg, 2010:102). As long as the policy implementers are not clear or aware of what is expected of them the likelihood for non-implementation is very high, hence all efforts should be made to ensure there is an effective flow of information to these agents such that all the agents involved know the details of the policy without doubt. Conscientising and sensitising the implementing agents about the provisions of the policy ensure a more proactive approach to the implementation of the policy.

3.2.7.4.3.5 Participatory action research

According to Mwaniki (2004:250) participatory research refers to an activity in research which is used to serve the ends of empowerment, conscientisation and emancipation in development. Reason (1994:329) cited in Prozesky and Mouton (2001:539) defines participatory research as a methodology for an alternative system of knowledge production. Prozesky and Mouton (2001:540) note that participatory research explicitly enters the political arena, focusing on issues related to political interests that are catered for by research. According to Mwaniki (2004) conscientisation is a process by which subjects of research achieve a new way of understanding their position in society and how to change it. Participation is a process by which subjects of research control and own as many aspects of the research activity as possible.

Cameron, Frazer, Harvey, Rampton and Richardson (1992:15) note that research is a form of advocacy. They contend that this advocacy position of research is characterised by a commitment on the part of the researcher, not just to do research on subjects, but for subjects. Such a commitment formalises what is actually a rather common development in field situations, where a researcher is asked to use his/her authority as an expert to defend subjects' interests, getting involved in their campaigns, for example for education in a language of their choice and speaking on their behalf. Participatory action research is therefore research about and for the subjects (Cameron, Frazer, Harvey, Rampton & Richardson, 1992; Jankie, 2009; Tollefson, 2006).

Participatory action research draws some of its theoretical underpinnings from critical theory and Marxism. Like critical theory, participatory action research aggressively investigates issues related to creation and maintenance of socio-economic inequality by the elites. Drawing from Marxism, participatory action research realises that domination of masses by elites is rooted not only in the polarisation of control over means of material production, but also over the means of knowledge production and

access to it, including the social power to determine what is valid or useful knowledge (Mwaniki, 2004:250).

Participatory action research provides researchers with an understanding of the relationship and link between ideology and epistemology as well as knowledge and power. It consists of the following key methodological features and principles;

(a) The change agent and the participant
(b) The emphasis on participation
(c) The nature of the researcher – subject relationship
(d) The incorporation of local knowledge
(e) Mobilising and empowering communities

Participatory action research is committed to working almost exclusively with and for grassroots groups, communities, or social classes and their organisations in rural areas in the Third World. Mwaniki further notes that participatory action research seems appropriate when groups exhibit the following characteristics;

(a) That they are poor, marginalised and excluded socially and economically, exploited and oppressed. Their marginalisation and exclusion in society is seen as an important condition that participatory action research seeks to address. Their relative lack of power or disempowered status in society is also emphasized, especially when participants from grassroots groups whose very existence can be seen as illegitimate by local power structures.
(b) That they are a culturally vulnerable group that is vulnerable to colonisation and assimilation by a dominant culture.

Mwaniki (2004:251) describes participatory action research as a critical methodology and strategy for multilingual language policy implementation. It encourages and promotes participation or collaboration between beneficiaries of multilingual language policy implementation together with policy makers or organisations that drive multilingual language policy implementation. Participatory action research allows both the beneficiaries of multilingual language policy implementation and the policy

makers or the organisations driving the implementation of multilingual language policy to operate on an equal basis as they search for what best works in their circumstances. It also allows for the incorporation of local knowledge in the implementation process.

Mwaniki notes that the importance of participatory action research as a methodology and strategy of multilingual language policy implementation derives from its ability to mobilise and empower communities, which is the ultimate goal of multilingual language policy implementation and language management. Chelser (1991) cited in Prozesky and Mouton (2001:546) contends that participatory action research is not an end in itself, but a basis for and a means through which, action can be planned and implemented. Realising the participatory nature of participatory action research, Mwaniki (2004:252) highlights that social action or change should therefore be community-initiated and defined as a shared goal by the participants themselves based on their perception of reality, while the change agents support or help the people concerned to undertake such actions.

Akong'a (1991); Fals-Borda and Rahman (1991) and Huizer (1984) cited in Prozesky and Mouton (2001:546) note that participatory action research is particularly concerned with action that induces positive, progressive, remedial and corrective social change or transformation. Relating participatory action research to multilingual language policy implementation, Mwaniki (2004:252) notes that participatory action research is not only a methodology or strategy of facilitating multilingual language policy implementation, but it also serves to locate the implementation of multilingual language policies within the greater context of mobilising and empowering communities.

3.2.7.4.3.6 Dialogical intervention strategies

Romm (2001) indicates that dialogical intervention strategies attempt to mediate between different people's conflicting perceptions of the situation and the variety options for appropriate conduct. A dialogical intervention approach seeks to establish

possibilities for participation as well as allow for some form of negotiation between competing views of the situation under consideration in order to extend considerations of options for action. A dialogical intervention strategy does not expect that all people will reach a consensus on the issues at stake; instead it sees negotiations as hypotheses for continued action on the part of the different participants.

Basing on this objective of dialogical intervention strategy, human development is more important than solutions that are arrived at. The process of addressing issues ideally through dialogical strategies is more important than the solution itself. It is only solutions that bear the mark of a dialogical encounter in their formulation and implementation that can be seen as standing the test of development in human terms. Applying dialogical intervention strategies to multilingual language policy implementation, Mwaniki (2004:253) notes that dialogical intervention strategies provide the means through which views of different stakeholders can be integrated into the implementation process. They allow for some form of negotiation between competing views on issues related to multilingual language policy implementation.

They also provide a discursive space for continued action among the different stakeholders involved in the implementation process. Dialogical intervention strategies also help in raising public consciousness about the policy in question as long as debates on the policy continue (Mwaniki, 2004:253).

3.2.7.4.3.7 Indigenisation

Mwaniki (2004:253) reports that indigenisation presupposes that government structures, in social, political and economic domains, are dialogically brought to “own” multilingual language policy implementation initiatives. Indigenisation ought to be supported by tangible social, political and economic benefits to all stakeholders involved in the multilingual language policy development and implementation process. In other words, it is only when stakeholders involved in multilingual language policy implementation develop a sense of ownership of the language

policies as being their own, rather than being imposed from “outside” that they can support their implementation (Cooper, 1989; Ladefoged, 1992; Adegbija, 1993; 1994b; 1997; 2001; Tremmel, 1994; Kaplan and Baldauf, 1997; Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer, 1998; Grinevald, 1998; Zvobgo, 1997; 2007; Crystal, 2000; Fishman, 1991; Strubell, 2001; King, 2001; Klaus, 2003; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2003; Batibo, 2005; Benson; 2005; Trudell, 2006; Troy & Walsh, 2008; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Lasimbang & Kinajil, 2008; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Hatoss, 2008; Hornberger & Hult, 2008; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b; Ndhlovu, 2010; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Hornberger, 2006b; 2009).

Various stakeholders involved in multilingual language policy implementation can support policy implementation when they identify with the policies and acknowledge their socio-economic and political value to their well-being. Indigenisation relates to the cultivation of the spirit of ownership and identification with a project to ensure its success. As long as implementing agents construct the policy as another layer of policy they have to deal with, and as a source of frustration or something to be pushed down the list of priorities, non-implementation of such a policy is inevitably. Implementation is only possible in an environment where the policy is taken as of particular relevance or interest to the implementing agents (Zvobgo, 1997; 2007; Georgiou, Ó Laoire & Rigg, 2010).

3.2.7.4.3. 8 Project management

Williams (2002:13) notes that a project is a unique venture with a beginning and an end. It is conducted by people to meet established goals with parameters of cost, schedule and quality. Williams describes project management as management of the scope; cost; people and time. Project management approach works where there is a clear statement of the objectives, resources, time frames for particular actions or interventions and a clear statement of the expected results and mechanisms for redress if the project results are not achieved. According to Mwaniki (2004:254) project management as a strategy for language management focuses on the pragmatics of the implementation of the language policies. In language management,

project management allows for a clear identification of the scope of multilingual language policy implementation initiatives.

It also allows for a clear determination of the cost that will be incurred in the implementation processes, mechanisms to be deployed in managing the people who will be drivers of the implementation process and the management of time frames within which various objectives will be achieved. In multilingual language policy implementation, project management provides a framework within which multilingual language policies can be implemented using available resources while remaining conscious of the overall objectives of multilingual language policy implementation and the time frames within which support structures for multilingual services provision have to be realised.

3.3 Seven areas of policy development for language-in-education policy implementation

Kaplan and Baldauf (1997:127-139; 2003:217-220) state that once a language-in-education policy is formulated, there are a number of issues which then need to be examined as part of any language-in-education implementation programme. Kaplan and Baldauf (1997; 2003) outline seven areas of policy development for language-in-education policy implementation, namely, curriculum policy, access policy, personnel policy, materials and methods policy, community policy, resourcing policy and evaluation policy. The education sector has to formulate these policies and make these planning decisions prior to the implementation of the language-in-education policy. These policies are interrelated such that failure to secure one may affect the implementation process.

3.3.1 Access policy

The access policy focuses on who must study what language(s) at what levels and for what duration in years, hours, weeks and periods of study. The access policy determines what segment of the student population will be exposed to language(s) education and how that segment will be identified, provided with readiness training,

and induced to undertake the available instruction, and it will need to devise strategies to secure parental and community support for any plan put in place. It is usually formulated by government or the education sectors of the government, particularly the ministry of education in centralised countries to meet societal, economic or political needs (Kaplan & Baldauf (1997; 2003; Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008). The determination of the access policy must be based on thorough research in the form of language surveys and fact-finding to determine implementation modalities among other planning and organising issues.

3.3.2 Personnel policy

Personnel policy relates to the allocation of human resources required for implementing language policies. Any language-in-education policy 'requires for its effectiveness the availability of teachers who will deliver the instruction. Personnel policy issues relate to questions such as: from what sector of the total pool of teachers will language teachers be drawn? What sort of education will they be provided to prepare them to teach? How is that training different from the training of any other teachers? How long will it take? Who will be the teacher trainers? What is it that the potential teachers need to know? There is a need for a group of teachers trained in language pedagogy and reasonably fluent in the target language, if not native speakers of the target language. Personnel policy examines the entry requirements for teacher training, recruitment and deployment. It particularly evaluates whether there are any language proficiency standards required for teachers who are supposed to teach the language(s) in question (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008; Kaplan, Baldauf & Kamwangamalu, 2011).

Mere native speakership is not a qualification that is sufficient for teaching any language. One needs to be trained, tested, qualified and certified to be a competent language teacher. Teachers must be linguistically equipped in these languages, native and/or learned to them as subjects and in them as languages of instruction. Mother tongue education is more successful where speakers of the concerned language have a strong presence in the education system and come from the

population of fluent speakers of the concerned language. It requires teachers who are able to teach in the concerned languages. Comprehensive pre-service and in-service teacher training are also a necessity to rehabilitate mother tongue education (Rampton, 1990; Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; Skutnabb-Kangas & García, 1995; García, 1997; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Heugh, 2003; Henrard, 2003; Alidou, 2004; Annamalai, 2004; Batibo, 2005; Benson, 2005; Chiuye & Moyo; 2008; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh, 2010; Hamid; 2010; Kaplan, Baldauf & Kamwangamalu, 2011).

The policy of deployment of teachers may facilitate or derail the implementation of mother tongue education policies. Poor deployment strategies often result in situations where teachers find themselves in schools where they cannot speak and teach the language to be used as a medium of instruction and taught as a subject. Inappropriate linguistic deployment of teachers undermines implementation of mother tongue education policies and limits the degree to which they can demonstrate results. (Paulston, 1988; 1994; Nahir, 1983; 1988; 1998; Bamgbose, 1991; Fishman; 1991; Morgan, 2001; Benson, 2005; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2010).

Skutnabb-Kangas and García (1995:239) warn that efforts should be made to teach pupils' mother tongue by members of the same ethnolinguistic group as the pupils. These teachers must have native-like or near- native proficiency in the pupils' mother tongue and be extremely knowledgeable of the history and culture of the ethnolinguistic group. Language shift among learners is inevitable when all or most of the teachers come from the dominant group and do not speak the minority language (Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010:10). According to Tankersley (2001:120) the majority in a country usually do not want to learn the language of the minority because they fear that they would lose their superiority, and they enforce the use of their own language. In this regard, Skutnabb-Kangas and Dunbar (2010:21) argue that teachers of indigenous children should to the extent possible be recruited from within the children's community and be conversant in the children's language.

Kaplan and Baldauf (1997:130) and Crystal (2000:138) identify the following major challenges regarding personnel policy; the source of teachers, the training of teachers and the reward of teachers. Teacher training is a critical need, and ideally these teachers would come from the population of fluent speakers of the concerned language. It is undisputable that a polity undertaking to introduce a new language into the curriculum will be faced with a shortage of competent teachers and there may be a need to use untrained teachers as a stop-gap measure. In view of these three major challenges related to personnel policy, Kaplan and Baldauf suggest short and long term strategies which can be adopted to augment the pool of qualified teachers. Market forces may pressure language teachers trained in one language to retrain in the new language to retain their positions.

Kaplan and Baldauf (1997:131) note two issues that underlie teacher training, namely, to achieve and maintain competence in the target language and incentives for teachers to place themselves in the pool. As Kaplan and Baldauf correctly observe, the first problem is complex since the languages have not been used in education before, there is likely to be a limited number of individuals who are competent in these languages. It will definitely take time to have trained teachers in these languages and when this time is added to the time required to train certified teachers, it constitutes a significant investment of time by the individual. It is highly likely that the required number of individuals who will choose to join the teaching profession as teachers of these languages will be very low unless the government is prepared and willing to offer incentives to these teachers.

Government is in a position to provide motivational structures that the education sector nor the community, simply cannot provide. If a nation wishes to develop a pool of teachers of a particular language, it may provide a range of instrumental incentives to encourage young people to study the selected languages. Such motivation enhancing devices may include position designation in the civil service requiring proficiency in those languages, thus widening the domains of use of the languages in question. They also include the allocation of funding to the education sector to improve instruction in those languages, including special salary incentives for

qualified teachers or student teachers, granting of language study scholarships, exchange programmes and special leave in countries where the languages are spoken, providing subsidised pre-service training and satisfying reward, development of media campaigns to enhance popular attitudes relating the value of those languages and to create public awareness on the new roles assigned to the languages (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997:126-127).

Considering the low status of the teaching profession in most countries, there is a need for the government to ensure that this negative attitude is overcome in order to attract new blood into the system and retain the old generation. Government also needs to widen the domains of use for the concerned languages so that language teachers discover career paths that do not only lead to the opportunity to be teachers. In cases where a small starting figure of trained teachers in the language already exists, government might need to provide subsidised in-service training for these teachers to be able to at least teach the language(s) in question (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997:131).

To add to Kaplan and Baldauf's (1997) discussion, it is also important that extensive recruiting campaigns need to be launched in areas where these languages are spoken. These campaigns have to ensure that the word gets to all the people who might be potential candidates. This might include use of outreach programmes by teacher training institutions to schools in areas where these languages are spoken to offer career guidance and attract students. This might entail working with media, particularly radio stations that broadcast in these languages to reach out to the intended target audience when it is time to recruit student teachers. Personnel policy relates to the management variables and it also fits under management oriented methodologies and strategies, such as planning, leading, organising, staffing, technical skills development, conceptual skills development and human skills development.

3.3.3 Curriculum policy

According to Kaplan and Baldauf (1997:128-129), curriculum policy issues focus on these questions: what language(s) and when should they be introduced and for how long? Once the education sector determines which language(s) need to be taught, the next thing would be to turn its attention to a whole range of curricular issues. Curriculum policy also focuses on the development of the syllabus. A primary issue under curriculum policy concerns the space in the curriculum allocated to language(s) of instruction. Since the school calendar, and particularly the school day is limited, the curriculum is not endlessly permeable; i.e. in general, whenever something is added to the curriculum, it is always at the expense of something that is already in the curriculum. Often the questions that arise include: what subject areas need to be reduced or eliminated in order to make space for the language of instruction? This is a controversial and highly contentious question since each subject in the curriculum is often there as a result of certain pressures (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008).

Critical issues in curriculum policy are the questions when to start language instruction, over what duration is it to be provided and with what intensity. Curriculum policy also defines what curriculum is mandated and by whom, how it is developed and who is involved. In countries where education is centralised, all curriculum policy is centrally defined, developed and mandated with educationists, educational linguists and curriculum experts as policy makers (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008). However, there are instances when curriculum policy formulation takes a bottom-up approach, involving teachers and speakers of the concerned language in the policy making process although the top-down curriculum policy is the most prevalent approach. Baldauf, Li & Zhao (2008:239) argue that top-down curriculum policies usually lead to failure in implementation, suggesting that bottom-up approaches may be more successful.

3.3.4 Methods and materials policy

Mother tongue education requires course books in the concerned language as well as teachers able to teach in the language. The existence of materials for language educational literacy is an essential ingredient in the success of language acquisition planning. The greater the variety of materials available in the language, and the more they are used in education, the stronger the language is. Language is usually better maintained and revitalised if education is conducted in the language with materials in oral, written and other forms. No teaching programme can succeed without good teaching and learning materials, and good materials are of no value unless there are teachers trained to use them (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Crystal, 2000; Davids, 2001; Henrard, 2003; Benson, 2005; Batibo, 2005; Chiuye & Moyo, 2008; Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008).

Learners cannot develop and acquire the necessary communication skills in their respective mother tongues without readers and learning materials. Improvised works and repetitive drills developed by resourceful teachers end up as boring exercises for pupils and promote loss of interest in the language. Lack of teaching and learning materials in the mother tongue is a critical issue, as pupils cannot learn effectively without recourse of learning resources. Similarly, teachers cannot effectively teach without recourse of these teaching resources (Kaplan and Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Crystal, 2000; Davids, 2001; Henrard, 2003; Benson, 2005; Batibo, 2005; Chiuye & Moyo, 2008; Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008).

Methods and materials policy define what teaching methods and materials are to be used. It refers to teaching approaches and methodologies as well as teaching and learning resources such as textbooks. It further defines how the chosen methods are actually implemented. The methods and materials policy is closely related to the curriculum policy and it is the critical component in curriculum implementation process. In countries where the curriculum is tightly controlled, methodology is often prescribed and some specific training in it given; textbooks or teaching materials are often centrally produced and approved (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Baldauf, Li &

Zhao, 2008). In some nations, school textbooks and teaching materials are produced and published by certain prescribed and approved publishing houses in the nation as is the case in Zimbabwe.

Kaplan and Baldauf (1997:134) warn that language-in-education planning must select an appropriate methodology, must guarantee that the materials to be used are consonant with the methodology, provide authentic language and are also consonant with the expectations of teachers. Teaching materials have to coincide with the methodology being employed to deliver the language instruction and the methodologies used to train teachers have to match both these. Methodologies have to be chosen with some awareness of the skills of the teachers available for the delivery of language instruction. Methods and materials policy also focus on issues related to questions such as, who will prepare the materials? How long will it take to do so? What density of materials per child is required to maintain a viable programme? What role, if any, will be played by native-speakers in materials development? What materials and methods can be drawn from the community?

3.3.5 Resourcing policy

Resourcing policy in language-in-education policy studies entails the allocation of financial resources and infrastructure to organise teaching and learning activities. It determines how the policy will be supported fiscally and physically. It asks how the program is going to be funded and how much is needed? Who will provide funding for teacher training? Who will pay for the production of teaching materials? Resourcing policy spells out the source of funding and looks at the cost-benefit analysis. A thorough and detailed cost-benefit analysis should be undertaken to establish probable costs and likely benefits of the language plan. Resourcing policy varies in different countries with different language programs being funded at multiple levels by governments at state, regionally and / or local level or by individuals and governmental and non- governmental organisations (Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008:235).

Although some linguistic minorities are able to mount successful educational programs, using their languages as media of instruction and teaching their languages as subjects, many such communities lack the resources needed to support such policies. Given the limited capacities of these communities to fund their programs, state support or external support is usually indispensable. However, state budgetary support entails state control and control of resources usually means control of medium of instruction policy (King & Benson, 2004; Trudell, 2006; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Ndhlovu, 2010).

Funding determines the success of a program. Policy implementation is contingent on the availability of resources. It must be known that the implementation of any language-in-education plan, like any other human resource development plan, is going to be moderately expensive. Thus, language education is not only competing with other subjects for time in the curriculum, but often for a share of relatively fixed resources. One of the difficult problems in language education as most scholars attest has been the willingness of education agencies to articulate complex effective plans, but to fail at the level of implementation by withholding the resources necessary for the achievement of the plan. If adequate resources are not available or released to sustain and promote linguistic development, language change in one direction can easily revert to the other (Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; 2007; Adegbija, 1994a; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Zvobgo, 1997; 2007; Webb, 2002; Annamalai, 2004; Benson, 2005; Trudell, 2006; Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008; Lewis & Trudell, 2008).

Lewis and Trudell (2008:269) note that once a policy is developed and an acquisition plan prepared, adequate resources must be made available for its implementation. This often is primarily a matter of political will; however, in nations with relatively few resources, capacity for resourcing the policy in terms of both expertise and finances may pose a significant obstacle. In nations where resources are limited or not forthcoming, effective policy implementation inevitably requires significant engagement by local communities. In addition, non-governmental organisations of various kinds can also come in handy, providing funding, expertise and consultation. However, the local community and non-governmental can fund the implementation if

policy decisions are comprehensive and carefully considered and provide the desired policy environment.

A well formulated national policy can help create the political, economic and social environment in which local communities, with or without assistance from outside sources are able to engage with implementation of the policy and non-governmental organisations are free to intervene and provide the much needed funding, consultation and expertise. Thus, the official policy must consciously promote measures to facilitate implementation. Considerations of financial and material resources should be made if curriculum reform is to succeed. Many educational programmes have failed to take-off or have been left incomplete because of the failure to consider the financial implications of a curriculum reform. In a national system of education the resources necessary for reform ought to come mainly from government, or at least the national government should create enabling conditions for the funding of anticipated reforms. Unavailability of funding renders all reform initiatives impossible to undertake (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; Zvobgo, 1997; Benson, 2005).

Resourcing policy relates to economic variables, management variables and management oriented methodologies and strategies, such as planning and organising.

3.3.6 Community policy

Language-in-education planning does not occur in vacuum; students and teachers live in a community beyond the classroom and students have parents who are concerned about the education their children are exposed to. Funding for the support of educational systems comes from the larger community, hence the need to involve everyone (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008). The community policy is about agency and it focuses on questions related to the level to which the community is involved and has been consulted about what languages the school offers. They address issues related to students' language choices, do they have a

choice of language or are policies decided in the top-down manner? Community policies are seldom put in place where language-in-education policy is made following a top-down pattern. Community policy therefore focuses on parental attitudes, involvement and consultation. It also relates to socio-cultural variables (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997:124).

3.3.7 Evaluation Policy

According to Kaplan and Baldauf (1997:135), evaluation policy focuses on cost effectiveness of the plan, evaluation of the implementation process to detect any obstacles that can derail the successful implementation of the plan and evaluation of the implementation of the policy whether or not the stated policy objectives and outcomes have been achieved. Language-in-education policies are targeted to reach specific goals and objectives and have criteria by which policy impact can be measured. Evaluation mechanisms need to be developed to determine whether societal changes predicted in policy development are occurring and to determine whether they are occurring to the extent needed within the time permitted. Evaluation needs to be designed in such a manner that the results can be fed back into the system in order to produce modifications to the system.

Evaluation policy also relates to efforts of justifying the necessary expenditure if compared to expenditure for all other segments of the education sector and other sectors. It is about putting forward evidence that the proposed plan and its implementation is cost-effective. In some cases a plan may in itself be excellent, but if the resources required to implement it cause bankruptcy of the system, that can hardly be considered cost-effective. In education, as in any other subsidised areas, there must be some reasonable return on investment. In the same way that plans have failed at the level of implementation because the system starved them, it may also be the case that plans are so generously funded that everything else in the system is starved to accomplish a single objective. Evaluation must be designed to achieve some sort of equilibrium among competing demands without assuring the failure of any segment through inadequate resource allocation (Bamgbose, 1991;

2000; 2007; Adegbija, 1994a; Zvobgo, 1997; 2007; Vawda & Patrinos, 1999; Brock-Utne & Hopson, 2005; Benson, 2005; Patrinos & Velez, 2009; Turrent & Oketch, 2009).

An evaluation policy also asks questions such as are students required to sit for examinations? What criteria do they need to meet? Are these criteria in line with the prescribed methods and materials? Are individual students' linguistic and cultural needs catered for by the criteria? Is teacher quality evaluated by students' examination success or failure? Evaluation policy provides criteria used in assessing the extent to which students have reached the set requirements of a language-in-education policy (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008).

Language tests in multilingual societies play a central role in accepting certain languages and rejecting others. Much of language educational policy is actually realised through tests as the indirect action and practice that serves as de facto language education policy. As covert policy mechanisms, tests manipulate language and create de facto language policies often in contradiction to declared policies. These new de facto language education policies override and contradict existing policies and create alternative language policy realities. Given the power of tests, language education policy documents often become no more than declarations of intent that can easily be manipulated even in ways that contradict the official language-in-education policy. Tests are often more powerful than any written language-in-education policy. Testing in a language sends a direct message about language priorities and the exclusion of other languages (Cooper, 1989; McGroarty, Beck & Butler, 1995; Shohamy, 2006; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b; Makoni, 2011).

Tests serve as means designed primarily to create or improve incentives to learn a target language. Testing presents a language as worthy of study and systematic attention that goes into testing. Like other aspects of educational technology, tests evoke particular local meanings according to the way they are viewed by the teachers, learners and parents. Testing in selected languages diminishes the status

of the non-examined languages. Tests determine the status, prestige and hierarchy of languages in the curriculum. In an examination driven education system a non-examined subject is not given so much attention (Cooper, 1989; Hale, 1992; Pennycook, 1994; McGroarty, Beck & Butler, 1995; Shohamy, 2006; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Makoni, 2011; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b)

The non-examination of a language cultivates among learners a feeling that it is not important. When a language is not examined children and parents tend to start believing that their language is worthless than the examined languages. These attitudes usually have a strong negative influence on the development, teaching and learning of the language. The tested language(s) become the only important language(s) to focus on. Testing in marginalised languages establishes their existence within the education system and it can promote efforts of developing, teaching and learning these languages. Testing guarantees easy policy implementation (Cooper, 1989; Hale, 1992; Pennycook, 1994; McGroarty, Beck & Butler, 1995; Shohamy, 2006; 2008 Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Makoni, 2011; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010).

Language tests affect the teachers' and pupils' language preferences. They serve as significant mechanisms that affect the linguistic repertoire. As policy mechanisms, tests are capable of maintaining and promoting the status of a particular language, while eliminating others and monitoring the prestige of the favoured language. Tests define which language(s) is valued within the educational system. They valorise the language(s) that are examined. For marginalised indigenous languages, examinations 'can be powerful pieces of evidence that a hitherto 'invisible' language does indeed exist in terms that an educational bureaucracy can understand and, consequently, must acknowledge. Not only the educational bureaucracy can understand and acknowledge it, but even learners, parents and publishers will likewise give due recognition to such a language (Scotton, 1988; Cooper, 1989; Hale, 1992; Pennycook, 1994; McGroarty, Beck & Butler, 1995; Shohamy, 2003; 2006; 2008 Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b; Ojwang, 2011; Makoni, 2011).

Testing in previously marginalised languages legitimises their existence in the education system and it promotes their development, teaching and learning. Testing also promotes publishing in the language because examinations will mean a readily available market for the books already exists. Any attempt to ensure language equity in education must pay special attention to evaluation policies (Scotton, 1988; Cooper, 1989; Hale, 1992; Pennycook, 1994; Crawford, 1994; McGroarty, Beck & Butler 1995; Shohamy, 2003; 2006; 2008; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b; Ojwang, 2011; Makoni, 2011).

CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

4.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a discussion of the research design and methodology of the study, the nature of the research and sampling procedures of the study. It also presents, analyses and discusses the results and findings of the pilot study conducted prior to the main research.

The research is an evaluative case study of the implementation process of the 2002 policy development in classroom practice against its stated objectives and outcomes. It examines the implementation process of the policy statement to establish the causes of the delay in implementation. Together therewith, it examines the conditions and factors that contributed to the success story of Tonga. Qualitative and quantitative methods were used to gather and analyse data. In language management, theory presupposes method. Given these dialectics of theory and method in language management, the questions that were asked as part of the different data gathering techniques are based on the language management variables, methodologies and strategies and the seven areas of policy development. Once a language-in-education policy is determined, these seven areas of policy development need to be examined and developed as part of any language-in-education policy implementation program. These seven areas of policy development are prerequisites to successfully implement language-in-education policies (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003).

The LMA offers a coherent framework to understand problems that underpin multilingual language policy implementation. It provides language management variables, methodologies and strategies that can be deployed to understand and analyse dilemmas attendant to multilingual language policy implementation. Language management variables, methodologies and strategies can also be deployed to facilitate multilingual language policy implementation (Mwaniki,

2004:256). Since the focus of the study is to examine the dilemmas attendant to the implementation of the 2002 policy development and the causes of the success story of Tonga, basing questions asked through the different data gathering techniques on language management variables, methodologies and strategies proved to be useful in addressing the research questions and achieving the objectives of the study.

The researcher examined whether the seven areas of policy development for language-in-education policy implementation were developed to facilitate the successful implementation of the policy statement. Focus on the language management variables, methodologies and strategies, as well as the seven areas of policy development assisted the researcher to establish the causes of the delay in the implementation of the policy statement since the target year (2005) for the implementation of the policy statement has passed without the policy achievement of the stated objectives and outcomes. In the *Secretary's Circular, No. 1 of 2002* and the *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002*, it is stated that official minority languages will be taught and examined at grade 7 level by year 2005, but this has not happened except in Tonga in 2011.

4.2 Research design: An evaluative case study

4.2.1 Evaluation research

Evaluation research or programme evaluation is the scientific and systematic application of social research procedures to assess the conceptualisation, design, implementation, effectiveness and efficiency of social intervention programmes (Rutman, 1984:10; Rossi & Freeman, 1993:5).

Posavac and Carey (1992) identify four types of evaluation research:

- The evaluation of need
- The evaluation of process
- The evaluation of outcome
- The evaluation of efficiency

Rossi and Freeman (1993) distinguish three types of evaluation studies:

- Analysis related to conceptualisation and design of interventions
- Monitoring of program implementation or implementation evaluation research; and
- Assessment of program effectiveness and efficiency

Babbie and Mouton (2001:340) observe that the former classification relates closely with the latter. Type one of evaluation research is what Rossi and Freeman (1993) describe as conceptualisation and design type in evaluation research. Type three and four of the former scholars' classification is what latter scholars classify as programme effectiveness and efficiency or outcome evaluation.

In view of these types of evaluation studies, this study focuses on the analysis of the conceptualisation and design of the 2002 Policy Statement, but more important to monitor the implementation of the policy statement which is the major focus of the thesis. To evaluate the implementation process of the policy statement, it is necessary to understand the conceptualisation and design of the policy statement. Analysis of the conceptualisation and design of the policy development focuses on the policy objectives. It specifically evaluates whether the policy is designed to amicably address the problem and if its conceptualisation and design is not also a cause in the delay on implementation.

Implementation evaluation research constitutes a major focus of evaluation research and its aim is to evaluate the implementation process of a particular policy, program, therapy or strategy. Implementation evaluation research aims to answer the question whether an intervention policy, program, therapy, or strategy is implemented as designed. It evaluates if the necessary inputs are in place to support policy implementation. It seeks to establish if the policy was well conceptualised and if the target groups and implementers were adequately informed and involved. It aims to establish if interventions were well conceptualised and properly implemented. If an intervention policy was not successfully implemented or did not achieve the stated

policy objectives and outcomes, then evaluation research investigates the causes of these deviations or delays (Morris & Fitz-Gibbon, 1978; Rutman, 1984; Posavac & Carey, 1992; Rossi & Freeman 1993; Babbie & Mouton, 2001).

The policy development that is evaluated is still being implemented although the target year for the final phase of implementation has passed. This study evaluates the implementation process to examine the causes of the delay in its implementation. It also examines the conditions and factors that led to the success story of Tonga which though also came six years after the target year of 2005.

The purpose of evaluation range from program monitoring as a management tool, to provide evidence within a context of accountability, to establish the necessary conditions to enable the assessment of program outcomes or their impact, to improve and refine social interventions as a result of public demand, to meet accreditation demands and for academic purposes to obtain certain qualifications. The main aim is not only to obtain a qualification, but to also contribute to the body of knowledge (Rutman, 1984; Posavac & Carey, 1992; Rossi & Freeman 1993; Patton, 1997; Mouton. 2001; Babbie & Mouton, 2001). From these varied aims of evaluation research Patton (1997) list three main reasons for evaluation research, namely, judgement-oriented evaluations, improvement-oriented evaluations and knowledge-oriented evaluations.

In view of these three aims of evaluation, the purpose of this study is mainly twofold, namely, to provide improvement-oriented and knowledge-oriented evaluations. It examines the constraints that hinder the proper implementation of the policy development to give suggestions on improvement and better the understanding of how bottom-up policies work. Generalisations from the selected cases can be useful to shape the formulation and implementation of policies that involve languages in similar situations as the ones under study.

Implementation evaluation research uses a multi-method approach to gather data. The researcher utilised the available forms of observation, used interviews and

analysed existing documentary sources (Morris & Fitz-Gibbon, 1978; Rutman, 1984; Posavac & Carey, 1992; Rossi & Freeman, 1993; Clarke & Dawson, 1999; Mouton, 2001; Leedy & Ormrod, 2005; Babbie & Mouton, 2001).

4.2.2 Case study research

A case study is a strategy to do research. It is an empirical investigation of a particular contemporary phenomenon within its real life context with the use of multiple sources of evidence. Case study research is a method of choice when the phenomenon under study is not readily distinguishable from its context. It is a type of qualitative research design in which in-depth data is generated relative to a single or number of individual(s), program(s), or event(s) to learn more about an unknown or poorly understood situation (Robson, 1993; Blaxter, Hughes & Tight, 2001; Yin, 2003; Leedy & Ormrod, 2005; Nieuwenhuis, 2007).

The case study research method helps to answer the questions “how” and “why”. It offers a multi-perspective analysis in which the researcher considers not just the voice and perspective of one or two participants in a situation, but also views of other relevant groups of actors and the interaction between them. Case study research opens the possibility to give a voice to the powerless and voiceless, such as children or marginalised groups, and in this case it is the official minority language speakers. The case study method helps to develop comprehensive understanding of people. Case studies offer significant insight and understanding of the dynamics of a specific situation (Nieuwenhuis, 2007:75; Holliday, 2010:99).

The use of multiple sources and techniques in the data gathering process is a key strength of the case study method. Unlike other research designs, case studies employ a variety of data gathering techniques which ensure that the researcher gathers as much data as possible from a variety of informants.To employ a variety of data gathering techniques and reach a number of participants ensure the balance and representativity of data gathered. It also helps the researcher to cross-check

his/her findings and to see the same issue(s) from different perspectives. It confirms or challenges the findings of one method with those of another (Bell, 2009:116).

In case study research, the researcher determines in advance what evidence to gather and what analysis techniques to use with the data to answer the research questions and achieve the objectives of the study. Data gathering in case study research is largely qualitative, but it may also include quantitative data. This is true for this specific study. Case study research gathers data through tools like surveys, interviews, documentation reviews, observation, focus group discussions and questionnaires (Cohen & Manion, 1994; Mikkelsen, 1995; Becker, 1998; Silverman, 2000; Blaxter, Hughes & Tight, 2001; Leedy & Ormrod, 2005; Nieuwenhuis, 2007).

The case study method has been criticised for its dependence on a single case, which lead to the claim that case study research is incapable of providing a generalisable conclusion. However, researchers dispute this position by noting that it is not always the purpose or intent of case study research to provide a generalising conclusion. Some scholars argue that one can often generalise on the basis of a single case. Case studies may be central to scientific development via generalisation as supplement or alternative to other methods. These scholars argue that case studies can serve as a foundation for generalisation, especially when they are related to a theoretical framework. The framework may be adjusted or enhanced as case study results provide new results (Eckstein, 1975; Walton, 1992; Cohen & Manion, 1994; Mikkelsen, 1995; Becker, 1998; Silverman, 2000; Blaxter, Hughes & Tight, 2001; Leedy & Ormrod, 2005; Flyvbjerg, 2007; Gobo, 2007).

The afore-cited scholars indicate that the case study method allows the researcher to probe deeply and analyse the multifarious phenomena that constitute the life cycle of a single unit with a view to establish generalisations about the wider population to which that unit belongs. They note that sometimes researchers focus on a single case, because its uniqueness or exceptional qualities can promote understanding or inform practice for similar situations. In some cases researchers focus on two or more cases, which often differ in certain key ways, to make compare, build theory or

propose generalisations. In the analysis of data generated from case study research, an overall portrait of the case(s) is constructed and conclusions that may have implications beyond the specific case(s) are drawn (Eckstein, 1975; Walton, 1992; Mikkelsen, 1995; Becker, 1998; Silverman, 2000; Blaxter, Hughes &Tight, 2001; Leedy & Ormrod, 2005; Flyvbjerg, 2007; Gobo, 2007). This is also the case in this study where the selected primary schools in the districts, where official minority languages are spoken serve as a foundation for generalisation about the wider population to which these units belongs.

Scholars who argue that one can generalise from a single case study recognise that a case study is ideal for generalisation if the falsification test is used, a key component of critical reflexivity. Through falsification, if one observation does not fit with the proposition of the theory, the theory is considered invalid and must be revised or rejected. These scholars justify their position with the use of the vivid and rich imagery proposition that, 'All pigs are white.' They contend that just one observation of a single black pig will falsify the proposition that 'All pigs are black.' These scholars argue that the strategic choice of a case(s) significantly add to the generalisability of a case study or studies. They warn that generalisations from case studies must be handled with care, particularly when one single case is studied. Any generalisation is largely tentative and must be substantiated by other studies. Otherwise the case(s) should be related to a theoretical framework which may be revised as a case study or studies provide new evidence. They also indicate that the strategic choice of a case(s) adds to the generalisability thereof (Eckstein, 1975; Walton, 1992; Mikkelsen, 1995; Becker, 1998; Silverman, 2000; Blaxter, Hughes & Tight, 2001; Leedy & Ormrod, 2005; Flyvbjerg, 2007; Gobo, 2007).

Case study research aims to gain greater insight and understanding of the dynamics of a specific situation (Nieuwenhuis, 2007:76; Casanave, 2010:67). To justify the validity and necessity to focus on a single case, Hamalet (1994), cited in Nieuwenhuis (2007:76), indicates that focus on a single case as the object of study is like the concentration of the global in the local. Metaphors such as 'a dewdrop in which the world is reflected' have been used to describe a well selected case and to

justify the advantage of focusing on a single case. To focus on a single case helps the researcher to focus thoroughly on the subject of inquiry.

Part of the motivation to use an evaluative case study relates to the fact that, case study research helps limit the scope of the study. It helps the researcher to focus in detail on the case(s) of study and characterise individual cases, identifying their unique and common points to produce a rich and thick informative description of each which helps to make generalisations about other cases within the same area. Case studies explore, describe and analyse particular bounded phenomena and provide depth and detail. They ensure a generation of thick and extensive descriptions of the phenomenon under study (Cohen & Manion, 1994; Lodico, Spaulding & Voegtle, 2006; Holliday, 2010; Casanave, 2010). Language management is preoccupied with comprehensively understanding and explaining multilingual language policy implementation. To explain these dilemmas attendant to multilingual language policy implementation, language management depends on thick descriptions of linguistic and social phenomena (Mwaniki, 2004:270).

In view of the nature of the LMA method, a case study research usually is qualitative and has the ability to generate in-depth descriptions of a small number of cases. This helps to generate these thick descriptions that contribute to a holistic understanding of the dilemmas attendant to multilingual language policy implementation. Mikkelsen (1995:80) provides a valuable justification to focuse on a single case with his remark that the case study is, in many ways, ideally suited to the needs and resources of the small-scale researcher. It endorses a focus on just one example, or perhaps two or three.

Criticism against case studies is that the researcher may become so emotionally involved with the group that it may cloud judgement (Nieuwenhuis, 2007:77). There is no way that a researcher cannot become involved if he/she is to establish trust and rapport with the researched. Although it is important to draw a fine line on the extent to get involved, it is also difficult if research is on and for the participants. Jankie (2009:180) warns that research in the field of education, and other disciplines

concerned with the cause of social justice and human emancipation, cannot be regarded as a neutral enterprise.

Jankie (2009) argues that such research seeks to learn from, and contribute to socially constructed forms of knowledge. It may challenge the researcher's perceptions of the surrounding world. Qualitative research seeks to obtain an insider view of the phenomenon and get as close as possible to the participants of the research to collect resonant and fertile data. This calls for emotional involvement on the part of the researcher. Blaxter, Hughes and Tight (2001:73) note that case study data is drawn from people's experiences and practices and is realistic. Since case studies build on actual experiences and practices, they are linked to action research and their insights contribute to change practice. Case study research may be a subset of a broader action research project.

Based on the reasons for conducting policy monitoring studies indicated by Mouton (2001:571), this study evaluates the implementation process of the 2002 policy development in classroom practice to examine the dilemmas of its implementation. The target year for the implementation of the final phase of the policy statement passed and the policy statement objectives and outcomes were not achieved. Out of the six target languages, only one, Tonga emerged as the first to be examined. Why Tonga first? This evaluative case study evaluates the implementation of this policy statement against the stated policy statement objectives and envisaged outcomes. It seeks to establish the causes for the delay in implementation, examine the conditions and factors that contributed to the success story of Tonga and suggest possible ways to facilitate the implementation of the policy development in similar languages.

4.3 Qualitative and quantitative Research

Qualitative and quantitative researches differ, not only in the nature of the data and the subsequent methods to gather and analyse the data, but also in their philosophical rationale. Quantitative research is usually avoided in human sciences, because subjective human feelings and emotions are difficult or impossible to

quantify. Qualitative research takes more account of the ‘soft’, personal data. It is useful to construct the attitudes, beliefs and motivations within a subject. A researcher that does qualitative research will attempt to obtain an inside view of the phenomenon and get as close as possible to the participants of the research to collect resonant and fertile data. This will enable the development of a social construct through the dynamic process of research.

Qualitative research is an inquiry process of understanding in which a researcher develops a complex, holistic picture, analyse words, and report detailed views of informants and conduct the study in a natural setting. It is an attempt to establish how participants create meaning of a specific phenomenon. This is done by means of analysing their perceptions, attitudes, understanding, knowledge, values, feelings and experiences with the aim to approximate their construction of the phenomenon Qualitative research implies a direct concern with experience as ‘lived’, ‘felt’ or ‘undergone’. It focuses on exploration, in as much detail as possible, to seek to achieve ‘depth’ rather than ‘breath’. Research questions are general and broad and seek to understand participants’ experiences of a central phenomenon. In qualitative research, a researcher often approaches reality from a constructivist position which allows for multiple meanings of individual experiences (Walliman, 2001; Blaxter, Hughes & Tight, 2001; Babbie & Mouton, 2001; Mouton, 2001; Ivankova, Creswell & Clark, 2007; Nieuwenhuis, 2007; Holliday, 2010).

The research problem determines the kind of data needed to address the research problem and achieve the objectives of the study. It also determines the kind of analysis that will be appropriate to analyse the data. The reasons to choose particular data collection and analysis methods are determined by the nature of what the researcher wants to investigate, the particular characteristics of the research problem and the specific sources of information (Walliman, 2001; Blaxter, Hughes & Tight, 2001; Ivankova, Creswell & Clark, 2007; Casanave, 2010).

In this study, field research entailed seeking to construct all the possible explanations for the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development and the success

story of Tonga. It meant gathering data from as many and varied participants and sources as possible. As qualitative research, this study seeks to establish how participants create meaning from the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development and the success story of Tonga. This is done by analysing their perceptions, attitudes, understanding, knowledge, values, feelings and experiences to approximate the causes of the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development and the success story of Tonga.

This research adopted a qualitative approach to collect and analyse data to address the research problem, objectives and questions. Data gathered through documentary analysis, class observations, semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions were analysed qualitatively. Content analysis was used in an inductive and deductive approach to analyse qualitative data. The inductive approach was useful, because it allowed research findings to emerge from the frequent themes in the raw data without the limitations imposed by a deductive approach. This involved the examination of words and phrases in the interviews and focus group discussions data that related to language management variables, methodologies and strategies, seven areas of policy development, the vitality model and Webb's (2010) factors and conditions that determine the success or failure of bottom-up and top-down approaches. The study adopted conceptual or thematic analysis and coded the existence and frequency of occurrence of the causes of the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development. The same was done for the conditions and factors that led to the success story of Tonga.

Given that the deductive approach is criticised for obscuring or rendering key themes invisible, this study complemented it with an inductive approach to address what Nieuwenhuis (2007:99) calls the "blind" and "blank" spots which impact negatively on the trustworthiness of the study. This was also done to avoid clouding data analysis with preconceptions and biases. The deductive approach proved useful in testing and proving the research hypothesis of the study and the theory of the study in terms of its adequacy to explain the non-implementation dilemma of bottom-up multilingual language policies. Deductive codes were derived from the LMA, the seven areas of

policy development for language-in-education policy implementation, the vitality model, Webb's (2010) factors that determine the success and failure of bottom-up and top-down policies, Babbie and Mouton's (2001) conceptual model of social programmes and the reviewed literature.

The analytical frameworks and reviewed literature served as a source of reference for understanding and evaluating the implementation process of the 2002 policy development. They guided data collection and provided analytical categories for the analysis and interpretation of data. In the analysis of the language survey and learners' questionnaires, the researcher adopted a quantitative and qualitative approach.

4.4 Sampling

Sampling refers to the identification and selection of participants for the study from a selected target population. It is used to select a portion of the population for study. The major criteria to use to decide on a sample size is the type of study, time, the resources available to the researcher and the extent to which the selected sample is representative of the target population, (Bless & Higson-Smith, 2000; Nieuwenhuis, 2007; Flyvbjerg, 2007; Gobo, 2007). In this study these four factors were considered in deciding the sample size.

Qualitative research is based on non-probability and purposive sampling rather than probability or random sampling approaches. The sample size is small and is purposefully selected from individuals who have the most experience with the studied phenomenon. This is because the aim is to search for the richest possible data in qualitative research. In qualitative research, sampling decisions are made with the purpose to obtain the richest possible sources of information to answer the research questions and achieve the research objectives. Sampling in qualitative research is flexible and continues until there is data saturation (Bless & Higson-Smith, 2000; Lodico, Spaulding & Voegtle, 2006; Nieuwenhuis, 2007; Ivankova, Creswell & Clark, 2007; Holliday, 2010; Flyvbjerg, 2007; Gobo, 2007).

4.4.1 Purposive sampling

Participants for this study were selected using purposive sampling. Blaxter, Hughes and Tight (2001:161) define purposive sampling as a sampling method that involves handpicking supposedly typical or interesting cases. It selects participants of the study among a selected target population, because of some defining characteristics that make them the holders of the data needed for the study. The defining characteristics of the participants for this study are discussed below.

Pupils are the target population for which the 2002 policy development was and is intended. They are the principal participants of language management in the school domain, because their language practices and beliefs are to be modified or confirmed. Teachers are the implementers of the policy and are charged with the modification or confirmation of the learners' language practices and ideologies. School heads are also part of the management team that supervise teachers in the school domain.

District education officers are the middle level managers who are tasked with the responsibility to monitor and enforce the implementation of the policy. They are responsible for the deployment of teachers and communicate policy developments to schools. Curriculum and examination officers are the most relevant authorities on issues related to the curriculum, access, evaluation, methods and materials policy. Policy makers are the top managers in the school domain who oversee the formulation, implementation and evaluation of the policy. They are the funders of the policy since the Zimbabwean education system is centralised. More information about policy makers was also gathered from the participants in the study, because much about the policy makers' position can also be learnt from the grassroots level.

Parents are valuable sources of information on community policy and they are presumed to be the agents that led to the 2002 policy development through their language committees and associations. Parents are affected by the policy and are the speakers of the languages involved. Officials from the Zimbabwe Indigenous

Languages Promotion Association (ZIPLA) are the language activists who worked with the speakers of official minority languages and non-governmental organisations leading to the formulation of the 2002 policy development. Officials from language committees and associations of the languages in question are the language activists who lobbied government for the 2002 policy development.

Principals and lecturers in the United College of Education and the Joshua Mqabuko Polytechnic are charged with the responsibility to train teachers in official minority languages. These two colleges are the closest to the languages in question. Lecturers in the Departments of African Languages, Linguistics, Education and Curriculum Studies at the Great Zimbabwe University, University of Zimbabwe and Lupane State University were targeted, because tertiary institutions are strategic government institutions that can advance the language agenda through research and promotional activities. The Great Zimbabwe University is the closest to Venda speakers and already offers a degree in Venda. The University of Zimbabwe is the oldest and biggest university in the country. The Lupane State University is also the closest to all three languages in question. Makoni (2011:450) state that the participation of local universities in the promotion of minority languages is critically important. Citing Finlayson and Madiba (2002), Makoni (2011:450) asserts that local universities contribute to the intellectualisation of African languages.

African universities, research institutes and other institutions concerned with the study and the promotion of African languages, have a unique role to play in strengthening the roles that African languages play in the daily lives of Africans. National universities and related institutions are primary instruments for the practical promotion of African languages. They are able to promote African languages through critical promotional activities, such as the compilation of dictionaries, writing of teaching and learning materials, experimentation in pilot projects, corpus, acquisition and prestige planning (*The Addis Ababa Language Plan of Action for Africa*, 1986; Ngara, 1995; Chimhundu*, et al*., 1998; Bambgose, 1991; 2000; Strubell, 2001; Webb, 2002; Harford, 2011; Batibo, 2005; Nkomo, 2008).

Tertiary and higher education institutions make a crucial contribution in the development of African languages through training of language teachers, lecturers, writers, curriculum experts, language experts, such as linguists, lexicographers, terminologists, editors, translators and interpreters. Through research articles, book chapters, books, conference papers, dissertation and theses, researchers, lecturers and students contribute significantly to language acquisition planning, language documentation and development. Tertiary and higher education institutions have an advisory, consultative and advocacy role in a nation on language-in-education policy issues. Language experts in tertiary and higher education institutions are able to serve as advisors, consultants and advocates on language-in-education policies (*The Language Plan of Action for Africa*, 1986; Chimhundu, *et al*., 1998; Strubell, 2001; Webb, 2002; Harford, 2011; Batibo, 2005; Nkomo, 2008).

Researchers in the African Languages Research Institute (ALRI) are responsible for language development and documentation and training of language experts and technical skills development. Given the mission statement of the ALRI of being an institute that aims to research, document and develop Zimbabwean indigenous languages to promote and expand their use in all spheres of life, the lexicographic work of the ALRI is therefore significant in developing local languages as media of instruction. Masuku and Ndhlovu (2007:341) perceive the ALRI's mandate as an institute that should prepare local languages for wider socio-economic and cultural functions in Zimbabwe.

To share similar sentiments with Masuku and Ndhlovu (2009:342), the interplay between lexicography, the school curriculum and its subsequent link to the language of instruction in education systems cannot be over-emphasized. To emphasize the central role of lexicography in education, Masuku and Ndhlovu (2007:341) note that it is the missing piece in, and possible solution to, the puzzle of the successful use of African languages as media of instruction in African education systems. The compilation of lexicographic reference works is a necessary prerequisite for the successful use of African languages as media of instruction in schools. The development of reference works in the form of orthographies, scientific and technical

terms as well as the compilation of dictionaries is a solid foundation for the successful and effective use of local languages in education.

In an elaboration of the close-knit relationship between lexicography and education, Masuku and Ndhlovu (2007:347) state that any language can be used as a language of instruction, provided that it has a recognised orthography and its structure has been described. For a language to be a subject and suitable for use as a medium of instruction for teaching and learning in technical and scientific subjects, there has to be stages of fundamental and applied research. There needs to be experimentation in term creation that leads to standardisation and elaboration of terms used in technical scientific subjects. Unless this is done, the language will not develop and will be less fit as an academic tool (Brock-Utne, 1993:30). The documentation of African languages makes them functional.

Masuku and Ndhlovu (2009:245) indicate that vocabulary acquisition is important in all language teaching and language enhancement initiatives. It is even more important in the use of these languages as media of instruction in schools. Teachers have to help their students to accumulate and enrich their vocabulary in the language of instruction and those taught as subjects. Dictionaries are useful and reliable tools and sources for increasing and enhancing vocabulary growth in a particular language. This increases the ability to use the language with confidence and with relative ease, as well as to better the simplicity and comprehension of certain concepts. Dictionaries create conducive linguistic environments for decisive changes in education policies to be initiated as policy makers would be taking these decisions from an informed position. Lexicographic activities have the necessary impact or influence needed in the formulation of national policies to be followed in the development and raising of the status of the languages involved (Ngara, 1982; Chabata, 2007; Masuku & Ndhlovu, 2007).

Corpus planning activities capacitate local languages to serve as media of instruction in schools. They increase their prestige and visibility as well as their institutional and functional status. These corpus activities also create prospective language-related

career opportunities for speakers of these languages. These opportunities serve as incentives to teach these languages and major in them.

In their review of the research activities of the ALRI, Masuku and Ndhlovu (2007) as well as Chabata (2007) credit the ALRI for addressing the language of instruction dilemma in Zimbabwe, and for taking lexicography beyond its traditional task of dictionary-making into the realm of language planning and development. They note that the various lexicographic projects in Zimbabwean indigenous languages paid close attention to the demands of the schools and higher education curricula. They substantiate their claim by noting that the compilation and planning of various dictionaries that cover terms used in different disciplines offered in Zimbabwean schools, colleges and universities is testimony of this success. They argue that research activities in the national languages have truly catered for the demands of the schools and higher education curricula.

Publishers are key stakeholders to language-in-education policy planning and implementation. They play a critical role as suppliers of teaching and learning materials. They play a leading role to ensure the availability of teaching and learning materials in all languages included in the school curriculum, either as subjects or as media of instruction. According to *The 1996 National Cultural Policy of Zimbabwe*, the publishing industry plays a critical role in the development and promotion of indigenous languages. The policy stipulates that:

> The publishing industry has a key role in the development and promotion of culture, and will therefore be assisted in order to become an efficient institution for intellectual, scientific and cultural progress of the nation. Government will, in partnership with local publishers, promote local literary and scientific publications including those in indigenous languages. Government will upgrade the existing Literature Bureau into a full-fledged Publishing House and will support all efforts aimed at publishing at a price affordable to the majority of the people.

Non-governmental organisations are also key stakeholders in language-in-education policy planning and implementation. They support human and civil rights, which include linguistic human rights and educational linguistic human rights. Their main influence is in spreading and supporting beliefs about diversity, multilingualism and human or civil rights that can bolster the campaigns of language activists to persuade

their national governments to adopt policies that guarantee the respect of linguistic human rights. They influence beliefs and ideologies more than practices in language planning, management and policy (Spolsky, 2009:224). Spolsky (2009:206) describes non-governmental organisations as activist groups outside or within the national group. Non-governmental organisations also play a key role on issues related to development oriented methodologies and strategies of the LMA. They facilitate development communication, participatory action research, advocacy, indigenisation, conceptual skills development, litigation, legislation, dialogical intervention strategies and project management. They also provide technical and financial support.

All the selected participants are either part of the programme management system, human resource base or stakeholders that have a direct or indirect bearing on the success or failure of the policy. The choice of these participants is partly informed by Babbie and Mouton's (2001) conceptual model of social programmes which identify goals, target groups, measurable outcomes/critical success factors/benefits, programmes components, management systems, human resource base, stakeholders and context as the key sources of information in evaluating a policy. The components of this model overlap extensively with the theories adopted in this study.

4.4.2 Purposive sampling: Schools

Purposive sampling decisions are not restricted to the selection of participants, but it also involves the settings, incidents, events and activities to be included for data collection (Nieuwenhuis, 2007:79). Field research was carried out in the districts where official minority languages are predominantly spoken. Tonga is predominantly spoken in the Binga district, Venda in Beitbridge and Kalanga in Bulilima and Mangwe[1]. Valuable insights were also gained from Nambya, Sotho and Shangani speakers whose languages were introduced into the curriculum beyond grade 3 level

[1] Bulilima and Mangwe districts were initially one district, Bulilimamangwe.

by the 2002 policy development. These languages are also official minority languages, just like the languages in question.

To ensure the representation of all the grades, these grades were grouped into three categories. They are infant phase: Grades 1-3; the intermediate or transitional phase: Grades 4-5 and the final phase: Grades 6-7. One grade from each category was chosen for class observations to represent all the grades in each category. This approach helped the researcher to focus in depth on each phase or level of primary education to understand the implementation process in terms of where it was at the time of the research and when implementation reached each phase. The *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002 and* the *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002* stipulate that the teaching of official minority languages as subjects and languages of instructions would be introduced to a grade per year until these languages were taught and examined in grade 7. The phases are tabulated underneath.

Figure 1: Timeframes for the implementation of the 2002 policy development

Grade	**Year**
Grade 3	Already in place by 2001
Grade 4	January 2002
Grade 5	January 2003
Grade 6	January 2004
Grade 7	January 2005

(*Ministry of Education, Sports, Arts and Culture, Secretary's Circular, No. 1 of 2002* and the *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002*)

The sampling of the selected schools was done using purposive sampling which consisted of detecting cases within extreme situations, specifically for certain characteristics or cases within a wide range of situations. The reason therefore was to maximise variation and include all the possible linguistic situations that are likely to affect the implementation process. The choice of the three schools was based on three major factors, namely, linguistic homogeneity, linguistic heterogeneity and linguistic fragmentation. The context, in which the policy is implemented, is decisive for its failure or success. One primary school in each district in a rural area, where

each of the selected languages is predominantly spoken, was selected. One primary school in an urban centre, in the oldest high density suburb in each district, was chosen where each of the selected languages is spoken. I chose a school in the oldest high density suburb, because it is usually where the locals of the district are concentrated and where their children learn. Finally, one primary school in each district in a linguistically mixed or fragmented rural area, where each of the selected languages is spoken, was chosen.

Linguistically mixed or fragmented schools in urban areas are more likely to be associated with integrative language contact. Linguistically mixed schools in rural areas are most likely to maintain interactive language contact, although in cases where the subordinate language group has low ethnolinguistic vitality, integrative and expansive language contact occurs. These types of language contacts in mixed linguistic communities present unique challenges to mother tongue education policies, and hence warrant separate treatment.

Schools in communal areas that predominantly speak the concerned official minority language are the schools where the policy statement is most urgently needed and most easily operationalised. In these schools, most of the children are monolingual when they start school and their classes are largely linguistically homogeneous. It is urgent, necessary and easy to implement mother tongue education policies there. In areas of extreme linguistic fragmentation or linguistic heterogeneity in the composition of the school and class populations, creative classroom organisation is required to effectively implement a policy like the one in question. In some cases the population of the speakers of the target language may be too small to support the use of a language as a medium of instruction. Students have to be in linguistically homogeneous groups for mother language arts instruction (Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; Skutnabb-Kangas & García, 1995; García, 1997; Siemienski, 1997; Henrard, 2003; Benson, 2005; Trudell, 2006).

The *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002* and the *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002* state that official minority languages have to be taught as mother tongue in

areas where they are spoken. In view of linguistic homogeneity, heterogeneity, fragmentation and the policy stipulations, the question is raised if all the schools, in areas where these languages are spoken, are best suitable to implement the 2002 policy development. To what extent can the linguistic profiles of these schools be some of the causes of the delay in the implementation process of the policy development?

4.5 Data gathering techniques

Primary research methods focus on participants involved in language planning, policy and management in the school domain to corroborate data gathered from each group of participants and through different techniques. The different participants in the school domain were involved to gain a deeper and balanced understanding of the causes of the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development and to examine the conditions and factors that contributed to the success story of Tonga. Data for this study were gathered through semi-structured interviews, non-participant class observations, focus group discussions, learners' and language survey questionnaires and documentary analysis. A review of secondary sources was also done. The use of a combination of these data gathering techniques complement the data gathered through different methods and from different participants to ensure that the researcher obtain rich data which is impossible to obtain through one method.

The use of a multi-method approach helped the researcher to validate and cross-check his findings and to confirm or challenge the findings with regard to those of others. The multi-method, which is also known as triangulation, ensures cross-checking the existence of certain phenomena and the veracity of individual accounts by gathering data from a number of informants and sources and subsequently comparing and contrasting one account with another to produce a comprehensive and balanced a study (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005; Lodico, Spaulding & Voegtle, 2006; Nieuwenhuis, 2007; Gobo, 2007; Flyvbjerg, 2007; Bell, 2009).

Questions used during the different data gathering techniques were derived from the analytical frameworks of the study. These frameworks guided and informed data collection and analysis. Deriving questions used in the different data gathering techniques from the language management variables, methodologies and strategies helped the researcher to establish whether the optimal set of language management variables, methodologies and strategies were secured for the implementation of the 2002 policy development. It also helped the researcher to ascertain whether the seven areas of policy development, which need to be examined as part of any language-in-education policy implementation program, were given the attention they deserve in the implementation of the 2002 policy development.

Giles, Bourhis and Taylor's (1977) vitality model helped to assess how the vitality of the language groups in question contributed to the delay in the implementation of the policy development and success story of Tonga. Webb's (2010) factors and conditions that determine the success and failure of top-down and bottom-up approaches helped to establish how these factors and conditions contributed to the delay or success story of Tonga. Babbie and Mouton's (2001) conceptual model of social programmes proved useful in examining how the core dimensions that characterise all interventions contributed to the delay in the implementation of the policy development and success story of Tonga.

4.5.1 Documentary analysis

It focused on all types of written communication that may shed light on the formulation and implementation of the 2002 policy development. Documentary analysis involved the analysis of documentary sources, which shed light on the language-in-education policy and material relevant to a particular set of policy decisions in the Zimbabwean language-in-education policy, generally and specifically for the 2002 Policy development. These documents included sources, such as policy documents, acts, the Constitution of Zimbabwe, statutory instruments, language-in-education policy circulars, curriculum policies, school timetables, annual grade 7 public examination pass rate reports, grade 7 public examinations results slips,

annual school enrolment reports, pupils' progress school reports, scheme books, marks schedules, class attendance registers, newspapers articles and oral submissions from official minority language speakers.

These documents were analysed to establish pupils' linguistic profiles, whether official minority languages are taught in the schools, to examine the speakers' views on the teaching and learning of official minority languages and to examine public and political debates on the formulation and implementation of the policy statement. This involved content and textual analysis of the documentary sources which shed light on the language-in-education policy and material relevant to a particular set of policy decisions in the Zimbabwean language-in-education policy, generally and specifically the 2002 policy development.

Some of the key documents that the researcher analysed are the*1999 Report of the Nziramasanga Commission of Inquiry into Education and Training in Zimbabwe;* The *1979 Constitution of Zimbabwe;* The *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006; The 1996 National Cultural Policy of Zimbabwe;* The*1997 Position Paper on Zimbabwe's Language Policy;* The *1998 Report on the Formulation of a National Language Policy: National Language Policy Advisory Panel Report;* The *Secretary's Circular No. 1 of 2002: Policy Regarding Language Teaching and Learning;* The *Secretary's Circular No. 3 of 2002: Curriculum Policy: Primary and Secondary Schools;* The *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007: Policy Guidelines on the Teaching of Local Languages in Primary and Secondary Schools in Zimbabwe; Re: Response to the Binga Chiefs' Concern on the Teaching of Languages* and the *Zimbabwe School Examinations Council's Examinations Circular Number 2 of 2011*. All these are documented policy enunciations wherein the Zimbabwean language policy and language-in-education policy are enshrined and can be inferred from.

Current research on language-in-education policies is informed by critical thinking that focus on how language-in-education policies create inequalities among learners. How do language-in-education policies marginalise some learners while granting privileges to others? How do language-in-education policies serve the interests of

dominant groups within society? How can linguistic minorities further their interests with attempts to change language-in-education policy? (Tollefson, 2002b:3). This approach to language-in-education policy studies emphasizes the need to understand language-in-education policies in connection with broad social, political and economic forces that shape not only education, but social life in general (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Tollefson, 1991; 2002a; 2006; Tsui & Tollefson, 2004).

Critical scholars perceive themselves as social activists. Their responsibility is not only to understand how dominant social groups use language to establish and maintain social hierarchies, but it also investigates ways to alter those hierarchies. Critical scholars have social and political roles for social justice and human emancipation (Forester, 1985:13). Critical thinking also entails that scholars and students in language-in-education policy studies should develop the ability to critically "read" language-in-education policies. This implies understanding the social and political implications of particular language-in-education policies adopted in specific historical contexts (Tollefson, 2002b:4; Tsui & Tollefson, 2004:1-2). Tollefson (2002b:4) states that the critical perspective to language-in-education policies aggressively investigates how language policies affect the lives of individual and groups who often have little, or no, influence over the policy making process.

Since the 1990s, a revival of interest in language-in-education policy studies led to a growing awareness that language-in-education policies have a considerable impact, not only on the school performance of students and the daily work of teachers, but also on various forms of socio-economic, linguistic and political (in) equalities (Tollefson, 1991:1-2; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004a:vii). This led to the rise of critical scholars who are concerned with how language-in-education policies determine social, linguistic, economic and political (in) equalities. This then explains the use of critical discourse analysis in examining how the language provisions of the selected policy documents contribute to the delay in the teaching of official minority languages in Zimbabwe.

Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth, CDA) was used as an analytic and interpretive framework. The researcher, through textual and content analysis of language policy documents which enshrine the Zimbabwean language-in-education policy, explore how policy documents contribute or do not to the delay in the implementation process of the 2002 policy statements. CDA ties and relates well with critical theory, one of the constituent theories of the LMA. It is an essential method of the LMA (Mwaniki, 2012; 27-29). Mwaniki (2012:28) notes that discourse analysis and CDA are essential methods in language management, because they are useful tools to examine and point out how texts, discursive and socio-cultural practices integral, to multilingual language policy, planning and implementation, predict different kinds of actions and identities.

Lo Bianco (2009:113) observes that in language policies, power, politics, ideologies and status differentials are played out in texts. The CDA demonstrates that public texts, such as language policy documents, often carry agendas they conceal. Language policies are ideologically laden and clouded by political ideology and also reflect the ideologies of those who control them. They do not stand alone, but they are connected to political, social and economic dimensions. Language-in-education policies are a form of imposition and manipulation of language policy used by those in authority to implement ideology or turn practice into ideology through formal education. In this regard, language-in-education policies create, perpetuate and sustain systems of social and linguistic inequality, and policy makers usually promote their interests through such policies. Language policies are therefore governmental strategies meant, mostly consciously to promote and entrench the interests of specific classes and other social groups (Paulston, 1988; Schiffman, 1996; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Verhoeven, 1997; Shohamy, 2006; Tollefson, 1991; 2002a; 2004; 2006; Shameem, 2004; Ferguson, 2006; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004a; Pelinka, 2007; Lo Bianco, 2009; Spolsky, 2009; Abdelhay, Makoni & Makoni, 2011; Alexander, 2012a; Novak-Lukanovič & Limon, 2012).

The choice of a language of instruction is bound up with matters of wider relationships which express overt or covert domination of one group over the other.

There are policies that have a false front, publicly declaring that a particular language can be used for purpose *a* and purpose *b*, but concealing another reality, sometimes even contradicting with that reality (Schiffman, 1996; Shohamy, 2006). In this light, an understanding of language policies, without an evaluation of the background from which they arise, is probably futile; if not simply trivial (Schiffman, 1996; Tollefson, 1991; 2002b; 2006; Shohamy, 2006).

Abdelhay, Makoni and Makoni (2011:2) submit that more often, language policy documents conceal inequality. Citing Phillip and Jørgensen (2001:1), they further contend that the language of policy documents is never neutral. The diction used reflects a particular way of talking about and perceiving the world or any aspect of it. Language indices and expresses power; it is involved where there are power struggles and a challenge to power. Language is a useful instrument for establishing, maintaining, perpetuating and entrenching power. It is also useful in challenging, subverting and altering distributions of power. It provides a finely articulated vehicle for difference in power in hierarchical social structures. Language is a medium of domination and social force. It serves to legitimate power relations and it is ideological (Habermas, 1967: 259 cited in Wodak, 2007:187).

CDA methodology analyses texts to examine, identify and indicate the discursive sources of power, dominance, inequality and bias and how these are initiated, sustained and reproduced across time and contexts. In texts, discursive differences are negotiated and they are governed by differences in power. Consequently, texts are often used as sites of struggle and they often reflect traces of differing discourses and ideologies contending and struggling for dominance. In this regard, CDA becomes a useful tool in examining the structural relationships of dominance, hegemony, discrimination, exclusion, power and control as embedded and manifested in language. It helps in examining covert and overt ways of assimilating and annihilating linguistic minorities. CDA helps to critically investigate social and linguistic inequalities as they are expressed, constituted and legitimised by language use (Fairclough, 1995; Fairclough and Wodak, 1997; Wodak, 2007; Lo Bianco, 2009; Abdelhay, Makoni & Makoni, 2011; Makoni, 2011).

Discursive practices have major ideological effects which produce, reproduce, maintain, perpetuate, entrench and sustain unequal power relations between social classes, ethnolinguistic majorities and minorities by means of the ways in which they represent elements and position people. Discourse sustains, produce, maintain, perpetuate and reproduce the social or linguistic *status quo* and at the same time it can transform it (Fairclough, 1995; Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; Tollefson, 1991; 2002a; 2006; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004a; Wodak, 2007; Lo Bianco, 2009; Abdelhay, Makoni & Makoni, 2011). In this regard, CDA can yield valuable information related to the policy makers' language ideologies. According to Abdelhay, Makoni & Makoni (2011:2), in language policies, languages are very often accorded different statuses and even listed in a particular order which cannot be justified by the need to list them alphabetically. Some languages acquire dominant status while others are marginalised in the process. For example, some languages are referred to as official, national, minority, official minority, major, main, compulsory and optional languages.

Arising from differential function, status and prestige, some languages become dominant and acquire higher status, while others are marginalised. Languages begin to enjoy greater recognition and subsequent protection by the state by virtue of the status assigned to them. Languages other than the languages chosen for government and education take a low status in the eyes of the nation's citizens and are denigrated as inferior. The threat of language shift, accommodation, diglossia and death hangs over languages which have an unenviable concentration of status-poor, officially inconsequential and functionally emaciated languages. In Africa the very presence of ex-colonial languages and dominant African national languages and the disproportional status and prestige associated with them is a major threat to minority languages which are functionally insignificant by comparison (Paulston, 1988; 1994; Bamgbose, 1991; 2000; 2007; Adegbija, 2001; Hinton, 2001; May, 2001; 2006; Ongarora, 2002; Batibo, 2004; 2005; 2009a; 2009b; Bagwasi, 2009; Ndhlovu, 2008a; 2008b; 2009; Nkomo, 2008; Ndlovu, 2011).

Since language policies are examples of the language(s) of politics, a nuanced understanding and analysis of language policies requires detailed, textual analysis.

Language policy ideologies are sought from political discourses underwriting specific patterns of language use. For example, the use of passivisation, euphemism or metaphors or the organisation of the text to foreground or background certain information is based on effecting specific agendas (Fairclough 1995; Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; Joseph, 2006; Wodak, 2007; Pelinka, 2007; Ndhlovu, 2008a; 2009; Lo Bianco, 2009; Abdelhay, Makoni & Makoni, 2011; Makoni, 2011). The social inequalities and differences in statuses of languages and the hierarchical ordering of languages beyond the alphabetical ordering justification created, perpetuated and sustained by language policies are useful in understanding and explaining the non-implementation dilemma bedeviling multilingual language-in-education policies.

Joseph (2006:46; 49) notes that, if language and politics were a country, education would be its capital, the great centralised and centralising metropolis that everyone passes through, from which the country is run and where its future course is determined. Education is at the centre of whatever language and politics debate that arises. It is through education that social classes, language and national identity are created, maintained, perpetuated, entrenched, performed, reflected and above all reproduced (Eastman, 1983; Tollefson, 1991; 2002a; Corson, 1993; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; May, 2001; 2006; Hailemariam, 2002; Tollefson & Tsui, 2004a; Fishman, 2006; Shohamy, 2006; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2006; Paulston & Hiedemann, 2006; Ferguson, 2006; Rassol, 2007; Ndhlovu, 2008a; 2008b; 2009; Nkomo, 2008; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh, 2010). Language policies therefore make the linkage between language and politics more precise, and language policies and politics mutually influence each other by facilitating or redressing inequality (Pelinka, 2007).

Gee (2011:10) states that language is political and any language use derives its meaning from what Gee calls the ‘games’ or the practice of which it is part or used. Consequently, Gee argues that any full description of any use of language has to deal with ‘politics’. CDA is therefore a valuable tool in researching language in relation to power and ideology because ideologies are produced, expressed, perpetuated, sustained and reproduced in texts and discourse. In this regard, CDA of

language policy documents further helps expose the policy makers' political will, an essential ingredient in policy implementation. A close analysis of language policy documents that enshrine the Zimbabwean language-in-education policy through CDA helps explain the causes of the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development.

The adoption of CDA as an analytic and interpretive framework for documentary analysis therefore stems from the realisation that power, politics, ideology and status differentials are deeply and inextricably embedded in language policy documents, and CDA proves to be useful in explaining the non-implementation dilemma bedevilling multilingual language-in-education policies. Content analysis of these documents yielded valuable public and political information on the formulation and implementation of the policy statement. It revealed the discursive sources of power, hegemony, dominance and inequality of the Zimbabwean languages. It also reflected how these sources are initiated, perpetuated, maintained, entrenched and reproduced in the analysed policy documents. Moreover, this analysis made clear how the dominant language groups create policies that favour their interests and uncovered the hidden agendas concealed in the policies.

Describing language policies of African countries, Bamgbose (1991; 2000) notes that language policies of African countries are characterised by one or more of the following problems: avoidance, vagueness, arbitrariness, fluctuation and declaration without implementation. This assertion informed me in my analysis of the selected policy documents and in examining the causes of the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development. The selected policy documents served to corroborate the evidence from other sources and to further examine the formulation and implementation process of the 2002 policy development.

Documentary analysis is a relatively unobtrusive form of research, which does not necessarily require the researcher to approach respondents directly. Rather, the researcher can trace the respondents' steps, actions, agendas and ideologies through the documents that they left behind. Documentary analysis is particularly

useful when access to the informants of the research is difficult or impossible, especially in cases where the staff members no longer belong to the organisation being investigated. In this case, documentary analysis can prove to be an extremely useful alternative source of data, especially given the changes in the personnel of the ministry under study. Documentary analysis also has the advantage of providing an opportunity for researchers to study trends over time. They are also useful for determining value, interest, positions, political climate, public attitude and historical sequences. When conceptualised as a complement to the use of other methods, documentary analysis has considerable general usefulness (Johnson, 1984:23; Robson, 1993; Blaxter, Hughes & Tight, 2001).

In this study, documentary analysis proved to be an extremely valuable alternative source of data given that some of the policy makers in the ministry of education, sports, arts and culture are no longer in this ministry because their term of office ended. For example, the person who was the minister of education, sports, arts and culture when the policy was formulated and declared is no longer with this ministry. And since the formulation and declaration of the 2002 policy development there have been several changes in the permanent secretaries and key staffs in the ministry.

4.5.2 Observation

Observation varies according to the researcher's interests. In some instances a researcher will have little, or no, interaction with those that he or she is observing. Sometimes, due to the demands of the research, the researcher may become immersed in the situation that he or she observes. He or she may become part of the participants and live with them and like them. Observations allow for flexibility where the researcher can take advantage of unforeseen data sources as they surface. In this case, the nature of the research require little or no interaction between him or her and those he or she is observing since he intends to observe what actually happens in classroom practice. Observation can be participant or non-participant or structured or unstructured, disclosed or undisclosed (Blaxter, Hughes & Tight, 2001; Walliman,

2001; Leedy & Ormrod, 2005; Nieuwenhuis, 2007; Angrosino, 2007; Rugg & Petre, 2007; Davies, 2007; Bell, 2009).

4.5.2.1 Disclosed vs undisclosed observation

Disclosed observation refers to a case where participants know that they are being observed, and undisclosed observation is where the participants are not aware that they are being observed. Disclosed and undisclosed observation can be done with the researcher being active among the participants, i.e. being both a researcher and a participant or with the researcher being a passive; if reflective observer of a chosen subject area. Due to research ethical considerations, researchers seem to agree that undisclosed observation raises serious ethical concerns when those being observed have not granted consent to being observed or when they are not aware that they are, in fact, being observed (Nieuwenhuis, 2007; Angrosino, 2007; Rugg & Petre, 2007; Davies, 2007; Bell, 2009).

However, in researches that involve crime investigations undisclosed observation works and is highly recommended, but for academic researches like this one, it is usually un-ethical to adopt undisclosed observation. Due to ethical considerations, the researcher in this study disclosed his status as a researcher to the participants to be observed and clearly revealed the purpose of the research.

4.5.2.2 Participant observation

Participant observation refers to a situation whereby the researcher becomes part of the research process and works with the participants in the situation to design and develop intervention strategies. This type of an approach is commonly used in action research projects and participatory action research. A participant observation method entails that the researcher becomes a participant in the situation that is observed and may intervene in the dynamics of the situation or even try to alter it. The researcher thus immerses him/herself in a chosen setting to gain an insider perspective of that setting. The researcher gets completely immersed in the setting to such an extent that someone who does not know will think he/she is not a researcher, unless told.

This is commonly used in some ethnographic studies (Blaxter, Hughes & Tight, 2001; Walliman, 2001; Nieuwenhuis, 2007; Angrosino, 2007; Rugg and Petre, 2007; Davies, 2007; Bell, 2009).

4.5.2.3 Non-participant observation

Nieuwenhuis (2007:83-84) defines non-participant observation as the systematic process of recording the behavioural patterns of participants, objects and occurrences without necessarily questioning or communicating with them. It is an everyday activity whereby researchers use their senses of seeing, hearing, touching, smelling, tasting and intuition and introspection to gather data. According to Walliman (2001:241) non-participant observation is a method of recording conditions and events and activities through the non-inquisitorial involvement of the researcher. Non-participant observation refers to a situation where the researcher is a complete observer looking at the situation from a distance, i.e. from the outsider's perspective. Non-participant observation is the least obstructive form of observation. It can record whether people act differently to what they say or intend. People can sometimes demonstrate their understanding of a process better by their actions than by verbally explaining their knowledge (Blaxter, Hughes & Tight, 2001; Walliman, 2001; Nieuwenhuis, 2007; Angrosino, 2007; Rugg & Petre, 2007; Davies, 2007; Bell, 2009).

Rugg and Petre (2007:110) note that non-participant observation shows the researcher something without the filtering effect of language. The researcher sees how something actually happens, including all sorts of things that are so familiar to the respondents that they would never think of mentioning them in an interview. It is useful for working out what the respondents really do often or rarely, as opposed to what they claim they do. They can reveal characteristics of groups or individuals which would have been impossible to discover by other means. For example, interviews reveal how people perceive what happens, not necessarily what actually happens. Non-participant observations are therefore useful in discovering whether people do what they say they do or behave in the way they claim to behave (Bell, 2009:184).

As a qualitative data gathering technique, non-participant observation is used to enable the researcher to gain deeper insights and understanding of the phenomenon being observed. It is an essential data gathering technique because it holds the possibility of providing the researcher with an insider perspective of the group dynamics and behaviours in different settings. It allows one to hear, see and begin to experience reality as participants do. As a researcher one learns through personal experience, i.e. through observation and reflection (which is part of the interim data analysis) how the setting is socially constructed in terms of discourse and language, communication lines and power (Nieuwenhuis, 2007:84).

As the researcher gets involved in observation, he/she builds a relationship with the participants in the setting, thus enabling him/her to employ other data gathering techniques with greater ease. Observation can be useful for getting a general understanding of the domain as part of the researcher's initial familiarisation (Rugg and Petre, 2007:113). Offering good observation practices, Nieuwenhuis (2007:84) stresses that during the initial phases of the observation process the researcher ought to adopt a relatively passive role. He/she must never seek the required data aggressively at the start of the process and must not induce behaviour for the purposes of his/her data collection. Nieuwenhuis further notes that it is good for the researcher to observe events as they occur in the natural setting. As he/she gets immersed in the setting, participants often use him/her as a confidant to share their problems and concerns with.

The researcher must remain in his role, and for example not become a therapist in the study. He or she has to always protect any participant's integrity and anonymity. He/she must explore how participants normally deal with the situation, and be frank and truthful about his/her role as an observer. As the researcher observes the situation he/she must learn the discourse and language that participants use and use that discourse and language when conducting interviews.

4.5.2.4 Structured observation

In this study, the researcher adopted the disclosed non-participant structured observation method which according to Blaxter, Hughes and Tight (2001:176) is the most useful for monitoring classroom events. Structured observations require an observer to assign observed events into previously defined categories. These events are recorded and coded simultaneously while present in the classroom. Structured observations involve three stages, namely, the recording of the events in a systematic manner as they happen; the coding of these events into pre-specified categories and finally subsequent analysis of the events to give descriptions of the observed events and activities.

In this study, the researcher focused on language use in the classroom, i.e. the language of instruction for Content subjects, timetable, charts, teaching materials and learning aids and learners' participation. I also checked the teachers' plan and scheme books, records of marks, pupils' exercise books and progress reports. These aforementioned variables were observed to identify the languages used for teaching and learning in the classroom as well as those that are taught as subjects. This was done to examine the implementation of the 2002 policy development in classroom practice, i.e. whether official minority languages are used as languages of instruction and taught as subjects.

Pre-categorising and structuring one's observations can reduce the time commitment dramatically and help the researcher focus on the very issues that he/she wants to observe. However, structured observations have been criticised for risking losing both detail and flexibility. The data provides snapshots of limited periods of time, especially with regards to language use in the classroom, and as such conclusions drawn are tentative and at best can be indicative rather than conclusive (Harbon & Shen, 2010:280). In order to address this challenge the researcher developed the observation sheet prior to the fieldwork and tested it in a pilot study to ensure that issues that might have been missed were identified prior to the main data collection. The researcher addressed this limitation of non-participant, structured class

observations with documentary analysis, the questionnaire method and through semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions.

Class observations sought to elicit information related to the curriculum, materials and evaluation policy as well as educational and socio-cultural variables. Information related to these two variables can also shed light on issues related to the other variables, methodologies and strategies of the LMA. One infant class, one intermediate class and the last grade were observed in session to get a balanced picture of the implementation of the 2002 policy development in classroom practice. All the events observed throughout the period of observation were documented in the observation schedule and also recorded for later listening and evaluation. These observations provided findings which were triangulated with the interview, questionnaires and focus group discussions data to increase the validity of the data, findings and conclusions.

4.6 Questionnaires

Questionnaires are one of the most widely used social research techniques. A questionnaire enables the researcher to organise the questions and receive replies without actually having to talk to every respondent. Questionnaires are a relatively economic method of gathering data in terms of cost and time of soliciting data from a large number of people. Time for checking facts and pondering on the questions can also be taken by respondents which tend to lead to more accurate information (Walliman, 2001:236-237; Wagner, 2010:26). Questionnaires can be delivered personally and by post or email or through research assistants. Postal and email surveys are likely to have lower response rates and possibly poorer answers because the respondents have no one available to answer any queries; but they may allow a larger number of people to be surveyed.

Postal and email surveys are useful in cases where the postal services are affordable, reliable and fast and where the participants have access to the internet and are computer literate. Delivering the questionnaires personally helps

respondents to overcome difficulties with questions that might need clarification, but such concerns should be minimised to ensure that the questionnaire is as user-friendly and accessible as possible and can be completed without the help of the researcher. Delivering questionnaires in person also offer the possibility of checking on responses if they seem incomplete or odd and generally leads to a higher response rate and better results (Blaxter, Hughes & Tight, 2001:179; Wagner, 2010:30). Considering that in this study these questionnaires are intended for primary school learners, delivering them in person was a necessity to help learners with possible challenges.

While questionnaires are relatively cheap and effective in preventing the personality of the interviewer having effects on the results, they do have certain limitations. They are not suitable for questions which require probing to obtain adequate information, as they should only contain simple, one-stage questions and are often affected by space constrains. The data obtained from questionnaire is mainly a superficial assessment of complex constructs such as language ideologies which need to be further unpacked and complemented with interviews and focus group discussions which provide rich and in-depth data (Wagner, 2010:26). Questionnaires are also associated with problems of failing to gain the required response from the complete sample because the questionnaires tend to be returned by the more literate sections of the population (Walliman, 2001:238). Bearing in mind these limitations of the questionnaire method, the researcher therefore complimented the questionnaire method with documentary analysis, class observations, focused group discussions and semi-structured interviews.

Questionnaires were distributed to learners in grade 6 and 7 in each of the selected primary schools in the selected districts. Grade 6 and 7 pupils were chosen to complete the questionnaire, because they now have a rich experience of the curriculum that enables them to respond adequately to the questionnaire and they are more literate to complete a questionnaire. They have been in the curriculum long enough to respond to the questions and are able to provide reliable information. The questions focused on educational variables, management variables and socio-

cultural variables as well as management and sociolinguistic oriented methodologies and strategies of the LMA as well as the seven areas of policy development in language-in-education policy implementation.

Through these questionnaires the researcher sought to establish the pupils' mother tongues, home languages, availability of trained teachers who teach official minority languages, teaching of the official minority languages in question, use of official minority languages in question as languages of teaching and learning, availability of teaching materials in official minority languages and pupils' linguistic competency in the language(s) used as languages of teaching and learning. The learners' questionnaire also provided valuable insights about the teachers' and learners' language attitudes which in most cases reflect their parents' language ideologies.

4.7 Language survey questionnaire

The selected schools are some of the schools that are targeted by the ministry of education to implement the 2002 policy development. The selection of these schools was based on three linguistic grounds, i.e. one school from each of the selected districts in rural areas where the official minority languages are predominantly spoken, one school from each of the selected districts in rural areas and urban areas which are linguistically heterogeneous and or fragmented. This selection was based on these criteria to examine how these language profiles affect the ease with which the 2002 policy developments are implemented.

The language survey questionnaire was completed by each class teacher in the selected schools. The major objective of the questionnaire was to identify the language situation in schools where official minority languages are spoken, i.e. what proportion of the school population, i.e. teachers and pupils speak these languages as their mother tongue. The analysis of the linguistic profiles of these schools was useful to determine whether all schools in areas, where official minority languages are spoken should, be expected to implement the 2002 policy development. Or whether there are some schools in these areas that should be exempted because of linguistic fragmentation or there is need to reconsider classroom organisation

strategies in order to effectively implement mother tongue education policies in areas where official minority languages are spoken, especially given that these languages should be taught as mother tongues in areas where they are spoken.

4.7.1 Linguistic homogeneity, heterogeneity and fragmentation

The linguistic profile of the selected schools is useful in explaining the causes of the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development and the success story of Tonga in that the linguistic homogeneity, heterogeneity and fragmentation of the selected schools has a great bearing on the ease and urgency of implementing the policy development in question. They help determine and identify which schools are best suitable to implement the 2002 policy development. Linguistically homogeneous schools are schools where the 2002 policy development is most urgently needed and most easily operationalised. Linguistically heterogeneous schools naturally require creative classroom organisation to effectively implement the 2002 policy development. Linguistically fragmented schools prove to be difficult and there may be no alternative to the use of the national language and English.

Given this background, are all the schools in the districts where these languages are spoken best suitable to teach these languages? The selection of these schools might not be 100% reflective of the sampling procedures adopted in this study, but they cannot be too far from being representative of the linguistic geography of the areas where official minority languages are spoken. The choice of these schools was done in close consultation with district administration officers, district education officers, teachers and heads in the selected districts who know the linguistic geography of the areas where the official minority languages are spoken. The absence of linguistic data in the census results made the task of identifying these schools difficult given the unreliability and biases of oral sources. However, to address the limitations of oral sources the researcher consulted widely before choosing a particular school.

4.7.2 Teachers' home languages/mother tongues

The analysis of the teachers' linguistic profiles is useful to understand the staffing situation in these schools to evaluate if they are adequate teachers who are native speakers of the concerned official minority languages in the selected schools. In language-in-education policy implementation a planning issue that needs to be addressed is the teacher cadre which will teach the concerned language(s). Teachers of indigenous children should to the extent possible be recruited from within indigenous communities. When all or most of the teachers come from the dominant group and do not speak the pupils' language, pupils are forced to shift and prefer these teachers' language. (Nahir, 1988; 1998; Skutnabb-Kangas & García, 1995; García, 1995; Crystal, 2000; Tankersley, 2001; Skutnabb-Kangas & Dunbar, 2010; Skutnabb-Kangas & Heugh, 2010).

The success of policy implementation largely depends upon the effectiveness of the school head in mobilising resources and directing the energies of teachers towards the successful implementation of the policy (Zvobgo, 1997:128). The school heads' home languages are therefore central in this discussion because of their role as the immediate managers in the school domain. Heads who are native speakers of the concerned languages are more likely to respond differently to non-native speakers; hence, it is central to consider their home languages.

4.8 Interviews

Nieuwenhuis (2007:87) defines an interview as a two-way communication in which the interviewer asks the participants questions to collect data and to learn about ideas, beliefs, views, opinions, practices and behaviours of the participants. In qualitative research, interviews help the researcher to see the world through the eyes of the participant. The aim is always to obtain rich descriptive data that will help the researcher understand the participant's construction of knowledge and social reality. Interviews are useful for collecting data which would probably not be accessible using techniques such as documentary analysis, observation or questionnaires. Unlike

documentary analysis, observations and questionnaires, interviews, especially unstructured and semi-structured interviews, give room for in-depth probing or clarifications since they involve questioning and discussing issues with people (Blaxter, Hughes & Tight, 2001; Bell, 2009; Wagner, 2010).

Interviews offer opportunities for follow-ups of ideas, probe of responses and investigation of motives and feelings which the questionnaire can never do. The way in which a response is given, for example the tone of voice, facial expression, hesitation can provide information that a written response would conceal (Bell, 2009:157). Interviews allow the researcher to reassure and encourage the respondent to be full in his/her answers. Visual signs such as nods, smiles are valuable tools for promoting complete responses. However, the personality of the interviewer can have some effects on the results (Walliman, 2001:239).

While interviewing is suitable for quantitative data collection, it is particularly useful when qualitative data is required, hence their use in this study. For this study the researcher conducted face-face interviews because of their advantage over telephone and on-line interviews. In face-face interviews the researcher is in a good position to be able to judge the quality of the responses of the participants, since he/she can even look at the non-verbal forms of communication that also help ascertain the participant's inner feelings about the subject. The researcher can be able to notice if a question is properly understood and to reassure and encourage the participant through his/her body language and appreciation of the responses which are all valuable tools in promoting complete responses (Walliman, 2001:238). Face-face interviews are also relatively cheaper compared to telephone and on-line interviews and are the only option available in areas with no telephone and cellphone network coverage and internet connections.

In qualitative research interviews are classified as unstructured or semi-structured or structured interviews (Walliman, 2001; Leedy & Ormrod, 2005; Davies, 2007; Nieuwenhuis, 2007; Rugg & Petre, 2007).

4.8.1 Unstructured or open-ended interviews

According to Nieuwenhuis (2007:87), open-ended or unstructured interviews often take the form of a conversation with the intention that the researcher explores with the participant his/her views, ideas, beliefs and attitudes about certain events or phenomena. Open-ended interviews are normally spread over a period of time and consist of a series of interviews. In open-ended interviews participants may propose solutions or provide insight into events or phenomenon being studied.

4.8.2 Semi-structured interviews

Semi-structured interviews are commonly used in research projects to corroborate data emerging from other data sources. In this study, semi-structured interviews were used to corroborate data gathered through observation, learners' and language survey questionnaires, focus group discussions and documentary analysis. Semi-structured interviews require the participant to answer a set of predetermined questions. Semi-structured interview schedules basically define the line of inquiry. They are organised around areas of particular interest, while still allowing considerable flexibility in scope and depth. Researchers conducting semi-structured interviews need to be attentive to the responses of the participants so that they can identify new emerging lines of inquiry that are directly related to the issues under investigation, and explore and probe these. Semi-structured interviews are usually preferred because they allow for the probing and clarification of answers. Semi-structured interviews like open-ended interviews are the most used and recommended for qualitative research. Semi-structured interviews are flexible and more likely to yield the information that the researcher had not planned to ask for (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005; Nieuwenhuis, 2007; Wagner, 2010).

Semi-structured interviews are also referred to as reflective interviews. They use prompt sheet that contain carefully selected lists of topics. Questions used in semi-structured interviews are the kind which do not invite or require simple yes or no answers. Semi-structured interview questions seek to stimulate reflection and

exploration of ideas and issues. They are often concerned with people's feelings (Davies, 2007:29). The semi-structured nature of semi-structured interviews leave some space for following-up interesting topics when they arise, allowing for an in-depth probing and exploration of the subject in question. Like open-ended interviews, semi-structured interviews allow the researcher to explore the situation under study in its depth, allowing him or her to get information which he or she cannot predict.

4.8.3 Structured interviews or closed interviews

In structured interviews, interview questions are detailed and developed in advance. Structured interviews are frequently used in multiple case studies or larger sample groups to ensure consistency. However, if they are overly structured they inhibit probing. Structured interviews are mostly used for quantitative research (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005:146). Rugg and Petre (2007:138) describe structured interviews as a spoken questionnaire. Because of their closed nature they rarely leave room or some space for following-up interesting topics when they arise. Structured interviews only allow a limited set of responses, usually the yes or no kind of answers, but since this study aims to stimulate reflection and exploration of ideas and issues related to the implementation of the 2002 policy development and the success story of Tonga, the researcher used semi-structured interviews to gather data from school heads, policy makers, education officers, ZIPLA officials, officials from language associations or committees of official minority language speakers, book publishers, non-governmental organisations, curriculum development unit and examining body officials, lecturers and principals in selected teacher training colleges and in Departments of African Languages, Linguistics, Curriculum Studies and Education in selected universities and researchers at the ALRI.

Semi-structured interviews with policy makers, which include the minister of education, the permanent secretary, the principal director for primary schools, Provincial Education Directors (PEDs) and District Education Officers (DEOs), focused on the language management variables, its management, sociolinguistic and development oriented methodologies and strategies of the LMA and the seven areas

of policy development in language-in-education policy implementation. In the ministry of education, sport, arts and culture is the minister of education who is assisted by a deputy. The minister is an elected member of the legislature and is appointed to the cabinet by the head of state or government. The minister is responsible for ensuring that the policies formulated and approved by government are adhered to and implemented. He or she directs and guides the civil servants in implementing policy and delivering educational services (Zvobgo, 1997:85).

The permanent secretary in the ministry of education is the ministry's chief executive or accounting officer who supervises the day to day operations of the ministry. Permanent secretaries in the ministry are responsible for issuing out policy directives of the ministry. The permanent secretary oversees the implementation of educational policy as directed by government. It is the duty of the permanent secretary to evolve strategies for the effective implementation of policy as well as define the structure of the ministry itself. The secretary holds the key to the implementation of ministry's policies and programmes, authorises the disbursement of funds for various programmes and deploys (Zvobgo, 1997:86). The director for primary schools oversees at national level the day to day operations of primary schools and ensures that policies formulated and approved by government pertaining to the operations of primary schools are implemented and adhered to. He/she is assisted by the PEDs and DEOs in discharging his/her duties.

PEDs ensure that educational services are delivered to the people in a manner which promotes provincial and national development and that local needs are adequately responded to. PEDs are assisted by deputy PEDs. The PEDs assist in the implementation of educational policies at provincial level. They receive from head office regulations and policies that help effect educational activities and ensure that these are implemented. They are responsible for monitoring and advising on the implementation of government policy on education. Two PEDs in the provinces where official minority languages are spoken were interviewed in this study, i.e. the PEDs for Matabeleland North and South provinces.

District Education Officers (DEOs) strengthen and support the operations of PEDs. They are the task force that sees to the day to day operations of the education system by regular visits and inspections to schools. They do on-the-spot checks on the operation of school heads and teachers. They are the action people whose responsibility is to get things moving and get the job done. They are the centres for implementation of ministry policies, rules and regulations in the field. Zvobgo (1997: 124) describes them as the police force that beats the school corridors to ensure that both heads of schools and teachers are at their places of work and that learning and teaching is actually taking place and according to governing policies and regulations.

DEOs are important agents in the development of the curricular and its implementation. They are divided into two groups, i.e. the professional staffing primary/ secondary section and standards control primary or secondary section. The professional staffing section deals with staff establishment and deployment of teachers. It works closely with teachers' colleges regarding the deployment of teachers. By and large the staffing section also concerns itself with the welfare and needs of teachers (Zvobgo, 1997:119-120).

The standard control section is mainly concerned with the maintenance of high quality education in both primary and secondary sectors of the school system. They ensure that the curriculum is being implemented. They organise in-service training for teachers and heads. They work closely with the Curriculum Development Unit (CDU) in the implementation of recommended syllabuses in all schools and in initiating changes in those syllabuses. They recommend and supervise the use of teaching aids and look for support materials and services to strengthen teaching. They carry out definite periodic supervision and inspection of the operations of the schools (Zvobgo, 1997:120-121). Interviews with education officers focused on educational, socio-cultural and management variables and management, sociolinguistic and development oriented methodologies and strategies of the LMA and the seven areas of policy development for language-in-education policy implementation. Given the centrality of these arms in the ministry of education, sport, arts and culture, the

researcher saw it fit to interview all these key branches of the ministry to get a balanced picture of the implementation process of the 2002 policy development.

Researchers in the ALRI were interviewed to gather information on linguistic variables, technical skills development and corpus planning in official minority languages. Interviews with officials from the ZILPA and language associations or committees of the official minority languages focused on all the language management variables and management, sociolinguistic and development oriented methodologies and strategies of the LMA and all the seven areas of policy development in language-in-education policy implementation. Interviews with officials from CDU and the Zimbabwe Schools Examination Council (Zimsec) focused on the curriculum policy, materials and methods policy, evaluation policy, educational, linguistic and socio-cultural variables.

Interviews with principals and lecturers in teacher education colleges and the Departments of African Languages, Linguistics, Curriculum Studies and Education in universities sought to elicit information on educational and management variables as well as sociolinguistic and development oriented methodologies and strategies of the LMA. Interviews with school heads focused on educational, socio-cultural and management variables and management, sociolinguistic and development oriented methodologies and strategies of the LMA as well as the seven areas of policy development. They also provided valuable information insights even on other variables and methodologies and strategies as well.

Interviews with book publishers focused on educational variables, materials and methods policy, curriculum policy and acquisition planning. Interviews with book publishers also provided valuable insights on issues related to linguistic variables and corpus planning, i.e. issues related to standardisation of official minority languages, availability of standard orthography for official minority languages. These interviews were also used to gain an understanding on development oriented methodologies and strategies, i.e. how book publishers as key stakeholders are involved in language-in-education planning and policy formulation. They also revealed critical

issues related to management oriented methodologies and strategies in view of government, for example, issues related to planning, organising, resourcing policy, staffing, political variables, particularly political will reflected in the government's support or lack of it in publishing in official minority languages, technical skills development, i.e. training of editors.

Interviews with non-governmental organisations focused on the role of non-government organisations such as Basilwizi Trust and Silveria House in the formulation and implementation of the 2002 policy development. These interviews mainly focused on development oriented methodologies and strategies, such as advocacy, development communication, litigation, conceptual skills development, participatory action research, dialogical intervention strategies, human skills development and community policy. In addition to this, interviews with non-governmental organisations offered more insights on management oriented methodologies and strategies in view of government. They also offered insights on issues related to planning, organising, controlling, economic variables, resourcing policy, methods and materials policy, staffing, human and technical skills development. They were also useful in examining the vitality of the ethnolinguistic groups in question, especially given that they have worked with these language groups extensively.

Interviews with officials from ZIPLA and the language associations/committees of the language groups under study and other official minority languages focused on all the variables, methodologies and strategies of the LMA. They also focused on the seven areas of policy development and yielded valuable information related to the ethnolinguistic vitality of the language groups under study. Interviews with the different participants of this study also revealed valuable insights on issues related to the ethnolinguistic vitality of the language groups in question.

4.9 Focus group discussions

Nieuwenhuis (2007:90) states that the focus group discussion strategy assumes that group interaction will be productive to widen the range of responses, activate forgotten details of previous experiences and lessen inhibitions that may otherwise discourage participants to disclose information. They produce data rich in detail that is difficult to achieve with other research methods. They are also useful in exploring thoughts and feelings and not just behaviour. Unlike other research methods, focus group discussions allow for debating or arguing about the responses being generated and group dynamics assist in data generation.

Group forces or dynamics become an integral part of the procedure with participants engaged in discussion with each other rather than directing their comments solely to the moderator. Focus group discussions create a social environment in which group members are stimulated by the perceptions and ideas of each other and they can increase the quality and richness of data compared to one-on-one interviews. Group dynamics serve as a catalytic factor in bringing information to the fore. Group dynamics therefore become an important dimension of what will be analysed as part of the data generated. Focus group interviews are valuable when in-depth information is needed about how people think about an issue – their reasoning about why things are as they are, why they hold the views they do (Law, 2003:299 cited in Bell, 2009:162).

In focus group discussions participants are able to build on each other's ideas and comments to provide an in-depth view, which are not always attainable from individual interviews. Unexpected comments and new perspectives can be explored easily within the focus group and can add value to the research. Focus group discussions therefore generate in-depth qualitative data about a group's perceptions, attitudes and experiences on a defined topic (Nieuwenhuis, 2007:90). They also allow the researcher to reach out to as many informants as possible at the same time in one setting (Blaxter, Hughes & Tight, 2001:172).

However, it may happen that some participants experience group discussions as threatening and sometimes the information collected may be biased through group processes such as domination of the discussions by the more outspoken individuals, group think and the difficulty of assessing the viewpoints of less assertive participants (Nieuwenhuis, 2007:91). In order to ensure that all participants are comfortable the moderator ensured a good rapport between himself and the group members and among group members so that all members were free and encouraged to express their views and feelings fully and honestly. The researcher ensured all group members were afforded equal chances to air their views to avoid dominance by the outspoken members. Each member was afforded an opportunity to express his/her ideas freely.

The other limitation of focus group discussions is that it requires all participants to congregate in the same place at the same time; this is particularly difficult if the potential participants live in geographically distinct regions. To address this problem, the researcher worked with groups of members from the same area to avoid cases where people have to walk long distances for the discussion. This was particularly a serious challenge in urban settings. However, the researcher worked with groups of people who at least stay close to each other or in one street. Through purposive sampling the researcher ensured that the selected group members of each group are representative of the target population in terms of age and gender. These groups were made up of parents and school leavers/youths the future parents and the pool from which potential teachers is drawn from.

Focus group discussions with the learners' parents focused on issues related to socio-cultural and educational variables and development oriented methodologies and strategies. Skutnabb-Kangas and García (1995:234; 237) note that the success of multilingual policies involving minority languages depends on how informed and enlightened are the parents. They argue that parents should be well informed at all times and be organised to direct the school's educational and language policy. They should ensure that administrators and staff carry out their wishes on ways in which

their children are educated. These discussions also yielded valuable data about the ethnolinguistic vitality of the language groups in question.

Focus group discussions with teachers focused mainly on, but were not limited to, educational and socio-cultural variables and management, sociolinguistic and development oriented methodologies and strategies of the LMA as well as the seven areas of policy development. They also provided valuable information insights even on other variables and methodologies and strategies as well. These teachers were grouped into three groups according to the three phases, infant phase (grade 1-3), intermediary phase (grade 4-5) and the final phase (grade 6-7). Since teachers work within these communities focus group discussions with them also yielded valuable information about the ethnolinguistic vitality of language groups in question.

4.10 Recording interview and focused group discussions data

Recording an interview must be done in a meticulous manner. Most people are very much uncomfortable with being recorded and they fear that recording can be used to identify them and they feel it lacks confidentiality. They also feel that once they are recorded verbatim chances of remaining anonymous are very low. Tape recording makes some respondents anxious and less likely to reveal confidential information. To avoid situations where participants felt uncomfortable to give their views, the researcher clearly explained the purpose of the study before the discussions and interviews, guaranteed confidentiality, anonymity and also sought the consent of the participants to record and explained why recording was preferred to note taking.

Tape recording helps the researcher focus on the process of the interview, i.e. focus his/her attention on the interviewee, giving him /her appropriate eye contact and non-verbal communication, and offer the researcher a verbatim record of the whole interview. Given this advantage of tape recording I choose to record and take notes in these sessions, especially given that note taking give the researcher an instant record of the key points of the interview. Note taking also assisted in ensuring that both data collection and analysis were on-going, cyclical, non-linear and interactive

which is a quality of qualitative research (Blaxter, Hughes & Tight, 2001:173). All the interviews and discussions were audio recorded for subsequent and repetitive listening and evaluation. These were transcribed before the final analysis and analysed and discussed through content analysis using inductive and deductive approaches.

4.11 Secondary sources

Secondary sources are useful in that they shed light on, or complement, the primary data gathered. They are valuable for confirming, modifying or contradicting research findings. Further, it is always good and appropriate to consider what has been already done to build on it in the process of adding new knowledge. This was also meant to equip the researcher with theoretical perspectives and previous research findings related to the subject at hand. Secondary sources were also used to acquire insights and arguments as well as to help shape and consolidate the researcher's arguments.

The use of secondary sources involved a review of literature on language planning, policy and management generally and language planning, policy and management in education specifically. It also involved a review of literature on mother tongue education and the theoretical frameworks of the study. In addition to this body of literature, the researcher reviewed literature on research design and methodology to identify the best research design and methodology of the study that helped address the research problem of the study. Insights gained from secondary sources also proved useful in the deductive and inductive analysis of the data.

4.12 Pilot study: Definition

According to Blaxter, Hughes and Tight (2001:42-43), a pilot study is a small-scale, preliminary study that is conducted prior to large-scale research. It is conducted to test the efficiency and effectiveness of the chosen data gathering techniques. It helps the researcher see how well the chosen research techniques work in practice. A pilot study enables the researcher to ensure that issues that might have been missed are

identified prior to the large-scale research. It helps the researcher test the user-friendliness of the chosen data gathering instruments. It also helps the researcher identify problems related to the chosen research instruments prior to the large-scale research. These problems range from problems of comprehension, logical problems or other sources of confusion associated with the chosen data gathering instruments.

A pilot study also provides an indication of the response rate and kind of responses that can be expected, whether they are of sufficient quality to address the research questions and achieve research objectives of the study. It helps the researcher estimate how much time it would take to gather and analyse the data as well as to identify any likely challenges in analysing the data from the different research instruments. It basically helps the researcher judge the feasibility of the overall research plan (Blaxter, Hughes & Tight, 2001; Leedy & Ormrod, 2005; Wagner, 2010).

4.12.1 Area of study

The pilot study was conducted in one of the predominantly Sotho speaking communal areas in Gwanda South from the 31st of January 2011 to the 2nd of February 2011. One primary school in this predominantly Sotho speaking area was identified for this purpose. According to the list of schools that are supposed to implement the 2002 policy development, the chosen school is one of the 52 primary schools that are expected to implement the 2002 policy development of teaching and learning in Sotho (*Ministry of Education, Sport and Culture - Gwanda, Primary Schools in the Sotho speaking areas*). Apart from speaking Sotho, people in this communal area speak Ndebele and there are very small pockets of Venda speakers as well.

4.12.2 Participants of the pilot study

Pupils, teachers and the school head participated in this pilot study.

4.12.3 Research techniques

The researcher used class observations, semi-structured interviews, language and the learners' questionnaire for the pilot study. Through class observations, the language survey and learners' questionnaire and semi-structured interviews with teachers and the school head, the researcher focused on the seven areas of policy development and socio-cultural variables as well as management variables and management, sociolinguistic and development oriented methodologies and strategies of the LMA.

The researcher sought to evaluate the implementation process of the 2002 policy statement and to examine whether the seven areas of policy development for language-in-education policy implementation and the language management variables and methodologies and strategies were developed, secured and deployed to facilitate the implementation of the 2002 policy development. This was meant to help the researcher identify the causes of the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development.

4.12.3.1 Language survey questionnaire

By means of the language survey questionnaire, the researcher gathered that the school has 489 pupils and the majority of pupils are first language speakers of Sotho. It emerged that out of the 489 pupils in the school, 315 pupils, i.e. 64% in this school are first language speakers of Sotho, and 174 pupils, i.e. 36% are first language speakers of Ndebele. These data were further confirmed through semi-structured interviews with the teachers and the school head. Table 1 gives a summary of the breakdown of the number of pupils who are speakers of Sotho and Ndebele per grade in this school. Despite the fact that the school is predominantly Sotho, the large population size of Ndebele speakers warrant division of classes according to the pupils' mother tongues to facilitate mother tongue education in Sotho and Ndebele. The population size of Ndebele speakers in this school can support all that goes into mother tongue education.

4.12.3.1.1 Teachers' and learners' language profiles

The school where the pilot study was conducted had 15 teachers including the headmaster. 13 out of the 15 teachers in the school said they were first language speakers of Sotho, and only 2 said they were first language speakers of Ndebele. The researcher also learnt that the school head was also a first language speaker of Sotho. This school therefore has a good number of teachers who are native speakers of Sotho.

Table 1: A school in Gwanda south rural where Sotho is predominantly spoken

Grade	Teachers' mother tongue	Ndebele speakers	Sotho speakers
1A	Sotho	16	18
1B	Sotho	11	23
2A	Sotho	24	27
2B	Sotho	13	20
3A	Sotho	13	23
3B	Sotho	10	16
4A	Sotho	12	21
4B	Sotho	19	18
5	Ndebele	11	20
6A	Ndebele	17	28
6B	Sotho	15	27
7A	Sotho	11	14
7B	Sotho	12	18
Special Class	Sotho	3	9
Head	Sotho		

Totals, % where applicable	13 Sotho – 87% 2 Ndebele – 13%	174 – 36%	315 – 64%

4.12.3.2 Non-participant structured class observation

This involved the analysis of the school enrolment reports, class attendance registers, scheme books, plan books, marks schedules, pupils' exercise books, pupils' progress school reports, grade 7 public examination results and reports to establish whether Sotho is taught as a subject in the school and used as a language of teaching and learning as well as to establish the learners' language profiles. The researcher conducted class observations, where he observed, one grade 1 class, one grade 5 class, and one grade 7 class in session to examine the implementation process of the 2002 policy development, i.e. whether Sotho is used as a language of instruction and taught as a subject up to grade 7. The researcher observed the following classes in session when the following subjects were taught; Grade 1:*Pre-Learning Skills*; Grade 5: *Mathematics* and Grade 7: *Environmental Science*.

The researcher observed the following variables;

1. Language of instruction, namely, if Sotho is used as language for teaching and learning.
2. Student participation, i.e. pupils' involvement in the learning activities, focusing on the language(s) they use in class and the impact of the chosen language(s) of instruction on their participation in classroom activities. This was done to establish whether learners use Sotho in classroom activities.
3. Timetable, i.e. whether Sotho is included in the school timetable and class timetables.
4. Charts, i.e. whether they are any charts in Sotho which indicate that Sotho is taught as a subject.
5. Teaching materials/ learning aids, i.e. whether they are any Sotho textbooks or teaching materials and/or learning aids.

All these variables were observed to ascertain whether Sotho is used as a language of instruction and/or taught as a subject, and if not to establish why it is not used for teaching and learning and taught as a subject.

4.12.3.2.1 Language of instruction and learners' participation in class

In all the classes that the researcher observed, the predominant languages of teaching and learning were Ndebele and English. Code-switching and mixing between Ndebele and English was a common feature of classroom interaction. Teachers used Ndebele and English and the pupils answered questions only in English, except in grade 1 where pupils used Ndebele and English. Across all the grades which the researcher observed, Sotho was not used by both the teachers and the pupils. The interactions were in Ndebele and English.

However, outside the classroom learners interacted in Sotho among themselves and with their teachers. Learners participated in classroom activities in English, but most of them had challenges in expressing themselves in English. The researcher observed that Sotho is neither taught as a subject nor used as a language of instruction in this school. This observation was also confirmed by the data that came from the learners' questionnaire and semi-structured interviews with the teachers and the school head.

4.12.3.2.2 School timetable and class timetables

In all the class timetables and in the school timetable Sotho was not appearing, and this is an indication that it is not taught as a subject. This was further confirmed in an interview with the deputy head who drafts the school timetable and the different teachers who were interviewed as well as the school head.

4.12.3.2.3 Charts, teaching materials and learning aids

The researcher observed that there were no Sotho charts, no Sotho teaching materials and learning aids in all the classes observed. This was further confirmed by

data from the learners' questionnaire where nearly all grade 6 and 7 pupils who completed the questionnaire indicated that there are no Sotho textbooks in the school. All the teachers interviewed, including the school head confirmed that the school does not have Sotho textbooks.

Through the analysis of the scheme books, marks schedules, pupils' exercise books, pupils' progress school reports, grade 7 public examination results and reports, the researcher noted that Sotho is not taught as a subject in the school. Sotho was not appearing in the teachers' scheme books, marks schedules, pupils' progress school reports, grade 7 public examination duplicate results slip and in the grade 7 public examination reports and there were no Sotho pupils' exercise books and textbooks in the observed classes. All these sources indicated that Sotho is not taught as a subject in this school. This corroborated with what the learners indicated in the learners' questionnaire and the researcher gathered through semi-structured interviews with the teachers and the school head.

4.12.3.3 Learners' questionnaire

The questions in the questionnaire focused on the following categories;

1. Pupils' grade: Question 1.
2. Pupils' mother tongue and home languages: Questions 2-3.
3. Language(s) of teaching and learning: Questions 4-8; 12.
4. Learners' competence in the language(s) of teaching and learning: Questions 9-11.
5. Availability of Sotho teaching materials: Question13.

Table 2 summarises the findings from the learners' questionnaires. Findings from the learners' questionnaire further confirm or corroborate what the researcher noted through class observations and semi-structured interviews with the teachers and the school head.

Table 2: A school in Gwanda south rural where Sotho is predominantly spoken

Grade	6	7	Totals - % where applicable
Sample size	34	19	53
Question 2: What is your mother language:	19 (B) 15 (F)	2 (B) 16 (F) 1 (B & F)	21 – 39.6% 31 – 58.5% 1 – 1.9%
Question 3: Which language do you speak when you are at home?	19 (B) 15 (F)	1 (B) 18 (F)	20 – 37.7% 33 – 62.3%
Question 4: Which language(s) does your teacher use when teaching?	30 (A & B) 2 (A) 1 (F) 1 (No indication)	3 (A & B) 2 (A) 14 (A, B & F)	33 – 62.3% 4 – 7.5% 1 – 1.9% 1 – 1.9% 14 – 26.4%
Question 5: In which language(s) were you taught in grade 1-3?	32 (A & B) 1 (B) 1 (A)	13 (A & B) 6 (B)	45 – 84.9% 7 – 13.2% 1 – 1.9%
Question 6: In which language(s) were you taught in grade 4-7:	34 (A & B)	7 (A & B) 11 (A, B & F) 1 (A)	41 – 77.4% 11 – 20.8% 1 – 1.9%
Question 7: What language(s) does your teacher use when teaching Mathematics?	33 (A & B) 1 (B)	14 (A & B) 5 (A)	47 – 88.7% 1 – 1.9% 5 – 9.4%
Question 8: What language(s) does your teacher use when teaching Content?	34 (A & B)	13 (A & B) 6 (A)	47 – 88.7% 6 – 11.3%
Question 9: Do you understand the language(s) the teachers use when teaching?	21 (A & B) 5 (A) 8 (B)	2 (A & B) 9 (A, B & F) 3 (A & F) 5 (Spoiled)	23 – 43.4% 5 – 9.4% 8 – 15.1% 9 – 17% 3 – 5.7% 5 – 9.4%

Question 10: Can you speak the language(s) that the teachers use when teaching?	1 (A & B) 2 (A) 18 (B) 13 (No indication)	 4 (A) 11 (A, B & F) 2 (B & F) 2 (Spoiled)	1 – 1.9% 6 – 11.3% 18 – 34% 13 – 24.5% 11 – 20.8% 2 – 3.8% 2 – 3.8%
Question 11: When you do not understand or speak this/ these language(s) very well, what does your teacher do?	21 (A, B & O) 1 (A & B) 1 (B) 11 (B & O)	4 (A, B & O) 11 (A & B) 3 (B) 1 (A)	25 – 47.2% 12 – 22.6% 4 – 7.5% 11 – 20.8% 1 – 1.9%
Question 12: Do your teachers allow you to answer or ask questions in your home language in the classroom?	9 (Yes B) 10 (No B) 0 (Yes F) 15 (No F)	1 (Yes B) 1 (No B) 8 (Yes F) 8 (No F) 1 (Spoiled)	10 – 18.9% 11 – 20.8% 8 – 15.1% 23 – 43.4% 1 – 1.9%
Question 13: Do you have Sotho textbooks in your class?	0 (Yes) 34 (No)	3 (Yes) 16 (No)	3 – 5.7% 50 – 94.3%
Key: A – English; B – Ndebele; F – Sotho; O – Teacher ask other pupils to explain			

In this school 53 pupils completed the learners' questionnaire and 58.5% of these pupils are Sotho speakers, 39.6% are Ndebele speakers and only 1.9% of these pupils speak Sotho and Ndebele as their mother tongues. The outright majority of these pupils (62.7%) speak Sotho at home and 37.7% of these pupils speak Ndebele at home.

The outright majority of these pupils (62.3%) indicated that their teachers teach them in English and Ndebele, 26.4% of these pupils indicated that they are taught in English, Ndebele and Sotho, 7.5% indicated that their teachers teach in English only, 1.9% indicated that the teachers teach in Sotho only and 1.9% did not indicate their

response. The overwhelming majority of the pupils (85.9%) indicated that they were taught in English and Ndebele in grade 1-3. Some pupils, i.e. 13.2% indicated that they were taught in Ndebele only in grade 1-3 and only 1.9% indicated that they learnt in English in grade 1-3. Most pupils (77.4%) indicated that they were/are taught in English and Ndebele in grade 4-7. Few pupils, i.e. 20.8% all from the grade 7 class indicated that they were/are taught in English, Ndebele and Sotho in grade 4-7. Only 1.9% of these pupils indicated that they were/are taught in English only in grade 4-7.

The outright majority of the pupils (88.7%) indicated that they are taught Mathematics in English and Ndebele, 9.4% indicated that they are taught Mathematics in English and only 1.9% indicated that Mathematics is taught in Ndebele. The outright majority of the pupils (88.7%) indicated that Content is taught in English and Ndebele and only 11.3% of the pupils indicated that they learn Content in English. This data indicates that English and Ndebele are the most predominantly used languages of instruction.

At least 43.4% of the pupils indicated that they can understand English and Ndebele which are used as languages of instruction, 17% of the pupils indicated that they understand English, Ndebele and Sotho which are used as languages of instruction, 15.1% of the pupils indicated that they only understand Ndebele, 9.4% of the pupils indicated that they understand English, another 9.4% did not properly indicate their responses and 5.7% indicated that they understand English and Sotho. These results reflect that the majority of these pupils (75.5%) understand Ndebele and 66.1% understand English which are the most predominantly used languages of instruction. In the main research, this question was rephrased to minimise the problems that respondents had, especially as reflected in the high number of spoiled papers. In the final questionnaire I provided the language options to minimise this problem.

At least 34% of the pupils indicated that they can speak Ndebele, 24.5% of the pupils did not indicate their responses, 20.8% indicated that they can speak English, Ndebele and Sotho, 11.3% of the pupils indicated that they can speak English, 3.8% of the pupils indicated that they can speak English and Sotho, 3.8% of the pupils did

not properly indicate their responses and 1.9% of the pupils indicated that they can speak both English and Ndebele. This data indicates that at least 60.5% of the pupils can speak Ndebele and 34% can speak English which are the most predominantly used languages of instruction. However, the high rate of blank answers to this question led to the rephrasing of this question as well in the final research.

Most pupils (47.2%) indicated that when they do not understand or speak the language(s) of instruction, their teachers use English, Ndebele and ask other pupils to explain, 22.6% of the pupils indicated that their teachers use English and Ndebele when they do not understand, 20.8% of the pupils stated that their teachers explain in Ndebele and ask other pupils to explain as well, 7.5% of the pupils indicated that their teachers explain in Ndebele and 1.9% of the pupils indicated that the teachers use English. These results indicate that when pupils do not understand the common option is for teachers to explain in Ndebele. Explaining in English is the second option and the third option is that teachers ask other pupils to explain. Interviews with the teachers revealed that the third option is commonly used because the teachers cannot explain concepts in the official minority language or because they want to facilitate peer-peer learning.

Only 18.9% of the pupils indicated that they are allowed to ask or answer questions in Ndebele in class and 15.1% of the pupils indicated that they are allowed to ask or answer questions in Sotho in class. This indicates that the pupils are not encouraged to resort to their local languages in class and this was also confirmed in the interviews with the teachers who indicated that they do not encourage their pupils to use local languages except when learning Ndebele because examinations are in English.

Nearly all the pupils (94.3%) indicated that there are no Sotho textbooks in their classes.

4.12.3.4 Semi-structured interviews with the teachers and the school head

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 14 teachers of the school and the school head to corroborate data gathered through documentary analysis, class observations, the language survey questionnaire and learners' questionnaire. These interviews further examined the implementation process of the 2002 policy development to establish the causes of the delay in implementation. The semi-structured interviews with the teachers and the school head focused on the following variables;

1. Educational variables: personnel policy, materials and methods policy, curriculum policy, access policy, evaluation policy and resourcing policy.
2. Socio-cultural variables: the value of mother tongue education in socio-cultural terms
3. Linguistic variables: level of language development, i.e. whether the Sotho has a working orthography that teachers are familiar with and can use for teaching and whether Sotho is taught and used as a medium of instruction.
4. Political variables, as reflected by government support in terms of the personnel policy, materials and methods policy, curriculum policy, access policy, resourcing policy, organising, controlling, leading, development communication, indigenisation, advocacy, conceptual skills development and human skills development of teachers and the school head.
5. Management variables/Management oriented methodologies and strategies: how these are reflected in issues affecting and related to teachers, for example planning, particularly establishing planning on the part of policy makers on issues related to teacher training, i.e. pre and in-service training and the availability of teacher training colleges which offer official minority languages as well as the deployment of teachers. Leading, i.e. supervision of teachers in implementing the policy development by school heads, education officers and ministry. Organising focused on issues mentioned under leading, such as, staffing/training, i.e. recruitment, selection and training of teachers and lecturers in teacher education colleges, mobilisation of teaching materials, development of the access policy,

training of resource teachers, curriculum experts, language experts and specialists.

Controlling focused on the enforcement of the implementation of the policy development and ways designed to ensure compliance with the stipulations of the policy development by teachers and enforced by the school head, education officers and the ministry. Conceptual skills development focused on conceptual skills development of teachers and the school head, i.e. understanding the policy development and how it buttresses into the entire human resource development plan and more importantly to the value of mother tongue based multilingual education, value of mother education for minority language speakers, universal access to education and education for all. Human skills development focused on skills development of teachers and school heads by education officers and the ministry following the policy development or before its declaration.

6. Economic variables as they manifest in teachers' views reflecting the policy makers' decisions related to economic variables, resourcing of the policy in terms of human resource training, i.e. teacher training, recruitment of lecturers in teachers' colleges and materials development .
7. Sociolinguistic oriented methodologies and strategies focused on language surveys to establish the pupils' language demographics, teachers' language demographics, acquisition planning, corpus planning, and multilingual services provision, in particular mother tongue based multilingual education involving minority languages and how it enlarges these speakers' choices within and outside the education sector.
8. Development oriented methodologies and strategies focused on advocacy, development communication targeting teachers by government, Sotho Language Committee and ZIPLA officials, indigenisation of the policy.

4.12.3.4.1 Teacher training, availability and deployment

All the teachers who were interviewed indicated that they have not been equipped or trained to teach in Sotho and to teach Sotho as a subject. They indicated that in their

training they majored in other subjects other than Sotho since Sotho was/is not offered in teacher training institutions. Teachers who are native speakers of Sotho expressed concern that their being first language speakers of Sotho is not enough to help them teach in Sotho and to teach Sotho as a subject. They indicated that they need training in the language on issues such as spelling, orthography and pronunciation before they can start teaching it as a subject and teaching in it. Teachers who are first language speakers of Sotho also revealed that their command of Ndebele is not the best; hence their teaching in Ndebele and of Ndebele might affect the academic success of the learners they are teaching. This was observed by the researcher too in one class which he observed where one teacher kept on mixing up the past and present tense in Ndebele.

In an interview with the deputy head of the school this concern was also raised when the deputy head admitted that low proficiency in Ndebele among Sotho speaking teachers is a considerable impediment to the educational progress of pupils taught by them. They are themselves second language speakers of Ndebele. The deputy head noted that many teachers who are second language speakers of Ndebele do not have the adequate skills and command of Ndebele to adequately explain concepts in Ndebele. Consequently, the deputy head argued that the limited command of Ndebele by these teachers negatively affects the teaching and learning process of content subjects that are predominantly taught in Ndebele as well as the teaching and learning of Ndebele as a subject.

The deputy head further expressed that the practice of using Ndebele as a language of teaching and learning from the beginning of primary education is based on the assumptions that all primary school teachers in Matabeleland and parts of Midlands are good models of spoken Ndebele and can effectively teach it and in it, yet the actual practice reveals otherwise. The deputy head submitted that experience with the performance of primary school teachers who are not native speakers of Ndebele shows that many of them are poor models of written and spoken Ndebele and hence this has detrimental effects on the learners; academic performance.

All the interviewed teachers expressed that they do not know of teacher training colleges that offer Sotho as a subject or teach in Sotho. The researcher also learnt that the teacher training programme does not include language-in-education policy studies and this partly explains why most teachers are not aware of what language(s) are they suppose to teach in, when, who and for how long. This point to the dire need to include language-in-education policy issues in the teacher training curriculum.

All the Sotho speaking teachers indicated that they chose to teach in the school and the two first language speakers of Ndebele who indicated that they recently graduated as qualified teachers said they were deployed to teach in this school after graduation. In as much as the bulk of the teachers indicated that they chose to teach in this school, they indicated that the procedure is that after training, teachers are randomly deployed without any linguistic considerations. It emerged that even in approving the applications of those who choose to teach in a particular school, the ministry does not make any linguistic considerations. This indicates that deployment strategies of teachers do not consider the languages the teachers speak and this affects the successful implementation of the policy statement. This deployment strategy reflects poor planning and organising in terms of how teachers should be deployed to successfully implement the policy development.

4.12.3.4.2 Human skills development

The researcher also noted that since the declaration of the 2002 policy development teachers in this school have not received any form of in-service training to help them implement the policy.

4.12.3.4.3 Advocacy, development communication and indigenisation

In interviews with the different teachers in the school, it also emerged that most teachers are not aware of the stipulations of the 2002 policy development. Most of them could not state the details or the stipulations of the policy development. In as much as the teachers acknowledged that the ministry communicate policy developments through circulars, they expressed concern that such circulars delay

reaching their school and in most cases they never get to read them as individuals. They indicated that they rely on information from the head who explain to them the details of the circulars. Some teachers also expressed that they get to know about language-in-education policy developments in the media.

This lack of awareness shows that the ministry and the Sotho language committee did not roll out advocacy activities in these communal areas. Teachers have not been adequately and thoroughly conscientised about the policy development before and after its declaration by the ministry. This also shows that they have been no promotion programmes that have been developed in this area to facilitate the implementation of the policy development. Lack of knowledge of the policy statement stipulations by the majority of the teachers interviewed also show that the teachers have not been dialogically brought to “own” the policy development by government, Sotho language committee and ZIPLA. Most teachers have not conceptualised the policy statement as their “own”, with the exception of the school head and the other resource teacher who are involved in materials development for Sotho.

All the teachers, including locals indicated that they do not know about the Sotho Language Committee. Only a few teachers who indicated that they are involved in materials development in Sotho indicated that they only know the Sotho Writers Association.

4.12.3.4.4 Controlling and leading

It also came out that the district education officers have not made any follow-ups on the implementation of the policy development in question since its declaration. All the teachers, including the school head indicated that education officers have not visited the school for almost two years. In their last visit to the school, the teachers indicated that the education officers were concerned with whether the teachers are discharging their duties as expected, in terms of planning and scheming. The teachers indicated that the education officers did not discuss issues related to the policy development. This shows that the policy has not been followed-up, monitored and evaluated in this

school. All the teachers indicated that the education officers cited fuel problems and lack of transport as the major impediments to their regular inspections.

The school head indicated that he cannot enforce the teaching of Sotho, because the necessary resources needed for the implementation of the policy development are available. The head cited that there are no textbooks, no syllabus and teachers have not been trained to teach Sotho and there is need to develop a writing system to be used and familiarise teachers with the writing system. The head also noted that the ministry has not clarified the access policy of the policy statement making it difficult to implement the policy in linguistically heterogeneous schools. The head concluded that once the syllabus and teaching materials are available, and issues related to the access policy clarified, then they can start teaching Sotho.

Concerns over lack of clarity in terms of the access policy in relation to the implementation of the 2002 policy development were also expressed by some of the teachers who were interviewed. These teachers indicated that they do not how to implement the policy in classes that are linguistically heterogeneous.

4.12.3.4.5 Educational and socio-cultural variables and multilingual services provision

All the teachers interviewed expressed the dire need for mother tongue education citing both instrumental and sentimental reasons. These teachers demonstrated a shared acknowledgement of the benefits of mother tongue education for official minority language speaking pupils. They displayed a shared recognition that first language speakers of Sotho will benefit from learning in their mother tongue and their mother tongue. Most of the teachers indicated that for pupils to whom Ndebele is a second language, their exposure to Ndebele is limited mainly to the classroom since once they leave the classroom they resort to Sotho; hence learning in Ndebele is an impediment to these learners' academic achievement.

Some of the interviewed teachers cited how the lack of mother tongue education in Gwanda South contributed to poor grade 7 results. In explaining the poor results,

these teachers cited the language of teaching and learning as one of the major contributing factors for the poor grade 7 results in districts where official minority language speaking learners are exclusively taught in their second language (Ndebele) and third language (English).

Some teachers who were interviewed highlighted that their experience as markers of grade 7 public examinations showed that the language of teaching and learning really determines the success or failure of the learner. They noted that districts with official minority languages experience high failure rates because learners are taught in their second language (Ndebele) and in most cases by teachers who are second language speakers of Ndebele. They further noted that in districts/regions where Ndebele and English are the only two languages spoken in the district/region, grade 7 results are much better than in regions and districts with official minority languages, Ndebele/Shona and English. These teachers argued that learners in districts/regions with Ndebele/ Shona and English have an advantage of being taught in their mother tongue and learning it as a subject.

In an interview with the different teachers, the researcher learnt that pupils are not allowed or encouraged to ask or answer questions in Ndebele or Sotho in class. However, the teachers indicated that they allow learners to use Ndebele only when they are learning Ndebele. This corroborates what the learners indicated in the questionnaire where the majority of the pupils indicated that they are not allowed to ask or answer questions in Ndebele and Sotho in class. This was also observed during class observations where the researcher observed that learning took place only in Ndebele and English and the teachers are the ones who code-switched and mixed Ndebele and English while the learners strictly answered all questions asked by the teacher in English, except in grade one where pupils responded in Ndebele at some point.

When asked to explain how these teachers handle linguistic diversity in class, they indicated that they resort to Ndebele to bridge the gap, especially if it is considered that most of the pupils cannot speak or understand English. These teachers

expressed that they resort to Ndebele to help the pupils master the content and grasp the concepts. All the teachers indicated that teaching exclusively in English is a waste of time since most pupils will be left behind and would not participate. However, the teachers indicated that even if they ask questions in Ndebele they expect the pupils to respond in English to cultivate and polish their English skills. All the teachers indicated that they are not taught how to handle linguistically diverse classes in teacher training colleges and as such they said they are not sure how to implement the policy development in classes that are linguistically heterogeneous. They expressed that after the declaration of the policy development the ministry did not specify how the policy was to be implemented in linguistically heterogeneous classes.

All the teachers interviewed indicated that they do not teach Sotho as a subject. This confirmed what the researcher noted through class observations and from the learners' questionnaire.

4.12.3.4.6 Organising, planning, political variables, resourcing policy

Two teachers from this school are Sotho resource teachers and are involved in the writing of Sotho school textbooks. They revealed that the publication of Sotho textbooks was now at an advanced stage. They highlighted that UNICEF offered to pay for the publication of Sotho textbooks which were going to be published by Longman, one of Zimbabwe's prescribed and authorised school textbook publisher. They indicated that the publication of Sotho textbooks has been hampered by financial problems.

The two resource teachers noted that before UNICEF offered to pay for the publication of these textbooks, no one was willing to offer to pay for their publication, including the government which declared the 2002 policy development. The researcher learnt that the government constantly cited lack of funds as the major obstacle in the publication of Sotho textbooks. In the researcher's view, this is an indication that the government had not budgeted for the implementation of this policy

development. This reflects lack of planning, organising and poor resourcing policy on the part of the government. It can also be interpreted as a reflection of lack of political will since government is expected to fund the implementation of the policy.

According to the two resource teachers, the appointment of the current minister of education saw the first meaningful steps towards the implementation of the 2002 policy development. The two teachers stated that at the beginning of 2010, the ministry of education, UNICEF and other donors entered into a partnership to procure school textbooks and stationery kits for schools nationwide. These teachers indicated that the minister highlighted that a significant chunk of the funds from the donor community would be spent on publishing textbooks in official minority languages.

When the researcher got to this school for the pilot study, the school had just received new school textbooks for all the other subjects, except for Sotho from the ministry in collaboration with UNICEF. The collaboration between the ministry and donor community show the role of supranational organisations in the implementation of the policy development. Moreover, the two resource teachers expressed that the authorised publishers of school textbooks were also sceptical about publishing Sotho teaching materials citing market viability problems and lack funds to pay for the publications. The two teachers noted that they were looking forward to receiving Sotho textbooks in April 2011 which is when they hoped to start teaching Sotho.

The absence of government support which is reflected in the lack of both human resources and teaching materials to support the implementation of the policy development, particularly during the term of office of the former minister of education reflects poor planning, organising, controlling, leading and lack of political will on the part of the government of the time. Policy formulation without adequate provision of resources to back up such implementation amounts to carrying on with an existing policy and reflects lack of political will.

4.12.4 Summary of pilot study findings

A comparative analysis of data gathered through the different data gathering techniques and from the different participants of the study shows a corroboration of the data gathered. The first observation is that all the participants involved in the study revealed that Sotho is not yet taught in the school and it is not used as a language of teaching and learning. This was confirmed through class observations where the researcher noted that Sotho is not included in the list of subjects in the pupils' school report, in grade 7 public examination results slips and reports, in the teachers' scheme books and marks schedules, Sotho is not included in the school timetable and there are no Sotho textbooks, no Sotho syllabus, no Sotho charts in all the classes and all the teachers have been not been trained or equipped to teach Sotho. This was also confirmed the through learners' questionnaire and semi-structured interviews with the teachers and the school head.

From these findings the researcher concluded that the non-implementation dilemmas attendant to the policy development are a result of the failure to develop, secure and deploy educational variables such as teaching materials (materials and methods policy), trained teachers (personnel policy), development of the syllabus (curriculum policy), lack of clarity on the access policy, which all indicate poor planning and resourcing of the policy and lack of political will. Poor deployment strategies of teachers, lack of in-service training programmes for teachers and trained teachers as well as the absence of teacher training colleges that train Sotho teachers indicate lack of adequate planning and organising on the part of the ministry and government. Lack of awareness of the stipulations of the policy development by most teachers reflects the dire need for advocacy, development communication, indigenisation and human and conceptual skills development by the government, Sotho language committee and ZIPLA. Lack of follow-ups by education officers reflect poor leading and controlling on the part of the ministry.

All these issues point to the government's apparent lack of political will to give concrete support for the implementation of the policy development. It emerges that

the government did not examine, develop, secure and deploy language management variables, i.e. educational variables, economic variables, management variables, language management methodologies and strategies, i.e. management oriented methodologies and strategies such as planning, leading, organising, controlling, human resource skills development and evaluation, sociolinguistic oriented methodologies and strategies, such as, corpus planning and development oriented methodologies and strategies, such as, advocacy, development communication, indigenisation and project management as well as the seven areas of policy development for language-in-education policy implementation.

The aforementioned variables, methodologies, strategies and policies which Kaplan and Baldauf (1997; 2003) as well as Mwaniki (2004) indicate that they need to be examined, secured, developed and deployed as part of any language-in-education policy implementation program were not examined, secured, developed and deployed to facilitate the implementation of the 2002 policy development. The failure to develop, secure and deploy these variables, methodologies and strategies and policy areas of development partly explain why the policy development has not been implemented in this school.

4.12.5 Key lessons from the pilot study

From this pilot study the researcher noted that there is need to add on the learners' questionnaire a question related to their language preference, i.e. the language(s) they would like to be taught in to establish whether the learners themselves want to be taught in their home language or not. This will also reveal the learners' language attitudes which will help in determining what methodologies and strategies have to be deployed to address negative attitudes or encourage the positive attitudes to ensure the successful implementation of the policy development. It will also reveal the parents' language ideologies which in most cases are reflected in the learners' language ideologies. This information will also be very useful in assessing the ethnolinguistic vitality of the selected language groups.

The researcher noted that it is necessary to re-phrase question 9 and 10 in the learners' questionnaire which focus on the learners' understanding and ability to speak the language(s) of teaching and learning. This was addressed providing a list of languages from which pupils have to choose between "yes" and "no". The need to change the phrasing of these questions stemmed from the realisation that some learners did not indicate their responses to these questions and some mixed up their responses making the analysis of the questionnaire very difficult. Similar observations and changes were made with regards to question 12 which focuses on the use of mother tongue in class. These questions seem to have posed problems of comprehension to the pupils and they also presented serious problems to the researcher in terms of their analysis following the pupils' mix-up of responses to the questions. I ensured that I give the language options so that the pupils will just indicate their responses with a tick to minimise problems of mixing up responses and wrong spellings.

I also added questions which asked pupils to indicate whether their teacher can speak or understand the official minority language in question. I also included a question which asked pupils to indicate whether they learnt the official minority language in question from grade 1-7 to identify when it was introduced in the school and to what level it is taught.

4.13 Conclusion

This chapter addressed how and who questions, which are pertinent to this chapter. It also presented and discussed the findings from the pilot study and key lessons learnt from it. The next chapter presents, analyses and discusses the data for the main research.

CHAPTER FIVE

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

5.1 Introduction

Chapter 5 focuses on data presentation, analysis and discussion. The first part of this chapter focuses on documentary analysis, followed by the presentation, analysis and discussion of data gathered through language survey questionnaires and learners' questionnaires. The last part of the chapter presents, analyses and discusses the data from semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions. It concludes with a summary that triangulates data from the different data sources and methods used for the study.

5.2 Documentary analysis using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

This section provides a textual analysis of policy documents that enshrine the Zimbabwean language-in-education policy and language policy. It explores how political discourse manifests in these policy documents and how it contributes to the delay in the implementation process of the 2002 policy developments. It assesses the covert and overt implications of the policy documents that enshrine the Zimbabwean language-in-education policy and how they affect the implementation process of the 2002 policy developments. The section aims to determine the extent to which the language-in-education policy documents' language provisions are adequate to promote the teaching and learning of official minority languages. Results from documentary analysis are verified, tested and confirmed with the use of data and results from other data gathering methods and sources.

The following policy documents are analysed: the *1997 Position Paper on Zimbabwe's Language Policy*; the *1998 Report on the Formulation of a National Language Policy by the National Language Policy Advisory Panel*; the *1999 Report of the Nziramasanga Commission of Inquiry into Education and Training in Zimbabwe;* the *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002*; the *Secretary's Circular*

Number 3 of 2002; the *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007*; the *1987 Education Act, as Amended in 2006*; the *1979 Constitution of Zimbabwe*; the *1996 National Cultural Policy of Zimbabwe*; *Re: Response to the Binga Chiefs' Concern on the Teaching of Languages* and the *Zimbabwe School Examinations Council's Examinations Circular Number 2 of 2011*and the *Constitution of Zimbabwe (Draft, 17 July 2012)*.

5.2.1 The dominant and non-dominant language dichotomy

In the *1987 Education Act, as Amended in 2006*, the *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002*, the *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002* and the *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007*, English, Ndebele and Shona are termed the three *main languages* or *major languages* of Zimbabwe. The use of *main* and *major* language acts as a preparatory statement for differences in the status of the languages in question. This is reinforced by the use of the epistemic non-modal present tense *are*. It asserts this linguistic reality as objective and factual, without further qualification. The categorical assertion of the status of Shona, Ndebele and English is expressed through the epistemic use of the non-modal present tense *are*. For example:

> Shona and Ndebele *are* the two major local languages (The *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002*).
>
> The two Major Local Languages of Zimbabwe *are* Shona and Ndebele (The *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007*).

The use of the definite article, namely, *the* in these clauses, implies that reference is to a specific and unique instance of the concept. Here it is Shona, Ndebele and English which are *the main languages*.

In the *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006*, Part XII, Section 62, Subsection (1) it is stated that:

> …all *the* three *main languages* of Zimbabwe, namely Shona, Ndebele and English, shall be taught on an equal-time basis in all schools up to form two level.

The *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002* stipulates that:

> Shona and Ndebele *are the* two *major local languages*

The *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007* states that:

> *The* two *Major Local Languages* of Zimbabwe *are* Shona and Ndebele
>
> …*the* three *main languages* of Zimbabwe, namely Shona, Ndebele and English, should be taught on an equal time basis in all schools up to Form Two level.

The terms *major* and *main* invoke images of other languages as being *minor* and of secondary importance. Abdelhay, Makoni and Makoni (2011:8) express *major* language, and its synonym *main* language, is a rendition of the dominant and hegemonic status of a language. The policy documents accord Shona, Ndebele and English the status of dominant languages without the explicit use of the word dominant. The term *major*, and its synonym *main*, are euphemisms or a depoliticised expression for *dominant* (Abdelhay, *et al*., 2011:8; Makoni, 2011:442). Abdelhay, Makoni and Makoni (2009:8) note that euphemism in policy documents make statements appear more positive than what they are. The *main* or *major* language status of English, Ndebele and Shona is a potent language shifting trigger for minority language speakers.

The linguistic and cultural capital, ascribed to Shona, Ndebele and English in the aforecited policy documents inevitably gives the impression that they are of more value and use compared to other official minority languages. The distinction between *main* or *major* and *minor* languages embodies a difference in power, status, right, privileges and prestige to the languages in question. This dichotomisation inevitably underscores the complex situatedness of particular languages with respect to power relations and differences in status and prestige. The *status differentia* in the cited policy documents creates, perpetuates and sustains systems of linguistic inequality in the education system. It demeans the spirit to implement the 2002 policy developments.

5.2.2 The national and non-national language dichotomy

According to the *1996 National Cultural Policy of Zimbabwe* (p. 5)*;* the *1997 Position Paper on Zimbabwe's Language Policy* (p. 5); the *1998 Report on the Formulation of a National Language Policy by the National Language Policy Advisory Panel* (p. 23-25) and the *1999 Report of the Nziramasanga Commission of Inquiry into Education and Training in Zimbabwe* (p. 169-170), Ndebele and Shona are national languages and Venda, Tonga, Nambya, Kalanga, Sotho and Shangani are official minority languages. The elevation of Shona and Ndebele as national languages increases their predominance and influence over the official minority and other minority languages. Shona and Ndebele are supported and promoted by the state as national languages. They are rallying points for nation building, integration, unity and national identity. This attests the observation that the main threat to African languages in the postcolonial era is no longer only the ex-colonial languages, but dominant African national languages. They also assumed the role of killer languages.

5.2.3 The official and non-official language dichotomy

English is the official language of Zimbabwe (the *1997 Position Paper on Zimbabwe's Language Policy* (p. 5); the *1998 Report on the Formulation of a National Language Policy by the National Language Policy Advisory Panel* (p. 23-25) and the *1999 Report of the Nziramasanga Commission of Inquiry into Education and Training in Zimbabwe* (p. 169-170); *The 1979 Constituion of Zimbabwe* (Section 82, subsection (1) (a), (b) (ii) and (iii); Section 87, subsection (4) (b)). The quadriglossic linguistic situation in Zimbabwe in the context of English as the High variety *vs* Shona, Ndebele, official minority languages and other minority languages as the Low varieties; Shona as the High variety vs Ndebele, official minority languages and other minority languages as the Low varieties; Ndebele as the High variety *vs* the official minority languages and other minority languages as the Low varieties and official minority languages as the High varieties *vs* minority languages as the Low varieties impacts negatively on the promotion, development, teaching and learning of official minority languages.

The official language status of English led to the marginalisation of Shona, Ndebele, official and non-official minority languages. The official national language status of Shona and Ndebele marginalises the official and non-official minority languages. The official minority languages status of official minority languages marginalises the non-official minority languages. The policy documents overtly and covertly entrench and perpetuate the diglossic hegemony of Shona, Ndebele and English. English, Ndebele and Shona as official, national and main languages have a perceptual salience that impels a shift towards them by minority language speakers. It impacts negatively on efforts to promote, develop, teach and learn official minority languages.

5.2.4 The developed and non-developed language dichotomy

The *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002* stipulates that Shona and Ndebele are already fully developed for study throughout the country's education system, and all provisions for teaching the languages are in place and are continually being upgraded to meet changing demands. The same occurs in the *1999 Report of the Nziramasanga Commission of Inquiry into Education and Training in Zimbabwe* (p. 156; 169-170). This sets the foundation for further entrenchment of Ndebele and Shona hegemony with its recommendation for the compulsory and nationwide teaching of Ndebele and Shona in all schools. The report describes Ndebele and Shona as well established and developed languages.

The covert implication of this statement is that the official minority languages are not developed. The use of the developed and non-developed language status dichotomy in view of Shona, Ndebele and official minority languages diminishes the status of official minority languages. It makes them less preferred languages for education. This dichotomy is a source of exclusion and stigmatisation of official minority languages. It presents them as languages that are not suitable for use throughout the Zimbabwean education system.

5.2.5 The population dimension of language exclusion

The *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002* and the *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007* define Kalanga, Venda, Tonga, Sotho, Shangani and Nambya as minority local languages or indigenous (minority) languages. In the *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002* minority local languages are described as languages that are spoken by relatively small indigenous groups in various parts of Zimbabwe.

Bamgbose (2007:2) states thatpopulation is used, rather mis-used to accord languages status. Bamgbose argues that this approach is unjustified, because the distinction between major and minority languages is arbitrary. This is reflected in the linguistic profiles of the selected schools in this study. What is accepted as a major language in one area may have less speakers than a minority language in another area. People tend to develop negative attitudes towards minority languages and this kills the spirit to develop and promote the teaching and learning of such languages. Given a choice, very few minority language speakers prefer to be taught in their minority languages. Most commercial publishers avoid publishing in such languages. Because of the privileged status of major languages, there is always a 'mad' rush for major languages as *the* languages of education. This is clearly reflected by the learners' preferences for English, Shona or Ndebele in the learners' questionnaires which were distributed to grades 6 and 7 pupils in the selected schools.

5.2.6 The core and optional subject dichotomy

The policy documents that enshrine the Zimbabwean language-in-education policy condemn official minority languages to under-valued positions. They are deemed as optional subjects and languages which are taught as mother tongue only in areas where they are spoken. They are taught at the discretion of the minister and could be used, not should be used for teaching other subjects. Shona, Ndebele and English are core, mandatory or compulsory subjects which should be taught everywhere in the country and to the whole nation and they should be used to teach other subjects.

The *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002* stipulates:

> Shona and Ndebele are the two major local languages. They *can* be offered for study *in any part of the country* where numbers of learners are high enough. The two languages *are already developed for study throughout the country's educational system*…Shona and Ndebele have the same status as English in our education system…it is now mandatory that Ndebele and Shona be treated exactly like English in all formal learning situations. They *can* also be used in the teaching of other subjects where this facilitate comprehension of concepts…The *compulsory* learning of Shona and Ndebele in *all* Zimbabwean Schools already applies up to Form 2. This is now being extended (a year at a time) up to Form 4.

According to the *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002*:

> …*all* primary schools *should* offer the following subjects from grades 1 to 7.
>
> 3.2.1 **Language and Communication**
>
> - Shona and Ndebele
>
> …**4.2 Core Subjects**
>
> 4.2.1 It is *compulsory* for *all* learners to study the following five core subjects up to 'O' level:-
>
> English Language
>
> History
>
> Shona or Ndebele…

The*1987 Education Act, as Amended in 2006* states:

> (1)…*all the three main languages* of Zimbabwe, namely Shona, Ndebele and English *shall be* taught on an equal-time basis in *all* schools up to form two level.

The *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007* demands:

> Shona and Ndebele are allocated the same time with English on the school timetable at primary school level.
>
> …*Provinces* should gradually start offering both Shona and Ndebele in areas where only one of the two was on offer.
>
> …all the three main languages of Zimbabwe, namely, Shona, Ndebele and English, *should* be taught on an equal time basis in *all* schools up to Form Two level

Tonga, Kalanga, Nambya, Venda, Shangani and Sotho, as mother tongue will be introduced *in their respective areas in addition to* Shona or Ndebele and English. At secondary school level they will be offered as *optional subjects* and *learners' interest, abilities and available resources should guide their selection*. School heads *should* note that the choice of optional subjects *depends largely upon the environment*, f*acilities and staff available in the school as well as the individual learners;*

preferences and ability to cope with the curriculum. They *will be* offered *together with* Shona or Ndebele *which will be offered at secondary school level*. *The Minister or the school may* authorise their teaching and during the course of instruction at primary and secondary school levels, teachers *could* use them whenever they help to communicate fundamental ideas and concepts better (the *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006, Section 62*, subsection (1) and (2)); the *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007*; the *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002*).

The status of Shona and Ndebele as the main or major, developed and national languages as well as core and compulsory subjects in all primary and secondary schools, valorise them. Tthe status of official minority languages as minority languages and optional subjects or additional languages to be taught only as mother tongue in areas where they are spoken, with stringent conditions attached to their teaching at secondary schools, stigmatise them. The teaching of these languages at secondary school level as optional subjects, on condition of the availability of teachers and resources, does not encourage teachers, parents and learners to invest time and resources in teaching and learning them at primary school level.

The effect of the stringent conditions is that most schools ignore the policy, because they can truthfully claim that teachers are not available. Interview and focus group discussions data show there are no teacher education colleges that offer training in these languages and teachers are randomly deployed without any linguistic considerations. It is not surprising for parents, teachers and pupils to ask: Why then waste time and resources on a language that learners are more than unlikely to find at secondary school level?

To teach official minority languages in addition to Shona or Ndebele subordinates these languages and reduces them to a level lower than Shona and Ndebele in terms of importance in the curriculum. It creates the impression that they are of secondary importance. A genuine sign to promoting the teaching and learning of official minority languages requires the teaching of Shona and Ndebele as additional languages in areas where minority languages are predominantly spoken.

Despite the declaration of intent to promote development, mother tongue education, linguistic diversity as well as to preserve the Zimbabwean heritage in the *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007* and the *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006, Section 62, subsection (4))*, the reviewed policy documents restrict the functional space for official minority languages in the education sector. This is done in the name of nationalism. It appears that the policy documents that enshrine the Zimbabwean language-in-education policy and language policy, promote linguistic diversity, but this diversity is not based on equality amongst all languages. Instead, a hierarchical ranking order is proposed and it subordinates official minority languages and reduce them to languages of secondary importance.

The emphasis of the equal number of periods per week dedicated to Shona, Ndebele and English is more than a statement. It underscores the centrality of these subjects in the curriculum. Except in schools in Binga district, schools in Bulilima, Mangwe and Beitbridge districts where Kalanga and Venda are taught, class observations revealed that official minority languages are allocated the minimum number of periods per week in the school and class timetables. In some cases they share slots with Ndebele or Shona. Given that Ndebele and Shona are examined at Grade 7, they inevitably enjoy the lion's share of the time. In some schools and grades where official minority languages are allocated nine periods per week, for example in Binga and Beitbridge they are not taught in addition to Shona or Ndebele. This is a violation of the stipulations of the *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006*, the *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002*, the *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002* and the *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007*.

There is an emphasis on the equality of Shona, Ndebele and English in the policy documents. This relegates other local languages to languages of secondary importance. Despite that *Appendix 'C'* of the *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002* allocate Shona , Ndebele and local languages (i.e. official and non-official minority languages) equal time, 8 periods per week for grades 1-2 and 9 periods per week for grades 3-7 in primary schools, emphasis is on the equality between Shona, Ndebele and English. This raises questions such as: Is it deliberate or an oversight? Which

agendas are concealed by this emphasis? What impact does it have on the spirit to implement the 2002 policy developments?

This reflects the fiction of language equality. Official minority languages together with Shona, Ndebele and English are allocated equal number of periods in the primary school curriculum. But, the apparent legal equality of status reflected in the same number of periods is fiction, because there already exist a specific ranking order of languages: Shona, Ndebele and English *are the three main language*s of Zimbabwe which *should* be taught on an equal-time basis in all schools. This means that they are equated to English. They are core and compulsory subjects in all schools in Zimbabwe.

The stipulation in all policy documents that it is mandatory that Shona and Ndebele have the same status as English, further widen the gap in status between these languages and official minority languages. It stresses the importance of Shona, Ndebele and English, which is not mentioned in the discussion on the status of official minority languages. Shona, Ndebele and English are said to be treated equal in terms of the number of hours allocated each week, provision of teaching and learning materials, research and level of difficulty. The dominant and hegemonic status of Shona, Ndebele and English is textually disguised and reproduced in these policy documents. The emphasis on the equality of status between Shona, Ndebele and English points to a preoccupation with the hierarchical order of the languages involved in these policy documents.

While these policy documents give the impression that official minority languages have a place in the Zimbabwean education system, some of their covert and overt implications prescribe Shona, Ndebele and English as *the* languages. The act to give higher priority and status to Shona, Ndebele and English undermine the status of the official minority languages and efforts that aim to promote their development, teaching and learning. The *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002* states that official minority languages will be offered as subjects, together with Shona or Ndebele which will be offered at secondary school level. This clause leaves the impression that

official minority languages are not going to be offered at secondary school level. Yet, in the section that outlines the curriculum for secondary schools, the circular stipulates that official minority languages will be offered as optional subjects.

This might appear as a contradiction and inconsistency, but the modifications, conditions, opt-outs, escape clauses and alternatives that qualify the teaching of these languages iplicate what the government's official position is, namely, that they have no space at secondary level. To confirm this speculation is the absence of a slot for official minority languages in *Appendix 'C'* of the *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002* which indicates the number of periods per week for all the subjects offered at secondary school level. Negative attitudes to mother tongue education in official minority languages are reinforced by its marginal position as a transit to the prestigious literacy in Ndebele or Shona and English. The clause seems to imply that only major languages will be taught at secondary school level and this perpetuates the hegemony hostile to official minority languages.

The clauses that stress the equality of Shona, Ndebele and English reflect what Abdelhay, Makoni and Makoni (2011:8) as well as Makoni (2011:443) refer to as 'the fiction of language equality'. At the level of status planning, the policy documents that enshrine the Zimbabwean language-in-education policy assign Shona, Ndebele and English equal status in the Zimbabwean education system. The legal equality of status is fiction, because there is a ranking order already in existence. English is the national official language and Shona and Ndebele are the official national languages. This suggests that Shona, Ndebele and English are not of equal importance in Zimbabwe, although the textual meaning imply they have the same status in the education system.

Ndebele and Shona are not required in employment and for admission to higher education. An exception to the rule is for the Bachelor of Arts and Linguistics with Ndebele and Shona as majors, the Bachelor of Education with Ndebele and Shona as majors and Ndebele and for Shona majors in teacher education colleges. In practice, a full 5 'Ordinary' level certificate is considered to be one that has 5 'O' level

passes which include Mathematics and English. Emphasis is on English and Mathematics. Ndebele and Shona and other local languages are not a requirement in the full 5 'O' level certificate. It is justified to ask: What is the motivation to study and major in these languages if the career paths of the education system do not stress the need for a qualification in these subjects?

The superior status of English is reflected in the *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007* where English is accorded more periods that Shona and Ndebele. In the *Zimbabwe School Examinations Council's Examinations Circular Number 2 of 2011* English is listed as a core subject, while Ndebele and Shona are optional subjects alongside Tonga. The distinction between core and optional subjects, compulsory and additional subject embody a difference in power, status, rights, privileges and prestige of the languages in question. This dichotomisation inevitably underscores the complex situatedness of particular languages with respect to power relations and differences in status and prestige. This distinction provides further political and educational ground and power for Shona, Ndebele and English to emerge as the dominant languages.

5.2.7 Incentives

In view of the efforts to create or improve the opportunity to learn official minority languages, classroom instruction in these languages and teaching them as subject is merely permissible and not obligatory. Clauses to promote the teaching of official minority languages are weak and neutralised. In terms of material provision, the publication of teaching materials in these languages delayed. Kalanga and Sotho materials were not yet published during the time of the field research. Despite the government's pledge in the *1996 National Cultural Policy of Zimbabwe* (p 8; 11) to partner with local publishers to promote and develop Zimbabwean languages through funding of training and competions to promote local literary and scientific publications, which include indigenous languages, very little has been done in this regard. This is especially true in view of official minority languages.

Evidence is reflected in the data from field research, existing research and newspaper articles (Hachipola, 1998; Chimhundu, *et al*., 1998; the*1999 Report of the Nziramasanga Commission of Inquiry into Education and Training in Zimbabwe*; Nkomo, 2007; 2008; Ndhlovu, 2008a; 2008b; 2009; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b; Gondo, 2009; Mavunga, 2010; Makoni, 2011; Ndlovu, 2011; Harris, 2009; Bulawayo Bureau, 2010; Moyo, 2010; Sunday News Reporters, 2010; Mlotshwa, 2011; Chinowaita, 2011; Business Reporter, 2011; Herald Reporter, 2011; Mafuba, 2011; Staff Reporter, 2011; Dube, 2012; Nthambe, 2012; Tshuma, 2012; Coltart, 2012).

The use of these languages in the media is still low to promote opportunities to learn them. They are all slotted in one station, namely, National FM, where they compete for airtime. The methods which focus on the incentive to learn them, such as to make them compulsory subjects are not in place. At secondary schools these languages are offered as optional subjects under stringent conditions. In primary schools they are not examined. Only Tonga has been examined. These languages are not prerequisites for employment. No matter how well-established a language may be in the school curriculum, if it is not a prerequisite for employment, teachers, parents or learners will not see the need to teach or learn it. They will only do so if there are practical demands for the language outside the teaching field and the education sector.

Given the limited job market that requires a qualification in official minority languages and very limited airtime accorded to these languages on National FM, who will be motivated to invest time and resources to teach or learn these languages? Efforts to teach and learn these languages are constrained by their low status and value in the education system and other domains, such as the media industry. The negative attitudes towards mother tongue education in official minority languages in Zimbabwe are intensified by the disuse of mother tongue in the public domain. This renders literacy skills in these languages irrelevant for access or upward social mobility. For official minority languages to function alongside English, Shona and Ndebele as viable languages of education, their use in education must be rewarding. Minority

language speakers need to know what mother tongue education in these languages will do for them. These languages must become options for career choices.

Almost all these incentives are present for Shona and Ndebele. But sadly, they lack for official minority languages. Shona and Ndebele are compulsory subjects in primary and secondary schools, while official minority languages are optional subjects. They are offered in terms of certain prescribed conditions which leave majors in these languages at the mercy of the state and school authorities. Proficiency in Shona or Ndebele is requirement at the end of the primary and secondary school education, but this is not the case with official minority languages. In the policy documents that enshrine the Zimbabwean language-in-education policy, proficiency in official minority language is not used as a measure of school success. But, proficiency is emphasized in Shona, Ndebele and English. Official minority languages can only be taught in areas where they are spoken. This confine or limit speakers of these languages to schools in their districts, which in most cases are poorly resourced for other subjects in terms of staffing, equipments and materials, infrastructure. In most cases these schools are not the best in terms of the range of subjects they offer and or with regard to their pass rates.

5.2.8 The hierarchical ordering of languages

There is a ranking order of languages reflected in the *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006*, the *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002*, the *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002* and in the *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007*. In all the aforementioned policy documents, Shona is mentioned, followed by Ndebele and finally English. This is the case except for two instances out of seven in the *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002* and one instance out of eight in *the Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007*. In the *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006* all the cases present Shona always first. In the *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002* it is only in one case out of seven where Shona is not listed first where the ranking order is presented.

The ranking order of these languages cannot be explained alphabetic. There is more to the ranking order than the alphabet since the ordering completely defies it. The language, which is supposed to appear last if alphabetically ordered, actually comes first. English, which is supposed to be first, appears last in the row. This ranking order reflects the politics of language in Zimbabwe. This ranking order is also evident in the media, where Shona programs are always presented first. The news bulletin on Zimbabwe Television and Radio Zimbabwe are read first in Shona and then in Ndebele. The national anthem is sung first in Shona and then in Ndebele on all radio stations, and television and national events. Possibly, English is listed last to disguise the hypocricy of the leaders who lambast the West and yet embrace their language. It reflects the ideology of the ZANU-PF government which Ndhlovu (2011) sums up as follows:

> No to everything British, but their language.

The terms *main* and *major* languages imply a ranking order and they suggest a hierarchically structured relation of statuses between the languages which are *main* / *major* and *minor*. There is clearly a hierarchy of languages in Zimbabwe with English, Shona and Ndebele receiving almost all official recognition, while official minority languages are lowly regarded and accorded limited functional space. The policy documents strongly favour English, Shona and Ndebele. This hierarchical ordering of languages impacts negatively on efforts that aim to at promote the development, teaching and learning of official minority languages, because they are reduced to languages of secondary importance.

5.2.9 Vagueness, arbitrariness and inconsistency

Apart from restricting the functional space of official minority languages the clauses of the *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006*, the *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002* and the *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007* are vague. They just say that official minority languages will be taught in areas where they are spoken. This clause is couched in sufficiently general terms to go down well. A 'catch-all formula' is used

to be interpreted in a flexible manner to use Bamgbose's (1991:113) words. Vague and general terms in policy documents facilitate non-compliance.

It would have been better if the policy documents explicitly stated that official minority languages are supposed to be taught in areas where these languages are predominantly spoken or where numbers are high enough and specify how enough high these numbers should be or where there is a sufficient number to constitute a class, in which case is where such policies are urgently needed and can be easily operationalised. In some areas where these languages are spoken, the small population size of these speakers cannot support all that goes into using a language as a medium of instruction. In some cases the linguistic profiles of the schools require creative classroom organisation to effectively implement the 2002 policy development. The vague nature of these clauses reflect an element of arbitrariness in that their being vague is a cover-up for decisions which are not informed by relevant fact-finding, language surveys and planning prior to the policy. If this policy development was informed by relevant fact-finding and planning the clauses would not have been as vague as they are.

There are some inconsistencies and incoherencies in the policy documents in their stipulations. For example, the *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007* which is said to further re-define and re-articulate the implementation of the teaching and learning of local languages which was indicated by the *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002* and the *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002* reverts back to the stipulations of the *1987 Education Act* with regard to the teaching and learning of official minority languages. While the *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002* and the *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002* stipulate that official minority languages will be taught in schools in areas where they are spoken, the *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007* and the *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006* still stipulate:

> In areas where the Indigenous (Minority) languages other than Shona and Ndebele are spoken, *schools may* teach such languages (The *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007*).
>
> (2) In areas where indigenous languages other than those mentioned in subsection (1) are spoken, *the Minister may* authorize the teaching of such languages in schools… (The *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006*, Section 62, subsection (2)).

The amendment on the stipulations of the *1987 Education Act*, section 62, subsection (2) that were inscribed in the *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002* and the *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002* have not been effected in the *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006* which serves as the main point of reference. According to the *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006* and the *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007* the teaching and learning of official minority languages is still at the discretion of the Minister and the school. They *may* be taught, yet the stipulations in the *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002* and the *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002* changed this position with the stipulation that official minority languages *will be* taught in primary schools in areas where they are spoken.

This contradicts the spirit and letter of the *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002* and the *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002*. The *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002* and the *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002* indicate:

> From January 2002 the languages *will be* assisted to advance to a grade per year until they can be taught at Grade 7 (The *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002*).
>
> …Tonga, Kalanga, Nambya, Venda, Shangani and Sotho as mother tongues *will be* introduced in their respective areas in phases as follows:-... (The *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002*).

These inconsistencies, incoherencies and contradictions in policy documents can lead to confusion among policy implementers. They can lead to lack of clarity on what the official position and status of local languages in the curriculum is. This can inevitably contribute to the delay in the teaching and learning of official minority languages. This highlights the need to have an explicitly, written language-in-education policy which will be the main point of reference. Circulars are to be supplementary documents. These contradictions and inconsistencies contribute to fluctuation in the policy, especially in its implementation.

The vagueness of the policy documents is also compounded by the rather 'loose' use of the terms *indigenous languages* and *local languages* with regard to Ndebele, Shona and the official minority languages. At some point *local languages* refer to official minority languages only and at some point it is a general term for all the indigenous languages. The same is true for the term *indigenous languages*. One

struggles to tell to which languages these terms refer. There is a need to clearly distinguish the meaning of these terms, because the mix-up confuses implementers and readers with regard to the status of these so-called local and indigenous languages.

The absence of an explicitly, written language-in-education policy document reflects avoidance of policy making. Bamgbose (1991:113) argues that a definite statement of policy is preferred to the avoidance of such statements. In this case, an explicit language-in-education policy document is preferred to numerous policy circulars which require patience to gather to gain a full picture and understanding of the stipulations of the language-in-education policy.

The *1987 Education Act* cannot be the substitute of the language-in-education policy, given the complexity of issues that it handles and addresses. It must be an extra statutory instrument that engenders the ethos and culture of the explicit language-in-education policy. An explicit language-in-education policy document is equivalent to a one-stop shop where one can buy everything he/she wants under one roof. Policy circulars toss those concerned to and fro. In some cases, some are nowhere to be found, because they are bits and pieces that need to be gathered to obtain a complete picture. It takes unusual patience, dedication, sacrifice and perseverance to search for all these bits and pieces of the complete picture of the language-in-education policy.

Given an explicit policy document, its weaknesses can be examined and suggestions made for modifications without the stress about where to start looking for circular 2 or 4. In the context of continuous changes in the authorities who head the education departments and all its related organs, an explicit language-in-education policy document is highly recommended. It will ensure continuity, coherence and consistency in the stipulations of the policy documents. With policy circulars, a new officer will not have time to search for each circular, especially given the numerous circulars that the Ministry distributes. Circulars are not user-friendly and accessible as the main point of reference for language-in-education policies.

Since the implementation of policies is far removed from the policy makers, the instructions for their implementation through circulars pass through many ranks before they get to the teachers in the different schools. These circulars are interpreted differently, get lost or do not reach their intended destinations. Consequently, an explicit language policy can be the best alternative in this context to avoid information black-outs which some schools endure. It may decrease misinterpretation of information, which inevitably affects policy implementation.

With the declaration of the *Zimbabwe School Examinations Council's Examinations Circular Number 2 of 2011*, official minority languages face further challenges with regard to significance in the education sector. They now have to compete with well-established and privileged languages, Shona and Ndebele, in the final grade 7 examinations from the angle of optional subjects. Given the weak stipulations on the teaching and learning of official minority languages, it is likely that Shona and Ndebele will be the most preferred languages. They are said to be already fully developed and have high status and prestige.

According to the *Zimbabwe School Examinations Council's Examinations Circular Number 2 of 2011*:

> Four subjects *should* be entered while the following three are common to all candidates:
>
> ENGLISH
>
> MATHEMATICS
>
> GENERAL PAPER,
>
> Candidates should choose <u>one of</u> Shona, Ndebele **or** Tonga as the fourth subject.
>
> **PLEASE NOTE THAT AT GRADE 7, CANDIDATES MUST SIT FOR FOUR SUBJECTS.**

The stipulations of this circular contradict the stipulations of the *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002*, the *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002*, the *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006* and the *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007* which stipulate that Shona, Ndebele and English are core and compulsory subjects in all primary schools and official minority languages must be taught as additional subjects, which means they cannot be taught independently of Shona or Ndebele. This circular

presents a hierarchical ordering of these languages, with the latest language in the curriculum presented last in the row. The hierarchy is similar to the one maintained in the other reviewed policy documents where Shona always comes first.

In response to the stipulations of the *Zimbabwe School Examinations Council's Examinations Circular Number 2 of 2011*, the director for primary schools in his response to Binga chiefs' concern on the teaching of local languages underscores that;

> However, it must be emphasized that these local languages do not supplant the three main languages of Zimbabwe. Learners will learn and be examined in English, ChiShona or IsiNdebele in addition to the local languages which they might choose to do (*Re: Response to the Binga Chiefs' concern on the teaching of the languages*).

An official from the ministry of education's head office reiterated this position in the interview. He argued:

> No it is wrong. It is wrong interpretation…it is a misinterpretation of the Act that resulted in…timetabling Tonga instead of Ndebele for their exams. It is that kind of misunderstanding. We are going to correct that (Interview, WS650302).

These contradictions in the stipulations of the policy documents reflect poor coordination and communication within the different structures of the Ministry of Education. They reflect hierarchical disintegration within the structures of the ministry. They point to a lack of coordination between the structures of the ministry when policies are developed. They reveal that there is no consultation among the structures when policies are deliberated or formulated. They also indicate a lack of thorough knowledge of the stipulations of the language-in-education policy by officials in the ministry and other structures of the ministry.

The *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002* and the *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002* which were respectively published on the 3rd and 28th of January 2002, carry stipulations that apply with immediate effect:

> These languages are currently taught up to Grade 3. *From January 2002* the languages will be assisted to advance to a grade per year until they can be taught at Grade 7 (The *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002*).

> It is against this background that the Ministry of Education, Sport and Culture has adopted a new policy on curriculum for primary and secondary education which should be implemented *with effect from 1 January, 2002* (The *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002*).
>
> **IMMEDIACY OF THE SITUATION**
>
> The compulsory learning of Shona and Ndebele in all Zimbabwean Schools already applies up to Form 2…the above provisions *have immediate effect* (The *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002*).

The compulsory teaching and learning of Shona and Ndebele in all Zimbabwean schools in the *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002* is discussed under the title: "IMMEDIACY OF THE SITUATION", in capital letters. This emphasizes the urgency and importance of the policy development. The compulsory teaching and learning of Ndebele and Shona was to apply with immediate effect, while the teaching and learning of official minority languages is not emphasized as such.

The 2002 policy circulars were a last-minute rush decision in a crisis situation. (See: Ndlovu, 2011). According to Mumpande (2006:42) members of parliament who attended the Education Portfolio Committee meeting with ZIPLA officials, expressed their shock when they heard the legal implications of the stipulations of Section 62 of the *1987 Education Act*. After this meeting and revelation of the legal implications of the stipulations of the *1987 Education Act*, the *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002* was declared on the 3rd of January 2002. Mumpande (2006:42) indicates that ZIPLA officials meet with the Education Portfolio Committee on the 17th of October 2001 and on the 3rd of January 2002, the Ministry through the *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002*, declared the introduction of official minority languages and the compulsory teaching of Shona and Ndebele in all Zimbabwean schools. It was to be effected from the 1st of January 2002, yet the circular was only published on the 3rd of January.

The interval between the time the idea was shared with the ministry and the 2002 policy decision was too short for meaningful planning. This reveals the arbitrary nature of the decision. There was very little time for thoughtful analysis and careful planning for the implementation of the policy before its declaration. (See: Ndlovu, 2011). Mumpande's (2006:42) narration of the state of mind of the members of

parliament in the meeting that led to the *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002*, confirms it beyond any reasonable doubt, that this was a last-minute rush decision in a crisis situation. Typically, such policies are associated with poor analysis of the policy framework. It is true especially for their practical implementation and feasibility in a given economic environment and against available resources.

The major criseses at hand were the fear to lose support among official minority language speakers, the legal implications of the *1987 Education Act* and the threatened Ndebele and Shona hegemony. Given that the advocacy activities of ZIPLA intensified on the eve of the first presidential elections since independence, it is more than tempting to conclude that apart from the alarm raised by the legal implications of the *1987 Education Act*, the policy development was also declared for political expediency. The development was possibly a subtle way to silence the minority language speakers at a time when their support was contested by the ruling and opposition parties on the eve of the first decisive presidential elections since independence.

The advocacy activities that promote the teaching of official minority languages run counter to the ideological and sociological trend of Ndebele and Shona as the 'super tribes'. (See: Hachipola, 1998; Mumpande, 2006; Nkomo, 2007; 2008; Ndhlovu, 2008a; 2008b; 2009; Makoni, 2011; Ndlovu, 2011). Mumpande (2006:42) states that members of the Education Portfolio Committee viewed the teaching of official minority languages as an attempt by minority language groups in Matabeleland to assert their autonomy from Ndebele. Some politicians expressed concern that the promotion of official minority languages would divide the 'Ndebele' people when the *1987 Unity Accord* had acknowledged their place. Makoni (2011:442) argues that minority languages were, from the onset, excluded by the President of Zimbabwe who termed the *1987 Unity Accord* 'a charter which would bind once and for all, the two major tribes of Zimbabwe, Shona and Ndebele into one'.

Five of these official minority languages are spoken in Matabeleland. This is a province which is a Ndebele area that overlooks that the Ndebeles constitute only a

fraction of the total population of the people in Matabeleland. The development that Shona and Ndebele should be taught in all Zimbabwean schools as compulsory subjects was a subtle way to address the potential threat presented by the teaching and learning of official minority languages beyond grade 3. In the context of these possible interpretations of the stipulations of the *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002* it is impossible to enforce the effective teaching of official minority languages. It is highly unlikely to make them compulsory or core subjects alongside Ndebele and Shona.

Noteworthy in the *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002* is the immediate application of the compulsory teaching and learning of Shona and Ndebele up until Form 4 in all Zimbabwean schools. Shona and Ndebele are the hegemonic languages which official minority language speakers are challenging, but just when their languages have been acknowledged in the education system, Shona and Ndebele are with immediate effect compulsory up to Form 4 in all Zimbabwean schools and accorded exactly the same status as English in all formal learning situations. This development is indeed counter to the efforts to level the plain between Shona, Ndebele and official minority languages.

The policy development re-asserts and re-affirms the hegemonic status of Shona and Ndebele. It is possibly part of the provisions for teaching Shona and Ndebele to meet changing demands which seek to threaten the hegemony of the national languages espoused in the *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002*. It is tempting to conclude that the changing demands to be met, referred to in the *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002* might also include the 2002 policy statements which sought to claim space for official minority languages. The *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002* stipulates:

> All the provisions for teaching the languages are in place and are continually being upgraded to meet changing demands.
>
> It has already been amply proven that the new syllabi for Shona and Ndebele can be learnt by all school children regardless of ethnic origin. Further adjustments are under way to ensure that the languages are suitable for any child regardless of their mother tongue.

One may ask: Why bother to teach official minority languages given this background? Why invest resources and time to teach official minority languages? Instead of leveling the ground for all the languages in Zimbabwe, these clauses are efforts to entrench Shona and Ndebele hegemony. They widen the divide between Shona, Ndebele and the official minority languages. In the government's view, the teaching of official minority languages might have posed the threat to undermine the national agenda of achieving the nationalist goals of developing learners who are proficient in the national languages to foster national unity.

The position paper addressed to Binga chiefs by the director of primary schools in the Ministry of Education, Sport, Arts and Culture, confirms the observation that the compulsory teaching of Shona and Ndebele nationwide is an attempt by the government to forge national unity. The director notes:

> …all schools in Zimbabwe are expected, in line with the National Vision, to teach, first and foremost, the three main languages. The vision states that "Zimbabwe shall emerge as a United, Strong, Democratic, Prosperous and Egalitarian Nation…by the year 2020.
>
> …learners in the Mashonaland areas should learn and speak English. Conversational IsiNdebele and IsiShona. Similarly, learners in the Matabeleland areas areas are expected to learn and speak English, IsiNdebele and Conversational ChiShona. It is expected that this will result in the much needed unity as all our people will better understand each other (*Ministry of Education, Sport, Arts and Culture, Re: Response to the Binga chiefs' concern on the teaching of languages*).

States respond to centrifugal movements of minority language speakers by re-asserting the hegemony of the dominant languages. Dominant groups do not remain silent and passive when their hegemony or dominance is threatened. They devise policies to keep their subordinates 'in their place' (Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977:307; Tollefson, 2004:264).

The immediate application of the policies of teaching Shona and Ndebele, as well as official minority languages, reflect an element of arbitrariness. Given the prevailing economic conditions and the state of the education system at that stage, demarcates this as an ambitious project to embark on. Since the policy was 'a last-minute rush decision in a crisis situation, it was mainly concerned with status planning. It was a case of declaration without implementation. Implementation of last-minute rush

decisions is difficult due to poor environmental analysis and unchecked impracticalities associated with rashly formulated political rather developmentally expedient policies, which are more emotively subjective. This possibly explains the delay in the implementation of the policy.

Even the compulsory teaching of Shona and Ndebele in all schools was going to be an uphill task to undertake given the huge exodus of teachers to neighbouring countries in search of greener pastures during the time that the policy was declared. Teaching as a profession was not paying. It was the most shunned profession, as reflected in the low student turn-out at teacher education colleges. In this context, it is difficult to mobilise and convince official minority language speakers to train as teachers for official minority languages. The annual progression of the teaching of official minority languages itself was too ambitious a project given the unfavourable conditions in the country then. The time frame was inadequate for the mobilisation of the necessary inputs, such as teachers and materials.

The annual progression of the classes illustrates the problem of lack of feasibility. Its basis was not informed by research since learners' questionnaires from some districts indicate that these languages are not taught up to grade 3. In selected schools in Mangwe, Chiredzi, Hwange and Gwanda South learners who completed the learners' questionnaires indicated that some of these official minority languages were not taught up to grade 3 by 2001. In some of the schools they are still not taught, a position that contradicts the policy stipulations of the *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002* that the teaching of these languages was already in place up to grade 3 by 2001.

There is no clear policy that determines how the 2002 policy will be fiscally and physically supported. There is no plan that indicates how the policy was going to be funded in the then dwindling economy. The 2002 policy development preceded the training of teachers in these languages, and the preparation of materials and resources and research into the linguistic geography of these languages in their

respective districts. Because of the impromptu nature of the directives, it is not surprising that the policy implementation has not moved as anticipated.

5.2.10 Declaration without implementation

The policy was declared, but there is not even a single teacher education college yet that offers training in official minority languages and textbooks are still not available, in some of these languages, for example for Sotho and Kalanga. Teachers are still deployed randomly without any linguistic considerations to areas where these languages are spoken. The random deployment of teachers without any linguistic consideration defeats efforts of promoting mother tongue education in official minority languages and teaching them as subjects. According to teachers, heads and ministry officials that I interviewed teachers are randomly deployed under the understanding that a teacher trained in Zimbabwe can teach anywhere in Zimbabwe. In our interviews some ministry officials argued that;

> People can learn these languages on the job…human beings are capable of learning (Interview, WS650302).

In as much as the *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002* stipulates that the annual progression of the classes will enable the necessary inputs, such as teachers, classrooms and materials to be made available in advance, it does not spell out how teachers and teaching materials will be mobilised. Apart from mentioning that the annual progression of classes will enable the provision of materials and teachers, there is no clear policy on materials and methods and policy as well as on the personnel policy. How are these materials and teachers going to be secured? By whom will these materials be developed? Who will train teachers? What qualification will be required since these languages were not taught before at primary, secondary schools, and in tertiary education? What pre-service and in-service training will be rolled out, especially given that the policy applies with immediate effect before teacher training colleges have even trained a single teacher majoring in the languages?

The interview with the Minister of Education revealed that there has not been a clear policy that spells out how these inputs will be made available until the time when UNICEF intervened through the Education Transition Fund (ETF). There was no plan or budget to back the implementation. At least in terms of the curriculum policy *Appendix C* of the *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002* specify the time allocation for official minority languages. Though defined, the access policy of the 2002 policy developments is vague as indicated earlier.

Given that the 2002 policy was a result of a bottom-up initiative, the assumption is that the representatives of the speakers of official minority languages are representing the views of the speakers of these languages. The 2002 policy circulars do not mention whether these languages will be examined in the final examinations for grade 7 pupils. They do not state how these languages will be examined, i.e whether as core subjects alongside Ndebele and Shona or optional subjects. A statement about their status in the grade 7 examinations only came out in 2011. Since the reviewed literature of this study indicates that tests are powerful policy mechanisms that can create de facto policies particularly in examination-oriented curricula, it was an oversight to overlook the evaluation policy of the 2002 policy development. The outright majority of the participants of the study argued that the non-examination of these languages also contributed to the delay of their development, teaching and learning.

The status of official minority languages only permits restricted and conditional use and teaching of these languages. In essence, the policy documents present a weak case for medium of instruction in official minority languages and a very strong case for medium of instruction in and teaching of Shona, Ndebele and English. The restricted use of official minority languages and their low status does not place them on an equal footing with Shona, Ndebele and English which are accorded higher status. Consequently, official minority languages have to contend with this handicap imposed on them. The granting of permission to teach and learn official minority languages is realised deontically through the use of the modal auxiliary *may*/ *could* as opposed to *must*/ *should*/ *can* for Shona and Ndebele (See: Makoni, 2011:442). Due

to the inequity of status and functions between dominant and minority languages, the latter find themselves in a disadvantaged position.

According to the *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007*;

> *In areas* where the Indigenous (Minority) Languages other than Shona and Ndebele are spoken, schools *may* teach such languages *in addition to Shona and Ndebele*. The Curriculum Development Unit *may* be approached for assistance with the provision of syllabi.

In the same spirit the *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006* stipulates that;

> (2) *In areas* where indigenous languages other than those mentioned in subsection (1) are spoken, the Minister *may* authorize the teaching of such languages in schools *in addition to* those specified in subsection (1).

The use of the escape clause *may* express a less firm decision and position regarding the teaching of other local languages. It entails that the teaching and learning of official minority languages is not obligatory since the directive is expressed through the deontic use of the modal *may*. Although the policy documents permit the use of local languages as media of instruction, the directive is given using a weak clause riddled with an escape making the decision less firm. The *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007* stipulates that;

> … during the course of instruction at both primary and secondary school levels, teachers *could* use the Local Languages whenever they help to communicate fundamental ideas and concepts better.

When referring to the use of Shona and Ndebele as media of instruction the directive is more firm and obligatory. It is *mandatory* to treat Ndebele and Shona *exactly* like English in all formal learning situations, i.e. they *must* be used as media of instruction just like English which is used as the language of instruction. There is a shift from being general to being specific in terms of which local languages *must* be the media of instruction. According to the *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007* local languages *could* be used as media of instruction, but in the *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002* Shona and Ndebele *can* be used for teaching other subjects. The *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002* stipulates that;

> …it is now *mandatory* that Ndebele and Shona be treated exactly like English in all formal learning situations. They *can* also be used in the teaching of other subjects where this facilitate comprehension of concepts.

Clauses on the teaching of official minority languages are riddled with modifications, alternatives, opt-outs or let-outs which permit reluctant implementers to meet the requirements of the policies in a minimalist way. Reluctant implementers are able to justify their failure to teach these languages by claiming that their teaching was not possible given the governing conditions that dictate their teaching. These clauses sound weak, unsatisfactory and virtually meaningless, a feature which Skutnabb-Kangas (1998: 7; 2006:275-276) identify as a common one for clauses relating to language-related rights for minority language speakers. For example;

The *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002* stipulates that;

> 4.4 **Optional Subjects**
>
> Learners' interest, abilities and available resources should guide the selection of optional subjects from the following five groups: -
>
> 4.4.1 **Group 1: Languages**
>
> Kalanga, Tonga, Nambya, Shangani, Venda, Sotho…
>
> **NB** School heads should note that the choice of optional subjects depends largely upon the environment, facilities and staff available in the school as well as the individual learners' preferences and ability to cope with the curriculum

According to the *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007*;

> In areas where Indigenous (Minority) Languages other than Shona and Ndebele are spoken, schools may teach such languages in addition to Shona and Ndebele. The Curriculum Development Unit (CDU) *may* be approached for assistance with the provision of syllabi.

Given that the *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002* stipulates that official minority languages are supposed to be taught up to grade 7, the *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007* should stipulate that schools *should / must* approach CDU for assistance with the provision of syllabi. In Zimbabwe the curricula for all schools is centralised. All curriculum policy, methods and materials policy are centrally defined, developed and mandated. Through the CDU, the Ministry controls the production and distribution of pedagogical materials, including syllabi development.

Curriculum and materials are tightly controlled. Methodology and content of the materials and syllabi is prescribed and centrally approved by the CDU. The use of the escape clause *may* is therefore a cause for concern in this context because the directive should be obligatory if indeed these languages are to be taught in schools. *May* is less compelling and facilitates non-implementation of the 2002 policy developments. The clauses that refer to the teaching and learning of official minority languages are merely permissible not obligatory.

This does not motivate teachers, parents and pupils to see the value of teaching and learning official minority languages. It does not give teacher training colleges the impetus to introduce these languages in their curriculum. Neither does it motivate speakers of official minority languages nor non-speakers of these languages to attach any value to the teaching and learning of these languages. Nor does it provide an impetus for commercial book publishers to publish in these languages. The clauses do not motivate potential writers in these languages. In essence the clauses do not provide an enabling and compelling policy environment for the effective implementation of the 2002 policy developments.

Policy documents that cover the use of minority languages in education are so heavily qualified that the minority is completely at the mercy of the state or school authorities as reflected in the *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006* and in the *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007* since the discretion for the teaching of these languages lies with the minister and school and is dictated by available resources which in actual fact are supposed to be provided by the state.

On the other hand, clauses that focus on the teaching of Shona, Ndebele and English contain firm decisions which are expressed through the deontic use of the legal *should* and *must* which express the *mandatory*, *compulsory* and *obligatory* teaching of Shona and Ndebele. The clauses referring to Shona and Ndebele create obligations and contain demanding formulations, where implementers are obliged to ('*shall* or *must*') act in order to ensure the stipulations are implemented. For example;

> …all the three main languages of Zimbabwe, namely Shona, Ndebele and English, *shall* be taught on an equal-time basis in all schools up to form two level (The *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006*).
>
> …this means that Shona, Ndebele and English *mus*t be equated in the following respects… (The *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002*).
>
> …all the three main languages of Zimbabwe, namely Shona, Ndebele and English *should* be taught… (The *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007*).
>
> …all primary schools *should* offer the following subjects from grades 1 to 7.
>
> 3.2.1 Language and Communication
>
> - Shona and Ndebele up to grade 7
>
> 4.2.1 It is *compulsory* for all learners to study the following five core subjects up to 'O' level:-
>
> …Shona or Ndebele (The *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002*)

In contrast to demanding formulations and few opt-outs and alternatives in the clauses of the main languages, formulations that relate to official minority languages include a range of escape clauses. They have ample modifications, let-outs, opt-outs and alternatives, which include *may*, *in their respective areas*, *in addition to*, *learners' interest and abilities* and *available resources should guide the selection of optional languages* (i.e. official minority languages), *school heads should note that the choice of optional subjects depends largely upon the environment, facilities and staff available in the school as well as the individual learners' preferences and ability to cope with the curriculum*. The clauses covering official minority languages are conditional formulations which are much more heavily qualified than the unconditional formulations covering Shona and Ndebele. None of the policy clause referring to official minority languages is binding and enforced by sanctions.

The numerous restrictions and conditions associated with the teaching of official minority languages at secondary school level are rather at the discretion of policy makers and implementers. Clauses promoting official minority languages are carefully worded and policy implementers seem not to have any obligation to take positive measures to implement mother tongue education in these languages. The clauses amount to statements of encouragement to offer these languages rather than

obligations that oblige implementers to take positive measures to implement mother tongue education in these languages. In essence these weak, neutralised and less compelling clauses do not promote the development, teaching and learning of official minority languages.

These stipulations create hegemonic space for Shona, Ndebele and English in schools and effectively reduce the space of official minority languages. They re-assert and re-articulate the dominance and hegemony in favour of Shona, Ndebele and English. This being the underlying spirit and letter of these policy documents, there is no legal ground for enforcing the successful implementation of the 2002 policy developments.

5.2.11 The nationalist and nationist ideology in the policy documents

The nationalist ideology, exclusive nation building and subtle policies of Zimbabwe that promote assimilation into the dominant language groups constrict the functional space and status of minority languages and impacts negatively on the implementation of the 2002 policy developments. Chances for education in a minority language are very limited where the general policy is directed towards assimilation, but good where the development of ethnic identities is tolerated and promoted (Verhoeven, 1997:403). Politicians play a dominant role in the development of nationalism by manipulating language as an instrument for the expression of collective consciousness. Nation building suggests the dominance and attempted incorporation of peripheral ethnic groups by a single core ethnic group. Those seeking to create or manipulate national identities have habitually attempted to do so through the formulation and implementation of language policy and planning measures (Orman, 2008: xi; 24).

Such policies usually include rational arguments such as the need for national unity as in the director's response to Binga chiefs' concern on the teaching of languages. The director's argument is that national unity is forged through Ndebele and Shona and it appears national unity is only perceived along the lines of Ndebele and Shona.

The argument overlooks unity in diverse and foster unity only through the national languages. In this position paper (*Re: Response to the Binga Chiefs' concern on the teaching of the languages*) the Ministry of Education, Sport, Arts and Culture states:

> …all schools in Zimbabwe are expected, in line with the National Vision, to teach, first and foremost, the three main languages. The vision states that **"Zimbabwe shall emerge as a United, Strong, Democratic, Prosperous and Egalitarian Nation with a High Quality of life for all Zimbabweans by the year 2020."** (p. 2).
>
> …learners in the Mashonaland areas should learn and speak English. Conversational IsiNdebele and ChiShona. Similarly, learners in the Matabeleland areas are expected to learn and speak English, IsiNdebele and Conversational ChiShona. It is expected that this will result in the much needed unity as all our people will better understand each other (p. 3).

The stipulations of the *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002* clearly play out the subtle policy of assimilating minority groups into the dominant language groups of Zimbabwe. It stipulates that;

> All the provisions for teaching the languages are in place and are continually being upgraded to meet the changing demands…It has already been amply proved that the new syllabi for Shona and Ndebele can be learnt by all school children regardless of ethnic origin. Further adjustment are under way to ensure that the languages are suitable for any child regardless of their mother mother tongue.

One is forced to ask; what are these changing demands? Possibly, they include those that seek to threaten the nationalist ideology of nation building based on competence in Shona and Ndebele. These further adjustments just came in time in 2002 and 2006 through the *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002*, the *2006 Amendment of the 1987 Education Act*, the *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007* and partly in the *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002* where it was declared that Shona and Ndebele have equal status as English in the education system, they should be taught on a compulsory basis throughout the country, they are core/ compulsory in all primary schools and the compulsory learning of Shona and Ndebele in all Zimbabwean schools is being extended up to form 4.

It is more than tempting to see these policy developments as counter policies whose aim is to re-assert the hegemonic position of the national languages which was under threat following the lobbying and advocacy activities of minority language groups which then led to the promulgation of the *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002*. The

compulsory nationwide teaching and learning of Shona and Ndebele as well as the proof that the new syllabi for Shona and Ndebele can be learnt by all school children regardless of ethnic origin and further adjustments underway to ensure that the languages are suitable for any child can arguably be interpreted as aimed at further institutionalising and entrenching the hegemonic status of Shona and Ndebele in the quest to achieve the nationalist objectives of Shonalising and Ndebelelising every Zimbabwean citizen to promote national identity and unity.

In the nationalist discourse, multilingualism is usually perceived as a barrier to nation building, national integration, unity, identity and a threat to the unity of the state. Competing languages are deliberately and subtly accorded low status of optional/additional subjects or afforded the opportunities to be taught under stringent conditions which ultimately make their teaching impossible or very minimal. In this regard, covert and overt language-in-education policies are declared and implemented to secure the status of the national language, and to assimilate as well as suppress minority languages. Measures such as the compulsory and nationwide teaching and learning of Ndebele and Shona constitute some of the key strategies for securing their position as the national languages. This interpretation of the dominance and attempted incorporation of minority language speakers into the two core ethnic groups Shona and Ndebele is further reflected in the expected learning outcomes and the primary and secondary school curriculum policy goals.

Medium of instruction policies can be agents and instruments of cultural and linguistic imperialism. An overtly assimmilationist agenda is reflected in the policy documents' expected learning outcomes and compulsory nation-wide teaching of Shona and Ndebele as core subjects in all primary and secondary schools of Zimbabwe. It stands out clear that language issues in Zimbabwe are clouded by the political agenda of nation building since national identity and cohesion are worked out only through Shona and Ndebele, the official national languages. Shona and Ndebele are promoted in policy documents as the superodinate mediums as part of the ethnically based cultural nationalism. The policy stipulations of the reviewed policy documents

that enshrine the Zimbabwean language-in-education policy and language policy exert more pressure on official minority languages to shift to Shona and Ndebele.

The overt and covert stipulations of the policy documents aim to give dominance to Shona, Ndebele and English. They eliminate official minority languages or relegate them to limited domains. The expected learning outcomes and policy goals promote a shift to the national languages Shona and Ndebele, and this violate the heritage of linguistic diversity in Zimbabwe and negatively affect efforts aimed at promoting the teaching and learning of official minority languages. The goals of the primary and secondary school curriculum policy and the expected learning outcomes of both primary and secondary schools' curriculum policy embody the nationalist ideology, exclusive nation building and subtle national policies of pushing for linguistic uniformity and assimilation into the dominant language groups.

Through the curriculum policy goals and expected learning outcomes minority language groups are subjugated and subsequently assimilated into either Ndebele or Shona depending on the province they are found. Minority language speakers are in a way coerced through the policy of learning Shona and Ndebele into the Zimbabwean nation building project of what Ndhlovu (2009:71) calls the insistence on a bimodal and bicultural dispensation in Zimbabwe based on Shona and Ndebele linguistic/ cultural norms. Despite the provision that minority languages have a space in the curriculum they are coerced through the curriculum policy goals and expected learning outcomes to learn Shona and Ndebele without choice.

According to the *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002* the foundation of the curriculum policy for Zimbabwean primary and secondary schools is to focus on the individuals' development of sound national values. And the thrust of the curriculum policy is geared towards implementing national goals of;

> 2.4. promoting national identity, pride, unity, cultural norms and values so as to preserve the Zimbabwean heritage through the teaching and learning of the *appropriate humanities and indigenous languages*.

National identities are often defined on the basis of numerous taxonomies with language being the most commonly used. According to the *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002* national identity in Zimbabwe will be promoted through the curriculum policy through the teaching and learning of the *appropriate humanities and indigenous languages*. In this case, one poses to think, which *appropriate humanities* and *indigenous languages*? Are there some which are considered inappropriate? Which are those, and why?

The expected learning outcomes tempt one to conclude that the *appropriate indigenous languages* are the compulsory ones. These are the languages which by the end of the primary school and secondary school courses learners must be able to communicate effectively in, both in written and spoken form. These languages turn out to be the three main languages of Zimbabwe which in terms of their status they have been accorded the '*the*' languages of Zimbabwe. According to the *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002* and the *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007* the expected learning of outcomes of the primary school and secondary school curriculum are as follows;

> By the end of the primary school course learners are expected to:
>
> 3.1.1 communicate effectively in both written and spoken forms of either Shona or Ndebele and English;
>
> By the end of the four year secondary school course learners should be able to: -
>
> 4.1.2 communicate effectively and proficiently orally and in writing in English and Shona or Ndebele;
>
> 4.1.4 play a meaningful role in nation-building and project a positive national identity;

The positive national identity to be projected by learners entail being able to function in the national languages and being able to meet the nationist ends by communicating effectively and proficiently orally and in writing in English. The curriculum policy goals and the expected learning outcomes of both the primary and secondary course embody the nationalist and nationist ideology of Zimbabwe. They overtly and covertly reflect attempts of using Shona and Ndebele as the rallying points in forging national identity, integration, pride and unity. The governing

nationalist and nationist ideologies of the policy makers have no room for other local languages.

The ideological foundations of the Zimbabwean education policy centre around three languages whose aim is to enhance economic development (English) and promote national culture (Shona and Ndebele). The founding and guiding ideological considerations that inform the Zimbabwean education policy do not compel and prioritise the teaching of official minority languages. National identity that is referred to here is that which is embedded and embodied in the national languages. Given that the ideological inclination of the policy is critical in driving policy implementation, when proficiency in the other local languages is not a requirement at the end of both primary and secondary education, efforts to promote their teaching and learning amount to nothing.

A series of question cross one's mind; then, why enforce their teaching if proficiency in them is not necessary for certifying a successful primary and secondary school graduate? Why waste time, energy and resources on subjects that will not count at the end of the course? Emphasis on fluency and literacy in English, Ndebele and Shona in the expected learning outcomes of the Zimbabwean curriculum policy provides incentives and opportunities for minority language speakers to shift to these main languages.

Zimbabwe is broadly defined in terms of Matabeleland and Mashonaland. The major provinces that make up Zimbabwe are defined along Ndebele and Shona respectively. The Zimbabwean radio station that broadcasts in Shona and Ndebele, the national languages is called Radio Zimbabwe, all this embody the politics of language in Zimbabwe. In a position paper, *Re: Response to the Binga chiefs' concern on the teaching of languages* the ministry of education, sport, arts and culture clearly demonstrates the nationalist agenda embedded in the language-in-education policy. Ndebele and Shona are seen as the languages for forging and cementing national unity.

The role of the education sector as a key institution in the apparatus of the nation state and a pivotal agent in the inculcation of the nation state values is clearly reflected in the reviewed policy documents. The policy documents engender the major national goals which are to be promoted through the education system. These circulars serve as vanguards of the national ethos. For example;

> Above all, it is one of our major national goals to promote national identity, pride, unity, cultural norms and values so as to preserve the Zimbabwean heritage through the teaching and learning of the Indigenous Languages… (The *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007*).
>
> The focus is on the individual's development of sound national values…and responsible citizenship…The thrust of this curriculum policy is geared towards implementing the national goals of:-
>
> …demonstrate an understanding of ethical principles of conduct including nationhood… (The *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002*).

A close analysis of the reviewed policy documents reveals the strategic role of the education sector in perpetuating and reinforcing linguistic homogeneity. They reflect how the route to nationhood through the ethnicisation of a polity occurs through the education system. The focus of the curriculum policy for primary and secondary schools focuses on the individual's development of sound national values. The thrust of the curriculum policy is geared towards implementing the national goals. The curriculum policy seeks to instill among learners ethical principles of conduct, including nationhood. All this clearly reflect the interplay between language, education and nationalism.

This being the case the stipulations of the policy documents that enshrine the Zimbabwean language-in-education policy help us infer a lot about the political will and commitment of the Zimbabwean government to see the effective implementation of the 2002 policy developments. Given that it is through education that language and national identity are created, performed and above all reproduced, the reviewed policy documents that enshrine the Zimbabwean language-in-education policy maintain the national culture and induct everyone into it. This derails efforts to implement the 2002 policy development. The linguistic hegemony of Shona and Ndebele is entrenched and re-asserted by their status as the main or major and

national languages which are core compulsory subjects in all primary and secondary schools of Zimbabwe.

The overt and covert implications of the policy documents in question as well as the contradictions enshrined in them contribute to the delay in the implementation process of the 2002 policy developments. Some of the policy stipulations are counteract efforts aimed promoting the teaching and learning of official minority languages. The reviewed policy documents therefore show a strong influence of the desire of nation-building, national identity construction, national integration, unity and operational efficiency. They are well aligned and intricately intertwined with the nexus of language politics, nationalist and nationist ideology. While the policy documents that enshrine the Zimbabwean language-in-education policy give the impression that multilingualism is promoted, they are underpinned by the philosophy of linguistic assimilation and homogenisation.

5.3 The 1987 Education as Amended in 2006 and the Constitution of Zimbabwe

In the *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006* and the *Constitution of Zimbabwe* language gets much poorer treatment and in some instances disappears completely in clauses where it should appear. As indicated earlier, language provisions focusing on the official minority languages in the Education Act are very weak, neutralised and riddled with escape clauses. In the *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006*, Section 4, children's fundamental right to education in Zimbabwe, language disappears completely. The children's right to education is not guaranteed in their language(s) of choice. The section does not give any indication of the language in which education should be provided. Language completely disappears in all the five subsection of Section 4.

The *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006* stipulates that no child in Zimbabwe shall be discriminated against by the imposition of onerous terms and conditions in regard to his/her admission to any school on the grounds of his/her race, place of origin, national or ethnic, origin, political opinions, colour, creed or gender. In the

discussion of the grounds for discrimination, language is left out, yet it is an important human attribute that warrants separate mention because attributes such as race, place of origin, national or ethnic, origin and colour do not always presuppose one's language. In as much as there is a separate section in the *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006* that focuses on language use in education, inclusion of language in Section (4) of the *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006* is indispensable.

Moreover, discrimination in the *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006* with regards to children's fundamental right to education in Zimbabwe is only limited to issues of admission to school. In as much as the *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006* refers to discrimination in relation to a situation where a term or condition shall be onerous if it requires the child upon whom it is imposed or the child's parent *to do anything* which is not required to be done or possessed by children or parents, as may be, of a different race, tribe, place of origin, national or ethnic origin, political opinion, colour, creed or gender, *anything* in this clause is too vague and general for a legal instrument.

To consider the onerous nature of learning in a non-mother tongue, especially in primary schools, there is a need for a clause in Section (4) of the *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006* that outlaws discrimination by the imposition of onerous terms and conditions such learning in a non-mother tongue. This will guarantee children's educational linguistic human rights and their fundamental right to education.The obligation in the *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006* in Section 5 that it is the duty of the parents to ensure that every child of school-going age attends primary school is incomplete if it does not allow the parents to choose the language of instruction for their children or accommodate the linguistic preferences for the parents.

In the *Constitution of Zimbabwe* language disappears and other human attributes get much better treatment in the *Constitution of Zimbabwe* under Chapter III, The declaration of rights, particularly those outlined in Section 23. Language is only mentioned in Section 18, subsection (3) (b) and (3) (f), Provisions to secure

protection of law and in Section 82, subsection (1) (a) and (1) (b) (ii) and (iii), Qualifications of judges and Section 87, subsection (4) (b), Removal of judges from office. Unlike the *Constitution of the Republic of South Africa* which has a specific and dedicated section for language, the *Constitution of Zimbabwe* overlooks this critical human attribute.

In as much as the legal experts such as Lovemore Madhuku and Innocent Maja and the current Minister of education among others have conscientised ZIPLA and the majority of the readers of the Zimbabwean newspapers (See: Mumpande, 2006; Maja, 2010a; 2010b; 2010c; Takawira, 2010; Sunday News Reporters, 2010; Business Reporter, 2011) of the unconstitutionality of section 62 the *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006*, the grounds of these allegations are somewhat shaky since the *Constitution of Zimbabwe* does not have explicit provisions that protect minority languages in education. Like in the *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006* language disappears in the paragraph that outlaws inhuman treatment or degrading punishment or other such treatment and discrimination in Section (15), subsection (1) and particularly Section (23), subsection (1), and specifically subsection (2) (a) and (b).

To base on the clause that outlaws discrimination in terms of race, place of origin and tribe is highly problematic. The reason is that mother tongue is not always equal to ethnic origin, tribe, race, place of origin and colour. Section (23), subsection (1) (a) and (b) and subsection (2) (a) and (b) could have been the best basis for challenging the unconstitutionality of section 62 of the *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006*, but since language disappears in these subsections it is problematic and difficult to outlaw language discrimination on the basis of race, tribe, place of origin and colour because these markers do not always presuppose one's mother tongue.

Even in the definition of mother tongue, colour, race, place of origin and tribe are not used as criteria for defining a mother tongue because these variables do not always presuppose one's mother tongue. A mother tongue is defined using the criteria of competency, identification, i.e. internal and external, function and origin, i.e. the

language which one learnt first (Skutnabb-Kangas and Bucak, 1995:360). Hence to base on race, colour and tribe is problematic when one attempts to point out discrimination that is language related. No one is genetically predisposed to learn or acquire any particular language, so children of any colour, racial, ethnic, tribal or genetic background can learn any language they are exposed to (Schiffman, 1996:276). Consequently, one cannot safely outlaw linguistic discrimination basing on race, ethnicity, tribal ground and colour; language must be included among these human attributes.

Given the stipulations of the *Constitution of Zimbabwe* and the *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006*, official minority language speakers have very little or nothing to fall back on in terms of meaningful guarantees if they feel their linguistic human rights and educational linguistic human rights are violated. The delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development can possibly be attributed to lack of an enabling and compelling legislation for their teaching. However, Section 6 of the *July 2012 Draft Constitution of Zimbabwe* departs remarkably from the current Constitution in that it recognises 16 official languages, namely, Chewa, Chibarwe, English, Kalanga, Koisan, Nambya, Ndau, Ndebele, Shangani, Sign language, Sotho, Tonga, Tswana, Venda and Xhosa. The binding language clauses contain firm and obligatory decisions, expressed through the deontic use of the legal *must*, except in subsection (2) of Section, 6 where the clause contain an escape clause *may*. Language, one of the most important human attributes which people are not supposed to be discriminated against is included in the clauses that outlaw discrimination (Chapter, 4.13 (3)).

Nonetheless, the right to education in Chapter 2.11(2) (d); Chapter 2.12 (a); Chapter 2.19; Chapter 4.32; Chapter 4.38 (1) (f) is still not guaranteed in one's language of choice or mother tongue.

5.4 Conclusion: Documentary analysis

Documentary analysis of the policy documents reveal that the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development can be partly traced to the policy directives guiding the teaching and learning of official minority languages. The reviewed policy documents that enshrine the Zimbabwean language-in-education policy and language policy promote the state-sanctioned languages, Shona, Ndebele and English at the expense of official minority languages as a central part of the nationalist and nationist project. The reviewed policy documents reflect the marginalisation and subjugation of official minority languages and the concomitant valorisation of the main/major languages of Zimbabwe, Shona, Ndebele and English. These policy documents rationalise the unequal relationships between the so-called main/major languages and minor languages. The language-in-education policy documents language provisions for teaching and learning official minority languages are largely inadequate. In as much as the policy documents seem to be giving the impression of accommodating official minority languages in the curriculum, they are overtly and covertly underpinned by the philosophy of linguistic homogenisation and assimilation of these language groups into the dominant groups.

The most pessimistic interpretation of the reviewed policy documents suggest that the 2002 policy developments were largely to silence speakers while the *status quo* is maintained by non-implementation. They were also declared to safeguard and satisfy the demands of the dominant language groups, Shona and Ndebele. They seek to re-assert the hegemonic position of these languages which were under threat as a result of the lobbying activities of minority language speakers to assert their position in education. It is surprising to note that instead of the 2002 policy developments centering on the official minority languages the centre stage and loud emphasis is usurped by the promulgations that re-articulate and re-assert as well as stress the diglossic hegemonic status of Shona, Ndebele and English. The policy documents overtly and covertly reflect assimilationist tendencies.

The policy documents in question empower Shona, Ndebele and English with the allocation of increased institutional and functional space as well as status at the expense of the official minority languages which they purport to promote. (See: Ndhlovu, 2008; Makoni, 2011). The policy documents mainly serve the interests of the dominant groups of expanding their political and geographical control over minority language groups. The numerous restrictions, conditions, escape clauses and the weak nature of the policy stipulations on the teaching and learning of official minority language impact negatively on the implementation of the 2002 policy developments. The successful teaching and learning of these languages requires that they should be accorded at least some protection and institutional support that English, Shona and Ndebele enjoy because their promotion take place in a larger linguistic and educational environment that strongly supports the hegemony of the English and Ndebele or Shona dominated education system.

5.5 Language survey questionnaire

The language survey questionnaires were used to examine how linguistic homogeneity, heterogeneity and fragmentation in the composition of the school and class populations in the selected schools affect the ease with which the 2002 policy development is implemented. The questionnaires were also useful in establishing the staffing situation in the selected schools in terms of the availability of teachers whose mother tongues and / home languages is the official minority language of the selected districts and schools. The availability of teachers whose mother tongue and home language is the official minority language to be taught in the districts is an added advantage that can facilitate the implementation of the 2002 policy development. The next section presents, analyses and discusses data gathered through the language surveys.

Table 3: A school in Binga rural where Tonga is predominantly spoken

Grade	Teacher's home language	Tonga speakers	Ndebele speakers	Chewa speakers
1A	G	38		
1B	I	37		
1C	G	37		
2A	G	40		
2B	G	36		
2C	G	38		
3A	E	41		
3B	G	43		
3C	G	40	1	
4A	E	44		
4B	G	45		
5A	B	47	1	
5B	G	46	1	
6A	G	41		
6B	G	41		
6C	G	43		
7A	B	34	1	
7B	G	33		1
SPC	G	20		
Head	G			
Totals - % where applicable	2 (B) – 10% 2 (E) – 10% 15 (G) – 75% 1 (I) – 5%	744 – 99.3%	4 – 0.5%	1 – 0.1%
Key: B – Ndebele; E – Shona; G – Tonga; I – Chewa				

This school is predominantly Tonga speaking. Almost all the pupils (99.3%) speak Tonga as their mother tongue. In terms of its linguistic profile, it is one school in

Binga district where the 2002 policy development is most urgently needed and most easily operationalised. The small population size of Ndebele and Chewa speakers cannot support all that goes into mother tongue education; hence the only alternative will be to use Tonga. This school is well staffed to implement the 2002 policy development because 75% of the teachers speak Tonga as their mother tongue and the added advantage is that even the school head is Tonga.

Table 4: A school in Binga rural where Tonga is spoken alongside other languages

Grade	Teacher's home language	Tonga speakers	Ndebele speakers	Nambya speakers	Chewa speakers	Shona speakers
1A	F	19	8	2	3	6
1B	E	15	14			9
2A	B	39	11	3		
2B	G	36	11	5	1	
3A	G	33	4	2		
3B	B	27	11	1		
4A	B	30	6	3	1	1
4B	B	35	8	4		
5A	G	29	5	3	2	
5B	G	21	13	1	3	1
6A	G	16	10	3		
6B	G	21	10	1		1
6C	G	14	15	2		2
7A	G	24	8	1		1
7B	G	19	10	5	1	
SPC	G	9	4	1		2
Head	G					
Totals - % where applicable	4 (B) – 23.5% 11 (G) – 64.7% 1 (E) – 5.9% 1 (F) – 5.9%	387 – 63.9%	148 – 24.4%	37 – 6.1%	11 – 1.8%	23 – 3.8%
Key: B – Ndebele; C – Nambya; E – Shona; F – Sotho; G – Tonga; I – Chewa						

Despite being a linguistically mixed school, the outright majority of the pupils (63.9%) are Tonga speakers. This makes it possible to implement the 2002 policy statement with relative ease despite the linguistic heterogeneity of the school. However, the linguistic profile of the school requires creative classroom organisation to effectively

implement the 2002 policy statement given that Ndebele speakers also constitute a sizeable population that can support all that goes into using a language as a medium. In this case pupils should be allocated classes according to their mother tongues.

It must be the case that the other language groups, who constitute the minority, already speak either Tonga or Ndebele as second languages. Their population size is too small to support all that goes into using a language as a medium. Consequently, there are no serious challenges in using either Tonga or Ndebele as languages of instruction and teaching them as subjects to these small groups. In out-group communication these language groups definitely need either Tonga or Ndebele to function. The outright majority of the teachers (64.7%) speak Tonga as their mother tongue and the school head is also Tonga, and this makes it easy to implement mother tongue education in Tonga.

Table 5: A school in Binga urban where Tonga is spoken

Grade	Teacher's home language	Tonga speakers	Ndebele speakers	Shona speakers	Nambya speakers	Chewa speakers
1A	B	35	4	3	2	
1B	I	30	8	4		
2A	G	30	12	4	3	
2B	G	29	10	7	1	
3A	F	28	5	11		1
3B	G	31	8	5	1	
4A	G	26	6	7		4
4B	G	26	6	8	1	2
5A	G	29	9	4		3
5B	G	28	8	5	2	2
6A	E	23	7	7	3	
6B	J	24	11	6		
7A	B	18	4	5	2	
7B	E	20	6	4		1
Head	G					
Totals % where applicable	2 (B) - 13.3% 2 (E) - 13.3% 1 (F) - 6.7% 8 (G) - 53.3% 1 (I) - 6.7% 1 (J) - 6.7%	377 – 64%	104 – 17.7%	80 – 13.6%	15 – 2.5%	13 – 2.2%
Key: B – Ndebele; C – Nambya; E – Shona; F – Sotho; I – Chewa; G – Tonga; J – Kalanga						

This is the only primary school in Binga urban. Unlike other schools in similar settings, which are usually linguistically heterogeneous, this school is still predominantly Tonga speaking with 64% of the pupils speaking Tonga as their mother tongue. This is very unique of Binga town when compared to Mangwe and Beitbridge urban. Despite being a fishing town and a tourist resort area, Binga has

largely remained Tonga speaking as reflected by the number of pupils speaking Tonga. This facilitates the easy implementation of mother tongue education in Tonga. Moreover, in terms of the school's staff complement, more than half of the teachers (53.3%) speak Tonga as their mother tongue, including the school head, a condition that also makes it easy to implement mother tongue education in Tonga.

Like in the school represented in Table 4, it must be the case that Nambya and Chewa speakers already speak either Tonga or Ndebele as their second languages. And given that the population size of these groups is too small to support all that goes into mother tongue education, there are no serious challenges in using either Tonga or Ndebele as languages of instruction and teaching them as subjects in this case. In out-group communication these language groups definitely need either Tonga or Ndebele to function. However, Shona speaking pupils also constitute a sizeable population which through creative classroom organisation like in the case of Tonga and Ndebele can support mother tongue education in Shona. Nonetheless, in some classes the number of Shona speakers is however too small to constitute a class.

Table 6: A school in Bulilima rural where Kalanga is predominantly spoken

Grade	Teacher's home language	Kalanga speakers	Ndebele speakers	Tswana speakers	Shona speakers	Tonga speakers
1A	B	27	13			
1B	B	29	9		1	
2A	J	26	12	1	1	
2B	B	28	8			
3A	B	25	13			
3B	B	38	13	1		
4A	J	28	16			1
4B	B	33	11		2	
5A	E	34	11			
5B	F	36	6			
6A	B	33	8			
6B	E	31	10			
7A	B	30	9			
7B	J	32	7			
Head	J					
Totals - % where applicable	8 (B) – 53.3% 2 (E) – 13.3% 1 (F) – 6.7% 4 (J) – 26.7%	430 – 73.8%	146 – 25%	2 – 0.3%	4 – 0.7%	1 – 0.2%
Key: B – Ndebele; E – Shona; F – Sotho; G – Tonga; J – Kalanga; P – Tswana						

This school is predominantly Kalanga speaking despite the presence of other language groups such as Ndebele (25%), Tswana (0.3%), Shona (0.7%) and Tonga (0.2%). Given this linguistic profile, this school is one of the schools in Bulilima district where the teaching of Kalanga is most urgently needed and most easily operationalised. However, in this school Ndebele speaking pupils constitute a sizeable population that can support all that goes into mother tongue education. Creative classroom organisation where classes are divided according to pupils'

mother tongue will facilitate mother tongue education in Kalanga and Ndebele. Tswana, Shona and Tonga speakers can choose either Kalanga or Ndebele because their population size is too small to support all that goes into mother tongue education.

Compared to the school represented in Table 3, this school has a sizeable number of Ndebele speakers despite being predominantly Kalanga speaking. The staff complement of the school does not match the linguistic profile of the school. The outright majority of the teachers in the school are Ndebele speakers and this can pose challenges to the teaching of Kalanga. Only 26.7% of the teachers, including the school head are native speakers of Kalanga.

Table 7: A school with a mixed population in Bulilima rural

Grade	Teacher's home language	Kalanga speakers	Ndebele speakers	Shona speakers
1A1	J	15	21	
1A2	I	13	22	
2A1	B	10	21	
2A2	B	13	17	1
3A1	B	15	19	1
3A2	E	8	28	
4A1	B	4	27	
4A2	B	6	25	
5A1	B	19	14	
5A2	B	18	15	
6A1	J	10	28	
6A2	H	12	28	
7A1	J	20	24	
7A2	B	10	26	
Head	B			
Totals - % where applicable	9 (B) – 60% 1 (E) – 6.7% 1 (H) – 6.7% 1 (I) – 6.7% 3 (J) – 20%	173 – 35.3%	315 – 64.3%	2 – 0.4%
Key: B – Ndebele; E – Shona; H – Venda; I – Chewa; J - Kalanga				

Despite being a school with a mixed population in Bulilima where Kalanga is predominantly spoken, in this school Kalanga speakers are outnumbered by Ndebele speakers. Ndebeles constitute the outright majority of 64.3% while the Kalangas are 35.3% of the total population of the pupils in this school. Given the sizeable population sizes of the two language groups, mother tongue education in these languages require creative classroom organisation where allocation of classes will be

according to the pupils' mother tongues. The population of Shona speakers in this school is too small to support all that goes into using a language as a medium; hence these learners can choose either Kalanga or Ndebele. Ndebele speaking teachers, including the school head constitute 60% and Kalanga speaking teachers constitute 20% which will not be able to support the teaching of Kalanga.

Table 8: A school in Mangwe urban where Kalanga is spoken

Grade	Teacher's home language	Kalanga speakers	Ndebele speakers	Tswana speakers	Sotho speakers	Shona speakers	Venda speakers	Tonga speakers
1A	B	5	29			11		
1B	J	13	20			10		
1C	B	3	35			8		
1D	I		38			5		
2A	B	12	25			10		
2B	E	3	31			11		1
2C	F	5	24	1	2	5	1	
2D	B	10	28			7		
3A	J	14	28			5		
3B	B	5	34			5		
3C	B	3	33	1		7		
3D	B	4	35			6		
4A	B	3	26			16		
4B	E	6	28			9		
4C	J	6	26		2	9		
4D	J	17	25			5		
5A	B	6	33	1		5		
5B	J	24	15			6		1
5C	B	3	35			5		
5D	B	6	34			5		
6A	B	6	28			9		

6B	B	4	33			7		
6C	E		36			8		
6D	B	5	30			4		
7A	B	4	33			2		
7B	E	2	30			5		
7C	J	2	32			5		
7D	B	10	25			1		
H.I.U	J	4	1				1	
SPC	B	3	13			3		
Head	J							
Totals - % where applicable	17 (B) - 55% 1 (I) – 3% 8 (J) – 26% 1 (F) – 3% 4 (E) – 13%	188 – 15.2%	843 – 68.2%	3 – 0.2%	4 – 0.3%	194 – 15.7%	2 – 0.2%	2 – 0.2%
Key: B – Ndebele; E – Shona; F – Sotho; G – Tonga; H- Venda; I – Chewa; J – Kalanga; P - Tswana								

This is one of the three primary schools in Plumtree town, and it is the only one that is located in the high density suburb. The other two are in the central business district of the town and because of their location they were not ideal for the study because they attract learners from the elite and the other one is a boarding school which draws its population of pupils from outside Mangwe and Bulilima as well. In as much as it is not doubtful that the school is linguistically diverse, the degree of diversity reflected by the population figures is in very small numbers such that the outright majority can be easily identified. Plumtree town is a border town which attracts people from different language groups. Ndebele speakers are the majority and represent 68.2%. Shona speakers constitute 15.7% and Kalanga speakers constitute 15.2%. Unlike Binga town, which have the majority of the pupils in the selected school speaking the local language of the area as their mother tongue, Plumtree town has the outright majority of the pupils speaking Ndebele.

The linguistic profile of the school poses serious challenges in implementing the 2002 policy development. Creative classroom organisation will enhance mother tongue education in Ndebele, Kalanga and Shona. Class allocation must be done according to the pupils' mother tongues. In each grade at least Ndebele, Kalanga and Shona speaking pupils can constitute classes of their own. However, for the other language groups the population size of the speakers is too small to support all that goes into using a language as a medium. Kalanga speaking teachers, including the head constitute 26%, Ndebele speaking teachers constitute the outright majority of 55% and Shona speaking teachers constitute 13%.

Table 9: A school in Beitbridge rural where Venda is predominantly spoken

Grade	Teacher's home language	Venda speakers	Shona speaker	Ndebele speaker	Sotho speakers	Shangani speakers
1A	E	29	1	2		1
1B	E	29	2	3		4
2	E	35	1	3	2	
3	H	40	2	1		2
4	B	35		2	2	4
5	H	33	1	1	2	5
6	B	26		1	1	4
7	B					
Head	B					
Totals - % where applicable	4 (B)- 44.4% 3 (E)- 33.3% 2 (H)- 22.2%	227 – 82.8%	7 – 2.6%	13 – 4.7%	7 – 2.6%	20 – 7.3%
Key: B – Ndebele; D – Shangani; E – Shona; F – Sotho; H – Venda						

The linguistic profile of this school is incomplete because at the time of the research grade 7 pupils had finished writing their public examinations and were no longer coming to school. This school is predominantly Venda speaking with a total of 82.8% of the learners speaking Venda as their mother tongue. Though there is a reflection

of linguistic diversity, other language groups are in very small populations of not above 10% each, and cannot support all that goes into using a language as a medium; hence Venda will be the alternative. Given this linguistic profile, this school is among other schools in Beitbridge districts where the teaching of Venda is most urgently needed and can be most easily operationalised.

The staff of the school does not match the linguistic profile of the school and is not able to support mother tongue education in Venda. Only 22.2% of the teachers are native speakers of Venda, 44.4%, including the head are Ndebele speaking and 33.3% are Shona speaking and they are all infant specialists in a school that is predominantly Venda speaking.

Table 10: A school with a mixed population in Beitbridge rural

Grade	Teacher's home language	Shangani speakers	Shona speakers	Ndebele speakers	Sotho speakers	Venda speakers	Pfumbi speakers
1A	E	8	4	2	2	23	
1B	B	7	5		1	23	
2A	H	7	3	1	1	26	
2B	E	11	3	2		22	
3A	E	13	2	1	1	22	
3B	H	6	1	1	1	29	
3C	E	9	9	1	1	18	
4A	E	11	3	1		16	1
4B	H	8	2			18	1
4C	E	7	2	1		21	1
4D	F	11			1	21	
5A	E	8	6	1	1	21	
5B	H	5	7	1	4	20	1
6A	E	3	2	1		30	
6B	E	11	2		1	26	
6C	H	7	3			31	
7A	H						
7B	E						
Head	H						
Totals - % where applicable	1(B) – 5.3% 10 (E) – 52.6% 7 (H) – 36.8% 1 (F) – 5.3%	132 – 22.6%	54 – 9.2%	13 – 2.2%	14 – 2.4%	367 – 62.8%	4 – 0.7%
Key: B – Ndebele; D – Shangani; E – Shona; F – Sotho; H – Venda; V – Pfumbi							

The linguistic profile of this school is incomplete because at the time of the research grade 7 pupils had finished writing their public examinations and were no longer coming to school. Despite being linguistically heterogeneous, this school has Venda speaking pupils as the outright majority in the school constituting 62.8%. The 62.8% population size of the Vendas is an undoubtedly reasonably large population where the teaching of Venda is most urgently needed and can be most easily operationalised under creative classroom organisation. Coming second are the Shangani speakers who constitute 22.6%. Shangani speakers constitute a sizeable population, like in the Venda case, and require creative classroom organisation to implement mother tongue education. Ndebele, Shona, Sotho and Pfumbi speakers constitute small population sizes which cannot support mother tongue education; hence these speakers can choose either Venda or Shangani.

The outright majority of the teachers (52.6%) are Shona speaking, and 36.8% are Venda speaking, including the head. Ndebele and Sotho speaking teachers constitute 5.3% each and there are no Shangani speaking teachers, yet the school has a big population of Shangani speaking pupils which can support mother tongue education.

Table 11: A school in Beitbridge urban where Venda is spoken

Grade	Teacher's home language	Venda speakers	Ndebele speakers	Shona speakers	Sotho speakers	Shangani speakers	Pfumbi speakers	Sign language users	Nambya speakers
1A	F	18	6	24	3				
1B	H	10	9	23	1				
1C	F	5	5	33	3				
1D	F	13	7	22	3	3			
2A	H	8	4	27	1				
2B	E	18	5	22					
2C	H	10	10	19	1	2			
2D	H	14	4	23	2	1			
3A	H	8	6	20	3				
3B	F	10	6	23					
3C	E	8	11	30	1	1			
3D	H	8	8	25	1				
4A	H	6	10	20	3		1	2	
4B	H	3	12	22	3		1	2	
4C	E	5	9	19				2	
4D	H	10	6	20	1			2	
5A	H	9	8	20	2	2			
5B	H	9	5	20	2				
5C	H	5	6	25					
5D	E	7	8	12	3				1
6A	H	14	9	17	2				
6B	B	6	8	22	4				
6C	B	10	12	14	2				
6D	B	11	21		1				
7A	H	6	7	23	6				
7B	H	5	6	27	4				
7C	F	15	5	21	1				

7D	E	13	6	21	2	1			
HIR	F	2	2	2	1				
MCR	E	1		5		1			
MCR	B	2	1	2	1				
HII	B	2		6					
HII	B	4	1	1	2				
Head	D								
Totals - % where applicable	6 (B)- 17.6% 1 (D)- 2.9% 6 (E)- 17.6% 6 (F)- 17.6% 15 (H)- 44.1%	270 – 22.6%	213 – 17.8%	631 – 52.8%	58 – 4.9%	12 – 1%	2 – 0.2%	8 – 0.7%	1 – 0.1%
Key: B – Ndebele; C – Nambya; D – Shangani; E – Shona; F – Sotho; H – Venda; U – Sign language; V – Pfumbi									

This is one of the four primary schools in Beitbridge urban. It is the oldest and one of the two primary schools located in the high density suburb. The other two schools are located in the central business district and because of their location they were avoided since they attract learners mainly from the elite. This school is linguistically heterogeneous with the outright majority of the pupils speaking Shona (52.8%) as their first language, yet Shona is not taught in the school. Venda speakers constitute 22.6% and Ndebele speakers constitute 17.8%. The successful implementation of mother tongue education in Venda, Shona and Ndebele require creative classroom organisation. This requires the need to allocate pupils classes according to their mother tongues. The population size of the other language groups is too small to support all that goes into mother tongue education, and as such they can choose any one of the three languages which they already speak.

This school has 44.1% of the staff complement speaking Venda as their mother tongue, Ndebele and Shona speaking teachers constitute 17.6% each. The school head is Shangani. The available teachers in this school cannot support mother tongue education in Venda and Shona.

5.6 Conclusion: Language survey questionnaires

If the letter and spirit of the 2002 policy development is to teach official minority languages as mother tongues in areas where they are spoken, in most schools that are linguistically heterogeneous mother tongue education is possible through creative classroom organisation. In these sociolinguistic situations pupils will have to be allocated classes based on their mother tongue in cases where the numbers of the concerned language groups can at least constitute a class. Where the numbers are not adequate to support mother tongue education, any of the other languages that they already speak will be an alternative.

In some schools the population size of official minority language speakers reveal cases where more than one official minority language can be taught in one school. In some schools other languages deserve to be taught given the population figures of the pupils who speak the languages, but they are not taught, for example Shona in the selected schools in Beitbridge urban, Mangwe urban and Binga urban. Shona speaking pupils in these schools constitute a sizeable population that can support all that goes into mother tongue education.

The staffing situation in the selected schools in Binga district is unique when compared to that of other selected schools in other districts where Venda and Kalanga are spoken. The outright majority of the teachers, including the school heads in Binga district are mother tongue speakers of Tonga. The uniqueness of the staffing situation in Binga district possibly explains the success story of Tonga and the delay in the teaching of Venda and Kalanga. The selected schools in Mangwe, Bulilima and Beitbridge are poorly staffed with teachers who are native speakers of the concerned official minority languages. Given that most teachers in these schools

are not mother tongue speakers of these languages, their limited proficiency in these languages might affect the teaching of these languages as subjects and their use as languages of instruction.

In the districts where the selected schools are linguistically homogeneous and official minority language speakers are the outright majority, the poor staffing situation in terms of teachers who are native speakers of the concerned languages can possibly be the cause of the delay in the teaching of the concerned official minority languages. In cases where teachers who are speakers of the concerned official minority language constitute a sizeable population, linguistic heterogeneity can possibly be the cause of the delay, especially given that the languages involved are of different status.

In addition to this, all the selected schools in Binga district exhibit a large degree of linguistic homogeneity and have large population sizes of Tonga speakers even in linguistically mixed schools. Possibly, the staffing situations and linguistic profiles of the selected schools in Binga, Mangwe, Bulilima and Beitbridge explain why Tonga was the first language to be examined and why Kalanga and Venda are lagging behind.

5.7 Learners' questionnaires and class observation data

This section focuses on the analysis of the learners' questionnaires which were distributed to grade 6 and 7 pupils in the selected schools. Pupils who were able to read and write were selected with the help of their class teachers to complete the questionnaires. The major aim of the learners' questionnaires was to examine the possible causes of the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development and success story of Tonga through the analysis of the learners' views.

The questionnaire focused on the language management variables, methodologies and strategies which need to be secured in multilingual language policy implementation as well as the seven areas of policy development that need to examined as part of any language-in-education policy implementation programme.

The major aim of the questionnaires was to find out if the seven areas of policy development were developed as part of the measures for implementing the 2002 policy development. The aim was also to ascertain whether the language management variables, methodologies and strategies were secured and deployed at an optimal level to facilitate the implementation of the 2002 policy development. The focus on educational variables shaded some light on the other language management variables, methodologies and strategies.

Question 1 of the questionnaire focused on the pupils' grade. Questions 2 and 3 of the questionnaire focused on the pupils' mother tongues and the language they speak at home. Responses to question 2 and 3 were useful in analysing responses to question 14 in view of the different speakers' language attitudes.

Question 4 and 7 are related though the former expects pupils to indicate whether they learnt the official minority languages from grade 1 to 7. This information is useful in tracing when these languages were introduced in the school curriculum and how far the teaching has gone. Question 5 and 6 helped the researcher identify whether there are teachers who can speak and understand these languages in the selected schools. Question 8, 9, 12 and 13 seek to find out whether official minority languages are used as media of instruction as per the policy stipulations. Question 10 and 11 investigate if pupils in the selected schools are able to speak and understand the major and the official minority languages. These are the languages in which they are supposed to be taught in their schools given that the *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002* stipulates that official minority languages should be taught in their respective areas as mother tongue.

Given this background, responses to questions, 10 and 11 are useful in determining the desirability of the 2002 policy development in the selected schools. If very few pupils speak and understand the official minority language, then such a population cannot support mother tongue education in the concerned official minority language. If pupils speak and understand the official minority language, then mother tongue

education in the concerned official minority language is most urgently needed and can be easily operationalised.

Question 13 seeks to find out the attitudes of the teachers towards local languages whether in class they encourage their learners to use these languages. Question 14 focuses on the learners' language attitudes to infer the ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness and social and cultural character of their language groups. In most cases, the learners' language attitudes, ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness and social and cultural character usually reflect their parents' language ideologies, practices, ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness and social and cultural character. Speakers' attitudes towards their language are a key factor in language maintenance, revitalisation and acquisition planning. These attitudes depend to a very large extent on the status and prestige of their language and their ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness (Giles, Bourhis and Taylor, 1977; Crystal, 2000; Adegbija, 2001; Shameem, 2004; Batibo, 2005).

Question 15 relates to materials policy. Mother tongue education requires course books in the language. The greater the variety of materials available in the language, the more they are used in education (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; 2003; Crystal, 2000; Davids, 2001; Henrard, 2003; Benson, 2005; Batibo, 2005; Chiuye & Moyo, 2008; Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008). Pupils' responses to question 4, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13 and 15 in the learners' questionnaire were corroborated using information gathered through class observations. Class observations were conducted in three selected grades, i.e. one class from the infant phase, grade 1, one class in the intermediate phase, grade 4 or 5 and one class in the final phase, grade 6 or 7 to ensure a representative cover of all the levels of primary school education. The focus was on whether official minority languages are taught or not. An observation checklist was used with the categories, language of instruction, student participation, timetable, charts, teaching materials / learning aids, language used by learners outside the classroom.

The common purpose was to make observations of classroom language practices, elicit teachers' language attitudes and check for the availability of teaching and

learning materials, inclusion of the languages in question in the school and class timetables and pupils' exercise books for the official minority languages in question. Class observations were also recorded through audio taping for later listening and evaluation. The results of selected questions in the learners' questionnaire were also triangulated with data from the language survey questionnaire, focus group discussions with the teachers and parents and class observations to provide details to explain the findings of the analysis as well to cross-check the findings of the different sources and methods.

Table 12: A school in Beitbridge district where Venda is predominantly spoken

Grade	6	Totals - % where applicable
Sample size	21	21
Question 2: What is your home language?	1 (B) 1 (F) 19 (H)	1 – 4.8% 1 – 4.8% 19 – 90.5%
Question 3: Which language do you speak when you are at home?	1 (B) 1 (F) 19 (H)	1 – 4.8% 1 – 4.8% 19 – 90.5%
Question 4: Did you learn Venda in: Grade 1 Grade 2 Grade 3 Grade 4 Grade 5 Grade 6	 21 (Yes) 0 (No) 20 (Yes) 1 (No) 1 (Yes) 20 (No) 0 (Yes) 21 (No) 0 (Yes) 21 (No) 0 (Yes) 21 (No)	 21 – 100% 0 – 0% 20 – 95.2% 1 – 4.8% 1 – 4.8% 20 – 95.2% 0 – 0% 21 – 100% 0 – 0% 21 – 100% 0 – 0% 21 – 100%
Question 5: Can your teacher speak Venda?	20 (Yes) 1 (No)	20 – 95.2% 1 – 4.8%
Question 6: Does your teacher understand Venda?	21 (Yes) 0 (No)	21 – 100% 0 – 0%
Question 7: Do you learn Venda at school?	21 (Yes) 0 (No)	21 – 100% 0 – 0%
Question 8: What language or language(s) does your teacher use when	20 (A & H)	20 – 95.2%

teaching Mathematics	1 (A)	1 – 4.8%
Question 9: What language(s) does your teacher use when teaching Content?	21 (A & H)	21 – 100%
Question 10: Can you speak the following language(s): English Ndebele Venda?	10 (B & H) 9 (A, B & H) 1 (H) 1 (A & H)	10 – 47.6% 9 – 42.9% 1 – 4.8% 1 – 4.8%
Question 11: Do you understand the following language(s): English Ndebele Venda?	21 (A, B & H)	21 – 100%
Question 12: What does your teacher do when you do not understand the lesson?	21 (A, B, H & O)	21 – 100%
Question 13: In class are you allowed to ask or answer questions in: Ndebele Venda?	15 (Yes B) 6 (No B) 11 (Yes H) 10 (No H)	15 – 71.4% 6 – 28.6% 11 – 52. 4% 10 – 47.6%
Question 14: Indicate the language(s) you would like to be taught in	6 (A) 10 (B) 5 (H)	6 – 28.6% 10 – 47.6% 5 – 23.8%
Question 15: Do you have Venda textbooks in your school?	21 (Yes) 0 (No)	21 -100% 0 – 0%
Key: A – English; B – Ndebele; F – Sotho; H – Venda; O – The teacher asks others to explain		

In this school 21 pupils completed the learners' questionnaire. During the time of the research, grade 7 pupils in this school had finished writing their final examinations and they were no longer coming to school. From 21 respondents to the questionnaire, 90.5% speak Venda as their first language and use it at home. Ndebele and Sotho speakers constitute 4.8% each and the 4.8% of Ndebele speakers speak Ndebele at home and the 4.8% of Sotho speakers speak Sotho at

home. All the pupils indicated that they can speak and understand Venda, as such this school is best suitable to implement mother tongue education in Venda.

All the pupils indicated that they learnt Venda in grade 1. Almost all the pupils (95.2%) indicated that they learnt Venda in grade 2. The outright majority of the pupils (95.2%) indicated that they did not learn Venda in grade 3. All the pupils indicated that they did not learn Venda in grade 4 and grade 5. All the pupils indicated that they are not learning Venda in grade 6. Through class observations in grade 1, 5 and 6 the researcher noted that Venda was only taught up to grade 5. However, focus group discussions with the teachers revealed that Venda was not taught in grade 4 because the teacher could not speak or understand Venda completely. Ndebele was not included in the school timetable and class timetable for grade 1 pupils. In focus group discussions with the teachers it emerged that Ndebele is introduced in grade 4 as a subject. However, this is not in line with the stipulations of the 2002 policy developments and the Education Act because according to these policy documents official minority languages are supposed to be taught in addition to Ndebele or Shona.

In grade 1 and 5 classes Venda was schemed for, it appeared in the records of marks, pupils' report and there were pupils' exercise books for the subject with daily exercises. There was a dedicated section for Venda charts in each of these classes and Venda appeared in the class and school timetables, 8 periods per week for grade 1 pupils and 9 periods for grade 5 pupils and there were Venda textbooks in the two classes. However, in grade 6, Venda was not included in the class and school timetable. It was not schemed for. It was not appearing in the records of marks and pupils' reports. There were no Venda charts in the class. There were no pupils' exercise books for Venda, but there were Venda textbooks in the class.

The outright majority of the pupils (95.2%) indicated that their teacher can speak Venda. All the pupils indicated that their teacher can understand Venda. All the pupils indicated that their teacher teaches Mathematics in English and 95.2% of the pupils indicated that their teacher also teaches Mathematics in Venda. No child indicated

that Ndebele is used to teach Mathematics. All the pupils indicated that their teacher uses English when teaching Content subjects and 95.2% of the pupils indicated that their teacher also use Venda. No child indicated that the teacher use Ndebele. All the pupils indicated that when they do not understand their teacher resorts to Venda, Ndebele, English and ask other pupils to explain.

At least 52.4% of the pupils indicated that they are allowed to ask or answer questions in Venda and 71.4% of the pupils indicated that they are allowed to ask and answer questions in Ndebele. This data indicates that Venda is used in teaching other subjects in this school. This matches what the researcher observed in this class during a Religious and Moral Education lesson. In grade 1 the Shona speaking teacher taught Mathematics predominantly in Venda and English. The Venda speaking teacher in grade 5 taught Environmental Science mainly in English and also used Venda at some point.

The outright majority of the pupils in this predominantly Venda speaking school preferred to be taught in Ndebele. Since Venda is predominantly used as a medium of instruction in this class, one would expect these pupils to choose it as their most preferred medium of instruction. The outright majority of these pupils (47.6%) preferred to be taught in Ndebele and 28.6% of the pupils preferred English. Only 23.8% of the pupils preferred Venda. These results raise a number questions such as, why this high preference for Ndebele in a predominantly Venda speaking community? Given that in this school the outright majority of the teachers are Ndebele speakers the high preference for Ndebele by the pupils can possibly be explained in the light of Skutnabb-Kangas and Dunbar's (2010) observation that if majority of the teachers are non-native speakers of the pupils' language; pupils shift to these teachers' language.

Is it a question of prestige and status associated with Ndebele that it is examined and Venda is not? In light of the low status accorded to Venda, this possibly explains why it is the least preferred medium because speakers' attitudes are largely determined by the status and prestige of their language. Since Venda is not examined, this

possibly explains the low preference for Venda. Provided that learners' language attitudes are a reflection of their parents' language ideologies and practices; the low preference for Venda is possibly an indication of the Vendas low ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness. Since the speakers' attitudes towards their language are a key factor in the success of language revitalisation and acquisition planning, the negative attitudes of Venda speakers towards their language can partly explain the delay in the teaching of Venda.

All the pupils indicated that there are Venda textbooks in the school. Despite the availability of Venda textbooks for all the grades, Venda is still not taught beyond grade 5. The possible explanation for this based on the language survey questionnaire is that there is a shortage of linguistically competent Venda teachers. In focus group discussions with teachers in this school it emerged that teachers are not linguistically equipped to teach in Venda and to teach it as a subject. Since Venda is not yet examined at grade 7, one can also conclude that this could be the other reason why it is not taught up to grade 7 despite the availability of textbooks. In focus group discussions, teachers in this school indicated that they devote time to examined subjects.

> There was a time when we had to teach…Ndebele and Venda. We were supposed to teach them together, but then we realised that it was time consuming. We didn't get enough time for teaching Ndebele which was going to be tested. So why teach them Venda which was not going to be tested (Interview, WS650324).

Table 13: A school in Beitbridge district where Venda is spoken alongside other languages

Grade	6A	6B	6C	Totals - % where applicable
Sample size	30	32	36	98
Question 2: What is your home language?	1 (D) 2 (E) 26 (H) 1 (B)	9 (D) 1 (E) 22 (H)	6 (D) 3 (E) 27 (H)	16 – 16.3% 6 – 6.1% 75 – 76.5% 1 – 1.0%
Question 3: Which language do you speak when you are at home?	2 (D) 1 (E) 25 (H) 1 (B) 1 (No indication)	9 (D) 1 (E) 21 (H) 1 (No indication)	6 (D) 3 (E) 27 (H)	17 – 17.3% 5 – 5.1% 73 – 74.5% 1 – 1.0% 2 – 2.0%
Question 4: Did you learn Venda in:				
Grade 1	28 (Yes) 2 (No)	32 (Yes) 0 (No)	34 (Yes) 2 (No)	94 – 95.9% 4 – 4.1%
Grade 2	27 (Yes) 3 (No)	32 (Yes) 0 (No)	33 (Yes) 3 (No)	92 – 93.9% 6 – 6.1%
Grade 3	0 (Yes) 30 (No)	1 (Yes) 31 (No)	35 (Yes) 0 (No) 1 (No indication)	36 – 36.7% 61 – 62.2% 1 – 1.0%
Grade 4	0 (Yes) 30 (No)	1 (Yes) 31 (No)	35 (Yes) 0 (No) 1 (No indicationi)	36 – 36.7% 61 – 62.2% 1 – 1.0%
Grade 5	0 (Yes) 30 (No)	1 (Yes) 31 (No)	36 (Yes) 0 (No)	37 – 37.8% 61 – 62.2%
Grade 6	0 (Yes) 30 (No)	1 (Yes) 31 (No)	35 (Yes) 0 (No) 1 (No indication)	36 – 36.7% 61 – 62.2% 1 – 1.0%

Question 5: Can you teacher speak Venda?	29 (Yes) 1 (No)	32 (Yes) 0 (No)	36 (Yes) 0 (No)	97 – 99. 0% 1 – 1.0%
Question 6: Does your teacher understand Venda?	30 (Yes) 0 (No)	32 (Yes) 0 (No)	35 (Yes) 0 (No) 1 (No indication)	97 – 99.0% 0 – 0% 1 – 1.0%
Question 7: Do you learn Venda at school?	30 (Yes) 0 (No)	32 (Yes) 0 (No)	36 (Yes) 0 (No)	98 – 100% 0 – 0%
Question 8: What language(s) does your teacher use when teaching Mathematics?	28 (A &H) 2 (A)	29 (A & H) 3 (A)	25 (A & H) 11 (H)	82 – 83.7% 5 – 5.1% 11 – 11.2%
Question 9: What language(s) does your teacher use when teaching Content?	28 (A & H) 2 (A)	27 (A & H) 5 (A)	28 (A & H) 7 (A) 1 (H)	83 – 84.7% 14 – 14.3% 1 – 1.0%
Question 10: Can you speak the following language(s): English Ndebele Venda?	13 (A, B & H) 10 (H) 3 (A & H) 4 (B & H)	 14 (H) 16 (A & H) 1 (A) 1 (Ni)	35 (A, B & H) 1 (H)	48 – 49.0% 25 – 25.5% 19 – 19.4% 4 – 4.1% 1 – 1.0% 1 – 1.0%
Question 11: Do you understand the following language(s): English Ndebele Venda?	27 (A, B & H) 3 (A & H)	27 (A, B & H) 3 (A & H) 2 (A)	36 (A, B & H)	90 – 91.8% 6 – 6.1% 2 – 2.0%
Question 12: What does your teacher do when you do not understand the lesson?	2 (H) 24 (H & O) 2 (A, B, H & O) 1 (B & H) 1 (O)	32 (H)	36 (H)	70 -71.4% 24 – 24.5% 2 – 2.0% 1 – 1.0% 1 – 1.0%

Question 13: in class are you allowed to ask or answer questions in: Ndebele Venda?	2 (Yes B) 28 (No B) 24 (Yes H) 6 (No H)	0 (Yes B) 32 (No B) 1 (Yes H) 31 (No H)	0 (Yes B) 36 (No B) 36 (Yes H) 0 (No H)	2 – 2.0% 96 – 98.0% 61 – 62.2% 37 – 37.8%
Question 14: Indicate the language(s) you would like to be taught in	12 (H) 2 (A & H) 2 (A) 1 (E) 9 (B & H) 1 (D & H) 1 (Spoiled) 2 (E & H)	20 (H) 4 (A) 1 (E) 1 (Spoiled) 1 (A & D) 5 (B)	24 (H) 10 (A & H) 1 (Spoiled) 1 (A & E)	56 – 57.1% 12 – 12.2% 6 – 6.1% 2 – 2.0% 9 – 9.2% 1 – 1.0% 3 – 3.1% 2 – 2.0% 1 – 1.0% 5 – 5.1% 1 – 1.0%
Question 15: Do you have Venda textbooks in your school?	30 (Yes) 0 (No)	31 (Yes) 1 (No)	35 (Yes) 0 (No) 1 (Spoiled)	96 – 98.0% 1 – 1.0% 1 – 1.0%
Key: A – English; B – Ndebele; D – Shangani; E – Shona; H – Venda; O – The teacher asks others to explain				

In this school 98 pupils completed the learners' questionnaire. Only grade 6 pupils completed the questionnaire because grade 7 pupils were no longer coming to school after completing their grade 7 final examinations. The outright majority of the pupils (76.5%) who completed the questionnaire were Venda speaking. Shangani speakers constituted 16.3%, Shona speakers 6.1% and Ndebele speakers 1%. The outright majority of the pupils (98%) and (97.9%) indicated that they can speak and understand Venda respectively.

The outright majority of the pupils (95.9%) indicated that they learnt Venda in grade 1. The majority of the pupils (93.9%) indicated that they learnt Venda in grade 2. At least 62.2% of the pupils indicated that they did not learn Venda in grade 3, grade 4

and grade 5. However, almost all the pupils in grade 6C indicated that they are learning Venda in grade 6, but almost all the pupils in the other grade 6 classes indicated that they are not learning Venda in grade 6. Why these variations? All the pupils indicated that Venda is taught in the school. Class observations and focus group discussions with the teachers in this school revealed that Venda is currently taught up to grade 5. It was only taught up to grade 6 during the first term and this changed following a directive that Venda was not going to be examined in 2012. Ndebele was, however not included in the school timetable and class timetables for grades 1 to 3. In focus group discussions with the teachers I learnt that Ndebele is introduced in grade 4 as a subject. However, this is not in line with the stipulations of the 2002 policy developments and the Education Act.

In grade 1A I observed that Venda was taught. It appeared in the class and school timetable, 8 periods per week for grade 1 and 2. It was schemed for; it appeared in the records of marks and pupils' reports. There was a dedicated section for Venda charts. There were Venda pupils' exercise books with daily exercises. In grade 4A I noted that Ndebele and Venda were slotted together in the timetable, i.e. they shared the 9 periods. There were no Venda charts. Venda was schemed for. It appeared in the pupils' reports and records of marks. There were Venda pupils' exercise books with daily exercises and compositions.

In grade 6C the researcher observed that Venda was not taught. It was not appearing in the class and school timetable. It was not schemed for. It was not appearing in the records of marks and pupils' progress reports. There were no pupils' exercise books for Venda. There were no charts for all the subjects since the class was used as a venue for the grade 7 examinations, but the teacher confirmed in focus group discussions that there were no Venda charts in the class. Almost all the pupils (99%) indicated that their teachers can speak and understand Venda.

The outright majority of the pupils (94.9%) indicated that their teachers use Venda when teaching Mathematics and 88.8% of the pupils indicated that their teachers also use English when teaching Mathematics. Almost all the pupils (99%) indicated

that Content is taught in English and 85.7% of the pupils indicated that their teachers also teach Content in Venda. The outright majority of the pupils (98.9%) indicated that when they do not understand the lesson their teachers resort to Venda and 27.5% of the pupils indicated that their teachers ask other pupils to explain. Only 3% of the pupils indicated that the teachers resort to Ndebele and 2% indicated that their teachers use English. Only 2% of the pupils indicated that the teachers allow them to ask or answer questions in Ndebele and 62.2% of the pupils indicated that their teachers allow them to ask or answer questions in Venda. This data indicates that Venda is used as a medium of instruction in this school.

This matches the data gathered through observation in the different classes where class observations were conducted. I observed that Ndebele was not used as a medium of instruction in the classes I observed. The Shona speaking teacher in grade 1A used Venda alongside English in teaching Mathematics. Venda was the most predominantly used medium of instruction. The Shona speaking teacher in grade 4A used English predominantly in teaching Mathematics. Venda was mainly used to give instructions and to further clarify or elaborate when pupils had difficulties in mastering the concepts. The Venda speaking teacher in grade 6C used English predominantly in teaching Environmental Science. However, Venda was used to clarify difficult and new concepts.

The outright majority of the pupils (81.5%) preferred to be taught in Venda. Only 20.3% of the pupils preferred English, 14.3% of the pupils preferred Ndebele, and 2% of the pupils preferred Shangani. Unlike in the school where Venda is predominantly spoken, the outright majority of the pupils in this school choose Venda as their most preferred medium of instruction. One is forced to ask, Why this shift? Is it because of the significant number of Venda speaking teachers? Is it the influence of the classroom practice where Venda is predominantly used as a medium of instruction in place of Ndebele?

Could it be that in terms of social status and use in the community Venda serves as the lingua franca in the area or it is because it is the language of the majority?

However, Shangani, the second largest group, is not so much preferred, yet speakers of this language constitute a sizeable population that can support mother tongue education in the language. This is possibly due to the unavailability of Shangani speaking teachers in the school as reflected in the language survey questionnaire or possibly the non-teaching and use of Shangani in the school

Almost all the pupils (98%) indicated that there are Venda textbooks in the school. Despite the availability of Venda textbooks and at least a sizeable number of Venda speaking teachers in this school, Venda is still not being taught up to grade 7. Some of the possible explanations for the non-teaching of Venda up to grade 7 could be the same as the ones offered for the school represented in Table 12.

Table 14: A school in Beitbridge urban where Venda is spoken

Grade	6A	6B	6C	6D	7A	7B	7C	7D	Totals- % where applicable
Sample size	20	20	17	20	20	20	20	20	157- 100
Question 2: What is your home language?	3 B 9 E 1 F 7 H	4 B 8 E 2 F 6 H	2 B 9 E 1 F 5 H	8 B 10 E 2 H	1 B 12 E 4 F 3 H	5 B 12 E 2 F 1 H	1 B 10 E 1 F 8 H	7 B 8 E 1 F 4 H	31 – 19.7% 78 – 49.7% 12 – 7.6% 36 – 22.9%
Question 3: Which language do you speak when you are at home?	3 B 9 E 1 F 7 H	4 B 8 E 2 F 6 H	3 B 9 E 5 H	7 B 10 E 3 H	1 B 12 E 4 F 3 H	6 B 10 E 1 F 1 H 1 A & E 1 E & H	3 B 9 E 1 F 7 H	7 B 8 E 5 H	34 – 21.7% 75 – 47.8% 9 – 5.7% 37 – 23.6% 1 – 0.6% 1 – 0.6%
Question 4: Did you learn Venda in: Grade 1									

Grade 2 Grade 3 Grade 4 Grade 5 Grade 6 Grade 7	19 Yes 1 No 19 Yes 1 No 19 Yes 1 No 0 Yes 20 No 0 Yes 20 No 0 Yes 2 No	20 Yes 0 No 20 Yes 0 No 20 Yes 0 No 0 Yes 20 No 0 Yes 20 No 0 Yes 20 No	16 Yes 1 No 15 Yes 2 No 13 Yes 4 No 0 Yes 17 No 0 Yes 17 No 0 Yes 17 No	12 Yes 8 No 13 Yes 7 No 14 Yes 6 No 0 Yes 20 No 0 Yes 20 No 0 Yes 20 No	17 Yes 3 No 17 Yes 3 No 18 Yes 2 No 0 Yes 20 No 0 Yes 20 No 0 Yes 20 No 0 Yes 20 No	19 Yes 1 No 19 Yes 1 No 19 Yes 1 No 1 Yes 19 No 1 Yes 19 No 1 Yes 19 No 1 Yes 19 No	18 Yes 2 No 18 Yes 2 No 16 Yes 4 No 2 Yes 18 No 0 Yes 20 No 0 Yes 20 No 0 Yes 20 No	13 Yes 7 No 13 Yes 7 No 14 Yes 6 No 0 Yes 20 No 0 Yes 20 No 0 Yes 20 No 0 Yes 20 No	134- 85.4% 23 – 14.6% 134- 85.4% 23 – 14.6% 133- 84.7% 24 – 15.3% 3 – 1.9% 154- 98.1% 1 – 0.6% 156- 99.4% 1 – 0.6% 156- 99.4% 1 – 1.3% 79 – 98.8%
Question 5: Can your teacher speak Venda?	20 Yes 0 No	3 Yes 17 No	14 Yes 3 No	20 Yes 0 No	19 Yes 1 No	20 Yes 0 No	20 Yes 0 No	20 Yes 0 No	136 - 86.6% 21 – 13.4%
Question 6: Does your teacher understand Venda?	20 Yes 0 No	18 Yes 1 No 1 Ni	10 Yes 7 No	20 Yes 0 No	20 Yes 0 No	20 Yes 0 No	20 Yes 0 No	20 Yes 0 No	148- 94.3% 8 – 5.1% 1 – 0.6%
Question 7: Do you learn Venda at school?	20 Yes 0 No	19 Yes 1 No	12 Yes 5 No	19 Yes 1 No	19 Yes 1 No	19 Yes 1 No	19 Yes 1 No	19 Yes 1 No	146 – 93% 11 – 7%
Question 8: What languages does your teacher use when teaching Mathematics?	19 A 1 A & B	18 A 1 A & B 1 B	13 A 1 A & B 1 B 2 A, B & H	3 A 17 A, B & H	20A & B	20 A	7 A 13A & B	20 A	100- 63.7% 36 – 22.9% 2 – 1.3% 19 – 12.1%
Question 9: What languages does your teacher use	20 A	20 A	14 A 2 A, B & H	3 A 17 A, B & H	14 A	20 A	6 A	19 A	116- 73.9% 19 – 12.1%

when teaching Content?			1 B		6 A & B		14A & B	1 A & B	21- 13.4% 1 – 0.6%
Question 10: Can you speak the following languages: English Venda Ndebele?	8 A 3 A & B 1 B 3 A & H 4 A, B & H 1 H	6 A 4 A & B 3 A & H 7 A, B & H	3 A 2 A & B 12 A, B & H	1 A 1 A & B 17 A, B & H 1 H	2 A 4 A & B 2 A & H 12 A, B & H	4 A & B 16 A, B & H	2 A & B 1 A & H 17 A, B & H	8 A & B 12 A, B & H	20 – 12.7% 28 – 17.8% 1 – 0.6% 9 – 5.7% 97 – 61.8% 2 – 1.3%
Question 11: Do you understand the following languages: English Venda Ndebele?	12 A, B & H 7 A & B 1 A & H	11 A, B & H 3 A & B 3 A & H 3 A	16 A, B & H 1 A & B	16 A, B & H 2 A & B 2 A	16 A, B & H 4 A & B	16 A, B & H 4 A & B	18 A, B & H 1 A & B 1 A & H	13 A, B & H 7 A & B	118- 75.2% 29 – 18.5% 5 – 3.2% 5 – 3.2%
Question 12: What does your teacher do when you do not understand the lesson?	4 A 1 A & O 6 B 9 A & B	7 A 5 B 2 A & B 6 O	2 A 6 B 4 A & B 1 O 3 A, B & O 1 A, B & H	2 A 4 A & O 5 B 8 A, B, H & O 1 B & O	1 B 18 A, B & H 1 B & O	3 A 7 A & O 2 A & B 2 A, B & O 3 A, B & H	1 B 5 A & B 1 O 9 A, B & O 3 A, B & H	3 A 8 A & O 1 O 8 A, B & O	21 – 13.4% 20 – 12.7% 24 – 15.3% 22 – 14% 9 – 5.7% 22 – 14% 25 – 15.9% 8 – 5.1% 3 – 1.9%

						1 B, H & O 2 B & H	1 B & O		1 – 0.6% 2 – 1.3%
Question 13: In class are you allowed to ask or answer questions in: Venda Ndebele?	16 Yes B 4 No B 0 Yes H 20 No H	18 Yes B 2 No B 0 Yes H 20 No H	11 Yes B 6 No B 0 Yes H 17 No H	13 Yes B 7 No B 1 Yes H 19 No H	0Yes B 20No B 0Yes H 20No H	19 Yes B 1 No B 2 Yes H 18 No H	8 Yes B 12 No B 1 Yes H 19 No H	0 Yes B 20 No B 0 Yes H 20 No H	85 – 54.1% 72 – 45.9% 4 – 2.5% 153 - 97.5%
Question 14: Indicate the languages you would like to be taught in	4 A 6 A & B 2 A & H 1 A, B, E & H 2 A, B & H 2 B 1 E 1 H 1 Spoiled	12 A 1 A & B 4 B 1 E 1 H 1 R	8 A 5 B 2 E 2 H	8 A 4 A & B 7 B 1 B & E	5 A 4 A & B 1 A & H 2 B 2 E 2 H 1 B & H 1 B & F 2 F & H	11 A 1 A & B 1 A, B & H 2 B 3 E 1 H 1 A, B & E	10 A 5 B 2 E 3 H	18 A 1 B 1 E	76 – 48.4% 16 – 10.2% 3 – 1.9% 1 – 0.6% 3 – 1.9% 28 – 17.8% 12 – 7.6% 10 – 6.4% 1 – 0.6% 1 – 0.6% 1 – 0.6% 1 – 0.6% 1 – 0.6% 2 – 1.3% 1 – 0.6%
Question 15: Do you have Venda textbooks in your school?	19 Yes 1 No	19 Yes 1 No	17 Yes 0 No	20 Yes 0 No	20 Yes 0 No	20 Yes 0 No	20 Yes 0 No	20 Yes 0 No	155- 98.7% 2 – 1.3%
Key: A – English; B – Ndebele; E – Shona ; F – Sotho ; H – Venda; O - The teacher asks others to explain; R – Zulu; Ni – No indication									

In this school 157 pupils completed the questionnaire and 49.7% of the pupils speak Shona, 22.9% of the pupils speak Venda, 19.7% of the pupils speak Ndebele and 7.6% of the pupils speak Sotho. The outright majority of the pupils (47.8%) speak Shona at home, 23.6% of the pupils speak Venda at home, 21.7% of the pupils speak Ndebele at home and 5.7% of the pupils speak Sotho at home. At least 68.8% of the pupils indicated that they are able to speak Venda and 78.4% indicated that they understand Venda.

The outright majority of the pupils (85.4%) indicated that they learnt Venda in grade 1 and grade 2. Most of the pupils (84.7%) indicated that they learnt Venda in grade 3. The outright majority of the pupils (98.1%) indicated that they did not learn Venda in grade 4. Almost all the pupils (99.4%) indicated that they did not learn Venda in grade 5 and grade 6. The outright majority of the pupils (98.8%) indicated that they are not learning Venda at grade 7, and 93 % of the pupils indicated that Venda is taught in their school. Class observations in this school revealed that Venda is taught up to grade 5. However, Ndebele was not included in the school timetable and class timetable for grade 1 to grade 3 classes like in the other selected schools in this district. This violates the stipulations of the policy circulars and Education Act.

In grade 1A and grade 4B I observed that Venda is taught. There were Venda textbooks in the two classes. There was a dedicated section for Venda charts in grade 1A and no Venda charts in grade 4B. Venda was schemed for and appeared in the records of marks and pupils' reports. There were pupils' daily exercise books for Venda. Venda was included in the school and class timetables, allocated 8 periods per week for grade 1 pupils and 9 periods for grade 4 pupils. In grade 7A I noted that Venda was not taught. It was not schemed for and was not appearing in the records of marks and pupils' reports. There were no charts for all the subjects. Venda was not included in the class and school timetable.

The outright majority of the pupils (86.6%) indicated that their teachers can speak Venda, and 94.3% indicated that their teachers can understand Venda. The outright

majority of the pupils (98.7%) indicated that their teachers teach Mathematics in English, 36.3% of the pupils indicated that their teachers use Ndebele as well when teaching Mathematics and only 12.1% of the pupils indicated that their teachers also use Venda. Almost all the pupils (99.4%) indicated that Content is taught in English, 26.1% of the pupils indicated that Ndebele is used to teach Content and only 12.1% of the pupils indicated that Venda is also used to teach Content. Only 22.9% of the pupils indicated that their teachers resort to Venda when they do not understand the lesson, 54% of the pupils indicated that their teachers ask others to explain, 68.1% of the pupils indicated that their teachers resort to Ndebele and 75.1% of the pupils indicated that their teachers use English.

At least 54.1% of the pupils indicated that they are allowed to ask or answer questions in Ndebele in class and 2.5% of the pupils indicated that they are allowed to ask or answer questions in Venda in class. English seems to be the most predominantly used language of instruction. Ndebele follows second and Venda is the third language that is used for teaching and learning. Shona which is spoken by the outright majority of the pupils in the school is not used as a language of instruction or taught as a subject. This possibly reflects lack of planning before determining which language(s) should be used as languages of instruction and taught as subjects in different schools. Beitbridge is a border town and it inevitably attracts people from different language groups and as such, language-in-education planners and policy makers must consider this factor in fact-finding prior to policy formulation. It is an anomaly for Shona not to be taught as a subject and used as a medium of instruction given that Shona speakers constitute the outright majority in this school.

During class observation in grade 1A in a *Pre-Learning Skills* lesson on greetings, I noted that the Sotho speaking teacher used both English and Venda, but English dominated. In grade 4B in a Social Studies lesson on *Our Country*, the Venda speaking teacher used English, Ndebele and Venda. However, English and Ndebele dominated. In grade 7A in a Mathematics lesson on the topic *Tens and Units*, the Venda speaking teacher delivered the lesson exclusively in English. In all these

classes the language used by pupils to respond to questions was determined by the language in which the question was asked. One notes that there are variations in terms of languages of instruction depending on the teachers. Given that this school is in an urban setting, the possible explanation for the teachers' language preference could be that English is used as the common language, Ndebele is taken as the language of wider communication in the province and Venda is the local language. English and Ndebele therefore serve as the common languages in this linguistically mixed school.

The outright majority of the pupils (63.6%) preferred to be taught in English, 32.9% of the pupils preferred Ndebele, 12% of the pupils preferred Venda, and 9.4% of the pupils preferred Shona. Only 0.6% of the pupils preferred Zulu and 1.3% of the pupils preferred Sotho. English is the most preferred medium in this urban school. Shona which is spoken by the outright majority group is not the most preferred, possibly, because it is not taught as a subject and used as a medium of instruction in this school. The second largest group, Venda also seems not to be in favour of its mother tongue too. Noteworthy, Ndebele is the second most preferred medium, yet its speakers are the third largest group. Possibly, this attests observations that when teachers do not attribute status to all the languages spoken by learners, the tendency is for learners to prefer the languages used by their teachers. English is the most used medium of instruction by teachers followed by Ndebele and then Venda. The pupils' language preferences reflect this hierarchy as well.

Almost all the pupils (98.7%) indicated that there are Venda textbooks in the school, but Venda is still taught up to grade 4. Given that this school has a sizeable number of Venda speaking teachers and textbooks; one is forced to ask why Venda is still taught up to grade 4? Could it be because these teachers are generally unsure of the relevance and / or appropriateness of this language in formal education as reflected by the low scores for Venda in questions 8, 9, 12 and 13 of the learners' questionnaire? Could it because their classes are linguistically mixed, hence the preference for English and Ndebele? Is it because Venda is not examined at grade 7?

Table 15: A school in Bulilima district where Kalanga is predominantly spoken

Grade	6A	6B	7A	7B	Totals - % where applicable
Sample size	20	16	19	15	70
Question 2: What is your home language?	15 (J) 5 (B)	12 (J) 4 (B)	17 (J) 2 (B)	9 (J) 5 (B) 1 (B & J)	53 – 75.7% 16 – 22.9% 1 – 1.4%
Question 3: Which language do you speak when you are at home?	15 (J) 5 (B)	11 (J) 5 (B)	13 (J) 6 (B & J)	8 (J) 2 (B) 5 (B & J)	47 – 67.1% 12 – 17.1% 11 – 15.7%
Question 4: Did you learn Kalanga in:					
Grade 1	18 (Yes) 2 (No)	16 (Yes) 0 (No)	19 (Yes) 0 (No)	15 (Yes) 0 (No)	68 – 97.1% 2 – 2.9%
Grade 2	18 (Yes) 2 (No)	16 (Yes) 0 (No)	19 (Yes) 0 (No)	15 (Yes) 0 (No)	68 – 97.1% 2 – 2.9%
Grade 3	18 (Yes) 2 (No)	15 (Yes) 1 (No)	19 (Yes) 0 (No)	15 (Yes) 0 (No)	67 – 95.7% 3 – 4.3%
Grade 4	20 (Yes) 0 (No)	15 (Yes) 1 (No)	19 (Yes) 0 (No)	15 (Yes) 0 (No)	69 – 98.6% 1 – 1.4%
Grade 5	20 (Yes) 0 (No)	15 (Yes) 1 (No)	19 (Yes) 0 (No)	15 (Yes) 0 (Yes)	69 – 98.6% 1 – 1.4%
Grade 6	19 (Yes) 1 (No)	16 (Yes) 0 (No)	19 (Yes) 0 (No) 0 (Yes) 19 (No)	15 (Yes) 0 (No) 0 (Yes) 15 (No)	69 – 98.6% 1 – 1.4% 0 – 0% 34 – 100%
Grade 7					
Question 5: Can your teacher speak Kalanga?	0 (Yes) 20 (No)	2 (Yes) 14 (No)	0 (Yes) 19 (No)	14 (Yes) 1 (No)	16 – 22.9% 54 – 77.1%
Question 6: Does your teacher	19 (Yes)	15 (Yes)	0 (Yes)	15 (Yes)	49 – 70%

understand Kalanga?	1 (No indication)	1 (No)	19 (No)	0 (No)	21 – 30%
Question 7: Do you learn Kalanga at school?	19 (Yes) 1 (No)	15 (Yes) 1 (No)	19 (Yes) 0 (No)	15 (Yes) 0 (No)	68 – 97.1% 2 – 2.9%
Question 8: What language(s) does your teacher use when teaching Mathematics?	20 (A & B)	16 (A & B)	14 (A & B) 1 (A, B & J) 4 (A)	 14 (A, B & J) 1 (A)	50 – 71.4% 15 – 21.4% 5 – 7.1%
Question 9: What language(s) does your teacher use when teaching Content?	20 (A & B)	16 (A & B)	14 (A & B) 5 (A)	2 (A & B) 1 (A) 12 (A, B & J)	52 – 74.3% 6 – 8.6% 12 – 17.1%
Question 10: Can you speak the following language(s): English Kalanga Ndebele?	17 (B & J) 2 (A, B & J) 1 (A & B)	10 (B & J) 5 (A, B & J) 1 (J)	8 (B & J) 8 (A, B & J) 1 (A & B) 1 (A & J) 1 (No indication)	6 (B & J) 8 (A, B & J) 1 (A & J)	41 – 58.6% 23 – 32.9% 2 – 2.9% 1 – 1.4% 2 – 2.9% 1 – 1.4%
Question 11: Do you understand the following language(s): English Kalanga Ndebele?	10 (A, B & J) 9 (B & J) 1 (A & B)	10 (A, B & J) 5 (B & J) 1 (A & J)	17 (A, B & J) 1 (B & J) 1 (A & B)	12 (A, B & J) 2 (B & J) 1 (A)	49 – 70% 17 – 24.3% 2 – 2.9% 1 – 1.4% 1 – 1.4%
Question 12: What does your teacher do when you do not understand the lesson?	3 (A, B & O) 14 (B & O) 2 (B) 1 (B & J)	3 (A, B & O) 13 (B & O)	2 (A, B & O) 17 (B & O)	 1 (B & O) 13 (B, J & O) 1 (J & O)	8 – 11.4% 45 – 64.3% 2 – 2.9% 1 – 1.4% 13 – 18.6% 1 – 1.4%

Question 13: In class are you allowed to ask or answer questions in: Ndebele Kalanga?	13 (Yes B) 7 (No B) 0 (Yes J) 20 (No J)	14 (Yes B) 2 (No B) 0 (Yes J) 16 (No J)	14 (Yes B) 5 (No B) 0 (Yes J) 19 (No J)	12 (Yes B) 3 (No B) 1 (Yes J) 14 (No J)	53 – 75.7% 17 – 24.3% 1 – 1.4% 69 – 98.6%
Question 14: Indicate the language you would like to be taught in	7 (B & J) 7 (A & B) 3 (A & J) 1 (A) 1 (B) 1 (A, B & J)	2 (B & J) 7 (A & B) 1 (A & J) 4 (A) 2 (B)	2 (B & J) 10 (A & B) 2 (A & J) 1 (A) 3 (B) 1 (B & E)	3 (B & J) 7 (A & B) 1 (A) 4 (B)	14 – 20% 31 – 44.3% 6 – 8.6% 7 – 10% 10 – 14.3% 1 – 1.4% 1 – 1.4%
Question 15: Do you have Kalanga textbooks in your school?	0 (Yes) 20 (No)	0 (Yes) 16 (No)	0 (Yes) 19 (No)	0 (Yes) 15 (No)	0 – 0% 70 – 100%
Key: A – English; B – Ndebele; J – Kalanga; O – The teacher asks others to explain					

In this school 70 pupils completed the learners' questionnaire. The outright majority of these pupils (75.7%) speak Kalanga as their first language. Native speakers of Ndebele constitute 22.9% and 1.4% of these pupils speak Ndebele and Kalanga as their mother tongues. Kalanga is the language used at home by the outright majority of the pupils (67.1%). Ndebele is spoken at home by 17.1% of these pupils and 15.7% speak Ndebele and Kalanga at home. Noteworthy in this school is the case of children who indicate that their mother tongues and home languages are both Ndebele and Kalanga in this predominantly Kalanga speaking community. This is possibly a reflection of the effects of intermarriages and marked bilingualism, which parents from this school highlighted in focus group discussions. The outright majority of the pupils (95.8%) and (95.7%) indicated that they can speak and understand Kalanga respectively.

Almost all the pupils (97.1%) indicated that they learnt Kalanga in grade 1 and grade 2. The outright majority of the pupils (95.7%) indicated that they learnt Kalanga in grade 3. Almost all the pupils (98.6%) indicated that they learnt Kalanga in grade 4, grade 5 and grade 6. However, all grade 7 pupils indicated that they were not learning Kalanga in grade 7; possibly because Kalanga is not examined at grade 7 hence it is dropped at grade 7. The outright majority of the pupils (97.1%) indicated that Kalanga is taught in their school. During class observations in this school, I noted that Kalanga was taught up to grade 6. However, the minimum number of periods allocated to Kalanga in the lower grades raises critical questions on the level of adequacy of its teaching and learning. The time allocated to Kalanga is inadequate to achieve any sort of fluency. In grade 1A Kalanga appeared in the school and class timetable allocated 4 periods per week, instead of the required 8 periods per week. There was a dedicated section for Kalanga charts in the class. Kalanga was schemed for and appeared in the records of marks and pupils' reports. There were Kalanga pupils' exercise books and there were no Kalanga textbooks in the class.

In grade 4B I noted that Kalanga was included in the school and class timetable allocated 5 periods per week instead of the required 9 periods per week. The amount of time allocated to Kalanga reflects that it is not treated the same as Ndebele and English. There were no charts for Kalanga except for the flash cards and reading cards and a poem. Kalanga was schemed for and it appeared in the records of marks and pupils' reports. There were pupils' exercise books for Kalanga. There were no Kalanga textbooks in the class. In grade 6A Kalanga appeared in the school and class timetable allocated 9 periods per week. There were no charts for Kalanga. Kalanga was schemed for and appeared in the records of marks, but there were no marks for Kalanga. It appeared in the pupils' reports and there were Kalanga exercise books for the pupils. There were no Kalanga textbooks.

Only 22.9% of the pupils indicated that their teachers can speak Kalanga and 70% of the pupils indicated that their teachers understand Kalanga. Given these results this possibly explains why Ndebele and English dominate as languages of instruction. This illustrates a case where as a result of the poor policy of deployment of teachers,

teachers find themselves in a school where they cannot teach in the approved local language or teach it as a subject.

All the grade 6 and 7 pupils indicated that their teachers use English when teaching Mathematics and 92.8% of the pupils indicated that their teachers also use Ndebele when teaching Mathematics. Almost all the pupils in grade 7B and one pupil in 7A indicated that their teachers use Kalanga when teaching Mathematics. All the pupils indicated that their teachers use English when teaching Content and 91.4% of the pupils indicated that the teachers also use Ndebele when teaching Content. Only 17.1% of the pupils, all from grade 7B indicated that their teacher use Kalanga as well to teach Content. According to the language survey questionnaire, grade 7B pupils are taught by a Kalanga speaking teacher hence why the teacher uses Kalanga. Most probably, the other teachers use Ndebele and English because as indicated by the learners and in the language survey questionnaire, they lack linguistic competence in Kalanga.

During class observations in grade 1 where both classes were combined in an Environmental Science lesson on *Materials and Technology*, the Ndebele speaking teacher delivered the lesson in Ndebele and English, but Ndebele was the most predominantly used language. Without the teacher's permission some of the pupils named the materials in their mother tongue, Kalanga and the teacher asked them for the Ndebele equivalents. The teacher did not encourage pupils to name the concepts in Kalanga the language in which, it appeared most pupils could say what materials they had picked outside the class or which the teacher asked them to name. In grade 4B in a Mathematics lesson on *Decimals*, the Ndebele speaking teacher taught in English and Ndebele. However, English enjoyed the lion's share throughout the lesson. In grade 6A in a Mathematics lesson on *Mass and Capacity*, I noted that the lesson was predominantly in English, but the Ndebele speaking teacher resorted to Ndebele here and there to clarify and emphasize concepts.

Almost all the pupils (98.6%) indicated that their teachers resort to Ndebele when they do not understand the lesson and 95.7% of the pupils indicated that their

teachers ask other pupils to explain. Almost all the pupils in grade 7B and one pupil from grade 6A indicated that their teachers resort to Kalanga when they do not understand. In focus group discussions with the teachers it emerged that they ask other pupils to explain to others when they do not understand because they (the teachers) cannot speak the pupils' local language. The outright majority of the pupils (75.7%) indicated that they are allowed to ask or answer questions in Ndebele in class, and only 1.4% of the pupils in grade 7B indicated that they are allowed to ask or answer questions in Kalanga.

From these responses and class observations I noted that English and Ndebele are the most predominantly used languages and Kalanga is used mainly in grade 7B, a class taught by a Kalanga speaker. The teacher's preferences for Ndebele and English can be partly attributed to their lack of linguistic competence in Kalanga since three of them are not native speakers of Kalanga and pupils indicated that only 22.9% of the teachers can speak Kalanga.

Like in the school where Venda is predominantly spoken, in this predominantly Kalanga speaking school, only 30% of the pupils who completed the questionnaire indicated that they would want to be taught in Kalanga. The outright majority of the pupils (81.4%) indicated that they would like to be taught in Ndebele and 64.3% of the pupils preferred English. Why this 'mad' rush for Ndebele in a predominantly Kalanga speaking school? Could it be because of the prestige and status of Ndebele as the core subject, national language and lingua franca in Matabeleland provinces? The low status of Kalanga seems to have stuck even in the minds of children in as far as Kalanga is concerned in official domains, and its impotence in education appears to have been institutionised and canonised.

The high language and social status, as well as prestige, of Ndebele may be the reason why Kalanga speakers identify more with Ndebele than with their mother tongue. The data from the learners' questionnaires reveal that Kalanga speakers have negative attitudes towards their language. Could this be the possible reason why Kalanga has lagged behind and one of the two official minority languages that

have not received its textbooks? Given that a language acquires an inferior status when compared to other languages in the school curriculum because it is not an examined subject or used as a medium of instruction, this could be a possible explanation for the low preference for Kalanga as a language of instruction. Since Ndebele and English are examined and are the most used languages of instruction this possibly explain why Kalanga is not the most preferred medium of instruction in this predominantly Kalanga speaking school.

In light of the observation that the rate of language shift to a large extent depends on the amount of attraction or pressure from the dominant language, in Zimbabwe the amount of pressure from Ndebele and Shona is too high. As revealed in documentary analysis, Ndebele and Shona have been accorded far much higher status than the official minority languages and this means they have constricted the functional space of official minority languages in the public domains. Their pervasive influence is also encroaching into the family domain as well as reflected by the number of pupils whose mother tongues or home languages are both Ndebele and Kalanga. With an increase in status and prestige, the utilisation value of Ndebele and Shona was also augmented. This, in turn, gives Ndebele and Shona more weight compared to official minority languages and promotes language shift. There is a pull towards the major languages and the more powerful and functionally dominant the language, the more pressing its attraction and pull, the greater the tendency to shift towards it.

Minority language speaking pupils are under pressure to shift from their language when all, or most, of the teachers come from the dominant group or do not speak their language. The preference for Ndebele may be explained in these terms advanced by Skutnabb-Kangas and Dunbar (2010:10), especially given that Ndebele speaking teachers constitute the outright majority in this school. The low status and prestige accorded to official minority languages influence pupils to shun their languages. Possibly, the invisibility of these local languages in school premises can partly explain why these learners prefer other languages to their mother tongues. In their responses to questions 8, 9, 12 and 13, pupils indicated that the most preferred local language as a medium of instruction by teachers is Ndebele. Consequently, the

teachers' preference for Ndebele naturally influences these predominantly Kalanga speaking pupils to opt for Ndebele as their most preferred medium.

All the pupils indicated that they are no Kalanga teaching materials in their school. Despite being among the pioneering language groups in the lobbying and advocacy activities that led to the 2002 policy development, Kalanga like Sotho still do not have textbooks. The unavailability of textbooks and linguistic incompetence of the teachers in this school are some of the possibly major causes of the delay in the teaching of Kalanga.

Table 16: A school in Bulilima district where Kalanga is spoken alongside other languages

Grade	6A1	6A2	Totals - % where applicable
Sample size	16	16	32
Question 2: What is your home language?	16 (B)	14 (B) 1 (A & B) 1 (J)	30 – 93.8% 1 – 3.1% 1 – 3.1%
Question 3: Which language do you speak when you are at home?	16 (B)	15 (B) 1 (A & B)	31 – 96.9% 1 – 3.1%
Question 4: Did you learn Kalanga in: Grade 1 Grade 2 Grade 3 Grade 4 Grade 5	16 (Yes) 0 (No) 16 (Yes) 0 (No) 16 (Yes) 0 (No) 16 (Yes) 0 (No) 16 (Yes)	15 (Yes) 1 (No) 15 (Yes) 1 (No) 16 (Yes) 0 (No) 16 (Yes) 0 (No) 16 (Yes)	31 – 96.9% 1 – 3.1% 31 – 96.9% 1 – 3.1% 32 – 100% 0 – 0% 32 – 100% 0 – 0% 32 – 100%

Grade 6 Grade 7	0 (No) 16 (Yes) 0 (No)	0 (No) 16 (Yes) 0 (No)	0 – 0% 32 – 100% 0 – 0%
Question 5: Can your teacher speak Kalanga?	16 (Yes) 0 (No)	2 (Yes) 14 (No)	18 – 56.3% 14 – 43.8%
Question 6: Does your teacher understand Kalanga?	16 (Yes) 0 (No)	3 (Yes) 13 (No)	19 – 59.4% 13 – 40.6%
Question 7: Do you learn Kalanga at school?	16 (Yes) 0 (No)	16 (Yes) 0 (No)	32 – 100% 0 – 0%
Question 8: What language(s) does your teacher use when teaching Mathematics?	16 (A & B)	16 (A & B)	32 – 100%
Question 9: What language(s) does your teacher use when teaching Content?	16 (A & B)	16 (A & B)	32 – 100%
Question 10: Can you speak the following language(s): English Kalanga Ndebele?	15 (A & B) 1 (A, B & J)	1 (A & B) 1 (A, B & J) 13 (B) 1 (B & J)	16 – 50% 2 – 6.3% 13 – 40.6% 1 – 3.1%
Question 11: Do you understand the following language(s): English Kalanga Ndebele?	14 (A & B) 2 (A, B & J)	14 (A & B) 1 (A, B & J) 1 (B)	28 – 87.5% 3 – 9.4% 1 – 3.1%
Question 12: What does your teacher do when you do not understand the lesson?	11 (B & O) 5 (A, B & O)	1 (B & O) 3 (A, B & O) 10 (A & B) 2 (B)	12 – 37.5% 8 – 25% 10 – 31.3% 2 – 6.3%
Question 13: In class are you allowed to ask or answer questions in:	2 (Yes B) 14 (No B)	11 (Yes B) 5 (No B)	13 – 40.6% 19 – 59.3%

Ndebele Kalanga	0 (Yes J) 16 (No J)	0 (Yes J) 16 (No J)	0 – 0% 32 – 100%
Question 14: Indicate the language(s) you would like to be taught in	9 (B) 5 (A & B) 2 (A)	4 (B) 10 (A & B) 2 (A)	13 – 40.6% 15 – 46.9% 4 – 12.5%
Question 15: Do you have Kalanga textbooks in your school?	0 (Yes) 16 (No)	0 (Yes) 16 (No)	0 – 0% 32 – 100%
Key: A – English; B – Ndebele; J – Kalanga; O – The teacher asks others to explain			

In this school 32 pupils completed the questionnaire. Only grade 6 pupils completed the questionnaire because grade 7 pupils were no longer coming to school after completing their final examinations. The outright majority of the pupils (93.8%) are Ndebele speakers, 3.1% speak Kalanga and another 3.1% speak both English and Ndebele. The outright majority of the pupils (96.9%) speak Ndebele at home and this includes the Kalanga speaking child who indicated that Kalanga is his/her mother tongue and 3.1% speak both Ndebele and English at home. Only 9.4% of the pupils who completed the questionnaire indicated that they can speak and understand Kalanga.

Almost all the pupils (96.9%) indicated that they were taught Kalanga in grade 1 and grade 2. All the pupils indicated that they learnt Kalanga in grade 3 to grade 6. All the pupils indicated that Kalanga is taught in their school. Through class observations in this school I noted that Kalanga is taught up to grade 6, but it is not allocated the minimum required number of periods per week. In grade 1A1 and grade 4A1 Kalanga was allocated 3 periods per week instead of the stipulated 8 periods per week for grade 1 to 2 pupils and 9 periods per week for grade 3 to 7 pupils in the school and class timetable. In grade 6, Kalanga was allocated 2 periods per week instead of the stipulated 9 periods per week.

The number of periods allocated to Kalanga decrease with grades instead of increasing as is the requirement. This clearly reflects the value and status of Kalanga in the curriculum. The decrease in the number of periods allocated to Kalanga in the upper grades reflects that more time is dedicated to the examinable subjects. In all the classes that I observed, Kalanga was schemed for and it appeared in the records of marks as well as in pupils' reports. There were Kalanga exercise books for the pupils and a dedicated section for Kalanga charts. There were no Kalanga textbooks in all the classes. At least 56.3% of the pupils indicated that their teachers can speak Kalanga and 59.4% of the pupils indicated their teachers can understand Kalanga.

All the pupils indicated that their teachers use English and Ndebele to teach Mathematics. All the pupils indicated that their teachers use English and Ndebele when teaching Content. All the pupils indicated that their teachers resort to Ndebele when they do not understand the lesson, no child indicated that their teachers resort to Kalanga, 56.4% of the pupils indicated that their teachers use English when they do not understand and 65.5% of the pupils indicated that the teachers ask other pupils to explain, a strategy which teachers indicated they use because they cannot speak the pupils' local language. During class observations in grade 1A1 in a Mathematics lesson on *Subtraction using graphs*, I noted that English and Ndebele were the most predominantly used languages. The theme song or rhyme of the lesson was *Amaxoxo anguten ayenath' emthonjeni* (Ten frogs were drinking in a well). The Kalanga speaking teacher at some point during the lesson encouraged the pupils to say their answers in Kalanga.

In grade 4A1 in an Environmental Science lesson on *The Digestive tract*, the Ndebele speaking teacher used English predominantly. Some concepts or parts of the digestive tract were explained in Ndebele. Kalanga was not used in the class. Pupils responded to the teacher's questions in the language the questions were asked. In grade 6A1 in a Mathematics lesson on *Addition of mixed numbers*, the Kalanga speaking teacher taught mainly in English and partly in Ndebele. Kalanga was not used throughout the lesson by the Kalanga speaking teacher. All the pupils indicated that they are not allowed to ask or answer questions in Kalanga in class and at least

40.6% of the pupils indicated that they are allowed to ask or answer questions in Ndebele. These findings indicate that English and Ndebele are the most predominantly used media of instruction.

The outright majority of the pupils (87.5%) indicated that they would prefer to be taught in Ndebele and 59.4% of the pupils preferred English. Since almost all the pupils who completed the questionnaire are Ndebele speakers, it is not surprising why Ndebele was the most preferred medium. All the pupils indicated that there are no Kalanga textbooks in the school. Like in the school represented in Table 15 most probably the unavailability of teaching materials is also another major cause of the delay in the teaching of Kalanga. Given the staffing situation and linguistic heterogeneity of this school, it is likely that even when textbooks are made available, like in the other schools in Beitbridge where textbooks are available, the unavailability of enough linguistically competent Kalanga teachers will derail the teaching of Kalanga.

Table 17: A school in Mangwe urban where Kalanga is spoken

Grade	6A	6B	6C	6D	7A	7B	7C	7D	Totals -% where applicable
Sample size	22	20	20	20	20	21	21	19	163
Question 2: What is your home language?	17 B 2 E 3 J	14 B 1 E 3 J 2 A & B	17 B 2 E 1 I	16 B 1 E 3 J	19 B 1 B & J	11 B 5 E 3 J 1 B & E 1 B & P	19 B 2 E	16 B 1 E 2 F	129- 79.1% 14- 8.6% 12- 7.4% 2- 1.2% 1- 0.6% 1- 0.6% 1- 0.6% 1- 0.6% 2- 1.2%
Question 3: Which language do you speak	10 B 1 E	11 B 2 E	17 B 2 E	17 B 1 E	19 B	15 B 4 E	17 B 2 E	17 B 1 E	123- 75.5% 13- 8%

when you are at home?	4 B & E 2 A & B 4 B & J 1 A, B & E	4 A & B 2 B & J 1 J	1 A & B	1 B & J 1 J	1 B & J	1 B & E 1 J	1A & B 1 B & J	1 F	5- 3.1% 8- 4.9% 9- 5.5% 1- 0.6% 3- 1.8% 1- 0.6%
Question 4: Did you learn Kalanga in: Grade 1 Grade 2 Grade 3 Grade 4 Grade 5 Grade 6 Grade 7	0 Yes 22 No 0 Yes 22 No 0 Yes 22 No 0 Yes 22 No 17 Yes 5 No 22 Yes 0 No	0 Yes 20 No 1 Yes 19 No 2 Yes 18 No 3 Yes 17 No 18 Yes 2 No 19 Yes 0 No 1 Ni	1 Yes 19 No 1 Yes 19 No 1 Yes 19 No 3 Yes 17 No 20 Yes 0 No 20 Yes 0 No	0 Yes 20 No 0 Yes 20 No 0 Yes 20 No 0 Yes 20 No 19 Yes 1 No 20 Yes 0 No	0 Yes 20 No 0 Yes 20 No 0 Yes 20 No 0 Yes 20 No 0 Yes 20 No 19 Yes 1 No 20 Yes 0 No	0 Yes 21 No 0 Yes 21 No 0 Yes 21No 0 Yes 21No 0 Yes 21 No 18 Yes 3 No 20 Yes 0 No 1 Ni	0 Yes 21 No 0 Yes 21 No 0 Yes 21 No 0 Yes 21No 0 Yes 21 No 19 Yes 2 No 20 Yes 1No	2 Yes 17 No 1 Yes 18 No 1 Yes 18 No 1 Yes 18 No 1 Yes 18 No 17 Yes 2 No 17 Yes 2 No	3- 1.8% 160- 98.2% 3- 1.8% 160- 98.2% 4- 2.5% 159- 97.5% 7- 4.3% 156- 95.7% 75- 46% 88- 54% 154- 94.5% 8- 4.9% 1- 0.6% 77- 95.1% 3- 3.7% 1- 1.2%
Question 5: Can your teacher speak Kalanga?	0 Yes 22 No	5 Yes 15 No	20 Yes 0 No	1 Yes 18 No 1 Ni	0 Yes 20 No	1 Yes 19 No 1 Ni	21 Yes 0 No	19 Yes 0 No	67- 41.1% 94- 57.6% 2- 1.2%
Question 6: Does your teacher understand	22 Yes 0 No	15 Yes 5 No	3 Yes 16 No	17 Yes 3 No	20 Yes 0 No	21 Yes 0 No	21 Yes 0 No	19 Yes 0 No	138- 84.7% 24- 14.7%

Kalanga?			1 Ni						1- 0.6%
Question 7: Do you learn Kalanga at school?	22 Yes 0 No	20 Yes 0 No	20 Yes 0 No	20 Yes 0 No	20 Yes 0 No	19 Yes 1 No 1 Ni	21 Yes 0 No	19 Yes 0 No	161- 98.8% 1- 0.6% 1- 0.6%
Question 8: What languages does your teacher use when teaching Mathematics?	22 A	19 A 1 A & B	14 A 6 A & B	20 A	6 A 14 A & B	3 A 18 A & B	1 A 20 A & B	19 A & B	85- 52.1% 78- 47.9%
Question 9: What languages does your teacher use when teaching Content?	22 A & B	20 A	1 A & B 19 A	20 A	17 A & B 3 A	18 A & B 3 A	21 A & B	19 A & B	98- 60.1% 65- 39.9%
Question 10: Can you speak the following languages: English Kalanga Ndebele?	4 A, B & J 18 A & B	2 A, B & J 14 A & B 3 B 1 B & J	19 A & B 1 B	2 A, B & J 12 A & B 5 B 1 A & J	5 A, B & J 13 A & B 1 B 1 Ni	2 A, B & J 17 A & B 1 B 1 J	8 A, B & J 13 A & B	1 A, B & J 18 A & B	24- 14.7% 124- 76.1% 11- 6.7% 1- 0.6% 1- 0.6% 1- 0.6% 1- 0.6%
Question 11: Do you understand the following languages: English Kalanga Ndebele?	11 A, B & J 11 A & B	3 A, B & J 13 A & B 3 B 1 B & J	19 A & B 1 B	2 A, B & J 12 A & B 5 B 1 J	4 A, B & J 15 A & B 1 B	12 A, B & J 8 A & B 1 B	6 A, B & J 15 A & B	2 A, B & J 17 A & B	40- 24.5% 110- 67.5% 11- 6.7% 1- 0.6% 1- 0.6%
Question 12: What does your teacher do when you do not understand the lesson?	22 B	14 B 1 A 1 B & O	7 B 1 A 2 B & O	1 B 19 A	15 B 1 A	6 B 9 B & O	20 B & O	11 B 5 B & O	76- 46.6% 22- 13.5% 37- 22.7%

		3 A & B			4 A & B	2 A & B			9- 5.5%
		1 A, B & O	3 A, B & O					3 A, B & O	
									7- 4.3%
			5 O						
						3 O	1 O		9- 5.5%
			1 A & O						
									1- 0.6%
			1 Ni						
									1- 0.6%
						1 E			1- 0.6%
Question 13: In class are you allowed to ask or answer questions in: Ndebele Kalanga?	22 Yes B	20 Yes B	12 Yes B	20 Yes B	20 Yes B	21 Yes B	21 Yes	4 Yes B	140- 85.9%
	0 No B	0 No B	8 No B	0 No B	0 No B	0 No B	0 No B	15 No B	23- 14.1%
	0 Yes J	4 Yes J	0 Yes J	0 Yes J	0 Yes J	0 Yes J	0 Yes J	0 Yes J	4- 2.5%
	22 No J	16 No J	20 No J	20 No J	20 No J	21 No J	21 No J	19 No J	159- 97.5%
Question 14: Indicate the language you would like to be taught in	7 A & B	3 A & B	13 A & B	1 A & B	1 A & B	15 A & B	15 A & B	7 A & B	62- 38%
	1 A	1 A	4 A	3 A	8 A	1 A	3 A		21- 12.9%
	1 J	1 J		1 J	5 J			1 J	9- 5.5%
	2 A & J	1 A & J	1 A & J		2 A & J	1 A & J	1 A & J	4 A & J	12- 7.4%
	1 E	1 E		3 E					5- 3.2%
	1 B & E	2 B & E				1 B & E			4- 2.5%
	3 A, B & J							3 A, B & J	6- 3.7%
	3 A, E & J								3- 1.8%
	1 B, J & H								1- 0.6%
	1 A, B & H								1- 0.6%
	1 A, E & G								1- 0.6%
	1 A, E & H								1- 0.6%
	1 B, E & F								1- 0.6%
	1 B, E & H								1- 0.6%
		2 B		12 B	1 B	1 B			16- 9.8%
		1 A, B, E & J							1- 0.6%

		1 A, P &R 1 A, B & R 1 J, M & Q 1 A, M, Q & R 1 J, M & S							1- 0.6% 1- 0.6% 1- 0.6% 1- 0.6% 1- 0.6%
			1 E & J 1 B & J		2 E & J 1 G, H & J	1 B & J 1 B &P		1 E & J 1 E & G 1 A, B, F & T 1 A, B & F	4- 2.5% 2- 1.2% 1- 0.6% 1- 0.6% 1- 0.6% 1- 0.6% 1- 0.6%
							1 A & E 1 A & R		1- 0.6% 1- 0.6%
Question 15: Do you have Kalanga textbooks in your school?	0 Yes 22 No	20 Yes 0 No	20 Yes 0 No	20 Yes 0 No	20 Yes 0 No	21 Yes 0 No	21 Yes 0 No	19 Yes 0 No	141- 86.5% 22- 13.5%
Key: A – English; B – Ndebele; E – Shona; F – Sotho; G – Tonga; H – Venda; I – Chewa; J – Kalanga; M – Afrikaans; Ni – No indication; O – The teacher asks others to explain; P – Tswana; Q – Chinese; R – Zulu; S – Pedi; T – Xhosa									

In this school 163 pupils completed the questionnaire. The outright majority of these pupils (79.1%) speak Ndebele as their first language, 8.6% speak Shona, 7.4%

speak Kalanga, 1.2% speaks Ndebele and English, 1.2% Sotho, 0.6% speaks Shona and Ndebele and another 0.6% speaks Ndebele and Tswana. The majority of the pupils (75.5%) speak Ndebele at home, 8% speak Shona at home, 5.5% speak Ndebele and Kalanga at home, 4.9% speak English and Ndebele at home, 1.8% speaks Kalanga at home, 0.6% speaks Sotho at home and another 0.6% speaks English, Ndebele and Shona at home. Noteworthy, in this school are the cases of pupils who indicate that they use more than one home language and these could be possibly indications of intermarriages and marked bilingualism. The use of English relates to its prestige and status.

Only 15.8% of the pupils are able to speak Kalanga and 25.7% understand Kalanga. The outright majority of the pupils (98.2%) indicated that they did not learn Kalanga in grade 1 and grade 2. Almost all the pupils (97.5%) indicated that they did not learn Kalanga in grade 3. The outright majority of the pupils (95.7%) indicated that they did not learn Kalanga in grade 4. Almost all grade 6 pupils (90.2%) indicated that they learnt Kalanga in grade 5 and almost all grade 7 pupils except for 1 pupil indicated that they did not learn Kalanga in grade 5. Almost all the pupils (94.5%) indicated that they are learning and learnt Kalanga in grade 6. The outright majority of the pupils (95.1%) in grade 7 indicated that they were learning Kalanga in grade 7. Almost all the pupils (98.8%) indicated that Kalanga is taught in their school.

Given the time allocated for Kalanga, unavailability of teaching materials and limited number of linguistically competent Kalanga teachers in this school, it cannot safely be concluded that the language is properly taught. The amount of time allocated to Kalanga is inadequate to achieve any sort of literacy or proficiency in it. During class observations in grade 1C, 4A and 6A I noted that Kalanga is allocated 1 period per week instead of 8 periods per week for grade 1 to 2 pupils and 9 periods per week for grade 3 to 7 pupils in the school and class timetable. This reflects the low value and status accorded to Kalanga in the curriculum. In grade 1C and 4A there was a dedicated section for Kalanga charts. In grade 6A there were no Kalanga charts except for the months of the year. In all the three classes Kalanga was schemed for

and appeared in the records of marks and in the pupils' reports. There were Kalanga pupils' exercise books and there were no Kalanga textbooks in all the three classes.

Only 41.1% of the pupils indicated that their teachers can speak Kalanga and 84.7% of the pupils indicated that their teachers can understand Kalanga. This possibly explains why the teaching of Kalanga is not effective. The teachers lack communicative competence in Kalanga since the outright majority of them are Ndebele speakers. This also explains why Kalanga is not even used as a medium of instruction. Even if classes are organised according to the pupils' mother tongue to effect proper mother tongue education in Kalanga, the number of Kalanga speaking teachers is far too low to support mother tongue education in Kalanga. The same is equally true for Shona because only 13% of the teachers are mother tongue speakers of Shona.

All the pupils indicated that their teachers teach Mathematics in English. Only 47.9% of the pupils in grade 6B, 6C and all the grade 7 classes indicated that Ndebele is also used to teach Mathematics in their classes. No child indicated that Kalanga is used to teach Mathematics. All the pupils indicated that their teachers use English when teaching Content and 60.1% of the pupils except those from grade 6B indicated that their teachers also use Ndebele when teaching Content. The outright majority of the pupils (79.1%) indicated that when they do not understand the lesson their teachers resort to Ndebele, 33.1% of the pupils indicated that their teachers ask other pupils to explain and 23.9% of the pupils indicated that their teachers use English. Almost all the pupils, i.e. 85.9% indicated that they are allowed to ask or answer questions in Ndebele in class and only 2.5% of the pupils all from grade 6B indicated that they are allowed to ask or answer questions in Kalanga. These results show that English and Ndebele are the most preferred media of instruction.

Through class observations in grade 1C in a Home Economics lesson on *Cleanliness*, the Ndebele speaking teacher taught in English and Ndebele. In grade 4A in an Environmental Science lesson on *Materials and Technology*, the lesson was predominantly in English although the Ndebele speaking teacher explained some

terms and concepts in Ndebele. Pupils struggled to name the materials they were asked to name in the book in English, but they whispered the answers in Ndebele and feared to say out the answers in Ndebele and the teacher did not encouraged them to say their answers in Ndebele. In grade 6A in a Mathematics lesson on *Percentages*, the Ndebele speaking teacher taught predominantly in English and used a bit of Ndebele here and there to explain and simplify concepts. In all these classes Kalanga was not used and this matches the pupils' responses to questions 8, 9, 12 and 13.

The outright majority of the pupils (70.4%) indicated that they prefer English as their medium of instruction, 60.6% of the pupils indicated that they prefer Ndebele, 25.1% of the pupils preferred Kalanga, 14.2% of the pupils preferred Shona, 3% of the pupils preferred Venda, 2.4% of the pupils preferred Zulu, 1.8% of the pupils preferred Sotho, another 1.8% preferred Tonga and another 1.8% preferred Afrikaans. Tswana was chosen by 1.2% of the pupils, another 1.2% of the pupils preferred Chinese, 0.6% of the pupils preferred Pedi and another 0.6% of the pupils preferred Xhosa. Like the other schools in urban centres, English was the most preferred medium of instruction in this school. In this school there was an unusual choice where pupils preferred some languages spoken in South Africa and Botswana. For example Afrikaans, Pedi, Xhosa, Zulu and Tswana which is also spoken in Botswana.

The possible explanation for this unusual choice can be explained in terms of the visibility of these languages in the most followed South African soapies in Zimbabwe, such as *Generations* among other soapies on South African television channels which Zimbabweans watch by means of satellite dishes. The choice of Tonga is also interesting because of its minority language status. Why Tonga of all the minority languages and when the two district are too far apart? The choice of Venda and Sotho could also be attributed to the visibility of these languages in South African television channels accessible to Zimbabweans. For Venda it could be the popularity of *Muvhango* a popular Venda SABC 2 soapie. The choice of Venda, Sotho and Tonga can also be explained in terms of the fact that some pupils in the school speak

Sotho, Venda and Tonga. More intriguing is the choice of Chinese which has gained so much popularity in Zimbabwe following the government's 'look east policy' where the government made bilateral agreements with the Chinese government for trade among other business initiatives. In essence, among other factors the visibility of these languages attracts the pupils' attention.

The outright majority of the pupils (86.5%) indicated that there are Kalanga textbooks in the school. However, focus group discussions with the teachers revealed that the pupils referred to old Kalanga textbooks which were published by the Curriculum Development Unit for grade 1 pupils, which however, are used by the teachers for all the grades to teach Kalanga. Even if this school is provided with Kalanga textbooks, the teaching of Kalanga is not likely to be effective because the school does not have enough Kalanga speaking teachers. The delay in the teaching of Kalanga in this school can also be largely attributed to the shortage of Kalanga speaking teachers, unavailability of teaching materials and linguistic heterogeneity in the composition of class and school population.

Table 18: A school in Binga rural where Tonga is predominantly spoken

Grade	6A	6B	6C	7A	7B	Totals - % where applicable
Sample size	12	15	2	30	10	69
Question 2: What is your home language?	12 (G)	15 (G)	2 (G)	29 (G) 1 (B)	9 (G) 1 (I)	67 – 97.1% 1 – 1.4% 1 – 1.4%
Question 3: Which language do you speak when you are at home?	12 (G)	15 (G)	2 (G)	29 (G) 1 (B)	9 (G) 1 (I)	67 – 97.1% 1 – 1.4% 1 – 1.4%
Question 4: Did you learn Tonga in:						

Grade 1 Grade 2 Grade 3 Grade 4 Grade 5 Grade 6 Grade 7	12 (Yes) 0 (No) 12 (Yes) 0 (No) 12 (Yes) 0 (No) 12 (Yes) 0 (No) 12 (Yes) 0 (No)	15 (Yes) 0 (No) 15 (Yes) 0 (No) 15 (Yes) 0 (No) 15 (Yes) 0 (No) 14 (Yes) 0 (No) 1 (Ni) 15 (Yes) 0 (No)	2 (Yes) 0 (No) 2 (Yes) 0 (No) 2 (Yes) 0 (No) 2 (Yes) 0 (No) 1 (Yes) 0 (No) 1 (Ni) 2 (Yes) 0 (No)	30 (Yes) 0 (No) 30 (Yes) 0 (No) 30 (Yes) 0 (No) 28 (Yes) 2 (No) 28 (Yes) 2 (No) 29 (Yes) 1 (No) 21 (Yes) 4 (No) 5 (Ni)	10 (Yes) 0 (No) 10 (Yes) 0 (No) 10 (Yes) 0 (No) 10 (Yes) 0 (No) 10 (Yes) 0 (No) 10 (Yes) 0 (No) 8 (Yes) 1 (No)	69 – 100% 0 – 0% 69 – 100% 0 – 0% 67 – 97.1% 2 – 2.9% 67 – 97.1% 2 – 2.9% 65 – 94.2% 2 – 2.9% 2 – 2.9% 68 – 98.6% 1 – 1.4% 29 – 72.5% 5 – 12.5% 6 – 15%
Question 5: Can your teacher speak Tonga?	12 (Yes) 0 (No)	14 (Yes) 0 (No) 1 (Ni)	2 (Yes) 0 (No)	1 (Yes) 28 (No) 1 (Ni)	10 (Yes) 0 (No)	39 – 56.5% 28 – 40.6% 2 – 2.9%
Question 6: Does your teacher understand Tonga?	12 (Yes) 0 (No)	15 (Yes) 0 (No)	2 (Yes) 0 (No)	27 (Yes) 2 (No) 1 (Ni)	10 (Yes) 0 (No)	66 – 95.7% 2 – 2.9% 1 – 1.4%
Question 7: Do you learn Tonga at school?	12 (Yes) 0 (No)	15 (Yes) 0 (No)	2 (Yes) 0 (No)	30 (Yes) 0 (No)	10 (Yes) 0 (No)	69 – 100% 0 – 0%
Question 8: What language(s) does your teacher use when teaching Mathematics?	12 (A)	14 (A) 1 (A & G)	2 (A & G)	30 (A, B & G)	10 (A & G)	26 – 37.7% 13 – 18.8% 30 – 43.5%
Question 9: What	12 (A)	15 (A)	2 (A)			29 – 42%

language(s) does your teacher use when teaching Content?				30 (A, B & G)	10 (A & G)	30 – 43.5% 10 – 14.5%
Question 10: Can you speak the following language(s): English Tonga Ndebele?	8 (A, B & G) 3 (B & G) 1 (A & B)	6 (A, B & G) 9 (B & G)	2 (B & G)	8 (A, B & G) 8 (B & G) 13 (G) 1 (A & G)	4 (A, B & G) 6 (G)	26 – 37.7% 22 – 31.9% 1 – 1.4% 19 – 27.5% 1 – 1.4%
Question 11: Do you understand the following language(s): English Tonga Ndebele?	12 (A, B & G)	14 (A, B & G) 1 (B & G)	2 (A, B & G)	14 (A, B & G) 3 (B & G) 11 (A & G) 2 (G)	4 (A, B & G) 6 (A & G)	46 – 66.7% 4 – 5.8% 17 – 24.6% 2 – 2.9%
Question 12: What does your teacher do when you do not understand the lesson?	12 (G & O)	14 (G & O) 1 (G)	2 (G & O)	27 (A, B, G & O) 1 (A, B & G) 2 (A, G & O)	10 (A & G)	28 – 40.6% 1 – 1.4% 27 – 39.1% 1 – 1.4% 2 – 2.9% 10 – 14.5%
Question 13: In class are you allowed to ask or answer questions in: Ndebele Tonga?	12 (Yes B) 0 (No B) 12 (Yes G) 0 (No G)	9 (Yes B) 6 (No B) 15 (Yes G) 0 (No G)	2 (Yes B) 0 (No B) 2 (Yes G) 0 (No G)	0 (Yes B) 30 (No B) 0 (Yes G) 30 (No G)	0 (Yes B) 10 (No B) 1 (Yes G) 9 (No G)	23 – 33.3% 46 – 66.7% 30 – 43.5% 39 – 56.5%
Question 14: Indicate the language(s) you would like to be taught in	3 (G) 2 (A & G) 4 (A) 2 (B & G)	4 (G) 2 (A & G) 2 (A) 4 (B & G)	2 (G)	8 (G) 8 (A & G) 5 (A) 1 (B & G)	1 (G) 2 (A & G) 5 (A)	18 – 26.1% 14 – 20.3% 16 – 23.2% 7 – 10.1%

	1 (A & B)	3 (A, B & G)		4 (A & B) 3 (A, B & G) 1 (A & C)	1 (A & B) 1 (A & I)	6 – 8.7% 6 – 8.7% 1 – 1.4% 1 – 1.4%
Question 15: Do you have Tonga textbooks in your school?	12 (Yes) 0 (No)	14 (Yes) 0 (No) 1 (Ni)	2 (Yes) 0 (No)	30 (Yes) 0 (No)	10 (Yes) 0 (No)	68 – 100% 0 – 0%
Key: A – English; B – Ndebele; C – Nambya; G – Tonga; I – Chewa; Ni – No indication; O – The teacher asks others to explain						

In this school 69 pupils completed the learners' questionnaire. Out of these 69 pupils, 97.1% speak Tonga as their first language and use Tonga at home. Ndebele and Chewa speakers constitute 1.4% each and they are each spoken by 1.4% of the pupils at home. Almost all the pupils (98.5%) can speak Tonga and all the pupils can understand Tonga. All the pupils indicated that they learnt Tonga in grade 1 and grade 2. Almost all the pupils (97.1%) indicated that they learnt Tonga in grade 3 and grade 4. The outright majority of the pupils (94.2%) indicated that they learnt Tonga in grade 5. The outright majority of the pupils (98.6%) indicated that they are learning and learnt Tonga in grade 6 and 72.5% of the grade 7 pupils indicated that they were learning Tonga in grade 7. All the pupils indicated that Tonga is taught in their school.

During class observations in grade 1B, 4A and 7A I noted that there was a dedicated section for Tonga charts in all the three classes. There were Tonga textbooks in the classrooms and Tonga was schemed for and appeared in the records of marks and in the pupils' progress reports. There were pupils' daily exercise books for Tonga and composition books for grade 4 and 7. Tonga was allocated 8 periods per week for grade 1 to 2 pupils and 9 periods per week for grade 3 to 7 pupils in the school and class timetables. However, Ndebele was not included in the school and class timetable for grade 1 to grade 3 classes, yet the policy demands that Tonga should be taught in addition to Ndebele.

In this school Tonga is taught up to grade 7 and is allocated the required minimum number of periods in grade 7, a sign that it is rated similar to other languages. However, I observed that there were two grade 7 classes, i.e. Tonga and Ndebele where the Tonga class was learning only Tonga and the Ndebele class was learning only Ndebele. The teaching of Tonga separately, not in addition to Ndebele is a violation of the stipulations of the policy circulars and the Education Act.

At least 56.5% of the pupils indicated that their teachers can speak Tonga and 95.7% indicated that their teachers can understand Tonga. All the pupils indicated that their teachers teach Mathematics in English, 62.3% of the pupils indicated that Tonga is also used in teaching and learning Mathematics and 43.5% of the pupils all from grade 7A taught by a Ndebele speaking teacher indicated that their teacher uses Ndebele as well in teaching Mathematics. All the pupils indicated that they are taught Content in English, 58% of the pupils indicated that Content is also taught in Tonga and 43.5% of the pupils all from grade 7A taught by a Ndebele speaking teacher indicated that their teacher also uses Ndebele.

During class observations in grade 1B in an Environmental Science lesson on *Weather*, the Chewa speaking teacher taught predominantly in Tonga. English was used here and there to familiarise the pupils with the concepts in English. Pupils responded to the teacher's question in the language used by the teacher to ask the questions. Ndebele was only used in the theme song for the lesson, *Izihlahla ziyanyikinyeka* (The trees are shaking / moving). In grade 4A in a Social Studies lesson on *Places of Interest*, the Shona speaking teacher taught mainly in English, but Tonga was also used, especially when the pupils seemed lost. Ndebele was not used. The theme song for the lesson was in English, *Beautiful Zimbabwe*. In grade 7A in an Environmental Science lesson on *Health and Pollution*, the Ndebele speaking teacher taught mainly in English, but Tonga and Ndebele were also used here and there to clarify concepts.

All the pupils indicated that when they do not understand the lesson, their teachers resort to Tonga. A total of 57.9% of the pupils indicated that their teachers use

English and 40.5% of the pupils, all from grade 7A taught by a Ndebele speaking teacher indicated that their teacher resorts to Ndebele. At least 43.5% of the pupils indicated that their teachers allow them to ask or answer questions in Tonga and 33.3% of the pupils indicated that they are allowed to ask or answer questions in Ndebele. These results show that English and Tonga are the most predominantly used languages of instruction in this school.

Unlike in the predominantly Venda and Kalanga speaking schools represented in Tables 12 and 15, in this predominantly Tonga speaking school, 65.2% of the pupils indicated that they prefer to be taught in Tonga, 63.7% of the pupils indicated that they would prefer to be taught in English and 27.5% of the pupils preferred Ndebele. In this school, Tonga is the most preferred medium instruction to the national language by teachers when teaching Mathematics and Content. The outright majority of the teachers in this school speak the language of the pupils who constitute the majority. Possibly, this accounts for this high preference for Tonga to Ndebele by pupils.

Unlike the other language groups, Tonga speakers show a very strong allegiance to their language as reflected by the overwhelming preference for Tonga as a medium of instruction. There is clearly a more favourable role of Tonga in the school curriculum because it is predominantly used alongside English as a medium of instruction. Apart from these factors, possibly the fact that Tonga was going to be examined and was taught up to grade 7 and allocated the same number of periods as Ndebele in this school convinced these pupils of the value of acquiring literacy in their mother tongue. The strong positive attitude towards Tonga reflected by the pupils and teachers, especially Tonga speaking teachers is possibly an indication of the Tonga speakers' strong ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness and pride in their language.

Compared to the predominantly Kalanga speaking school represented in Table 15, the language survey questionnaire of this school shows that it is mainly linguistically homogeneous. The school represented in Table 15 is somewhat heterogeneous with

Ndebele speakers constituting a sizeable population. Given that when two languages are in contact, speakers of the less powerful language inevitably shift to the powerful and dominant language, possibly the contact of the Kalanga and Venda speakers with Ndebele explains their high preference for Ndebele.

Unlike this school, the schools represented in Tables 12 and 15 are affected most probably by the presence of an adjacent culturally dominant language, Ndebele. The continued dominance of Ndebele or Shona in the form of the teachers or pupils who speak these majority languages promote language shift to the majority languages, and hence the high preference for Ndebele in the schools represented in Tables 12 and 15. The prolonged contact of the Kalanga and Venda speakers with Ndebele speakers led to language shift, accommodation, diglossia and low ethnolinguistic vitality among Kalanga and Venda speakers. Tonga speakers in this area are, however not under such pressure because Ndebele speakers constitute a very small population to cause language shift among Tonga speakers.

All the pupils indicated that there are Tonga textbooks in their school. Given that mother tongue education requires course books and teachers able to teach the language, the availability of Tonga textbooks and Tonga speaking teachers, including the headmaster in this school are a good combination of factors that possibly explain why Tonga has emerged as the first to be examined.

Table 19: A school in Binga rural where Tonga is spoken alongside other languages

Grade	6A	6B	6C	7A	7B	Totals - % where applicable
Sample size	12	10	12	23	21	78
Question 2: What is your home language?	7 (G) 4 (B) 1 (C)	6 (G) 4 (B)	5 (G) 7 (B)	15 (G) 7 (B) 1 (C)	11 (G) 7 (B) 3 (C)	44 – 56.4% 29 – 37.2% 5 – 6.4%
Question 3: Which language	6 (G)	6 (G)	5 (G)	15 (G)	11 (G)	43 – 55.1%

do you speak when you are at home?	5 (B) 1 (C)	4 (B)	7 (B)	7 (B) 1 (C)	7 (B) 3 (C)	30 – 38.5% 5 – 6.4%
Question 4: Did you learn Tonga in: Grade 1 Grade 2 Grade 3 Grade 4 Grade 5 Grade 6 Grade 7	 9 (Yes) 2 (No) 1 (Spoiled) 9 (Yes) 2 (No) 1 (Spoiled) 10 (Yes) 2 (No) 10 (Yes) 2 (No) 11 (Yes) 1 (No) 12 (Yes) 0 (No)	 9 (Yes) 1 (No) 10 (Yes) 0 (No) 10 (Yes) 0 (No) 10 (Yes) 0 (No) 9 (Yes) 1 (No) 10 (Yes) 0 (No)	 9 (Yes) 3 (No) 10 (Yes) 2 (No) 11 (Yes) 1 (No) 11 (Yes) 1 (No) 11 (Yes) 1 (No) 12 (Yes) 0 (No)	 12 (Yes) 11 (No) 16 (Yes) 7 (No) 21 (Yes) 2 (No) 18 (Yes) 5 (No) 21 (Yes) 2 (No) 22 (Yes) 1 (No) 23 (Yes) 0 (No)	 12 (Yes) 9 (No) 14 (Yes) 7 (No) 17 (Yes) 3 (No) 1 (Ni) 18 (Yes) 3 (No) 21 (Yes) 0 (No) 20 (Yes) 1 (No) 21 (Yes) 0 (No)	 51 – 65.4% 26 – 33.3% 1 – 1.3% 59 – 75.6% 18 – 23.1% 1 – 1.3% 69 – 88.5% 8 – 10.3% 1 – 1.3% 67 – 85.9% 11 – 14.1% 73 – 93.6% 5 – 6.4% 76 – 97.4% 2 – 2.6% 44 – 100% 0 – 0%
Question 5: Can your teacher speak Tonga?	12 (Yes) 0 (No)	10 (Yes) 0 (No)	12 (Yes) 0 (No)	23 (Yes) 0 (No)	21 (Yes) 0 (No)	78 – 100% 0 – 0%
Question 6: Does your teacher understand Tonga?	12 (Yes) 0 (No)	10 (Yes) 0 (No)	12 (Yes) 0 (No)	23 (Yes) 0 (No)	21 (Yes) 0 (No)	78 – 100% 0 – 0%
Question 7: Do you learn Tonga in	12 (Yes) 0 (No)	10 (Yes) 0 (No)	12 (Yes) 0 (No)	23 (Yes) 0 (No)	21 (Yes) 0 (No)	78 – 100% 0 – 0%

school?						
Question 8: What language(s) does your teacher use when teaching Mathematics?	11 (A & G) 1 (A, B & G)	10 (A & G)	3 (A & G) 9 (A, B & G)	15 (A & G) 8 (A, B & G)	19 (A & G) 2 (A, B & G)	58 – 74.4% 20 – 25.6%
Question 9: What language(s) does your teacher use when teaching Content?	10 (A & G) 2 (A, B & G)	10 (A & G)	 12 (A, B & G)	4 (A & G) 1 (A, B & G) 18 (A)	 20 (A) 1 (A & B)	24 – 30.8% 15 – 19.2% 38 – 48.7% 1 – 1.3%
Question 10: Can you speak the following language(s): English Tonga Ndebele?	10 (A, B & G) 1 (A & B) 1 (B & G)	8 (A, B & G) 1 (B & G) 1 (A & G)	8 (A, B & G) 3 (A & B) 1 (B)	22 (A, B & G) 1 (Ni)	 1 (A & B) 20 (A)	48 – 61.5% 5 – 6.4% 2 – 2.6% 1 – 1.3% 1 – 1.3% 1 – 1.3% 20 – 25.6%
Question 11: Do you understand the following language(s): English Tonga Ndebele?	11 (A, B & G) 1 (A & G)	9 (A, B & G) 1 (A & G)	8 (A, B & G) 2 (A & B) 2 (B & G)	22 (A, B & G) 1 (A & B)	21 (A, B & G)	71 – 91.0% 2 – 2.6% 3 – 3.8% 2 – 2.6%
Question 12: What does your teacher do when you do not understand the lesson?	12 (G & O)	10 (G & O)	 12 (A, B, G & O)	18 (G & O) 1 (A, B, G & O) 2 (B, G & O) 2 (A, G & O)	19 (G & O) 1 (A, G & O) 1 (B, G & O)	59 – 75.6% 14 – 18% 3 – 3.8% 2 – 2.6%
Question 13: In class are you allowed to ask or answer questions:	12 (Yes B) 0 (No B) 12 (Yes G)	10 (Yes B) 0 (No B) 10 (Yes G)	11 (Yes B) 1 (No B) 12 (Yes G)	1 (Yes B) 22 (No B) 3 (Yes G)	1 (Yes B) 20 (No B) 2 (Yes G)	35 – 44.9% 43 – 55.1% 39 – 50%

Ndebele Tonga?	0 (No G)	0 (No G)	0 (No G)	20 (No G)	19 (No G)	39 – 50%
Question 14: Indicate the language(s) you would like to be taught in	6 (A, B & G) 2 (A & G) 2 (A & B) 1 (A & C) 1 (A, B & C)	7 (A, B & G) 2 (A & G) 1 (B & G)	1 (A, B & G) 3 (A & G) 4 (B & G) 1 (A & B) 1 (A) 1 (B) 1 (A, C & G)	5 (A, B & G) 10 (A & G) 1 (B & G) 2 (A & B) 4 (A) 1 (A, B, C, & G)	1 (A, B & G) 11 (A & G) 1 (B & G) 2 (A & B) 1 (A & C) 5 (A)	20 – 25.6% 28 – 35.9% 7 – 9% 7 – 9% 2 – 2.6% 1 – 1.3% 10 – 12.8% 1 – 1.3% 1 – 1.3% 1 – 1.3%
Question 15: Do you have Tonga textbooks in your school?	12 (Yes) 0 (No)	10 (Yes) 0 (No)	12 (Yes) 0 (No)	23 (Yes) 0 (No)	21 (Yes) 0 (No)	78 – 100% 0 – 0%
Key: A – English; B – Ndebele; C – Nambya ; G – Tonga; Ni – No indication; O – The teacher asks others to explain						

In this school 78 pupils completed the learners' questionnaire. The majority of these pupils (56.4%) speak Tonga as their first language, 37.2% speak Ndebele as their first language and 6.4% speak Nambya as their first language. Tonga is spoken at home by 55.1%, 38.5% speak Ndebele at home and 6.4% Nambya. At least 65.4% of these pupils can speak Tonga and the outright majority of these pupils (96.2%) can understand Tonga.

At least 65.4% of the pupils indicated that they learnt Tonga in grade 1 and 75.6% of the pupils indicated that they learnt Tonga in grade 2. The majority of the pupils (88.5%) indicated that they learnt Tonga in grade 3 and 85.9% of the pupils indicated that they learnt Tonga in grade 4. The outright majority of the pupils (93.6%) indicated that they learnt Tonga in grade 5 and 97.4% of the pupils indicated that they learnt and are learning Tonga in grade 6. All grade 7 pupils indicated that there

were learning Tonga in grade 7. All the pupils indicated that Tonga is taught in their school.

During class observations in grade 1A, 4A and 7A I noted that Tonga was included in the school and class timetables. Tonga was allocated 8 periods per week for grade 1 to 2 pupils and 9 periods per week for grade 3 to 7 pupils. However, Ndebele was not included in both timetables for grade 1 to 3, which is a violation of the stipulations of the policy documents. Tonga was schemed for and appeared in the records of marks and pupils' reports. There were pupils' Tonga daily exercise books and composition books for grade 4 to 7 and there was a dedicated section for Tonga charts in all the three classes. Tonga textbooks were available in all the three classes. All the pupils indicated that their teachers can speak and understand Tonga. All the pupils also indicated that there are Tonga books in their school. Given the staffing situation of this school and that all the pupils indicated that there are Tonga textbooks in their school, this possibly explains why mother tongue education in Tonga has been a success in this district.

All the pupils indicated that they are taught Mathematics in English and Tonga. Only 25.6% of the pupils indicated that Mathematics is also taught in Ndebele in their classes. All the pupils indicated that their teachers teach Content in English. At least 50% of the pupils indicated that their teachers also teach Content in Tonga and only 20.5% of the pupils indicated that their teachers use Ndebele as well to teach Content. The preference for Tonga by these teachers can be attributed to the fact that they are all native speakers of Tonga. Ndebele is probably used to accommodate Ndebele speakers and other language groups that cannot speak Tonga.

During class observations in grade 1A in a Mathematics lesson on *Subtraction*, the Sotho speaking teacher taught in all the three languages, English, Tonga and Ndebele. The theme song used to introduce the lesson was in Ndebele, *Amatsh' anguten asemzileni* (Ten stones are in a row). In grade 4A in a Mathematics lesson on *Length and Perimeter*, the Ndebele speaking teacher taught in English and

Ndebele only. The pupils responded to the teacher's questions in the language used by the teacher to ask the questions. In grade 7A the Tonga speaking teacher taught mainly in English. Ndebele was used here and there in giving instructions. Pupils responded to the teacher's questions in the language used by the teacher.

All the pupils indicated that when they do not understand the lesson their teachers resort to Tonga and ask other pupils to explain to others. Only 21.8% of the pupils indicated that their teachers also use Ndebele to clarify and explain when they do not understand and 20.6% of the pupils indicated that their teachers use English. At least 50% of the pupils indicated that their teachers allow them to ask or answer questions in Tonga in class, 44.9% of the pupils indicated that they are allowed to ask or answer questions in Ndebele in class. These results show that English and Tonga are the most predominantly used languages of instructions in this school.

In this linguistically mixed school where Tonga is the most predominantly spoken language, 73.1% of the pupils indicated that they would like to be taught in Tonga, 89.8% of the pupils indicated that they would like to be taught in English a shift from the language preferences for pupils in most rural schools of the study. Only 46.2% of the pupils preferred Ndebele. Tonga is more preferred to Ndebele another indication of the Tonga speakers' positive attitudes to their language. Possibly, the validation of Tonga in the curriculum and the availability of the majority of teachers who speak Tonga influence the pupils' choice and contribute to these positive attitudes.

The high scores for Tonga as a preferred medium of instruction by pupils and teachers in the schools represented in Tables 18 and 19 are possibly an expression of the Tonga speakers' clear and strong loyalty towards their language, especially given that in most cases the pupils' language attitudes are a reflection of the parents' language ideologies and practices.

Table 20: A school in Binga urban where Tonga is spoken

Grade	6A	6B	7A	7B	Totals - % where applicable
Sample size	17	24	24	26	91
Question 2: What is your home language?	9 (G) 2 (B) 5 (E) 1 (C)	14 (G) 7 (B) 3 (E)	15 (G) 3 (B) 5 (E) 1 (C)	16 (G) 5 (B) 4 (E) 1(I)	54 – 59.3% 17 – 18.7% 17 – 18.7% 2 – 2.2% 1 – 1.1%
Question 3: Which language do you speak when you are at home?	9 (G) 2 (B) 5 (E) 1 (C)	14 (G) 6 (B) 3 (E) 1 (C)	17 (G) 4 (B) 3 (E)	17 (G) 5 (B) 4 (E)	57 – 62.6% 17 – 18.7% 15 – 16.5% 2 – 2.2%
Question 4: Did you learn Tonga in:					
Grade 1	14 (Yes) 3 (No)	16 (Yes) 8 (No)	18 (Yes) 6 (No)	19 (Yes) 7 (No)	67 – 73.6% 24 – 26.4%
Grade 2	15 (Yes) 2 (No)	18 (Yes) 8 (No)	18 (Yes) 6 (No)	19 (Yes) 7 (No)	70 – 76.9% 21 – 23.1%
Grade 3	16 (Yes) 1 (No)	19 (Yes) 5 (No)	19 (Yes) 5 (No)	21 (Yes) 5 (No)	75 – 82.4% 16 – 17.6%
Grade 4	17 (Yes) 0 (No)	20 (Yes) 4 (No)	19 (Yes) 5 (No)	21 (Yes) 5 (No)	77 – 84.6% 14 – 15.4%
Grade 5	17 (Yes) 0 (No)	23 (Yes) 1 (No)	22 (Yes) 2 (No)	21 (Yes) 5 (No)	83 – 91.2% 8 – 8.8%
Grade 6	17 (Yes) 0 (No)	24 (Yes) 0 (No)	24 (Yes) 0 (No)	22 (Yes) 4 (No)	87 – 95.6% 4 – 4.4%
Grade 7			5 (Yes) 19 (No)	9 (Yes) 17 (No)	14 – 28% 36 – 72%
Question 5: Can your teacher speak Tonga?	17 (Yes) 0 (No)	21 (Yes)	23 (Yes) 1 (No)	24 (Yes) 2 (No)	85 – 93.4% 3 – 3.3%

		3 (No indication)			3 – 3.3%
Question 6: Does your teacher understand Tonga?	17 (Yes) 0 (No)	24 (Yes) 0 (No)	22 (Yes) 2 (No)	24 (Yes) 2 (No)	87 – 95.6% 4 – 4.4%
Question 7: Do you learn Tonga at school?	17 (Yes) 0 (No)	24 (Yes) 0 (No)	23 (Yes) 1 (No)	26 (Yes) 0 (No)	90 – 98.9% 1 – 1.1%
Question 8: What language(s) does your teacher use to teach Mathematics?	16 (A, B & G) 1 (A & B)	5 (A, B & G) 11 (A & B) 8 (A)	24 (A, B & G)	24 (A, B & G) 2 (A)	69 – 75.8% 12 – 13.2% 10 – 11%
Question 9: What language(s) does your teacher use to teach Content	8 (A) 9 (A & B)	7(A) 13 (A & B) 4 (A, B & G)	6 (A) 10 (A & B) 8 (A, B & G)	7 (A) 13 (A & B) 6 (A, B & G)	28 – 30.8% 45 – 49.5% 18 – 19.8%
Question 10: Can you speak the following language(s): English Ndebele Tonga?	13 (A, B & G) 3 (A & G) 1 (A & B)	17 (A, B & G) 2 (A & G) 3 (A & B) 2 (B & G)	18 (A, B & G) 2 (A & G) 2 (A & B) 2 (B & G)	13 (A, B & G) 1 (A & G) 2 (A & B) 6 (B & G) 2 (A, B, E & G) 1 (A) 1 (G)	61 – 67% 8 – 8.8% 8 – 8.8% 10 – 11% 2 – 2.2% 1 – 1.1% 1 – 1.1%
Question 11: Do you understand the following language(s): English Ndebele Tonga?	13 (A, B & G) 1 (A & B) 3 (A & G)	23 (A, B & G) 1 (A & B)	17 (A, B & G) 5 (A & B) 2 (A & G)	11 (A, B & G) 5 (A & B) 6 (A & G) 1 (A) 1 (G) 2 (B & G)	64 – 70.3% 12 – 13.2% 11 – 12.1% 1 – 1.1% 1 – 1.1% 2 – 2.2%
Question 12: What does your teacher do when you do not understand the lesson?	15 (A, B, G & O) 1 (B, G & O) 1 (A, B & O)	10 (A, B, G & O) 10 (B, G & O) 1 (A, B & O) 2 (A, B & G) 1 (G)	19 (A, B, G & O) 1 (B, G & O) 1 (A, B & O) 3 (A, B & G)	16 (A, B, G & O) 4 (B, G & O) 2 (A, B & O) 2 (A, B & G) 1 (G) 1 (B & G)	60 – 65.9% 16 – 17.6% 5 – 5.5% 7 – 7.7% 2 – 2.2% 1 – 1.1%

Question 13: In class are you allowed to ask or answer questions in: Ndebele Tonga?	6 (Yes B) 11 (No B) 5 (Yes G) 12 (No G)	12 (Yes B) 12 (No B) 9 (Yes G) 15 (No G)	3 (Yes B) 21 (No B) 0 (Yes G) 24 (No G)	5 (Yes B) 21 (No B) 2 (Yes G) 24 (No G)	26 – 28.6% 65 – 71.4% 16 – 17.6% 75 – 82.4%
Question 14: Indicate the language(s) you would like to be taught in	3 (A & B) 5 (A & G) 5 (A) 1 (A, B & G) 1 (B) 2 (G)	12 (A & B) 2 (A & G) 4 (A) 2 (B) 1 (G) 1 (G & M) 2 (B & G)	7 (A & B) 1 (A & G) 3 (A) 4 (A, B & G) 4 (B) 4 (G) 1 (B & G)	7 (A & B) 6 (A & G) 3 (A) 2 (A, B & G) 1 (B) 5 (G) 1 (A, E & G) 1 (A & E)	29 – 31.9% 14 – 15.4% 15 – 16.5% 7 – 7.7% 8 – 8.8% 12 – 13.2% 1 – 1.1% 3 – 3.3% 1 – 1.1% 1 – 1.1%
Question 15: Do you have Tonga textbooks in your school?	17 (Yes) 0 (No)	24 (Yes) 0 (No)	24 (Yes) 0 (No)	25 (Yes) 1 (No)	90 – 98.9% 1 – 1.1%
Key: A – English; B – Ndebele; C – Nambya; E – Shona; G – Tonga; M – Afrikaans; O – The teacher asks others to explain					

In this school 91 pupils completed the learners' questionnaire. Tonga is spoken by 59.3% of these pupils and 18.7% of these pupils speak Ndebele and another 18.7% speak Shona and 2.2% speak Nambya and 1.1% of these pupils speak Chewa. The outright majority of these pupils (62.6%) speak Tonga at home, 18.7% speak Ndebele, 16.5% speak Shona and 2.2% speak Nambya at home.

The outright majority of the pupils (73.6%) indicated that they learnt Tonga in grade 1 and 76.9% of the pupils indicated that they learnt Tonga in grade 2. The majority of the pupils (82.4%) indicated that they learnt Tonga in grade 3 and 84.6% of the pupils indicated that they learnt Tonga in grade 4. Almost all the pupils (91.2%) indicated that they learnt Tonga in grade 5 and 95.6% of the pupils indicated that

they learnt and are learning Tonga in grade 6. Only 28% of the pupils in grade 7 indicated that they were learning Tonga in grade 7 and 98.9% of the pupils indicated that Tonga is taught in their school.

During class observations in grade 1A, 4B and 7A I noted that Tonga is included in the school and class timetables and allocated the required minimum 8 periods per week for grade 1 to 2 pupils and 9 periods per week for grade 3 to 7 pupils. Unlike in all the other districts, Tonga is also taught up to grade 7 and allocated the required minimum number of periods per week. However, like in the schools represented in Tables 18 and 19 Ndebele was not included in both timetables for grade 1 to grade 3 classes, which is a violation of the stipulations of the policy documents. There was a dedicated section for Tonga charts in all the three classes and Tonga was schemed for. It appeared in the records of marks and pupils' reports. There were pupils' Tonga daily exercise books and composition books for grade 4 and 7 and there were Tonga textbooks in all the three classes.

The outright majority of the pupils (93.4%) indicated that their teachers can speak Tonga and 95.6% of the pupils indicated that their teachers can understand Tonga. Given the staffing situation of this school and that almost all the pupils 98.9% indicated that there are Tonga textbooks in the school, it is not surprising why Tonga is being taught in this school throughout the grades.

All the pupils indicated that their teachers teach Mathematics in English and 89% of the pupils indicated that their teachers also teach Mathematics in Ndebele. A total of 75.8% of the pupils indicated that their teachers teach Mathematics in Tonga as well. All the pupils indicated that their teachers teach Content in English and 69.3% of the pupils indicated that their teachers also teach Content in Ndebele and 19.8% of the pupils indicated that their teachers use Tonga as well in teaching Content. The high scores for Ndebele and English can possibly be attributed to the fact that all the teachers for these classes are not native speakers of Tonga, or maybe this is an attempt to accommodate linguistic diversity.

During class observations in grade 1A in a Mathematics lesson on *Subtraction*, the Ndebele speaking teacher taught in all the three languages English, Tonga and Ndebele. The theme song for the lesson was in Ndebele, *Amatsh' anguten asemzileni* (Ten stones are in a row). The pupils responded to the teacher's questions in the language used by the teacher, but in group activities Tonga dominated. In grade 4B in a Social Studies lesson on *Causes of Accidents*, the Tonga speaking teacher taught mainly in English, but encouraged pupils to say the answers in their different home languages. In grade 7A in a Content lesson on revision of all the topics likely to come in the final examination the lesson was exclusively in English and pupils used the language used by their teacher. Ndebele was used here and there in giving instructions.

The outright majority of the pupils (97.8%) indicated that their teachers resort to Ndebele when they do not understand the lesson and 93.4% of the pupils indicated that when they do not understand the lesson their teachers use Tonga to explain and 89% of the pupils indicated that their teachers ask other pupils to explain and 79.1% of the pupils indicated that their teachers use English. Only 28.6% of the pupils indicated that they are allowed to ask or answer questions in Ndebele and only 17.6% of the pupils indicated that they are allowed to ask or answer questions in Tonga. This is more typical of schools in urban centres where English is highly prized and where linguistic heterogeneity necessitates the insistence on English and the national language as the common languages. English, Ndebele and Tonga seem to be the most used languages of instruction.

In this predominantly Tonga speaking school the overwhelming majority of pupils (73.7%) indicated that they prefer to be taught in English. This is typical of schools in urban centres as reflected in the other selected schools in similar settings. Ndebele was the second most preferred medium by 51.7% of the pupils. Tonga was the third most preferred in this predominantly Tonga speaking school by 41.8% of the pupils. Why this low preference for Tonga? Possibly because these pupils are taught by non-Tonga speaking teachers, hence this influence and Ndebele seems to be their teachers' most preferred language of instruction. Even though Tonga is the third most

preferred medium in this school, the high scores for Tonga in an urban setting and in classes taught by non-Tonga speakers still demonstrates positive attitude towards Tonga by the teachers and pupils. Pupils and teachers in this district, show a strong desire for the use of Tonga in education unlike pupils and teachers in other districts where Kalanga and Venda are spoken.

Almost all the pupils (98.9%) indicated that there are Tonga textbooks in their school. The availability of Tonga textbooks and the sizeable population of Tonga speaking teachers can be the possible explanation for the success story of Tonga in this school as well.

5.8 Comparative discussion of the data from class observations and the language survey questionnaire and learners' questionnaires

The possible causes of the delay to teach the official minority languages and the conditions and factors that contributed to the success story of Tonga derived from the learners' questionnaires, class observations and language survey questionnaires are: the availability of teachers, language attitudes, incentives, linguistic homogeneity and heterogeneity of schools and availability of teaching materials.

5.8.1 Availability of teachers

Out of all the districts, Binga district is well staffed with teachers and heads who are native speakers of Tonga. In all the selected schools in Binga district, Tonga speaking teachers constitute the outright majority and the schools are headed by Tonga speakers. This shows that Tonga speakers asserted themselves and took a leading role in ensuring the successful teaching of Tonga. Unlike in the other districts, Tonga speakers have gained some ground in these schools and this extends their power in the schools to ensure their language is taught, and this possibly explains their success story. Possibly, the shortage of Venda and Kalanga speaking teachers explains why mother tongue education in their respective districts has delayed. Schools in these districts are mainly staffed with non-Venda and non-Kalanga

speaking teachers due to poor policies of teacher deployment and lack of teacher training in these languages.

Expressing his concern about the random deployment of teachers and lack of teacher training in official minority languages of Zimbabwe, the current minister of education, sport, arts and culture noted that;

> …if minority languages are to be taught in schools, there should be teachers who are well versed in the languages, who will be able to instruct in them (Harris, 2009).
>
> …there is need to have only those teachers fluent in local languages assigned to primary schools in Matabeleland regions…Teacher training is the responsibility of Higher Education and that is the source of the situation that we find ourselves in, where we end up with teachers that may not be conversant in local languages…We need to oversee the training of our teachers so that in their deployment, we know where they are needed and in what numbers… (Mlotshwa, 2011).
>
> "The ministry has to make sure that there are teachers who can instruct and teach the languages" (Staff, Reporter, 2011).
>
> "There is a serious dearth of material at present. Thereafter, we will have to train teachers to teach these languages. Teacher training colleges will have to train teachers to learn the particular skills needed for teaching these languages. Tied to this will be the need to ensure that we have a sufficient number of teacher trainees, whose mother tongue is one of these indigenous languages…there is need for enhancement in teacher training at colleges and universities around minor languages" (Business Reporter, 2011).

The Patriotic Union of Matabeleland (PUMA) expressed concern about the random recruitment and deployment of teachers in primary schools in Bulawayo and other Matabeleland regions. The major concern of the Union relates to the deployment of teachers who cannot speak the local languages in Bulawayo and Matabeleland regions in an education system that claims to prioritise mother tongue education, particularly in the first three grades of primary school education. The president of the Union expressed that it is time that the minister of education walk the talk in the recruitment and deployment of teachers, ensuring that pupils are taught by teachers who understand and speak their mother tongues (Byo24News, 2011).

5.8.2 Language attitudes

The functional dominance of English and Ndebele or Shona in the national scheme of things dictates that anyone who desires any meaningful participation in national affairs must learn them. Consequently, the amount of pressure imposed on minority

language speakers to shift to Ndebele and Shona is insurmountable given that the expected learning outcomes at the end of primary and secondary school education require proficiency in these languages and not in official minority languages. Proficiency requirements in Ndebele and Shona at the end of primary and secondary school education promote active bilingualism among minority language speakers and in turn, foster language shift. It also cultivates negative attitudes towards other languages which are part of the curriculum, but proficiency in them is not a requirement at the end of primary and secondary school education.

These proficiency requirements reduce official minority languages to languages of secondary importance, and inevitably impact negatively on efforts aimed at promoting their teaching and learning and promotes negative attitudes towards them. The status of Ndebele and Shona as national languages is in itself a form of pressure imposed on official minority language speakers to shift. The pressure for minority language speakers to shift to Ndebele and Shona partly stems from their high status in the education sector. Language attitudes of the nation's education system embedded in the policy documents influence the ways in which language is taught and used in classrooms. These attitudes are possibly responsible for the prevailing language attitudes reflected by the teachers and pupils.

Ndebele and Shona are *core or compulsory subjects in all primary and secondary schools in Zimbabwe and should be taught throughout the nation regardless of the learners' ethnic origin*, while official minority languages *may be taught in the areas where they are spoken as mother tongues* and they are to be taught *in addition to* either Shona or Ndebele and are *optional subjects* at secondary school level. Ndebele and Shona have equal status with English. The privileged position of Ndebele and Shona attracts minority language speakers to shift to them. It is therefore, possibly the lack of equality of status and functions in Zimbabwean languages that stifle efforts of extending mother tongue education to official minority language speakers.

Given that language tests determine the status and hierarchy of languages this can possibly explain the pupils' and teachers' language preferences and the number of periods allocated to Venda, Tonga and Kalanga. In a situation where a language is taught and used as a medium of instruction, but not tested, the impression is that the language is of no value. Such a situation is likely to lead to few periods being allocated to the language and low motivation and negative attitudes among pupils and even teachers. Consequently, efforts of promoting such a language do not yield the desired results.

In most schools in Beitbridge, Bulilima and Mangwe, Venda and Kalanga are allocated few periods and dropped either in grade 6 or 7 to concentrate on the examined subjects. Negative attitudes towards Kalanga and Venda continue to be reinforced by their marginal position, i.e. not being taught up to grade 7 and as transits to more prestigious literacy in Ndebele and English. In interviews and focus group discussions, the outright majority of the participants of the study revealed that official minority languages are not taught up to grade 7 because they are not examined and offered in secondary schools and beyond. It emerged that focus and attention is directed to subjects which are examined. Possibly, this explains why Venda and Kalanga are not taught up to grade 7. Unlike Shona, Ndebele, English and Tonga, Venda and Kalanga are not tested in the final grade 7 examinations; hence the delay in their teaching and learning. If they were tested in the final grade 7 examinations maybe they could be taught up to grade 7 since the tested language becomes important and tests guarantee easy policy implementation (Cooper, 1989; McGroarty, Beck & Butler, 1995; Shohamy, 2006; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b; Makoni, 2011).

Children usually reflect the value system of their parents, which may vary from strong personal allegiance, attachment to intolerance towards their languages. According to one participant of the study from the Kalanga association, the influence at home has a great effect on one's attitudes towards one's language (Interview, WS650300). The low scores for Venda and Kalanga, especially where they are predominantly spoken possibly indicate the low ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness of these speakers and

their negative attitudes towards their languages. These attitudes also reflect the negative social and cultural character of the Kalanga and Venda speakers. They possibly explain the variations in the teaching of the three official minority languages and the success story of Tonga. Research is unequivocal that the more positive the attitudes of a language group are towards their language, the more pride they take in their language, and the more likely their community is to revitalise and maintain its language (Nahir, 1984; 1988; 1998; Paulston, 1988; 1998; Adegbija, 1994a; 2001; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Batibo, 2005).

The teachers' and pupils' language attitudes reflect a lack of a communicative need for Kalanga and Venda speakers in the form of Kalanga and Venda. These speakers are active Kalanga-Ndebele and Venda-Ndebele bilinguals and this entails that the promotion of Kalanga and Venda is not meant to fill a perceived communicative vacuum. These speakers already have a common 'new' language Ndebele which in terms of competence and function and to some extent in terms of identification and origin is now their mother tongue. The negative attitudes of the pupils towards Kalanga and Venda which in most cases match those of the parents reflect the groups' low ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness. This possibly explains why Kalanga and Venda have remained behind when compared to Tonga.

The pupils' and teachers' language choices reflect prestige related effects on language choice as a result of a sociologically determined hierarchical structure of languages, which has its roots in socio-historical, political and economic experiences. Venda and Kalanga speakers have a historical legacy of domination by the Ndebele and Shona in the pre-colonial, colonial and postcolonial eras. They have suffered more than double linguistic imperialism. These painful historical legacies that these groups suffered left a lasting impact on their attitudes towards their languages and their ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness, social and cultural character and ethnic and linguistic nationalism. These legacies have been further compounded by the colonial and postcolonial subtractive bilingual policies. Their socio-historical experiences of being dominated culminated in language accommodation, language shift, diglossia and low ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness.

Coupled with colonial and postcolonial policies this phase of domination has left a permanent legacy and syndrome of inferiority complex among Kalanga and Venda speakers. This inferiority complex has stuck to their minds to the extent that it has become institutionised and canonised. Consequently, these speakers have developed low emotional, functional, intellectual and loyalty stake of their languages and shifted to dominant languages. They often lack self-esteem and readily abandon their language, culture and self-identity in favour of the more widely used languages. Their languages are a stigma and these speakers have a low estimation of their languages and culture. Their past offers only demobilising symbols which force them to forget or hide their linguistic identity.

The language preferences of the teachers and pupils in Beitbridge, Bulilima and Mangwe districts possibly reflect the effects of the legacies of pre-colonial, colonial and postcolonial policies. Possibly, this explains why most Venda and Kalanga speaking pupils and teachers prefer Ndebele and English. As I also learnt in focus group discussions and interviews, these group lack self-esteem in their language and readily shift to Ndebele. The negative attitudes of Kalanga and Venda speakers towards their languages possibly account for their shift to Ndebele and the delay in the teaching of their languages. They lack the required ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness and ethnic and linguistic nationalism to drive the implementation of the 2002 policy development.

It is possible that the teachers' and pupils' language preferences are deeply rooted in the long-standing low status of Kalanga and Venda and the negative socio-historical experiences associated with Kalanga and Venda as languages of *amahole* in the pre-colonial era and their status as minority languages in the colonial and postcolonial eras. During the colonial and postcolonial era, the assimilationist policies in education that gave and give prominence to Shona, Ndebele and English further promoted language shift among minority language speakers to Ndebele or Shona and English. These policies sought and seek to assimilate minority members into the wider society of Ndebele and Shona. Moreover, the bilingual character of the groups can also explain the shift and preference for Ndebele. Ndebele has been made part

of them as they are identified as the third group of the Ndebele state and they fall under the Matabeleland region, and hence they are 'Ndebele'. Possibly, their low ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness explains their overwhelming preference for Ndebele, and hence the delay in the teaching of Kalanga and Venda.

Part of the pressure that promote language shift comes from a language associated with power or political influence. When such a languages comes in contact with a less powerful language, usually the speakers of the weaker language will want to identify themselves with the more powerful language. At times, these speakers are coerced to shift to the language of the dominant group (Paulston, 1988; 1994; Nahir, 1988; 1998; Adegbija, 1993; 1994b; 1994; 1997; 2001; Crystal, 2000; Kamwendo, 2002; 2005; Shameem, 2004; Batibo, 2005; Liddcoat & Baldauf, 2008; Tulloch, 2008; Webb, 2009; 2010). As part of the historical legacies of domination of official minority languages, in the pre-colonial era, Ndebele was a language of political influence and power. Minority language speakers from Kalanga and Venda groups in Matabeleland identified with Mzilikazi and inevitably identified with this great leader's language through cohesion and voluntarily for social prestige. Given the pre-colonial, colonial and postcolonial experiences of the Kalanga and Venda speakers in Zimbabwe, it is tempting to conclude that their assimilation into the Ndebele group during Mzilikazi's time left a lasting impact on their ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness.

In the history of the Tonga, the legacy of historical domination by the Ndebele do not compare to the experiences of the other groups. Because of the unfavourable climatic conditions for agriculture in Binga, Mzilikazi did not extend much of his influence to the Tonga speakers. Tonga speakers are proud of their resistance to and avoidance of Ndebele raiding in the mid 19th century and the term 'Tonga' means independent or grumblers, a term which the Tonga used to refer to themselves in opposition to the groups who were vassals and paid tribute to senior Shona chiefs. (See: Lancaster, 1974; Tremmel, 1994; Mumpande, 2006; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b; Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2009).

Consequently, Tonga speakers were not subjected to the domination of Mzilikazi which weakened the ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness of the Kalanga and Venda speakers. Despite the subtractive bilingual policies of colonial and postcolonial eras, Tonga speakers seem to have within their district stubbornly and doggedly resisted Ndebele hegemony and stuck to their language because of their pride in their language and mostly likely due to the largely linguistically homogeneous nature of their district as well. Research on Tonga people reveal that right from the pre-colonial era through the colonial era to the postcolonial era, Tonga speakers have been active in resisting every attempt, overt and covert, to assimilate them into the Ndebele group (*"Tonga Elders Press for Teaching of their Language in Schools"* in *The Herald*, 25 April 1994 cited in Tremmel, 1994; Tremmel, 1994; Hachipola, 1998; Mumpande, 2006; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b).

The high scores for Tonga as the most preferred medium of instruction reflect that Tonga speakers express clear and strong feelings of loyalty towards their language; an indication of these speakers' high ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness. The positive attitudes towards Tonga reflect that Tonga is viewed as a prestigious language by its speakers. Possibly, these intensely favourable attitudes towards Tonga could be one of the ingredients for their success. The attitudes of teachers and parents in diglossic communities where there is a high and low variety, show strong loyalty towards the high variety and the desire for the children to know this variety in addition to their home language. Given that younger students in particular are heavily influenced by the attitudes and examples of their peers, their teachers and parents, possibly, this explains why the language preferences of the pupils and teachers in the selected schools vary.

5.8.3 Linguistic homogeneity, heterogeneity and fragmentation

Unlike other districts, Binga district is largely linguistically homogeneous and the speakers of Tonga constitute a big population. This is true even in areas which are linguistically heterogeneous, which includes the urban centre. Consequently, this makes it easy to implement mother tongue education because the pupils are largely

monolingual when they enter school. Linguistic heterogeneity and fragmentation in the composition of school or class populations in other districts could be the source of difficulty in implementing mother tongue education policies. In areas characterised by linguistic heterogeneity where the different language groups can constitute separate classes, there is need to allocate pupils classes according to their mother tongues to effectively implement mother tongue education.

However, in the selected school where Venda is predominantly spoken, the school is largely linguistically homogeneous, but mother tongue education in Venda is still lagging behind. Possibly, this is due to the unavailability of adequate teachers who are native speakers of Venda in this school. According to a reporter for *Byo24News*, activists in Matabeleland argued that the dominance of teachers who are not native speakers of the language predominantly spoken in the school endangers the teaching of that particular language (Byo24News, 2011).

In Bulilima, Mangwe and Beitbridge the significant presence of politically and culturally dominant groups lead to cases of language contact, overlap, competition and imbalances in the sizes of languages. This usually lead to integrative and expansive language contact, language shift, language accommodation, diglossia and low ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness as well as assimilation of the smaller groups by the larger groups or politically powerful languages even though they constitute a small population in the area. The significant presence of adjacent politically and culturally dominant, Ndebele speakers in the other districts facilitates language shift, language accommodation, diglossia and low ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness. Language maintenance is possible in the absence of an adjacent politically or culturally dominant group. The norm for ethnic groups in prolonged contact within a nation is for the subordinate group to shift to the language of the dominant group. (See: Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977; Paulston, 1988; 1994; Adegbija, 1993; 1994a; 1994b; 1997; 2001; Strubell, 2001; Dorian, 1998; May, 2001; 2006; Obanya, 2004; Batibo, 2005; Cartwright, 2006; Fishman, 2006; Paulston & Heidemann, 2006; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2006; Bamgbose, 2007; McCarty, Skutnabb-Kangas & Magga, 2008).

The low status and negative socio-historical status of the Venda and Kalanga, make language shift to the *lingua franca* in the aforementioned geo-demographic set-ups inevitable. Consequently, speakers of the non-dominant languages cultivate negative attitudes towards their languages. However, given that in Binga district the Tongas dominate, Tonga is maintained as the lingua franca and other groups are forced to function in Tonga in out-group communication. This possibly explains their favourable attitudes to Tonga because they are still largely linguistically homogeneous. The positive attitudes of Tonga speakers reflect that they have a strong ethnolinguistic vitality which helps them to survive as a distinctive group even when they are in contact with the dominant Ndebele speakers.

Given that ethnolinguistic groups whose demographic trends are favourable are more likely to have strong positive attitudes towards their language and have high ethnolinguistc vitality and awareness, possibly Tonga speakers have remained resolute because of this advantage. The more geographically concentrated the minority language is, the less threatening is the majority / dominant language to the ethnolinguistic vitality of the minority community. (See: Giles, Bourhis & Taylor, 1977; Bourhis, 2001; Cartwright, 2006). Possibly, these geographical and demographic factors explain the pupils' and teachers' language choices, success story of Tonga and the delay in the teaching and learning of Kalanga and Venda. The choice of Ndebele and English as the most preferred media of instruction in the other districts probably relates to the schools' demographics where the dominant languages are preferred as lingua francas and common languages for the linguistically diverse classes.

In all the selected schools teachers taught the selected official minority languages to all the pupils. This is not in line with the policy stipulations and it presents serious challenges in implementing the 2002 policy development, especially in schools that are linguistically heterogeneous. This could have been one of the sources of difficulty in implementing the policy. The lack of clarity of the policy documents on the access policy of the 2002 policy development could possibly be the major source of this problem.

The access policy of the 2002 policy development is not clearly defined. Who exactly is supposed to learn in these languages and be taught these languages as subjects? The vague nature of the policy stipulations that they should be taught in areas where they are spoken does not clearly demarcate or clarify the access policy. It is only in the *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002* that the issue of these languages *being taught as mother tongues in their respective areas* is mentioned.

In the *Daily News* of the 26th of July 2011 the Deputy Minister of Education was quoted saying;

> My ministry has already accepted, through provisions in the Education Act, that these local languages *be* taught in areas *where they are spoken as first language* and they be used as "medium of instruction" up to Form Two.

This is not in line with the stipulations of the *1987 Education Act as Amended in 2006*. According to the Act, the Minister *may* authorise the teaching of these languages in areas where they are spoken; the qualification *where they are spoken as first language* is not there. Even if one base on the Deputy Minister's statement the access policy remains problematic in that official minority languages could be spoken in a particular area as first languages, but by a very small population that cannot support all that goes into mother tongue education. Possibly, the vagueness of the access policy of the 2002 policy development reflects lack of prior planning in the form of language surveys. Adequate fact-finding during the planning stages could have gone a long way in identifying which languages should be taught in the district where official minority languages are spoken and necessary implementation modalities were going to be devised to ensure the successful implementation of mother tongue education policies.

The vagueness of the access policy can also possibly be another contributing factor of the delay in the teaching of official minority languages because mother tongue education is very difficult to implement in linguistically heterogeneous classes. In focus group discussions and interviews with teachers, school heads, education officers and officials in the Ministry this question was raised and all the respondents in these different categories indicated that all pupils in the areas where these

languages are spoken, regardless of their mother tongue should learn these languages. However, this is a violation of the stipulations of the *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002* which demands that these languages should be taught *as mother tongues* in areas where they are spoken. These problems also possibly emanate from the implementers' lack of knowledge of the policy, the inconsistencies, vagueness and incoherencies in the policy documents.

5.8.4 Availability of teaching materials

Some of the schools in other districts have textbooks and a sizeable number of teachers who speak the local languages, but the teaching of the official minority languages still lags. For example, the selected school in Beitbridge urban and the linguistically mixed school in Beitbridge district. The school where Venda is predominantly spoken has textbooks, but very few teachers who are native speakers of this language. The unavailability of Kalanga textbooks possibly also contributes to the delay in the teaching of Kalanga because in the absence of teaching materials, efforts to implement mother tongue education are rendered hollow.

This can be further substantiated by the Venda district local languages coordinator's concern in *The Herald* of the 22nd of October 2010 who attributed the non-implementation of the policy of teaching and learning Venda and Sotho to the shortage of textbooks which had not been printed due to lack of funds. According to the coordinator the government had promised to pay, but the publishers demanded cash up front. In this article, the coordinator appeals to well-wishes and donors to assist with funds to address the challenge as a matter of urgency. Noteworthy in this article is that the publication of Shangani textbooks was as a result of donor support, an indication that the government did not assist with funds. (See: Harris, 2009; Herald Reporter, 2011; Mafuba, 2011; Moyo, 2010).

The lack of funds cited by the Venda district local languages coordinator and his plea to well wishers and donors to chip in as a matter of urgency and the revelation that publication of Shangani textbooks was made possible through donor funding reflects

lack of political will, poor organising, planning and resourcing on the part of the government. The current Minister of Education's remarks following his revelation that there are no teaching materials in official minority languages attest to this as well.

> "It shocked me to know that in the past 30 years, we have not had textbooks in minority languages. It is an indictment of the education system of this country (Mlotshwa, 2011).

The plea of the Venda district local languages coordinator gives the impression that government surrendered this initiative to the concerned language speakers as also reflected in the Deputy Minister of Education's words quoted in the *Daily News* of the 26th of July 2011;

> It is incumbent upon language associations and book publishers and indeed writes to work hard to provide reading materials in these languages.

In the *Daily News* of the 26th of July 2011 the Deputy Minister indicates that government is limited by finances to assist in materials development. He said;

> Some of the issues pertaining to book policy were obviously implementable to the extent that government finances permit… Funds limit the government's funding capabilities towards purchasing reading materials.

All this points to, lack of funding and unavailability of teaching materials as some of the constraints in the implementation of the 2002 policy development. It also points to lack of genuine political will since there was no commitment to pledge the required financial and material resources for the successful teaching and learning of these languages.

The availability of teaching materials and teachers who are native speakers of Tonga in Binga district is a good combination of factors that promote successful mother tongue education. Given that the outright majority of the teachers in Binga district are native speakers of Tonga it entails that in addition to the written materials, these teachers can serve as oral sources in teaching the language. The availability of teachers who are native speakers of the language where teaching materials do not exist is an advantage in that these teachers can improvise teaching materials. Emphasising the complementarity of teachers and textbooks the current minister of education in Zimbabwe noted that;

> "It's not just a question of issuing textbooks. If you don't have a teacher who can speak that language, the textbook is useless. We need to have teachers in languages like Sotho, Venda and Kalanga… (Mlotshwa, 2011).

Possibly, in Beitbridge district despite the availability of teaching materials the shortage of teachers who are native speakers of Venda impacts negatively on the successful and effective teaching of Venda. Non-native speakers of Venda in these schools lack the necessary linguistic skills or competence to properly teach in Venda even though textbooks are available. These teachers cannot complement textbooks as oral materials / sources needed to effectively teach the language, for example in as far as story telling is concerned. In schools where native speakers are available they are very few to support the implementation of mother tongue education despite the availability of textbooks. Where textbooks are not available and teachers are non-native speakers of the language in question as is the case in Kalanga areas, teachers cannot improvise teaching materials due to lack of knowledge of the language.

5.9 Conclusion: Comparative discussion of the data from class observations and the language survey questionnaire and learners' questionnaires

The availability of teachers who are native speakers of Tonga, availability of teaching materials, incentives, particularly in the form of examinations and requirements of Tonga for employment in Binga, positive language attitudes and linguistic homogeneity in Binga emerge as some of the factors and conditions that contributed to the success story of Tonga. On the other hand, this combination is missing in the other language groups, and this possibly explains why the delay.

5.10 Semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with school heads in the selected schools, local language coordinators, district education officers, provincial education directors for the districts and provinces where the selected languages are spoken, the director for primary schools in the ministry of education and the minister of education. Semi-structured interviews were also conducted with principals in teacher

training colleges in the selected two colleges, heads of departments in the faculty of education and language departments in the selected universities. The researcher also conducted semi-structured interviews with officials from publishers of educational materials, curriculum development unit and the examining body, Zimsec. Semi-structured interviews were also conducted with officials from ZILPA and the different language associations for the language groups in question and non-governmental organisations that have played a role in promoting the teaching and learning of official minority languages. Focus group discussions were conducted with teachers and parents in the selected schools,

The major focus of the interviews and group discussions was to examine the causes of the delay in the teaching and learning of Tonga, Venda and Kalanga and to examine the factors and conditions that contributed to the success story of Tonga. Conversations with these participants were audio-taped for later listening and evaluation. To effectively analyse the data from semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions, data was organised according to inductively and deductively derived themes. Deductive themes were derived from the language management variables, methodologies and strategies, seven areas of policy development for language-in-education policy implementation, the ethnolinguistic vitality model and Webb (2010)'s factors that determine the success or failure of bottom-up and top-down policies. These themes are also derived from the reviewed literature of this study.

Data from interviews and focus group discussions is analysed and discussed according to the language groups using the frequencies of occurrence of the causes of the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development and success story of Tonga. These frequencies of occurrences are derived from the transcribed data from interviews and focus group discussions. This section concludes with a comparative discussion of data from interviews and focus group discussions and overall conclusion of the whole chapter.

5.10.1 Causes of the delay in the teaching of Kalanga

Table 19 shows the frequencies of occurrence of the causes of the delay in the teaching of Kalanga reflected in the responses of the different participants of the study in Bulilima and Mangwe districts and other participants from outside these districts. A tick against each cause and underneath the participants indicates that the concerned participants identified the cause as having contributed to the delay in the teaching of Kalanga. This table is derived from the transcribed data gathered through semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions with teachers in Bulilima and Mangwe districts; parents in Bulilima and Mangwe districts; Kalanga language association; teachers in Beitbridge district, parents in Beitbridge district; Venda language committee; teachers in Binga district; parents in Binga district; Tonga language committee; education officers in Bulilima and Mangwe districts; education officers in Beitbridge district; education officers in Binga district; officials from ZILPA; officials from Silveria House; officials from Basilwizi Trust; officials from publishing houses; officials from CDU; officials from Zimsec; officials from the selected universities; officials from the selected teacher education colleges; an official from the department of teacher education and officials from the ministry of education, sport, arts and culture's head office.

Table 21: Frequencies of occurrence of the causes of the delay in the teaching of Kalanga

Causes	Participants																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V
Teacher training, availability and deployment	√	√	√							√			√	√			√	√		√		
Teachers' attitudes and resistance	√	√	√							√								√				
Availability of teaching materials	√	√	√							√				√	√		√	√		√	√	√
Dialectical Variations	√		√				√															
Funding	√		√											√		√	√			√	√	√
Political will	√	√	√							√			√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√	√
Linguistic hegemony and Politics of language	√	√	√											√	√		√	√		√		
Elite closure		√							√					√			√				√	
Incentives	√	√	√							√					√		√	√		√		√
Collaboration, Consultation and Coordination of stakeholders	√	√														√	√	√		√		√
Legislation	√	√	√							√			√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√	√
Litigation	√	√																				
Advocacy	√	√	√							√				√		√	√		√	√		√
Linguistic diversity	√	√	√				√													√		
Community support for language-political change	√	√	√				√	√						√			√	√		√	√	
Social and Cultural character of the community, Ethnolinguistic awareness and Linguistic nationalism	√	√	√				√							√			√	√			√	
Emigration	√	√								√												
Immigration			√				√															
Population size		√																				
Concentration & Proportion	√	√	√				√													√		
Marked Bilingualism and	√	√					√			√								√				

Communicative need																						
Exogamy/ Mixed marriages		√																				
Socio-historical status		√	√				√			√												
Formal institutional support factors	√		√											√	√		√			√		

Key: A–Teachers Bulilima and Mangwe Districts; B–Parents Bulilima and Mangwe Districts; C–Kalanga Language Association; D–Teachers Beitbridge District, E–Parents Beitbridge District; F–Venda Language Committee; G–Teachers Binga District; H–Parents Binga District; I–TOLACCO; J–Education Officers Bulilima and Mangwe Districts; K–Education Officers Beitbridge District; L–Education Officers Binga District; M–ZILPA Officials; N–Silveria House Officials; O–CDU Officials; P–Zimsec Officials; Q–University Officials; R–Teacher Education College Officials; S–Department of Teacher Education Official; T–Ministry of Education, Sport, Arts and Culture Officials; U–Basilwizi Trust; V–Publishers

5.10.1.1 Teacher training, availability and deployment

Teachers, parents, education officers and officials from the Kalanga association indicated that Kalanga is taught in Bulilima. There was a shared concern from these participants on the quality of teaching because teachers have not been trained to teach the language, there is a shortage of teachers who are native speakers of Kalanga and teachers deployed in the district can neither speak, nor understand, Kalanga. All the participants of the study indicated that they are no teacher education colleges that offer training in Kalanga and as such teachers are not equipped to teach the language.

It also emerged that the districts are mainly staffed with non-native speakers of Kalanga who cannot speak or understand Kalanga. Teachers, education officials, ministry officials and teacher education officials indicated that when teachers complete their training they choose three provinces they would like to teach in. However, the education officers make the final selection for deployment considering the staffing situation in the provinces and districts. It emerged from all the participants that teachers are randomly deployed without any linguistic considerations on the understanding that a teacher trained in Zimbabwe can teach anywhere in Zimbabwe. Some officials in the ministry argued that the issue of personnel is not a problem because teachers can always learn the language on the job and teach in it and teach it as a subject.

> People can learn these languages on the job…human beings are capable of learning (Interview, WS650302).

Teachers find themselves in areas where they cannot speak, understand and teach the local language of the area. All the participants of the study argued that the poor deployment strategies of teachers jeopardise efforts of promoting the teaching and learning of Kalanga. However, some participants argued that even if teachers were to be deployed in terms of the languages they speak, the districts would end up understaffed because there are few Kalanga speakers who are in the profession and still in the country. Teachers in this district expressed that given that they are non-native speakers of Kalanga, the unavailability of teaching materials in Kalanga further compound the problem because in their case they cannot improvise or translate teaching materials from Ndebele textbooks as they are expected to. Some participants argued that if native speakers are deployed in the district they can possibly teach the language. However, both Kalanga and non-Kalanga speaking teachers and other participants argued that native competence is not an adequate attribute for these teachers to teach the language.

Participants who shared this view expressed that this is even compounded by the fact that these native speakers of Kalanga did not learn Kalanga even at primary school level; hence they lack the necessary cognitive academic language proficiency in the language. Apart from the poor policy of teacher deployment, participants of this study attributed the shortage of Kalanga speaking teachers to the huge exodus of Kalanga speakers to South Africa and Botswana. This shortage of teachers was also attributed to the low value attached to education among the Kalanga speakers. It emerged that most Kalanga speakers drop-out of school for South Africa and Botswana because of their proximity to these two countries leading to a vicious cycle of the shortage of Kalanga speaking teachers.

Education officers and officials from teacher education colleges argued that the shortage of Kalanga speaking teachers is due to low turn-outs of student teachers from Kalanga speaking communities. These low turn-outs were attributed to the Kalanga speakers' preference for crossing to South Africa and Botswana before or

soon after completing their Ordinary or Advanced level in search of greener pastures. In as much as the participants of the study in the two districts acknowledged that emigration to neighbouring countries is a contributing factor to the shortage of teachers, they also argued that adverts for the intakes from the teacher education colleges are inaccessible. Officials from teacher education colleges, education officers and community members in these districts also expressed that the other problem is the required pass in Mathematics. They indicated that most candidates in the districts do not have the required pass in Mathematics. Consequently, the participants of the study proposed the need for a waiver in the requirement of Mathematics in the teacher education colleges. Some participants also proposed the need to introduce incentives in the form of scholarships and better salaries to improve the uptake and retention of teachers who can teach Kalanga.

Some participants of the study interpreted the unavailability of teacher training programmes in Kalanga as a reflection of lack of political will, poor planning, leading and organising for the policy development. Officials from the teacher education colleges attributed the delay in the introduction of these languages to the unavailability of lecturers and the delay in the approval of the curriculum for these languages by the Department of Teacher Education at the University of Zimbabwe. However, officials from the Department of Teacher Education denied receiving the proposed syllabi for the official minority languages. Some officials from universities argued that the issue of lecturers is not a problem because there are Doctoral, Masters and Bachelor of Arts degree holders who are native speakers of these languages who can assist and be staff developed to lecture in teacher education colleges.

They indicated that some Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Arts Honours, Masters and Doctoral students in their departments have written research projects, dissertations and theses in Kalanga. According to officials from the selected universities the problem relates to lack of commitment and will among the policy makers and implementers. An official from the ministry of education attributed the lack of training of teachers to poor collaboration and coordination between the two ministries of

education. It also emerged that teachers have not been in-serviced following the 2002 policy development. Teachers and parents expressed that there is a dire need for in-service training to equip teachers with skills of teaching in Kalanga and teaching it as a subject. Teachers expressed that the workshops that were held were selective, targeting only Kalanga speaking teachers, and as a result they did not make any difference.

5.10.1.2 Availability of teaching materials

All the participants of the study attributed the delay in the teaching of Kalanga to the unavailability of teaching materials. They all expressed that serious and proper teaching and learning cannot take place without the recourse of teaching materials. Teachers in this district indicated that they are using infant textbooks to teach across all the grades because they do not have textbooks. They indicated that they are expected to translate Ndebele texts in teaching Kalanga, which they said was a very difficult task for them, especially given that they are not speakers of Kalanga. Native speakers expressed that despite their native competence, lack of a standard orthography and dialectical variations compound the task of translating. They also argued that their communicative competence is not sufficient for the translation exercise, which require among other things cognitive academic competence in Kalanga, which they lack. Some teachers argued that Kalanga lacks scientific terms for teaching other subjects such that they run short of terms when trying to explain concepts. An official from the African Languages research Institute indicated that the institute has built a sizable Kalanga corpus in an effort to develop Kalanga.

Interviews with officials from the Kalanga association, Curriculum Development Unit officials, education officers, ministry officials and other participants revealed that the delay in the publication of teaching materials was as result of lack of funding for the publications and delay in the production of Kalanga manuscripts. It emerged that unlike the Tonga group; the Kalanga group lacked funding and did not have donor support to fund the production and purchase of teaching materials, which the Tonga group had. Some participants of the study attributed the delay in the production of

teaching materials to lack of standardisation of Kalanga and dialectical variations which took time to be resolved. Officials from the Kalanga association, ministry, education officers, teachers, some parents and other participants of the study from other districts argued that unlike Venda and Tonga, which are developed and taught up to tertiary level in South Africa and Zambia respectively, Kalanga is not taught and developed in Botswana; hence it lacked this advantage. Consequently, the rate of materials development was affected by this disadvantage leading to the delay in the production of textbooks since they had to start from scratch.

The delay in the publication of teaching materials was also attributed to the publishers' lack of interest to publish in Kalanga. Some participants of the study, including the publishers expressed that publishing in languages like Kalanga was deemed economically unviable because the readership is so small and disheartening. Publishers also expressed that their reluctance to publish in Kalanga was also largely due to lack of an enabling policy environment. They indicated that apart from the fact that the market determines their publishing directions and priorities; the language-in-education policy also plays a critical role in determining their publishing directions and priorities.

These publishers expressed that the policy environment did not give them the impetus to publish in Kalanga and it did not guarantee a readily available market for Kalanga materials since Kalanga is not examined. They argued that it is pointless to publish in a language that is not examined because in such a language there is no compelling reason for schools to buy the books; hence for them there is no readily available market for the materials. They argued that when a language is examined, schools are sought of coerced or forced to buy the materials.

These publishers also argued that they could not publish in Kalanga because then the syllabus was not yet developed and approved. They indicated that in their case the approval and availability of a syllabus in a language at least guarantees that the language will be taught and as such there is a potentially readily available market. The publishers also expressed that the policy development was not clearly

communicated to them and as such they were hesitant to test the waters without official communication from the ministry. They indicated that the policy development was poorly communicated to them and writers resulting in a situation where people did not take the policy seriously. It emerged that it was only when the current minister of education came in emphasizing the examination of official minority languages and approaching them with funding from the ETF to publish teaching materials in official minority languages that they realised the seriousness and urgency of the matter. Ministry officials indicated that in addition to market viability problems, the hesitancy of publishers was also largely due to poor collaboration with them and poor communication of policy developments with all relevant stakeholders.

Publishers expressed that with the availing of the ETF by the current minister of education, some language groups; particularly the Kalanga group was not willing to publish with their allocated publisher because of misunderstandings related to copyright issues. Some publishers expressed that the Kalanga association was not forthcoming and difficult to work with resulting in it having no one to publish their work. Interviews with the association confirmed these misunderstandings which led the association into establishing its own publishing house, which however at the time of the research was still struggling to publish the books. Officials from the association argued that the publishers wanted to take advantage of them because before the ETF they argued that publishing in Kalanga was not viable. Some participants argued that the unavailability of teaching materials reflects lack of political will, poor planning, leading and organising of the part of the policy makers before.

5.10.1.3 Political will

The outright majority of the participants pointed that poor staffing, organising, leading, resourcing, controlling and planning for the policy development are indications of lack of political will. In as much as some participants argued that the policy development came at a time when the economy of the country was already showing signs of collapse, they argued that the government should have planned and assessed the feasibility of such an ambitious project against the backdrop of an

already strained and dwindling economy. These participants argued that the government should have assessed whether it has the capacity to fund the implementation of the policy and even consider the feasibility of the set timeframes. Some participants argued that the then dwindling economy is not a genuine excuse because with proper planning the government would have been able to foresee and anticipate the twist and turns and develop a fall-back plan.

Officials from a non-governmental organisation that was involved in the lobbying and advocacy that led to the 2002 policy development described the policy development as a last minute rush decision in a crisis situation. The outright majority of the participants indicated that the delay in the implementation of the policy was due to unchecked impracticalities embedded in rashly formulated political rather than educationally expedient policies which are more emotively subjective than empirically objective. An official from an advocacy organisation that was involved in advocacy and lobbying that led to the 2002 policy development argued that the situation that led to the policy development was ‘more of a firefight situation’. The official indicated that the government feared the legal implications of the stipulations of the Education Act with regards to the exclusion and discrimination of official minority language speakers.

Some participants argued that the poor communication of the policy development in itself is also testimony of the government’s reluctance to implement the policy because key stakeholders were not informed of the development such that it was never taken seriously by stakeholders. These participants argued that the government should have conscientised all stakeholders about the policy development. Consequently, a sizeable number of the participants argued that the policy was mainly declared for political expediency before the first presidential elections since independence in order to appease or interest the various communities and win votes. Some participants argued that the policy was declared merely to pacify and silence the speakers at a time when their support was contested by the ruling and opposition parties. These participants argued that if the policy was declared whole-heartedly the government would have proceeded to create an

enabling policy environment. The hostile political climate at the time when the policy was declared was also said to have repelled the donor community that was working with some of the language groups and disrupted potential funding opportunities for the policy.

Most participants, especially teachers argued that the government was reluctant to ensure the successful implementation of the policy because it did not monitor or enforce its implementation through its organs; even long after the target year of the implementation process. They indicated that supervisory activities were ineffective and they were no inspectors who could speak or understand the language, and as a result the inspections were superficial until the introduction of language coordinators following the appointment of the current minister of education. However, interviews with teachers and education officers revealed that at the time of the research these coordinators were being re-deployed back to schools leaving a vacuum again which they said will affect the inspection and enforcement of the policy.

Some participants of this study indicated that there is need to have representatives of these language groups across all levels of decision making in the ministry to ensure their successful teaching and learning. They argued that those in power are mainly drawn from the two national languages and as such they safeguard their interests and promote their own languages. Interviews with officials from the Curriculum Development Unit and Zimsec revealed that these languages still do not have subject managers in these offices. Some education officers and ministry officials attributed the lack of supervision to lack of vehicles and the bad economy which led to fuel shortages and grounded the inspectors.

The weak and neutralised language provisions that permit the teaching of official minority languages were also cited as reflections of government's lack of political will. The outright majority of the participants expressed that the fact that these language provisions are riddled with escape clauses indicates the government's reluctance to enforce the teaching of these languages. Citing the Education Act and some of the policy circulars, some of these participants argued that the teaching of official

minority languages is merely permissible rather obligatory and their teaching remains a prerogative of the implementers and the minister. Some participants argued that the maintained status differentia of these languages as *official minority languages* and *additional or optional subjects* reflects government's reluctance to promote their teaching. Most parents in this district argued that the government discriminates, excludes and marginalises them because of their numerical inferiority, and hence the reluctance to promote the teaching of their language.

However, the current minister of education was commended for his commitment in ensuring the teaching of official minority languages. Some participants indicated that his appointment saw the first positive and significant strides towards the implementation of the 2002 policy development. The minister was credited for sourcing funding that led to the publication of teaching materials in some of the official minority languages. Most participants argued that, had it not been for the ETF, official minority languages will be still without teaching materials. The minister was also credited for emphasizing serious teaching of these languages, creating the posts for language coordinators who specifically monitor the teaching of these languages and for being more visible in the districts where the languages are spoken to monitor the situation in person.

The minister was also commended for sourcing inspection vehicles and for lobbying for a more comprehensive language policy document and language bill which promote the teaching of these languages and introduction of these languages in teacher colleges and review of teacher deployment policies.

5.10.1.4 Linguistic hegemony and politics of language

The outright majority of the participants attributed the delay in the teaching of Kalanga and other minority languages to linguistic hegemony and politics of language in the country. These participants indicated that the government places a lot of emphasis and prominence on English, Ndebele and Shona giving the impression that they are 'the' languages of Zimbabwe. The participants revealed that

language use in Zimbabwe, for example in the media and the education sector embody covert and overt assimilationist tendencies where the two hegemonic dominant national languages are being overtly and covertly promoted and perpetuated. These participants argued that the reluctance of the government to promote the teaching of Kalanga and other minority languages is largely a covert and subtle approach of the government to protect and promote Ndebele and Shona hegemony. They argued that the status differentia and low status accorded to official minority languages in the curriculum and nation is a tactical way of promoting assimilation and language shift to the dominant national languages. In this regard, these participants argued for the need for language equality in the country.

It emerged that the division of the country's major provinces based on Ndebele (Matabeleland) and Shona (Mashonaland) clearly reflects the government's desire to coerce and assimilate other language groups into the two dominant language groups. Participants of the study argued that this approach overlooks the presence of the other language groups and further minorities them and stifle efforts of promoting their development, teaching and learning. Some participants argued that the names of the provinces are ideologically laden and the status accorded to local languages in Zimbabwe carry political overtones which suppress and marginalise non-national languages.

It also emerged from some the participants that government fears that the promotion of official minority languages mainly in the Matabeleland region will undermine Ndebele hegemony and promote division in the region. These participants indicated that the government claimed that the teaching of these languages would promote tribalism in the nation. However, the participants argued that forced assimilation and false unity under Ndebele and Shona are instead the most likely potential causes of unrest and discontent among non-national language speakers. Interviews with ministry officials confirmed the government's desire to promote national unity and nation building through the teaching and learning of Ndebele and Shona in all schools on a compulsory basis. One official argued that for purposes of nation

building the government came up with a policy that demands that all pupils should learn both national languages.

> For nation building we came up with a policy that if you are in Mashonaland, in addition to learning Shona and English you have also to learn conversational Ndebele. If you are in Matabeleland you have to learn conversational Shona…that was for purposes of nation building (Interview, WS650302).

5.10.1.5 Formal institutional support and control factors: Elite closure

Despite being said to be among the most well represented language group across different levels of decision making and having quite a number of prominent figures in strategic and influential positions, the Kalanga group still lags behind. This was largely attributed to the problem of elite closure. Comparing the Kalanga group with other groups, participants from the two districts and outside the districts lamented the lack of interest and involvement of the elites from the Kalanga group. They argued that these elites and political leaders show passivity and lack of interest in the development, promotion, teaching and learning of Kalanga. These participants expressed that if the elites from the Kalanga group had supported the initiative, the development, teaching and learning of Kalanga could be at an advanced stage.

Some parents in these districts argued that the elite from their communities shun their language and even hid their Kalanga identity. These parents argued that these elite prefer Ndebele to Kalanga and have shifted to Ndebele in their numbers. They argued that when these elite migrate out of the districts to work in other districts they completely lose their language and bring up their children in Ndebele. Apart from elite closure, lack of support from strong local traditional and political authority structures was also cited as another contributing factor to the delay in the development, teaching and learning of Kalanga. It was revealed that traditional and political leaders are not showing an interest in the language and address Kalanga speakers in Ndebele in rallies and meetings.

5.10.1.6 Linguistic diversity

Teachers and parents in schools with mixed populations in Bulilima rural and Mangwe urban as well as education officers in these districts also attributed the delay in the teaching of Kalanga in some parts of the districts to linguistic heterogeneity. Mangwe district in particular was said to be the worst affected although even some parts of Bulilima were said to be posing a similar challenge. Teachers in these schools argued that linguistic heterogeneity in the composition of the school and class populations make mother tongue education in Kalanga extremely difficult. As a result, these teachers indicated that such a policy is not desirable in their schools since they are forced to resort to Ndebele the 'common' language for the pupils. These teachers and parents argued that such a policy is most needed in Bulilima rural areas where the language is predominantly spoken. Comparing Kalanga and Tonga communities, these participants argued that Binga is largely linguistically homogeneous, and as such it was easy to implement mother tongue education in Tonga.

5.10.1.7 Informal institutional support and control factors: Advocacy

The outright majority of the teachers and community members in Bulilima and Mangwe indicated that they do not know about the association that represents them as Kalanga speakers. They argued that the delay in the teaching of their language is largely due to lack of advocacy. The few that indicated that they know the association expressed that the association does not visit them in their communities and it works in isolation. Some participants indicated that the association has been on and off. Parents and teachers in the district indicated that the association has not rolled out advocacy to promote the development, teaching and learning of Kalanga and raising awareness among the community members and teachers.

Officials from the association concurred with community members that they are invisible, inactive as well as on and off. They indicated that there is lack of community involvement, lobbying, sensitisation and conscientisation in their activities. One

official from the association described the association as top-down. The official indicated that there has not been any interaction between the association and the community. He noted that the community is not involved, and thus why it does not know that there is such an association.

> The various associations, particularly the Kalanga tend to be top-down…there hasn't been any interaction between the association and the people…the people are not involved. Thus why they don't know ukuthi kule-association enjalo (that there is such as association)…the people at the bottom are not effectively involved (Interview, WS650300).

Officials from the association and some teachers in the two districts also indicated that the association does not have the support of the local authorities. They indicated that right from the formation of the association, local traditional power bases were not involved and this explains their resistance of the policy. These participants indicated that the policy development was not properly propagated to the local authorities, hence their reluctance to enforce the implementation of the policy in their constituencies.

Responses of the participants clearly reflect that the association has failed to develop collaborative networks within the language community, and lacks support of local political and traditional authority structures. The association was also said to be very selective and exclusionary in its membership leaving out the community and the local power bases which can enhance its legitimacy, authority and power.

> Nga kwathwa kufomwa yoni iKalanga whatever…kumbe yicommittee…bafaka labadala phakathi from engxenye ama-areas wonke wona lawa engxenye bekuzakuba ngcono. Bengazenzeli bebodwa ngale ngoba as long as bebodwa akusoze kupase…Silabo osobhuku bonalabo, okhansili, obani bani abakaze babizwe kumaworkshops esiKalanga…so ozabuya ekhuthaza phansi ngapha kugrassroots mbani? Akula (Interview, WS650297). (When they formed the Kalanga whatever…or it's a committee they should have included the elders from maybe all these areas maybe it was going to be better. They should not do it alone because as long as they are alone it would not succeed…We have these kraalheads, concillors and these other ones; they have never been invited to the Kalanga workshops…so who would come and lobby the grassroots? No one).

The association was criticised for not being embedded in the community and for not drawing its support from the community and local power bases. However, some teachers and members of the association argued that some of the reasons for resistance on the part of the chiefs relates to the fact that most of the chiefs,

particularly in Mangwe are Ndebele speaking and they want to protect and promote only their language. Officials from the association indicated that their efforts are affected by the fact that they are detached from the community and are not constantly in touch with what is happening since they operate from outside the community and on a part-time basis with no dedicated members who are always on the ground to monitor the situation and enforce the teaching of their language.

The association was also described by both Kalanga speakers and some participants who have worked with it as not well mobilised and organised and divided. Officials from the association attributed the divisions within the association to differences on the writing system of the language. The association was said to be weakened by power struggles and lack of continuity as a result of changes in its leadership over time. Concurring with these participants, officials from the association indicated that divisions and poor organisational structure of the association jeopardised prospects of getting potential funders and publication of Kalanga textbooks in time. These officials also expressed that the activities and efforts of the association have been constrained by lack of financial security. They also indicated that the implementation of the policy has been slow because soon after the policy the association sort of relaxed and lost the momentum in advocacy.

5.10.1.8 Consultation

In all the three schools, teachers expressed concern with the top-down approach to language planning. They argued that the imposition of policies on them generate resistance even of well-intentioned policies. They expressed the need for consultation with all relevant stakeholders to enhance acceptance, ownership and indigenisation of policies. These teachers indicated that due to lack of consultation government crafts policies that do not take into account the linguistic profiles of their schools leading to difficulties in implementing the policies. They argued that some schools are linguistically mixed, but they are expected to teach in Kalanga and teach it as a subject, which they said was very difficult. Education officers and some officials from the ministry indicated that language surveys were not conducted prior to

the policy and teachers were not consulted. The access policy was said to be based on assumptions rather than research.

> According to the policy itself the assumption is that if a language is spoken in an area then that language should be taught in that area…I wouldn't say there was any structured research…there hasn't been really scholarly researches around that area. It is only assumed that in Beitbridge for example, it would be assumed that the whole population speaks Venda (Interview, WS650107).

5.10.1.9 Incentives

The delay in the teaching of Kalanga and other minority languages was also attributed to lack of incentives to promote their development, teaching and learning. The outright majority of the different participants of the study indicated that the low status of these languages in the curriculum does not promote their teaching and learning. They expressed that since prominence is given to English, Ndebele and Shona in the curriculum and job market, efforts of promoting the teaching of these languages are seriously hampered. Teachers, parents and publishers argued that the fact that these languages are not examined at grade 7 like English, Ndebele and Shona, there is no motivation to promote their development, teaching and learning. Teachers argued that in an examination-oriented curriculum, it is a waste of time and resources to dedicate time to a subject that is not going be examined.

Publishers argued that the fact that these languages have not been examined they have been reluctant to publish in them because heads spend monies on examinable subjects, and with examinations schools are forced to buy the materials, and as such there is a guaranteed and readily available market for the materials. Officials from the examining body argued that Kalanga and other official minority languages were not examined because the ministry had not made clear its position with regards to testing in these languages. The official also argued that the associations had not made their intentions clear and on their part the examinations of these languages come as an extra load which is not government funded. This possibly explains the body's stance to make all local languages optional subjects through the Zimbabwe School Examinations Council's *Examinations Circular Number 2 of 2011: Grade 7 2011 Examinations* to cut the expenses of running the examinations.

It also emerged that, because these languages are not a requirement for entry qualifications in higher and tertiary institutions and the job market, people do not see the need to focus on them. The non-teaching of these languages beyond primary schools was also said to be the source of discouragement for developing, teaching and learning these languages. The participants argued that the interest to develop, teach and learn official minority languages will be generated if they are taught beyond primary school level and if their demand in higher and tertiary institutions and in the job industry is high. Lack of incentives to promote the development, teaching and learning of official minority languages was also cited as an indication of lack of political will to promote their development, teaching and learning.

5.10.1.10 Teachers' attitudes and resistance

Some participants of the study, including teachers blamed teachers for having negative attitudes towards the teaching of Kalanga. Both Kalanga and non-Kalanga speaking teachers were equally blamed for not showing an interest. Native speakers were said to be hiding their Kalanga identity and not enthusiastic about the teaching of their language. Some teachers and parents, especially those in mixed communities argued that the policy is not suitable in their schools because of linguistic heterogeneity. Some teachers indicated that the introduction of Kalanga comes as an extra burden on the teachers and pupils on an already overcrowded curriculum.

However, some of these views were dismissed by both teachers and other participants arguing that teachers lack the resources to use and are not equipped native or through training to teach in Kalanga and to teach it as a subject. Some participants also expressed that the issue of attitudes was also a problem even among parents in the community. It was revealed that some parents resist the teaching of Kalanga because of its low status in the curriculum, confinement to primary school level and lack of demand for Kalanga in the job market.

5.10.1.11 Litigation

Some parents indicated that they are unaware of the channels that they can use to air their concerns on language-related rights violations. The outright majority of the parents, including school development committees indicated that they are not aware of the Constitution of Zimbabwe and the language-in-education policy and what it says about their language rights. They indicated that these documents are inaccessible and written in a language which they do not understand. Consequently, they are uninformed of their language rights and ways of redressing language-related rights violations.

5.10.1.12 Legislation

The outright majority of the participants expressed concern with the language provisions of the Constitution of Zimbabwe, the Education Act and other policy documents that enshrine the language-in-education policy. Some of these participants indicated that these policy documents are inaccessible, poorly communicated to different stakeholders. Some argued that language provisions pertaining to official minority languages in these documents are weak, neutralised and riddled with escape clauses in clauses that focus on official minority languages and are characterised by contradictions and inconsistencies. They argued that the Constitution is silent on language issues and does not guarantee and protect linguistic human rights and educational linguistic human rights. These participants argued that there is need for a Constitution that would enshrine, guarantee and protect linguistic human rights, educational linguistic human rights and language equality. They argued that there is no appropriate legislation to give legal sanction to the existence and operation of the language-in-education policy in Zimbabwe.

These participants argued that the Constitution and the Education Act are the major obstacles in the development, promotion, teaching and learning of official minority languages. They indicated that the absence of a substantive, collated and explicitly written down language policy and language-in-education policy are the main sources

of the problems affecting the teaching and learning of official minority languages. They noted that the Education Act and policy circulars which enshrine the language-in-education policy cannot be substitutes of a policy because they lack national reflection and are generated without wider consultation.

An official from the ministry of education argued that it is a great inconvenience to dig out the policy from the Secretary's circulars because these are not readily available, especially given the lack of continuity in the officials heading the ministry. Like many other participants, he argued that the language provisions in the Education Act cannot be substitutes of a sound policy. In view of this, these participants expressed the need for a comprehensive and explicit language policy which provides clear guidelines for the development, promotion, teaching and learning of official minority languages. They indicated that the policy should be managed by an independent commission.

Some participants, especially the teachers, argued that policy circulars and the Education Act are inaccessible. The outright majority of the teachers in the two districts indicated that they have never seen the circulars or read them. They indicated that the 2002 policy development was communicated to them by word of mouth by the school heads in their report backs from the heads' meeting in the district offices. Consequently, most teachers indicated that they do not know what exactly these circulars demand. Some teachers indicated that they only heard about the 2002 policy development as late as 2010. Teachers, education officers in the district, teacher education college officials, university officials, publishers and officials from advocacy groups indicated that policy developments are poorly disseminated and communicated to the implementers and other stakeholders.

They indicated that policy developments are not communicated to them as the key stakeholders. University officials revealed that they get these circulars and policy developments through their own efforts or liaison with colleagues in the ministry or other means. Publishers indicated that policy developments are not popularised and widely disseminated to conscientise all stakeholders of the development. Education

officers in the two districts indicated that there was need for conceptual skills development and human skills development for all implementing stakeholders following the policy development to facilitate its successful implementation. Lack of training for teachers and education officers following the policy development was said to be reducing the teachers' and education officers' capacity to implement and monitor the implementation of the policy development competently and efficiently.

Publishers indicated that they were reluctant to publish in Kalanga and other minority languages, partly because the policy environment was not enabling them or giving them the impetus to publish in these languages. The outright majority of the participants argued that the Education Act and the policy circulars give prominence to English, Ndebele and Shona and this affects the efforts of promoting the development, teaching and learning of official minority languages. These participants expressed that these policy documents push for the exclusivisity and supremacy of Shona and Ndebele. Some participants argued that the optional subject status of official minority languages in the curriculum impacts negatively on efforts of promoting their development, teaching and learning. The use of escape clauses in the language provisions that promote the teaching and learning of official minority languages was also said to undermine efforts of promoting their development, teaching and learning. Some participants argued that the policy documents are merely permissible when it comes to the teaching of official minority languages, yet clauses referring to English, Ndebele and Shona are firm and obligatory.

Problems of inconsistencies and contradictions in the policy documents were also raised by officials from the ministry of education and Zimsec. Responding to the allegations of inconsistencies and contradictions an official from the ministry argued that the examining body issued an incorrect policy which stipulated that national languages are optional subjects alongside the official minority languages. The official from the ministry reiterated that the official position of the ministry is that in addition to English and Ndebele or Shona official minority languages *may* be taught up to Form 2. This official argued that the Zimsec circular that stipulated that the national languages are optional subjects was wrong interpretation of the policy. On the other

hand, an official from Zimsec argued that the examining body cannot come up with its own policies that are at variance with those issued by the ministry.

These cases are an illustration of the inconsistencies and contradictions that characterise the language-in-education policy and they contribute to fluctuation in policy implementation and also reflect poor coordination, communication and collaboration amongst the organs of the ministry. It also reflects lack of thorough knowledge of the policies among other officials in the organs of the ministry.

5.10.1.13 Collaboration, coordination, consultation and communication with stakeholders

The outright majority of the publishers, university officials, some officials in the ministry of education and in teacher education colleges argued that the major problem with policy formulation and implementation in the country is the lack of inclusive all stakeholder participation in the debate of policy formulation. These participants indicated that there has not been an inclusive all stakeholders' consultation process in language planning and policy in the country. They argued that policy making has been done on an ad hoc top-down basis and policy developments are also poorly disseminated and communicated to all relevant stakeholders. It also emerged that there is poor communication, coordination and collaboration within the lower ministry of education itself and its organs and institutions as well as within the two ministries of education and their relevant organs and institutions which affects the implementation of well-intentioned policies.

These participants argued that the lower ministry does not communicate, coordinate, collaborate or consult well with its organs and institutions and with the sister ministry and its organs and institutions as well as other relevant stakeholders. They argued that the two ministries and their organs and other stakeholders are not operating in a cooperative, coordinated and cohesive manner. It emerged that there is poor information management and communication within the two ministries, between the two ministries and with other stakeholders. These participants expressed that there

are no closer operational linkages between the two ministries and with other stakeholders, thus there is no coordinated planning and deployment of skills and knowledge to ensure the successful implementation of policies.

They also expressed that poor communication, coordination, consultation and collaboration within the lower ministry itself and its organs and institutions and with the higher ministry result in poor alignment of goals and objectives of the country's education sector. They revealed that lack of harmony, consultation, collaboration and coordination of efforts result in information black-outs which affect the implementation of policy developments and led to unnecessary repetition of similar efforts by different stakeholders.

These participants argued that the absence or paucity of communication, coordination, consultation and collaboration with key stakeholders such as tertiary institutions which train language experts, teachers, editors, develop languages, research and advise on policy directions jeorpadise efforts of promoting the development, teaching and learning of official minority languages. They indicated that lack of communication, coordination, consultation and collaboration with publishers affects materials production. Lack of communication, coordination, consultation and collaboration with teachers and parents was also cited as the root cause of the lack of acceptance, ownership and indigenisation of the policies.

Reiterating his concern that appeared in the *Newsday* of the 31st of January 2011, the minister of education in our interview argued that the problem of poor communication, coordination, consultation and collaboration within the two ministries is real and reflected in the reluctance of the higher ministry to enforce the introduction of official minority languages in teacher education colleges years after the policy was issued. The minister argued that teacher training colleges are misplaced in the higher ministry because they service the lower ministry, hence they should be housed in his ministry.

> …Teacher training is the responsibility of Higher Education and that is the source of the situation that we find ourselves in, where we end up with teachers that may not be conversant in local

> languages…We need to oversee the training of our teachers so that in their deployment, we know where they are needed and in what numbers…(Mlotshwa, 2011).

However, despite these allegations of poor communication, coordination, consultation and collaboration, an official from the Department of Teacher Education in the ministry higher education and another official in the ministry of education argued that there is communication, coordination, consultation and collaboration within the two ministries.

5.10.1.14 Ethnolinguistic vitality

Low ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness of Kalanga speakers was cited by Kalanga and non-Kalanga speakers who participated in this study as another significant factor that contributed to the delay in the teaching and learning of Kalanga. Given the close relationship between the vitality model, Webb's factors that contribute to the success and failure of top-down and bottom-up approaches and some of the development oriented methodologies and strategies, ethnolinguistic vitality is used as the major theme in this discussion. However, the various structural components of the model, Webb's factors and some of the development oriented methodologies and strategies are discussed separately where this distinction is possible and necessary.

5.10.1.14.1 Social status, ethnolinguistic awareness, linguistic nationalism, social and cultural character of the community

Both Kalanga and non-Kalanga speakers who participated in this study indicated that the social status, social and cultural character of the Kalanga speakers and their low ethnolingustic awareness contributed immensely to the delay in the teaching of Kalanga. They revealed that Kalanga speakers lack a strongly developed sense of language loyalty due to their socio-historical status, subtractive bilingual education, linguistic hegemony and politics of language and long history of marginalisation and exclusion of their language. Their socio-historical status, marginalisation, exclusion and subtractive bilingual education were said to have contributed to their low self-esteem and continue to affect the intergenerational transmission of their language. Both Kalanga and non-Kalanga speakers indicated that subtractive bilingual

education, the negative socio-historical status, marginalisation and exclusion of Kalanga speakers also contributed to cultural hybridity, expansive and integrative language contact, language accommodation, shift and diglossia.

These experiences were cited as the possible causes of the unfavourable attitudes of Kalanga speakers towards their language and their low self-esteem which saps their morale and contribute to their low ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness as well as linguistic and ethnic nationalism. Participants of the study revealed that Kalanga speakers express comfort with Ndebele and most of them acknowledged that they feel more comfortable with Ndebele. As a result, this has affected their advocacy, commitment and support for the promotion, development, teaching and learning of Kalanga. Their comfort with Ndebele entails that they do not have a communicative need in the form of Kalanga since Ndebele already serves that function. Responses of the participants revealed that Kalanga speakers lack the necessary and prerequisite ethnolinguistic awareness and linguistic and ethnic nationalism for language-political change from below. For example, some Kalanga speakers said;

> They had pride of their being Tongas and they seem to seclude themselves from the rest, whereas for us here the Kalangas we find we fit well when we go into the Ndebele. We fit well and become better…We find we are healthy when we just go under the armpit of the Ndebele people (Interview, WS650275).
>
> Sesagxila kakhulu esiNdebeleni ukuthi umuntu asisuse khonaphana kuyathatha eside isikhathi. Ukuthi uquphune impande zoneziya zona asebekizo aha Kunzima…sebecomfortable (Interview, WS650297). (We are now deepely rooted in Ndebele such that it will take a long time for a person to change us. To uproot those roots that they are rooted in ah! Its difficult…They (the Kalangas) are now comfortable).

The responses of Kalanga speakers and other participants reflect that Kalanga is not viewed as Kalanga speakers' expression of individual and group identity; instead Kalanga speakers shun and conceal their Kalanga identity and masquerade as Ndebeles. It emerged that Kalanga speakers lack a strong sense of ethnolinguistic identity based on Kalanga. Kalanga speakers were said to be having tendencies of expressing their identities through Ndebele. Kalanga was said to be not significantly and meaningfully linked to a sense of distinctive identity among the Kalanga speakers; instead they lack pride in their language and easily assimilate to Ndebele

to the extent that they prefer to name their children in Ndebele and also identify themselves as Ndebeles.

> AmaKalanga lawo…nxa sesifika kwezinye izizwe ubuthathekile…lathi singothathekile…abantwana sebebizwa ngesiShona ngesiNdebele. Lathi asifuni ukuziveza egcekeni (Interview, WS650282). (The Kalangas…when they interact with other language groups they easily shift…We are also easily taken/assimilated…Our children are now being given Shona and Ndebele names. We are also not keen to reveal our identity).
>
> IsiKalanga sisalela emuva singabothathekile…sesilahla esethu isiKalanga abantwana labo sebengena khonapho labo (Interview, WS650272). (Kalanga is lagging behind because we easily assimilate…we are abandoning our Kalanga and even our children are following suit).

It was also revealed that even in social gatherings like community meetings, Kalanga speakers use Ndebele and ridicule those who speak in Kalanga in the meetings.

5.10.1.14.2 Ownership/ indigenisation and community support of language-political change

The responses of both Kalanga and non-Kalanga speakers reflect that the teaching and learning of Kalanga lacks community support, ownership and indigenisation by Kalanga speakers themselves. Despite indicating that they want their children to be taught Kalanga, Kalanga speakers, especially parents indicated that they have not taken the decision seriously or ensured that the policy is implemented. Both Kalanga and non-Kalanga speakers who participated in the study revealed that the nature and extent of community support for language-political change is very insignificant to contribute to any meaningful language-political change from below. Lack of a communicative need, bilingualism, exogamy, elite closure, socio-historical status, social status, low ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness and lack of community involvement and mobilisation were cited as other contributing factors to lack of ownership and community support for the teaching and learning of Kalanga by Kalanga speakers.

The reigning language ideology of Kalanga speakers and the meaning and role of Kalanga in the community is so negative that Kalanga speakers do not have any incentive to support language-political change. The responses of the parents in this

community reflect that the policy is not something which they as speakers of the language demanded. They do not see economic, educational and social value for Kalanga, and this perception was even shared by some of the teachers and reflected by the pupils in their choice of their preferred medium of instruction in the learners' questionnaires. It emerged that the communities are not participants in the movement and the association that represents them is not known by the outright majority of the members of the communities and is acting in isolation without consulting, engaging, involving and mobilising the community.

Responses, particularly those of the parents, officials from the Kalanga association and teachers in the district clearly reflect that ownership of the development, teaching and learning of Kalanga is clearly not local. The community does not have a stake in it, and the efforts to promote the teaching and learning of Kalanga are not internally motivated and perpetuated. Some members of these communities expressed a feeling of surrender, complacency and passive acceptance of the *status quo* and that they have internalised it such that they consider it natural and immutable.

> Ngithole vele ukuthi vele ulimi luncindezelwe lami ngalandela lami ukuthi yiyo impilo efanelwe iphilwe, ngalandela khonapho (Interview, WS650272). (I found that the language was marginalised and I also followed thinking thus the way of life that we should live, I followed that).

Responses of the participants reveal that local motivation to engage with the policy is weak and not adequately supported by communities and the local traditional authority structures in the districts. This was attributed to failure by the association to engage, mobilise and involve the community and local power bases. Lack of commitment on the part of the native speakers of Kalanga was cited as a retrospective step in the promotion, development, teaching and learning of Kalanga.

5.10.1.14.3 Absolute numbers

Parents in some of the communities in these districts argued that their vitality is affected by their small population size which contributes to their marginalisation, exclusion and minoritisation. Responses of the parents in these communities reflect that immigration, emigration, bilingualism and mixed marriages have significantly

contributed to the low population size of Kalanga speakers. The low rates of the intergeneration transmission of the language were also cited as contributing to the drastic decrease in the number of Kalanga speakers leading to the group's low ethnolinguistic vitality.

5.10.1.14.4 Exogamy / mixed marriages and marked bilingualism

Parents in all the three selected schools raised the issues of exogamy and marked bilingualism as also impacting negatively on their group vitality, ethnolinguistic awareness and social and cultural character as well as intergenerational transmission of their language. They argued that in mixed marriages, language retention rates are more favourable to Ndebele speakers and this is further enhanced by quick-exit transitional bilingual education in Ndebele. Consequently, these speakers end up being comfortable with the *status quo* and accepting it as natural and normal. This has also contributed to lack of a communicative need, a necessary prerequisite for successful language-political change from below. Responses of the participants reflect that Kalanga speakers already have a common 'new' language, Ndebele which they already express comfort with, such that Kalanga is intended to be used as a second language, with bilingualism the ideal.

Mixed marriages, bilingualism, language contact and subtractive bilingual education were said to be perpetuating diglossia, assimilation, language contact, accommodation and a shift to Ndebele. Unlike the Tonga group, it emerged that Kalanga speakers are more Kalanga-Ndebele bilinguals and as a result they have developed a sense of comfort and content with Ndebele.

> Ngapha kukalutshwane ukuthi uthole umuntu othi ukhuluma laye ngesiNdebele engakuzwa…Abantu isiNdebele bayasizwa. Yikho khonokho okudale uhlupho lokuthi isiKalanga singani lokhu sibuyela emuva (Interview, WS650214). (This side its very rare to talk to someone in Ndebele and find that the person cannot understand Ndebele…People understand Ndebele. Thus what has caused the problem of the underdevelopment of Kalanga).

> They are comfortable with Ndebele…because those areas can as well speak fluent in Ndebele. If you get to Binga here imh some people cannot speak…Unlike amanye ama-areas semikisile up but iBinga isese lama-areas ayi…(Unlike the other areas which are linguistically mixed, Binga still has some areas that are predominantly Tonga) (Interview, WS650202).

5.10.1.14. 5 Emigration and absolute numbers

The proximity of Kalanga speakers to the South African and Bostwana borders was said to be contributing to huge emigration and immigration rates that have affected the group's ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness. Emigration was also cited as having contributed to brain-drain and serious shortage of Kalanga speaking teachers. The proximity of the group to the borders and harsh economic conditions which affected the country were said to have contributed to high rates of early drop-outs in schools, which in turn perpetuate the vicious cycle of the dearth of teachers who can speak Kalanga. The proximity of the districts to the borders was also said to be contributing to the low value attached to education by Kalanga speakers. Emigration out of the district and the country was said to be leading to cases where emigrants acquire new languages and eventually lose their own and bring up their children in the newly acquired language which contributes to low rates of intergenerational transmission of Kalanga. These high rates of emigration were also said to have further contributed to the minoritisation of the group numerically.

5.10.1.14.6 Immigration, concentration and proportion

High immigration rates of speakers from other language groups in search of better economic opportunities in the two border districts was also said to be contributing to the group's low vitality and shift to Ndebele. The huge influx of Ndebele speakers which dates back to pre-colonial era was said to have swamped the Kalanga group through expansive and integrative language contact leading to linguistic heterogeneity which affects the successful implementation of mother tongue education policies. The immigrants were said to be contributing to the weakening of Kalanga vitality by assimilating the Kalangas into their languages, especially given that these languages are regarded as high status varieties and there are incentives that promote the shift to these dominant languages.

Moreover, the immigrants were said to be resisting the policy of teaching Kalanga. The huge immigration patterns into the districts were said to have also affected the

group distribution factors of the Kalanga group in terms of their concentration and proportion relative to other groups. Consequently, the districts are now largely linguistically mixed, exhibit marked bilingualism, affected by language shift and low ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness. Unlike the Tonga group, the Kalanga group was described as linguistically mixed and less geographically defined. It was said to have had a lot interaction with other ethnic groups leading to the dilution of its culture, diglossia, low ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness, language accommodation and shift.

5.10.1.14.7 Socio-historical status

Unlike the Tonga group, the Kalanga group was said to have a very negative socio-historical status that was marked by conquest and domination by the Ndebele group. These historical experiences were said to have left a permanent legacy of inferiority syndrome associated with being Kalanga. These historical experiences were further enhanced by the colonial and post-colonial subtractive bilingual language-in-education policies which further entrenched low emotional, intellectual and functional investment in Kalanga. Participants of the study who commented on the historical experiences of the Kalanga group argued that these experiences cultivated an inferiority complex associated with Kalanga which has been ingrained in the minds of Kalanga speakers in as far as their language is concerned. They argued that the syndrome has been institutionalised, canonised and entrenched with the divisions and amalgamations of the country's provinces and districts, which were said to be politically engineered to entrench Ndebele and Shona hegemony.

The negative socio-historical experiences of the Kalanga group was said to have contributed to the group's low ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness. They were cited as the root causes of the cases where most Kalanga speakers hold their language in disdain and feel ashamed to be associated with it. It emerged that during the pre-colonial era the Ndebele group settled right in the middle of the Kalanga group and assimilated it into the third Ndebele group *amahole*, a group that was despised to the point that many Kalanga groups changed their surnames and concealed their identity

and shifted to Ndebele. Coupled with the politics of language in the country and assimilationist educational policies, these historical experiences led to the minoritisation of Kalanga, hybridasation of Kalanga culture, language contact, accommodation, shift and diglossia, which inevitably resulted in the low ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness of the Kalanga group.

5.10.1.14.8 Formal institutional supports and control factors: Educational status of Kalanga

Given that a language is vital to the extent that its language and group members are well-represented formally and in the state's education system at primary, secondary and higher levels, participants of the study argued that poor representation of the language in these levels is also contributing to the delay in its development, teaching and learning. The low status of Kalanga in the education system was cited as another mitigating factor in the efforts of promoting its development, teaching and learning. Group discussions with teachers and class observations revealed that Kalanga fare badly in the school timetable compared to other languages. In most schools, Kalanga was allocated two or one period per week, i.e. one hour per week or thirty minutes per week.

Kalanga is not examined at grade 7 level and is only taught up to primary school level. Even in its teaching, it is taught without textbooks and by untrained teachers some of whom cannot speak or understand the language well. It is mainly taught as a subject and not used to teach other subjects because most teachers cannot speak it. Unlike Venda and Tonga, in Botswana where Kalanga is also spoken it is not taught even at primary school level; hence there is nowhere to draw the inspiration and insights to promote its development, teaching and learning.

5.10.2 Causes of the delay in the teaching of Venda

Table 22 shows the frequencies of occurrence of the causes of the delay in the teaching of Venda identified from the data gathered from the different participants of the study in Beitbridge district and other participants from outside this district. A tick

against each cause and underneath the participants indicates that the concerned participants identified the cause as having contributed to the delay in the teaching of Venda. This table is derived from the transcribed data gathered through semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions with teachers in Bulilima and Mangwe districts; parents in Bulilima and Mangwe districts; Kalanga language association; teachers in Beitbridge district, parents in Beitbridge district; Venda language committee; teachers in Binga district; parents in Binga district; Tonga language committee; education officers in Bulilima and Mangwe districts; education officers in Beitbridge district; education officers in Binga district; officials from ZILPA; officials from Silveria House; officials from Basilwizi Trust; officials from publishing houses; officials from CDU; officials from Zimsec; officials from selected universities; officials from selected teacher education colleges; an official from the department of teacher education and officials from the ministry of education, sport, arts and culture.

Table 22: Frequencies of occurrence of the causes of the delay in the teaching of Venda

Causes	**Participants**																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V
Teacher training, availability and Deployment				√	√						√		√	√			√	√		√		
Teachers' attitudes				√	√	√					√											
Availability of teaching materials				√	√	√					√			√	√		√	√		√	√	√
Dialectical Variations				√		√	√															
Funding						√								√		√	√			√	√	√
Political will				√	√	√					√		√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√	√
Linguistic hegemony and Politics of language				√	√	√								√	√		√	√		√		
Elite closure				√	√	√											√				√	
Incentives				√	√										√		√	√		√		√
Collaboration, Consultation and coordination between				√												√	√	√		√		√

stakeholders																						
Legislation				√	√	√					√		√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√	√
Litigation				√	√																	
Advocacy	√		√	√	√	√	√				√			√		√	√		√	√		
Linguistic diversity				√	√		√				√									√		
Community support for language-political change				√	√		√	√			√						√	√		√	√	
Social and Cultural character of the community				√	√																√	
Emigration				√	√																	
Immigration				√	√		√															
Population size				√	√																	
Concentration & Proportion				√	√		√													√		
Marked Bilingualism and Communicative need				√	√		√															
Socio-historical status				√	√		√															
Formal institutional support factors				√											√	√	√			√		

Key: A–Teachers Bulilima and Mangwe Districts; B–Parents Bulilima and Mangwe Districts; C–Kalanga Language Association; D–Teachers Beitbridge District, E–Parents Beitbridge District; F–Venda Language Committee; G–Teachers Binga District; H–Parents Binga District; I–TOLACCO; J–Education Officers Bulilima and Mangwe Districts; K–Education Officers Beitbridge District; L–Education Officers Binga District; M–ZILPA Officials; N–Silveria House Officials; O–CDU Officials; P–Zimsec Officials; Q–University Officials; R–Teacher Education College Officials; S–Department of Teacher Education Official; T–Ministry of Education, Sport, Arts and Culture Officials; U–Basilwizi Trust; V–Publishers

5.10.2.1 Teacher training, availability and deployment

The outright majority of the participants in this district and other participants from outside the district indicated that the shortage of competent and trained Venda speaking teachers is the major drawback in the teaching of Venda and other official minority languages. These participants revealed that there are no teacher training colleges that offer training in Venda. They argued that native competence is not an adequate attribute for effectively teaching in a language and teaching it as a subject.

Both Venda and non-Venda speaking teachers and some parents indicated that even the Venda speaking teachers cannot effectively teach in Venda and teach it as a subject because they did not learn it or train to teach in it and to teach it as a subject.

It emerged that Great Zimbabwe University offers a degree in Venda, but there was a widespread concern from Venda and non-Venda speaking teachers on the low turn-out of Venda speaking teachers in the progamme. The low turn-outs of Venda speakers in teacher education colleges and at Great Zimbabwe University was attributed to their low interest in education and the low value that they attach to education. Venda speakers who participated in this study acknowledged the problem citing the value of cattle, early drop-out from school and migration to South Africa as some of the contributing factors for these low turn-outs.

Some participants in the district and from outside the district proposed that the government should relax the entry requirements because most Ordinary level holders in the district are struggling with Mathematics leading to poor turn-outs from the district. There was a proposal that there is need to introduce bridging courses where students can train as teachers while bridging Mathematics to improve enrolment rates from Venda speakers. Parents and youths in the district also expressed concern about the poor communication channels of intakes, arguing that when teacher colleges advertise their intakes they do not reach out to their communities and *The Sunday Mail* and *The Sunday News* are hard to come by in their district. They proposed that these colleges should conduct career guidance workshops in the district to create awareness on their intakes and entry requirements. Officials from teacher education colleges argued that they are limited by financial constraints, and hence why they advertise their intakes in the Sunday newspapers only. They also indicated that they conduct career guidance workshops, but these are mostly confined to the urban centre of the district to centralise the workshops.

It also emerged that after the 2002 policy development, teachers did not receive any in-service training to help them teach in Venda or to teach it as a subject. Some teachers in this district also indicated that some officials in the ministry argue that

teachers can teach any language as long as they are given the orthography and have spent some time in the community. In our interview with an official in the ministry of education it emerged that that there is a misconception that teachers can teach anywhere and any language. The official argued that teachers can always teach the language while learning it, hence the random deployment of teachers without any linguistic considerations.

The shortage of Venda speaking teachers in the district was also cited by the majority of the participants as another contributing factor in the delay of the teaching and learning of Venda. The majority of the participants in this district, including officials from teacher education colleges and education officers cited the proximity of the district to the South African border as one contributing factor to the shortage of Venda speaking teachers. They indicated that most Venda speakers do not value education and they drop-out of school for South Africa and the few trained teachers also migrate to South Africa in search of greener pastures resulting in the dearth of Venda speaking teachers in the district.

These factors were cited as contributing to a vicious cycle of the shortage of Venda speaking teachers in the district. It also emerged that the low status attached to the teaching profession in the district also contributes significantly to the shortage of Venda speaking teachers. It was revealed that drop-outs who migrate to South Africa live better lives than teachers such that people do not see the value of education. Some even indicated that cattle ranchers are far much better than teachers in their living, and one Venda speaking teacher regretted her decision of joining the profession because during the training she lost a sizeable number of her cattle during her absence.

The poor policy of teacher deployment was also cited by the outright majority of the participants in the district and from outside the district as another contributing factor to the shortage of Venda speaking teachers in the district. Teachers and education officers in this district indicated that in as much as teachers choose three provinces they would want to teach in, their final deployment is largely determined by the

staffing situation in these provinces and there are no linguistic considerations in their deployment. Consequently, teachers find themselves in schools where they can neither speak nor understand the local language of the area which they are supposed to teach in and teach as a subject. The outright majority of the participants in this district indicated that their district is largely headed by and staffed with non-Venda speakers who can neither speak nor understand the language very well. Parents argued that this results in the distortion and corruption of their language. They also argued that the situation creates a serious teaching and learning problem which contributes to high rates of early drop-outs and poor academic performance.

The majority of Shona speaking teachers in the district argued that it is an uphill task for them to teach Venda because when they come to the district they are confronted with two new languages, Ndebele and Venda, which they are supposed to learn and teach. Similarly, Ndebele speakers indicated that Venda is foreign to them. Venda speaking teachers and parents in the district indicated that Venda speaking teachers' communicative language proficiency is not enough for the teachers to teach in Venda and to teach it as subject because they lack cognitive academic language proficiency in the language. Teachers and parents in this district also argued that despite the availability of Venda teaching materials, the teaching of Venda will remain ineffective because the outright majority of the teachers do not know the language. Lack of training in Venda in teacher education colleges and poor deployment of teachers were cited as a reflection of lack of political will, poor planning, leading and organising.

5.10.2.2 Teachers' attitudes

Some participants in the district argued that some heads and teachers have negative attitudes towards the teaching of Venda. Non-Venda speakers were blamed for not showing an interest to enforce and monitor the teaching of Venda and to learn and teach the language. However, some teachers argued it was, and is not an issue of attitude because such heads and teachers do not know the language and it is / was a challenge for such heads to assess it when teachers are / were teaching. Some

teachers blamed Venda speaking teachers for not showing a keen interest and passion in the development, teaching and learning of their language. These teachers argued that some Venda speaking teachers in their schools seem less interested and are not showing an initiative to help those who do not know the language. They blamed these teachers for not willing to trade subjects to take-up Venda classes and for not showing an interest to improvise teaching materials before the textbooks were produced.

They also indicated that the Venda speaking teachers argue that it is difficult to teach Venda, and as a result as non-native speakers they feel demoralised by the attitude of the native speakers. Some teachers argued that some Venda speaking teachers do not even want to be identified as Venda speakers; they hide their identity and are not proud of their language. Some parents argued that it is just an issue of resistance to change because teachers are accustomed to teaching in Ndebele and Ndebele. Some teachers argued that the introduction of Venda comes in as a burden to them and the pupils because the curriculum is already crowded and it is impossible to fit it in the timetable because it stretches the school day beyond the normal school time.

However, Venda speaking teachers argued that in their case it is not an issue of attitude, but of lack of thorough knowledge of the language. They argued that the language is difficult for them because they lack academic proficiency in the language and they have no idea of how teaching materials are developed. Some indicated that the changes in the orthography also affected them because they had to start learning the new orthography all over again.

5.10.2.3 Availability of teaching materials

The outright majority of the participants in this district and from outside the district argued that the delay in the production of teaching materials contributed to the delay in the teaching of Venda. It emerged that the schools received the pupils' books in early 2011. Teachers, parents and other participants argued that in the absence of teaching materials no serious and meaningful teaching and learning could take place,

especially given that most of the teachers can neither speak nor understand the language very well. This was said to have made it very impossible for teachers to even improvise teaching materials. Teachers also expressed that since they still do not have the teacher's guides it is still an uphill task for them to teach Venda, especially for non-Venda speakers. In all the three selected schools there was a shared concern from both Venda and non-Venda speaking teachers regarding the suitability and user-friendliness of the Venda books. These teachers argued that the Venda books deviate from the structure and outline of the other language textbooks because when they were adopted from South Africa there were not well adapted to suit the Zimbabwean context.

The delay in the production of teaching materials was attributed to lack of funding and sponsorship. It emerged that unlike the Tonga and Shangani speakers who got sponsorship for the production of their teaching materials, the Venda group among other things lacked funding to produce the books until the current minister of education got funding through the ETF programme. Market viability problems were also cited as another contributing factor to the delay of materials production. It emerged that the small population size of the group was considered less viable by publishers. Publishers also argued that the policy environment was not compelling enough to publish in Venda and other official minority languages because they are not examinable.

Economic meltdown that affected the country after the declaration of the policy was also cited as another cause of the delay in developing and producing teaching materials. However, some participants dismissed this view arguing that poor planning and lack of political will contributed to the delay. They argued that this was largely due to poor planning and analysis of the policy environment. These participants indicated that the policy was conceived outside the economic framework and environment. They expressed that the government did not make the necessary economic considerations to assess the capacity of the economy to support the ambitious policy initiative. They indicated that the policy did not consider the

impracticalities of implementation in the then dwindling and underperforming economy.

The delay in the production of locally produced textbooks was also attributed to lack of willingness among Venda speakers to write. An official in the district education office revealed that unlike the passionate and dedicated Tonga writers, Venda speakers were not forthcoming and were demanding guarantee of payment, an indication of lack of indigenisation of the initiative by speakers in this group. It was also revealed that the production of locally produced materials was delayed by the unavailability of printers that could capture the diacritics and symbols used in the writing system of Venda. Unlike Kalanga, Venda was said to have an advantage that it is developed and taught up to university level in South Africa, but efforts to adopt and adapt teaching materials from South Africa were said to have been delayed by government's initial refusal to allow the language groups to adopt and adapt books from neighbouring countries when the policy was declared. It was revealed that the government argued that the materials might not be suitable to the Zimbabwean context.

Lack of a standard orthography and changes in the orthography, which generated a lot of debate and divisions in the district were also cited as some of the contributing factors to the delay in the production of locally produced textbooks. It also emerged that the production of locally produced textbooks was delayed by lack of funding and it was revealed that their production stopped along the way due to being 'played down', allegedly by the publishers and government leading to the adoption of the South Africa series. The delay in the production of teaching materials was cited by some of the participants as a sign of the government's lack of political will, poor planning, leading and organising for the policy development.

5.10.2.4 Political will

The outright majority of the participants in this district and from outside the district argued that the policy lacked the prerequisite political will. These participants argued

that poor planning, resourcing, leading, controlling, staffing and lack of conceptual, technical and human skills development, enforcement, follow-up and monitoring of the policy are clear indicators of the government's lack of political will. Teachers indicated that there are no serious follow-ups on the implementation of the policy. The outright majority of the participants in the district and from outside the district argued that there is lack of commitment and insincerity among policy makers and middle managers in the ministry of education to the policy development

However, officials from the ministry, education officers and some participants cited economic challenges that affected the country as the source of the problem in the implementation of the policy. They argued that the government lacked the resources to implement the policy. However, the economic meltdown excuse was dismissed by other participants as a scapegoat. They argued that the government did not properly plan for the policy and to some extent lack the political will. Some of the participants argued that the policy was mainly declared to appease and pacify the electorate and gunner votes.

The low political and educational status of Venda and other minority languages was cited as a reflection of the government's negative attitude towards these languages. These participants argued that if the government was fully committed it was going to elevate the status of these languages and create incentives to promote their development, teaching and learning. Some of the participants argued that the failure to ensure that these languages have representatives across all levels of the ministry of education, curriculum development and examining body are signs of the government's lack of commitment. However, the current minister of education was credited for initiating change that saw the publication of teaching materials in these languages and for being emphatic about the need to ensure these languages are taught.

5.10.2.5 Linguistic hegemony and politics of language

The outright majority of the participants in the district and from outside the district attributed the delay in the teaching of Venda and other official minority languages to the politics of language prevailing in the country. These participants argued that the delay was an attempt to promote and protect the linguistic hegemony of the national languages. They expressed that government gives a lot of prominence to English, Ndebele and Shona. They also indicated that the prevailing status differentia of languages is an attempt to promote language shift and assimilation into the dominant languages. Venda speakers in the district and other participants from outside the district argued that the minority language status of their language is an insult to them as equal citizens of the democratic Zimbabwe. They argued for language equality and promotion of all languages to the status of official languages like in South Africa to avoid promoting linguistic hegemony and exclusion of other groups.

Some parents in the district argued that the division of the country's provinces along the two national languages was a politically engineered decision meant to create linguistic majorities and minorities. They argued that their being classified under Matabeleland entails that they are counted as Ndebeles. They revealed that this division has forced many minority language speakers in the province to identify themselves as Ndebeles leading to expansive and integrative language contact, language accommodation, shift, diglossia and low ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness and low intergenerational transmission of their language. These participants argued that the division of the country's main provinces according to Ndebele and Shona gives the impression that Ndebele and Shona are the only people in the country. It promotes the marginalisation and exclusion of other language groups. They argued that the low status accorded to official minority languages compared to the prominence given to Ndebele and Shona undermine efforts of promoting the development, teaching and learning of Venda and other official minority languages.

5.10.2.6 Elite closure

Some participants in the district, particularly parents and teachers and other participants from outside the district indicated that the development, promotion, teaching and learning of Venda lacks the prerequisite support of the elite from the district. These participants argued that key political leaders from the district and prominent figures in strategic and influential positions show passivity and lack of interest in the development, promotion, teaching and learning of Venda. Political leaders of the district who are Venda speaking were said to be addressing community meetings and rallies in either Ndebele or Shona. Unlike the Tonga political leaders, Venda political leaders and traditional leaders were said to be not putting any meaningful pressure to promote the development, teaching and learning of Venda. Parents argued that their leaders are quite about the language issue and it has never been an issue in their meetings. Some Venda speakers indicated that in as much as the traditional leaders want their language to be taught, their voices are not coordinated and they have not been mobilised because the Venda language committee is inactive.

5.10.2.7 Incentives

Most teachers and parents in this district and other participants from outside the district argued that there are no means designed to create or improve the opportunity to teach and learn Venda and those designed to create or improve the incentives to promote the development, teaching and learning of Venda. They argued that Venda is not an entry requirement in the job market, it is not taught at secondary school level and unlike other subjects that are taught at primary school level, it is not examined. Teachers argued that they do not emphasize the teaching of Venda because it is not examined; instead they dedicate more time and resources to examined subjects. They also argued that it is not a compulsory subject in school.

Moreover, given the shortage of teachers who can speak and understand Venda, it is mainly taught as a subject and not used as a medium of instruction in most schools.

Publishers argued that as long as a language is not examined and has market viability problems, very few commercial publishers will be willing to take the risk of publishing in that language unless there are incentives to do so.

5.10.2.8 Lack of consultation

Some teachers argued that some of the policies are not implemented because they as implementers are not consulted during the policy making process. They indicated that policies are just imposed on them and they are expected to implement them without questioning. They revealed that curriculum reforms are not adopted on the basis of a proper inclusive all stakeholders debate and with a broad consensus and they lack national reflection and debate. Consequently, this was said to generate resistance and lead to policies that are not feasible because prior environmental scan, consultation and planning was not done to access the feasibility and desirability as well as suitability of policies. These teachers illustrated their views by highlighting the lack of clarity of the access policy of the 2002 policy development. They indicated that there was need to identify schools which could best implement the policy and other implementation modalities, especially given the linguistically heterogeneous classes in their district.

Education officers in the district indicated that there were no linguistic surveys that were done to identify which schools can best implement the policy and to identify implementation modalities in cases of linguistic heterogeneity or fragmentation. These officers indicated that they based on assumptions and common knowledge that in Beitbridge there are Venda speakers; hence the access policy was not based on thorough research and informed decisions. Teachers and parents in linguistically mixed schools argued that in their case, linguistic heterogeneity is a source of difficulty in the implementation of mother tongue education policies. They argued that there is need for wide consultation and creation of platforms for channeling their views and concerns since teacher associations are mainly preoccupied with the bread and butter issues of the teachers and rarely address policy issues.

These teachers argued that lack of teacher participation in policy formulation contributes to lack of ownership and consensus. Consequently, it promotes resistance.

5.10.2.9 Legislation

The outright majority of the teachers in the district and education officers as well as the advocacy groups that worked with these language groups indicated that teachers have not seen or read the policy circulars and the Education Act and are not clear about its stipulations. The outright majority of the teachers indicated that they did not even know the colour of the Education Act and were seeing the Act and the circulars for the very first time during the interview. Poor dissemination of these circulars by school heads and ministry officials and education officers were cited as the root causes of the inaccessibility of the policy circulars and the Act. Teachers indicated that some heads do not circulate these policy documents they just file them.

Some teachers and education officers indicated that the education officers do not circulate these policy documents; instead they communicate the information verbally during the heads meetings and during school visits for inspection. Teachers argued that the word of mouth on issues of policy is not reliable and they have been receiving contradicting reports which have contributed to fluctuation in the implementation of the policy. However, some school heads argued that some teachers do not read the circulars when they come, they merely appendage their signatures to indicate that they have seen them.

The outright majority of the parents, including school development committee members in this district indicated that they have not seen or read the Zimbabwean Constitution or the Education Act. They indicated that they do not know whether they have language rights. They however, indicated that they met with the Constitution making outreach team and indicated the need for language equality and abolishment of the term minority languages in reference to their language. Officials from the Venda committee and other participants from outside the district argued that the

language-in-education policy does not provide an enabling policy environment for the promotion, development, teaching and learning of Venda. They argued that the policy still gives prominence to English, Ndebele and Shona.

Education officers in the district argued that the policy lacks clarity and indicated that there is need for conceptual and human skills development and training to help implementers understand what they are supposed to do. They indicated that the policy lacks clarity in terms of its stipulations with regards to the teaching of local languages and the access policy is vague. They also indicated that their visits to most schools revealed that both heads and teachers were ignorant of what they are supposed to do and how the languages are supposed to be taught and to whom.

5.10.2.10 Litigation

Some parents and teachers in the district indicated that parents are ignorant of the channels they can use to address language-related rights violations. Parents indicated that in addition to being illiterate themselves they are also led by illiterate school development committees and chiefs who do not know the Constitution and the Education Act and other policy documents that enshrine the language-in-education policy. They revealed that their leaders are also not aware of the litigation measures they can adopt and they have not been educated about such avenues that they can use to address language-related concerns. They said that although they have the desire to have their language in the curriculum, they do not know where to start and what to do.

> Lalapho esingakhalaza khona mina kakhulukhulu asilandlela enhlehle yokuthi khona when we find this kind of a problem. Where can we complain? (Interview, WS650327). (Even where we can express our grievances I personally really do not know. We do not have a clear channel of expressing our grievances when we find this kind of a problem. where can we complain?).
>
> Asikwazi ukuthi siqalise ngaphi (Interview, WS650329). (We do not know where to start).

5.10.2.11 Advocacy

The outright majority of the teachers, including locals in the district indicated that they do not know the Venda language committee. The few Venda speaking teachers who

indicated that they know the committee indicated that it used to exist, but they do not know whether it still exists. Teachers indicated that the committee has never visited them in the schools and heads indicated that they have not met it in their heads meetings. These teachers argued that lack of advocacy and lobbying by the committee and the speakers also contributed to the delay. They argued that there is no monitoring and coordinating body that is involved in mobilising and lobbying the community and other stakeholders, and as a result there is no push and pressure from below as is the case with the Tonga group. These teachers argued that the parents are not pushing for the teaching of their language; instead other language groups are the most vocal in opposing the teaching of Venda in areas that are linguistically mixed, especially in Beitbridge urban. They also indicated that most of the Venda speaking parents in some areas do not know that their children are supposed to learn Venda.

The outright majority of the parents in the district indicated that they do not know about the Venda language committee. Some were even adamant that such a committee does not exist. They indicated that the committee has never visited their communities and they had never seen or heard of anyone advocating or lobbying for the teaching of Venda. However, few parents indicated that they know about the committee, but like the teachers they revealed that they do not know whether it still exists. Some parents questioned the legitimacy, credibility and authority of the committee arguing that if it represents their interests why they were not involved when it was established and in the selection of the committee members. These parents argued that such a community should start at the grassroot level, involve the grassroots, embed itself in the community and draw its authority from the community.

> Vele ungaqalisa phansi ebantwini khonapha vele abakwazi khonokho ukuthi amakhomithi akhona. Ngobani abakhetha ikhomithi yonaleyo? Because the committee should not start from the ceiling isithi ebantwini yithi ikhomithi yakhona. Abantu khonapha phansi amakhomithi akhona abawazi…Amakhomithi ababebeleqiniso lokuthi bafuna isiVenda siphume sibili kumele…baqale phansi khonapha ebantwini…ikhomithi yakhona start from the community (Interview, WS650318). (If you ask people from the grassroots they do not know about these committees. Who elected that committee? Because the committee should not start from the ceiling saying to people we are the committee. People at the grassroot level do not know about these committees…The committees that are really committed to promoting Venda should…start right among the people at the grassroot…the committee should start from the community).

Given this description, the Venda committee along with the Kalanga association fit well among other associations of official minority language speakers described by an official from the Kalanga association as typically top-down, elitist and executive driven.

An official from the committee described the activities of the committee as on and off and an education officer in the district indicated that the committee is characterised by divisions that have put it into disrepute. According to the officer, unlike the Tonga committee, the Venda committee slackened when VETOKA collapsed while the Tonga committee soldiered on and continued with the struggle, and as a result the committee lost its momentum. The officer indicated that the committee is currently inactive and the majority of its members are no longer active members. Comparing the Venda committee with the Tonga committee some participants of the study indicated that for the association to reach where the Tongas are, it will need to be self-initiated, united, collective, organised, mobilised and involve the community as well as local power bases and build a strong unified force and push for the development, teaching and learning of the language.

5.10.2.12 Linguistic diversity

The linguistic heterogeneity of the district was also cited as another contributing factor to the delay in the teaching of Venda. Unlike the other districts, Beitbridge district was said to be housing the highest number of official minority languages and minority languages in addition to Shona and Ndebele. Education officers, teachers and parents in linguistically mixed communities in this district argued that linguistic heterogeneity in the composition of class and school population in the district pose serious challenges to the teaching and learning of Venda. Consequently, dominant language groups were said to be resisting the policy and some parents and teachers were even questioning the desirability of the 2002 policy in their contexts and expressing comfort and preference to continue with the *status quo*.

> Ungakhangela vele abantwana abanengi lapha asomaVenda…bahlangene, amaShona lamaNdebele so vele I think ukustikha kukhona lokhuyana okokuthi eMatabeleland South

> bekufundwani? – isiNdebele…akube yikho khonalokhuyana ngoba sekukhonfunza futhi abantwana… Mina kodwa bengibona kungcono ukuthi…bakhangele ukuthi esikolo lesikolo kuyabe kulemajority yabantwana kumbe abakhuluma ulimi bani…ukuthi bengadithemayina ukuthi khona isiVenda sifundiswe yini (Interview, WS650332). (If you check here, most of the children are not Venda…they are mixed they are, Shona and Ndebele so to stick to that practice that in Matabeleland South Ndebele was taught is best…let it continue like that because we are now even confusing the children…I personally think that it is better that…they identify in each school who are the majority and what language they speak…then they can determine whether Venda can be taught or not).

It emerged that the access policy of the policy development was not based on research as such challenges posed by linguistic heterogeneity and fragmentation was not planned for leading to challenges in the implementation process. Linguistic heterogeneity was also said to have eroded the ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness of the group and led to processes of language accommodation, shift and diglossia.

5.10.2.13 Ethnolinguistic vitality

5.10.2.13.1 Ownership / indigenisation and community support for language-political change

The outright majority of the participants of the study, including Venda speakers argued that lack of active community support, involvement, ownership and indigenisation of the promotion, development, teaching and learning of Venda by Venda speakers also contributed to the delay in the promotion, development, teaching and learning of Venda. These participants argued that the speakers have not shown the initiative themselves. They argued that Venda is actually downplayed by its speakers making the problem insurmountable. They expressed that the committee that is acting on their behalf is not embedded in the community and does not draw its authority from the community. They indicated that the committee has not mobilised, involved and engaged the community it represents such that ownership of the initiative is clearly not local.

Some speakers of Venda and other participants indicated that Venda speakers have developed a sense of surrender and passive acceptance of the language situation as immutable. These speakers expressed that the Venda speakers express comfort with *status quo*.

> At one time we were all Ndebele in Beitbridge…khathesi the majority ngamaShona so nxa sikhuluma lapha vele yisiShona (now the Shonas are the majority so when we communicate here we use Shona). So singabantu abadubekileyo. Sihlala silandela abanye emuva kuphela thina sisekhaya, emakhitshini angithi (So we are a troubled people. We are always following others while we are at home, right in our own kitchens you see)…So at times when you have a problem you end up accepting the problem despite the fact that you may not be comfortable. You say, ah akulandaba thina vele singathini (there is no problem what can we do) (Interview, WS650306).
>
> Lapha kukhuluma ibandla elikhulu. Its either uliNdebele or uliShona. Those are the two tribes…ukhona umuntu osirikhogunazayo?...Hanti thina safakwa eMatabeleland sahle sathiwa singamaNdebele. If saphiwa indawo kwathiwa yiSotholand or iVendaland ngathwa sikhuluma isiSotho kumbe isiVenda…Safoselwa ngoba satshelwa kwathiwa yiMatabeleland leMashonaland…sesizi-identifaya as people who are weak…best let's adjust to the most powerful nation next to us…we behave like the Ndebele and follow the Ndebele culture. If we were given that choice we were not supposed to behave like that (Interview, WS650335). (Here it's the big group that dominates. Its either you are Ndebele or Shona. Those are the two tribes…who recognises us?...We were classified under Matabeleland and called Ndebeles. If we were given a place called Sotholand or Vendaland we could be speaking Sotho or Venda…We were forced because we were told that its Matabeleland and Mashonaland…we now identify ourselves as weak people...).

Consequently, the initiative lacks the prerequisite community support for language-political change since a significant part of the community is not committed to the success of the policy development. The community is not an active agent and advocate for the policy. Venda speaking teachers and potential writers were blamed for not showing an interest and willingness to go an extra mile for their language.

5.10.2.13.2 Social status, ethnolinguistic awareness, linguistic nationalism, social and cultural character of the community

Lack of pride in Venda by Venda speakers was also cited by the majority of the participants as another contributing factor to the delay in the development, promotion, teaching and learning of Venda. Venda was said to be not the clearest sign of identity among most Venda speakers who fully identify themselves as Vendas. Venda speakers were said to be concealing their Venda identity and ashamed of their language. It emerged that most Venda speakers easily assimilate into other language groups and have low emotional attachment, pride, love and loyalty towards their language. Venda speakers indicated that when conversing with non-Venda speakers they are always the ones who shift and accommodate despite that they are in their district.

> Manje maVenda ka tinotoreka…anti murikuwa izvezvi tirikuyitaura Shona sekuti tirimaShona. Tirikuyirova…nenyaya yekuti tinobvuma kutoreka (Interview, WS650317). (We as Venda speakers we are easily taken in/ assimilated…as you can see right now we speak Shona as if we are Shona speakers. We are speaking it very well…because we accept being assimilated).

They also revealed that even in social gatherings and churches they sing Ndebele songs mostly, an indication of how they have been assimilated into the dominant group.

Participants of the study revealed that Venda is not viewed as an expression of individual and group identity and has not been significantly and meaningfully linked to a sense of distinctive identity among the Venda speakers. They indicated that Venda is not viewed as a strong core value of their community. Expansive and integrative language contact and cultural mingling with other language groups was said to have weakened the Vendas' ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness and diluted and eroded the Venda culture. Responses of some of the Venda speakers clearly reflect that the group does not fully recognise, appreciate and accept the value of its language and culture. It was revealed that due to language contact the group has failed to retain, promote and accentuate its unique ethnolinguistic identity and autonomy; instead it is accommodating, shifting and assimilating to the dominant groups. It emerged that due to the formidable, potentially threatening forces of expansive and integrative language contact as a result of huge immigration rates into this border district, the group has eroded and lost its ground and given in to different attempts to blur its identity.

> They (the Tonga people) like their culture kakhulu and enye into ingaba yicultural diversity okokuthi khona you find ukuthi eBinga ngale amaTonga basahlezi bebodwa ngesiTonga sabo okokuthi amacultures abo kakabi-influenced so kodwa ngapha eBeitbridge…they have eroded. So ukuthi nje ngingahlangana labakhuluma isiNdebele labantwabami bahle bakhulume isiNdebele. Ngingahlala labakhulumi isiShona labantwana…sebekhuluma isiShona…Okokuthi ah okwesiVenda kutshiyene njani lamanye amalanguages asisaboni ukuthi kungaba yiproblem…ngoba vele sivela emzini, emakhaya sihlezi lawo amaNdebele kumele babekwazi isiNdebele, abekwazi isiShona konke. But ngale basahlezi bodwa…thina sesibona engani yi-advantage ukuthi umntanami afunde isiNdebele. IsiVenda uzasifunda ekhaya (Interview, WS650313). (They (the Tonga people) like their culture very much and and the other thing is the issue of cultural diversity because you will find that the Tongas in Binga are still homogeneous as Tongas and their culture has not been influenced by other cultures, but here in Beitbridge…they have eroded. So if I live with Ndebele speakers my children automatically speak Ndebele. If I live with Shona speakers my children…automatically speak Shona…Such that we no longer see how different is the Venda way of life from that of other language groups and we no longer have a problem with this set up…because we come from the same houses, and in our homes we live

together with Ndebeles our children must be able to speak Ndebele and Shona. But that side (in Binga) they are are still homogeneous…we see it as an advantage for our children to learn Ndebele. They will learn Venda at home).

5.10.2.13.3 Emigration

The proximity of the Venda group to the South African border was also cited as another contributing factor to the low ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness of the Venda group. Apart from contributing to a reduction in the population size of Venda, emigration was cited by the outright majority of the participants as another contributing factor to the shortage of teachers. Venda speakers were said to drop-out of school for South Africa and the few trained Venda speaking teachers were said to be migrating in their numbers to South Africa leading to a vicious cycle of the shortage of teachers. Teachers and parents in the district revealed that the proximity of the district to the border has contributed to the low value attached to education and teaching as a profession. Teachers indicated that Venda speakers who dropped-out of school live better lives as such most of them are not attracted to the teaching profession.

5.10.2.13.4 Immigration, population size, concentration and proportion

The huge influx of other language groups into the district was cited as another major contributing factor of the low ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness of the Venda group. Given that Beitbridge is a border district, its economic influence was said to be attracting many people in search of better occupational and economic opportunities. Participants of the study indicated that due to high immigration patterns, Venda is highly ethnoculturally and ethnolinguistically threatened in two ways. Firstly, in that most Venda speakers have relinguified and secondly, Ndebele and Shona groups are importing and imposing their ‘integrative’ languages resulting in the erosion of Venda. Consequently, attempts to promote the teaching and learning of Venda were said to be strongly resisted by the immigrants, especially in the urban setting. It emerged that immigrants, particularly Shona speakers now constitute the outright majority in the district, especially in the urban centre.

The huge influx of other language groups was said to have led to language contact, accommodation, shift and diglossia. It was revealed that the high rates of immigration have further compounded the linguistic heterogeneity of the district further presenting serious challenges to the implementation of mother tongue education policies, especially in cases involving minority languages. Moreover, the huge immigration rates in the district were said to have affected the demographic factors of the district in terms of group distribution factors, i.e. concentration and proportion of Venda speakers compared to dominant groups and other language groups. Compounded by emigration these patterns were said to also have affected the group numbers factors of Venda, especially in terms of its population size.

The numerical inferiority of the group was cited as the basis for their exclusion and marginalisation. Unlike the Tongas, the Vendas were said to be linguistically mixed, making it very difficult to promote the teaching and learning of Venda and leading to cultural integration, erosion, diglossia, language accommodation and shift as well as low ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness.

> Maminor languages akawandisa …panemaTonga kuBinga panemalanguages mangani? AyisiTonga nanaNambya kana two, manje munomu Beitbridge paneSotho, pane vanhu vakawandisa veSotho yacho. PanemaShangani…maShona atovepo, vaPfumbi…Muno manyanya. Shangani, Pfumbi, Venda, Sotho, muKaranga vopinda vo…kudonserana kwacho kuda kunonyanya (Interview, WS650311). (There are many minority languages…In Binga where the Tongas live, how many languages are spoken there? Is it not Tonga and Nambya? Maybe two, but here in Beitbridge, there is Sotho, there are many Sotho speakers. There are Shangani speakers… Shona speakers are also there, Pfumbi speakers…This side it's too much. Shangani, Pfumbi, Venda, Sotho, the Shonas have also come in…maybe the conflicts are two many).

5.10.2.13.5 Marked bilingualism / multilingualism and communicative need

The bilingual and multilingual nature of the Venda community was said to be very pervasive and detrimental to the etholinguistic vitality and awareness of the Venda group. Unlike the Tonga, the Vendas were said to be more bilingual and multilingual which indicates lack of a communicative need in the form of Venda. It emerged that the bilingual and multilingual character of the Venda community is to its disadvantage since it is not the balanced type and the dominant groups were said to be unwilling and reluctant to learn Venda. Consequently, the rationale for using Venda was said

to be giving way to the advantage of using Shona and Ndebele as the 'integrative' languages. The bilingual and multilingual character of the Venda community is a potential threat to the development, promotion, teaching and learning of their language.

The bilingual and multilingual character of the Vendas leads to lack of a communicative need because Shona and or Ndebele seem to be the 'new common' languages such that Venda will be intended to be used only as a second language with bilingualism/multilingualism being the ideal. The bilingual and multilingual character of the group was also said to be promoting language accommodation, shift, diglossia and low ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness of the group. The participants of the study revealed that the bilingual and multilingual character of the Venda group is unstable and unbalanced between Venda and Ndebele and or Shona giving rise to a set of attitudes which are disastrous for the Vendas. Consequently, Shona and or Ndebele in all segments of life were said to be assuming the role of de facto languages of communication, which the Vendas claimed were truly indispensable and necessary for their survival.

5.10.2.13.6 Socio-historical status

Like the Kalanga group, the Venda group was also said to be affected by a negative past which left a legacy and an inferiority complex among Venda speakers. The domination and assimilation of the Venda group by the Ndebele state as *amahole* during the pre-colonial era was said to have affected the ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness of the Venda group as well. This historical past was said to have been further compounded by colonial and post colonial assimilationist educational policies and politics of language for nation building. Consequently, for the Venda group, the past offer demobilising symbols which make them to forget or hide their linguistic identity thereby diluting the vitality of the group as a distinctive and active collective group.

The entrenched linguistic hegemony of Ndebele and Shona and the politics of language for nation building were said to have weakened the ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness of the Venda group leading individuals to be ashamed of their language and to assimilate to dominant groups, resulting in poor rates of intergenerational transmission of the language. The socio-historical status of the group was said to have cultivated in them a sense of surrender and passive acceptance of the *status quo*, and hence the delay in the promotion, development, teaching and learning of Venda.

5.10.2.13.7 Formal institutional support and control factors: Educational status of Venda

Teachers and some participants of the study indicated that the poor representation of Venda speakers and other official minority language speakers in the ministry of education also affects the teaching and learning of Venda and other official minority languages. These participants indicated that right from the school level the head, the district education office up to the ministry, the group should have representatives who will bear the responsibility of ensuring the promotion, development, teaching and learning of the language. They argued that a non-native speaker will not have the same concern that a native speaker will have with regard to his/her language. They therefore argued for the need to have speakers of these languages who can assess and inspect their teaching.

Teachers and officials from outside the district argued that the delay in the implementation of the policy development is due to inadequate or lack of organisational structures in the ministry. For example, they referred to the fact that there were no language coordinators in the district education offices to enforce, monitor and supervise the teaching of Venda. They also argued that official minority language groups should have subject managers at the Curriculum Development Unit and Zimsec to ensure that they are fully accommodated in the system. They argued that lack of representation of these language groups reflects lack of political will to

accommodate them in the curriculum and to ensure they are taught like other subjects in the curriculum

The low status of Venda in the curriculum was also cited as another impediment to efforts of promoting its development, teaching and learning. Participants argued that the fact that the language is optional, not examined and not offered at secondary school level militate against efforts of promoting the development, teaching and learning of Venda. However, officials from other selected universities indicated that some Honours and Masters students in their departments have written research projects and dissertations in Venda. An official from the African Languages Research Institute indicated that Venda is one of the official minority languages which the institute included in its research activities since its establishment. However, the official indicated that nothing has been done in the language.

5.10.3 Causes of the delay in the teaching of Tonga

Table 21 shows the frequency of occurrence of the causes of the delay in the teaching of Tonga identified from the responses of the different participants of the study in Binga district and from outside this district. A tick against each cause and underneath the participants indicates that the concerned participants identified the cause as having contributed to the delay in the teaching of Tonga. This table is derived from the transcribed data gathered through semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions with teachers in Bulilima and Mangwe districts; parents in Bulilima and Mangwe districts; Kalanga language association; teachers in Beitbridge district, parents in Beitbridge district; Venda language committee; teachers in Binga district; parents in Binga district; Tonga language committee; education officers in Bulilima and Mangwe districts; education officers in Beitbridge district; education officers in Binga district; officials from ZILPA; officials from Silveria House; officials from Basilwizi Trust; officials from publishing houses; officials from CDU; officials from Zimsec; officials from selected universities; officials from selected teacher education colleges; an official from the department of teacher education and officials from the ministry of education, sport, arts and culture.

Table 23: Frequencies of occurrence of the causes of the delay in the teaching of Tonga

Causes	Participants																					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V
Teacher training, availability and Deployment							√	√	√				√	√			√	√		√		
Teachers' attitudes							√		√					√							√	
Availability of teaching materials							√	√	√			√		√	√		√	√		√	√	√
Funding								√						√		√	√			√		√
Political will							√	√	√				√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√	√
Linguistic hegemony and Politics of language							√	√						√	√		√	√		√	√	
Incentives							√	√				√		√	√		√	√		√		√
Collaboration, Consultation and Coordination between stakeholders							√									√	√	√		√		√
Legislation							√	√					√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√	√
Advocacy	√							√								√	√		√			
Community support for language-political change									√								√	√				
Formal institutional support factors								√						√	√		√			√		

Key: A–Teachers Bulilima and Mangwe Districts; B–Parents Bulilima and Mangwe Districts; C–Kalanga Language Association; D–Teachers Beitbridge District, E–Parents Beitbridge District; F–Venda Language Committee; G–Teachers Binga District; H–Parents Binga District; I–TOLACCO; J–Education Officers Bulilima and Mangwe Districts; K–Education Officers Beitbridge District; L–Education Officers Binga District; M–ZILPA Officials; N–Silveria House Officials; O–CDU Officials; P–Zimsec Officials; Q–University Officials; R–Teacher Education College Officials; S–Department of Teacher Education Official; T–Ministry of Education, Sport, Arts and Culture Officials; U–Basilwizi Trust; V–Publishers

5.10.3.1 Teacher training, availability and deployment

The outright majority of the participants in this district and from outside the district indicated that there are no teachers' training colleges and universities that offer training in Tonga. According to a media report, Tonga was recently introduced in the

Department of African Languages and Literature at the University of Zimbabwe (http://www.zbc.co.zw/news-categories/top-stories/24603-govt-recognises-minority-languages-vp-mujuru.html). Some participants argued that mere native competence is not an adequate attribute for teachers to teach in Tonga and to teach it as a subject. They argued that in addition to being native speakers, these teachers need to be equipped through training to properly teach in these languages and to teach them as subjects. Community members in this district expressed concern about the inaccessibility of adverts for the intakes from teacher training institutions. They argued that there is need for colleges to visit their communities to ensure information on intakes is well communicated, and communicated on time because *The Sunday Mail* and *The Sunday News* are inaccessible in their district.

The delay in the teaching of Tonga was also attributed to shortage of Tonga speaking teachers and poor policies of teacher deployment before. It emerged that the district was largely a temporary teacher district and was mainly staffed with teachers from outside the district who could not speak or understand Tonga. However, the staffing situation was said to have changed significantly such that in most schools in the district the outright majority of the teachers are Tonga speaking making it very easy to teach in Tonga and teach it as a subject. It also emerged that most of the temporary teachers are now drawn from the community making it easy to teach Tonga. Some teachers also indicated that lecturers from teacher colleges used to discourage teachers from doing their teaching practice in Binga citing the inaccessibility of the district as an excuse that would affect their supervision exercises. These teachers argued that this contributed to the shortage of Tonga speaking teachers in the district. Some teachers indicated that the government deploys teachers anywhere with the understanding that a teacher trained in Zimbabwe can teach anywhere.

5.10.3.2 Availability of teaching materials

The outright majority of the participants of the study also cited the delay in the production of adequate and a complete series of teaching materials as another

contributing factor to the delay of the teaching of Tonga. Lack of funding and experts in the language were cited as other contributing factors in the delay of the production of teaching materials. Despite the fact that Tonga is developed and taught up to university level in Zambia, it emerged that the government was initially opposed to the idea of cross-border collaboration in the development of teaching materials. The reluctance and unwillingness of publishers to publish in Tonga citing market viability problem was also cited as another contributing factor to the delay of the production of teaching materials. Publishers argued that they feared that the population size posed challenges in terms of market viability and the policy environment was not enabling and compelling to publish in Tonga before since Tonga was not examined.

Delays in the production of teaching materials were also attributed to the politics of language and linguistic hegemony in the country. The majority of the participants in the district indicated that there were fears that publishing in official minority languages; particularly in Matabeleland would threaten the market viability of Ndebele literature. The delay in the crafting and approval of the syllabus was also said to have contributed to the delay in the production of teaching materials. However, it was revealed that the Tonga group was the first language group to publish its teaching materials in 2008 without the support of the government. The declaration of the policy without supporting it with the necessary financial, human resource base and materials was interpreted by the majority of the participants as a sign of poor planning, organising, leading and lack of political will.

5.10.3.3 Political will

Lack of political will was cited by the outright majority of the participants as one of the major contributing factors to the delay in the development, teaching and learning of Tonga. These participants argued that lack of active political will and support on the part of the government then and lack of commitment and insincerity of some teachers, heads and education officers caused the delay. They argued that attempts to implement the policy developments were met with both covert and overt resistance and failure to fund and support the policy with the prerequisite human resource base

and technical skills. They also expressed that the government did not consider the financial, material and human resource implications of the policy prior to the policy. Consequently, these participants concluded that the government then was merely paying lip-service to the reform initiative and this discouraged the stakeholders involved in policy implementation. They indicated that the political will expressed by the government then to the policy development was not matched by corresponding action in the implementation sites.

The outright majority of the participants argued that the policy was mainly declared for political expediency to appease the electorate and win votes on the eve of the decisive presidential elections when their support was contested by the then ruling party and opposition party. These participants argued that the government did not give in whole-heartedly, instead its aim was to silence the language groups and gunner their votes. However, the current minister of education was credited for showing commitment and practical steps towards ensuring the successful development, teaching and learning of the official minority languages. Teachers and parents and other participants in the community expressed that with the visibility of the current minister in their district, following-up on the implementation and securing funding through his ETF programme, the promotion, development, teaching and learning of official minority languages will improve.

5.10.3.4 Politics of language and linguistic hegemony

Parents in this community argued that their district is the most marginalised and excluded by government. They argued that the minority language status of their language has its roots in their small population size. They described their district as ‘Binga the forgotten land’ and as a district that survives mainly from donor rather than government support. The outright majority of the participants in this district and from outside argued that the politics of language and linguistic hegemony in the country also account for the delay in the teaching of Tonga and other official minority languages. These participants argued that apart from reflecting lack of political will, the minority language status of Tonga and other official minority languages is a clear

reflection of the politics of language, which serve the nationalist ideology of national building and attempts to protect and entrench Ndebele hegemony in Matabeleland.

They argued that the division of the country's provinces along Ndebele and Shona, and the compulsory teaching of Ndebele and Shona are attempts of the government to promote nation building, cohesion and unity through forced assimilation into the dominant groups. They revealed that their incorporation into Matabeleland was a politically engineered decision to eliminate them and create the majority, the Ndebele through assimilation of smaller groups. Participants in this district and from outside the district argued that the government feared that the promotion, development, teaching and learning of Tonga and other official minority languages was going to foster division and tribalism and also undermine Ndebele hegemony. These participants argued for the need to ensure language equality and the development of inclusive language policies that treat all languages equal instead of policies and practices that promote and entrench exclusivity and supremacy of Ndebele and Shona.

5.10.3.5 Legislation

Like in the previous three districts, the outright majority of teachers in this district indicated that they have not seen or read the policy circulars that promote the teaching of Tonga and the Education Act. They argued that these policy documents are poorly disseminated and inaccessible to them as teachers. Consequently, the poor coordination of policy documents and pronouncements was cited as one other major cause of the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development. Participants of the study indicated that lack of clarity about the objectives and stipulations of the policy documents and how they should be implemented was another contributing factor to the delay in the teaching of Tonga. Teachers and other participants indicated that this generates resistance and reduce the capacity of the teachers to implement the policy developments competently, efficiently and accordingly.

Inconsistencies and contradictions in the policy documents with regards to the teaching of local languages were also cited as another contributing factor to the delay and causes of fluctuation in policy implementation. These inconsistencies and contradictions were cited as sources of confusions which are a result of verbal communication of policy developments. Teachers in this district indicated that they rely mainly on verbal communication and policy issues are brought to their attention when a problem arises and most of them are ignorant about the stipulations of these policy documents. They indicated that they are currently faced with two contradicting positions which have put them on the spotlight. One position states that all local languages are optional and the other indicates that Ndebele and Shona are compulsory and official minority languages should be taught in addition to Ndebele or Shona. As a result, they expressed that they are currently torn-in between these contradicting views.

The outright majority of the parents, including school development committees in this district indicated that they are not aware of the stipulations of the Education Act and the Constitution of Zimbabwe. Some indicated that they do not see how the Constitution protects them and their language. The outright majority of these parents indicated that they however, met the Constitution making outreach team and presented their request for autonomy from Matabeleland because they are not Ndebeles. Most of the parents and teachers indicated that they came to know of the 2002 policy development through advocacy activities of the Tonga language committee and from their traditional and political leaders in ward meetings as well as from the current minister of education who visited their district after assuming duty.

Some of the participants expressed that the language-in-education policy documents do not promote the official minority languages, instead they give prominence to Ndebele and Shona entrench and promote Ndebele and Shona hegemony. They argued that this defeats the whole purpose of promoting the development, teaching and learning of these languages.

5.10.3.6 Incentives

It emerged that the non-teaching and learning of Tonga beyond primary school level generated mixed feelings among parents and teachers. It was revealed that some parents were not initially enthusiastic about the development fearing that since Tonga is not taught at secondary school level what will happen to their children who would have learnt only Tonga at primary school. The uncertain future of Tonga beyond primary school level forced implementers and education officers to adopt a less head-on approach to the teaching and learning of Tonga, and as a result this was said to have slowed the pace of the implementation process. Moreover, the non-examination of Tonga before 2011 was also said to have not motivated publishers to publish more literature in the language.

5.10.3.7 Teachers' attitudes and resistance

Some participants and teachers revealed that the policy was met with resistance from the teachers and school heads, particularly those from other language groups. The root cause of this resistance was linked to the politics of language and linguistic hegemony. It emerged that the policy was resisted because of the conflict of interest among teachers from the dominant groups. It was revealed that these teachers feared that this would undermine the hegemony of their languages. Some teachers argued that this resistance was due to the feeling that they felt unfairly overloaded together with their pupils because unlike the other districts, they were forced to teach three languages. They argued that the load did not match the remunerations since they were now teaching an extra subject which teachers in other districts did not teach.

5.10.3.8 Consultation

Some teachers argued that lack of consultation is also another source of resistance of the policy. These teachers indicated that the imposition of policies without consultation does not promote ownership and indigenisation of the policy, hence the feeling that the policy is a burden or overload despite it being a well-intentioned

policy that can enhance the pupils' academic achievement and acquisition of other languages used in the curriculum.

5.10.3.9 Informal institutional support and control factors: Advocacy

Some parents in the district argued that they did not have educated people who could lobby and advocate for the policy before hence the delay in the teaching of Tonga. They however, indicated that with an increase in the number of educated Tonga speakers and the support of chiefs, their political representatives and non-governmental organizations, the group has managed to exert great pressure on the government leading to the introduction and examination of their language at grade 7. Some parents in the district and other participants, including an official from the ministry of higher education argued that the language associations were not exerting much pressure on the government since bureaucracies need a constant reminder to act, especially given that the government is reactionary in the delivery of service. These participants argued that the language associations and committees of the official minority language groups took a back seat after the declaration of the policy only to be awakened later by the unchanging *status quo*.

> The Tonga, Shangani people haven't been lobbying enough…If they were lobbying as much as they were recently doing from the conferences and workshops I have attended I think we could be at another stage (Interview, WS650090).

> I don't know whether, for example the Tonga, do they have an association? You see, nobody is very much aware of these things. Why they don't always make themselves visible so that at least when things are being discussed you remember now that there is this thing (Interview, WS650303).

5.10.3.10 Ethnolinguistic vitality

5.10.3.10.1 Ownership/ indigenisation and community support for language-political change

An official from the Tonga language committee indicated that initial resistance of the policy by some speakers of the official minority languages including Tonga speakers also delayed the implementation of the policy development. The official argued that the lack of the requisite community support for language-political change from below

in the initial stage was largely due to the long damage inflicted on these groups which had cultivated a sense of doubt about the success of the change of the *status quo*.

Some officials from selected universities and teacher education colleges argued that the reigning language ideology of some of the official minority language groups may be useful in explaining the delay in the teaching of their languages, especially given that the policy is as a result of a bottom-up approach to language planning. These officials argued that some official minority language speakers' perception of the meaning, view and role of their languages has been affected by the *status quo* leading to low emotional and functional investment in their own languages.

5.10.3.10.2 Formal institutional support and control factors: Educational status of Tonga

The non-teaching and learning of Tonga at teritiary level was cited as another cause of the delay in the teaching of Tonga. However, officials from the selected university indicated that although the language is not offered in their Departments they are students at Undergraduate, Honours, Masters and Doctoral levels who have written assignments, dossiers, research projects, dissertations and theses focusing on Tonga. Despite being one of the official minority languages which the ALRI included in its research activities, officials from the institute indicated that nothing has been done in Tonga. It emerged that research activities of the institute have mainly focused on the two national languages, Ndebele and Shona, and very little has been done in official minority languages even after the 2002 policy development. The official from the institute revealed that research activities in official minority languages are at a standstill except for the Shangani project, and some are at the verge of being aborted due to financial constraints and shortage of language experts.

Lack of representation of the Tonga group across the levels of decision making in the educational hierarchy was cited as another factor that contributed to the initial delay in the implementation of the policy. Some participants argued that the decision makers are not speakers of the affected official minority languages and they always

protect and promote the interests of their own language, especially the dominant Ndebele and Shona groups.

5.11 Why Tonga first?

Table 22 shows the frequencies of occurrence of the factors and conditions that contributed to the success story of Tonga as cited by the different participants of the study. A tick against each factor and condition and underneath the participants indicates that the concerned participants identified the factor and condition as having contributed to the success story of Tonga. This table is derived from the transcribed data gathered through semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions with teachers in Bulilima and Mangwe districts; parents in Bulilima and Mangwe districts; Kalanga language association; teachers in Beitbridge district, parents in Beitbridge district; Venda language committee; teachers in Binga district; parents in Binga district; Tonga language committee; education officers in Bulilima and Mangwe districts; education officers in Beitbridge district; education officers in Binga district; officials from ZILPA; officials from Silveria House; officials from Basilwizi Trust; officials from publishing houses; officials from CDU; officials from Zimsec; officials from selected universities; officials from selected teacher education colleges; an official from the department of teacher education; officials from the ministry of education, sport, arts and culture; teachers in Hwange district; parents in Hwange district; officials from the Nambya language and cultural association; education officers from Hwange district; education officers from Chiredzi district and officials from the Shangani language and cultural association.

Table 24: Frequencies of occurrence of the factors and conditions for the success story of Tonga

Factors & Conditions	**Participants**																											
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	1	2
Teacher Training, Availability and Deployment			√	√			√	√				√						√			√		√	√	√			
Availability of teaching materials		√	√				√	√		√	√	√		√	√		√			√	√	√	√	√	√	√		
Donor support	√		√			√	√	√	√			√		√			√	√			√	√	√	√		√		
Population size				√			√	√	√					√								√			√			
Concentration, proportion, & Linguistic homogeneity	√			√			√			√	√	√		√						√				√	√	√		
Elite support, Formal Institutional Control Factors	√		√	√			√	√	√		√	√		√			√			√	√			√	√			
Socio-historical status			√				√	√																				
Bilingualism & Communicative Need	√	√		√			√		√	√														√	√	√		
Exogamy/ Mixed marriages																								√	√			
Long history of Tonga in the curriculum	√						√																	√		√		
Advocacy/ Informal Institutional Support	√			√	√		√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√		√			√	√			√	√		√	

Factors																											
Ownership/ Indigenisation, Community support for language-political change	√			√			√	√	√	√	√	√		√			√			√	√		√	√	√		√	
Social Status, Ethno-linguistic awareness, Social & Cultural character of the community	√			√			√	√	√			√								√	√		√	√	√			
Linguistic/ Ethnic nationalism							√	√	√											√	√				√			

Key: A–Teachers Bulilima and Mangwe Districts; B–Parents Bulilima and Mangwe Districts; C–Kalanga Language Association; D–Teachers Beitbridge District, E–Parents Beitbridge District; F–Venda Language Committee; G–Teachers Binga District; H–Parents Binga District; I–TOLACCO; J–Education Officers Bulilima and Mangwe Districts; K–Education Officers Beitbridge District; L–Education Officers Binga District; M–ZILPA Officials; N–Silveria House Officials; O–CDU Officials; P–Zimsec Officials; Q–University Officials; R–Teacher Education College Officials; S–Department of Teacher Education Official; T–Ministry of Education, Sport, Arts and Culture Officials; U–Basilwizi Trust; V–Education Officers Hwange District; W–Education Officers Chiredzi District; X–Teachers Hwange District; Y–Parents Hwange District; Z–Nambya Language and Cultural Association; 1–Shangani Language and Cultural Association; 2–Publishers

Native and non-native speakers of Tonga, within and outside the district attributed the success story of Tonga to the availability of Tonga speaking teachers, availability of teaching materials, donor or external support, large population size of the group, linguistic homogeneity of the district, availability of a communicative need, elite support, socio-historical status of the group, the long history of Tonga in the curriculum, strong advocacy, community support for language-political change, ethnolinguistic awareness of the group, linguistic and ethnic nationalism, positive social and cultural character of the group.

5.11.1 Teacher training, availability and deployment

The outright majority of the participants attributed the success story of Tonga to the availability of Tonga speaking teachers in the district. These participants indicated that unlike the other districts, Binga is well staffed with Tonga speaking heads and teachers and this made it easy to teach in Tonga and teach it as a subject since the outright majority of the teachers in the district are native speakers of the language. The availability of Tonga speaking teachers was said to have made it easy for these teachers to improvise teaching materials before the publication of a full series of Tonga primary school textbooks. It also made it easy for these teachers to also teach other subjects in Tonga in addition to teaching it as a subject and in so doing entrenching it in the curriculum.

Most participants of the study indicated that unlike the other districts, Binga district was said to be strict and selective in the recruitment of both qualified and temporary teachers. It emerged that Binga district prioritise teachers who can speak and understand Tonga during recruitments.

> …in Binga yes we made sure that now we don't have a teacher who is trained or who went to college to learn how to teach Tonga we needed speakers of Tonga just to start up…so in Binga it wasn't difficult because Binga it's a temporary teacher district so temporary teachers are mainly children of Tonga…we encourage Binga children to go back to Binga after training (Interview, WS650109).

It was revealed that these recruitment strategies were as a result of the community's withdrawal of children from school after the district office at some point recruited non-Tonga speakers. As a result, the outright majority of the teachers and heads in the district are locals who can teach in the language and speak the language. Unlike the other districts, Binga district was said to have been shunned by most qualified teachers because of its remoteness and malaria problem.

In view of this problem, non-governmental organisations such as Save the Children and BIDA (Binga Development Association) were also said to have played a key role in improving the staffing situation in Binga. It emerged that these donor organisations embarked on building houses and improving living conditions for teachers and drilling

boreholes to attract teachers. These organisations were also said to have provided carefully monitored scholarships for Tonga speakers who wanted to train as teachers and ensured that they were deployed back in their district after graduation.

It was also revealed that unlike in the other districts, there is a huge uptake and enrolment from Tonga speakers in teacher colleges. Participants indicated that Tonga speakers now value education and are enrolling in their numbers in teacher training institutions and universities to promote the development of their district. All this was said to have facilitated the success of teaching Tonga.

5.11.2 Availability of teaching materials

The outright majority of the participants indicated that Tonga was the first to be examined because they received their teaching materials earlier than other language groups. It emerged that the Tonga group was the first to publish its teaching materials long before the government's ETF. The early publication of their textbooks was attributed to donor support, elite support and the keen interest of the teachers and other Tonga speakers to see more publications in their language. It was revealed that Tonga writers sacrificially gave their time and resources during the writing process and were not looking forward to payment. The passion for the language was said to have been the major driving force. Comparing Tonga writers with Venda writers, an education officer in Beitbridge indicated that in their case they did not have people who were ready and willing to write. Instead the few writers who were there demanded payment.

It also emerged that despite the fact that Tonga has many dialects, dialectical variations were not an issue. Instead these were accommodated as long as consistency was maintained and they were polished along the way. Unlike in the other groups, dialectical variations were not a source of division and delay. Teachers indicated that they validate the different dialectical variations that their children speak as long as they maintain consistency. They argued that this promotes an inclusive learning environment and enriches the language. Both Tonga and non-Tonga

speakers did not rule out the added advantage that Tonga is developed and taught up to tertiary level in Zambia. They acknowledged that this facilitated the easy development of teaching materials unlike in cases where the other language groups like Kalanga and Nambya had nowhere to start from or to take a leaf from. However, it emerged that this advantage was not immediately explored since the government was initially opposed to the idea of cross-border initiatives.

External and donor support was also said to have made it possible for the Tonga group to be the first to publish their teaching materials. Unlike the other groups, the Tonga group was said to have received funding from donors and community-based organisations such as Basilwizi Trust, a local non-governmental organisation of the Tonga group which made it possible for them to publish their materials early. It was also revealed that they also had a contact in the publishing house from their group who facilitated the publication of their books when minority languages were deemed less viable by most publishers. Elite support in the production of teaching materials was also said to have speeded up the whole process leading to the publication of the books early, and consequently leading to the success story of Tonga. The dedication, aggressiveness and organisation of the Tonga language committee was also said to have contributed to the early publication of their books leading to the success story of Tonga.

Moreover, it was revealed that unlike the other language groups, Tonga already had a variety of teaching materials. It emerged that before the publication of the current series, donor organisations like USAID, BIDA, Save the Children assisted in the production of earlier publications such as, *Buka Mwana*, *Yenda* and *Chijaana*. Some of the teaching materials which were there before were said to have been imported from Zambia.

5.11.3 Donor and external support

The outright majority of the participants attributed the success story of Tonga to donor and external support and funding. These participants argued that unlike the

other language groups, the Tonga group enjoyed unprecedented donor support and funding which led to the availability of teaching materials, teachers and ensured that advocacy and lobbying and community mobilisation was spread to all the corners of the district and other key stakeholders. The donors were said to have provided funding, expertise and consultation and facilitated litigation, participatory action research, community mobilisation, development communication, advocacy and dialogical intervention strategies targeting the community, policy makers, local power bases and other key stakeholders. The marginality and underdevelopment of Binga was said to have attracted the donor community leading to the inclusion of the language issue among other developmental priorities which the donors funded.

Tonga speakers acknowledged the key role that the donor community played, but they argued that it was not *manna* from heaven. They indicated that the donor community was motivated by their commitment, dedication and ownership of the initiative. They also argued that donor support came as a result of good collaboration, negotiation and networking on their part. They expressed that if ownership was not clearly local, no matter how well funded the initiative was, it was not going to bear the desired outcomes which they have seen. These participants further argued that they were not looking up to the donors for all the things to be done, instead they also had a higher affective stake and deep emotional attachment in the promotion, development, teaching and learning of their language. They expressed that in as much as the donors played a crucial role; the initiative was internally motivated and perpetuated. Donor support came in when they showed an attempt to develop, promote, teach and learn their language.

Apart from the donor community, Christian organisations such as the Roman Catholics were also said to have played a key role in research, civic education, advocacy, participatory action research, development communication, litigation and dialogical intervention strategies. Some of these activities culminated in the production of a book by a Roman Catholic Father titled, *The People of the Great River: The Tonga Hoped the Water would follow them*. It emerged that the book sowed a seed of empowerment and raised a much louder, clearer and more unified

voice of the Tonga which attracted more donors who funded and supported the promotion, development, teaching and learning of Tonga. The book and the activities of the donors provided a platform for the deployment of development communication, participatory action research, indigenisation and dialogical intervention strategies.

5.11.4 Ethnolinguistic vitality

The outright majority of the participants of the study attributed the success story of Tonga to the group's high ethnolinguistic vitality in terms of its social status, socio-historical status, large population size, concentration, proportion, favourable language retention rates in mixed marriages and institutional support and control factors in terms of formal and informal representation. Most participants of the study indicated that unlike the other language groups, the Tonga group exhibits a positive social and cultural character, heightened ethnolinguistic awareness and ethnic and linguistic nationalism. Community support for language-political change was also cited by many participants of the study as another driving force in the success story of the Tonga. The less bilingual character of the Tonga community was also cited as another factor which contributed to their success story because it entailed the group had a communicative need.

5.11.4.1 Absolute numbers

Most participants of the study cited the large population size of the Tonga group as another possible factor that can be used to account for their success story. These participants indicated that Tonga is probably the third if not the second largest group in Zimbabwe. They argued that speaker number counts and carries weight in the national scheme of things. They indicated that apart from conferring security and ensuring the ethnolinguistic vitality of the group, large population sizes also entail priority of attention and preferential treatment in the national scheme of things and to the ministry of education, publishers, and examination bodies as well as to politicians. Large population sizes for publishers guarantee market viability and attract publishers while small sizes are less attractive to commercial publishers. It emerged that

Zimbabwe Publishing House might have been among other things been persuaded to publish in Tonga because of the large population size of the group.

> They found an ear that was more willing to listen from ZPH…the Tonga of all the ethnic minorities are the ones who have a larger population…ZPH actually took advantage of the numbers of the Tonga kuti (that) okay lets have the Tonga first in terms of the market they maybe the second or third largest population… (Interview, WS650104).

To politicians population size plays a legitimate role in determining the demands that a language group can make on the state. Some participants of the study described Binga as a 'red zone' and Uzvimbamarambapfungwa for MDC. Uzvimbamarambapfungwa is a stronghold constituency for ZANU-PF, which in most elections has had the highest votes for ZANU-PF. These participants argued that given the large population size of Binga constituency political parties are trying their level best to win their support and they go out of their way to support their initiatives in the quest to gunner votes.

> Binga is called a red zone where its called Uzvimbamarambapfungwa for MDC…its just like an issue of proposing love kunkazana (to a girl) you have to find ways of winning the girl…You set a worm (Interview, WS650201).

This attribute of Binga was said to have helped in mobilising resources for the development of Tonga and also in creating an enabling environment for the thriving of Tonga. For the examining body like Zimsec that gets very little or no state subsidy in running public examinations, largeness of language speaker numbers mean a viable group that can sustain the costs of running an examination in it. An official from Zimsec argued that running examinations in the official minority languages comes as an extra burden, especially given that they are not state funded. Possibly, the examination of Tonga as an optional alongside Ndebele and Shona subject is an indication that the body is guaranteed that the population size of the group can cover and sustain the costs of running an examination in it.

5.11.4.2 Concentration and proportion of the group and linguistic homogeneity

The outright majority of the participants indicated that unlike the other districts, Binga district is largely linguistically homogeneous and this made it very easy to implement

and operationalise mother tongue education in Tonga and to teach it as a subject. They argued that linguistic homogeneity in the composition of the class and school population in Binga facilitated the easy implementation of mother tongue education because most of the children are largely monolingual when they begin school. Consequently, the policy was said to have been most urgently needed and mostly easily operationalised in the district. They also argued that due to the largely linguistically homogeneous nature of the district, the initiative was not resisted by the other language groups as was the case in some district since in Binga the other groups are a minority. Even the urban centre was said to be predominantly Tonga speaking, which is not the case with urban centres of other districts where official minority languages are spoken. It emerged that even in cases where classes are linguistically mixed the Tonga group still constitute the majority and this works to their advantage in the teaching of Tonga.

These participants also argued that the linguistic homogeneity of the district also ensured the ethnolinguistic vitality of the group which in turn promotes and heighten its ethnolinguistic awareness and preserve its positive social and cultural character which are all essential ingredients for effective and successful bottom-up approaches to language-political change. They argued that unlike the other language groups, the Tonga group is geographically well-defined in Binga district and there has not been much interaction with other ethnic groups which unfortunately led to expansive and integrative language contact, language accommodation, shift, diglossia and diluted and weakened the ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness of the other language groups and fostered a negative social and cultural character which is unhealthy for successful and effective bottom-up language-political change. The largely homogeneous nature of the district was attributed to its socio-historical status, remoteness and its being a malaria prone area that does not attract outsiders.

5.11.4.3 Bilingualism and communicative need

Most participants of the study indicated that unlike the other language groups, Tonga speakers are less bilingual. This was also confirmed during the research because of

all the six groups, this was the only group where group discussions were conducted through an interpreter. The other groups interacted in Ndebele and or Shona. Participants of the study indicated that the largely monolingual nature of the group means that the promotion, development, teaching and learning of Tonga is driven among other things by a genuine communicative need for this group. These participants argued that in as much as Tonga speakers can speak Ndebele, it is an uphill task for them because they cannot speak it fluently. They argued that the bilingual nature of other groups cultivated a feeling of comfort and passive acceptance of the *status quo*.

> It depends, if you are six being affected by the same thing the degree of your feeling differs so maybe those from the Kalanga they are comfortable with other language; those from Venda they are comfortable to be associated. Particularly in Binga we are not comfortable to be associated with the Ndebele thus why we fought hard…we want identity; we want our culture (Interview, WS650179).

> What I think is the biggest undoing for the other languages is that our brothers and sisters in those languages seem to accept assimilation into other languages…for them learning Ndebele makes no difference from learning Kalanga and because of that attitude they would not move fast. In Binga or in the Zambezi Valley it's quite different…I think that realisation and arrangement has helped us to make quick impact and move faster…last week we were launching the Shangani syllabuses and books. The majority of those people and even the speeches that were given were given in Shona and yet you are saying you want to learn your language and you are still giving Shona speeches...some of our fellow languages they are easily assimilated into other ethnic groups and for that reason they are not moving fast (Interview, WS650110).

On the other hand, Tonga speakers expressed discomfort with Ndebele which entails that among other things they have a communicative need. The group has not accepted Ndebele as their common 'new' language such that the promotion of Tonga is not intended for use as a second language. It emerged that unlike in other districts where official minority languages are spoken, in Binga Tonga is integral to everyday life. Consequently, it was said that its speakers exhibit pride in Tonga and speak it by preference in both rural and urban areas. In this regard, Tonga seems to be promoted to fill a communicative vacuum because the Tongas seem uncomfortable and uneasy with expressing themselves in Ndebele. Yet, on the other hand, other groups expressed and demonstrated comfort and competence in Ndebele and or Shona.

According to officials from advocacy groups that have worked with the six language groups most Venda, Kalanga, Sotho, Shangani and Nambya speakers were said to be unable to speak their mother tongues, and to be very comfortable with Ndebele and or Shona. As a result, these groups lack a communicative need in the form of these languages.

5.11.4.4 Exogamy/ mixed marriages

Nambya speakers are the closest neighbours of the Tonga group in Binga and they indicated that language retention rates in mixed marriages between them and the Tonga group are more favourable to the Tonga group. As a result, they indicated that this has strengthened the group vitality of the Tonga group while weakening theirs. In this regard, the strong vitality of the Tonga which partly derives from exogamy was said to have played a part in their success story. One possible explanation for the favourable language retention rates among the Tonga is that they are a matrilineal society.

5.11.4.5 Formal institutional support and control factors: Elite support

The majority of the participants also indicated that the success story of Tonga can also be attributed to elite support. These participants argued that unlike the other groups, the Tonga group enjoyed unprecedented support from their elite in strategic and influential positions. The elites from the district were said to be very supportive and involved in the development, promotion, teaching and learning of Tonga. It emerged that unlike the elites from the other groups, elites from the Tonga group exhibit a heightened sense of responsibility and ownership of the welfare, promotion, development, teaching and learning of their language. They were said to be demonstrating strong commitment to the initiative by mobilising each other and their resources and deploying their skills to ensure the success of the policy development.

> They found an ear that was more willing to listen from ZPH…the Tonga of all the ethnic minorities are the ones who have a larger population…ZPH actually took advantage of the numbers of the Tonga kuti (that) okay lets have the Tonga first in terms of the market they maybe the second or third largest population… at ZPH also the executive chairman also happens to be

> Tonga…although he cannot speak it, but he says I think I will rest when I feel I have contributed to my people (Interview, WS650104).

> Its support from the community itself; Tongas are self-initiated; they want their language to grow and be used just as Ndebele and Shona…it's a collective initiative by the community, starting from the chiefs, the politicians that belong to that community…for other marginalised languages to go the way Tonga has gone…they have to organise themselves as a community and fight for their rights (Interview, WS650115).

These participants also indicated that one of the community-based organisations, Basilwizi Trust, which funds the initiative, is managed by the local elite who prioritise the language issue in their activities.

It was revealed that unlike the other groups, the Tonga group has effective leadership, Tonga intellectuals, elites and activists who successfully mobilised and conscientised Tonga speakers and other key stakeholders to support the promotion, development, teaching and learning of Tonga. Most participants also attributed the success story of Tonga to the fact that the initiative was founded and based on collaborative, coordinated and cooperative networks with the local traditional and political power bases. Their committee was said to be composed of influential members of the community, educators, traditional leaders, members of the elite and community members as well. Interactions with some participants and ministry officials indicated that the traditional leaders from the district are at the forefront and have had several meetings with ministry officials which have seen the generation of a number of position papers between the two parties.

Binga district was also said to have the biggest number of chiefs and this was said to have amplified their voices. Unlike the other language committees and associations, the Tonga language committee was said to owe its success to the fact that its activities were founded, supported and endorsed by the traditional and political authorities of the district.

5.11.4.6 Long history of Tonga in the curriculum

Some participants of the study indicated that unlike the other languages, Tonga has been in the curriculum for quite some time, hence its success story. These

participants argued that when the policy development came, Tonga was already in the curriculum while other languages came into the curriculum after the policy development. Tonga and non-Tonga speakers indicated that despite the fact that Tonga was not examined at grade 7, it was taught and teachers already had some teaching materials to use. These participants indicated that when the 2002 policy development was declared the other languages were not taught up to grade 3 as the ministry indicated in the *Secretary' Circular Number 1 of 2002*. They argued that for Tonga it was just a matter of continuing from what was already there, hence facilitating the process.

5.11.4.7 Socio-historical status

Some participants argued that the history of the Tonga group offer strong mobilising symbols that lead them to take pride in their language thereby promoting their ethnolinguistic vitality. They argued that unlike the Sotho, Venda and Kalanga groups, the Tonga group pride itself in its resistance to and avoidance of Ndebele raiding and conquest in the 19th century. Unlike the other groups, the Tongas were not subjected to Ndebele dominion which weakened and diluted the ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness of the conquered groups and led to language accommodation, shift and diglossia. The history of the Tonga group was said to have also led to the largely linguistically homogeneous nature of the district. These participants argued that in as much as the Tonga group like the other groups was subjected to colonial and post colonial assimilationist and subtractive bilingual educational policies and politics of language embedded in the nationalist ideology, it stubbornly stuck to its language because of its pride in its language. Their history of advocacy for the introduction of Tonga was said to be dating back to the early days of the banning of Tonga during the colonial era.

It emerged that right from the pre-colonial era to the post colonial era they have and are resisting every attempt to assimilate them. Their history was therefore said to inspire them to bind together as a group and defend their identity which is embedded in the language.

5.11.4.8 Advocacy, indigenisation and community support for language-political change

The outright majority of the participants from Binga and outside attributed the success story of Tonga to the Tonga speakers' high emotional, intellectual and functional investment in their language. These participants argued that the success story of Tonga was derived from the speakers' high loyalty stake in their language. They argued that the success story of Tonga was as a result of the active support, deep involvement and participation of the speakers in the initiative. They indicated that in Binga, the initiative was internally motivated and perpetuated, and ownership of the initiative was clearly local. These participants argued that unlike the other groups, the Tonga group has a high affective stake and deep emotional investment in the promotion, development, survival, teaching and learning of Tonga.

Most participants indicated that, unlike in the other groups, the promotion, development and teaching of Tonga in Binga was an organised and collective initiative by the community, traditional leaders, the elite and politicians in the district. Some participants described the Tonga group as clearly the best organised and mobilised group. They indicated that the Tonga language committee and its community were more self-motivated, focused, united, passionate, vocal, hardworking, forceful, aggressive, dedicated, determined, persistent, unwavering and committed. Unlike the other language committees and associations, the Tonga committee was said to have mobilised and involved the grassroots to take ownership of the initiative.

> We have heard that Tonga has a very sound association spear-heading the growth and development of Tonga…If you look at Tonga I have heard that the reason why Tonga is now being examined at grade 7 is because of the association which is very aggressive (Interview, WS650100).
>
> …one of the reasons Tonga was the first to be examined is because the Tonga community was well-organised and they ensured the textbooks were written and printed…The Tonga people were clearly the best organised and mobilised (Interview, WS650346).

Participants referred to cases where the Tonga community demonstrated its support for language-political change, for example by withdrawing their children from school

when the education officers recruited and deployed Ndebele and Shona speaking teachers in the district.

These participants argued that unlike the other language groups, the committee that represented the Tonga group established collaborative, coordinated and cooperative networks with various stakeholders through advocacy and community engagement leading to the success story of Tonga. The Tonga language committee was described as ‘a brain-child of the chiefs and a dream of the grassroots’, an indication that it was a grassroots initiative that had legitimacy and authority in the eyes of the broader community. It emerged that the Tonga initiative incorporated the participation of the grassroots, the meso and macro level participants; a link which seems to be missing in the other language groups.

5.11.4.9 Social status, ethnolinguistic awareness, social and cultural character of the community

The outright majority of the participants also attributed the success story of Tonga to the Tonga speakers’ pride in their language and culture. It was revealed that unlike the other official minority language speaker, Tonga speakers attach a strong value to their language and have a strongly developed sense of language loyalty. These participants indicated that unlike the other groups, the Tonga group has a vibrant language and culture which are consciously promoted into prominence by its speakers. They argued that unlike the other groups, both the old and young generations among the Tonga group in Binga are eager to use and be associated with their language. This also emerged from the learners’ questionnaire where Tonga was the most preferred local language as medium of instruction in the district.

It emerged that Tonga is a strong core value in Tonga culture, and its promotion, development, teaching and learning is seen as a way of maintaining their identity. Speakers of the language indicated that the value of their language is over and above instrumental considerations; it defines who they are, and it is an expression of individual and group identity. Consequently, the non-teaching of their language and

the teaching of Ndebele in their view heralds cultural annihilation and attempts to assimilate them and blur their identity. The outright majority of the participants argued that the meaningful and significant link of Tonga to a sense of distinctive identity among the Tonga speakers played a key role in their success story. Tonga speakers were said to have a very strong sense of ethnolinguistic identity and a very positive social and cultural character as well as high self-esteem, which all combined to contribute to their success story. Their social status, ethnolinguistic awareness, social and cultural character were attributed to their socio-historical status and the largely linguistically homogeneous nature of their district.

5.11.4.10 Linguistic and ethnic nationalism

Although other language groups highlighted the problem of linguistic hegemony and the politics of language embedded in the nationalist ideology of nation building, Tonga speakers exhibited ethnic and linguistic nationalism. With the other language groups there was a sense of surrender and passive acceptance of the problem of the division of the country's provinces along Ndebele and Shona. In Beitbridge and Mangwe participants showed a passive acceptance of the *status quo* in a non-conflictual manner and that they have internalised it such that it is considered immutable.

However, the Tonga speakers went a step further to advocate for autonomy from Matabeleland province. They argued that there is need to re-look into the naming of the country's provinces and avoid the division along linguistic lines. They proposed that their province should be called Zambezi Valley province or Gwembe province. They argued that they are uncomfortable with being classified as the Matebele people because classifying them under Matabeleland compromise their identity and they interpret the act as an attempt to assimilate them into the hegemonic Ndebele group. Tonga speakers argued that to avoid assimilation, they should assert their ethnicity because the more geographically separated they are through provincial control behind a protective boundary, Zambezi Valley province or Gwembe province, the more they feel ethnolinguistically secure.

> …thus why ngapha loba sesibumba iConstitution entsha sacela ukuthi ingapha ibe ngenye iprovince ithiwe yiZambezi Province ngoba ukuthi sithiwe siyiMatabeleland hayi asiwo maNdebele thina. Kungani sesibizwa ngabanye abantu? So iMatabeleland ayikhanye lapho okulamaNdebele khona. Into leyi uhulumende kazange ayinanzelele kusukela kuthathwa lelilizwe…aluba sathathela okwenziwa kweleSouth Africa. ISouth Africa ayizange idinge ukusebenzisa amabizo emihlobo yabantu…kuyathwa sihlala eMatabeleland kanti vele singamaNdebele? Mangaki amaNdebele ala? (Interview, WS650206). (…thus why when we were drafting the new Constitution we requested that this area should be another province called Zambezi province because to say we are or in Matabeleland, no; we are not Ndebeles. Why are we being called by other people's name? So it should be clear where Matabeleland is; where the Ndebeles are. The government did not seriously look into this right from independence…we should have adopted the South African approach. South Africa did not use names of ethnic groups…they say we live in Matabeleland, are we Ndebeles? How many Ndebeles are here?).
>
> Ngcono lapha kube yiZambezi province. IZambezi valley province…ukuthi sizibone lathi njengabantu abazimeleyo njengamaTonga (Interview, WS650190). (It's better that we call this area Zambezi province. Zambezi valley province…so that as Tonga speakers we can see ourselves as independent people).

5.12 Conclusion: Interview and focus group discussions data

5.12.1 Teacher Training

Interview and focus group discussions data show that the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development is largely due to lack of teacher training in official minority languages. It emerged that there are no teacher training colleges that offer training in official minority languages, except for Venda and Shangani which are taught at degree level at Great Zimbabwe University. Media sources indicate that Tonga has been recently introduced in the Department of African Languages and Literature at the University of Zimbabwe (Mpofu, 2012; http://www.zbc.co.zw/news-categories/top-stories/24603-govt-recognises-minority-languages-vp-mujuru.html). Apart from the lack of pre-service training, it also emerged that teachers on the ground have not been in-serviced to implement the 2002 policy development. Teachers who participated in focus group discussions indicated that few workshops have been held, but they argued that these workshops did not help much because they were mainly targeting teachers who are speakers of official minority languages.

5.12. 2 Teacher availability and deployment

Interview and focus group discussions data indicate that the unavailability of teachers who are speakers of the official minority languages in question in the selected

schools is another cause of the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development. Data from interviews and focus group discussions revealed that schools have a serious shortage of teachers who can speak and understand the official minority languages to be taught in the selected schools, particularly in Kalanga and Venda speaking districts. It emerged that in Kalanga and Venda areas teachers are still being deployed without any linguistic considerations, and as a result most schools in these areas do not have teachers who can teach in these languages and teach them as subjects.

The shortage of teachers in Kalanga and Venda areas was attributed to low enrolments rates from these groups due to high failure rates in Mathematics, low interest in education among these groups and high emigration rates to South Africa and Botswana before and after training as teachers. Teachers were also blamed for having negative attitudes and feeling that the teaching of official minority languages is a burden. However, some teachers argued that it is not a question of attitudes, but they lack training in the languages and there are no resources.

On the other hand, in Binga the situation is totally different because apart from interview and focus group discussions data, the language survey questionnaires also indicated that the district is well staffed with Tonga speaking teachers and this possibly explains the success story of Tonga. It emerged that in Binga, there are linguistic considerations that the education office make in the recruitment and deployment of teachers, and most temporary teachers in the district are locals who can speak and understand the language.

5.12.3 Availability of textbooks

The delay in the production of teaching materials was also cited as another contributing factor to the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development and in the case of Kalanga it emerged that even at the time of the research their books were not yet published. The Venda group had just received its books in early 2011. However, the Tonga group was said to have been the first to succeed in

implementing the policy because their textbooks were published much earlier and already had other textbooks to use. Both Tonga and Venda groups were said to have an added advantage that their languages are developed and taught up to tertiary level in Zambia and South Africa respectively, hence it was easier for them to develop their materials. On the other hand, the Kalanga group started from scratch since the language is not developed and taught in Botswana.

5.12.4 Political will

Lack of political will also emerged as another cause of the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development. This lack of political will was said to be reflected in the lack of planning, leading, organising, resourcing, controlling and lack of a compelling policy environment for the development, teaching and learning of official minority languages. Confirming the observation that the government lacked political will to implement the 2002 policy development, the Vice President of Zimbabwe Cde Joice Mujuru was quoted speaking at the launch of Tonga language stories, essays and poems writing competitions in Binga saying;

> …government wants to be part of the programme to ensure its success…it is unfortunate that the programme was not understood when it was initiated by the Head of State and Government and Commander-in-Chief of the Zimbabwe Defence Forces, President Robert Mugabe (http://www.zbc.co.zw/news-categories/top-stories/24603-govt-recognises-minority-languages-vp-mujuru.html).

In an interview with newspaper reporters, the current Minister of Education blamed his predecessors for taking long to give recognition to minority indigenous languages and pledged his commitment to promote their development, teaching and learning. He expressed that;

> It shocked me to know that in the past 30 years, we have not had textbooks in minority languages. It is an indictment of the education system of this country. We have so far introduced textbooks from Grade 1 to 7 in marginalised languages (Mlotshwa, 2011).
>
> I do not know why it has taken all these years to get recognition. I have made the recognition of marginalised indigenous languages a priority (Moyo, 2010).

The current Minister of education was credited for showing commitment towards the development, teaching and learning of official minority languages. His commitment

was said to be seen in his sourcing of funds which led to the publication of textbooks in other official minority languages, examination of Tonga at grade 7 level, lobbying and advocating for a language bill and an explicit language policy as well as the inclusion of educational linguistic human rights for minority language speakers in the new Constitution of Zimbabwe, publication of more teaching materials in official minority languages, training of teachers in official minority languages, as well as for the examination of official minority languages by 2013. Newspaper articles also indicate that the current Minister has the prerequiresite political will to promote and develop official minority languages. In these newspaper articles the current Minister pledge his commitment to support and prioritise the development, teaching and learning of official minority languages. (See: Harris, 2009; Moyo, 2010; Sunday News Reporters, 2010; Mafuba, 2011; Staff Reporter, 2011; Chinowaita, 2011; Herald Reporter, 2011; Business Reporter, 2011; Mlotshwa, 2011; Byo24News, 2011; Sunday Mail Reporter, 2011; Coltart, 2012; Nthambe, 2012; Dube, 2012; Tshuma, 2012).

5.12.5 Linguistic hegemony and politics of language

The linguistic hegemony of Ndebele, English and Shona and the politics of language embedded in the nationalist ideology of nation building were also cited as other factors that contributed to the delay in the development, teaching and learning of official minority languages. It emerged that the high status of Ndebele and Shona as national languages thwart and subdue efforts of promoting the development, teaching and learning of official minority languages. Research findings of this study and existing research show that the nationalist government's nation building agenda, especially its coercive assimationist language-in-education policy and practice pays very little attention to the promotion, development, teaching and learning of official minority languages. The teaching of these languages is viewed as a threat to the nationalist ideology and national unity.

Research findings and existing research indicate that there are fears that the teaching of official minority languages will undermine the spirit and letter of the 1987

Unity Accord. There is a misconceived association between the use of mother tongue and tribalism among policy makers. The categorisation of the country's main provinces alond Ndebele (Matabeleland) and Shona (Mashonaland) lump minority language speakers into these ethnicised units and ignore the alternative identities of non-Ndebele and non-Shona speakers. (See: Hachipola, 1998; Moyo, 2002; Ndhlovu, 2004; 2005; 2008a; 2008b; 2009; 2010; Msindo, 2005; 2007; Mumpande, 2006; Nkomo, 2007; 2008; Muzondidya and Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2007; Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2009; Makoni, 2011; Ndlovu, 2011).

5.12.6 Linguistic diversity

Unlike Beitbridge, Mangwe and Bulilima districts, Binga district is largely linguistically homogeneous and this facilitated the easy implementation of the 2002 policy development. The Tonga group's largely homogeneous nature was also said to have preserved their ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness as well as their positive social and cultural character. Tonga has remained their primary language and as such it serves a basic communicative need in this predominantly Tonga speaking group. Linguistic heterogeneity and fragmentation in Beitbridge, Mangwe and Bulilima districts, which are border districts, pose serious challenges to mother tongue education in Venda and Kalanga.

Moreover, the heterogeneity of these districts was also cited as the cause of these groups' negative social and cultural character and low ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness. The largely linguistically heterogeneous nature of Venda and Kalanga areas also contributed to expansive and integrative language contact, language accommodation, shift, diglossia, mixed marriages and marked bilingualism, and inevitably lack of a communicative need. Linguistic diversity in these areas also impact negatively on the group number and distribution factors of these groups which inevitably affect their vitality and the ease with which mother tongue education policies are implemented.

5.12.7 Advocacy

Lack of community support for language-political change and community mobilisation, particularly among the Venda and Kalanga groups also emerged as another cause of the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development. It emerged that these groups were not organised and mobilised; instead their association were described as largely top-down and elitist. The community was, and is not involved and there is a lack of indigenisation and ownership of the initiative by the speakers themselves. On the other hand, the success story of Tonga was attributed to their being clearly the best organised, mobilised, aggressive, committed and persistent group. The Tonga took ownership of the initiative, mobilised the community and there was widespread community support for language-political change.

5.12.8 Elite closure

Elite closure among the Venda and Kalanga groups was also cited as another contributing factor to the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development. Despite having prominent figures in strategic and influential positions, these groups' initiatives were said to be affected by lack of elite support. It emerged that the problem of elite closure is more prevalent in these groups. Elite support on the part of the Tonga group emerged as another key contributing factor to their success story.

5.12.9 Incentives

Lack of incentives to promote the development, teaching and learning of official minority languages also emerged as another cause of the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development. The non-examination, non-teaching of these languages beyond primary school level, their low status and their optional subject status offered under a less compelling policy environment were cited as contributing factors to the delay in the development, teaching and learning of official minority languages.

5.12.9 Consultation, coordination, communication and collaboration

The paucity or lack of consultation, coordination, communication and collaboration among all the stakeholders was also cited as another impediment to the successful implementation of the 2002 policy development. It emerged that the lack of interaction between the macro, micro and meso levels and within these levels impacts negatively on the execution of policies, especially among the Venda and Kalanga groups. Collaboration of the micro and meso levels as well as constant lobbying and advocacy of the macro by the Tonga group was cited as another key contributing factor to their success story. (See: Zvobgo, 1997; 2007; the*1999 Report of the Nziramasanga Commission of Inquiry into Education and Training in Zimbabwe*; Mlotshwa, 2011; Business Reporter, 2011; Tshuma, 2012)

5.12.10 Emigration and Immigration

It also emerged that the huge emigration rates among the Venda and Kalanga speakers and the huge influx of other language groups into these border districts have also weakened their ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness. It has also facilitated language accommodation, shift and diglossia, and high immigration rates have also led to linguistic heterogeneity which affects the ease with which mother tongue education policies are implemented. On the other hand, the prevalence malaria, poor agricultural lands and remoteness of Binga was said to be repelling other language groups from migrating into Binga. Consequently, unlike the other districts, Binga has remained largely linguistically homogeneous leading to the preservation of the group's vitality.

5.12.11 Population size

The success story of the Tonga group was also attributed to their big population size when compared to other official minority groups. The big population size of the Tonga group was said to have worked to their advantage in terms of preferential treatment and priority of attention when it came to publishing their materials among other things.

5.12.12 Socio-historical status

The negative socio-historical status of the Kalanga and Venda groups as *amahole* during the pre-colonial era and the successive eras of domination by the Ndebele group through the subtle assimilationist colonial and postcolonial language-in-education policies weakened their ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness. This was further compounded by the postconial nationalist ideology that uses Ndebele and Shona as rallying points for nation building. These legacies of being dominated left a permant mark which fosted acceptance of the *status quo*, language accommodation, shift and diglossia. It led to a negative social and cultural character among these groups. On the other hand, the Tonga group was said to owe its success to its positive socio-historical status which is marked with resistance to and avoidance of Ndebele domination.

The Tonga group's resistance to and avoidance of the Ndebele dominion and hegemony entrenched in them a positive social and cultural character. It also preserved their ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness and heightened their linguistic and ethnic nationalism manifested in their strong desire for autonomy from Matabeleland province.

5.12.13 Legislation

It emerged that the policy environment in its current form is not promoting the development, teaching and learning of official minority languages. The language clauses relating to the teaching and learning of official minority languages were said to be weak and merely permissive and not obligatory. The general consensus was that instead the policy documents further entrench and promote Ndebele and Shona hegemony. Inconsistencies, incoherences and contradictions that characterise the policy documents were also cited as contributing factors to the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development.

Lack of knowledge of the policy documents by implementers and other key stakeholders emerged as another cause of the delay. As a result, implementers do

not have knowledge of what they are supposed to do. Managers are also not clear of what the policies demand and parents do not have knowledge of the policy documents and their language rights. Parents have no basis for effecting litigation measures and are also not aware of the available litigation measures for redressing language-related rights violations.

5.12.14 Long history of Tonga in the curriculum

It also emerged that unlike the other languages, Tonga has been in the curriculum for a long time and this made it easy for the teaching and learning of Tonga to proceed to other grades without challenges since teaching materials were already available.

5.12.15 Dialectical variations

The problems of dialectical variations and lack of standard orthographies for Kalanga and Venda in particular were also cited as other contributing factors to the delay in the development, teaching and learning of these languages.

5.12.16 Funding

Lack of funds emerged as another cause of the delay and a reflection of lack of political will. In as much there was a general consensus that the policy came at a time when the economy was already bleeding, the overwhelming majority of the participants argued that lack of planning which resulted in lack of funds contributed to the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development. However, the current Minister of education was credited for unveiling funds for the production of teaching materials. Donor and external support for the Tonga group was cited as another factor that contributed to the success story of the Tonga group. Unlike the Tonga group, Venda and Kalanga groups argued that they lacked funding, and as a result their efforts took time to take shape.

5.13 Conclusion

Data from all the different data sources and methods confirm the findings generated through the different methods and from the different sources used in this study. They all point to the failure to secure and deploy the language management variables, methodologies and strategies at an optimal level to facilitate the implementation of the 2002 policy development. The data also shows how the failure to develop the seven areas of policy development for language-in-education policy implementation accounts for the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy and success story of Tonga. It shows that the ethnolinguistic vitality of the three language groups also contributed to the delay and that the ethnolinguistic vitality of the Tonga group contributed to their success story. The data also shows how Webb's (2010) factors and conditions that determine the success and failure of top-down and bottom-up policies account for the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy and explain the success story of Tonga.

CHAPTER SIX

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the study based on the different data gathering techniques and sources used in this study. It provides a summative discussion on the causes of the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development. It also provides a concise discussion of the conditions and factors that led to the success story of Tonga. These findings, conclusions and recommendations are discussed against the theories adopted in this study and the reviewed literature. The results and findings from semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions corroborate the results and findings from documentary analysis, the language survey questionnaires, learners' questionnaires and class observations. These results and findings clarify the possible causes for the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development. They also illuminate the conditions and factors that led to the success story of Tonga.

6.2 Findings

6.2.1 Ethnolinguistic vitality model and Webb's (2010) factors

One of the key factors that emerge from the data that explains the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development and the success story of Tonga is the ethnolinguistic vitality of the three language groups in question. The results and findings of this study also show that the delay and success story of Tonga can be explained in terms of Webb's (2010) factors and conditions that determine the success and failure of bottom-up and top-down policies discussed under section 2.9 in chapter 2.

6.2.1.1 Economic status

Although Tonga is spoken in a fishing town and tourist resort area, the economic status of the Tonga is so low that efforts to promote the development, teaching and learning of Tonga have been sustained by external funding in the form of donor or external support. The same is true for the Venda and Kalanga speakers who occupy very busy border districts, yet their economic status is too low to support their language initiatives. The three language groups do not have sound economic control of their immediate environments that their initiatives delayed to take-off and yield the desired policy outcomes and goals largely due to financial constraints.

6.2.1.2 Social status, ethnolinguistic awareness, social and cultural character of the communities

From the different sources, including the speakers of the three concerned language groups, it emerged that Tonga speakers exhibit a positive and strong social and cultural character. They reflect a high degree and amount of group self-esteem. They are proud of their language and identity. Their group self-esteem closely resemble to what is attributed to them by the other language groups. The learners' questionnaires of pupils from Binga also attest to this observation. Venda and Kalanga speakers lack social status and they have the tendency not to express their identity through Venda or Kalanga. They lack a sense of language loyalty and pride in their language. They do not consider their languages as symbols of ethnocultural identity. The absence of the necessary ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness among the Kalanga and Venda speakers possibly explain the delay in the teaching of their languages.

Among the Kalanga and Venda speakers, their languages are not viewed as expressions of individual and group identities and are not meaningfully linked to a sense of distinctive identity by them. These two groups are ashamed to identify, and be identified, with their languages and they instead express their identities through Ndebele or Shona. The low ethnolinguistic vitality of the Kalanga and Venda groups is marked by low ethnolinguistic awareness as well low linguistic and ethnic

nationalism. This is reflected in the lack of necessary community support for language-political change, and their negative social and cultural character. This possibly explains why they lagged while the Tonga group succeeded.

As reflected in the data from semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions (See: Section 5.11.4), the heightened ethnolinguistic awareness as well as linguistic and ethnic nationalism of the Tonga group surpass that of the other groups; hence their success story. Tonga speakers have a strong sense of language loyalty and pride in their language. They support the efforts to promote the development, teaching and learning of their language. They took ownership of the initiative and have a deep emotional stake in the welfare, promotion, development, teaching and learning of their language. The positive attitudes of Tonga speakers toward their language possibly explain why they are the first to have their language examined at grade 7 level.

Scholars who did research on the Tonga people attribute the Tonga speakers' strong ethnolingustic awareness to their socio-historical status and past experience of being evacuated during the construction of the Kariba dam. These scholars argue that the eviction of the Tonga people taught them of the need to engage with government in all aspects which directly affect their lives. They also argue that the Tonga want to debunk and demystify stereotypes about them that they are backward and incapable. (See: Tremmel, 1994; Mumpande, 2006; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b). Some participants highlighted these as some of the factors that drive Tonga speakers to work hard. Some Tonga speakers described this era as the dawn era for them: *Bwacha lino* (It's dawn time). The titles of Tonga books carry these ideologically laden notions, for example, *Bwacha lino*, *Buka mwana* (Wake up child).

6.2.1.4 Socio-historical status

The past historical experiences of being dominated among the Kalanga and Venda speakers as *amahole*, do not offer much except for the demobilising symbols which lead individuals to forget, hide or shun their linguistic identity thereby diluting their

vitality as active, collective and distinctive entities. (See: Sithole, 1956; Ndoda, 1988; Hachipola, 1998; Ndlovu, 1999; Moyo, 2002; Mazarire, 2003; Nyathi, 2005; Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2009; Ndhlovu, 2009; Msindo, 2005; 2007; Makoni, 2011). The Tonga speakers have a past that offers them strong mobilising symbols, which include their pride to resist and avoid Ndebele raiding and the Shona conquest. The Tonga people define themselves as independent grumblers in opposition to the groups which were vassals to senior Shona chiefs. (See: Lancaster, 1974; Tremmel, 1994; Nyathi, 2005; Mumpande, 2006; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b).

6.2.1.5 Language status

All the three languages are official minority languages, which are low varieties in comparison to English, Ndebele and Shona. They have limited functional space in Zimbabwe. They are optional subjects at secondary school level, but Tonga is treated as a compulsory subject and medium of instruction in primary schools in Binga. In Binga, Tonga is also highly valued in the public sector and research findings of this study and existing literature indicate that it is a prerequisite for employment in Binga (See: Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b). Tonga is an official language in Zambia and Mozambique, while Venda is an official language in South Africa. Participants of this study in Binga indicated that the status of Tonga in Zambia serves as an inspiration to them to uplift the status of Tonga in Zimbabwe. The level of development of Venda, and its status in South Africa was also said to have influenced Venda speakers in Zimbabwe to develop their language. Kalanga is a minority language in Botswana and its low status within and without the borders of Zimbabwe is a source of shame for members of the Kalanga group, and as such inhibits their ethnolinguistic vitality.

6.2.1.6 Demographic factors: Group numbers and distribution factors

The different data sources of the study revealed that Kalanga and Venda speakers have less favourable demographic trends in terms of their distribution and concentration if compared to Tonga speakers. The language survey questionnaires

and other participants of the study indicated that Tonga speakers in Binga tend to be more linguistically homogeneous and dominant than other groups. Kalanga and Venda speakers are not as geographically well-defined as the Tonga people. They have had a lot more interaction with other ethnic groups. This might have diluted the Kalanga and Venda culture. The Tonga people are to a large extent linguistically homogeneous and are clearly geographically defined, and this has preserved their vitality.

Tremmel (1994:16) describes the isolation of the Tonga as 'splendid isolation'. He indicates that besides some men who migrated to towns and mines to search for job opportunities, Tonga people were basically isolated from the rest of the people. Consequently, they still exhibit a large degree of linguistic homogeneity. Hachipola (1998:39) indicates that linguistically, Tonga people are less contaminated in Binga. Among the Kalanga and Venda speakers, language contact led to language shift, language accommodation, diglossia and low ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness.

The concentration of Tonga speakers did not only ensure and safeguard their vitality, but it made it easy to implement mother tongue education in Tonga, because schools in Binga are to a large extent linguistically homogeneous in the composition of their school and class populations. In the Kalanga and Venda areas, which are very busy border districts, linguistic heterogeneity is a source of difficulty in the implementation of mother tongue education policies in these languages, especially given that speakers of dominant languages seem to dominate. The data sources of the study indicate that Tongas have a favourable population size compared to other official minority languages. Sources indicated that it is possibly the third largest, if not second largest, language group in Zimbabwe. Their large population size and high concentration in Binga are some of the factors that contributed to their success story.

Given the significance of the population size of an ethnolinguistic group in the national scheme of things and in determining the ethnolinguistic vitality of a group as well as determining language maintenance and publishing directions and priorities, possibly the large population size of the Tonga group contributed to the success

story of the Tonga. One Tonga participant indicated that the Zimbabwe Publishing House was persuaded by the large population size of Tonga speakers to publish in Tonga. That is why they were the first to publish their literature and also much earlier than the other groups. Interaction with officials from the Venda language committee, the Kalanga association and publishers also revealed the centrality of population size in decisions on publishing direction and priorities.

6.2.1.7 Exogamy / mixed marriages

Focus group discussions with Kalanga speakers revealed that the group's vitality was also weakened by intermarriages, expansive and integrative language contact with the Ndebele group since the pre-colonial period. (See: Hachipola, 1998; Moyo, 2002; Msindo, 2005; 2007; Nyathi, 2005; Mumpande, 2006; Ndhlovu, 2009; Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2009). These factors possibly explain their shift to Ndebele. There are cases where parents speak Kalanga with grandparents or among themselves and Ndebele with their children. In some cases, participants said that parents no longer speak Kalanga with one another, but rather use Ndebele. Among the Tonga, language retention rates in mixed marriages are more favourable to them, especially in cases involving Nambya speakers who expressed concern on the effects of intermarriages with Tonga speakers. Consequently, this boosts the ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness of the Tonga group and promotes high rates of intergeneration transmission of Tonga.

6.2.1.8 Marked bilingualism and communicative need

Kalanga and non-Kalanga speakers as well as Venda and non-Venda speakers indicated that Kalanga and Venda speakers are active Kalanga-Ndebele bilinguals, Venda-Ndebele bilinguals and Venda-Shona bilinguals. This was said to have led to a decrease in the number of Venda and Kalanga speakers, especially among the children. This indicates that these language groups lack the prerequisite condition for language revitalisation, promotion, acquisition and maintenance, the communicative need in the form of Venda and Kalanga. All this possibly explains why these groups

exhibit low ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness as well as low linguistic and ethnic nationalism, which has contributed to the delay in the teaching of their languages. Unlike other groups, the Tonga group is less bilingual and as such, the promotion and maintenance of Tonga is meant to fulfill a communicative need in the predominantly Tonga speaking district.

6.2.1.9 Immigration

The Bulilima, Mangwe and Beitbridge districts are very busy border districts whose urban centres are perceived to offer better occupational and economic opportunities. Consequently, the huge immigration rates of other language groups into areas where Kalanga and Venda are spoken, and their prolonged contact with these dominant groups led these language groups to adopt Ndebele and or Shona because of the perceived opportunities and incentives associated with proficiency in these languages. This has ethnoculturally threatened the Venda and Kalanga groups with co-ethnics relinquishing their languages and other-ethnics, Ndebele and Shona importing and imposing their 'integrative' languages. Immigration also led to processes of language accommodation, shifts and diglossia. Consequently, these groups lack a communicative need in the form of Venda or Kalanga. The high immigration rates also weakened the ethnolinguistic vitality and awareness of these groups. They also led to linguistic heterogeneity which affects the ease with which mother tongue education policies are implemented.

6.2.1.10 Emigration

Interaction with Venda and non-Venda speakers as well as Kalanga and non-Kalanga speakers revealed that emigration is rampant in these groups due to their proximity to the South African and Botswana borders. This was said to have contributed to the shortage and exodus of experts in these languages, teachers who are speakers of these languages and vocal advocates who are passionate about the teaching of these languages. Participants of the study indicated that this is contributing to the vicious cycle of shortages of teachers from these groups and low

turn-out of student teachers from these groups. The high emigration rates in these districts also impact negatively on these groups' ethnolinguistic vitality in terms of their group numbers and distribution factors which determine educational and publishing decisions and priorities.

6.2.1.11 Informal institutional support and control factors: Advocacy, ownership/ indigenisation and community support for language-political change

Although all three language groups have pressure groups that act on their behalf, their level of organisation and commitment vary a lot. Data gathered from the participants clearly revealed the difference in the levels of organisation and commitment of these three language groups' pressure groups. The Tonga group was described by both the Tonga and non-Tonga speakers as clearly the best and most well organised, mobilised, aggressive, committed, dedicated, united, popular, visible, vocal, determined, persistent and resilient group.

The Tonga committee also involved its local traditional leaders, who are the custodians of the language. The researcher's interaction with ministry officials and other participants showed that chiefs from Binga are at the forefront of this initiative. A number of position papers from them, and to them, have been a common feature in the offices of the ministry. Together with the Tonga language committee, chiefs from Binga maintained sustained discourse with ministry officials which explain their success. Similar observations have been made by scholars such as Mumpande (2006), Nyika (2008a; 2008b), Makoni, Makoni & Nyika (2008) and Ndhlovu (2010).

The Kalanga group was described by Kalanga and non-Kalanga speakers as the most divided, less popular, invisible, elitist, inconsistent group and detached from its speakers. The Venda group was also said to be divided, inactive, less visible, not aggressive, working in isolation, inconsistent and less popular. Kalanga and Venda committees were also criticised for not mobilising the local traditional leaders and for not working in collaboration with them. One member of the Kalanga association

indicated that Kalanga and Venda chiefs were not involved in the meetings that led to the 2002 policy development. It was only chiefs from Binga and Hwange who worked with ZIPLA. This may also explain why these groups lag, especially given the role of traditional leaders.

Community support for language-political change is an important prerequisite for successful bottom-up and top-down processes. The lack thereof among Venda and Kalanga speakers may explain why these groups lag, despite being pioneers in this initiative with the Tonga speakers. There is lack of community involvement, participation, ownership and indigenisation of the initiative among the Venda and Kalanga speakers. Local leaders, such as traditional and political leaders as well as the community are not involved or part of the initiative.

Although Kalanga and Venda speakers underscored the value of mother tongue education, they have not been mobilised to take responsibility of their language by their respective associations. The bodies that represent these language groups were not established by the speakers to act on their behalf. In some cases they are not known by the speakers. The speakers are not part of the movement. The ownership of the initiative is clearly not local. Possibly, the delay in the teaching of Venda and Kalanga is a result of the lack of the necessary community support for language-political change from the speakers. The Venda language committee and the Kalanga association did not obtain legitimacy and authority in the eyes of the broader communities. They do not have the necessary trust and support of their communities and have not secured the right to speak on their behalf. These pressure groups are not embedded in the communities and their source of authority does not originate from the communities they claim to represent. These pressure groups are a type of a top-down approach and are not people-driven. They are executive-driven and too elitist.

With the Tonga group, their committee mobilised members of the community, chiefs and school development committees, teachers and education officers. They also established the Tonga language committee, Basilwizi Trust, which is a non-

governmental organisation. Basilwizi Trust plays an instrumental role in the promotion, development, teaching and learning of Tonga. They also established Tonga on-line, a group that manages on-line activities that promote and market the Tonga culture and activities. The committee also forged links with non-governmental organisations and maintained a sustained discourse with the government. At the centre of these initiatives is the community, the local traditional and political leaders of the district.

The influence of local institutions, such as traditional leaders and cultural associations is significant. They have a very important role as the custodians of the language and culture. Their power is enshrined in the *New Traditional Leaders Act of 1999 (Chapter 29, 17)* and in their official body, the Council of Chiefs. This body seats in Parliament. Of all the districts of Zimbabwe, Binga district has the largest number of chiefs and as such the group has substantial support within its local traditional power bases (See: Mumpande, 2006; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b; Ndhlovu, 2010).

The rejection of Ndebele by Tonga speakers dates back to the 1960s when Tonga was banned in schools. After independence they formed a coalition under the name VETOKA, which however collapsed. The Tonga group continued and in the 1990s they even went to the extent of withdrawing their children from schools in protest against the deployment of Ndebele and Shona teachers in their district (Tremmel, 1994; *The Herald*, 25 April 1994 cited in Tremmel, 1994; Hachipola, 1998; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Nyika, 2008; Nyika, 2008a; Nyika, 2008b).

6.2.1.12 Formal institutional support and control factors: Elite closure

Findings of the study indicate that Kalanga and Venda speakers have a significant number of influential political figures and officials in strategic and influential positions in a variety of institutional settings than the Tonga group. However, the problem of elite closure is more prevalent among the Kalanga and Venda groups. Despite these influential people, these language groups are still lag. The elite from the Tonga group

were said to be very supportive, committed and passionate about their language. Makoni, Makoni & Nyika (2008:423) note that the activities of the Tonga have the backing of the Tonga elite researchers and activists who articulated a specific type of discourse construed as a source of authority. In addition to the discourse of the donor community and the Tonga community, these discourses constituted diverse and multiple ways in which realities were framed.

Mother tongue education is more successful where speakers of the concerned language have a strong presence in the education system and come from the population of fluent speakers of the concerned language. The availability of Tonga speaking school heads and teachers in Binga possibly contributed to the success story of Tonga. In terms of staffing the outright majority of the teachers in all the selected schools in Binga are Tonga speaking. In Beitbridge, Bulilima and Mangwe districts the schools are mainly staffed with non-Venda and non-Kalanga speakers.

The three languages are taught up to different levels, but only in primary schools. The exception is Venda, which is offered at university level. Tonga is the most established in primary school level and it has been examined at grade 7 level. Venda follows because it is taught with the recourse of textbooks although not yet fully established. Kalanga is the least because there are no teaching materials. In terms of the number of periods allocated to these three local languages, Kalanga was allocated the least number of periods in all the schools. Tonga is not only taught as a subject, but it is also used as a medium of instruction. Venda and Kalanga are mainly taught as subjects. This is probably due to the unavailability or shortage of teachers who are speakers of these languages.

Findings of this study and scholarly research indicate that Tonga was included in the curriculum for years, compared to Venda and Kalanga. This means that Tonga speaking teachers at least learnt it and have an idea of what to teach, unlike the Venda and Kalanga speaking teachers. This implies that there were already some materials that could be used, unlike in the case of Venda and Kalanga. Findings of this study and existing research indicate that collaborative initiatives that involved

mobilisation of teaching materials between the Tonga groups in Zimbabwe and Zambia dates back to the colonial days. (See: Tremmel, 1994; Hachipola, 1998; Mumpande, 2006; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Nyika, 2008a; 2008a).

Since Venda and Tonga are developed and taught up to tertiary level in South Africa and Zambia respectively, they have an added advantage. Kalanga is not taught or developed in Botswana. Kalanga writers had to start from scratch. Despite this added advantage, the Venda group still took a long time to produce its own materials. This was attributed to debates on orthography, unavailability of willing and dedicated writers, lack of funding and a problem with printers in Zimbabwe that could not capture the diacritics used in the Venda writing system (See: Hachipola, 1998; Bulawayo Bureau, 2010).

6.2.1.13 Ethnic and linguistic nationalism

Unlike the Kalanga and Venda speakers, Tonga speakers reflect an element of ethnic and linguistic nationalism; an attempt to assert their ethnicity manifested in the demands for greater control and autonomy of their ethnic region. The loud outcry of the Tonga speakers represented the desire for autonomy from Matabeleland, because in their view to belong to Matabeleland is synonymous to being Ndebele. They view the term Matabeleland as a type of integrative and expansive form of language contact. They expressed a desire to be classified as the people of the Zambezi valley or Gwembe Province. They argued that there is a need to re-look the naming of the country's provinces and to avoid the division of the country's provinces along linguistic lines. In their view, the current demarcation of the country's provinces is ideologically laden and seeks to recreate linguistic majorities. It eliminates minorities by assimilating them into hegemonic groups.

Cartwright (2006:200) states that to avoid assimilation, minority groups should assert their ethnicity. The more geographically concentrated they are, through territorial control behind a protective boundary, the less threatening is the majority group to the minority group's vitality. Tonga speakers feel they are more threatened if they

continue to be classified under Matabeleland. In the Beitbridge, Bulilima and Mangwe districts, participants showed a sense of surrender and passive acceptance of the *status quo* in a non-conflictual manner. They showed that they have internalised it to the extent that it is considered immutable.

6.2.1.14 Donor and external support

Despite the strong ethnolinguistic vitality, awareness and linguistic nationalism of the Tonga group, findings of this study and scholarly research also show that the role of the donor community cannot be understated in their success story. Unlike the Venda and Kalanga groups, the Tonga group received extensive donor support mainly on funding, issues of advocacy and civic education, participatory action research, dialogical intervention strategies, training on litigation measures and development communication. On issues of advocacy and civic education, the Tonga group benefited more than the other groups, especially if it is considered that the activities of Silveria and Binga Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace (CCJP) were initiated first among the Tonga.

The history of advocacy and civic education by civic organisations among the Tonga people dates back longer than in the other groups. The activities of Silveria House, the Roman Catholic Church and the (CCJP) among the Tonga date back to the early 1990s and the 1994 launch of the book, *The People of the Great River*, written by Father Mike Tremmel, a Catholic priest based in Binga. (See: Tremmel, 1994; Mumpande, 2006; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b). In his book, Tremmel (1994:10) notes that 'the message of their story may empower the Tonga to raise a much louder, clearer and more unified voice'. Tremmel (1994:10) indicates that his deepest hope is that his book will contribute towards making this a reality for the Tonga.

Tremmel's interaction with the Tonga about their experiences since their evacuation from the banks of the Zambezi River incorporates elements of advocacy, lobbying, development communication, participatory action research and dialogical intervention

strategies. In the *Foreword* of Tremmel's book, Hanly (1994:6) describes Tremmel's book as the 'voice of the voiceless'. He notes that 'the Tonga speak for themselves' in the book. He says that in the process of writing the book, 'a kind of "seed of empowerment" was planted'. Tremmel (1994:62) indicates that while he was writing his book, non-governmental and community-based organisations were already involved in community mobilisation, civic education, development communication and participatory action research in Binga. He notes that these non-governmental organisations sensitised the Tonga to become politically aware and active within their communities. This may explain why they have been the first to have their language examined.

The findings of this study and existing research in these languages indicate that the Tonga language committee realised soon after its establishment that it needs the support and cooperation of other language groups in similar situations to achieve its goal. Consequently, VETOKA and ZIPLA formation stem from the Tonga group's realisation that its strength lies in numbers. In 1996 they established the Tonga language committee which in 2001 formed a coalition with Venda, Kalanga, Sotho, Shangani and Nambya to form ZIPLA to build a national voice. It appears in all the cases of the formation of the coalition groups that the Tonga group was at the forefront. The other groups joined these coalitions to enhance the agenda set by the Tonga group. (See: Tremmel, 1994; Hachipola, 1998; Mumpande, 2006; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b; Ndhlovu, 2004; 2005; 2009; 2010; Nkomo; 2008). This possibly explains why the initiative is well indigenised by the Tonga group and their success story.

Apart from Silveria House, other non-governmental organisations such, as Save the Children, USAID, BIDA, World Vision and Basilwizi Trust played a critical role in support of the promotion, development, teaching and learning of Tonga (See: Tremmel, 1994; Mumpande, 2006; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Nyika, 2008a; 2008b). This was not the case with the Kalanga and Venda as indicated earlier. The Venda coordinator publicly pleaded for financial support from the donor community to publish their teaching materials in the press. (See: Bulawayo Bureau, 2010).

Although the Tonga speakers acknowledged that their marginality worked to their advantage to attract the donor community, they argued that this donor support was not *manna* from heaven. The donor community saw their determination and commitment and perceived them as fit to invest their resources for their initiatives.

6.2.2 Seven areas of policy development for language-in-education policy implementation

Apart from the delay being an issue to be blamed on the speakers, findings of this study indicate a lack of political will, which is reflected in the failure to develop the seven areas of policy development which need to be examined as part of any language-in-education policy implementation programme as also having contributed to the delay. The implementation of the 2002 policy development leaves much to be desired, because in some areas the languages are allocated inadequate time. In the class timetables these languages, especially Kalanga and Venda fare badly compared to the other subjects. There are insufficient teachers and teaching materials. There are no colleges that offer training for teachers in these languages. Teachers are still being randomly deployed without any linguistic considerations. These teachers have not been in-serviced. Kalanga still does not have teaching materials and the publication of teaching materials delayed in all these languages. With regards to Venda, the teachers do not have teachers' guides or resource books and there were concerns with regards to the user-friendliness and accessibility of the pupils' books.

The access policy is not clearly defined and this is the source of the confusion about who should be taught these languages. The access policy was determined based on common knowledge, rather than on informed and thorough research. The findings of the study indicate that the only signs to resource the policy financially only became visible when the ETF was introduced following the appointment of the current Minister of Education. The implementation process of the policy development was not evaluated. Except for Tonga, these languages are not yet examined and this is one of the major factors that were cited by the participants as contributing to the delay in

the promotion, development, teaching and learning of these languages. (See: Hachipola, 1998; Mumpande, 2006; Makoni, Makoni & Nyika, 2008; Makoni, 2011; Ndlovu, 2011). In terms of the community policy, it seems that the Venda and Kalanga communities were never consulted and involved in the initiative.

6.2.3 Language management variables

The findings of the study also reflect the failure to secure the greatest possible mix of the eight variables of the LMA. In terms of language development, corpus planning, status planning and acquisition planning a lot still need to be done. Some of these languages lack standard orthographies. Not much has been published in them and they need cultivation, elaboration and modernisation. These languages are only taught in primary schools, except for Venda and Tonga. Venda is offered at university level at Great Zimbabwe University and Tonga has been recently introduced at the University of Zimbabwe. This affects the effective teaching and learning of these languages. The status of these languages is still so low that it inhibits their development, teaching and learning.

These languages do not have an increased educational value. They are optional subjects, offered under tight and stringent conditions, and they lack social value in the job market. The failure to secure and deploy the optimal mix of the LMA variables, methodologies and strategies reflects lack of political will. Findings of the study indicate that there was a shift in the political commitment of the policy makers since the appointment of the current Minister of Education. He introduced the EFT that prioritises the publication of teaching materials in these languages.

The policy documents do not provide an enabling policy environment for the successful development, teaching and learning of official minority languages. The clauses that relate to the teaching of these languages are weak, neutralised, riddled with escape clauses, merely permissible and not obligatory. They do not provide an impetus to publish in these languages as well as to teach and learn them. The policy documents overtly and covertly entrench linguistic hegemony of English, Ndebele

and Shona. The current Constitution and Education Act have insignificant clauses on how these speakers can redress language-related rights violations in a legal way. Language disappears in the clauses that outlaw discrimination within the Constitution and the Education Act. Attempts to outlaw language-related rights violations based on current clauses can be dismissed. To allege language based discrimination on colour, ethnic origin, race and tribe is very problematic, especially given the definitions of a mother tongue. The policy documents are marred with inconsistencies, incoherence, contradictions and vagueness. They are also inaccessible to implementers and other key stakeholders.

6.2.4 Management oriented methodologies and strategies

The implementation process is poorly managed as reflected in poor supervision, leading, enforcement and monitoring of the implementation process. Research findings reflect the failure to secure and deploy language management oriented methodologies and strategies. This is reflected in the lack of planning for the policy, poor organising, poor leading which is reflected in the lack of follow-ups and monitoring of the implementation process and lack of knowledge of the policy stipulations by implementers, middle and top managers in the ministry. There are no control measures and in terms of staffing, teachers have not been trained, i.e. pre / in-service training to teach these languages. Middle level managers expressed concern that they were not trained after the policy development and no technical experts specialising in these languages have been trained so far. The only exceptions are Venda and Tonga which are now offered at university level. Issues related to conceptual skills development, technical skills development, specifically in these languages and human skills development have not been addressed.

6.2.5 Sociolinguistic oriented methodologies and strategies

Sociolinguistic oriented methodologies and strategies were not secured and deployed at an optimal level. The ministry did not carry out language surveys to identify the target schools or collect data on language attitudes and the distribution of

these languages to determine the access policy and ways of operationalising the policy in areas that are linguistically mixed, heterogeneous or fragmented. The public sector does not provide multilingual services and this reduces the demand for teaching and learning these languages. Corpus planning in these languages is far behind, the teaching of Kalanga, Venda and Tonga is confined to the primary school level. These languages are not offered at secondary school level. The educational, social and political value of these languages leaves a lot to be desired. All these were cited as impeding factors in the development, promotion, teaching and learning of Venda, Kalanga and Tonga.

6.2.6 Development oriented methodologies and strategies

Issues on development oriented methodologies and strategies have been explained in section 6.2 and in its subsections that relate to development oriented methodologies and strategies such as 6.2.2; 6.2.10; 6.2.11 and 6.2.12. The policy environment leaves a lot to be desired to promote the development, teaching and learning of these languages. Advocacy activities have not been seriously rolled out to Kalanga and Venda speakers as well as other stakeholders. The outright majority of the speakers of these languages lack awareness and knowledge of their language rights and the litigation measures they can adopt to redress language-related rights violations. Most speakers, including members of the school development committees, do not have knowledge of the stipulations of the policy circulars, the Education Act and the Constitution.

The policy documents are inaccessible to them in the literal sense and in terms of their availability in the languages that they understand and speak well. Significant development communication, dialogical intervention strategies, lobbying and advocacy among the Kalanga and Venda speakers are still needed to promote the indigenisation and ownership of the initiative. The management of the implementation process at national and community level among the Venda and Kalanga speakers needs serious attention. There is lack of harmony, consultation,

collaboration and coordination between, and within, the micro, meso and macro levels.

6.3 Conclusions

The research findings show that the major hitch in the successful implementation of the 2002 policy development lies squarely with the macro and the micro levels. They reflect shortcomings in both levels that contributed to the delay in the implementation of these policy developments. Although there is interaction to some extent between the top and the bottom, research findings show that there is a lack of consultation, collaboration and coordination between the top and the bottom. The same gap is visible within the top and its structures and within the bottom and its structures. It is also true for other key stakeholders, particularly among the Kalanga and Venda groups. The Tonga group seems to have maintained sustained discourse with the grassroots, the meso and macro levels, and this explains their success story.

The seven areas of policy of development which need to be examined as part of any language-in-education policy implementation programme were not developed. In some cases there were developed too late. The greatest possible mix of the LMA variables, methodologies and strategies was not secured and deployed at an optimal level. This explains the delay. The speakers, especially the Kalanga and Venda have not adequately and convincingly played their role as the community, and this too contributed to the delay. These speakers are not exerting meaningful pressure on the government in the same way as the Tonga.

An application of the structural variables developed by Giles, Bourhis & Taylor (1977) to assess the vitality of ethnolinguistic groups clearly reveals that the Kalanga and Venda speakers have low ethnolinguistic vitality. The economic, social, socio-historical and language status of the language is low. Their population size is small and this has been further precipitated by intermarriages with the Ndebele speakers, immigration and outward migration to South Africa and Botswana. Their proximity to Botswana and South Africa has further lowered their population size through

migration to South Africa and Botswana. The institutional presence of their languages is very limited, especially in formal and informal settings since Ndebele or Shona is usually used in out-group communication in the district as the Languages of Wider Communication. The low ethnolinguistic vitality of the two groups accounts for the lack of the prerequisite conditions and factors for successful language-political change from below such as ethnolinguistic awareness, social and cultural character, communicative need, linguistic and ethnic nationalism and community support for language-political change.

6.4 Recommendations

Based on the results and findings of this study I propose the following recommendations:

1. Given the different linguistic profiles of the selected schools, access policies should be informed by thorough research to determine policy implementation modalities for linguistically heterogeneous and fragmented schools.
2. There is a need to include linguistic data in census questionnaires to identify what languages are spoken where and by how many people. This will enhance planning, especially to determine implementation modalities for mother tongue education policies and decisions on materials, access and personnel policies.
3. There has to be consultation, coordination and collaboration among stakeholders from, and within, the macro, micro and meso levels to ensure the successful implementation of multilingual language-in-education policies.
4. There is a need for language empowerment through the Constitution that promotes multilingualism and guarantee and recognise linguistic human rights and educational linguistic human rights as fundamental human rights. The Constitution must spell out incentives to facilitate compliance and sanctions to discourage non-compliance. Litigation measures should also be made available and accessible to everyone.
5. In the light of the advantages of having explicitly written policies, there is also a need for a written language policy and language-in-education policy. These

policies must engender a culture of constitutionalism and domesticate international conventions, treaties and agreements. They must be the vanguards of international conventions, treaties and agreements as well as constitutional ethos championing and guarantying educational linguistic human rights and linguistic human rights. They have to be accessible language-wise and in the literal sense of accessibility to everyone.

6. Further research should be conducted on bottom-up activities of other official minority languages to examine the causes of the delay in their case to provide insights on how to facilitate the implementation process of the 2002 policy development and similar initiatives elsewhere.
7. The policy makers also need to clarify how official, national and official minority languages will be taught in schools to avoid inconsistencies in the teaching and learning of these languages. There is a need to attribute status to all the languages so that no one is forced to reject their identity to climb the perceived social, economic and political hierarchy.

REFERENCES

Abdelhay, A.K., Makoni, B. & Makoni, S.B. 2011. The Naivasha Language Policy: The Language of Politics and the Politics of Language in the Sudan. *Language Policy*, 10: 1 – 18.

Adegbija, E. 1993. Small Languages and Small Communities: The Graphization of a Small-Group Language: A Case Study of Oko. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 102: 153 – 173.

Adegbija, E. 1994a. *Language Attitudes in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Sociolinguistic Overview*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Adegbija, E. 1994b. Survival Strategies for Minority Languages the Case of Oko. *ITL Review of Applied Linguistics*, 103(4): 19 – 37.

Adegbija, E. 1997. The Identity, Survival, and Promotion of Minority Languages in Nigeria. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 125: 5 – 27.

Adegbija, E. 2001. Saving Threatened Languages in Africa: A Case Study of Oko, in Fishman, J.A. (ed.). *Can Threatened Languages be Saved? Reversing Language Shift Revisited: A 21st Perspective*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 284 – 308.

Alexander, N. 1992. Language Planning from Below, in Herbert, R. K. (ed.). *Language and Society in Africa: The Theory and Practice of Sociolinguistics*. Johannesburg: Witswaterand University Press. 143 – 149.

Alexander, N. 2012a. *Language Denied Means Citizens Ignored* [Online]. Available: http://mg.co.za/article/2012-02-03-language-denied-means-citizens-ignored [2012, February, 4].

Alexander, N. 2012b. After Apartheid: The Language Question. Unpublished Paper Delivered at the Critical Conversations of the International Institute for Studies in Race, Reconciliation and Social Justice. 19 March, University of the Free State, Bloemfontein.

Alidou, H. 2004. Medium of Instruction in Post-Colonial Africa, in Tollefson, J.W. & Tsui, A.B.M. (eds.). *Medium of Instruction of Policies. Which Agenda? Whose Agenda?* Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc, Publishers. 195 – 214.

Alisjahbana, S.T. 1971. Some Planning Processes in the Development of the Indonesian-Malay Language, in Rubin, J. & Jernudd, B.H. (eds.). *Can Language be Planned? Sociolinguistic Theory and Practice for Developing Nations*. Hawaii: Hawaii University Press. 179 – 187.

Allwright, D. & Bailey, K.M. 1994. *Focus on the Language Classroom: An Introduction to Classroom Research for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Angrosino, M. 2007. *Doing Ethnographic and Observational Research*. Los Angeles, London: SAGE Publishers Ltd.

Annamalai, E. 2004. Medium of Power: The Question of English in the Education Program on the Island of Leyte, in Tollefson, J.W. & Tsui, A.B.M. (eds.). *Medium of Instruction Policies. Which Agenda? Whose Agenda?* Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc, Publishers. 177 – 194.

Antia, B.E. 2000. *Terminology and Language Planning: An Alternative Framework of Practice and Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Appel, R. & Muysken, P. 1987. *Language Contact and Bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold Publishers.

Awoniyi, T.A. 1976. Mother Tongue Education in West Africa: A Historical Background, in Bamgbose, A. (ed.). *Mother Tongue Education: The West African Experience*. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 27 – 42.

Babbie, E. & Mouton, J., with contributions by Payze Vorster Boshoff Prozesky. 2001. *The Practice of Social Research*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press Southern Africa (Pty) Ltd.

Bagwasi, M. 2009. Choice of Mother Tongue: Cultural Identity or Economic Mobility?, in Kamwendo, G., Jankie, D. & Chebbane, A. (eds.). *Mother Tongue Education for All: Multilingualism in Education and Communities in Southern Africa*. Gaborone: UBTromso Collaborative Programme for San Research and Capacity Building. 59 – 63.

Bailey, R.W. 1998. Majority Language, Minority Misery: The Case of Sri Lanka, in Kibbee, D.A. (ed.). *Language Legislation and Linguistic Rights: Selected Proceedings of the Language Legislation and Linguistic Rights Conference, The University of Illinois at*

Urbana-Champaign, March, 1996. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 206 – 224.

Baker, C. 1988. *Key Issues in Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C. 1992. *Attitudes and Language*. Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C. 2000. *A Parents' and Teachers' Guide to Bilingualism*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Baldauf, R.B. 1994. 'Unplanned' Language Policy and Planning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 14: 82 – 89.

Baldauf, R.B. 2005. Language Planning and Policy Research: An Overview, in Hinkel, E. (ed.). *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. 957 – 970.

Baldauf, R.B., Li, M. & Zhao, S. 2008. Language Acquisition Management Inside and Outside the School, in Spolsky, B. & Hult, F.M. (eds.). *The Handbook of Educational Linguistics*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing. 233 – 250.

Baldauf, Jr. R.B. 2008. Rearticulating the Case for Micro Language Planning in a Language Ecology Context, in Liddicoat, A.J. & Baldauf, Jr. R.B. (eds.). 2008. *Language Planning and Policy: Language Planning in Local Contexts*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. 18 – 41.

Bamgbose, A. 1976. Introduction: The Changing Role of the Mother Tongue in Education, in Bamgbose, A. (ed.). *Mother Tongue Education: The West African Experience*. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 9 – 26.

Bamgbose, A. 1987. When is Language Planning not Planning? *Journal of West African Languages*, XVII(1): 6 – 14.

Bamgbose, A. 1989. Issues for a Model of Language Planning. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 13(1): 24 – 34.

Bamgbose, A. 1991. *Language and the Nation: The Language Question in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Bamgbose, A. 2000. *Language and Exclusion: The Consequences of Language Policies in Africa*. London: Transaction Publishers.

Bamgbose, A. 2007. Multilingualism and Exclusion: Policy, Practice and Prospects, in Cuvelier, P., Du Plessis, T. & Lut Teck, M.M. (eds.). *Multilingualism and Exclusion: Policy, Practice and Prospects*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers. 1 – 12.

Batibo, H.M. 2001. The Empowerment of Minority Languages for Education and Development: Keynote Theme Paper, in Trewby, R. & Fitchat, S. (eds.). *Language and Development in Southern Africa: Making the Right Choices*. *Conference Proceedings National Institute for Educational Development. Okahandja, Namibia 11-13 April 2000*. Windhoek: Gamsberg Mavmillan. 123 – 135.

Batibo, H.M. 2004. The Role of Minority Languages in Education and Development in Africa, in Kriel, M. (ed.). *The Language Web: Essays in Honour of Victor Webb*. Port Elizabeth: University of Port Elizabeth. 26 – 33.

Batibo, H.M. 2005. *Language Decline and Death in Africa: Causes, Consequences and Challenges*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Batibo, H.M. 2009a. Prospects for Mother Tongue Education in Botswana: What Message does Professor K.K. Prah's Keynote Address Bring?, in Kamwendo, G., Jankie, D. & Chebanne, A. (eds.). *Mother Tongue Education for All: Multilingualism in Education and Communities in Southern Africa*. Gaborone: UBTromso Collaborative Programme for San Research and Capacity Building. 43 – 46.

Batibo, H.M. 2009b. Preface, in Ndhlovu, F. 2009. *The Politics of Language and Nation Building in Zimbabwe*. Bern: Peter Lang AG, International Academic Publishers. xii-xiv.

Batibo, H.M. 2012. The Conflicts of World View Experienced by Speakers of Minority Languages Shifting to Major Languages. Unpublished Paper Delivered at the Department of Language Management and Language Practice's September Contact Session, Bloemfontein. July, 18.

Becker, H. 1998. *Tricks of the Trade*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Bell, J. 2009. *Doing Your Research Project: A Guide for First-Time Researchers in Education, Health and Social Science*. Maidenhead, England: Open University Press.

Benson, C. 2005. *The Importance of Mother Tongue-Based Schooling for Educational Quality*. Commissioned Study for the EFA Global Monitoring Report.

Blaxter, L., Hughes, C. & Tight, M. 2001. *How to Research*. Buckingham, Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Bless, C. & Higson-Smith, C. 2000. *Fundamentals of Social Research Methods: An African Perspective*. Lansdowne: Juta.

Blommaert, J. 1996. Language Planning as a Discourse on Language and Society: The Linguistic Ideology of a Scholarly Tradition. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 20(3): 199 – 222.

Bourhis, R.Y. 2001. Reversing Language Shift in Quebec, in Fishman, J.A. (ed.). *Can Threatened Languages be Saved? Reversing Language Shift, Revisited: A 21st Century Perspective*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd. 101 – 141.

Bowers, J. 1968. Language Problems and Literacy, in Fishman, J.A., Ferguson, C.A. & Das Gupta, J. (eds.). *Language Problems of Developing Nations*. New York: Wiley. 381 – 402.

Brann, C.M.B. 1983. *Language Policy, Planning and Management in Africa: A Select Bibliography*. Québec: CIRB [Publication H – 2].

Brock-Utne, B. 1993. *Education in Africa: Education for Self-reliance or Recolonization?* Blindern: University of Oslo.

Brock-Utne, B. & Hopson, R.K. 2005. Educational Language Contexts and Issues in Postcolonial Africa, in Brock-Utne, B. & Hopson, R.K. (eds.). *Language of Instruction for African Emancipation: Focus on Postcolonial Contexts and Considerations*. Dar es Salaam: Mkuki n Nyota Publishers, Cape Town: Centre for Advanced African Society. 1 – 21.

Brock-Utne, B. 2005. The Continued Battle over KiSwahili as the Language of Instruction in Tanzania, in Brock-Utne, B. & Hopson, R.K. (eds.). *Language of Instruction for African Emancipation: Focus on Postcolonial Contexts and Considerations*. Dar es Salaam: Mkuki n Nyota Publishers, Cape Town: Centre for Advanced African Society. 51 – 88.

Bruns, B., Mingat, A. & Rakotomalala, R. 2003. *Achieving Universal Primary Education by 2015: A Chance for Every Child*. Switzerland: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/ The World Bank.

Bulawayo Bureau. 2010. Lack of Funding: Blow to Venda, Sotho Curricula Development. *The Herald*, 22 October: 6.

Burne, D.H. 1968. Bilingual Education in the Andes of Perui, in Fishman, J.A, Ferguson, C.A. & Das Gupta, J. (eds.). 1968. *Language Problems of Developing Nations*. New York: Wiley. 403 – 414.

Business Reporter. 2010. Indigenous Languages Bill [Online]. Available: http://allafrica.com/stories/201003110058html [2010, March 27].

Byo24News. 2011. *Puma Challenges Ministry of Education's Language Policy* [Online]. Available: http://bulawayo24.com/index-id-news-sc-local-byo-736-article-Puma+challenges+Ministry+of+Education%27stlanguage+policy+html [2011, January 19].

Cameron, D., Frazer, E., Harvey, P., Rampton, H.B.H. & Richardson, K. 1992. *Researching Language: Issues of Power and Method*. London and New York: Routledge.

Cartwright, D. 2006. Geolinguistic Analysis in Language Policy, in Ricento, T. (ed.). *An Introduction to Language Policy, Theory and Method*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing. 194 – 209.

Casanave, C.P. 2010. Case Studies, in Paltridge, B. & Phakiti, A. (eds.) *Continuum Companion to Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. London/ New York: Continuum International Publishing Group. 66 – 79.

Chabata, E. 2007. The African Languages Research Institute: A Milestone in the Development of Zimbabwean Languages. *Lexikos*, *17 (Afrilex-reeks/ series 17:2007)*: 278 – 291.

Chimhundu, H., Nkiwane, M.D., Gutsa, J.N., Mano, J.D., Matimati, E.K., & Muchemwa, K.M.M. 1998. *Report on the Formulation of a National Language Policy: National Language Policy Advisory Panel*.

Chinowaita, M. 2011. Vernacular Languages Recognised. *Daily News*, 26 July: 17.

Chiswick, B., Patrinos, H. & Tamayo, S. 1996. *The Economics of Language: Application to Education*. Washington DC: World Bank.

Chiuye, G. & Moyo, T. 2008. Mother-Tongue Education in Primary Schools in Malawi: From Policy to Implementation. *South African Journal of African Languages*, 28(2): 133 – 144.

Chriost, D.M.G. 2008. Micro-level Language Planning in Ireland, in Liddicoat, A.J. & Baldauf, Jr. R.B. (eds.). 2008. *Language Planning and Policy: Language Planning in Local Contexts*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. 75 – 94.

Chua, C.S.K. 2008. Singaporean Educational Planning: Moving from the Macro to the Micro, in Liddicoat, A.J. & Baldauf, Jr. R.B. (eds.). 2008. *Language Planning and Policy: Language Planning in Local Contexts*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. 183 – 198.

Chumbow, B. 1987. Towards a Language Planning Model for Africa. *Journal of West African Languages*, XVII(1): 15 – 22.

Clarke, A. & Dawson, R. 1999. *Evaluation Research: An Introduction to Principles, Methods and Practice*. London: SAGE.

Cluver, A. D. De V. 1991. A Systems Approach to Language Planning: The Case of Namibia. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 15(1): 43 – 64.

Coetzee, J.K. 2001. Modernisation Theory, in Coetzee, J.K., Graaff, J., Hendricks, F. & Wood, G. (eds.). *Development: Theory, Policy and Practice*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press. 27 – 43.

Cohen, L. & Manion, L. 1994. *Research Methods in Education*. London: Routledge.

Coltart, D. 2012. *Minority Languages: Plugging Education Gap* [Online]. Available: http://www.newzimbabwe.com/opinion-9592-Minority+languages+plugging+the+gap/opinion.aspx [2012, November 18].

Cooper, R.L. 1989. *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Corson, D. 1993. *Language, Minority Education and Gender: Linking Social Justice and Power*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Coulmas, F. 1998. Language Rights: Interests of Language Groups and the Individual. *Language Sciences*, 20: 63 – 72.

Coulmas, F. 1999. *The Writing Systems of the World*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Crawford, J. 1994. Endangered Native American Languages. What is to be done and why? *Journal of Navajo Education*, 11(3): 3 – 11.

Crystal, D. 2000. *Language Death*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cummins, J. 1981. *Bilingualism and Minority-Language Children*. Toronto, Onto: OISE Press.

Cummins, J. 2000. *Language, Power and Pedagogy*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. 2006. Language Interaction in the Classroom: From Coercive to Collaborative Relations of Power, in García, O. & Baker, C. (eds.). *Bilingual Education: An Introductory Reader*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 108 – 113.

Cuvelier, P. 2010. Foreword, in Cuvelier, P., Du Plessis, T., Meeuwis. M., Vandekerckhove, R. & Webb, V. (eds.). *Multilingualism from Below*. Pretoria: Van Schaik. xii – xvi.

Daoust, D. 1997. Language Planning and Language Reform, in Coulmas, F. (ed.). *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers. 436 – 452.

Dauenhauer, N.M. & Dauenhauer, R. 1998. Technical, Emotional and Ideological Issues in Reversing Language Shift: Examples from Southeast Alaska, in Grenoble, L.A. & Whaley, L.J. (eds.). *Endangered Languages: Language Loss and Community Response: Current Issues and Future Prospects*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 57 – 98.

Davids, L.S. 2001. Empowering African Languages in the Namibian Education System, in Trewby, R. & Fitchat, S. (eds.). *Language and Development in Southern Africa. Making the Right Choices*. *Conference Proceedings National Institute for Educational Development Okahandja, Namibia, 11 – 13 April 2000*. Windhoek: Gamsberg Macmillian Publishers. 136 –142.

Davies, B.M. 2007. *Doing a Successful Research Project Using Qualitative or Quantitative Methods*. Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillian Publishers.

De Kadt, J. 2006. Language Development in South Africa – Past and Present, in Webb, V. & Du Plessis, T. (eds.). *The Politics of Language in South Africa. Selected Proceedings of a Colloquium held by the University of Pretoria at the Annual Conference of the Linguistic Association of Southern Africa, 6 to 8 July 2005, Dikhololo, South Africa*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers. 40 – 56.

De Wet, C. 2002. Factors Influencing the Choice of English as Language of Learning and Teaching (LoLT) – A South African Perspective. *South African Journal of Education*, 22(2): 119 – 124.

Devonish, H. 1986. *Language and Liberation: Creole Language Politics in the Caribbean*. London: Karia Press.

Djité, P.G. 2008. *The Sociolinguistics of Development in Africa*. Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Doke, C.M. 1931. *Report on the Unification of the Shona Dialects*. Hartford: Stephen and Austin and Sons.

Donnacha, J.M. 2000. An Integrated Language Planning Model. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 24(1): 11 – 35.

Dorian, N.C. 1998. Western Language Ideologies and Small-Languages Prospects, in Grenoble, L.A. & Whaley, L.J. (eds.). *Endangered Languages: Language Loss and Community Response: Current Issues and Future Prospects*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 3 – 21.

Dorian, N.C. 1999. Linguistic and Ethnographic Fieldwork, in Fishman, J.A. (ed.). *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 25 – 41.

Dube, G. 2012. *Zimbabwe gets $9 Million for Writing Minority Language Books* [Online]. Available: http://www.voazimbabwe.com/content/zimbabwe-textbooks-david-coltart-education-transtion-fund-minority-languages/1547747.html [2012, November 23].

Du Plessis, T. 2010. Language Planning from Below: The Case of the Xhariep District of the Free State Province. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 11(2): 130 – 151.

Eastman, C.M. 1983. *Language Planning: An Introduction*. Novato, California: Chandler & Sharp Publishers, Inc.

Eckstein, H. 1975. 'Case Study and Theory in Political Science', in Greenstein, F.J. & Polsby, N.W. (eds.). *Handbook of Political Science, Volume 7*. *Reading*, MA: Addison-Wesley. 79 – 139.

Ehlers, T. & Lazenby, K. (eds.). 2010. *Strategic Management: Southern African Concepts and Cases*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Ejieh, M.U.C. 2004. Attitudes of Student Teachers towards Teaching in Mother Tongue in Nigerian Primary Schools: Implications on Planning. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 17(1): 73 – 81.

England, N.C. 1998. Mayan Efforts Toward Language Preservation, in Grenoble, L.A. & Whaley, L.J. (eds.). *Endangered Languages: Language Loss and Community Response: Current Issues and Future Prospects*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 99 – 123.

Fairclough, N. 1995. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. New York: Longman.

Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. 1997. Critical Discourse Analysis, in Van Dijk, T.A. (ed.). *Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. London: SAGE Publishers Ltd. 258 – 284.

Faller, F. 2008. Universal Primary Education in Sub-Saharan Africa: Achievable or Impossible Target?, in Nwonwu, F. (ed.). *Millennium Development Goals: Achievements and Prospects of Meeting the Targets in Africa*. Pretoria: Africa Institute of South Africa. 37 – 76.

Fasold, F.W. 1984. *The Sociolinguistics of Society*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Fasold, R.W. 1990. *The Sociolinguistics of Language*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Fasold, R.W. & Shuy, R.W. 1970. *Teaching Standard English in the Inner City*. Washington, D.C: Centre for Applied Linguistics.

Ferguson, G. 2006. *Language Planning and Education*. Edinburg: Edinburg University Press.

Fishman, J.A. 1991. *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Emperical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual: Matters.

Fishman, J.A. 2006. Language Policy and Language Shift, in Ricento, T. (ed.). *Introduction to Language Policy Theory and Method*. Malden, Mass: Blackwell. 311 – 328.

Fishman, J.A., Hayden, R.G. & Warshauer, M.E. 1966. The Non-English and the Ethnic Group Press, 1910-1960, in Fishman, J. A. Nahirny, V.C., Hofman, J.E., Hayden, R.G., Warshauer, M.E., Kloss, H., Lemaire, H.B., Chester, C., Christian, J., Glazer, N. & Haugen, E. (eds.). *Language Loyalty in the United States: The Maintenance and Perpetuation of Non-English Mother Tongues by American Ethnic and Religious Groups*. The Hague, The Netherlands: Mouton & Co. 51 – 74.

Flyvbjerg, B. 2007. Five Misunderstandings about Case-Study Research, in Seale, C., Gobo, G., Gubrium, J.F. & Silverman, D. (eds.). *Qualitative Research Practice*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications. 390 – 404.

Forester, J. 1985. *Critical Theory and Public Life*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Gambahaya, Z. & Gwete, W.B. 1997. *Position Paper on Zimbabwe's Language Policy*.

García, O. 1997. Bilingual Education, in Coulmas, F. (ed.). *Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell. 405 – 420.

Gatsha, G. 2009. Introducing Minority and Marginalised Languages in Schools through Pastoral Care, in Kamwendo, G., Jankie, D. & Chebanne, A. (eds.). *Mother Tongue Education for All: Multilingualism in Education and Communities in Southern Africa*. Gaborone: UBTromso Collaborative Programme for San Research and Capacity Building. 64 – 68.

Gee, J.P. 2001. Educational Linguistics, in Aronoff, M & Rees-Miller, J. (eds.). *The Handbook of Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers. 647 – 663.

Gee, J.P. 2011. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis Theory and Method*. New York and London: Routledge.

Gellner, E. 1997. *Nationalism*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Georgiou, V., Ó Laoire, M. & Rigg, C. 2010. Shaping Language Policy on the Ground: The Official Languages Act (2003) in Ireland, in Cuvelier, P., Du Plessis, T., Meeuwis, M., Vanderkerckhove, R. & Webb, V. (eds.). *Multilingualism from Below*. Pretoria: Van Schaik. 95 – 116.

Giles, H., Bourhis, R.Y. & Taylor, D.M. 1977. Towards a Theory of Language in Ethnic Group Relations, in Giles, H. (ed.). *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations*. London: Academic Press. 307 – 348.

Gill, S.K. 2004. Medium-of-Instruction Policy in Higher Education in Malaysia: Nationalism Versus Internationalization, in Tollefson, J.W. & Tsui, A.B.M. (eds.). *Medium of Instruction of Policies. Which Agenda? Whose Agenda?* Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc, Publishers. 135 – 152.

Gobo, G. 2007. Sampling, Representativeness and Generalizability, in Seale, C., Gobo, G., Gubrium, J.F. & Silverman, D. (eds.). *Qualitative Research Practice*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications. 405 – 426.

Gondo, K.T. 2009. A Call for the Upliftment of the Shangani Language: An Evaluation of the Problems Surrounding Shangani Language Status and their Implications in Zimbabwe. *NAWA Journal of Language and Communication*, 3(1): 129 – 138.

Government of the Republic of South Africa. 1996. *The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996: Act 108 of 1996*.

Government of Zimbabwe. 1979. *Constitution of Zimbabwe*. Harare: Government Printers.

Government of Zimbabwe. 1987. *Chapter 25:04: Education Act, as Amended in 2006*. Harare: Government Printers.

Government of Zimbabwe. 1998. *New Traditional Leaders' Act (29:17)*. Harare: Government Printers.

Government of Zimbabwe. 1999. *Report of the Nziramasanga Commission of Inquiry into Education and Training in Zimbabwe*.

Government Recognises Minority Languages: VP Mujuru. [S.a.] [Online]. Available: http://www.zbc.co.zw/news-categories/top-stories/24603-govt-recognises-minority-languages-vp-mujuru.html [2012, October 29].

Government of Zimbabwe. 2012. *Constitution of Zimbabwe (Draft 17 July 2012)*. Harare: Government Printers.

Grenoble, L.A. & Whaley, L.J. 1998. Preface, in Grenoble, L.A. & Whaley, L.J. (eds.). *Endangered Languages: Language Loss and Community Response: Current Issues and Future Prospects*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. vii – xvi.

Grenoble, L.A. & Whaley, L.J. 1998. Toward a Typology of Language Endangerment, in Grenoble, L.A. & Whaley, L.J. (eds.). *Endangered Languages: Language Loss and Community Response: Current Issues and Future Prospects*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 22 – 54.

Grinevald, C. 1998. Language Endangerment in South America: A Programmatic Approach, in Grenoble, L.A. & Whaley, L.J. (eds.). *Endangered Languages: Language Loss and Community Response: Current Issues and Future Prospects*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 124 – 159.

Grin, F. 2003. Language Planning and Economics. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 4: 1 – 66.

Grin, F. & Vaillancourt, F. 1999. *The Cost-Effectiveness Evaluation of Minority Language Policies: Case Studies on Wales, Ireland and the Basque Country*. Flensburg: European Centre for Minority Issues.

Hachipola, S.J. 1998. *A Survey of the Minority Languages of Zimbabwe*. Harare: University of Zimbabwe Publications.

Hadebe, S. 2006. *The Standardisation of Ndebele Language through Dictionary-Making*. Harare/ Oslo: The ALLEX Project, the African Languages Research Institute,

University of Zimbabwe and the Department of Linguistics and Scandinavian Studies, University of Oslo.

Hailemariam, C. 2002. *Language and Education in Eritrea: A Case Study of Language Diversity, Policy and Practice*. Amsterdam: Aksant.

Hale, K. 1992. On Endangered Languages and the Safeguarding of Diversity. *Language*, 69(1): 1 – 3.

Hamid, M.O. 2010. Globalisation for Everyone and English Teacher Capacity: Language Policy Discourses and Realities in Bangladesh. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 11(4): 289 – 310.

Hanly, M. 1994. Foreword, in Tremmel, M. 1994. *The People of the Great River: The Tonga Hoped the Water would Follow Them*. Gweru/ Harare: Mambo Press in Association with Silveria House. 5 – 6.

Harbon, L. & Shen, H. 2010. Researching Language Classrooms, in Paltridge, B. & Phakiti, A. (eds.) *Continuum Companion to Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. London/ New York: Continuum International Publishing Group. 274 – 285.

Harford, C. 2011. English and the Distinctly African University: The Best of Both Worlds. Unpublished Paper Delivered at the Department of English 6th International Conference on English and the Distinctly African University. 1-3 June, Gaborone: University of Botswana.

Harlech-Jones, B. 1990. *You Taught Me Language: The Implementation of English as a Medium of Instruction in Namibia*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Harris, L.B. 2009. Indigenous Languages to be introduced at Primary Schools – Sen Coltart. *Sunday News*, 11- 17 October: 3.

Hatoss, A. 2008. Community-Level Approaches in Language Planning: The Case of Hungarian in Australia, in Liddicoat, A.J. & Baldauf, Jr. R.B. (eds.). *Language Planning and Policy: Language Planning in Local Contexts*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. 55 – 74.

Haugen, E. 1972. *The Ecology of Language: Essays by Einar Haugen Selected and Introduced by Anwar S. Dil*. Stanford, Carlifornia: Stanford University Press.

Haugen, E. 1983. The Implementation of Corpus Planning: Theory and Practice, in Cobarrubias, J. & Fishman, J.A. (eds.). *Progress in Language Planning*. Berlin: Mouton. 269 – 289.

Hawes, H.W.R. 1979. *Curriculum and Reality in African Primary Schools*. Harlow, Essex: Longman.

Henrard, K. 2003. Language Rights in Education: The International Framework, in Cuvelier, P., Du Plessis, T. & Teck, L. (eds.). *Multilingualism, Education and Social Integration*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers. 9 – 22.

Herald Reporter. 2011. 'Local Languages to be Examined by 2013'. *The Herald*, 25 July: 2.

Heugh, K. 2003. Rehabilitating Mother-Tongue and Bilingual Education – The Role of Civil Society, in Cuvelier, P., Du Plessis, T. & Teck, L. (eds.). *Multilingualism, Education and Social Intergration*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers. 120 – 130.

Hinton, L. 2001. Language Revitalization: An Overview, in Hinton, L. & Hale, K. (eds.). *The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice*. San Diego: Academic Press. 3 – 18.

Holliday, A. 2010. Analysing Qualitative Data, in Paltridge, B. & Phakiti, A. (eds.) *Continuum Companion to Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. London/ New York: Continuum International Publishing Group. 98 – 110.

Hornberger, N.H. 2006a. Frameworks and Models in Language Policy and Planning, in Ricento, T. (ed.). *Introduction to Language Policy Theory and Method*. Malden, Mass: Blackwell Publishing. 24 – 41.

Hornberger, N.H. 2006b. Voice and Biliteracy in Indigenous Language Revitalization: Contentious Educational Practices in Quechua, Guarani, and Māori Contexts. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 5(4): 277 – 292.

Hornberger, N.H. & Hult, F.M. 2008. Ecological Language Education Policy, in Spolsky, B. & Hult, F.M. (eds.) *The Handbook of Educational Linguistics*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 280 – 296.

Hornberger, N.H. 2009. Multilingual Education Policy and Practice: Ten Certainties (Grounded in Indigenous Experience). *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 24(2):1 – 18.

Human, P. *Yenza: A Blueprint for Transformation*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Indede, F. 2002. The Dilemma of National Integration in Multilingual Communities, in Owino, F.R. (ed.). *Speaking African: African Languages for Education and Development*. Cape Town: Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society. 99 – 105.

Ingram, D.E. 1989. Language in Education Planning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics. 10*: 53 – 78.

Ivankova, N.V., Creswell, J.W. & Clark, V.L.P. 2007. Foundations and Approaches to Mixed Research Methods, in Maree, K. (ed.). *First Steps in Research.* Pretoria: Van Schaik. 253 – 282.

Jacobs, K.A. 1998. A Chronology of Mohawk Language Instruction at Kahnawá:ke, in Grenoble, L.A. & Whaley, L.J. (eds.). *Endangered Languages: Language Loss and Community Response: Current Issues and Future Prospects*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 117 – 123.

Jankie, D. 2009. Nurturing the Dialogue on Mother Tongue Education in Southern African Societies, in Kamwendo, G., Jankie, D. & Chebanne, A. (eds.). *Mother Tongue for All: Multilingualism in Education and Communities in Southern Africa*. UBTromso Collaborative Programme for San Research and Capacity Building. 177 – 182.

Jernudd, B.H. 1973. Language Planning a Type of Language Treatment, in Rubin, J. & Shuy, R.W. (eds.). *Language Planning: Current Issues and Research*. Washington D.C: Georgetown University Press. 11 – 23.

Jernudd, B.H. 1977. Prerequisites for a Model of Language Treatment, in Rubin, J., Jernudd, B.H., Das Gupta, J., Fishman, J.A. & Ferguson, C.A. (eds.). *Language Planning Processes*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton. 41 – 54.

Jernudd, B.H. 1981. Planning Language Treatment: Linguistics for the Third World. *Language in Society*, 10: 43 – 52.

Jernudd, B.H. 1993. Language Planning from a Management Perspective: An Interpretation of Findings, in Jahr, E.H (ed.). *Trends in Linguistics Studies and Monographs 72. Language Conflict and Language Planning*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 133 – 142.

Jernudd. B.H. & Das Gupta, J. 1971. Towards a Theory of Language Planning, in Rubin, J. & Jernudd, B.H. (eds.). *Can Language be Planned? Sociolinguistic Theory and Practice for Developing Nations*. Hawaii: Hawaii University Press. 195 – 215.

Jernudd, B.H. & Neustupny, J.V. 1987. Language Planning: For Whom?, in Laforge, L. (ed.). *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Language Planning*. Québec: Presses de l' Université Laval. 69 – 84.

Jernudd, B.H. & Neustupny, J.V. 1991. 'Multi-Disciplined Language Planning', in Marshall, D.F. (ed.). *Language Planning* [Focusschrift in Honor of Joshua A. Fishman]. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 29 – 36.

Johnson, D. 1984. Planning Small-Scale Research, in Bell, J., Bush, T., Fox, A., Goody, J. & Goulding, S. (eds.). *Conducting Small-scale Investigations in Educational Management*. London: Harper and Row. 5 – 26.

Jones, D.V. & *Martin*-Jones, M. 2004. Bilingual Education and Language Revitalisation in Wales: Past Achievements and Current Issues, in Tollefson, J.W. & Tsui, A.B.M. (eds.). *Medium of Instruction Policies. Which Agenda? Whose Agenda?* Mahweh, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc, Publishers. 43 – 70.

Joseph, J.E. 2006. *Language and Politics*. Edinburg: Edinburg University Press.

Kamanda, M.C. 2002. Mother Tongue Education and Transtional Literacy in Sierra Leone: Prospects and Challenges in the 21st Century. *Language and Education*, 16(3): 195 – 211.

Kamwangamalu, N.O. 2003. Language and Education in Africa: Emancipation or Alienation?, in Cuvelier, P., Du Plessis, T.& Teck, L. (eds.). *Multilingualism, Education and Social Integration*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers. 175 – 184.

Kamwangamalu, N. 2004. Linguistic Renaissance for an Africa Renaissance: Language Policy and Language Planning, in Kriel, M. (ed.*). The Language Web: Essays in Honour of Victor Webb*. Port Elizabeth: University of Port Elizabeth. 34 – 43.

Kamwendo, G.H. 2002. Ethnic Revival and Language Associations in the New Malawi: The Case of Chitumbuka, in Englund, H. (ed.). *A Democracy of Chameleons. Politics and Culture in the New Malawi*. Uppsala: Nordic Africa Institute. 140 – 150.

Kamwendo, G.H. 2005. Language Planning from Below: An Example from Northern Malawi. *Language Policy*, 4: 143 – 165.

Kamwendo, G.H. 2009. Multilingualism in Education and Communities in Southern Africa: An Introduction, in Kamwendo, G., Jankie, D. & Chebanne, A. (eds.). *Mother Tongue Education for All: Multilingualism in Education and Communities in Southern Africa*.

Gaborone: UBTromso Collaborative Programme for San Research and Capacity Building. 9 – 15.

Kamwendo, G.H. & Kachiwanda, S.O. 2002. Enhancing the Role of an African Language in Education, in Owino, F.R. (ed.). *Speaking African: African Languages for Education and Development*. Cape Town: Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society. 195 – 202.

Kaplan, R.B. & Baldauf, R.B. 1997. *Language Planning: From Practice to Theory*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Kaplan, R.B. & Baldauf, R.B. 2003. *Language and Language-in-Education Planning in the Pacific Basin*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Kaplan, R.B., Baldauf, Jr, R.B. & Kamwangamalu, N. 2011. Why Educational Plans Sometimes Fail. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 12(2): 105 – 124.

Karam, F.X. 1974. 'Towards a Theory of Language Planning', in Fishman, J.A. (ed.). Advances in Language Planning. The Hague: Mouton. 103 – 124.

Kembo-Sure. 2004. Suba Ethno-linguistic Vitality and Ethnic Revival, in Kriel, M. (ed.). *The Language Web: Essays in Honour of Victor Webb*. Port Elizabeth: University of Port Elizabeth. 44 – 74.

Kendall, A. K. & Benson, C. 2008. Vernacular and Indigenous Literacies, in Spolsky, B. & Hult, F.M. (eds.). *The Handbook of Educational Linguistics*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing. 341 – 354.

Kennedy, C. 1983. Introduction to Language Planning, in Kennedy, C. (ed.). *Language Planning and Language Education*. London: George Allen & Unwin. 1 – 3.

Khubchandani, L.M. 1983. Language Planning Processes for Pluralistic Societies, in Kennedy, C. (ed.). *Language Planning and Language Education*. London: George Allen & Unwin. 93 – 110.

King, J. 2001. Te Kōhonga Reo: Māori Language Revitalisation, in Hinton, L. & Hale, K. (eds.). *The Green Book of Language Revitalisation in Practice*. San Diego: Academic Press. 119 – 128.

King, K.A. & Benson, C. 2004. Indigenous Language Education in Bolivia and Ecuador: Contexts, Changes and Challenges, in Tollefson, J.W. & Tsui, A.B.M. (eds.). *Medium*

of Instruction Policies. Which Agenda? Whose Agenda? Mahwah, New Jersey: Erlbaum Associates, Inc, Publishers. 241 – 262.

Klaus, D. 2003. The Use of Indigenous Languages in Early Basic Education in Papau New Guenea: A Model for Elsewhere? *Language and Education*, 17(2): 105 – 111.

Kristiansen, T. Harwood, J. & Giles, H. 1991. Ethnolinguistic Vitality in the Danish Capital of America. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 12(6): 421 – 448.

Labov, W. 1969. 'The Logic of Non-Standard English'. *Georgetown Monographs on Language and Linguistics*, 22: 1 – 22.

Labov, W. 1972. *Language in the Inner City: Studies in Black English Vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylavania Press.

Ladefoged, P. 1992. Another View of Endangered Languages. *Language*, 68(4): 809 – 811.

Lancaster, C.S. 1974. Ethnic Identity, History, and Tribe in the Middle Zambezi Valley. *American Ethnologist*, 1(4): 707 – 730.

Lasimbang, R. & Kinajil, T. 2008. Changing the Language Ecology of Kadazandusun: The Role of the Kadazandusun Language Foundation, in Liddicoat, A.J. & Baldauf, Jr. R.B. (eds.). *Language Planning and Policy: Language Planning in Local Contexts*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. 171 – 179.

Lastra Y, 2001. Otomí Language Shift and Some Recent Efforts to Reverse it, in Fishman, J.A. (ed.). *Can Threatened Languages be Saved? Reversing Language Shift, Revisited: A 21st Century Perspective*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd. 142 – 165.

Leap, W.L. 1986. American Indian English and its Implications for Bilingual Education, in Allen, H.B. & Linn, M.D. (eds.). *Dialect and Language Variation*. Orlando, Florida: Academic Press, Inc. 591 – 603.

Leedy, P.D. & Ormrod, J.E. 2005. *Practical Research*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson/ Merrill Prentice Hall.

Lemmer, E.M. 1993. Addressing the Needs of the Black Child with a Limited Language Proficiency in the Medium of Instruction, in Le Roux, J. (ed.). *The Black Child in Crisis: A Socio-Educational Perspective. Volume 1*. Pretoria: J.L. Van Schaik. 156 – 170.

Letsie, M.M. 2002. African Languages as Media of Instruction, in Owino, F.R. (ed.). *Speaking African: African Languages for Education and Development*. Cape Town: Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society. 195 – 202.

Levy, J.T. 2003. Language Rights, Literacy, and the Modern State, in Kymlicka, W. & Patten, A. (eds.). *Language Rights and Political Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 230 – 249.

Lewis, P.M. & Trudell, B. 2008. Language Cultivation in Contexts of Multiple Community Languages, in Spolsky, B. & Hult, F.M. (eds.). *The Handbook of Educational Linguistics*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing. 266 – 279.

Liddicoat, A.J. & Baldauf, Jr. R.B. 2008. Language Planning in Local Contexts: Agents, Contexts and Interactions, in Liddicoat, A.J. & Baldauf, Jr. R.B. (eds.). *Language Planning and Policy: Language Planning in Local Contexts*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. 3 – 17.

Lo Bianco, J. 2008. Educational Linguistics and Education Systems, in Spolsky, B. & Hult, F.R. (eds.). *The Handbook of Educational Linguistics*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. 113 – 126.

Lo Bianco, J. 2009. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Language Policy and Planning (LPP): Constraints and Applications of the Critical in Language Planning, in Le, T., Le, Q. & Short, M. (eds.). *Critical Discourse Analysis: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*. New York: Nova Science Publishers. 101 – 119.

Lodico, M.G., Spaulding, D.T. & Voegtle, K.H. 2006. *Methods in Educational Research: From Theory to Practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lubbe, H.J. Linguistic Rights Litigation. *Alternation*, 11(2): 118 – 143.

Luckett, K. 1995. National Additive Bilingualism: Towards a Language Plan for South African Education, in Heugh, K., Siegrum, A. & Pluddemann, P. (eds.). *Multilingual Education for South Africa*. Johannesburg: Heinemann. 73 – 78.

Luoch, T.O. & Ogutu, E.A. 2002. The Use of Mother Tongue and Tribalism: A Misconceived Association, in Owino, F.R. (ed.). *Speaking African: African Languages for Education and Development*. Cape Town: Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society. 89 – 98.

Macnamara, J. 1971. Success and Failures in the Movement for the Restoration of Irish, in Rubin, J. & Jernudd, B.H. (eds.). *Can Language be Planned?* Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii. 65 – 94.

Mafuba, C. 2011. Book Fair Blitz on Local Languages. *The Herald*, 1 August: 5.

Magwa, W. 2010a. Language Planning and Policy for Mass Education: A Case for Zimbabwe. Cape Town: Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society.

Magwa, W. 2010b. Revisiting the Language Question in Zimbabwe: A Multilingual Approach to the Language Education Policy. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 5(2): 157 – 168.

Maja, I. 2010a. Minority Languages Vital. *The Herald*, 10 March: 4.

Maja, I. 2010b. Entrench Language Rights in Constitution. *The Herald*, 17 March: 4.

Maja, I. 2010c. Minority Language Rights Vital. *The Herald*, 14 September: C1.

Makalela, L. 2005. 'We Speak Eleven Tongues' Reconstructing Multilingualism in South Africa, in Brock-Utne, B. & Hopson, R.K. (eds.). *Language of Instruction for African Emancipation: Focus on Postcolonial Contexts and Considerations*. Dar es Salaam: Mkuki n Nyota Publishers, Cape Town: Centre for Advanced African Society. 147 – 174.

Makoni, S. 2011. A Critical Analysis of the Historical and Contemporary Status of Minority Languages in Zimbabwe. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 12(4): 437 – 455.

Makoni, S, Makoni, B. & Nyika, N. 2008. Language Planning from Below: The Case of Tonga in Zimbabwe. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 9(4): 413 – 439.

Mansoor, S. 2005. *Language Planning in Higher Education: A Case of Pakistan*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.

Marshall, D.F. 1994. Language Maintenance and Revival. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 14: 20 – 33.

Martel, A. 1999. Heroes, Rebels, Communities and States in Language Rights Activism and Litigation, in Kontra, M., Phillipson, R., Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Varady, T. (eds.). *Language: A Right and a Resource: Approaching Linguistic Human Rights*. Hungary: Central European University Press. 47 – 80.

Maruatona, T. 2009. Planning in Implementing a Multicultural Literacy Education Curriculum in Botswana, in Kamwendo, G., Jankie, D. & Chebanne, A. (eds.). *Mother Tongue for*

All: Multilingualism in Education and Communities in Southern Africa. UBTromso Collaborative Programme for San Research and Capacity Building. 83 – 91.

Masuku. J. & Ndhlovu, F. 2007. The Role of the African Languages Research Institute in Addressing Language of Instruction Dilemmas in Zimbabwe. *Lexikos (Afrilex-reeks/ series 17:2007)*: 340 – 348.

Matras, Y. 2009. *Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mavunga, G. 2010. The Use of Shona as the Medium of Instruction in the First Three Grades of Primary School in Tonga-Speaking Community – Teachers' and Parents' Perceptions. *Language Matters*, 41(1): 126 – 147.

May, S. 2001. *Language and Minority Rights: Ethnicity, Nationalism and the Politics of Language*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

May, S. 2006. Language Policy and Minority Rights, in Ricento, T. (ed.). *Introduction to Language Policy Theory and Method*. Malden, Mass: Blackwell. 255 – 272.

Mazarire, G.C. 2003. *Who are the Ndebele and the Kalanga in Zimbabwe?* [Online]. Available: ir.uz.ac.zw/jspui/bitstream/…/1/Mazarire-Ndebele-and-Kalanga-pdf [2010, June, 5].

Mbeki, G. 2000. Preface: The Relevance of African Languages for Education and Development, in Prah, K.K. (ed.). *Between Distinction and Extinction: The Harmonisation and Standardisation of African Languages*. Cape Town: Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society. ix – xiii.

McCarty, T.L., Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Magga, O.H. 2008. Education for Speakers of Endangered Languages, in Spolsky, B. & Hult, F.R. (eds.). *The Handbook of Educational Linguistics*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd: 297 – 312.

McGroarty, M. 2002. Evolving Influences on Educational Language Policies, in Tollefson, J.W. (ed.). *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc Publishers. 17 – 36.

McGroarty, M., Beck, A. & Butler, F.A. 1995. Policy Issues in Assessing Indigenous Languages: A Navajo Case. *Applied Linguistics*, 16(3): 323 – 343.

Mikkelsen, B. 1995. *Methods for Development Work and Research: A Guide for Practitioners*. New Delhi: SAGE.

Ministry of Education, Sport and Culture. 1996. *The National Cultural Policy of Zimbabwe*. Harare: Government Printers.

Ministry of Education, Sport and Culture. 2002. *Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002. Curriculum Policy: Primary and Secondary Schools*.

Ministry of Education, Sport and Culture. 2002. *Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002. Policy Regarding Language Teaching and Learning*.

Ministry of Education, Sport and Culture. 2007. *Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007*. *Policy Guidelines on the Teaching of Local Languages in Primary and Secondary Schools in Zimbabwe*

Ministry of Education, Sport, Arts and Culture. 2011. *Re: Response to the Binga Chiefs' Concern on the Teaching of Languages*.

Ministry of Education, Sport and Culture – Gwanda. *Primary Schools in the Sotho Speaking Areas*.

Mlotshwa, K. 2011. *Coltart Speaks on Language Policy* [Online]. Available: http://www.newsday.co.zw/article/2011-01-31-coltart-speaks-on-language-policy [2011, February 2].

Mohanty, A.K. 2009. Multilingual Education: A Bridge too Far?, in Skutnabb-Kangas, T., Phillipson, R., Mohanty, A.K. & Panda, M. (eds.). *Social Justice through Multilingual Education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matter. 3 – 15.

Mohanty, A.K., Mishra, M.K., Reddy, N.U. & Ramesh, G. 2009. Overcoming the Language Barrier for Tribal Children: Multilingual Education in Andhra Pradesh and Orissa, India, in Skutnabb-Kangas, T., Phillipson, R., Mohanty, A.K. & Panda, M. (eds.). *Social Justice through Multilingual Education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. 283 – 297.

Molosiwa, A. 2005. Extinction or Distinction? Empowering Setswana as the Medium of Instruction in Botswana Schools, in Brock-Utne, B. & Hopson, R.K. (eds.). *Language of Instruction for African Emancipation: Focus on Postcolonial Contexts and Considerations*. Dar es Salaam: Mkuki n Nyota Publishers, Cape Town: Centre for Advanced African Society. 175 – 196.

Monaka, K.C. 2009. Mother Tongue Education: Prospects for Bakgalagari Learners, in Kamwendo, G., Jankie, D. & Chebanne, A. (eds.). *Mother Tongue for All:*

Multilingualism in Education and Communities in Southern Africa. UBTromso Collaborative Programme for San Research and Capacity Building. 69 – 79.

Morgan, G. 2001. Welsh: A European Case of Language Maintenance, in Hinton, L. & Hale, K. (eds.). *The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice*. San Diego: Academic Press. 107 – 113.

Morris, L.L. & Fitz-Gibbon, C.T. 1978. *How to Measure Program Implementation*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Moto, F. 2002. African Languages and the Crisis of Identity: The Case of Malawi, in Owino, F.R. (ed.). *Speaking African: African Languages for Education and Development*. Cape Town: Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society. 33 – 44.

Mouton, J. 2001. *How to Succeed in your Masters and Doctoral Studies: A South African Guide and Resource Book*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Mouton, J. 2001. Program Evaluation Research, in Coetzee, J.K., Graaff, J., Hendricks, F. & Wood, G. (eds.). *Development: Theory, Policy and Practice*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press Southern Africa. 569 – 583.

Moyo, H.J. 2002. Lexical Metamorphosis of the Kalanga Language: Towards an Analysis of the Impact of Ndebele Domination of the Kalanga Language. *Zambezia*, XXIX(ii): 142 – 148.

Moyo, L. 2010. *A First for the Tonga* [Online]. Available: http://www.thestandard.co.zw/local/27387-a-first-for-the-tonga.html [2010, November 13].

Mpofu, S. 2012. *Zimbabwe: Paradigm Shift on Minority Languages a Welcome Move* [Online]. Available: http://allafrica.com/stories/201205110870html [2012, May 5].

Msindo, E. 2005. Language and Ethnicity in Matabeleland: Ndebele-Kalanga Relations in Southern Zimbabwe, 1930-1960. *International Journal of African Historical Studies*, 38(1): 79 – 103.

Msindo, E. 2007. Ethnicity and Nationalism in Urban Colonial Zimbabwe: Bulawayo, 1950-1963. *Journal of African History*, 48(2): 267 – 290.

Mumpande, I. 2006. *Silent Voices: Indigenous Languages in Zimbabwe*. Harare: Weaver Press.

Mutasa, D.E. 1995. The Language Situation in Zimbabwe with Special Reference to the Sociological, Orthographic and Linguistic Problems of Minority Language Groups. *South African Journal of Linguistics*, 13(2): 87 – 92.

Muthwii, M.J. 2002. Status Language Planning in Multilingual States in Africa, in Owino, F.R. (ed.). *Speaking African. African Languages for Education and Development. CASAS Book Series NO 21*. Cape Town: Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society (CASAS). 77 – 87.

Muzondidya, J. & Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. 2007. 'Echoing Silences': Ethnicity in Post-colonial Zimbabwe, 1980 – 2007. *African Journal on Conflict Resolution*, 7(2): 275 – 297.

Mwaniki, M.M. 2004. Language Planning: Towards a Language Management Approach. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Bloemfontein: University of the Free State.

Mwaniki, M. 2010a. The Importance of Multilingualism in the Provincial Government Sphere in South Africa. Unpublished Paper Delivered at the Multilingual Informatics Development Programme (MIDP) Workshop. 14 May, Bloemfontein.

Mwaniki, M. 2010b. Mixed Approach to Multilingual Language Policy Implementation: Insights from Local Government Sphere in South Africa, in Cuvelier, P., Du Plessis, T., Meeuwis, M., Vandekerckhove, R. & Webb, V. (eds.). *Multilingualism from Below*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers. 68 – 94.

Mwaniki, M. 2011. *Research Statement: Language Management: A Paradigm Shift in Politics of Language*. Unpublished Research Project Proposal.

Mwaniki, M. 2011. Language Management in Africa: The Dialectics of Theory and Practice. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 29(3): 243 – 257.

Mwaniki, M. 2012. *Multilingualism and the Public Sector in South Africa*. Bloemfontein: SUN MeDIA.

Mwaniki, M. Mother Tongue Education in Primary Teacher Education in Kenya: Language Management of the Quota System, in Njoroge .M.C., Ndungu, R.W., Mwangi, P.W. & Orwenjo, D.O. (eds.). *Multilingualism and Education in Africa: Global Practices and Challenges, Volume 2 – Multilingualism and Education in Africa: The Reality on the Ground*. Dordrecht: The Netherlands: Springer. Forthcoming.

Myers-Scotton, C. 1993. Elite Closure as a Powerful Strategy: The African Case. *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, 103: 149 – 163.

Nagai, Y. & Lister, R. 2003. What is Our Culture? What is Our Language? Dialogue Towards the Maintenance of Indigenous Culture and Language in Papua New Guinea. *Language and Education*, 17(2): 87 – 104.

Nahir, M. 1983. Sociocultural Factors in the Revival of Hebrew. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 7(3): 263 – 284.

Nahir, M. 1984. Language Planning Goals: A Classification. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 8(3): 294 – 327.

Nahir, M. 1988. Language Planning and Language Acquisition: The 'Great Leap' in the Hebrew Revival, in Paulston, C.B. (ed.). *International Handbook of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. New York: Greenwood Press. 275 – 295.

Nahir, M. 1998. Micro Language Planning and the Revival of Hebrew: A Schematic Framework. *Language in Society*, 27(3): 335 – 357.

Ndhlovu, F. 2004. Is there Anything Minor about Minority Languages? Another look at the Politics of Language in Zimbabwe. Unpublished Paper Delivered at the Fourth International Conference on Preserving African Languages, Organised by the African Languages Research Project. 4-7 November, University of Maryland Eastern Shore.

Ndhlovu, F. 2005. Zimbabwe's Postcolonial Language Policy Formulation Paradigms, 1987-1998, in Crawhall, N.T. & Ostler, N. (eds.). *Creating Outsiders: Endangered Languages, Migration and Marginalization*. Bath: The Foundation of Endangered Languages. 145 – 152.

Ndhlovu, F. 2008a. The Politics of Language and Nationality in Zimbabwe: Nation Building or Empire Building? *South African Journal of African Languages*, 1: 1 – 10.

Ndhlovu, F. 2008b. The Conudrums of Language Policy and Politics in South Africa and Zimbabwe. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 28(1): 59 – 80.

Ndhlovu, F. 2009. *The Politics of Language and Nation Building in Zimbabwe*. Bern: Peter Lang AG, International Academic Publishers.

Ndhlovu, F. 2010. Language Politics in Postcolonial Africa Revisited: Minority Agency and Language Imposition. *Language Matters*, 41(2): 175 – 192.

Ndhlovu, F. 2011. *No to Everything British but their Language: Re-thinking English Language and Politics in Zimbabwe*. Unpublished Paper Delivered at the Department

of English 6th International Conference on English and the Distinctly African University. 1-3 June, Gaborone: University of Botswana.

Ndlovu, B.W. 1999. *Laphuma Elinye Lingakatshoni*. Harare: College Press.

Ndlovu, E. 2011. Mother Tongue Education in Official Minority Languages in Zimbabwe. *South African Journal of African Languages*, 31(2): 229 – 242.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S.J. 2009. *The Ndebele Nation: Reflections on Hegemony, Memory and Historiography*. Amsterdam-Pretoria: Rozenberg: UNISA Press.

Ndoda, D.E. 1988. *Indabikhona*. Gweru: Mambo Press in Association with the Literature Bureau.

Neustupny, J.V. 1968. Some General Aspects of 'Language' Problems and 'Language' Policy in Developing Societies, in Fishman, J.A., Ferguson, C. & Das Gupta, J. (eds.). *Language Problems of Developing Countries*. New York: John Wiley & Sons. 285 – 294.

Neustupny, J.V. 1974. Basic Types of Treatment of Language Problems, in Fishman, J.A. (ed.). *Advances in Language Planning*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton. 37 – 48.

Neustupny, J.V. 1978. *Post-Structural Approaches to Language*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Neustupny, J.V & Nekvapil, J. 2003. Language Management in the Czech Republic. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 4(3/ 4): 18 – 366.

Ngara, E. 1995. *The African University and its Mission Strategies for Improving the Delivery of Higher Education Institution*. Lesotho: Institute of Southern African Studies.

Ngara, E.A. 1982. *Bilingualism, Language Contact and Planning: Proposals for Language Use and Language Teaching in Zimbabwe*. Gwelo: Mambo Press.

Nical, I., Smolicz, J.J. & Secombe, M.J. 2004. Rural Students and the Philippine Bilingual Education Program on the Island of Leyte, in Tollefson, J.W. & Tsui, A.B.M. (eds.). *Medium of Instruction Policies. Which Agenda? Whose Agenda?* Mahweh, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc, Publishers. 153 – 176.

Nieuwenhuis, J. 2007. Qualitative Research Designs and Data Gathering Techniques, in Maree, K. (ed.). *First Steps in Research.* Pretoria: Van Schaik. 69 – 97.

Nkomo, D. 2007. Nationalism and Language Planning in Zimbabwe. Unpublished Paper Delivered at the Cultural Construction of Zimbabwe Conference. 20 – 22 November, Harare: Bronte Hotel.

Nkomo, D. 2008. Language in Education and Language Development in Zimbabwe. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 26(3): 351 – 362.

Novak-Lukanovič, S. & Limon, D. 2012. Language Policy in Slovenia. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 25(1): 27 – 39.

Nthambe, M.P. 2012. *Zimbabwe Indigenous Languages face Extinction* [Online]. Available: http://www.voazimbabwe.com/content/zimbabwe-indigenous-languages-extinction-/1550664.html [2012, November 23].

Nyathi, P. 2005. *Zimbabwe's Cultural Heritage*. Bulawayo: amaBooks.

Nyati-Ramahobo, L. 2000. Language Situation in Botswana. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 1(2): 244 – 400.

Nyika, N. 2008a. Language Activism in Zimbabwe: Grassroots Mobilisation, Collaboration and Action. *Language Matters*, 39(1): 3 – 17.

Nyika, N. 2008b. 'Our Languages are Equally Important': Struggles for the Revitalisation of the Minority Languages in Zimbabwe. *Southern African Linguistics Applied Language Studies*, 26(4): 457 – 470.

Obanya, P. 1980. Research on Alternative Teaching in Africa, in Yoloye, E.A. & Flechsig, H. (eds.). *Educational Research for Development*. Bonn: Deutsche Stiftung für International Entwicklung. 67 – 112.

Obanya, P. 2004. *Learning in, with, and from the First Language*. Cape Town: PRAESA.

Obeng, S.G. & Adegbija, E. 1999. Sub-Saharan Africa, in Fishman, J.A. (ed.). *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 353 – 368.

Ojwang, B. 2011. Political and Sociolinguistic Obstacles to the Expanded Functions of Kiswahil in Kenya. *Language Matters: Studies in the Languages of Africa*, 42(2): 231 – 247.

Ongarora, D.O. 2002. African Languages in Development: Prospects and Encumbrances, in Owino, F.R. (ed.) *Speaking African. African Languages for Education and Development. CASAS Book Series NO 21*. Cape Town: Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society (CASAS). 65 – 75.

Opuku-Amankwa, K. 2009. English-only Language-in-Education Policy in Multilingual Classrooms in Ghana. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 22(2): 121 – 135.

Organisation of African Unity, 1986. *Language Plan of Action for Africa*.

Orman, J. 2008. *Language Policy and Nation-Building in Post-Apartheid South Africa*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Osborn, D. 2010. *African Languages in a Digital Age: Challenges and Opportunities for Indigenous Language Computing*. Cape Town: Human Sciences Research Council; Ottawa: International Development Research Centre.

Ouane, A. 2010. Preface, in Heugh, K. & Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (eds.). *Multilingual Education Works from the Periphery to the Centre*. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan Pvt. vii – x.

Pakir, A. 2004. Medium-of-Instruction Policy in Singapore, in Tollefson, J.W. & Tsui, A.B.M. (eds.). *Medium of Instruction Policies. Which Agenda? Whose Agenda?* Mahweh, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc, Publishers. 117 – 133.

Panda, M. & Mohanty, A.K. 2009. Language Matters, so does Culture: Beyond the Rhetoric of Culture in Multilingual Education, in Skutnabb-Kangas, T., Phillipson, R., Mohanty, A.K. & Panda, M. (eds.). *Social Justice through Multilingual Education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. 301 – 319.

Patrinos, H.A. & Velez, E. 2009. Costs and Benefits of Bilingual Education in Guatemala: A Partial Analysis. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 29(6): 594 – 598.

Patton, M.Q. 1997. *Utilization-Focused Evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Paulston, C.B.1988. Bilingualism and Bilingual Education: An Introduction, in Paulston, C.B. (ed.). *International Handbook of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, Inc. 1 – 15.

Paulston, C.B. 1994. *Linguistic Minorities in Multilingual Settings. Implications for Language Policies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Paulston, C.B. & Heidemann, K. 2006: Language Policies and the Education of Linguistic Minorities, in Ricento, T. (ed.). *Introduction to Language Policy Theory and Method*. Malden, Mass: Blackwell Publishing. 292 – 310.

Peddie, R.A. 1991. Coming – Ready or Not? Language Policy Development in New Zealand. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 15(1): 25 – 42.

Pelinka, A. 2007. Language as a Political Category: The Viewpoint of Political Science. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 6(1): 129 – 143.

Pennycook, A. 1994. Incommensurable Discourses. *Applied Linguistics*, 15(2): 115 – 138.

Pennycook, A. 1998. *English and the Discourses of Colonialism*. London and New York: Routledge.

Pennycook, A. 2002. Language Policy and Docile Bodies: Hong Kong and Governmentality, in Tollefson, J.W. (ed.). *Language Policies in Education*. Mahwah: Laurence Erlbaum Associates. 91 – 110.

Phillipson, R. 1992. *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, R. 1996. Linguistic Imperialism. African Perspectives. *ETL Journal*, 50(2): 160 – 167.

Phillipson, R. 1999. Political Science, in Fishman, J.A. (ed.). *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 94 – 108.

Phillipson, R. 2007. Linguistic Imperialism: A Conspiracy or a Conspiracy of Silence? *Language Policy*, 6: 377 – 383.

Phillipson, R., Rannut, M. & Skutnabb-Kangas, T. 1995. Introduction, in Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Phillipson, R. (eds.). (in collaboration with Rannut, M.). *Linguistic Human Rights: Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 1 – 22.

Posavac, E.J. & Carey, R.G. 1992. *Program Evaluation: Methods and Case Studies*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Prah, K. K. 2000a. *African Languages for the Mass Education of Africans*. Cape Town: CASAS.

Prah, K.K. 2000b. *Mother Tongue for Scientific and Technological Development in Africa*. Cape Town: Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society.

Prah, K.K. 2002. Introduction: Rehabilitating African Languages, in Prah, K.K. (ed.). *Rehabilitating African Languages*. Cape Town: Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society. 1 – 6.

Prah, K.K. 2005. Language of Instruction for Education, Development and African Emancipation, in Brock-Utne, B. & Hopson, R.K. (eds.). *Language of Instruction for African Emancipation: Focus on Postcolonial Contexts and Considerations*. Dar es

Salaam: Mkuki n Nyota Publishers, Cape Town: Centre for Advanced African Society. 23 – 49.

Prah, K.K. 2009. Mother Tongue Education, Literacy and Multilingualism in Africa, in Kamwendo, G., Jankie, D. & Chebanne, A. (eds.). *Mother Tongue Education for All: Multilingualism in Education and Communities in Southern Africa*. Gaborone: UBTromso Collaborative Programme for San Research and Capacity Building. 31 – 42.

Prozesky, H. & Mouton, J. 2001. The Participatory Research Paradigm, in Coetzee, J.K., Graaff, J., Hendricks, F. & Wood, G. (eds.). *Development: Theory, Policy and Practice*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press. 537 – 551.

Rampton, M.B.H. 1990. Displacing the 'Native Speaker': Expertise, Affiliation and Inheritance. *ETL Journal*, 44(2): 97 – 101.

Rassol, N. 2007. *Global Issues in Language, Education and Development: Perspectives from Postcolonial Countries*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Reeves, N. & Wright, C. 1996. *Linguistic Auditing*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.

Reyes, I. & Moll, L.C. 2008. Bilingual and Biliterate Practices at Home and School, in Spolsky, B. & Hult, F.M. (eds.). *The Handbook of Educational Linguistics*. Blackwell Publishing: Malden. 147 – 160.

Ricento, T. 2006. Topical Areas in Language Policy: An Overview, in Ricento, T. (ed.*). An Introduction Theory and Practice*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. 231 – 237.

Robson, C. 1993. *Real World Research: A Resource for Social Scientists and Practitioner Researchers*. Oxford: Blackhood.

Romm, N. 2001. Organising a Dialogical Intervention Strategy (DIS) for Development, in Coetzee, J.K., Graaff, J., Hendricks, F. & Wood, G. (eds.). *Development: Theory, Policy and Practice*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press. 511 – 532.

Rossi, P.H. & Freeman, H.E. 1993. *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach*. Newbury Park, California, SAGE Publications, Inc.

Rubanza, Y.I. 2005. Competition through English, in Prah, K.K. (ed.). *Rehabilitating African Languages*. Cape Town: Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society. 39 – 51.

Rubin, J. 1971. Evaluation and Language Planning, in Rubin, J. & Jernudd, B.H. (eds.). *Can Language be Planned? Sociolinguistic Theory and Practice for Developing Nations*. Hawaii: The University Press of Hawaii. 217 – 252.

Rubin, J. 1973. Language Planning: Discussion of some Current Issues, in Rubin, J. & Shy, R. (eds.). *Language Planning: Current Issues and Research*. Washington: Georgetown University Press. 1 – 10.

Rubin, J. 1983. Evaluating Status Planning: What has the Past Decade Accomplished?, in Cobarrubias, J. & Fishman, J.A. (eds.). *Progress in Language Planning*. Berlin: Mouton. 329 – 344.

Rubin, J. & Jernudd, B.H. (eds.). 1971. *Can Language be Planned? Sociolinguistic Theory and Practice for Developing Nations*. Hawaii: The University Press of Hawaii.

Rubin, J. & Jernudd, B.H. 1971. Introduction: Language Planning as an Element in Modernisation, in Rubin, J. & Jernudd, B.H. (eds.). *Can Language be Planned? Sociolinguistic Theory and Practice for Developing Nations*. Hawaii: The University Press of Hawaii. xiii – xxiv.

Rugg, G. & Petre, M. 2007. *A Gentle Guide to Research Methods*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Rutman, L. 1984. Introduction, in Rutman, L. (ed.). *Evaluation Research Methods: A Basic Guide*. London: SAGE Publications. 9 – 25.

Safran, W. 1999. Nationalism, in Fishman, J.A. (ed.). *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 77 – 93.

Sallabank, J. 2008. Prestige from the Bottom-up: A Review of Language Planning in Guernsey, in Liddcoat, A.J. & Baldauf, Jr. R.B. (eds.). *Language Planning and Policy: Issues in Language Planning and Literacy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 120 – 138.

Schemidt, R. 2006. Political Theory and Language Policy, in Ricento, T. (ed.). *Introduction to Language Policy Theory and Method*. Malden, Mass: Blackwell. 95 – 110.

Schiffman, H.F. 1996. *Linguistic Culture and Language Policy*. London and New York: Routledge.

Scott, J.C. 1985. *Weapons of the Weak: Everday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Scotton, C.M. 1988. Patterns of Bilingualism in East Africa (Uganda, Kenya and Tanzania), in Paulston, C.B. (ed.). *International Handbook of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, Inc. 203 – 224.

Shameem, N. 2004. Language Attitudes in Multilingual Primary Schools in Fiji. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 17(2): 154 – 172.

Shohamy, E. 1993. *The Power of Tests: The Impact of Language Tests on Teaching and Learning*. Washington, DC: National Foreign Language Centre at Johns Hopkins University.

Shohamy, E. 2001. *The Power of Tests: A Critical Perspective of the Uses of Language Tests*. Singapore: Longman.

Shohamy, E. 2003. Implications of Language Education Policies for Language Study in Schools and Universities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87: 278 – 286.

Shohamy, E. 2006. *Language Policy: Hidden Agendas and New Approaches*. London: Routledge.

Shohamy, E. 2008. Introduction to Volume 7: Language Testing and Assessment, in Shohamy, E. & Hornberger, N.H. (eds.). *Encyclopedia of Language and Education. Volume 7. Language Testing and Assessment*. New York: Springer. xiii – xxii.

Siemienski, G. 1997. Vienna Seminar on Minority Education Issues 22-23 November 1996. Seminar Report. *International Journal on Minority and Group Rights*, 4: 175 – 185.

Silverman, D. 2000. *Doing Qualitative Research*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Simala, I.K. 2002. Empowering Indigenous African Languages for Sustainable Development, in Owini, F.R. (ed.). *Speaking African: African Languages for Education and Development*. Cape Town: CASAS. 45 – 57.

Simpson, A. 2003. Introduction, in Simpson, A. (ed.). *Language and National Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1 – 25.

Sithole, N. 1956. *Umvukela WamaNdebele*. Cape Town: Longman and Green.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. 1981. *Bilingualism or Not: The Education of Minorities*. Clevedon, Avon, England: Multlingual Matters Ltd.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. 1995. Introduction, in Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (ed.). *Multilingualism for All*. Lisse, the Netherlands: Swets and Zeitlinger B.V. 7 – 20.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. 1998. Human Rights and Language Wrongs – A Future for Diversity? *Language Sciences*, 20(1): 5 – 27.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. 1999. Educating Minorities, in Fishman, J. A. (ed.). *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 42 – 59.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. 2000. *Linguistic Genocide in Education or Worldwide Diversity and Human Rights?* Mahwah, N.J: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. 2003. Revitalisation of Indigenous Languages in Education: Contextualising the Papua New Guinea Experience. *Language and Education*, 17(2): 81 – 86.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. 2006. Language Policy and Linguistic Human Rights, in Ricento, T. (ed.). *Introduction to Language Policy Theory and Method*. Malden, Mass: Blackwell Publishing. 273 – 291.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Bucak, S. 1995. Killing a Mother Tongue – How the Kurds are deprived of Linguistic Human Rights, in Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Phillipson, R. (eds.). (In collaboration with Rannut, M.). *Linguistic Human Rights: Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter: 347 – 370.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Dunbar, R. 2010. Indigenous Children's Education as Linguistic Genocide and a Crime Against Humanity? A Global View. *Gáldu Čála Journal of Indigenous Peoples Rights*, 1/2010.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & García, O. 1995. Multilingualism for All – General Principles?, in Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (ed.). *Multilingualism for All*. Lisse, the Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger B.V. 221 – 256.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Heugh, K. 2010. Introduction- Why this Book?, in Heugh, K. & Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (eds.). *Multilingual Education Works: From the Periphery to the Centre*. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan Pvt. 3 – 39.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Phillipson, R. 1995. Linguistic Human Rights: Past and Present, in Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Phillipson, R. (eds.) (In collaboration with Rannut, M.). *Linguistic Human Rights: Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 71 – 110.

Spolsky, B. 2004. *Language Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spolsky, B. 2009. *Language Management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spolsky, B. & Shohamy, E. 1999. *The Languages of Israel: Policy, Ideology and Practice*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Spolsky B, & Shohamy, E. 2000. Language Practice, Language Ideology and Language Policy, in Lambert, R.D. & Shohamy, E. (eds.). *Language Policy and Pedagogy: Essays in Honor of Ronald Walton*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing. 1 – 41.

Staff Reporter. 2011. *Pupils to sit first Tonga Exam* [Online]. Available: http://www.newzimbabwe.com/news-5164-Pupils+to+sit+first+Tonga+exam/news.aspx [2011, May 20].

Stroud, C. 2001. African Mother-Tongue Programmes and the Politics of Language Citizenship versus Linguistic Human Rights. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 22(4): 339 – 355.

Strubell, M. 2001. Catalan A Decade Later, in Fishman, J.A. (ed.). *Can Threatened Languages be Saved? Reversing Language Shift, Revisited: A 21st Century Perspective*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd. 260 – 283.

Strydom, H. 2003. South African Law and Policy on Language in Education, in Cuvelier, P., Du Plessis, T. & Teck, L. (eds.). *Multilingualism, Education and Social Intergration*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers. 23 – 30.

Sunday Mail Reporter. 2011. *Coltart in bid to Change History* [Online]. Available: http://www.chronicle.co.zw/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1273:coltart-in-bid-to-chenge-history&history&catid=37:top-stories&Itemid=130 [2012 November 19].

Sunday News Reporters. 2010. Call to Recognise Minority Languages. *Sunday News*, 31 January – 6 February: 7.

Takala, S. & Sajavaara, K. 2000. Language Policy and Planning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 20: 129 – 142.

Takawira, A. 2010. Zim Languages Crying for Recognition [Online]. Available: http://eu.sundaymail.co.zw/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=291:zim-languages-crying-for-recognition&catid=48:blogs&Itemid=155 [2010, October 12].

Tankersley, D. 2001. Bombs or Bilingual Programmes: Dual-Language Immersion, Transformative Education and Community Building in Macedonia. *Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 4(2): 107 – 124.

Thompson, J.B. 1991. Editor's Introduction, in Bourdieu, P. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Oxford: Polity Press. 1 – 31.

Thondhlana, J. 2000. *Using Indigenous Languages for Teaching and Learning in Zimbabwe* [Online]. Available: http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~jar/ILAC/ILAC_4.pdf [2011, February 5].

Tickoo, M.L. 1995. Kamshmiri, a Majority-Minority Language: An Exploratory Essay, in Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Phillipson, R. (eds.). (In collaboration with Rannut, M.). *Linguistic Human Rights: Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter: 317 – 334.

Tollefson, J.W. 1991. *Planning Language, Planning Inequality: Language Policy in the Community*. London: Longman.

Tollefson, J.W. 2002a. Preface, in Tollefson, J.W. (ed.). *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc Publishers. ix – xii.

Tollefson, J.W. 2002b. Introduction: Critical Issues in Educational Language Policy, in Tollefson, J.W. (ed.). *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues*. Mahweh, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers. 3 – 16.

Tollefson, J.W. 2004. Medium of Instruction in Slovenia: European Integration and Ethnolinguistic Nationalism, in Tollefson, J.W. & Tsui, A.B.M. (eds.). *Medium of Instruction Policies: Which Agenda? Whose Agenda?* Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc, Publishers. 263 – 282.

Tollefson, J.W. 2006. Critical Theory in Language Policy, in Ricento, T. (ed.). An *Introduction to Language Policy Theory and Method*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. 42 – 59.

Tollefson, J.W. & Tsui, A.B.M. 2004. Preface, in Tollefson, J.W. & Tsui, A.B.M. (eds.). *Medium of Instruction Policies: Which Agenda? Whose Agenda?* Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc, Publishers. vii – ix.

Tollefson, J.W. & Tsui, A.B.M. 2004. Contexts of Medium-of-Instruction Policy, in Tollefson, J.W. & Tsui, A.B.M. (eds.). *Medium of Instruction Policies. Which Agenda? Whose Agenda?* Mahweh, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc, Publishers. 283 – 294.

Tremmel, M. 1994. *The People of the Great River: The Tonga Hoped the Water would Follow Them*. Gweru/ Harare: Mambo Press in Association with Silveria House.

Troy, J. & Walsh, M. 2008. Terminology Planning in Aboriginal Australia, in Liddcoat, A.J. & Baldauf, Jr. R.B. (eds.). *Language Planning and Policy: Issues in Language Planning and Literacy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 156 – 170.

Trudell, B. 2006. Local Agency in the Development of Minority Languages: Three Language Committees in Northwest Cameroon. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 27(3): 196 – 210.

Trudgill, P. 1975. *Accent, Dialect and the School*. London: Edward Arnold Publishers.

Trudgill, P. 1979. Standard and Non-Standard Dialects of English in the United Kingdom: Problems and Policies. *International Journal of Sociology of Language, 20*: 9 – 24.

Tshuma, N. 2012. 16 *Official Languages for Zimbabwe* [Online]. Available: http://www.newsday.co.zw/2012/07/21/2012-07-21-16-official-languages-for-zimbabwe/ [2012, July 21].

Tsui, A.B.M. 2004. Medium of Instruction in Hong Kong: One Country Two Systems, Whose Language?, in Tollefson, J.W. & Tsui, A.B.M. (eds.). *Medium of Instruction Policies: Which Agenda? Whose Agenda?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc, Publishers: 97 – 116.

Tsui, A.B.M. & Tollefson, J.W. 2004. The Centrality of Medium-of-Instruction Policy in Sociopolitical Processes, in Tollefson, J.W. & Tsui, A.B.M. (eds.). *Medium of Instruction Policies: Which Agenda? Whose Agenda?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc, Publishers: 1 – 20.

Tulloch, S, 2008. Preserving Dialects of an Endangered Language, in Liddicoat, A.J. & Baldauf, Jr. R.B. (eds.). *Language Planning and Policy: Issues in Language Planning and Literacy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 95 – 112.

Turrent, V. & Oketch, M. 2009. Financing Universal Primary Education: An Analysis of Official Development Assistance in Fragile States. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 29(4): 357 – 365.

UNDP. 1996. *Human Development Report 1996*. New York: Oxford University Press; Clarendon Press.

UNDP. 1999. *Human Development Report 1999*. New York: Oxford University Press.

UNDP. 2001. *Human Development Report 2001*. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press.

UNDP. 2004. *Human Development Report 2004: Cultural Liberty in Today's Diverse World*. New York: Oxford University Press, Clarendon Press.

UNESCO. 1953. *The Use of Vernacular Languages in Education*. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO. 2006. *Education For All: Literacy for Life: EFA Global Monitoring Report*.

Vawda, A.Y. & Patrinos, H.A. 1999. Producing Educational Materials in Local Languages: Costs from Guatemala and Senegal. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 19(4-5): 287 – 299.

Verhoeven, L.I. 1997. Sociolinguistics and Education, in Coulmas, F. (ed.). *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers. 389 – 404.

Wagner, E. 2010. Survey Research, in Paltridge, B. & Phakiti, A. (eds.) *Continuum Companion to Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. London/ New York: Continuum International Publishing Group. 22 – 38.

Walliman, N.S.R. 2001. *Your Research Project: A Step-by-Step Guide for the First-time Researcher*. London: SAGE Publications.

Walton, J. 1992. 'Making the Theoretical Case', in Ragin, C.C. & Becker, H.S. (eds.). *What is a Case? Exploring the Foundations of Social Inquiry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 121 – 137.

Webb, V.N. 2002. *Language in South Africa: The Role of Language in National Transformation, Reconstruction and Development*. Philadelphia, Penn: John Benjamins.

Webb, V. 2004. Language Policy in Post-Apartheid South Africa, in Tollefson, J.W. & Tsui, A.B.M. (eds.). *Medium of Instruction Policies. Which Agenda? Whose Agenda?* Mahwah, New Jersey: Erlbaum Associates, Inc, Publishers. 217 – 239.

Webb, V. 2009. Multilingualism in South Africa: The Challenge from Below. *Language Matters. Studies in the Languages of Africa*, 40(2): 190 – 204.

Webb, V. 2010. Multilingualism from Below. Really? In South Africa?, in Cuvelier, P., Du Plessis, T., Meeuwis, M., Vanderkerckhove, R. & Webb, V. (eds.). *Multilingualism from Below*. Pretoria: Van Schaik. 134 – 146.

Wiley, T.G. 2006. Accessing Language Rights in Education: A Brief History of the US Context, in García, O. & Baker, C. (eds.). *Bilingual Education: An Introductory Reader*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 89 – 107.

Williams, J.D. & Snipper, G.C. 1990. *Literacy and Bilingualism*. New York: Longman.

Williams, T. 2002. *Modelling Complex Projects*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Wodak, R. 2007. Critical Discourse Analysis, in Seale, C., Gobo, G., Gubrium, J.F. & Silverman, D. (eds.). *Qualitative Research in Practice*. London: SAGE Publishers Ltd. 185 – 201.

Wolff, H.E. 2002. The Heart of the 'African Language Question' in Education, in Owino, F.R. (ed.). *Speaking African: African Languages for Education and Development*. Cape Town: Centre for Advanced Studies of African Society. 129 – 148.

Wright, S. 2004. *Language Policy and Language Planning: From Nationalism to Globalisation*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Yee, D. 1994. *Review of Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*, J.C. Scott [Online]. Available: http://dannreviews.com/ [2012, July 23].

Yin, R.K. 2003. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE.

Zimbabwe School Examinations Council. 2011. *Examinations Circular Number 2 of 2011. Grade 7 2011 Examinations*.

Zvobgo, J.R. 1997. *State, Ideology and Education*. Gweru: Mambo Press.

Zvobgo, J.R. 2007. *Contextualising the Curriculum: The Zimbabwean Experience*. Harare: College Press.

INTERVIEWS

WS650077: Official from a selected teacher education college, 13 July 2011.

WS650078: Official from the Zimbabwe Indigenous Languages Promotion Association, 13 July 2011.

WS650080: Official from a selected teacher education college, 14 July 2011.

WS650084: Official from a selected university, 19 July 2011.

WS650085: Official from a selected university, 19 July 2011.

WS650086: Official from the Kalanga language and cultural association, 21 July 2011.

WS650088: Official from the African Languages Research Institute, 25 July 2011.

WS650090: Official from a selected university, 25 July 2011.

WS650091: Official from Silveria House, 26 July 2011.

WS650093: Official from a selected publishing house, 27 July 2011.

WS650094: Official from a selected publishing house, 27 July 2011.

WS650095: Official from a selected publishing house, 27 July 2011.

WS650096: Official from a selected publishing house, 27 July 2011.

WS650097: Official from a selected publishing house, 27 July 2011.

WS650098: Official from a selected publishing house, 27 July 2011.

WS65099: Official from the Zimbabwe School Examinations Council, 29 July 2011.

WS650100: Official from a selected university, 29 July 2011.

WS650101: Official from the Curriculum Development Unit, 29 July 2011.

WS650103: Official from Curriculum Development Unit, 29 July 2011.

WS650104: Official from Silveria House, 1 August 2011.

WS650107: Provincial Education Director Matabeleland South, 8 August 2011.

WS650108: Official from a selected teacher education college, 8 August 2011.

WS650109: Provincial Education Director Matabeleland North, 15 August 2011.

WS650110: Official from Basilwizi Trust, 15 August 2011.

WS650111: Official from a selected university, 18 August 2011

WS650112: Official from a selected university, 18 August 2011.

WS650113: Official from a selected teacher education college, 19 August 2011.

WS650115: Official from a selected university, 13 September 2011.

WS650116: Official from a selected university, 13 September 2011.

WS650118: Official from the Shangani language and cultural association, 15 September 2011.

WS650119: Education officer from Chiredzi district, 15 September 2011.

WS650170: Official from the Tonga language committee, 26 September 2011.

WS650179: Official from Basilwizi Trust, 28 September 2011.

WS650193: Education officer from Binga district, 1 October 2011.

WS650194: Education officer from Binga district, 1 October 2011.

WS650207: Official from the Kalanga language and cultural association, 5 October 2011.

WS650208: Education officers from Mangwe, 6 October 2011.

WS650209: Education officers from Bulilima and Mangwe districts, 6 October 2011.

WS650210: Education officer from Bulilima district, 6 October 2011.

WS650215: Official from the Nambya language and cultural society, 10 October 2011.

WS650216: Education officer from Hwange district, 10 October 2011.

WS650217: Official from the Nambya language and cultural society, 10 October 2011.

WS650241: Education officer from Hwange district, 14 October 2011.

WS650242: Official from the Nambya language and cultural association, 14 October 2011.

WS650299: Official from the Kalanga language and cultural association, 27 October 2011.

WS650300: Official from the Kalanga language and cultural association, 27 October 2011.

WS650302: Official from the ministry of education sport, arts and culture, 28 October 2011.

WS650303: Official from the department of teacher education in the ministry of higher and tertiary education, 28 October 2011.

WS650304: Education officer from Beitbridge district, 31 October 2011.

WS650305: Education officer from Beitbridge district, 31 October 2011.

WS650345: Official from the Venda language committee, 17 January 2011.

WS650346: Official from the ministry of education, sport, arts and culture, 20 January 2012.

FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS

WS650164: Teachers Binga district, 26 September 2011.

WS650168: Teachers Binga district, 26 September 2011.

WS650169: Teachers Binga district, 26 September 2011.

WS650171: Teachers Binga district, 27 September 2011.

WS650183: Teachers Binga district, 28 September 2011.

WS650189: Teachers Binga district, 29 September 2011.

WS650191: Teachers Binga district, 30 September 2011.

WS650192: Teachers Binga district, 30 September 2011.

WS650200: Teachers Binga district, 3 October 2011.

WS650201: Teachers Binga district, 3 October 2011.

WS650202: Teachers Binga district, 3 October 2011.

WS650203: Teachers Binga district, 3 October 2011.

WS650220: Teachers Hwange district, 11 October 2011.

WS650222: Teachers Hwange district, 11 October 2011.

WS650223: Teachers Hwange district, 11 October 2011.

WS650224: Teachers Hwange district, 11 October 2011.

WS650231: Teachers Hwange district, 13 October 2011.

WS650232: Teachers Hwange district, 13 October 2011.

WS650233: Teachers Hwange district, 13 October 2011.

WS650234: Teachers Hwange district, 13 October 2011.

WS650260: Teachers Hwange district, 17 October 2011.

WS650261: Teachers Hwange district, 17 October 2011.

WS650262: Teachers Hwange district, 17 October 2011.

WS650263: Teachers Mangwe district, 18 October 2011.

WS650266: Teachers Mangwe district, 18 October 2011.

WS650269: Teachers Mangwe district, 19 October 2011.

WS650270: Teachers Mangwe district, 19 October 2011.

WS650271: Teachers Mangwe district, 19 October 2011.

WS650275: Teachers Bulilima district, 24 October 2011.

WS650280: Teachers Bulilima district, 24 October 2011.

WS650281: Teachers Bulilima district, 24 October 2011.

WS650292: Teachers Bulilima district, 26 October 2011.

WS650297: Teachers Bulilima district, 26 October 2011.

WS650298: Teachers Bulilima district, 26 October 2011.

WS650306: Teachers Beitbridge district, 1 November 2011.

WS650310: Teachers Beitbridge district, 1 November 2011.

WS650311: Teachers Beitbridge district, 1 November 2011.

WS650313: Teachers Beitbridge district, 1 November 2011.

WS650324: Teachers Beitbridge district, 3 November 2011.

WS650328: Teachers Beitbridge district, 4 November 2011.

WS650330: Teachers Beitbridge district, 4 November 2011.

WS650341: Teachers Beitbridge district, 16 January 2011.

WS650342: Teachers Beitbridge district, 16 January 2011.

WS650343: Teachers Beitbridge district, 16 January 2011.

WS650344: Teachers Beitbridge district, 16 January 2011.

WS650172: Parents Binga District, 27 September 2011.

WS650174: Parents Binga district, Binga. 27 September 2011.

WS650176: Parents Binga district, 27 September 2011.

WS650177: Parents Binga district, 27 September 2011.

WS650178: Parents Binga district, 28 September 2011.

WS650181: Parents Binga district, 28 September 2011.

WS650185: Parents Binga district, 29 September 2011.

WS650186: Parents Binga district, 29 September 2011.

WS650187: Parents Binga district, 29 September 2011.

WS650188: Parents, Binga district, 29 September 2011.

WS650190: Parents Binga district, 29 September 2011.

WS650195: Parents Binga district, 2 October 2011.

WS650199: Parents Binga district, 2 October 2011.

WS650204: Parents Binga district, 3 October 2011.

WS650205: Parents Binga district, 4 October 2011.

WS650206: Parents Binga district, 4 October 2011.

WS650211: Parents Mangwe district, 8 October 2011.

WS650213: Parents Mangwe district, 8 October 2011.

WS650214: Parents Mangwe district, 8 October 2011.

WS650225: Parents Hwange district, 11 October 2011.

WS650226: Parents Hwange district, 12 October 2011.

WS650227: Parents Hwange district, 12 October 2011.

WS650235: Parents Hwange district, 13 October 2011.

WS650236: Parents Hwange district, 13 October 2011.

WS650239: Parents Hwange district, 13 October 2011.

WS650240: Parents Hwange district, 14 October 2011.

WS650244: Parents Hwange district, 15 October 2011.

WS650245: Parents Hwange district, 15 October 2011.

WS650246: Parents Hwange district, 15 October 2011.

WS650248: Parents Hwange district, 16 October 2011.

WS650250: Parents Hwange district, 16 October 2011.

WS650252: Parents Hwange district, 16 October 2011.

WS650253: Parents Hwange district, 16 October 2011.

WS650254: Parents Hwange district, 16 October 2011.

WS650272: Parents Bulilima district, 23 October 2011.

WS650273: Parents Bulilima district, 23 October 2011.

WS650279: Parents Bulilima district, 24 October 2011.

WS650282: Parents Bulilima district, 24 October 2011.

WS650283: Parents Bulilima district, 24 October 2011.

WS650284: Parents Bulilima district, 24 October 2011.

WS650287: Parents Bulilima district, 25 October 2011.

WS650288: Parents Bulilima district, 25 October 2011.

WS650290: Parents Bulilima district, 25 October 2011.

WS650295: Parents Bulilima district, 26 October 2011.

WS650314: Parents Beitbridge district, 1 November 2011.

WS650315: Parents Beitbridge district, 2 November 2011.

WS650316: Parents Beitbridge district, 2 November 2011.

WS650317: Parents Beitbridge district, 2 November 2011.

WS650318: Parents Beitbridge district, 2 November 2011.

WS650322: Parents Beitbridge district, 3 November 2011.

WS650323: Parents Beitbridge district, 3 November 2011.

WS650325: Parents Beitbridge district, 3 November 2011.

WS650326: Parents Beitbridge district, 3 November 2011.

WS650327: Parents Beitbridge district, 3 November 2011.

WS650329: Parents Beitbridge district, 4 November 2011.

WS650331: Parents Beitbridge district, 21 December 2011.

WS650332: Parents Beitbridge district, 21 December 2011.

WS650333: Parents Beitbridge district, 21 December 2011.

WS650334: Parents Beitbridge district, 21 December 2011.

WS650335: Parents Beitbridge district, 21 December 2011.

WS650336: Parents Beitbridge district, 21 December 2011.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002: Re: Policy Regarding Language Teaching and Learning

Appendix 2: Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002: Re: Curriculum Policy: Re: Primary and Secondary Schools

Appendix 3: Director's Circular Number 26 of 2007: Re: Policy Guidelines on the Teaching of Locak Languages in Primary and Secondary Schools in Zimbabwe

Appendix 4: Zimbabwe School Examinations Council Examinations Circular Number 2 of 2011

Appendix 5: 1987 Education Act, as Amended in 2006

Appendix 6: Constitution of Zimbabwe

Appendix 7: Constitution of Zimbabwe (DRAFT 17 JULY 2012)

Appendix 8: Re: Response to the Binga chief's concern on the teaching of languages

Appendix 9: The National Cultural Policy of Zimbabwe

Appendix 10: Position Paper on Zimbabwe's Language Policy

all communications should be addressed to
"The Secretary for Education Sport and Culture"
Telephone: 734051/59 and 734071
Telegraphic address : "EDUCATION"
Fax: 707599/ 734075

ZIMBABWE

Ref: D/132/1

Ministry of Education Sport and Culture
P.O Box CY 121
Causeway
Zimbabwe

3rd January 2002

SECRETARY'S CIRCULAR NUMBER 1 OF 2002

POLICY REGARDING LANGUAGE TEACHING AND LEARNING

In line with the findings of the Nziramasanga Commission and further to the existing policy regarding the teaching and learning of language in Zimbabwe's education system, we hereby redefine, the Ministry of Education, Sport and Culture's position on the issue. The redefinition will clear any uncertainties that may still exist.

1. MINORITY LOCAL LANGUAGES

These are languages that are spoken by relatively small indigenous groups in various parts of Zimbabwe. They include, but are not limited to Kalanga, Tonga, Venda, Nambya and Sotho.

These languages are currently being taught up to Grade 3. From January 2002 the languages will be assisted to advance to a grade per year until they can be taught at Grade 7. The table below shows how this will happen.

GRADE	YEAR
Grade 3	Already in place by 2001
Grade 4	January 2002
Grade 5	January 2003
Grade 6	January 2004
Grade 7	January 2005

The annual progression f the classes will enable the necessary inputs to be made in advance. This includes teachers, classrooms and materials.

By the time these languages are offered at Grade 7 in 2005, new arrangements will be made for their further development. In other words, we will cross this particular bridge when
we come to it.

2. NDEBELE AND SHONA

Shona and Ndebele are the two major local languages. They can be offered for study in any part of the country where numbers of learners are high enough. The two languages are already fully developed for study throughout the country's education system. All the provisions for teaching the languages are in place and are continually being upgraded to meet changing demands. Shona and Ndebele have the same status as English in our education system. They, among other things, have:

(a) Textbooks for all levels
(b) Graded general literature
(c) Qualified teachers
(d) Teaching materials
(e) Established cultural environments
(f) The support of other skills like the print and electronic media.

Like English, Shona and Ndebele can be taught entirely as literature, as curricular subjects or as both literature and curricular subjects.

In view of the above, it is now mandatory that Ndebele and Shona be treated exactly like English in all formal learning situations. They can also be used in the teaching of other subjects where this will facilitate comprehension of concepts. In practical terms this means that Shona, Ndebele and English must be equated in the following respects:

(a) Number of hours allocated each week
(b) Provision of teaching/learning materials
(c) Research
(d) Level of difficulty

It is important to note that Ndebele and Shona will be offered only in the L1 Mode. There will be no provision for the L2 mode in any formal schools. It has already been amply proved that the new syllabi for Shona and Ndebele can be learnt by all school children regardless of ethnic origin. Further adjustment are under way to ensure that the languages are suitable for any child regardless of their mother tongues.

N.B. School Heads should note that the choice of optional subjects depends largely upon the environment, facilities and staff available in the school as well as the individual learner's preferences.

5.0 **Syllabuses**

5.1 The Ministry's policy is that the formal curriculum for any school shall be based on syllabuses devised and approved by the Ministry of Education, Sport and Culture. Schools wishing to deviate from such syllabuses may do so only with the written permission of the Permanent Secretary.

5.2 Syllabuses are reviewed from time to time. Schools will therefore be informed of new syllabuses as and when these are made available.

6.0 **'A' Level Curriculum**

The 'A' level curriculum shall normally comprise one General Paper and a set of at least three related subjects from Appendix C.

T.K. Tsodzo (Dr)
SECRETARY FOR EDUCATION, SPORT AND CULTURE

Ref: D/111/1

All communications should be addressed to
"The Secretary for Education Sport and Culture"
Telephone: 734051/59 and 734071
Telegraphic address : "EDUCATION"
Fax: 794505

ZIMBABWE

Ministry of Education Sport and Culture
P.O Box CY 121
Causeway
Zimbabwe

28 January 2002

SECRETARY'S CIRCULAR NO. 3 OF 2002

Distribution:

Directors
Regional Directors
Deputy Directors
Deputy Regional Directors
Under Secretaries
District Education Officers
Education Officers
Correspondence and Independent Colleges
Heads of Secondary Schools
Heads of Primary Schools
Zimbabwe Teachers' Association Chairperson
Progressive Teachers' Union of Zimbabwe Chairperson
National Association of Education Officers Chairperson
National Association of Secondary Heads Chairperson
National Association of Primary Heads Chairperson
Association of Trust Schools - Chairperson
Responsible Authorities
Church Education Secretaries
The Secretary for Higher Education and Technology
Department of Teacher Education, University of Zimbabwe
All Universities
All Teachers' and Technical Colleges
ZIMSEC

RE: **CURRICULUM POLICY: PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS**

This circular cancels and replaces Secretary's Circular Minute No. 2 of 2001.

1.0 **Introduction**

The relevance of the curriculum is based on the extent to which it meets the needs of the individual learner, the national economy, society at large and the future challenges of the country. The ultimate goal is to provide an opportunity for each learner to obtain maximum benefit from the school curriculum according to the learner's potential. The focus is on the individual's development of sound national values such as self-reliance, entrepreneurship and responsible citizenship.

It is against this background that the Ministry of Education, Sport and Culture has adopted a new policy on curriculum for primary and secondary education which should be implemented with effect from 1 January, 2002.

2.0 GOALS

The thrust of this curriculum policy is geared towards implementing the national goals of:-

2.1 establishing a strong scientific, mathematical and technological base for economic development;

2.2 expanding the technical/vocational curriculum with a view to providing learners with skills for survival;

2.3 producing citizens who understand, appreciate and accept their civic and moral responsibilities within society;

2.4 promoting national identity, pride, unity, cultural norms and values so as to preserve the Zimbabwe heritage through the teaching and learning of the appropriate humanities and indigenous languages;

2.5 strengthening the development of affective, cognitive and psychomotor skills;

2.6 promoting and developing a healthy lifestyle through nutrition and physical education;

2.7 promoting development of aesthetic values and creativity;

2.8 promoting the practice of inclusive education through flexible accommodation of special needs among learners; and

2.9 providing special needs which include the acquisition of survival and appropriate acquisition skills like:-
- sign-language,
- mobility,
- self-care,
- braille literacy, and
- social skills for learners with special needs.

The education system expects pupils to develop skills and competencies in:

- language and communication
- numeracy and literacy
- science and technology
- aesthetics and creativity
- entrepreneurship
- ethics and responsible citizenship

3.0 PRIMARY SCHOOL CURRICULUM

3.1 Expected Learning Outcomes

By the end of the primary school course learners will be expected to:

3.1.1 communicate effectively in both the written and spoken forms of either Shona or Ndebele and English;
3.1.2 solve numerical problems and apply numeracy to daily life situations;
3.1.3 appreciate and apply science and technology and demonstrate creativity in the application to their daily lives and in the utilisation of local resources;
3.1.4 express and value the beauty and complexity of works of art and design;
3.1.5 appreciate the basics associated with enterprise, creation and development;
3.1.6 demonstrate an understanding of ethical principles of conduct including nationhood, good neighbourliness, citizenship and respect for humanity and sustainable use of the environment;
3.1.7 appreciate the value of sport and culture; and,
3.1.8 demonstrate and appreciate a healthy lifestyle.

3.2 Subjects to be offered

In view of the above all primary schools should offer the following subjects from grades 1 to 7.

3.2.1 Language and Communication

Commission
- Taylor (1974)
Curriculum 2005

- Shona or Ndebele up to Grade 7

NB Tonga, Kalanga, Nambya, Venda, Shangani and Sotho as mother tongues will be introduced in their respective areas in phases as follows:-

- up to grade 4 in 2002
- up to grade 5 in 2003
- up to grade 6 in 2004
- up to grade 7 in 2005

These subjects will be offered together with Shona or Ndebele which will be offered at secondary school level.

- Sign language for the hearing impaired
- English Language

- subjects not the competencies used.
- Streamline the curriculum

3.2.2 **Numeracy**

Mathematics

3.2.3 **Science and Technology**

Environmental Science
Technology and Computers (where facilities are available).

3.2.4 **Ethics and Citizenship**

Social Studies

Religious and Moral Education

3.2.5 **Practical Subjects**

Art and Craft

Home Economics

Music, Physical Education and Theatre Arts.

4.0 SECONDARY SCHOOL CURRICULUM UP TO 'O' LEVEL

4.1 Expected Learning Outcomes

At the end of the four year secondary school course learners should be able to:-

4.1.1 demonstrate versatility and adaptability to different social and economic environments;

4.1.2 communicate effectively and proficiently orally and in writing in English and Shona or Ndebele;

4.1.3 contribute positively to self, community and national development through the creative application of science, technology and practical and life skills;

4.1.4 play a meaningful role in nation-building and project a positive national identity;

4.1.5 project a positive self image through the realisation of the individual's potential; and

4.1.6 display a mature sense of appreciation of art, design, sport and culture.

The secondary school curriculum should offer a broad range of subjects to cater for the diversity of learner needs and abilities.

The four year secondary curriculum is a vehicle to enable each learner to realise his/her aspirations according to the environment, interests and abilities.

4.2 **Core Subjects**

4.2.1 It is compulsory for all learners to study the following five core subjects up to 'O' level:-

English Language;

History;

Mathematics;

Shona or Ndebele; and

Science (selected from 4.4.2).

Business? Tech Voc ??

4.2.2

HIV/AIDS and Life Skills Education.

Guidance and counselling

Physical Education, Sport and Culture.

*The subject areas under 4.2.2. above are compulsory but non-examinable except through other subjects.

4.3 **Full 'O' Level Certificate**

A full 'O' Level certificate shall consist of at least five (5) subjects passed at grade `C' level standard or better.

4.4 **Optional Subjects**

Learners' interest, abilities and available resources should guide the selection of optional subjects from the following five groups:-

4.4.1 **Group 1: Languages**

Kalanga, Tonga, Nambya, Shangani, Venda, Sotho, Nyanja, Swahili, Afrikaans, Portuguese, German, Spanish, French and Latin.

4.4.2 **Group 2: Science**

Integrated Science

Biology

Chemistry

Physics

Physical Science

Human and Social Biology

4.4.3 **Group 3: Mathematics**

Additional Mathematics
Statistics

4.4.4 **Group 4: Humanities and Social Sciences**

Literature in Shona or Ndebele

Literature in English

Religious Studies

Geography

* 4.4.5 **Group 5: Practical/Technical/Business/Vocational/ Commercial Subjects**

Analyse HEXCO results?

This group consists of practical, technical, vocational, commercial and business subjects (refer to Appendix 'B').

N.B. School Heads should note that the choice of optional subjects depends largely upon the environment, facilities and staff available in the school as well as the individual learners' preferences and ability to cope with the curriculum.

5.0 **Syllabuses**

5.1 The Ministry's policy is that the formal curriculum for any school shall be based on syllabuses devised and approved by the Ministry of Education, Sport and Culture. Schools wishing to deviate from such syllabuses may do so only with the written permission of the Permanent Secretary.

5.2 Syllabuses are reviewed from time to time. Schools will, therefore, be informed of new syllabuses as and when these are made available.

6.0 **'A' Level Curriculum**

The 'A' level curriculum shall normally comprise the General Paper and a set of at least three related subjects listed below:-

SCIENCES

Physics

Chemistry

Biology

Mathematics

Geography

COMMERCIALS

Economics

Business Studies

Accounting

Computer Studies

LANGUAGES AND HUMANITIES

Divinity

Literature in English

Shona/Ndebele

History

Geography

TECH/VOC SUBJECTS

Agriculture

Art and Design

Clothing and Textiles

Drama

Food Science

Geometric and Mechanical Drawing

T.K. Tsodzo (Dr)

SECRETARY FOR EDUCATION, SPORT AND CULTURE

11.4 Storekeeping

11.5 Business Calculations

12) VIDEO/FILMING

12. 1 Script Writing, Production and Presentation

13) PERFORMING ARTS

13.1 Music

13.2 Theatre Arts

13.3 Dance.

APPENDIX 'C' : TIME ALLOCATION

1. Primary School Curriculum

The minimum time in hours to be allocated to each subject per week is as below:-

SUBJECTS	GRADES 1 AND 2		GRADES 3 TO 7	
	Hours per week	Periods per week	Hours per week	Periods per week
Shona/Ndebele/Local languages	4	8	4½	9
English	4	8	4½	9
Mathematics	2½	5	3	6
Environmental Science	2	4	2	4
Social Studies	1½	3	2	4
Religious and Moral Education	1	2	2	4
Practical Subjects	1	2	2	4
Art	1	2	1	2
Music	1	2	1	2
Physical Education	1	2	1	2
Co-curricular Activities	1½	3	2	4
HIV/AIDS Education			½	1

NB 1. HIV/AIDS education will be taught from Grade 4 - 7

2. A period is normally 30 minutes.

2. SECONDARY SCHOOL CURRICULUM UP TO 'O' LEVEL

The following are the minimum numbers of periods allocated per week. A period normally lasts 40 minutes.

SUBJECTS	FORMS 1 AND 2		'O' LEVEL	
	Periods per week	Hours per week	Periods per week	Hours per week
English	5	3 hrs 20 min	5	3 hrs 20 min
History	4	2 hrs 40 min	4	2 hrs 40 min
Geography	4	2 hrs 40 min	4	2 hrs 40 min
Literature in English, Shona or Ndebele	2	1 hr 20 min	3	2 hrs
Religious and Moral Education	3	2 hrs	3	2 hrs
Foreign Languages	4	2 hrs 40 min	4	2 hrs 40 min
Shona/Ndebele	5	3 hrs 20 min	5	3 hrs 20 min
Science	6	4 hrs	6	4 hrs
Mathematics	5	3 hrs 20 min	5	3 hrs 20 min
Technical/Vocational	6	4 hrs	8	5 hrs 20 min
Business/Commercial	4	2 hrs 40 min	4	2 hrs 40 min
HIV/AIDS Education	1	40 min	1	40 min
Guidance and Counselling	1	40 min	1	40 min
Co-curricular Activities	3	2 hrs	3	2 hrs

3. 'A' LEVEL CURRICULUM

SUBJECT	PERIODS
SCIENCES	
Physics	8
Chemistry	8
Biology	8
Mathematics	8
Geography	8
General Paper (Compulsory)	1
COMMERCIALS	
Economics	8
Business Studies	8
Accounting	8
Computer Studies	8
General Paper (Compulsory)	1
LANGUAGES AND HUMANITIES	
Divinity	8
Literature In English	8
Shona/Ndebele	8
History	8
Geography	8
General Paper (Compulsory)	1
TECH/VOC SUBJECTS	
Agriculture	8
Art And Design	8
Clothing And Textiles	8
Drama	8
Food Science	8
Geometric And Mechanical Drawing	8
General Paper (Compulsory)	1
CO-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES	2
TOTAL TIME PER STUDENT	**27**

N.B. 1. Each student is expected to participate in co-curricular activities.

2. Times for practicals are included in the total time allocated for the subject.

3. Each period is generally 40 minutes.

All communications should be addressed to
"The Secretary for Education Sport and Culture"
Telephone: 734051/59 and 734071
Telegraphic address: "EDUCATION"
Fax: 794505

ZIMBABWE

Ref: D/132/1
Ministry of Education Sport and Culture
P.O. Box CY 121
Causeway
Zimbabwe

28 June 2007

DIRECTOR'S CIRCULAR NUMBER 26 OF 2007

DISTRIBUTION

- Directors: Head Office
- Provincial Education Directors
- District Education Officers
- Heads of Primary Schools
- Heads of Secondary Schools
- National Association of Primary School Heads
- National Association of Secondary School Heads
- Director: Zimbabwe School Examinations Council
- Responsible Authorities
- Zimbabwe Teachers' Association
- Progressive Teachers' Union of Zimbabwe
- Teachers' Union of Zimbabwe

RE: POLICY GUIDELINES ON THE TEACHING OF LOCAL LANGUAGES IN PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN ZIMBABWE

1.0 PREAMBLE

Most countries that are in post-colonial situations, including Zimbabwe, invariably find themselves examining the issue of Local Languages in terms of their utilization for development. Languages that the people are able to communicate in are critical for personal as well as national development. Above all, it is one of our major national goals to promote national identity, pride, unity, cultural norms and values so as to preserve the Zimbabwe heritage through the teaching and learning of the Indigenous Languages amongst other attributes.

The status of Local Languages in school curricula is addressed in:

- the Education Act [chapter 25:04] as amended, 2006 Part XII; Section 62,
- the Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002 on 'Policy Regarding Language Teaching and Learning', and
- the Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002 on 'Curriculum Policy: Primary and Secondary Schools'.

It is, however, Ministry's realization that the majority of educationists in this country are apparently giving a cursory attention to the provisions of these documents.

This circular, therefore, further redefines the implementation of the teaching and learning of Local Languages which should be adhered to in both primary and secondary schools in Zimbabwe

2.0 THE LOCAL LANGUAGES OF ZIMBABWE

The two Major Local Languages of Zimbabwe are Shona and Ndebele. However, whilst these have been receiving greater attention within the Ministry, the same cannot be said of the Indigenous Languages, which include, but are not restricted to, Tonga, Kalanga, Nambya, Sotho, Venda and Shangani. These Indigenous Languages should not be confused with local variations like ChiKorekore, ChiZezuru, ChiManyika which are dialects of the Shona Language.

3.0 IMPLEMENTING THE TEACHING OF LOCAL LANGUAGES

This section looks at the utilization of Local Languages not only as media of instruction but also as subjects in their own right in schools.

3.1 The underlying principle for using Local Languages as media of instruction lies in their proven ability to ensure effective communication between the learner and the teacher. Effective and efficient comunication is important for full comprehension of fundamental concepts by the learner. Therefore, during the course of instruction at both primary and secondary school levels, teachers could use the Local Languages whenever they help to communicate fundamental ideas and concepts better.

In Early Childhood Development (ECD) classrooms, the mother tongue (the local dialect of a language) should be used as the medium of instruction. In multi-cultural and multilingual ECD centres, as are usually found in towns, mining areas and other such settlements, provision should be made to accommodate the needs of as many pupils as practically possible in terms of mother tongue usage.

3.2 Shona and Ndebele are allocated the same time with English on the school timetable at primary school level. It is, however, at secondary school level that the two are allocated less time compared to English. This is contrary to the provisions of the Secretary's Circular Number 3 of 2002 which clearly stipulates a minimum

of five (5) periods per week for all main languages and a minimum of two (2) periods per week at the Junior Certificate Level and three (3) periods at Ordinary Level for literature, again for all the three languages.

3.3 One of the expected learning outcomes of the Zimbabwe school curricula is to ensure that all learners are able to communicate effectively and proficiently both orally and in writing in English, Shona and Ndebele. Provinces should gradually start offering both Shona and Ndebele in areas where only one of the two was on offer. It is, however, encouraging to note that some provinces are already setting up pilot schools at both primary and secondary school levels to start offering both Shona and Ndebele. This is commendable!

3.4 It should be appreciated that while all the three main languages of Zimbabwe, namely, Shona, Ndebele and English, should be taught on an equal time basis in all schools up to Form Two level, conversational Shona may be allocated less time than English and Ndebele in areas where Ndebele is predominantly spoken. Similarly conversational Ndebele may be allocated less time than English and Shona in areas where Shona is predominantly spoken.

3.5 In areas where the Indigenous (Minority) Languages other than Shona and Ndebele are spoken, schools may teach such languages in addition to Shona and Ndebele. The Curriculum Development Unit may be approached for assistance with the provision of syllabi.

4.0 CONCLUSION

Unless we promote the total utilisation of Local Languages more actively and purposefully than has been the case hitherto, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to involve the whole people in the development process. The most developed nations are those whose languages have developed the capacity to deal with the details, dynamism and other complexities that go with development. The notion that Local Languages cannot achieve that degree of sophistication may be a misnomer. If, as is generally accepted, there is some correlation among culture, ideology, education, development, and language, it has to be admitted that there is a lot that needs to be done with education and language development in Zimbabwe and it should start without delay.

L. C. Bowora
DIRECTOR: QUALITY ASSURANCE DIVISION
For: SECRETARY FOR EDUCATION, SPORT AND CULTURE

All communications should be addressed to:
The Director, Zimbabwe School
Examinations Council,

Zimbabwe School Examinations Council
Examinations Centre, Upper East Road, Mount Pleasant
P.O. Box CY 1464, Causeway, Harare, Zimbabwe

Telephone : 263 4 302623/4, 302642, 307815
Telegraphic address: "ZIMSEC"
Facsmile: 263 4 302288, 333889, 339080

Performance Measurement

Your Ref:
Our Ref : E/35

02 February 2011

EXAMINATIONS CIRCULAR
NUMBER 2 OF 2011

TO: Secretary for Education, Sport, Arts and Culture
All Provincial Education Directors (Ministry of Education, Sport, Arts and Culture)
All Regional Managers (ZIMSEC)
Grade 7 Examination Centres

GRADE 7 2011 EXAMINATIONS

A. (i) **EXAMINATION CENTRES**

Examinations will be conducted at approved centres only as detailed in CEO's Circular No. 34 of 1992. Institutions which do not meet the requirements of the circular should not register candidates. **The minimum number of candidates any Grade 7 centre is allowed to register is six. ZIMSEC will not accept fewer than six Entry Forms from any Grade 7 centre.** Please note that all "Adult Centres" have been merged with hosting school centres. Centres with adult candidates should register them as a separate class at the approved primary school/centre.

(ii) **PLEASE NOTE THAT TONGA LANGUAGE WILL BE OFFERED AS AN OPTION FOR THE FIRST TIME BEGINNING THIS EXAMINATION SESSION (OCTOBER 2011).**

B. **EXAMINATION ENTRY DOCUMENTS**

The following enclosed initial entry documents are enclosed:

1) OMR Entry Forms, (one per candidate).
2) Instructions on "How to Complete the OMR Entry Form".
3) Entry Register.

3 **SEX**

The sex is either male or female. Shade the appropriate lozenge.

4 **STATUS**

Status is either **Formal** or **Non-Formal** candidate. Shade as appropriate.

5 **CENTRE NUMBER**

Write the correct centre number (from the certificate of registration) and shade appropriate lozenges which correspond to the numbers above them. Please note that the first digit of your centre number has already been completed for you.

6 **CANDIDATE NUMBER**

Write the correct candidate number and shade appropriate lozenges which correspond to the numbers above. Every candidate number consists of four characters, e.g., 0101, 0202, 0505, 0742. **DO NOT ENTER MORE THAN 50 CANDIDATES PER CLASS.** If a class has more than 50 candidates, the additional pupils should be grouped into a new class and they should be numbered from 01.

7. (a) **SUBJECTS**

Shade the lozenge against each desired subject.

Four subjects should be entered while the following three are common to all candidates:

ENGLISH
MATHEMATICS
GENERAL PAPER,

Candidate should choose one of Shona, Ndebele **or** Tonga as the fourth subject.

PLEASE NOTE THAT AT GRADE 7, CANDIDATES MUST SIT FOR FOUR SUBJECTS.

3 Application

(1) This Act shall apply to all Government and non-Government schools, and Correspondence and Independent Colleges.

[Subsection substituted by Act 2 of 2006]

(2) The Minister may, at the written request of the responsible authority of any school, and subject to such conditions as he may specify by statutory instrument, exempt such school from all or any provisions of this Act that would otherwise apply to such school, and may, by like notice, vary or revoke such exemption.

PART II

FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS AND OBJECTIVES OF EDUCATION IN ZIMBABWE

4 Children's fundamental right to education in Zimbabwe

(1) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in any other enactment, but subject to this Act, every child in Zimbabwe shall have the right to school education.

(2) Subject to subsection (5), no child in Zimbabwe shall—

(*a*) be refused admission to any school; or

(*b*) be discriminated against by the imposition of onerous terms and conditions in regard to his admission to any school;

on the grounds of his race, tribe, place of origin, national or ethnic origin, political opinions, colour, creed or gender.

[Subsection as substituted by section 15 of Act 19 of 1998]

(3) For the purposes of subsection (2), a term or condition shall be deemed to be onerous if it requires the child upon whom it is imposed or the child's parent—

(*a*) to do anything; or

(*b*) to possess some quality, attribute, asset or property;

which is not required to be done or possessed by children or parents, as the case may be, of a different race, tribe, place of origin, national or ethnic origin, political opinion, colour, creed or gender.

[Subsection inserted by section 15 of Act 19 of 1998]

(4) Any person who contravenes subsection (2) shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a fine not exceeding level six or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding one year or to both such fine and such imprisonment.

[Subsection inserted by section 15 of Act 19 of 1998 and by section 4 of Act 22 of 2001]

(5) It shall be a defence in any criminal proceedings for an offence under subsection (2) for the accused person to show that, though he committed the act alleged against him—

(*a*) he committed the act on the grounds of the creed of the child against whom the act was committed, but he did so because the school concerned is controlled by a bona fide religious organization and members of that religious organization or adherents of a particular religious belief are accorded preference in admission to that school; or

(*b*) he committed the act on the grounds of the gender of the child against whom the act was committed, but—

(i) the act was reasonably justified in view of physiological differences between children of different gender; or

(ii) the act was reasonably necessary in the interests of defence, public safety or public morality; or

(iii) the act was reasonably justified because the school concerned was reserved for the admission of children of one gender and the child against whom the act was committed is of the other gender.

[Subsection inserted by section 15 of Act 19 of 1998]

5 Compulsory education

It is the objective in Zimbabwe that primary education for every child of school-going age shall be compulsory and to this end it shall be the duty of the parents of any such child to ensure that such child attends primary school.

6 Minimum fees for education

It is the objective that tuition in schools in Zimbabwe be provided for the lowest possible fees consistent with the maintenance of high standards of education, and the Minister shall encourage the attainment of this objective by every appropriate means, including the making of grants and other subsidies to schools.

7 General function of Minister

Subject to this Act, the Minister shall promote and enhance the education of the people of Zimbabwe and the progressive development of institutions devoted to that purpose and the Minister shall secure the provision of a varied, comprehensive and constantly developing educational service throughout Zimbabwe.

(4) If the Secretary finds that any teacher referred to in subsection (2) is not qualified under this section to hold the post in question he or she shall write to the responsible authority accordingly and the responsible authority shall, if it has employed the teacher concerned, terminate the employment of that teacher.

[Section substituted by Act 2 of 2006]

60 Discipline of teachers who are not members of Public Service

(1) The Minister shall make regulations governing the conduct and behaviour of all teachers who are not members of the Public Service:

Provided that such regulations shall as nearly as possible be similar in their substantive provisions to the regulations governing the conduct and behaviour of teachers who are members of the Public Service.

(2) Regulations made in terms of subsection (1) may provide for a disciplinary code for teachers, procedures for examining complaints concerning breaches of such code and for the imposition of penalties and the taking of other disciplinary action in respect of such breaches.

(3) The penalties and other disciplinary actions that may be provided for in terms of regulations made in terms of subsection (1) may include monetary penalties and suspension or disqualification from teaching in schools.

(4) Regulations made in terms of subsection (1) shall, in the event of any conflict or inconsistency with—

(*a*) regulations made in terms of the Labour Act [*Chapter 28:01*]; or

(*b*) any contract of employment between the teacher and the school; or

(*c*) any rules or code of conduct in force in the school concerned;

prevail over such regulations, contract, rules or code of conduct.

[Section substituted by Act 2 of 2006]

61 Any teacher may apply to join Public Service

Nothing in this Part contained shall be construed as precluding any teacher, whether referred to in this Part or not, from applying to join the Public Service.

PART XII

GENERAL

62 Languages to be taught in schools

(1) Subject to this section, all the three main languages of Zimbabwe, namely Shona, Ndebele and English, shall be taught on an equal-time basis in all schools up to form two level.

(2) In areas where indigenous languages other than those mentioned in subsection (1) are spoken, the Minister may authorise the teaching of such languages in schools in addition to those specified in subsection (1).

(3) The Minister may authorise the teaching of foreign languages in schools.

(4) Prior to Form one, anyone of the languages referred to in subsection (1) and (2) may be used as the medium of instruction, depending upon which language is more commonly spoken and better understood by the pupils.

(5) Sign language shall be the priority medium of instruction for the deaf and hard of hearing.

[Section substituted by Act 2 of 2006]

63 Curricula and examinations

The Secretary shall determine the curricula and the examination system for all schools and, in so doing, shall not determine different curricula and different examination systems for different schools on the ground that they are Government schools or non-Government schools.

64 Health in schools

(1) The Minister may, after consultation with the Minister responsible for health, make regulations in terms of section *sixty-nine* for the purpose of safeguarding the health of pupils or students attending, any educational institution operated by, or registered with, the Ministry.

(2) Regulations referred to in subsection (1) may provide for—

(*a*) the appointment of Government medical officers or other medical practitioners as school medical officers at Government schools and non-Government schools;

(*b*) the entry and inspection at all reasonable times by a Government medical officer or other medical practitioner authorized by the Minister of any school, residence or hostel or other building or premises whatsoever at any school or any lodging-house catering wholly or mainly for students or pupils attending any school;

(*c*) the closing of schools, residences, hostels or other buildings, premises or lodging-houses referred to in paragraph (*b*) on the grounds of health;

(*d*) the exclusion from any school of a student or pupil—

(i) who is suffering or has recently suffered from a communicable disease or has been in contact with a person suffering from such a disease; or

(2) The freedom referred to in subsection (1) shall include the right not to be compelled to belong to an association.

(3) Nothing contained in or done under the authority of any law shall be held to be in contravention of subsection (1) to the extent that the law in question makes provision—

(*a*) in the interests of defence, public safety, public order, public morality or public health;

(*b*) for the purpose of protecting the rights or freedom of other persons;

(*c*) for the registration of companies, partnerships, societies or other associations of persons, other than political parties, trade unions or employers' organisations; or

(*d*) that imposes restrictions upon public officers;

except so far as that provision or, as the case may be, the thing done under the authority thereof is shown not to be reasonably justifiable in a democratic society.

(4) The provisions of subsection (1) shall not be held to confer on any person a right to exercise his freedom of assembly or association in or on any road, street, lane, path, pavement, side-walk, thoroughfare or similar place which exists for the free passage of persons or vehicles.

22 Protection of freedom of movement

(1) No person shall be deprived of his freedom of movement, that is to say, the right to move freely throughout Zimbabwe, the right to reside in any part of Zimbabwe, the right to enter and to leave Zimbabwe and immunity from expulsion from Zimbabwe.

(2) Any restriction on a person's freedom of movement that is involved in his lawful detention shall not be held to be in contravention of subsection (1).

(3) Nothing contained in or done under the authority of any law shall be held to in contravention of subsection (1) to the extent that the law in question makes provision—

(*a*) for the imposition of restrictions on the freedom of movement of persons generally or any class of persons that are required in the national interest, or in the interests of defence, public safety, public order, public morality, public health, the public interest or the economic interests of the State;

[Paragraph as amended by section 3 of Act 5 of 2005 - Amendment No. 17]

(*b*) for the imposition of restrictions on the acquisition or use of land or other property in Zimbabwe;

(*c*) for the imposition of restrictions by order of a court on the movement or residence within Zimbabwe of any person or on any person's right to leave Zimbabwe—

(i) in consequence of his having been found guilty of a criminal offence under the law of Zimbabwe or for the purpose of ensuring that he appears before a court for trial for such a criminal offence or for proceedings preliminary to trial;

(ii) for proceedings relating to his extradition or lawful removal from Zimbabwe; or

(iii) for the purpose of ensuring that he appears before a court as a witness for the purposes of any criminal proceedings;

(*d*) for—

(i) the imposition of restrictions on the movement or residence within Zimbabwe of any person who is neither a citizen of Zimbabwe nor regarded by virtue of a written law as permanently resident in Zimbabwe; or

(ii) excluding or expelling from Zimbabwe any person who is not a citizen of Zimbabwe;

whether or not he is married or related to another person who is a citizen of or permanently resident in Zimbabwe;

[Paragraph as substituted by section 8(1) of Act No. 14 of 1996 - Amendment No. 14]

(*e*) for the imposition of restrictions by order of a court on the right of any person to leave Zimbabwe that are required for the purpose of ensuring that he appears before a court or other adjudicating authority as a party or a witness or to secure the jurisdiction of the court or other adjudicating authority for the purposes of any civil proceedings; or

(*f*) for the imposition of restrictions on the residence within Communal Land of persons who are not tribespeople to the extent that such restrictions are reasonably required for the protection of the interests of tribespeople or their well-being;

[Paragraph as amended by section 23 of Act 23 of 1987]

except, in the case of any provision referred to in paragraphs (*a*) to (*e*), so far as that provision or, as the case may be, the thing done under the authority thereof is shown not to be reasonably justifiable in a democratic society.

(4) The provisions of subsection (3)(*a*) shall not be construed as authorizing a law to make provision for excluding or expelling from Zimbabwe any person who is a citizen of Zimbabwe.

[Subsection as amended by section 3 of Act 5 of 2005 - Amendment No. 17]

23 Protection from discrimination on the grounds of race, etc.

(1) Subject to the provisions of this section—

(*a*) no law shall make any provision that is discriminatory either of itself or in its effect; and

(*b*) no person shall be treated in a discriminatory manner by any person acting by virtue of any written law or in the performance of the functions of any public office or any public authority.

(2) For the purposes of subsection (1), a law shall be regarded as making a provision that is discriminatory and a person shall be regarded as having been treated in a discriminatory manner if, as a result of that law or treatment, persons of a particular description by race, tribe, place of origin, political opinions, colour, creed, sex, gender, marital status or physical disability are prejudiced—

(*a*) by being subjected to a condition, restriction or disability to which other persons of another such description are not made subject; or

(*b*) by the according to persons of another such description of a privilege or advantage which is not accorded to persons of the first-mentioned description;

and the imposition of that condition, restriction or disability or the according of that privilege or advantage is wholly or mainly attributable to the description by race, tribe, place of origin, political opinions, colour, creed, sex, gender, marital status or physical disability of the persons concerned.

[Subsection as amended by s. 9 of Act No. 14 of 1996 - Amendment No. 14 and by section 4 of Act 5 of 2005 – Amendment No 17]

(3) Nothing contained in any law shall be held to be in contravention of subsection (1)(*a*) to the extent that the law in question relates to any of the following matters—

(*a*) matters of personal law;

[Paragraph as amended by section 3 of Act 5 of 2005 - Amendment No 17

(*b*) the application of African customary law in any case involving Africans or an African and one or more persons who are not Africans where such persons have consented to the application of African customary law in that case;

(*c*) restrictions on entry into or employment in Zimbabwe or on the enjoyment of services provided out of public funds in the case of persons who are neither citizens of Zimbabwe nor regarded by virtue of a written law as permanently resident in Zimbabwe;

(*d*) qualifications, not being qualifications specifically relating to race, tribe, place of origin, political opinions, colour, creed, sex, gender, marital status or physical disability, for service as a public officer or as a member of a disciplined force or for service with any public authority or any body corporate established directly by or under an Act of Parliament for a public purpose;

[Paragraph as amended by section 9 of Act No. 14 of 1996 - Amendment No. 14 and by section 4 of Act 5 of 2005]

(*e*) the appropriation of public revenues or other public funds; or

(*f*) the according to tribespeople to the exclusion of other persons of rights or privileges relating to Communal Land; or

[Paragraph as amended by section 20 of Act 23 of 1987 – Amendment No. 7]

(*g*) the implementation of affirmative action programmes for the protection or advancement of persons or classes of persons who have been previously disadvantaged by unfair discrimination.

[Paragraph inserted by section 4 of Act 5 of 2005 - Amendment No. 17]

(3a) Notwithstanding subsection (3)(*b*), in implementing any programme of land reform the Government shall treat men and women on an equal basis with respect to the allocation or distribution of land or any right or interest therein under that programme.

[Paragraph as inserted by section 4 of Act 5 of 2005 - Amendment No. 17]

(4) The provisions of subsection (1)(*b*) shall not apply to—

(*a*) anything that is expressly or by necessary implication authorized to be done by any provision of a law that is referred to in subsection (3); or

[Paragraph as amended by section 9 of Act No. 14 of 1996 - Amendment No. 14]

(*b*) the exercise of any discretion relating to the institution, conduct or discontinuance of civil or criminal proceedings in any court vested in any person by or under this Constitution or any other law.

(5) Nothing contained in or done under the authority of any law that discriminates between persons on the ground of their sex or gender shall be held to be in contravention of subsection (1)(*a*) or (*b*) to the extent that the law in question—

(*a*) gives effect to section 7(2) or any other provision of this Constitution; or

(*b*) takes due account of physiological differences between persons of different gender; or

(*c*) makes provision in the interests of defence, public safety or public morality;

except in so far as that law or, as the case may be, the thing done under the authority thereof is shown not to be reasonably justifiable in a democratic society.

[Subsection inserted by section 9 of Act No. 14 of 1996 - Amendment No. 14 and as amended by section 4 of Act 5 of 2005 – Amendment No 17]

24 Enforcement of protective provisions

(1) If any person alleges that the Declaration of Rights has been, is being or is likely to be contravened in relation to him (or, in the case of a person who is detained, if any other person alleges such a contravention in relation to the detained person), then, without prejudice to any other action with respect to the same matter which is lawfully

6 Languages

(1) The following languages, namely Chewa, Chibarwe, English, Kalanga, Koisan, Nambya, Ndau, Ndebele, Shangani, Shona, sign language, Sotho, Tonga, Tswana, Venda and Xhosa, are the official languages of Zimbabwe.

(2) An Act of Parliament may prescribe other languages as official languages and may prescribe languages of record.

(3) The State and all institutions and agencies of government at every level must—

(a) ensure that all official languages are treated equitably; and

(b) take into account the language preferences of people affected by governmental measures or communications.

(4) The State must promote and advance the use of all languages used in Zimbabwe, including sign language, and must create conditions for the development of those languages.

2.11 Children

(1) The State must adopt policies and measures to ensure that in matters relating to children the best interests of the children concerned are paramount.

(2) The State must adopt reasonable policies and measures, within the resources available to it, to ensure that children—

(a) enjoy family or parental care, or appropriate alternative care when removed from the family environment;

(b) have shelter and basic nutrition, health care and social services;

(c) are protected from maltreatment, neglect or any form of abuse; and

(d) have access to appropriate education and training.

(3) The State must take appropriate legislative and other measures—

(a) to protect children from exploitative labour practices; and

(b) to ensure that children are not required or permitted to perform work or provide services that—

(i) are inappropriate for the children's age; or

(ii) place at risk the children's well-being, education, physical or mental health or spiritual, moral or social development.

2.19 Education

(1) The State must take all practical measures to promote free and compulsory basic education for children.

(2) The State must take measures to ensure that girls are afforded the same opportunities as boys to obtain education at all levels.

4.13 Equality and non-discrimination

(1) Every person is equal before the law and has the right to equal protection and benefit of the law.

(2) Women and men have the right to equal treatment, including the right to equal opportunities in political, economic, cultural and social spheres.

(3) Every person has the right not to be treated in an unfairly discriminatory manner on such grounds as their nationality, race, colour, tribe, place of birth, ethnic or social origin, language, class, religious belief, political affiliation, opinion, custom, culture, sex, gender, marital status, age, disability or economic or social status, or whether born in or out of wedlock.

(4) A person is treated in a discriminatory manner for the purpose of subsection (3) if—

(a) they are subjected directly or indirectly to a condition, restriction or disability to which other people are not subjected; or

(b) other people are accorded directly or indirectly a privilege or advantage which they are not accorded.

(5) Discrimination on any of the grounds listed in subsection (3) is unfair unless it is established that the discrimination is fair, reasonable and justifiable in an open, just and democratic society based on human dignity, equality and freedom.

(6) The State must take reasonable legislative and other measures to promote the achievement of equality and to protect or advance people or classes of people who have been disadvantaged by unfair discrimination, and—

(a) such measures must be taken to redress circumstances of genuine need;

(b) no such measure is to be regarded as unfair for the purposes of subsection (3).

4.20 Language and culture

Every person has the right—

(a) to use the language of their choice; and

(b) to participate in the cultural life of their choice;

but no person exercising these rights may do so in a way that is inconsistent with this Chapter.

4.32 Right to education

(1) Every citizen and permanent resident of Zimbabwe has a right to—

(a) a basic State-funded education, including adult basic education; and

(b) further education, which the State, through reasonable legislative and other measures, must make progressively available and accessible.

(2) Every person has the right to establish and maintain, at their own expense, independent educational institutions of reasonable standards, provided they do not discriminate on any ground prohibited by this Constitution.

(3) A law may provide for the registration of educational institutions referred to in subsection (2) and for the closing of any such institutions that do not meet reasonable standards prescribed for registration.

(4) The State must take reasonable legislative and other measures, within its available resources, to achieve the progressive realisation of the right set out in subsection (1).

4.38 Rights of children

(1) Every child, that is to say every boy and girl under the age of eighteen years, has the right—

(a) to equal treatment before the law, including the right to be heard;

(b) to be given a name and family name;

(c) in the case of a child who is—

(i) born in Zimbabwe; or

(ii) born outside Zimbabwe and is a citizen of Zimbabwe by descent;

to the prompt provision of a birth certificate;

(d) to family or parental care, or to appropriate alternative care when removed from the family environment;

(e) to be protected from economic and sexual exploitation, from child labour, and from maltreatment, neglect or any form of abuse;

(f) to education, health care services, nutrition and shelter;

(g) not to be recruited into a militia force or take part in armed conflict or hostilities;

(h) not to be compelled to take part in any political activity; and

(i) not to be detained except as a measure of last resort and, if detained—

(i) to be detained for the shortest appropriate period;

(ii) to be kept separately from detained persons over the age of eighteen years; and

(iii) to be treated in a manner, and kept in conditions, that take account of the child's age.

(2) A child's best interests are paramount in every matter concerning the child.

(3) Children are entitled to adequate protection by the courts, in particular by the High Court as their upper guardian.

2.12 Youth

All State and all institutions and agencies of government at every level must take reasonable measures, including affirmative action programmes, to ensure that the youth, that is to say people between the ages of fifteen and thirty-five years—

(a) have access to appropriate education and training;

(b) have opportunities to associate and to be represented and participate in political, social, economic and other spheres of life;

(c) are afforded opportunities for employment and other avenues to economic empowerment;

(d) have opportunities for recreational activities and access to recreational facilities; and

(e) are protected from harmful cultural practices, exploitation and all forms of abuse.

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, SPORT, ARTS AND CULTURE

ZIMBABWE

RE: RESPONSE TO THE BINGA CHIEFS' CONCERN ON THE TEACHING OF LANGUAGES

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The importance of language in communication cannot be over emphasised. Language is the vehicle for transmission of a people's culture and has a unifying role in any nation. Culture itself is a tool for uniting the country's people and achieving development through it should be maximised.

2.0 PROVISION OF THE LAW ON LANGUAGES

As many of you may be aware, the Education Act, 2006, as amended provides policy guidelines on the languages to be taught in schools. It should be appreciated that all the three main languages of Zimbabwe, namely ChiShona, IsiNdebele and English should be taught on an equal time basis in all schools up to Form 2 level. At Form 3 level, learners begin to choose subjects based on their ability, interest, aptitudes, possible specialisation and career choice. It should also be appreciated that the teaching of local indigenous languages, other than ChiShona, IsiNdebele and English, is authorised in areas where these are spoken.

To that extent, it is now possible for communities to have their children learn their local indigenous languages which include the following in our schools:-

a) Chikorekore
b) Chimanyika
c) Kalanga
d) Karanga
e) Nambya
f) Ndau
g) Shangani
h) Sotho
i) Venda
j) Zezuru.

In this regard, all schools in Zimbabwe are expected, in line with the National Vision, to teach, first and foremost, the three main languages. The vision states that **"Zimbabwe shall emerge as a United, Strong, Democratic, Prosperous and Egalitarian Nation with a High Quality of life for all Zimbabweans by the year 2020"**. The schools then are at liberty to teach any one of the above cited local languages which, prior to Form 1 may be used as the medium of instruction depending on which language is more commonly spoken and better understood by the learners.

Schools may also teach foreign languages such as French, Portuguese and Afrikaans. The Act also provides for sign language as the priority medium of instruction for the deaf and hard of hearing.

It is important that we take note that in an effort to unite Zimbabweans through languages and realising that the Korekore learners, for example, should be at home in all parts of Zimbabwe, Government has provided that, just as our parliamentarians may speak in the August House in any of the 3 main languages, learners in the Mashonaland areas, should learn and speak English. Conversational IsiNdebele and ChiShona. Similarly, learners in the Matabeleland areas are expected to learn and speak English, IsiNdebele and Conversational ChiShona. It is expected that this will result in the much needed unity as all our people will better understand each other.

3.0 EXAMINATION OF LOCAL LANGUAGES

I am pleased that after about ten years of curriculum development the nation will see the first of the local indigenous languages, Tonga, being examined at the end of this year. Plans are at an advanced stage to do the same for other local languages. However, it must be emphasised that these local languages do not supplant the three main languages of Zimbabwe. Learners will learn and be examined in English, ChiShona or IsiNdebele in addition to the local languages which they might choose to do.

4.0 CONCLUSION

I am pleased that after about ten years of curriculum development the I hope this exaplanation has clarified the policy and position of Government with regard to the teaching and learning of languages in this country.

3.3 The establishment and provision of training facilities for the arts. To this end, schools, tertiary institutions and organisations which provide cultural training will be supported by Government.

3.4 The provision and establishment of a library system such that every Zimbabwean will have access to a library. This will include the establishment of libraries in every school and community as part of the National Library and Documentation Services programme.

3.5 The promotion of suitable cultural programmes for radio, television and newspapers by providing funds for such efforts.

3.6 The development and promotion of African Languages such that business, science and technology as well as history and literature will be accessible to Zimbabweans in the national languages. To this end research and other activities in the development of relevant terminologies will be funded and promoted in order to meet the demand of national languages in an industrial society.

3.7 The promotion and integration of culture with education through curricula and extra curricula cultural programmes. Particular emphasis will be paid to the important role played by culture in all aspects of national activity including agriculture, industry, science and technology, social relations and values.

4.3 Government will endeavour to ensure that the findings of such research will be widely disseminated as a way of creating a broader national culture, drawing together the strands of all Zimbabwe's cultural traditions and multi-cultural experience and development.

4.4 Priority will be placed on the establishment of facilities that store and exhibit national heritage, its restoration and its use to promote the cultural identity of the people of Zimbabwe, and their history.

5. TRAINING

The provision of training for all aspects of culture is fundamental. Government will identify training needs, establish and fund training programmes.

6. ZIMBABWEAN LANGUAGES

Indigenous languages constitute a rich linguistic and literacy heritage for all Zimbabweans and should provide fertile ground for enhancing national understanding and national unity. Research will be carried out in indigenous languages so that dictionaries, orthographies, textbooks, literary works as well as scientific and technological works are available in these languages. Priority will be given to those projects which enable these languages to be developed to a stage where they can be utilised at the highest educational levels.

7. PUBLISHING INDUSTRY

The publishing industry has a key role to play in the development and promotion of culture, and will be assisted to become an efficient institution for intellectual, scientific and cultural progress of the nation. Government will, in partnership with local publishers, promote local literary and scientific publications including those in indigenous languages.

8. THE CULTURE INDUSTRIES

The manufacture and marketing of radios, televisions, record players, cassettes, compact discs, music instruments, music equipment, etc. are critical to the development and popularization of culture. Government will endeavour to upgrade the status of the cultural industries in order to promote more investments and the production of high quality cultural products and implements for cultural development. Constant review will be made on policies and legislations pertaining to import and export of cultural products or implements necessary for cultural production.

8.1 Print Media

Both the State sponsored and privately owned mass media have key roles to play in the development and promotion of a national culture. It is therefore incumbent on the mass media to assume its responsibilities through active participation in the cultural process, in particular in promoting Zimbabwe's

12. DANCE

The Government will create an environment for the development of traditional dances to a high level of professionalism, and ensure that all Zimbabweans are able to enjoy this rich heritage either as practitioners or as audience, by offering dance groups facilities and opportunities for regular performances. International forms of dance such as ballet, will also be promoted through public and private cultural institutions.

13. LITERATURE

The Government will promote activities in the research, preservation and promotion of traditional literature. At the same time modern literature in English and Zimbabwean languages in all its forms will be promoted and developed through the funding of training, fellowships, competitions, publications and dissemination.

14. FINE ARTS

Antiques and crafts will be preserved and protected from destruction, theft or illegal exportation. Research work will be promoted in the restitution of cultural properties, and the findings popularised through the National Art Gallery, other galleries, museums, film and television outlets. Artists will be supported through the provision of funds for training, fellowships, exhibitions and publications.

POSITION PAPER ON ZIMBABWE'S LANGUAGE POLICY

1. Introduction

1.1. From the 25th to 29th November, 1996, Zimbabwe will host an Intergovernmental Conference on Language Policies in Africa which is expected to highlight the "use of African Languages as the best way of ensuring active participation of the African populations in the activities of national life and in particular, in the planning and management of development projects". It is expected that this conference will take stock of the current situation concerning the use and status of African languages, as well as examine and adopt a document to serve as a reference framework for the political and technical management of a language policy.

1.2 The Zimbabwe National Commission for UNESCO has set up a Technical Committee comprising of government officials and language experts, as a Task Force to prepare the Zimbabwean delegation and documents as well as to consider all the technical aspects of the conference itself. The Technical Committee has tasked a team led by language experts at the University of Zimbabwe to produce a document dealing mainly with the facts on the Zimbabwean Linguistic Situation. The document will be used as a reference by the Zimbabwean delegation in discussing the conference's critical evaluation of linguistic policies and practices in member States.

3. Comprehensive National Language Policy

3.1 From the analysis of the content of the Zimbabwe National Cultural Policy in terms of language issues, it is quite evident that there does not exist in Zimbabwe a documented comprehensive national language policy that would have done the following :

a) clearly define the status of all the languages in use in Zimbabwe;
b) define short, medium an long term goals in respect to the development, promotion and use of languages in Zimbabwe;
c) determine the methods and resources to be used in achieving the stated goals as well as targets and problems to be solved.

There is no doubt however, that the paper on the Zimbabwe's language situation (Facts on the Zimbabwean Linguistic Situation) will reveal the existence of clearly defined language policies and practices influenced by various pieces of legislation and decision of various media agencies such as the Zimbabwean Broadcasting Corporation and the Zimbabwe Newspapers and those of institutions of learning at various levels. The most significant of the dominant language practices are those concerning the status of English as an official language and how that translates into its use in education; in parliamentary debate; and in the writing and promulgation of laws; and public administration. Equally significant is the status of Shona and Ndebele as national languages in the above-mentioned areas and in particular in the media. The use of Shona and Ndebele in business, in such aspects as commercial advertisements; administrative posters; labelling of

ABSTRACT

In January 2002, the government of Zimbabwe officially declared six official minority languages, namely, Kalanga, Nambya, Shangani, Sotho, Tonga and Venda as languages of instruction and subjects in primary schools in the areas where they are spoken as mother tongues. The government had planned for these languages to be introduced to a grade per year until they could be taught at grade 7 level by 2005 (*Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002*). Three of these languages (Venda, Tonga and Kalanga) under the auspices of the Venda, Tonga and Kalanga Association (VETOKA) were pioneers in advocating and lobbying for the introduction of marginalised local languages in education in the early 1980s.

However, Kalanga and Venda have remained behind, despite having been the pioneers of this initiative. Long after 2005, only Tonga emerged as the first language to be examined in grade 7 in 2011. In current studies in language planning, policy and management, there have been strong suggestions that bottom-up approaches may be more successful than top-down approaches. Bottom-up approaches are said to be the most promising in terms of community commitment and sustainability (Alexander, 1992; Baldauf, 1994; 2005; 2008; Kaplan and Baldauf, 1997; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Mwaniki, 2004; 2010b; Benson, 2005; Trudell, 2006; Lewis and Trudell, 2008; Liddicoat and Baldauf, 2008; Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008; Hatoss, 2008). The delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development and success story of Tonga raises the questions: "Why this delay? Why was Tonga first?"

This study therefore examines the possible causes for the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development and the conditions and factors that led to the success story of Tonga. It is expected that an understanding of these causes could help explain the delay in the implementation of the other three languages and similar initiatives elsewhere. It is also hoped that this study will enhance our understanding of the dynamics of bottom-up approaches to language planning. In evaluating and examining the implementation of the 2002 policy development and conditions and factors that led to the success story of Tonga, I

adopted the Language Management Approach (LMA) proposed by Mwaniki (2004). The LMA is used alongside Kaplan & Baldauf's (1997; 2003) seven areas of policy development for language-in-education policy implementation; the ethnolinguistic vitality model advanced by Giles, Bourhis & Taylor (1977) as well as Webb's (2010) factors and conditions that determine the success and failure of bottom-up and top-down policies.

These three frameworks interrelate and overlap with one another, and also with some of the language management variables, methodologies and strategies. It emerged that the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development was due to the failure to secure and deploy the language management variables, methodologies and strategies at an optimal level. The failure to timeously develop the seven areas of policy development for language-in-education policy implementation also accounts for the delay.

On the one hand, the Tonga group owes its success to the deployment of some of the language management variables, methodologies and strategies and the development of some of the seven areas of policy development for language-in-education policy implementation. The ethnolinguistic vitality of the three language groups in question and the conditions and factors that determine the success or failure of bottom-up and top-down policies also contributed to the delay in the implementation of the 2002 policy development. The success story of Tonga is as a result of the Tonga group's ethnolinguistic vitality and some of the conditions and factors that determine the success and failure of bottom-up and top-down policies.

KEY TERMS

Language-in-education policy, language-in-education planning, language policy, language planning, language management, language management approach, mother tongue education, mother tongue based multilingual education, bottom-up approaches, top-down approaches.

OPSOMMING

Die Zimbabwiese regering het in Januarie 2002 amptelik ses minderheidstale, naamlik Kalanga, Nambya, Shangani, Sotho, Tonga en Venda, verklaar as onderrigtale en vakke in laerskole en gebiede waar hulle as moedertale gebesig word. Die regering was van plan om hierdie tale teen een graad per jaar in te faseer sodat hulle teen 2005 (*Secretary's Circular Number 1 of 2002*) tot op Graad 7-vlak onderrig kon word. Drie van hierdie tale (Venda, Tonga en Kalanga) was onder beskerming van die Venda, Tonga and Kalanga Association (VETOKA) baanbrekers wat aan die begin van die 1980's vir die ingebruikneming van gemarginaliseerde plaaslike tale in onderrig voorspraak gemaak en invloed gewerf het.

Kalanga en Venda het egter agterweë gebly ten spyte van die feit dat hulle die baanbrekers vir hierdie inisiatief was. Lank na 2005 het slegs Tonga na vore getree as die eerste taal waarin eksamens in 2011 in Graad 7 afgelê is. In huidige studies in taalbeplanning, -beleid en -bestuur is daar grondige aanduidings dat opwaartse benaderings dalk suksesvoller as afwaartse benaderings is. Opwaartse benaderings word as meer belowend beskou wat samelewingsbetrokkenheid en volhoubaarheid betref (Alexander, 1992; Baldauf, 1994; 2005; 2008; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Webb, 2002; 2009; 2010; Mwaniki, 2004; 2010b; Benson, 2005; Trudell, 2006; Lewis & Trudell, 2008; Liddicoat & Baldauf, 2008; Baldauf, Li & Zhao, 2008; Hatoss, 2008). Die vertraging in die implementering van 2002 se beleidsontwikkeling en Tonga se suksesverhaal opper die vrae: "Waarom hierdie vertraging? Waarom was Tonga eerste?"

Hierdie studie ondersoek daarom die moontlike oorsake vir die vertraging in die implementering van 2002 se beleidsontwikkeling en die omstandighede en faktore wat tot die Tonga-suksesverhaal bygedra het. Die verwagting is dat insig in hierdie oorsake die vertraging in die implementering van die drie ander tale en soortgelyke inisiatiewe elders kan help verduidelik. Die hoop word ook uitgespreek dat hierdie studie insig in die opwaartse benaderingsdinamika in taalbeplanning sal versterk. Ten einde die implementering van 2002 se beleidsontwikkeling en omstandighede, asook faktore wat tot die Tonga-suksesverhaal bygedra het, te beoordeel en te bestudeer, het ek die Taalbestuursbenadering soos voorgestel deur Mwaniki (2004), gebruik. Die Taalbestuursbenadering word saam met Kaplan en Baldauf (1997; 2003) se sewe areas van beleidsontwikkeling vir taal-in-onderrig beleidsimplementering gebruik. Die etnolinguistiese lewensvatbaarheidsmodel, soos voorgestel deur Giles, Bourhis en Taylor (1977), asook Webb (2010) se faktore en omstandighede wat die sukses en mislukking van opwaartse – en afwaartse beleide bepaal, word ook gebruik.

Hierdie drie raamwerke staan in verband met mekaar en oorvleuel, ook met van die ander taalbestuurveranderlikes, metodologieë en strategieë. Dit het aan die lig gekom dat die vertraging in die implementering van 2002 se beleidsontwikkeling te wyte is aan die feit dat die taalbestuurveranderlikes, metodologieë en strategieë nie optimaal vasgelê en ontplooi is nie. Die sewe areas van beleidsontwikkeling vir beleidsimplementering in taal-in-onderrig, wat nie betyds geïmplementeer is nie, het ook tot die vertraging bygedra.

Aan die een kant is die Tonga-groep se sukses te danke aan die ontplooiing van sommige taalbestuurveranderlikes, metodologieë en strategieë asook etlike van die sewe areas van beleidsontwikkeling vir beleidsimplementering in taal-in-onderrig. Die etnolinguistiese lewensvatbaarheid van die drie taalgroepe wat ter sprake is en die omstandighede en faktore wat die sukses en mislukking van opwaartse en afwaartse beleid het ook tot die vertraging in die implementering van 2002 se beleidsontwikkeling bygedra. Die Tonga-suksesverhaal kan toegeskryf word aan die

Tonga-groep se etnolinguistiese lewensvatbaarheid en ’n aantal omstandighede en faktore wat die sukses en mislukking van opwaartse en afwaartse beleid bepaal.

SLEUTELWOORDE

taal-in-onderrig-beleid, taal-in-onderrig-beplanning, taalbeleid, taalbeplanning, taalbestuur, taalbestuurbenadering, moedertaalonderrig, moedertaal-gebaseerde veeltalige onderrig, opwaartse benaderings, afwaartse benaderings